1523	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 : Washington, D.C.	BRIAN PALMER By Mr. Gingold 1639
V. : Tuesday, June 24, 2008 : DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary : of the Interior, et al. :	By Mr. Warshawsky 1536
: Defendants : AFTERNOON SESSION	
TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING	EXHIBITS
DAY 9 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON	NUMBER ADMITTED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
For the Plaintiffs: DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQUIRE LAW OFFICES OF DENNIS GINGOLD 607 14th Street, NW Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20005 (202) 824-1448	(No Exhibits Moved into Evidence.)
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 HAPPER, 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@veriz</u>
1524 For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE	1
JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE	1 PROCEEDINGS
J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE	2 THE COURT: Mr. Gingold?
GLENN GILLETT, ESQUIRE U.S. Department of Justice	3 MR. GINGOLD: Good afternoon. Thank you.
1100 L Street, N.W.	4 BY MR. GINGOLD:
Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010	13:47:18 5 Q. Just a couple of items to clean up before we move on. If we
	6 can bring up Plaintiffs' 189-C, please. And if we can focus on
JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney	7 the 1988 row, with particular attention to the last four
U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch	8 columns.
Civil Division	9 Do you recall me asking you questions as to why there
Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975	13:47:49 10 are blank spaces under disbursement rate, AR-171 disbursement
Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104	11 rate, percentage of receipts, and disbursement adjustment ratio,
	12 percent of actual disbursements?
For the Osage Nation: MERRILL GODFREY, ESQUIRE AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, LLP	13 A. Yes, I do.
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, NW	14 Q. Do you recall what your answer was?
Washington, D.C. 20036-1564 (202)887-4000	13:48:05 15 A. Yes, I do. I do know.
Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET	16 Q. During the break did you refresh your recollection?
Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse	17 A. I did.
333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.	18 Q. Okay. What is the answer to that question?
Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249	19 A. What happens is the CP&R data is on a calendar year basis
	13:48:19 20 and because it's on a calendar year basis, the EFT information
	21 we had and available we calculated on a calendar year basis.
Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	
Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.	22 And so the CP&R and EFT disbursements, the total funds that w
	22 And so the CP&R and EFT disbursements, the total funds that v23 out, are calculated on a calendar basis. The revenues during

Page 1523 to 1526 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1527		1529
1	So what we did is to take a standard convention to	1	there were additional information that would be brought forward,
2	convert calendar year to fiscal year, by taking essentially	2	if there was a full accounting, for example, then we wouldn't
3	9/12ths of one year plus 3/12ths of the previous year, to create	3	have to estimate.
4	an average for the fiscal year. So what happens when you do	4	So we used whatever information were available to us,
13:49:01 5	that, and you have to look back for 1987, for which there was	13:52:37 5	was available to us, so this number is based upon the available
6	not complete information in the CP&R, we didn't have what the	6	information.
7	disbursements would have been for 1988, so therefore a	7	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
8	disbursement rate was not calculated for that year.	8	identification Exhibit 192. This is identified as Attachment A,
9	MR. GINGOLD: In that regard, Antonio, could you put on	9	specific relief analysis.
13:49:21 10	the screen DX-272? If we can go to page 18 of DX-272, please.	13:53:14 10	BY MR. GINGOLD:
11	And if we can focus in on the top of the page.	11	Q. Did you prepare this document?
12	BY MR. GINGOLD:	12	A. Yes. It was prepared under my supervision.
13	Q. There's a statement on the top of this page above the	13	Q. Why did you prepare the document?
14	columns for year, records, and account. Do you see that,	14	A. Plaintiffs had indicated that they had a specific relief
13:49:49 15	Dr. Palmer?	13:53:28 15	alternative analysis, and had asked me to quantify that using a
16	A. I do. And it says it's by calendar year. I will also note	16.00.20 16	different interest rate number.
17	that there's some information here for 1987, but elsewhere in	17	So all of the columns in this Attachment A are
18	this document it explains that the information from 1987 is	18	identical except for the interest rate that's being used.
19	incomplete, it's only partial year information.	19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, at this point the
13:50:06 20	So therefore, by taking a fraction of that, it would be	13:53:47 20	government is going to object to this line of questioning. This
21	an incomplete number, so we weren't able to use the 1987	^{13.55.47} 20	
22	information either.	21	is with regard to a new claim, it's not rebuttal to anything
23	Q. Thank you, Dr. Palmer.	23	that was in the case-in-chief, certainly was not presented in
24		23	the plaintiffs' case-in-chief. It's essentially a damages
13:50:26 25	MR. GINGOLD: If we can put PX-189A back up on the	13:54:05 25	claim, and we can certainly argue about that, but fundamentally
13:50:26	screen, please, and if we can go to the fourth page. If we can Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	13:54:05	it's not proper rebuttal. Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
1	1528	1	1530
2	focus in on the benefit conferred total towards the bottom of	2	THE COURT: Well, I don't understand what it is yet, so
3	the page.	3	I want to hear what it is, Mr. Warshawsky. Objection overruled.
3		3	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.
	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recall me asking you a question as to	-	BY MR. GINGOLD:
13:51:10 5			
6	whether or not this benefit conferred total is higher or lower	13:54:18 5	Q. Dr. Palmer, did you modify your model to perform the
6	than the previous total that the CRA model produced?	6	specific relief analysis?
7	than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior	6 7	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data
7 8	than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break	6 7 8	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But
7 8 9	than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and	6 7 8 9	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical.
7 8 9 13:51:31 10	than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H?
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11	than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower.	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two.
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 12 13	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended?
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 13 14	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 14 13:51:48 15	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:55:03 15 16	specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended.
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended.
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process?
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20 21	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? A. Based upon the available information to us, that this is, I 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20 21	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about it. If there were different rates being used for different
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20 21 22	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? A. Based upon the available information to us, that this is, I believe, a reasonable calculation, again, conditional upon that 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20 21 22	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about it. If there were different rates being used for different assets within a portfolio, you could say the rate for the entire
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20 21 22 23	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? A. Based upon the available information to us, that this is, I believe, a reasonable calculation, again, conditional upon that information. 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20 21 22 23	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about it. If there were different rates being used for different assets within a portfolio, you could say the rate for the entire portfolio. So it's a standard convention to get an average.
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20 21 22 23 24	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? A. Based upon the available information to us, that this is, I believe, a reasonable calculation, again, conditional upon that information. Q. What is conditional upon that information? 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20 21 22 23 24	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about it. If there were different rates being used for different assets within a portfolio, you could say the rate for the entire portfolio. So it's a standard convention to get an average. Q. You said statutory. What were you referring to when you
7 8 9 13:51:31 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:51:48 15 16 17 18 19 13:52:08 20 21 22 23	 than the previous total that the CRA model produced? A. I believe the question you asked me was what the prior number was, and I couldn't recall. I did look during the break at a document, which was an amount from the previous model, and it was about \$10 billion higher. So this number is about \$10 billion lower. Q. Dr. Palmer, you testified that you relied on information provided during this trial. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You also testified that you made modifications in the data based on what you heard in this courtroom. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do you believe that your benefit conferred totals are a reasonable approximation of what the benefit conferred has been on the government? A. Based upon the available information to us, that this is, I believe, a reasonable calculation, again, conditional upon that information. 	6 7 8 9 13:54:35 10 11 12 13 14 13:55:03 15 16 17 18 19 13:55:18 20 21 22 23	 specific relief analysis? A. As I indicated, the model is the same, all of the input data are the same except for the rate that is used in Column H. But everything else is identical. Q. What rate did you use in Column H? A. Column H is a blended rate that is based upon a statutory rate and a bank rate. So it's blended between the two. THE COURT: Blended? THE WITNESS: It's a weighted average, that there's a sum in a bank and then there is a statutory amount, and it's a weighted average of those two, so it's blended. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is blending rates a conventional process? A. Well, an alternate way to think about it is an average rate for a portfolio would be another similar way of thinking about it. If there were different rates being used for different assets within a portfolio, you could say the rate for the entire portfolio. So it's a standard convention to get an average.

	1531		1533
1	A. Plaintiffs had provided to me again some statutes that	1	and before, but not after 1994.
2	indicated that there were certain rates that were required to be	2	Q. And specifically the statute reads: "The Secretary shall
3	paid on funds.	3	make payments to an individual Indian in full satisfaction of
4	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for	4	any claim of such individual for interest on amounts deposited
13:55:52 5	identification Exhibit 184.	13:58:52 5	or invested on behalf of such individual before October 25,
6	BY MR. GINGOLD:	6	1994, retroactive to the date the Secretary began investing
7	Q. This is Title 31, U.S.C. 9702, Investment of Trust Funds.	7	Individual Indian Monies on a regular basis, to the extent the
8	Have you seen this before?	8	claim is identified."
9	A. Yes.	9	Did you apply a rate other than the five percent rate
13:56:13 10	Q. And is this one of the statutes that plaintiffs' counsel	13:59:11 10	to the funds deposited before October 25, 1994?
11	provided to you in your preparation of the interest rates?	11	A. To funds that we identified that were held in banks, we
12	A. That is correct.	12	applied a bank rate to those monies. We used the information
13	Q. And it states as follows: "Except as required by a treaty	13	provided by Dr. Kehoe in his testimony to come up with an
14	of the United States, amounts held in Trust by the United States	14	estimate of funds in banks versus funds held that were not in
13:56:30 15	government, including annual interest earned on the amounts,	13:59:35 15	banks.
16	one, shall be invested in government obligations, and two, shall	16	Q. What rate did you apply for funds deposited or invested
17	earn interest at an annual rate of at least five percent."	17	after October 25, 1994?
18	Did you use that five percent floor factor in your	18	A. Well, we used when available there were funds that were
19	calculations at all?	19	invested that we had a rate from the BIA, and we used that rate
13:56:50 20	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, again we'll object. This	13:59:53 20	for those funds. And then we had a bank rate for the bank.
21	is not a benefits analysis anymore. Now he's talking about	21	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
22	interest that should have been earned based on a statute.	22	identification Exhibit 185. This is 25 U.S.C. Section 161(a).
23	THE COURT: Easier for me to listen to it than to	23	And the headnote reads: "Tribal funds in trust in Treasury
24	sustain the objection, counsel. Overruled.	24	Department; investment by Secretary of the Treasury; maturities;
13:57:05 25	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.	14:00:27 25	interest; funds held in trust for individual Indians."
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1532		1534
1	A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor.	1	1534 BY MR. GINGOLD:
-	A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor.	-	BY MR. GINGOLD:
1 2 3	A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD:	1 2 3	BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B.
2	A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor.BY MR. GINGOLD:Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard?	2	BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before?
2 3 4	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. 	2 3 4	BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have.
2 3 4 13:57:17 5	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were 	2	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for
2 3 4	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, 	2 3 4 14:00:36	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994?
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had.
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court?
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13:57:54 15	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. We II, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:57:54 15 16	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks; it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:01:34 15 16	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead.
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17 18 19 13:58:12 20	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis?
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17 18 17 18 19 13:58:12 20 21	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first paragraph, please. 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20 21	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. We lay had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis? A. On average these I don't remember specifically year by
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17 18 19 13:58:12 20	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for indentification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first paragraph, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis? A. On average these I don't remember specifically year by year, but these rates are higher because the bottom line is
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 57:54 15 16 17 18 19 13:58:12 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first paragraph, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is this another statute that plaintiffs' counsel provided to 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20 21 22	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis? A. On average these I don't remember specifically year by year, but these rates are higher because the bottom line is higher.
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 13 14 13:57:54 15 16 17 18 19 13:58:12 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first paragraph, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is this another statute that plaintiffs' counsel provided to you in your calculations? 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20 21 22 23 24	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis? A. On average these I don't remember specifically year by year, but these rates are higher because the bottom line is higher. Q. For funds that were held in banks up until 1933, what rate
2 3 4 13:57:17 5 6 7 8 9 13:57:36 10 11 12 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 57:54 15 16 17 18 19 13:58:12 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes, I did use this five percent floor. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And how did you employ the five percent standard? A. What I did is to look at monies that were held by the U.S. government, so I took the total trust amount, those that were held by the U.S. government, applied a floor of five percent, and those that were held in banks, applied a bank rate, and then the fraction that was in each created a weighted average between the two, to get the blended rate that's presented in Attachment A. Q. You did not use did you just testify you did not use a blended rate for funds held in banks? A. The funds held in banks, it was also somewhat of a blended rate because some were held in time deposits, some were held in checking accounts, and so that also was a blended rate to adjust for the fact that there were different instruments being used. Q. Did you employ a five percent floor in that analysis? A. Not in the banks, no. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 186. If we can focus on the first paragraph, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Is this another statute that plaintiffs' counsel provided to 	2 3 4 14:00:36 5 6 7 8 9 14:01:00 10 11 12 13 14 14:01:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:01:58 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I would like you to turn your attention to paragraph B. Have you seen this paragraph before? A. Yes, I believe I have. Q. Is this what you relied on to calculate the interest for funds deposited after October 25, 1994? A. We used when available we used the rate that was provided to us that was the BIA rate. We had that defendants provided that, I believe. It was an exhibit we had. Q. Now let's go back to Plaintiffs' 192. Let's deal with the interest rate itself and how you applied it. Can you please explain that to the Court? A. Well, this is applied in the same manner, this is the same model as we had before that we had discussed earlier today in Attachment A. We are now using the blended rate instead of the 10-year bond rate. So before the calculation was benefit to the government, and this is now looking at the same nominal dollars but now using the statutory rate instead. Q. Do you recall whether these rates are higher or lower than the rates identified in the benefit conferred analysis? A. On average these I don't remember specifically year by year, but these rates are higher because the bottom line is higher.

Page 1531 to 1534 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdfactory.com

	1535		1537
1	A. There again, it was a bank rate that we had estimated.	1	Q. And was that before, after, or about the same time that
2	Q. And for funds held in Treasury after 1933, what rate did you	2	Professor Cornell was engaged?
3	apply?	3	A. Professor Cornell was engaged at the same time. The firm
4	A. After 1933, there was the five percent floor, and then up to	4	CRA was engaged, so it would have been the same time.
14:02:41 5	1994 and after that we had used, as we discussed earlier, the	14:06:06 5	Q. Is it fair to say that you've been working on this project
6	BIA rate, when available.	6	with Professor Cornell all that time since the engagement?
7	MR. GINGOLD: If we can go to page four of	7	A. I was involved with the initial discussions, I was involved
8	Plaintiffs' 192.	8	in other matters in the interim. So I haven't been full-time on
9	BY MR. GINGOLD:	9	this in all the time, but I have been involved since its
14:03:03 10	Q. There's a column on the far right, it's Column J, headed	14:06:24 10	inception.
11	"Accumulated Dollars, End of Year." And there is no number in	11	Q. When did you become back involved on a full-time basis?
12	the total there, is there?	12	A. As we were preparing for trial, I became involved back on a
13	A. No. Again, this is similar to Attachment A. The only	13	full-time basis.
14	difference of this entire attachment are just the interest rates	14	Q. And approximately when was that?
14:03:21 15	that are used in Column H, so the calculations will be different	14:06:38 15	A. About the time we started finishing the Attachment A, we
16	but the calculated numbers will be different, the	16	started working on the finalization of Attachment A. We had
17	calculations are the same. And therefore the bottom line here	17	done it earlier, worked on that, and then as we were doing some
18	is 62 billion, and hence my deduction that these rates are on	18	more work on that, so I would imagine it would have been
19	average higher than the 10-year bond rate.	19	sometime in May, probably.
14:03:40 20	Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of your	14:06:56 20	Q. When you're talking about finalizing Attachment A, are you
21	understanding of the statutory obligation to pay interest to the	21	talking about the version that was filed with the plaintiffs'
22	Trust beneficiaries?	22	brief in March, or are you talking about the version that was
23	A. The blended rate and the theory behind what the statutory ${f A}$	23	presented by Professor Cornell?
24	obligation was was provided to me by counsel. I just applied a	24	A. I was involved in the version that was presented in March,
14:03:58 25	quantification of that, and this is the result of that	14:07:13 25	and then as I mentioned finalizing, it was the version that was
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1536		1538
1	1536 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had	1	1538 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the
2		2	
-	quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had		presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from
2 3 4	quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before.	2 3 4	presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5	quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before.Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute?	2 3 4 14:07:28 5	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6	quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before.Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6	presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right?
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7	quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before.Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute?	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct?
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system?
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. ECOSS-EXAMINATION EY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12 13	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12 13 14	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. DROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system?
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. ECOSS-EXAMINATION EY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case?
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. DROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:42 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. DCOSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? A. Okay. 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20 21	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. DEY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay: Q. Dr. Palmer, when were you first hired to work on the Cobell 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20 21	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were looking for potentially multiple experts. So I was aware that
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20 21 22	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. MST WARSHAWSKY! Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? A. Okay. Q. Dr. Palmer, when were you first hired to work on the Cobell case? 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:22 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20 21 22	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were looking for potentially multiple experts. So I was aware that there may be a possibility.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20 21 22 23	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? A. Okay. Q. Dr. Palmer, when were you first hired to work on the Cobell case? A. I believe it was around December, December of '07 or earlier 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20 21 22 23	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were looking for potentially multiple experts. So I was aware that the remuse the run you end published in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were provide in the set in the se
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20 21 22 23 24	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. DY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? A. Okay. A. I believe it was around December, December of '07 or earlier this year. Sometime in that time frame, I don't remember 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20 21 22 23 24	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were tooking for potentially multiple experts. So I was aware that there may be a possibility.
2 3 4 14:04:15 5 6 7 8 9 14:04:30 10 11 12 13 14 14:05:15 15 16 17 18 19 14:05:32 20 21 22 23	 quantification. It's based on the exact same model that we had used before. Q. Do you believe that's a reasonable approximation of the amount that would be reflected in the interest rates authorized by statute? A. I just want to say, conditional upon the data, which was before, and conditional upon the understanding that plaintiffs provided to me of the rate, yes, I think it's reasonable. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Palmer. A. Good afternoon. Q. My name is John Warshawsky with the Justice Department. I know you've testified a number of times from your CV, but just to be sure, if there's any question I ask that you would like me to clarify it or rephrase, please let me know and I'll be happy to work with you. Okay? A. Okay. Q. Dr. Palmer, when were you first hired to work on the Cobell case? A. I believe it was around December, December of '07 or earlier 	2 3 4 14:07:28 5 6 7 8 9 14:07:28 10 11 12 13 14 14:07:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:08:12 20 21 22 23	 presented with Dr. Cornell, which I believe was pretty much the same thing. Q. Basically it was just rounding some numbers down, like from billions to millions and millions to billions. Is that right? A. I don't remember the specific changes. Q. The basic numbers in the March version and the version presented in the case-in-chief by Professor Cornell, those numbers didn't really change. Is that correct? A. I don't believe they did. The model didn't change. Q. Prior to your becoming involved in this case have you ever been involved in any aspect of the Individual Indian Money system? A. No. Q. Had you ever read or published had you ever published any articles regarding the Individual Indian Trust system? A. No, I have not. Q. How did you first learn that you might be required to serve as a rebuttal witness in this case? A. When CRA was originally retained in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were looking for potentially multiple experts. So I was aware that the remuse the run you end published in this matter, they had asked for my CV as well as Professor Cornell's, and so they were provide in the set in the se

	1539		1541
1	would be testifying last week, and it didn't happen, and he had	1	A. And prior for example, Dr. Scheuren's testimony, I
2	to go. So at that point I became the rebuttal witness.	2	reviewed his calculations. I reviewed the calculations that
3	Q. Okay. And the reason I ask, you were never identified until	3	went into Attachment A and how those would change based upon the
4	last week as being a witness in this case. Correct?	4	new information that we had received.
14:08:47 5	A. That is correct.	14:10:59 5	Q. Well, when did you start preparing the calculations that
6	Q. And you said that Professor Cornell couldn't be here today	6	ended up in what ultimately appears as Plaintiffs'
7	because he had a deposition?	7	Exhibit 189-A?
8	A. Yes. He had a deposition in a matter, and he had	8	A. I believe it was after the last of the defendants' experts,
9	rescheduled that. And the discovery was closing and he had to	9	so that was probably Thursday evening we started on those
14:09:03 10	be on the West Coast for that deposition, so he was not able to	14:11:15 10	calculations.
11	attend.	11	Q. And would you describe the process for preparing those
12	Q. When did that deposition take place?	12	calculations?
13	A. It took place what's today, Tuesday?	13	A. Certainly. We reviewed the transcripts that we had, putting
14	Q. Yes.	13	those into making sure we had the right information. We also
14:09:13 15	A. The deposition took place yesterday.	14:11:33 15	received the PACER database, I believe on Friday, that had the
14:09:13 15	Q. When did discovery close in that case?	14:11:33 15	
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	information regarding electronic funds transfer. So we
18	 A. That was the last day it could happen. Q. Now, you've testified in a lot of matters before. Right? 	18	incorporated that information after analyzing that. So it was kind of a process of updating the different fields with
10	A. That's correct.	10	
14:09:25 20		14:11:52 20	information we received, and making sure we validated against
14:09:25 20 21	Q. And you've testified in trial?A. I have.	14:11:52 20 21	the testimony that we had heard.
21	A. Thave. Q. You have?	21	Q. Now, when you're using the term we, who are you referring
22		22	to?
23		23	A. There are colleagues of mine at CRA who also worked on this
14:09:32 25	Q. And you've testified in depositions?	14:12:04 25	project.
14:09:32 LJ	A. That is correct.	14:12:04 ZJ	Q. Who is that?
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	4540		1510
1	1540	1	1542
1	Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition?	1	A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There
2	Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor.	2	A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others.
23	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. 	-	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this?
2 3 4	Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	2 3 4	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of
2 3 4 14:09:41 5	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was
2 3 4	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days.
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA?
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct.
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that?
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:10:11 5 16	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16 17	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. A fter you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16 17 18	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information.
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16 17 18 19	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Therefore, the analysis is only as good as the inputs to the
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19 14:10:32 20	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:13:15 20	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information.
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19 14:10:32 20 21	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: A fter you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it would be used and how we could use that information in our 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:56 15 16 17 18 19 14:13:15 20 21	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Q. I would like to ask you if we could pull up 189-A,
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it would be used and how we could use that information in our model. 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 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 14 12 12 10 11 12 13 14 12 14 12 12 10 11 12 13 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 11 14 12 14 11 11	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Q. I would like to ask you if we could pull up 189-A, please.
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19 14:10:32 20 21 22 23	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. SY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. A fter you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it would be used and how we could use that information in our model. Q. And when you said you reviewed the calculations, are you 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 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 14 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Q. I would like to ask you if we could pull up 189-A, please. M. H would like you to go to the 1934 line, which I
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19 14:10:32 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY! Very good, Your Honor. SY MR. WARSHAWSKY! Q. After you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it would be used and how we could use that information in our model. Q. And when you said you reviewed the calculations, are you referring to the ones that went into the original Attachment A 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 12 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 12 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 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 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 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 14 12 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 12 14 12 14 12 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 14 12 12 12 14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Q. I would like to ask you if we could pull up 189-A, please. Mn I would like you to go to the 1934 line, which I believe is on the second page. Do you remember, with respect to
2 3 4 14:09:41 5 6 7 8 9 14:09:55 10 11 12 13 14 14:10:11 15 16 17 18 19 14:10:32 20 21 22 23	 Q. What's more important, to be in court or be at a deposition? MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Did you discuss the fact that you would be testifying instead of Professor Cornell with Professor Cornell? A. Yes. Q. Tell me what tell the Court what Professor Cornell explained to you as to why you needed to testify. MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. He's here testifying, he's your witness. Let's deal with him. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: A fiter you learned that you were going to be the testifying witness in the rebuttal case, what did you do to prepare? A. I reviewed the calculations and the material that we used to support those calculations, also part of my preparation for this was as I sat through the testimony of defendants' experts, learning that information and being able to think of when it would be used and how we could use that information in our model. Q. And when you said you reviewed the calculations, are you 	2 3 4 14:12:14 5 6 7 8 9 14:12:29 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 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 14 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 A. One of the persons is Pat Breslin, John Hirshleifer. There are also many others. Q. Were they all working Thursday and Friday on this? A. Yes. John wasn't, but Pat was. And we had another team of other people as well. Clarence was working on this, Seth was working on this, Kate. Numerous people working on both those days. Q. And the only people that worked on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A were employees of CRA? A. That's correct. Q. Now let me ask you about I do want to get back to the subject that Mr. Gingold was asking you about at the very end there, your benefits conferred analysis. You said that that was your opinion based upon or you said conditioned upon data or something like that. What did you mean by that? A. The analysis is based upon the available input data. As has been discussed in this trial and there are concerns about if it's good information or the quality of the information. Therefore, the analysis is only as good as the inputs to the information. Q. I would like to ask you if we could pull up 189-A, please. M. I would like you to go to the 1934 line, which I

Page 1539 to 1542 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	4540		A E A E
1	\$6.5 million?	1	Q. Do you remember a witness testifying about how the
2	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Do you want to blow that up? No, not	2	government makes borrowing decisions?
3	highlight, just blow it up. Well, that doesn't help.	3	A. Yes, he did testify a government witness did testify
4	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	4	about that.
14:14:38 5	Q. If you look above the yellow line, we're looking at we're	14:17:26 5	Q. Okay. And do you recall that decision is made based on
6	eventually going to get there. Do you remember the minus	6	billions of dollars?
7	\$6.5 million figure from 1934?	7	A. Based on billions of dollars?
8	A. As I see it here, yes.	8	Q. Right.
9	Q. And explain again why you thought it was significant that	9	A. I don't remember the exact testimony, but
14:15:00 10	that number went down.	14:17:40 10	Q. Well, I don't know if I can use this or not. But I'm
11	A. I don't know that I indicated any significance to it. The	11	reading from page 1242, this is Mr. Grippo's testimony, June 18
12	reason it had gone down is because disbursements were greater	12	in the afternoon session.
13	than receipts that year.	13	Question: "When the financing group makes the
14	Q. But you didn't attribute it to money going into the system,	14	decisions of what to borrow and how much, does it borrow down to
14:15:18 15	out of the system? You had been talking about this in the	14:18:09 15	the penny?"
16	context of banks and the Glass-Steagall Act, I believe. Right?	16	Answer: "No."
17	A. The negative sign there is that disbursements are greater	17	Question: "How does that work?"
18	than revenues, so therefore that the flow into the outflow of	18	Answer: "We borrow in billion dollar increments, and
19	the Trust in that year was greater than the inflow of the Trust	19	so as we are looking at these balances we are making a
14:15:38 20	in that year.	14:18:20 20	determination whether to increase or decrease the borrowing by
21	Q. You weren't attributing it to any particular factor in your	21	at least a billion dollars."
22	discussion about the Glass-Steagall Act, though, were you?	22	Do you remember that testimony, sir?
23	A. No.	23	A. That sounds familiar.
24	Q. In fact, in your analysis, did you find it to be an unusual	24	Q. I beg your pardon?
14:15:56 25	circumstance for disbursements to exceed collections in a given	14:18:30 25	A. That sounds familiar.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1544		1546
1	year?	1	Q. And how did you consider that testimony in your benefits
2	A. There were not many instances of it, that's correct.	2	analysis?
3	Q. You did not see many instances. Is that correct?	3	
4			A. That was not incorporated in any way in what we did, that
	A. I did not.	4	A. That was not incorporated in any way in what we did, that the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars.
14:16:05 5	A. I did not.Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from	4 14:18:48 5	
14:16:05 5 6			the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars.
_	Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from	14:18:48 5	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are
6	Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not?	14:18:48 5 6	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it
6 7	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. 	14:18:48 5 6 7	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis.
6 7 8	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10	the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right?
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question.
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14:16:42 15	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14:16:42 15 16 17	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you?
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14:16:42 15 16 17 18	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:16:42 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they I guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:16:42 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:41 20	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they I guess I don't understand the question, because the IIM
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20 21	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? A. From their data that they reported, yes. 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:41 20 21	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they I guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are available to the government. If it decides to use the IIM funds, they're available to the government, and so it's part of
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20 21 22	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? A. From their data that they reported, yes. Q. Were you present for the testimony of Gary Grippo? 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:41 20 21 22	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they I guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are available to the government, and so it's part of its calculation.
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:16:42 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20 21 22 23	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? A. From their data that they reported, yes. Q. Were you present for the testimony of Gary Grippo? A. I can't remember if I read it or if I heard it. But I'm 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:41 20 21 22 23	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether theyI guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are available to the government, and so it's part of its calculation. Whether the government makes decisions about funds it
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? A. From their data that they reported, yes. Q. Were you present for the testimony of Gary Grippo? A. I can't remember if I read it or if I heard it. But I'm somewhat familiar with it. 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:24 20 21 22 23 24	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether they I guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are available to the government, and so it's part of its calculation. Whether the government makes decisions about funds it has available and funds it needs, I don't know that they say
6 7 8 9 14:16:22 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:16:42 15 16 17 18 19 14:16:56 20 21 22 23	 Q. But you reviewed the data provided by the government from Michelle Herman and Dr. Angel, did you not? A. I did. Q. And you did see instances there where there were greater disbursements than collections in a given year. Right? A. And as I testified earlier today, when we had actual information of disbursements from the checks and EFTs and observed that when we had the actual information versus the numbers that Michelle Herman had, her numbers were often higher during that period, so we had adjusted the numbers accordingly. Q. My question was, when you looked at the data from Michelle Herman and from Dr. Angel, you did see a number in quite a few more years where there were disbursements in excess of collections. Right? A. From their data that they reported, yes. Q. Were you present for the testimony of Gary Grippo? A. I can't remember if I read it or if I heard it. But I'm somewhat familiar with it. Q. And why do you believe you're somewhat familiar with it? 	14:18:48 5 6 7 8 9 14:19:03 10 11 12 13 14 14:19:24 15 16 17 18 19 14:19:41 20 21 22 23	 the government makes decisions based on billions of dollars. According to the testimony, those billions of dollars are comprised of all the individual monies that come into it, so it didn't affect our analysis. Q. And just to be clear, your analysis hasn't actually made a determination that the government decided to benefit from additional funds that you've attributed to the IIM. Right? A. I have not determined what the government has decided, if that's your question. Q. Right. I mean, you haven't actually made a determination whether the government made a decision to take into consideration additional funds from the IIM, have you? A. The funds were available to the government; whether theyI guess I don't understand the question, because the funds are available to the government, and so it's part of its calculation. Whether the government makes decisions about funds it has available and funds it needs, I don't know that they say which dollar they need from which fund. They have a fund, they

	1547		1549
1	or whatever their holding that comprises that total dollar	1	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace$ And were you given that instruction, by the way, before or
2	amount.	2	after you finished the analysis that's become Plaintiffs' 189-A?
3	Q. So Dr. Palmer, you agree it's the government that makes the	3	A. 189 the instruction was given before, because we were
4	decision. Right?	4	doing it concurrently. 189-A was being finished on Saturday.
14:20:10 5	A. The government has funds available to it and it makes	14:23:25 5	We were asked to start preparing this calculation, and then this
6	decisions what to do with the funds that are available to it.	6	calculation was finished subsequent to the 189-A, I believe you
7	Q. And let me read a little bit more from Mr. Grippo's	7	called it.
8	testimony. This is on page 1243, beginning at line six.	8	Q. I believe Plaintiffs' 189-A is the Attachment A analysis.
9	Question: "Now, we looked earlier at the \$336 million	9	A. Okay.
14:20:29 10	annual IIM receipts, gross receipts. Do you recall that?"	14:23:42 10	Q. From this morning.
11	Answer: "Yes."	11	A. From this morning?
12	Question: "What would that be in weekly terms?"	12	Q. Right. I'm sorry, the one that you discussed this morning.
13	Answer: "It would be roughly 6 million, 330 by 52."	13	A. Yes, yes, we had finished that one up on Saturday. The
14	Question: "Would the weekly \$6 million in gross IIM	14	process of preparing the rates here was started on Saturday and
14:20:45 15	receipts impact the decisions about whether and how much to	14:23:58 15	finished into Sunday.
16	borrow?"	16	Q. When did you finish Plaintiffs' 189-A, by the way?
17	Answer: "It would not."	17	THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, I'm sorry that I had a good
18	Do you remember that testimony?	18	weekend and nobody else had one. But I don't really care when
19	A. It sounds familiar.	19	these things were finished. What's the relevance of this? You
14:20:54 20	Q. And so Mr. Grippo was testifying that an additional	14:24:15 20	want to get him to say, oh, my god, the other number is too low,
21	\$6 million of IIM receipts wouldn't influence a borrowing	21	let's find a higher number. Is that the point?
22	decision. Right?	22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'm trying to understand the
23	A. His testimony was about how much on a weekly basis. We're	23	instructions that were given for the preparation.
24	looking at a cumulative amount, and if something were a rounding	24	THE COURT: You may care but I don't, so be guided
14:21:13 25	error in Mr. Grippo's terms, then funds are still available to	14:24:34 25	accordingly.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1548		1550
1	the government for its use. And the funds that are available	1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, I care about what you care
2	totally comprised of accounts that are held by the government.	2	about, Your Honor. So we'll move on.
3	So it may look at a big picture, but that big picture	3	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
4	is comprised of lots of little things that are added together to	4	Q. Now let me ask you about
14:21:35 5	get there.	14:24:48 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's go back to 189-A.
6	Q. This is basic economic theory that you're talking about.	6	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
7	Right?	7	Q. And you said that 189-A, the model for that, that's
8	A. It's the way that a system would work.	8	basically the same model as the model that was used to generate
9	Q. I mean, this is a theoretical analysis that you're	9	Professor Cornell's model and the version that was attached to
14:21:44 10	presenting. Right?	14:25:04 10	the plaintiffs' brief. Right?
11	A. What we're presenting here is a calculation of funds that	11	A. That is correct.
12	are available to the government that then are for its benefit.	12	Q. And so it's fair to say that all the analytic work certainly
13	Q. I would like to ask you a few questions about, I believe you	13	that went into preparing the Attachment A presented by
14	marked it Plaintiffs' 192, the alternative calculation?	14	Professor Cornell, that was Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, all of the
14:22:28 15	Dr. Palmer, when were you asked to begin preparing the	14:25:22 15	analytic work that went into that ended when the plaintiffs
16	specific relief analysis, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 192?	16	submitted the brief in March of 2008. Right?
17	A. This was asked on Saturday.	17	A. No.
18	Q. And so you're you're referring to three days ago. Right?	18	Q. Well, what work I thought you said it was just rounding
19	A. Three days ago we were asked to prepare this, yes.	19	between the brief and Professor Cornell's Attachment A?
14:22:45 20	Q. And what instructions were you given with respect to the	14:25:38 20	A. Well, I guess I'm not sure analytic work, continued work
21	preparation of this?	21	was done in terms of the analysis of the input data. The
22	A. The instructions were given that we were asked to follow a	22	structure of the model did not change, but the input data was a
23	statutory rate for use in some years, and then to combine that	23	concern and continued work was done.
1 24		24	Q. You're aware that the government filed a brief in response
24	with a bank rate or what the alternative would be, and we came		
14:23:06 25	with a bank rate or what the alternative would be, and we came up with a bank rate to combine with that. <i>Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u></i>	14:25:58 25	to the March brief filed by the plaintiffs. Right? <i>Rebecca Stonestreet</i> (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1551		1553
1	A. I believe that's correct.	1	A. Well, as I just mentioned in my, what you said was my long
2	Q. Did you ever review that brief?	2	answer, is that we looked at the support for those monies and
3	A. I think I did read that.	3	where those numbers had come from. It didn't seem as very
4	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you put up pages 98 and 99 from	4	strong support.
14:26:12 5	the government's brief, please?	14:29:19 5	Also, from the information we had, I believe it was in
6	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	14.23.13 6	AR-171 as well, that there were no tribal monies in the system
7	Q. 98 and 99, if you can just look at those two. This is a	7	now. We looked through also there were the documents that we
8	section regarding Tribal IIM receipts.	8	had seen that tribal money should have been out of the system,
9		9	and then when we looked for receipts and disbursements, the
14:26:48 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to 98, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	14:29:39 10	•
14:26:48 10 11		14:29:39 10 11	checks and EFTs that had gone out of the system, we counted
12	Q. Do you remember reviewing this section of the brief?A. It seems familiar.	12	everything that went out of the IIM Trust.
12		12	Q. Now, you said there's no Tribal IIM money in the system now.
13	Q. What is your understanding of the meaning of Tribal IIM?	14	Do you know why that is?
14:27:05 15	A. Tribal IIM were my understanding is tribal monies that	14:29:55 15	A. Well, it said it had to be out. If I remember, there's a
14:27:05 13	were in the IIM Trust.	14:29:55 13 16	document that said it had to be out.
10	Q. I beg your pardon?	10	Q. But you understood that I mean, your analysis covers the
	A. Tribal monies that were in the IIM Trust.		life of the IIM system. Right?
18 19	Q. And you said in direct examination, I believe, that you	18 19	A. That's correct.
14:27:21 20	weren't able to quantify the amount of Tribal IIM?	_	Q. And at some point in time there was IIM money in the system.
	A. That's correct.	14:30:08 20	Right?
21	Q. Are you aware you see the highlighted section from	21	A. There was IIM money in the system?
22	page 98 of the brief right below the quote from the Court, where	22	Q. At some point. You're talking about the absence of money
23	it says, "The receipts associated with Tribal Trust money	23	now. My question is, over the life of the system, did you do
24	deposits are reflected in Column E of AR-171, entitled	24	anything to remove Tribal IIM money from your collections?
14:27:38 25	'Tribal IIM,' which totals \$1.513 billion." Do you see that?	14:30:27 25	A. When we had, again, reported information, the 1909 to 1911,
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1552		1554
	• • •	4	
1	A. I see that.	1	those were reported disbursement information. When we had
2	Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had	2	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis
2	Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right?		actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money
2 3 4	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that 	2 3 4	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we
2 3 4 14:27:57 5	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my 	2	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis.
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he 	2 3 4	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911?
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9	actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe.
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money?
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15	Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual.
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:28:28 15 16	Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really complete information for us.	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15 16	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis,
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really complete information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15 16 17	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right?
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out.
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM on that. 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19 14:31:44 20	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20 21	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM on that. Q. And in fact, that \$1.513 billion was reflected in the AR-171 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19 14:31:44 20 21	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage headright is?
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20 21 22	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really complete information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM on that. Q. And in fact, that \$1.513 billion was reflected in the AR-171 that you reviewed this morning with Mr. Gingold. Right? 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19 14:31:44 20 21 22	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage headright is? A. I 've done some reading and also talked to some individuals.
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20 21 22 23	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really complete information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM on that. Q. And in fact, that \$1.513 billion was reflected in the AR-171 that you reviewed this morning with Mr. Gingold. Right? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19 14:31:44 20 21 22 23	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage headright is? A. I 've done some reading and also talked to some individuals. Q. And what have you read?
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal HIM on that. Q. And in fact, that \$1.513 billion was reflected in the AR-171 that you reviewed this morning with Mr. Gingold. Right? A. That's correct. Q. And what if anything did you do to follow up on the 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 20 21 22 23 24	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage headright is? A. I've done some reading and also talked to some individuals. Q. And what have you read? A. There are some reports to the, which was it there's some
2 3 4 14:27:57 5 6 7 8 9 14:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 14:28:28 15 16 17 18 19 14:28:47 20 21 22 23	 Q. So you were aware as of April 2008 that the government had quantified this amount as being \$1.5 billion roughly. Right? A. The government had an estimate. I had no idea where that estimate had come from. During the testimony of this trial, my recollection is Dr. Angel said that it was an estimate that he came up with, and there was cross-examination of that, there was no support for that, and there were times pointed out where the number of 10 to 15 percent had been used, but there was documentary evidence, or something I recalled, one to two percent. So the numbers were very different, and seeing a number here of 1.5 million, we had no support for that, we had no information. So again, what we were relying upon was the best available information that we could, and this was not really complete information for us. Q. Okay. That's a long answer. But the question was, you were aware in April that the government contended it was 1.5 billion? A. We saw from the AR-171 there was an estimate of Tribal IIM on that. Q. And in fact, that \$1.513 billion was reflected in the AR-171 that you reviewed this morning with Mr. Gingold. Right? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 14:30:54 5 6 7 8 9 14:31:08 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:31:31 15 16 17 18 19 14:31:44 20 21 22 23	 actual disbursements through checks or EFTs, those are the basis we used for disbursement calculations. So if the tribal money was in the system and it came out at those times, yes, then we would have incorporated it in our analysis. Q. 1909 to 1911? A. 1909 to '11, also the 1988 to 2002 time period, we have all the checks and EFTs that were paid out, and there was tribal money in the system at that point, I believe. Q. Can you tell Judge Robertson how much of your collections figure reflects Tribal IIM money? A. I cannot tell that. I don't think there again, the documents we reviewed this morning said the auditors were not able to distinguish how much was tribal and how much was individual. Q. It's fair to say, it's not been taken out of your analysis, right? A. There's nothing been taken out. Q. You talked this morning about Osage headrights. What have you done to gain an understanding of the nature of what an Osage headright is? A. I 've done some reading and also talked to some individuals. Q. And what have you read?

	1555		1557
1	was, but there's an annual report I remember reading that talked	1	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2	about Osage headright and the Osage tribe and the head shares.	2	Q. You see what we've got here, name of agency and tribe, and
3	Q. And you said you talked to somebody? Who did you talk to?	3	then the second column is population.
4	A. I talked to counsel.	4	A. Yes, I see that.
14:32:21 5	Q. Plaintiffs' counsel?	14:35:21 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll down to the Osage.
6	A. Plaintiffs' counsel.	6	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
7	Q. Prior to your being involved in this, you had never heard of	7	Q. And do you see 1,496 is the population of Osage?
8	Osage headrights. Right?	8	A. Yes, I see that.
9	A. That is correct.	9	Q. Why didn't you use that number instead of your straight line
14:32:29 10	Q. Let's refer to the Osage adjustments worksheet within	14:35:34 10	interpolation, 1,708 for 1889?
11	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189-A, please. And you recognize this	11	A. I didn't remember or didn't think about this information.
12	document, don't you, sir?	12	It could be used. And if there's better information, obviously
13	A. Yes, I do.	13	I'm happy to use it and incorporate it.
14	Q. And I believe one of the things you did was some sort of	14	Q. So if you would have used that, that would have lowered your
14:32:57 15	straight line interpolation of headright shares based on	14:35:56 15	calculation of Osage headright revenues. Right?
16	Dr. Angel's testimony?	16	A. That is correct.
17	A. That's correct. We had Dr. Angel testify that the headright	17	Q. Because what you did was you took the per share amount and
18	shares were different early on, and he estimated that there were	18	multiplied it times the number of headright interests. Right?
19	1,500 at the beginning, I believe, 1880, we have here, and then	19	A. Right.
14:33:19 20	he said there were 2,100 in 1906. Not knowing the exact number,	14:36:07 20	Q. And then for 1889 you multiplied it times 1,708 rather than
21	we did a straight line interpolation between the two points, as	21	1,496?
22	an estimate.	22	A. Right. We were trying to the government had put on 2,229
23	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And you tried to consider available data whenever possible	23	all the way back, so we were trying to, based upon Dr. Angel's
24	in doing your analysis. Right?	24	testimony, we were trying to at least make some adjustment that
14:33:33 25	A. That's correct.	14:36:25 25	the government hadn't made to their calculations that they used.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1556		1558
1	Q. Your number for 1889 is, what, 1,708 shares? I'm in	1	We used that information. If there's more, happy to use it.
2	Column C now of 1889.	2	Q. So in any event, here you overstated Osage revenues in your
3	A. Yes, I see that.	3	model. Right?
4	Q. 1,708 shares?	4	A. It would be yes, they would be higher.
14:33:50 5	A. I see that, yes.	14:36:41 5	Q. And that was from 1889, you wouldn't be able to estimate
6	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up Defendant's	6	how much interest you've imputed based on your benefit analysis?
7	Exhibit 484, please?	7	A. Well, this number could be put into the model and it could
8	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	8	be rattled through and it would see what the answer was. It
9	Q. Dr. Palmer, I have had put before you what's a Commissioner	9	would be a very quick calculation if you pulled the spreadsheet.
14:34:17 10	of Indian Affairs report from 1889. Have you seen this document	14:37:01 10	Q. Do you remember testifying regarding Plaintiffs' 183? We
11	before, sir?	11	don't have to pull it up unless you want. But that was the
	A. I believe I have.	12	Osage Nation motion, the motion that was filed by the government
13	Q. And did you review Commissioner of Indian Affairs reports in	13 14	in the Osage Nation?
14 14:34:30	the course of doing your work?	14 14:37:13 15	A. Yes. Yes.
	A. I reviewed several of them. I don't remember all the		Q. How did you become aware of that brief?
16 17	information. There's a lot of information in those reports.	16 17	A. That is something that was provided to me by counsel.
17	Q. Did you review journal vouchers?A. I'm not sure I did. I don't know. I don't remember.	17	Q. And what were you told when you were provided that brief?A. That here's a brief that was filed in a different matter by
18	Q. Well, let's focus on this one, Defendant's Exhibit 484. Do	10	
14:34:48 20	Service, let a locua on this one, Delenuant a Exhibit 484. Do	13 14:37:29 20	the government, and there was information about Osage in it. Q. Were you given any instructions on how to utilize what was
	you remember Dr. Angel testifying about this?	14.37.29 20	
	you remember Dr. Angel testifying about this?	21	
21	A. I'm not sure. I don't remember what his particular	21 22	on page 39?
21 22	A. I'm not sure. I don't remember what his particular testimony was on this document.	21 22 23	on page 39? A. I don't believe we were given any instructions. They were
21 22 23	 A. I'm not sure. I don't remember what his particular testimony was on this document. Q. Well, refer to page three, please. 	22 23	on page 39? A. I don't believe we were given any instructions. They were saying, here, this is something you may want to consider in your
21 22 23 24	 A. I'm not sure. I don't remember what his particular testimony was on this document. Q. Well, refer to page three, please. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And you're going to have to really 	22 23 24	on page 39? A. I don't believe we were given any instructions. They were saying, here, this is something you may want to consider in your analysis. So we saw that, so we lowered the Osage number.
21 22 23	 A. I'm not sure. I don't remember what his particular testimony was on this document. Q. Well, refer to page three, please. 	22 23	on page 39? A. I don't believe we were given any instructions. They were saying, here, this is something you may want to consider in your

Page 1555 to 1558 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1559		1561
1	before that's within Plaintiffs' 189-A. In Column E, you see	1	A. I don't know the accounting and the specifics of these
2	you've referred to DX-372, Osage data?	2	documents. My understanding of the Osage annuity is that it was
3	A. That is correct.	3	transferred in for the individuals and would be going to the IIM
4	Q. What did you mean by that caption?	4	Trust. I'm not sure exactly the steps it got to get there.
14:38:02 5	A. I believe that is the number that was used by Ms. Herman of	14:42:11 5	Q. You don't know why this is indicating coming out of Tribal?
14.38.02 G	what her calculation is of what the fraction of the Osage	6	A. That's correct, I do not know.
7	annuity went into the IIM Trust.	7	Q. Let's go to 2028 and 2029. Have you reviewed these pages
8	Q. I mean, you referred to that as being an estimate, didn't	8	
9	you?	9	before, these types of pages?
14:38:23 10	yου? Α. Yes.	14:42:34 10	A. Again, if they were in the backup binder I 've probably seen
14:38:23 10 11		14:42:34 10 11	them but I couldn't cite to any specific information or
12	Q. I want to walk through one example with you to see if I	12	understanding of them.
	understand how you utilized it.		Q. And I understand. I'm not asking you to memorize everything
13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll pull up Defendant's	13	in the binders, but I want to get your understanding of what a
14	Exhibit 517.	14	document like this how you would understand this document to
14:38:43 15	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	14:42:48 15	be used.
16	Q. And I'll tell you, this is a spreadsheet I prepared, and I'm	16	Do you see at the top of 2028 where it's referred to as
17	going to try to go to the DX-372 numbers to see how they tie	17	a Tribal nonscheduled check request?
18	into this and see if that's consistent with your understanding	18	A. 2028?
19	of how Ms. Herman prepared these numbers.	19	Q. We've got it highlighted on the screen if that helps.
14:39:02 20	DX-372, let's start with we're working with pages	14:43:01 20	A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, thank you.
21	2025 to 2054.	21	Q. Do you have an understanding of what was meant by that?
22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: If I may, Your Honor, it's a 30-page	22	A. No.
23	document, if I might provide it to the witness so we can just	23	Q. Below it it says account PL 7386706. Do you know what that
24	move through it quicker.	24	is?
14:39:31 25	THE COURT: Fine.	14:43:14 25	A. No.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1560		1562
1		1	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
•	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	•	Q. And you saw it says paid principal, that 3,152,632.55.
2	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you?	2	 Q. And you saw it says paid principal, that 3,152,632.55. That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page?
		-	
2	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you?	2	That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page?
23	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you?I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do	23	That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is.
2 3 4	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372?	2 3 4	That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page?A. Yes, it is.Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a
2 3 4 14:40:25 5	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps.
2 3 4 14:40:25 6 7	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:41:03 15	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:43:6	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:41:03 15 16	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:44:06 15 16	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:41:03 15 16 17	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:43:64 15 16 17	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:41:03 15 16 17 18	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:13 14 14:13 14 14:13 14 14:13 14 14:13 14 14:13 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 14 14:13 15 16 17 18 19 14 14:13 15 16 17 18 19 14 14:13 15 16 17 18 19 14 14:13 15 16 17 18 19 11 11 11 12 11 11 11 11 12 11 11 11 11	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:1:03 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14:43:65 16 17 18 19	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:1:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:41:24 20	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these documents before? 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:44:25 20	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments into various individual accounts at the Osage Agency. That's
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:1:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:41:24 20 21	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these documents before? A. Again, they look like they were some of the ones in the four backup binders, but I did not focus on those. 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 14 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments into various individual accounts at the Osage Agency. That's consistent with what you just said. Right? A. Yes.
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:1:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:41:24 20 21 22	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these documents before? A. Again, they look like they were some of the ones in the four 	2 3 4 14:43:35 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:44:06 15 16 17 18 19 14:44:25 20 21 22	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments into various individual accounts at the Osage Agency. That's consistent with what you just said. Right?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:1:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:41:24 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these documents before? A. Again, they look like they were some of the ones in the four backup binders, but I did not focus on those. Q. Well, do you have any understanding, looking on 2026, and we'll have it highlighted here, of why under the Tribal column 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:44:25 20 21 22 23	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments into various individual accounts at the Osage Agency. That's consistent with what you just said. Right? A. Yes. Q. Let's look at the next page. We've got another amount coming out of Tribal. Do you see that?
2 3 4 14:40:25 5 6 7 8 9 14:40:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:41:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:41:24 20 21 22 23	 Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize the pages I've handed to you? I understand you may not recognize the specific pages, but do you recognize these types of documents from reviewing DX-372? A. They don't seem familiar. I may have reviewed something similar to it, but they don't Q. Let's go through it and see if it refreshes your recollection. Because you referred to DX-372 in your schedule. A. Yes, I did. I don't believe these were in 372. Q. I beg your pardon? A. I don't believe these were in 372, were they? Q. Yes, they were. A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, these are the backup of the other four binders and not in the first binder. Q. Did you not review the backup to the first binder? A. I had looked at some of the documents but I confess to not going through all the documents in the backup binders, in all four backup binders. Q. Let's look at 2026 to 2029. Have you ever seen these documents before? A. Again, they look like they were some of the ones in the four backup binders, but I did not focus on those. Q. Well, do you have any understanding, looking on 2026, and 	2 3 4 14:43:35 5 6 7 8 9 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:43:54 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 14 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 That's the same amount that we saw on the previous page? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page, 2029. Have you seen a document like this before? You can look at the entire page if it helps. A. Same answer as I've been giving about the others. Q. So you see it's showing a disbursement out of that PL 7386706? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And a collection going into a couple of items with a 6039 number that's been highlighted. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you have an understanding what the 6039 refers to? A. My understanding is the 6039 is the individual account. Q. You're talking about the IIM account. Right? A. Yes. Q. And indeed, if you look at the description down below, it says to transfer funds for the December 2000 quarterly payments into various individual accounts at the Osage Agency. That's consistent with what you just said. Right? A. Yes. Q. Let's look at the next page. We've got another amount

1	4500		
	1563 Q. That's \$2,419,814.14. Go to the next page. And you see	1	1565 two amounts that you've just shown me, though. You've shown me
2		2	
2	we've got another one of these check requests?	3	different things with one amount going two different amounts
4	A. That's correct.	4	but there's nothing that links the two for this same period.
-	Q. Tribal nonscheduled check request, again coming out of the	-	Q. Oh. Well, let's look at the batch date on page 2026. And
14:44:52 5	same account, PL 7386706, and the same amount we were talking		you can look at the dates at the bottom of 2028. There's a date
_	about, \$2.4 million?	6	prepared, 11/29/00. Do you see that? And on 2029, you see the
7	A. Yes.	7	effective date on this at the top?
8	Q. And do you see below where it says payees, various	8	A. Well, if I'm looking at 2026 and comparing it with 2030,
9	annuitants?	9	both of those seem to be very similar, and yet you had them in
14:45:05 10	A. Yes, I see that.	14:48:43 10	different columns.
11	Q. Do you know what that refers to?	11	So I'm not sure both of them were Tribal to IIM, yet
12	A. No.	12	you have one, a payment to 6039, and the other is a payment to
13	Q. And if we move forward two pages to 2033, again it shows	13	annuitants.
14	payees, various annuitants.	14	Q. I see the confusion. Where do you see the second payment as
14:45:17 15	A. Yes, it does.	14:48:57 15	being a payment to IIM? I'm talking about 2030 to 2033.
16	Q. It doesn't say anything about the IIM Trust, does it?	16	A. I was looking at the columns on 2026 and 2030. There's
17	A. It does not.	17	two there's a column from Tribal column to IIM. I just
18	Q. And you didn't see anything referencing the 6039 account	18	looked at these two, that those seem to be the same, and yet you
19	here, did you, with respect to those last three pages that we	19	had them treated differently on your 517. So I'm trying to
14:45:32 20	were talking about?	14:49:17 20	understand
21	A. Oh, I'm sorry.	21	Q. Where do you see 2030 I'm sorry, where do you see it
22	Q. No, that's fine.	22	being IIM money on 2030?
23	A. In the last three pages	23	A. What's the oh, I'm sorry, I must be reading this wrong.
24	Q. Referring to 2030 through 2033. Actually, it's four pages.	24	So that number below is not under IIM, that's the total, so it's
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	14:49:37 25	
14:46:21 25	A. I do not see the number 6039 on any of the pages that you've	14:49:37 ZJ	a separate thing?
14:46:21 25	A. I do not see the number 6039 on any of the pages that you've Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	14:49:37 ZJ	a separate thing? Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.ne</u>
14:46:21 25		14:49:37 ZJ	
14:46:21 25	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	14:49:37 23	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.ne
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.ne
1	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. 1564		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Q. Right. Right.
1	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.ne 1566 1566 Q. Right. Right. 1 A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the
1 2 3 4	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages?	1 2 3	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account?
1 2 3 4	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. . Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians . there, right, on those four pages? . A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages	1 2 3 4	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be.
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to.	1 2 3 4	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Image: Stonestreet 1566 Q. Right. Right. Image: Stonestreet 1566 A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Image: Stonestreet 1566 Tribal account? Image: Stonestreet Image: Stonestreet Image: Stonestreet A. Okay. Image: Stonestreet Image: Stonestreet Image: Stonestreet Image: Stonestreet
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right?	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I Q. Right. Right. I A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 1 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed A.
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152.
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL. 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029.
1 2 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10 11 12 13	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.)
1 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10 11 12 13 14	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Q. Right. Right. 1566 A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the 1777 Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. 166 A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was 166 payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. 16 A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they?
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 44:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 4:47:19 15	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL. 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 I
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 14:47:19 15 16	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 4:47:19 15 16 17	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.me 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there?
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 4:47:19 15 16 17 18	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKYE Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.me 1566 R. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Image: Comparison of the tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. Image: Comparison of the tribal account? Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes.
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 14:47:19 15 16 17 18 19	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter@@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals. A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.me 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB?
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 4:47:19 15 16 17 18 19 4:47:31 20	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that 1 prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals. A. Yes. Q. And I put it under payment to 6039?	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:51:13 20	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.me 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB? A. I do.
1 2 3 4 4:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 4:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 14:47:31 20 21	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL. 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals. A. Yes. Q. And I put it under payment to 6039? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:51:13 20 21	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.me 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. They're a little different, aren't they? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB? A. I do. Q. Do you know what that means?
1 12 3 4 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 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 21 22	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 Intergeneration 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals. A. Yes. Q. And I put it under payment to 6039? A. Yes. Q. And that second amount that we saw, the payment to the	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:51:13 20 21 22	Rebecce Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 Ingregorer2@veriation. 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB? A. I do. Q. Do you know what that means? A. BB I believe were transfers.
1 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:47:31 20 21 22 23	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 Intergeneration (200) (2	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:51:13 20 21 22 23	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 tigregorer2@vertamenta 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. Why don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB? A. I do. Q. Do you know what that means? A. BB I believe were transfers. Q. Are these actual check disbursements? Do you understand
1 14:46:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:47:02 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:47:31 20 21 22	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 Intergeneration 1564 directed me to. Q. And you didn't see any reference to individual Indians there, right, on those four pages? A. I don't see the term individual on any of these pages either. Q. By the way, on 2031 you saw, next to that account number PL 7386706, you saw the account name was Osage Tribe. Right? A. That is correct. Q. Does that give you any additional information as to what that account might refer to? A. No. Q. In any event MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll put that back up, 571, was it? No, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the spreadsheet that I prepared. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Do you see for this first payment here what I've done is I've taken the 3.152 figure that we saw for the individuals. A. Yes. Q. And I put it under payment to 6039? A. Yes. Q. And that second amount that we saw, the payment to the	1 2 3 4 14:49:46 5 6 7 8 9 14:50:27 10 11 12 13 14 14:51:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:51:13 20 21 22	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter@werizen.net 1566 Q. Right. Right. A. So they're both these pages are both debits out of the Tribal account? Q. That's what they appear to be. A. Okay. Q. One, remember we looked at the check request, one was payments to 6039, and that's the amount on my spreadsheet that I show under 6039. A. Well, there isn't a page the 2033 that you had pointed out, to various annuitants, there's not a similar page for the previous amount, for the 3,152. Q. My don't you look at 2029. A. Okay. (Witness complies.) Q. And if you look at the top right-hand corner of 2029, do you see the document number there? A. Yes. Q. Do you see the first two letters are BB? A. I do. Q. Do you know what that means? A. BB I believe were transfers.

Page 1563 to 1566 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1567		1569
1	Q. If in fact BB transfers are not checks, they wouldn't have	1	A. That is correct. We pulled the government's numbers and
2	been captured in the CP&R data. Right?	2	this 12.04 is what we've come up with.
3	A. If they're not checks, the answer is no.	3	Q. I just want to review one other, and I'll be quick with this
4	Q. They would not be in the CP&R data?	4	one, one other document from DX-372, pages 2005 to 2011, please.
14:51:52 5	A. That's correct.	14:56:30 5	And have you seen this document before, Dr. Palmer?
6	Q. And your analysis wouldn't have picked those transfers up,	6	A. These are very similar to the ones you just showed me, I
7	would they?	7	believe.
8	A. I don't know if the transfers would have been picked up in	8	Q. In fact, this is a document that was attached to the
9	the receipts or in the expenditures. What I have in the CP&R	9	government's brief filed in April. Do you remember that?
14:52:07 10	and EFT are funds that went out of the Trust.	14:56:42 10	A. No, I do not.
11	Q. Well, let me just try to get through these relatively	11	Q. Referring so you didn't review this when it was attached
12	quickly. I understand that these documents apparently aren't	12	to the government's April brief. Is that correct?
13	ones that you're particularly familiar with. But if we were to	13	A. I reviewed the brief but I don't know that I reviewed all
14	go through the next three quarterly payments within this fiscal	14	the attachments.
14:52:27 15	year, if we go to let's go to 2037, please. And you see once	14:57:01 15	Q. And referring to page 2007, do you see in the description
16	again here we've got 3,008,161 paid again to the 6039 accounts?	16	here once again an explanation of the 0611, subcategory of 6039,
17	A. Yes.	17	payments to IIM accounts, estates, guardianships, minors, and
18	Q. And going forward to 2039, here you see we've got roughly	18	whereabouts unknown?
19	\$2.26 million being paid to various annuitants?	19	A. That's what it says.
14:53:24 20	A. Yes.	14:57:24 20	Q. And then moving forward to 2011, again up in the top you see
14:53:24 20 21	_	14:57:24 20 21	
21	Q. And you see how I've put those two amounts, one that are	21	the payees, "various annuitants"?
	payments to 6039, and one that are payments to annuitants?		A. I see that.
23	A. Yes, I see that.	23	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And if you can show the top of that,
24	Q. And I'll save everybody. We could go through the next two	24	please.
14:53:49 25	payments, and if Mr. Gingold wants, I'm sure he can cover it on	14:57:47 25	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1568		1570
1	redirect; I did the same thing for the remaining two quarterly	1	Q. Do you know what a public voucher means, what it means when
2	payments in fiscal year 2001, and you see I came up with a total	2	
	payments in fiscal year 2001, and you see I came up with a total	2	a document is called a public voucher?
3	payment to 6039 of 12,037,147?	3	a document is called a public voucher? A. I can't say the precise definition, no.
4		_	
	payment to 6039 of 12,037,147?	3	A. I can't say the precise definition, no.
4	payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that.	34	A. I can't say the precise definition, no.Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued
4 14:54:07 5	payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A,	3 4 14:58:04 5	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created?
4 14:54:07 5 6	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. 	3 4 14:58:04 5	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure.
4 14:54:07 5 6 7	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks?
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know.
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example?
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007.
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 13 14	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right?
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:55:03 15	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14:58:34 15	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction.
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:55:03 15 16	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14:58:34 15 16	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:55:03 15 16 17	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14:58:34 15 16 17	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that?
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14:55:03 15 16 17 18	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14:58:34 15 16 17 18	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 13 14 14:55:03 15 16 17 18 19	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:58:34 15 16 17 18 19	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 55:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:55:21 20	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to your question, your question to me earlier was, was it 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:58:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:59:05 20	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've established, have we not, that that's a payment from Osage Tribe
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 12 13 14 14 14 55:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:55:21 20 21	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to your question, your question to me earlier was, was it estimated, and yeah, I called it estimated. Q. Certainly wasn't for the fiscal year 2001 we just went 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14: 12 13 14 14: 58:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:59:05 20 21	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've established, have we not, that that's a payment from Osage Tribe account? A. I believe you showed me something earlier in the previous
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 10 11 12 13 13 14 14 13 15 16 17 18 19 14:55:21 20 21 22	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to your question, your question to me earlier was, was it estimated, and yeah, I called it estimated. Q. Certainly wasn't for the fiscal year 2001 we just went through. Right? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 14:59:05 20 21 22	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've established, have we not, that that's a payment from Osage Tribe account?
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 55:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:55:21 20 21 22 23 24	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to your question, your question to me earlier was, was it estimated, and yeah, I called it estimated. Q. Certainly wasn't for the fiscal year 2001 we just went through. Right? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14: 58:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:59:05 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've established, have we not, that that's a payment from Osage Tribe account? A. I believe you showed me something earlier in the previous set of documents. I don't know the Osage Tribal account number, so
4 14:54:07 5 6 7 8 9 14:54:53 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 55:03 15 16 17 18 19 14:55:21 20 21 22 23	 payment to 6039 of 12,037,147? A. Yes, I see that. Q. And if we go to your Attachment C, this is on Exhibit 189-A, Attachment C I'm sorry, Attachment A, Column C. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go down to fiscal 2001. I hope everybody remembers at this point. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Column C, do you see the 12.04? A. Yes, I do. Q. That's what you've indicated is the government calculated figure for Osage? A. That's correct. Q. In fact, that was based on the documents within DX-372. Right? A. For the years you've shown here. There are many years there were not information that Ms. Herman estimated, so that this is the Osage government calculated column, yes referring back to your question, your question to me earlier was, was it estimated, and yeah, I called it estimated. Q. Certainly wasn't for the fiscal year 2001 we just went through. Right? 	3 4 14:58:04 5 6 7 8 9 14:58:17 10 11 12 13 14 14 14:58:34 15 16 17 18 19 14:59:05 20 21 22 23	 A. I can't say the precise definition, no. Q. Do you have an understanding as to whether a check is issued when a public voucher is created? A. I'm not sure. Q. Or in this case perhaps many checks? A. I don't know. Q. But you did know back when we were talking about 2007, for example? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Go back to page 2007. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You did recognize that this was different than the public voucher document that we were talking about earlier. Right? A. The title of it is an intrabureau cash transaction. Q. And if you look at the document number on this one, again the leader on it is a BB. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. And this is a disbursement from PL 7386706, and we've established, have we not, that that's a payment from Osage Tribe account? A. I believe you showed me something earlier in the previous

Page 1567 to 1570 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1571		1573
1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you go to the first page on	1	Exhibit 189-A, the first page, Attachment A.
2	this, please? Yeah, here we are. Go to the top of page 2005.	2	A. Okay.
3	A. Yes.	3	Q. And actually, I don't know which page we're on, but we're
4	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	4	actually on a good page. Let's look at that line. We're
14:59:36 5	Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to what that	15:02:36 5	talking about fiscal year 2001. We saw the 12.04 million figure
6	particular account refers to?	6	which we got by going through the DX-372 documents.
7	A. That's what it says.	7	A. That is correct.
8	Q. This is a payment, go to 2007, this is a disbursement from	8	Q. But you've got a \$23.6 million figure there next to it.
9	the Osage Tribe account into the 6039, the IIM account. Right?	9	Right?
14:59:59 10	A. Yes.	15:02:54 10	A. That is correct.
11	Q. And then move forward to 2008. This was also a payment out	11	Q. And what does that figure represent?
12	of the Osage Tribe account?	12	A. The 23.6 would be the value of the Osage annuity less the
13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Blow it up here.	13	1.25 percent that goes to the tribe.
14	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	14	Q. That's basically your per share amount times 2,229 shares,
15:00:16 15	Q. Do you see that?	15:03:13 15	reduced by the 1.25 percent. Right?
16	A. I do.	16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And then if we go and you see down under the payees,	17	Q. And this is your collections amount. Right?
18	various annuitants?	18	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. This is not the
19	A. Yes.	19	same document we provided to defendants. We have a total of
15:00:24 20	Q. And there's nothing on this document or the next page, 2009,	15:03:32 20	4,685,121 in our document. There's a different number on this
21	that refers to the IIM Trust accounts. Right?	21	document.
22	A. IIM is not anywhere on this document and the following page,	22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'm sorry, it's supposed to be
23	that's correct.	23	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189 - A from this morning.
24	Q. Now, I believe based on your testimony this morning, since	24	MR. GINGOLD: It's not the same document.
15:00:46 25	you've included as revenues within your collections number all	15:03:49 25	MR. WARSHAWSKY: We'll get there.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
-	1572		1574
1	Osage headright payments, I mean, you've basically taken the	1	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2	number of shares, total number of shares times the per share	2	Q. Okay. There we are. We've had our own technical
3	amount. Right?	3	difficulties here. We're back.
4	A. That is correct.	4	2001, you see there's the 12.04 million figure that we
15:01:01 5	Q. You haven't distinguished the amount that went to IIM	15:04:02 5	talked about from DX-372?
6	accounts from amounts that went directly to annuitants?	6	A. Yes.
7	A. Depending on if the disbursements were made through the IIM	7	Q. And you've taken that out of collections. Right?
8	account, then we would take account to when we have CP&R and	8	A. That's correct.
9	electronic transfers, if they're electronic transfers that were	9	Q. And next to it you've got your \$23.62 million figure.
15:01:23 10	made to Osage individuals, headright owners, we would capture	15:04:14 10	Right?
11	those payments.	11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. My question, Dr. Palmer, is you're showing disbursements.	12	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And that was the 98.75 percent of 2,229 shares times the per
13	These were two disbursements coming out of the Osage Tribe	13	share amount. Right?
14	account for the Osage annuity payment.	14	A. Right.
15:01:39 15	A. Okay.	15:04:23 15	Q. And you've added that into collections. Right?
16	Q. The headright payment. Part of which went into IIM	16	A. That's correct.
17	accounts, part of which were paid directly to various	17	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ So your collections figure includes all collections I
18	annuitants.	18	mean, all Osage headright revenues. Right?
19	A. Okay.	19	A. That is correct.
15:01:49 20	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And your analysis doesn't distinguish those two groups of	15:04:34 20	Q. Reduced by the 1.25 percent?
21	payees, does it?	21	A. Yes.
22	A. In terms of to reiterate, in terms of disbursements, we	22	THE COURT: Can I stop just a minute and clear up a
23	take into account all of the checks and electronic funds	23	little problem I had this morning. There's discussion on
24	transfers that come out of the IIM account.	24	1.25 percent and then there's discussion of 1.25 headrights. I
15:02:07 25	Q. Let's pull up I'm sorry, let's pull up Plaintiffs'	15:04:53 25	don't know whether we're dealing with percentages or headrights,
1	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	1	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net

Page 1571 to 1574 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1575		1577
1	because 1.25 headrights is a lot less than 1.25 percent of	1	through the IIM Trust. Is that correct?"
2	2,229. So which is it?	2	Answer: "The way you've defined it, that sounds like
3	THE WITNESS: Do we have the document from this	3	that's correct. Yes."
4	morning?	4	Question: "And if in fact you've included those types
15:05:07 5	THE COURT: Well, you were shown a document that spoke	15:07:42 5	of revenues in the Osage corrected amounts in Column D, would
6	in terms of one-and-a-quarter headrights.	6	you agree that those amounts should come out of the
7	THE WITNESS: Then we took out too much.	7	calculation?"
8	THE COURT: And you've been talking about	8	Answer: "If the amounts never flowed into the IIM
9	one-and-a-quarter percent.	9	Trust, then they should not be in my calculation."
15:05:17 10	THE WITNESS: Then we took out too much.	15:07:55 10	That's basically the scenario that we've just gone
11	THE COURT: It's a small number, but I don't know which	11	through with some of these documents. Right?
12	one is which.	12	A. And I would agree with that.
13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Yeah, that was if we could put it	13	Q. So if in fact the money doesn't go into the IIM Trust, if
14	up, please.	14	the payments are made directly to the annuitants from the tribal
15:05:40 15	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	15:08:10 15	account, it shouldn't go in your calculation?
16	Q. This is Plaintiffs' 183, the Osage Nation brief.	16	A. That's correct.
17	A. If we could pull it up, we could look at it if it's	17	Q. I asked Dr. Cornell, Professor Cornell further, and we can
18	possible.	18	pull up 334, lines 24 to 21 of the next page, 334, 335. I asked
10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Matthew is working at it right now.	19	
	Here we are.	15:08:42 20	Professor Cornell if he could quantify the impact of his
15:05:50 20 21		15:08:42 20 21	including this. And you can actually see it unfortunately
21	And do you remember what page we were on? 38 or 39.	21	we'll have to jig over here, but it's the question at the bottom
	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, you're correct. We pulled	22	of 24 on 334.
23	out too much.		"Have you ever done a calculation to get a sense as to
24	THE COURT: So you pulled out too much. So that's	24	how much of the \$58 billion that you showed us, your bottom, how
15:06:25 25	actually a difference that favors the plaintiffs. Okay.	15:09:11 25	much of that is attributable to the difference between the use
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1576		1578
1		1	of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage
2	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I	2	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?"
	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand.	-	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe
2	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	2 3 4	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?"
2 3 4 15:06:39	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for	2 3 4 15:09:22 5	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony.	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see."
2 3 4 15:06:39 6 7	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not.	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not?	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not.	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not?	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that?
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell.	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16 17	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue.
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15:07:04 15 16 17 18	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled.
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16 17 18 19	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15:07:04 15 16 17 18	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A . I was not. Q . Oh, you were not? A . No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account."	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16 17 18 19	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account." "Yes."	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your colleague made a few weeks ago.
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16 17 18 19 15:07:21 20	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A . I was not. Q . Oh, you were not? A . No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account." "Yes." Question: "And monies from that tribal account are	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19 15:10:09 20	 1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your colleague made a few weeks ago. A. You know, again, hypothetically, I don't know what kind of
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 15:07:21 20 21 22 23	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A . I was not. Q . Oh, you were not? A . No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account." "Yes." Question: "And monies from that tribal account are disbursed directly to individuals, not to a trust account, but	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19 15:10:09 20 21	 1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your colleague made a few weeks ago. A. You know, again, hypothetically, I don't know what kind of went into the Trust, what goes out of the Trust. As best we can
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15:07:04 15 16 17 18 19 15:07:21 20 21 22	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account." "Yes." Question: "And monies from that tribal account are disbursed directly to individuals, not to a trust account, but to individuals who have what are called headright interests.	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:20 15 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19 15:10:09 20 21 22	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your colleague made a few weeks ago. A. You know, again, hypothetically, I don't know what kind of went into the Trust, what goes out of the Trust. As best we can identify, if indeed your hypothetical is correct, it's probably
2 3 4 15:06:39 5 6 7 8 9 15:06:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 15:07:21 20 21 22 23	1576 THE WITNESS: It favors the defendants. THE COURT: All right. It's adjustable. Now I understand. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. I would like to you were present, of course, for Professor Cornell's testimony. A. I was not. Q. Oh, you were not? A. No. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up page 334? This is from the June 10, 2008 afternoon testimony of Doctor or Professor Cornell. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. If you read through this question and answer that I presented to him, it said, Question: "And so you, for example let me just give you a different view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account." "Yes." Question: "And monies from that tribal account are disbursed directly to individuals, not to a trust account, but to individuals who have what are called headright interests. Are you with me?"	2 3 4 15:09:22 5 6 7 8 9 15:09:40 10 11 12 13 14 15:09:56 15 16 17 18 19 15:10:09 20 21 22 23	1578 of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage calculation?" Answer: "I haven't, but if we went to the bottom maybe we can see." And if you read on down to line 21, I don't want to make people listen to this, but getting down to the bottom, he gets to, his bottom line is about 11-plus billion dollars on line 20 of page 335. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you make an estimate sitting here today, if in fact what you've calculated as being in Column D, if that's really not properly part of the IIM system, if it really is the government's calculation MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a legal conclusion. This Court hasn't ruled on that issue. THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you to make the same calculation your colleague made a few weeks ago. A. You know, again, hypothetically, I don't know what kind of went into the Trust, what goes out of the Trust. As best we can identify, if indeed your hypothetical is correct, it's probably the same order of magnitude.

	1579		1581
1	Morgan Angel exhibit receipts are adjusted to account for	1	Q. And then the next column, total proven coverage, do you know
2	acknowledged understatement of revenues using 77 percent cited	2	what that refers to?
3	in DX-365.	3	A. No.
4	You testified a little bit about that this morning?	4	Q. And that's the caption of this document, by the way, "Proven
15:11:03 5	A. Yes.	15:14:18 5	Coverage." Right?
6	Q. When did you first become aware of Defendant's Exhibit 365?	6	A. That is correct.
7		7	Q. Don't you think it's important to know why the document was
8	A. When I read, I think it was the Judge's opinion of	8	
9	January 30th, he had cited that document.	9	made before you choose the 77 percent figure at the bottom?
15:11:22 10	Q. And who made the decision to utilize DX-365's figure to make		A. The revenues were said to be understated. This was a
15:11:22 10 11	the adjustment on this page?	15:14:34 10	document that gave a number of an estimate of 77 percent. It
12	A. I did.	11	was a number that we used. If we had the actual amount of
	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up Defendant's	12	understatement, if we knew the amount that had gone into the
13	Exhibit 365.	13	general Treasury fund, we would have used that as the number.
14	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	14	Since we didn't, this provided an estimate.
15:11:31 15	Q. Dr. Palmer, what's your understanding of why this document	15:14:52 15	Q. Are you saying that this document stated revenues were
16	was created?	16	understated?
17	A. This document was created, I think as part of an analysis	17	A. If you go to the bottom of the document and see what it
18	the defendants were doing. The part that I would utilize is at	18	says, that's what it said, that the credits into the accounts
19	the bottom, the footnote that says estimated credits into the	19	was a fraction of collections. It was an estimate.
15:12:10 20	IIM accounts, the IIM accounts is currently estimated at	15:15:09 20	Q. How did you interpret that to be a statement that revenues
21	77 percent of total collections.	21	were understated?
22	Q. Well, up at the top, let's focus on the top, it says, proven	22	A. Well, this was credits into the account, so what the
23	coverage 1909 to 2006 in dollars, millions, do you see that?	23	accounts are credited as.
24	A. I do.	24	Q. Now, you've sat through a lot of this trial. I understand
15:12:30 25	Q. What was meant by that?	15:15:21 25	you weren't here for everything, but you've listened to a lot of
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1580		1582
1	A. Again, I believe this was part of an analysis done, there	1	it. Right?
2	were several pages to this document where they assumed different	2	A. Yes.
3	amounts credited and then looked at the effect over time, and	3	Q. And you've heard testimony about the notion that money
4			
	that footnote is on every page of the document.	4	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not
15:12:50 5	that footnote is on every page of the document. Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but	4 15:15:38 5	
15:12:50 5 6		_	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not
	Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but	15:15:38 5	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account.
	Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the	15:15:38 5	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right?
6 7	Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage?	15:15:38 5 6 7	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM
6 7 8	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8	that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust.
6 7 8 9	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right?
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here.
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here.
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was.
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel?
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20 21	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. Q. What was the DCV? 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20 21	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel? A. Yes, I remember the chart.
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20 21 22	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. Q. What was the DCV? A. I think the V stands for verification. I don't remember 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20 21 22	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel? A. Yes, I remember the chart. Q. And do you remember when she was talking about money coming
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20 21 22 23	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. Q. What was the DCV? A. I think the V stands for verification. I don't remember what the D and the C were. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20 21 22 23	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel? A. Yes, I remember the chart. Q. And do you remember when she was talking about money coming into the IIM system ultimately going to, for example, to tribal
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. Q. What was the DCV? A. I think the V stands for verification. I don't remember what the D and the C were. Q. Did you ever review any of the DCV materials in this case? 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20 21 22 23 24	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel? A. Yes, I remember the chart. Q. And do you remember when she was talking about money coming into the IIM system ultimately going to, for example, to tribal accounts and not going to IIM accounts?
6 7 8 9 15:13:08 10 11 12 13 14 15:13:26 15 16 17 18 19 15:13:43 20 21 22 23	 Q. I understand you used the 77 percent from the footnote, but my question is, do you understand what was meant by the reference to proven coverage? A. Again, my understanding was this was a document prepared as part of the reconciliation that was being done. Q. And I'm just trying to understand why you considered the 77 percent figure as relevant to your analysis. Looking in the third column, there's a caption, proven by transaction reconciliation testing and interest recalculation. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. What did that refer to? A. I know no more than it says there. Q. And the next column says proven by DCV only. What did that refer to? A. Again, I know no more than it says there. Q. What was the DCV? A. I think the V stands for verification. I don't remember what the D and the C were. 	15:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 15:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 15:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 15:16:28 20 21 22 23	 that collections coming into the IIM system may in fact not be the ultimate destination may not be an IIM account. Right? A. If funds go into the IIM Trust, then they are for IIM accounts. That's the reason they go into the Trust. Q. You haven't distinguished between IIM accounts and the IIM system in your analysis. Right? A. My understanding of IIM system is something that Michelle Herman had talked about, but this talks about credits into IIM accounts of collections, so I was focusing on the IIM Trust and the IIM accounts here. Q. You referred to Ms. Herman's testimony. You were here for all of it? A. I believe I was. Q. And you remember that big chart that she had on an easel over here, I forget, Defendants', what was it, 371 Defendants' 370, the big easel? A. Yes, I remember the chart. Q. And do you remember when she was talking about money coming into the IIM system ultimately going to, for example, to tribal

Page 1579 to 1582 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdfactory.com

	4500		4505
1	1583 even the 2007 data, most current data, what went to her	1	1585 those years?
2	construction of what an IIM account was versus others, and she	2	A. He had testified to that, and also on Michelle Herman's
3	couldn't. She said she hadn't been asked to.	3	exhibit there was a comment about revenues being understated.
4	So she couldn't identify the distinction between that.	4	Q. And I just want to understand what your opinions are right
15:17:00 5	So I'm not sure how that relates to this.	15:19:52 5	now. You have an opinion that those years are understated. Is
6	Q. Well, I understand you remember that, but my question was,	6	that correct?
7	do you remember her talking about money coming into the	7	A. I relied upon the information that they provided. I did not
8	IIM system and going to tribes, for example?	8	do the specific research for those years. They had testified to
9	A. I'm not sure I'm really familiar with the IIM system. It's	9	it, so I used that information.
15:17:17 10	something that defendants, that Michelle Herman had talked	15:20:05 10	Again, the purpose that we tried to incorporate as much
11	about. Here we're talking about credits into IIM accounts and	11	of the information and knowledge from the trial as we could.
12	total collections. There's no IIM system that I understand	12	Q. You just mentioned Dr. Angel's testimony. Did you have an
13	here.	13	understanding, when Dr. Angel testified about understatement of
14	Q. Well, if you understand I'll ask you to assume that	14	collections in those years, whether he was also talking about an
15:17:34 15	Defendant's Exhibit 365, total collections as referenced in the	15:20:26 15	understatement of disbursements?
16	note that you've been talking about, that that refers to	16	A. He specifically made reference to revenues, he did not make
17	collections into the IIM system. Would that change your	17	any reference to disbursements, I believe.
18	understanding that this was a statement that revenues were	18	Q. Well, let's pull up Dr. Angel's testimony, pages 791, 792.
19	understated?	19	This is from the afternoon of June 17th. We'll start at the
15:17:53 20	A. As I mentioned earlier this morning, if we had the correct	15:20:48 20	bottom, at line 24 on 791. Do you see that, sir?
21	information we would have used it, as revenues were	21	And Dr. Angel, knowing the relatively limited amount of
22	understated was the testimony, therefore we needed an estimate	22	new information you've added since October, what then in your
23	for those. Once I applied this estimate for that, the	23	opinion is the relevance of your total IIM chart for this
24	disbursement rates for those time periods, given the ratios that	24	particular remedies trial?
15:18:12 25	we had looked at from time periods when we had reported	15:21:12 25	And you're reading on, sir, in the next answer: Well,
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1584		1586
1	information, seemed reasonable. So this seemed like a	1	it's multiple. First of all, we were able to gather some
2	reasonable estimate for those time periods as well.	2	receipt and disbursement information, but the receipt and
3	Q. Well, is it fair to say that your use of 77 percent from	3	disbursement information we were able to gather clearly is
4	this document is contingent upon this document standing for the	4	limited. It's limited in the number of years that's presented,
15:18:30 5	proposition that revenues are understated?	15:21:31 5	and certainly it's limited in the scope of what's presented.
6	A. This document gave an estimate. We used that estimate. We	6	This is not all receipts and all disbursements. It gave us an
7	needed some basis. If this estimate is incorrect, then we would	7	additional number to work with. I certainly hoped, as I added
8	use a different estimate. But we tried to use an estimate of	8	it to the IIM table, that it would be beneficial to
9	understated revenues, and this is something that defendants had	9	statisticians and modelers, as long as they understood the
15:18:49 10	provided, so we used it.	15:21:51 10	limitations of the data.
11	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace$. And if you misunderstood the purpose of this document, you	11	Do you remember that testimony, sir?
12	would agree that your use of the 77 percent in your model was	12	A. Yes.
13	incorrect?	13	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And in that testimony he was talking about both receipts and
14	A. The 77 percent could still be correct. Again, once I looked	14	disbursements being understated. Right?
15:19:02 15	at the ratio of the disbursement rate during the period, then it	15:21:59 15	A. Yes, he did.
16	seemed like a reasonable thing to do. So we went through this	16	Q. But you haven't adjusted disbursements similar to your
17	number. This was a number we used here. Is it 76? Is it 80?	17	adjustment to collections, have you?
18	I don't know exactly precisely. Here was an estimate based on	18	A. We did not. Again, I looked at the ratio once we made the
19	this document, and so we used it.	19	adjustment, and it seemed to be in the reasonable range of what
15:19:21 20	Q. Now, you've expressed I believe some concerns, and certainly	15:22:14 20	disbursements we have had in other periods, so we had adjusted
21	there are concerns reflected in your model regarding the years	21	just the disbursements I'm sorry, just the revenues.
22	1923 to 1949. Correct?	22	If the adjustment rate we used for revenues was
23	A. Those are the years that the information from Dr. Angel	23	incorrect, and that they both should be adjusted up, there may
24	that he provided at the trial.	24	be a different factor, but this is what we used.
15:19:37 25	Q. And you were concerned that collections were understated in	15:22:30 25	Q. In fact, if they're both understated by roughly the same
1	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>

Page 1583 to 1586 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1587		1589
1	amount, it doesn't affect the bottom line, the account balance	1	disbursements and revenues. I did not assume the relationship.
2	at September 30, 2007. Right?	2	Q. Very good, Dr. Palmer. My question, though, because you
3	A. It would affect it, actually, in the calculation.	3	talked about regression, was: You didn't utilize a regression
4	Q. How so, if receipts and disbursements are understated by the	4	technique in your analysis, did you?
15:22:47 5	same amounts?	15:25:25 5	A. We did linear interpolation for estimation.
6	A. Well, if there's a differential, and they're both higher by	6	Q. Which is not regression analysis. Right?
7	a certain amount in that differential, the dollar value will be	7	A. It is a technique, it's not a regression technique. Again,
8	different. So if you take two numbers and you inflate both	8	Dr. Scheuren had said he confirmed it was a reasonable thing
9	numbers by the same percentage, if one's higher than the other,	9	to do.
15:23:01 10	as you get higher it's going to be a larger dollar amount.	15:25:38 10	Q. Okay. Thank you.
11	Also my understanding is the reason they were	11	Let's pull back up your spreadsheet, Attachment A.
12	understated is because this was information from the disbursing	12	This is Plaintiffs' 189-A. And let's go to the collections
13	officers and not the funds that were in Treasury. You're right,	13	page. I forget what the tabs are called. Your receipts
14	there was not any information about this, but generally I would	14	analysis.
15:23:19 15	think that the disbursing officers would have a pretty good hand	15:26:31 15	Now, you recognize this as the receipts worksheet
16	in monies that were disbursed, monies in Treasury would be in	16	from yes, up in the upper left-hand corner, you see it says
17	Treasury potentially being held. In that case you would have no	17	"6/23, Final Model"?
18	more or fewer disbursements out of Treasury than from the	18	A. Yes.
19	disbursing agent. So it seemed reasonable to adjust the	19	Q. So we're working with the right one now. This is from the
15:23:37 20	revenues and not the disbursements.	15:26:46 20	receipts worksheet to your document, the Excel spreadsheet that
21	Q. So you've adjusted collections upward but left disbursements	21	we got late last night. Right?
22	where they are. Right?	22	A. That's correct.
23	A. That is correct.	23	Q. And let's go to the years 1923 to 1949, and over in
24	Q. And you listened to Dr. Scheuren's testimony as well.	24	Column O, Excel spreadsheet Column O, is that where you applied
15:23:52 25	Right?	15:27:11 25	the 77 percent figure?
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1588		1590
1	1588 A. I.did	1	A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes
	A. I did.	1	A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes.
1 2 3	A. I did.Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time	1 2 3	A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes.Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365?
2	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data 	2	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from
234	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? 	2 3 4	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit.
2	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. 	2	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from
2 3 4 15:24:02 5	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in 	2 3 4	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized 	2 3 4	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one?
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 13 14 15:28:05 15 16	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77?
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19 15:24:53 20	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation to hold force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19 15:28:12 20	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean increased.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19 15:24:53 20 21	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. So it really didn't address the problem. His time series technique was a smoothing process, it was not a regressive process. It's not going to adjust if one is 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19 15:28:12 20 21	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean increased. THE WITNESS: Increased.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19 15:24:53 20 21 22	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. So it really didn't address the problem. His time series technique was a smoothing process, it was not a regressive process. It's not going to adjust if one is differentially affected. 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19 15:28:12 20 21 22	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean infraesed. THE WITNESS: Increased. THE WITNESS: Increased.
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19 15:24:53 20 21 22 23	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. Do it really didn't address the problem. His time series technique was a smoothing process, it was not a regressive process. It's not going to adjust if one is aifferentially affected. Q. You didn't utilize a regressive process either, did you? 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19 15:28:12 20 21 22 23	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So basically how did you use the 77 percent on this one? A. So as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean increased. THE WITNESS: Increased. THE WITNESS: Increased. THE COURT: Because inflated would suggest that they're higher than they should be, but you're taking the position that
2 3 4 15:24:02 5 6 7 8 9 15:24:19 10 11 12 13 14 15:24:36 15 16 17 18 19 15:24:53 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I did. Q. And do you remember his testimony about utilizing time series techniques to address uncertainty created by missing data for the values in these years? A. I did. Q. And do you remember or are you aware that for every year in the period of 1923 to 1949, the time series techniques utilized by NORC and Dr. Scheuren ended up increasing the collections figures? A. I do know that that was the result of his calculations. Of course those calculations were premised upon relationships of other years, so he has assumed a relationship between disbursements and collections for all years prior, so his estimation is going to continue that relationship during those years. If those years were differentially wrong or information in one was understated and the other was not, his estimation technique would force that to be the same relationship to hold for that time. So it really didn't address the problem. His time series technique was a smoothing process, it was not a regressive process. It's not going to adjust if one is a differentially affected. Q. You didn't utilize a regressive process either, did you? A. I looked through Dr. Scheuren's process and the calculations 	2 3 4 15:27:25 5 6 7 8 9 15:27:38 10 11 12 13 14 15:28:05 15 16 17 18 19 15:28:12 20 21 22 23 24	 A. That is the 77 percent figure, yes. Q. That's the one that you took from Defendant's Exhibit 365? A. That's the number we used was .77, and yes, that was from that exhibit. Q. The one with the little note at the bottom, 365. Right? A. Yes. Q. Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And scroll over a little bit. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: A so as I testified about this morning, the revenues were inflated. So if they had been 77 percent of what they should have been, they were divided by .77, which would cause them to be inflated. Q. You increased the receipts by dividing the figures in Column M by .77? A. That is correct. Q. You didn't make THE COURT: You don't mean inflated, you mean increased. THE WITNESS: Increased. THE COURT: Because inflated would suggest that they're higher than they should be, but you're taking the position that they should have been this high.

Page 1587 to 1590 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1591		1593
1		1	
2	clarification. I was thinking that they were larger because of the factor.	2	
3	THE COURT: You divided the numbers in Column M by the	3	
4		4
	percentage in Column O to get the number in Column P.		
15:28:35 5	THE WITNESS: That is correct. A mathematical	15:30:52 5	
_	calculation.	7	······································
7	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	-	
8	Q. And you didn't make a similar adjustment to receipts I'm	8	
9	sorry, to collections for this period of 1923 to 1949, even	9	
15:28:46 10	though Dr. Angel testified that both collections and let me	15:31:15 10	_
11	say that again. I may have gotten it wrong there.	11	4
	You didn't make a similar adjustment to the	12	
13	disbursements data even though Dr. Angel testified that both	13	
14	collections and disbursements were understated in those years.	14	
15:29:05 15	Right?	15:31:24 15	
16	A. As we talked about earlier, because they were differential,	16	
17	that we had the information from	17	
18	Q. Dr. Palmer, it's really a yes or no question.	18	
19	A. Well, then, my previous answer stands.	19	
15:29:16 20	Q. You did not make an adjustment to disbursements for those	15:31:39 20	MR. WARSHAWSKY: We practiced it. If you'd like, Your
21	years?	21	Honor, I may do it. No, he's not doing it right, actually. He
22	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. He misstated	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23	Dr. Angel's testimony.	23	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
24	THE COURT: Well, then, I think he better say again	24	
15:29:26 25	what it was.	15:32:00 25	A. I do.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1592		1594
1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can pull it up again if you would	1	Q. I would have taken a sum of the two columns, but he's taken
2	like.	2	the difference for each individual item and then summed it at
3	THE COURT: Are we going to stand by your previous	3	the bottom, 169.6 million?
4	testimony or are you going to clarify it for us, Doctor?	4	A. Okay.
15:29:37 5	THE WITNESS: My previous answer that I already gave I	15:32:14 5	Q. And that's for the years 1923 to 1949?
6	thought was adequate. But do you want me to answer it again?	6	A. That's correct. Oh, wait oh, yes, yes.
7	THE COURT: Let me hear it again. Everybody seems to	7	Q. And sitting here today, do you have any sense as to what the
8	know what it was but me.	8	interest impact is on your benefit calculation, moving those
9	THE WITNESS: The answer was that we adjusted the	9	years forward, if in fact you shouldn't have increased those
15:29:51 10	revenues and not the disbursements. Dr. Angel had said that	15:32:32 10	amounts by 169.6 million?
11	both may have been understated. The comment, though, the reason	11	A. I do not know.
12	that the revenues and disbursements were understated is because	12	Q. In the billions, do you think?
13	we only have information from the account officers, the	13	A. I do not know.
14	disbursing officers.	14	THE COURT: We're going to take a 10-minute break.
15:30:08 15	So there were funds in Treasury, but what seemed	15:42:35 15	(Recess taken at 3:32 p.m.)
16	reasonable is that things that were being disbursed would be	16	THE COURT: Before we continue here, we had talked
17	disbursed through disbursing officers. Funds held in Treasury	17	about hearing some summaries, and I don't know about you-all,
18	would not likely have the same disbursement rates because they	18	but it's beginning to be obvious to me that if we do that this
	wouldn't be going through a disbursing officer. So it seemed	19	afternoon it's going to be a bit rushed. And I wonder how we
19		15:42:52 20	all feel about doing this tomorrow afternoon instead of this
19 15:30:23 20	reasonable to adjust the revenues and not the disbursements.		all feel about doing this tomorrow alternoon instead of this
		21	
15:30:23 20	reasonable to adjust the revenues and not the disbursements.	21 22	afternoon.
15:30:23 20 21	reasonable to adjust the revenues and not the disbursements. And as a sanity check to that, the disbursement rates, once they		afternoon. MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's fine with us, Your Honor.
15:30:23 20 21 22	reasonable to adjust the revenues and not the disbursements. And as a sanity check to that, the disbursement rates, once they were adjusted, seemed reasonable.	22	afternoon. MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's fine with us, Your Honor. MR. DORRIS: That would be great.
15:30:23 20 21 22 23 23	reasonable to adjust the revenues and not the disbursements. And as a sanity check to that, the disbursement rates, once they were adjusted, seemed reasonable. THE COURT: So the answer to Mr. Warshawsky's question	22 23	afternoon. MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's fine with us, Your Honor. MR. DORRIS: That would be great. THE COURT: All right, good.

Page 1591 to 1594 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1595		1597
1	the afternoon.	1	the fourth page.
2	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I take that back.	2	If you want to go ahead and highlight the section down
3	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Mr. Gingold is going to be doing	3	where we have the revenue and the collections and disbursements
4	redirect, so	4	numbers.
15:43:18 5	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	15:46:42 5	Now, in your analysis you used the collections figure
6	Q. Dr. Palmer, I wanted to turn but first of all, let me	6	of 66.8 million. Right?
7	just address the question I think the Judge was asking as we	7	A. 66 point yes.
8	were leaving. Dr. Palmer, if we you know, if you were to	8	Q. And if it assists you, we can jump to Plaintiffs'
9	take your model and take the Osage your calculation of Osage,	9	Exhibit 189-A real quickly. And this would actually go I think
15:43:39 10	you know, the 98.75 percent calculation, take those numbers out	15:47:18 10	into your you have to help me here. Yes, it's actually in
11	of your collections figure and put back in the government	11	your collections analysis. It's not Attachment it's the
12	calculated figure you're with me. Right?	12	collections analysis within Attachment A.
13	A. I'm listening.	13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if it's okay with you and
14	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace$. And that would end up reducing your total revenues. Right?	14	it's okay with the plaintiffs, we received this as an Excel
15:44:00 15	A. That's correct.	15:47:52 15	spreadsheet, I mean, the Excel document, all of the attachments
16	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace$ And when you did disbursement rate calculations, what impact	16	in one. It would be easier working with that than
17	would that have on your disbursement rate calculations?	17	Plaintiffs' 189-A that we received this morning.
18	A. Let's see. For the 1909-1911 period it would not have any	18	MR. GINGOLD: Do you know whether it's been modified at
19	effect. That's actually, the change that you had mentioned	19	all by anyone?
15:44:28 20	earlier today about the spreadsheet that was given to you last	15:48:07 20	MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, if you look up in the top left,
21	night I'm answering the question, but I'm saying is it would	21	it's your 6/23 version.
22	not affect the disbursement rate we used for that period.	22	MR. GINGOLD: The other one we had, somebody modified
23	I'm saying that the previous version that was	23	that document.
24	originally given to you on Saturday night, Sunday morning, that	24	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, the receipts worksheet, if you
15:44:45 25	had in there the Osage adjustment to the revenue. When I looked	15:48:20 25	can tell me which of your PX-189s, we can do it that way, too.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1596		1598
1	at that and thought about it, that was incorrect, so I adjusted	1	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2	that out. So the disbursement percentage that's used for the	2	Q. Referring down to line 1955, do you see you've got the 66.814 there?
4	1909 to 1911 period, that's then the basis for the missing data	З	A. Yes.
	around the 1909 to 1911 period, that would be completely unaffected by any change of Osage information.		
15:45:08 3	The other percentage the other information that we	15:48:41 D	Q. In Column H. And that was the one that you took from the Comptroller General report?
7	used for the other missing data later, where we used the CP&R	7	A. I believe that's correct.
8	check and EFT information from 1988 to 2002, there we are	8	Q. Go back to the Comptroller General report, Plaintiffs'
9	dividing by the adjustment, so that would cause that	9	Exhibit 53. Now, on the same line you also had a disbursements
15:45:31 10	disbursement ratio to change.	15:49:05 10	figure, disbursements of Individual Indian Monies, total
11	Q. Your disbursement rate would go up?	11	66.2 million?
12	A. It would go up, that's correct.	12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. And for that middle period where you blended the two	13	Q. But you didn't use that in your analysis, did you?
14		14	A. We did use that.
	rates you remember?		
15:45:44 15	rates you remember? A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it	15:49:16 15	Q. So if we go to disbursements, what are we going to see for
15:45:44 15 16		15:49:16 15 16	Q. So if we go to disbursements, what are we going to see for 1955?
	A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it		
16	A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and	16	1955?
16 17	A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not.	16 17	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements,
16 17 18	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document 	16 17 18	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955.
16 17 18 19	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. 	16 17 18 19	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
16 17 18 19 15:46:04 20	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. A. Yes, that's correct. 	16 17 18 19 15:49:36 20	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Your disbursements figure in Column F is 49.37 million?
16 17 18 19 15:46:04 20 21	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. A. Yes, that's correct. Q. You remember this, the Comptroller General audit report for 	16 17 18 19 15:49:36 20 21	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Your disbursements figure in Column F is 49.37 million? A. Yes. As I testified this morning, we did use that number.
16 17 18 19 15:46:04 20 21 22	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. A. Yes, that's correct. Q. You remember this, the Comptroller General audit report for 1955? 	16 17 18 19 15:49:36 20 21 22	 1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Your disbursements figure in Column F is 49.37 million? A. Yes. As I testified this morning, we did use that number. We adjusted that number by the ratio we had talked about, and
16 17 18 19 15:46:04 20 21 22 23	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. A. Yes, that's correct. Q. You remember this, the Comptroller General audit report for 1955? A. Correct. 	16 17 18 19 15:49:36 20 21 22 23	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Your disbursements figure in Column F is 49.37 million? A. Yes. As I testified this morning, we did use that number. We adjusted that number by the ratio we had talked about, and the reason, that document talks a lot about problems and issues
16 17 18 19 15:46:04 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Then that would be an average. It would be slightly it would be higher as well, because one of the rates was higher and one of them was not. Q. Now let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53. This was a document that you reviewed this morning with Dr. Gingold. A. Yes, that's correct. Q. You remember this, the Comptroller General audit report for 1955? A. Correct. Q. And if we go to page six it's actually, at the bottom it says page number two but I think actually on your exhibit it's <i>Rebecca Stonestreet</i> (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u> 	16 17 18 19 15:49:36 20 21 22 23 24	1955? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you pull up disbursements, please? Why don't you go to Attachment A, 1955. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Your disbursements figure in Column F is 49.37 million? A. Yes. As I testified this morning, we did use that number. We adjusted that number by the ratio we had talked about, and the reason, that document talks a lot about problems and issues that they had with disbursements, identification of

Page 1595 to 1598 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1599		1601
1	number.	1	one by one. There was not any particular word or phrase that
2	Q. So this is a situation where you took one number from a	2	said disbursements were overstated by this amount. It was by
3	particular page but didn't take you didn't use the same	3	reading this document that I was concerned about disbursements,
4	number well, you used the collections number for your	4	so I adjusted them.
15:50:10 5	analysis but your disbursements number didn't make it to	15:52:54 5	There's not any individual word or any individual
6	Attachment A. You adjusted it down. Right?	6	particular statement in here, it was as I read the document I
7	A. We it made it, we adjusted it down because of the	7	was concerned about the disbursements, and so I adjusted it.
8	concerns that were listed for the disbursement document. There	8	THE COURT: Dr. Palmer, you said you used the exact
9	were no concerns listed for receipts but there were many	9	same words about three times in a row. I was concerned about
15:50:24 10	concerns listed for disbursements. So we adjusted it, as we had	15:53:12 10	the disbursements so I adjusted it. How did you know the amount
11	examined earlier this morning about the ratio for adjustments	11	by which to adjust it?
12	for when we saw funds that were identified for leaving through	12	THE WITNESS: The amount that I used was the
13	the check and EFT, and we can identify that and compare it, we	13	calculation that I had seen later when I had actual disbursement
14	used that adjustment factor here as well.	14	data through checks and electronic funds transfers, I compared
15:50:43 15	Q. And you testified this morning about the reasons that you	15:53:28 15	those to what the defendants had used during the time period
16	adjusted it down with respect to that report. Right?	16	when they had data, and that they reported disbursement ratios
17	A. That's correct.	17	during the same years, I took the average of the amount by which
18	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Would you go to that report again,	18	theirs were different from the amount, the disbursement ratio
19	please, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53? And we're going to look at	19	that I reported. So I took that ratio and that's the number by
15:50:58 20	pages 10 and 11, at least the original pages 10 and 11 which now	15:53:51 20	how much I adjusted things.
21	appear on page eight of this exhibit.	21	This was the 1.3 factor on Schedule C that we had
22	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	22	talked about this morning. That's the number. Because when I
23	Q. You remember this, what's showing here now, paragraphs one	23	had numbers that the defendants used, numbers that we found from
24	and two, and then on the next page three and four?	24	analyzing the checks and the electronic funds, so what I'm going
15:51:15 25	A. Yes.	15:54:08 25	to call actual disbursements out of the fund, when I can compare
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1600		1602
1	Q. Those were the reasons that you testified about. Right?	1	those apples to apples, I came up with that ratio, and that's
1 2	Q. Those were the reasons that you testified about. Right?A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many	1 2	those apples to apples, I came up with that ratio, and that's the number that I used to adjust.
		_	
2	A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many	2 3 4	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4 15:51:28 5	A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked	2 3 4 15:54:23 5	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay.
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6	A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7	A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning.	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs'
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh,
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that.
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right?
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct.
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation?
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal.	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:24 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18	the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were. Here	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it was not necessarily clear what those disbursements were concerns 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:24 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20 21	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it was not necessarily clear what those disbursements were. Here it just said disbursements, so I adjusted the disbursements. 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20 21	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was used. Q. I'm sorry?
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20 21 22	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: A. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it was not necessarily clear what those disbursements were. Here it just said disbursements, so I adjusted the disbursements. Q. Is there anything in paragraph one that tells you that the	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:41 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20 21 22	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was used. Q. I'm sorry? A. So the same methodology was used. We did plug in the
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:28 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20 21 22 23	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it was not necessarily clear what those disbursements were. Here it just said disbursements, so I adjusted the disbursements. Q. Is there anything in paragraph one that tells you that the amount of disbursements? You can answer 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20 21 22 23	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was used. Q. I'm sorry? A. So the same methodology was used. We did plug in the additional data points.
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:24 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20 21 22 23 24	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were. Here it just said disbursements, so I adjusted the disbursements. Q. Is there anything in paragraph one that tells you that the amount of disbursements? You can answer yes or no and then we'll follow up. 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20 21 22 23 24	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was used. Q. I'm sorry? A. So the same methodology was used. We did plug in the additional data points. Q. You saw Dr. Scheuren's analysis where he ran
2 3 4 15:51:28 5 6 7 8 9 15:51:28 10 11 12 13 14 15:51:54 15 16 17 18 19 15:52:20 20 21 22 23	 A. These were indicative of the reasons. There were many there's a whole section of this document I believe that talked about the problems with disbursements, and these are the ones we talked about this morning. Q. Well, you didn't talk about any other reasons in your testimony this morning, did you? A. These were examples that we used that we talked about this morning of the reasons that I was concerned about the disbursement number; therefore, I adjusted it. Q. Look at paragraph number one here. MR. WARSHAWSKY: If you'll blow that up, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Can you tell me why paragraph one provided you with a basis to adjust down the amount of disbursements? It says that disbursements were not always supported by applications for withdrawal. A. Right. So there seemed to be disbursements were made, it was not necessarily clear what those disbursements were. Here it just said disbursements, so I adjusted the disbursements. Q. Is there anything in paragraph one that tells you that the amount of disbursements? You can answer 	2 3 4 15:54:23 5 6 7 8 9 15:54:21 10 11 12 13 14 15:54:59 15 16 17 18 19 15:55:19 20 21 22 23	 the number that I used to adjust. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. There's certainly nothing that you saw in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 that you could point to and tell Judge Robertson, oh, 74-and-a-half percent is the right number to reduce disbursements by? A. There's nothing in this document where it would give that. Q. Dr. Palmer, let's turn to disbursements. One question I've got at the outset is you've obviously got a lot more data points now than Professor Cornell had when he ran his linear interpolation back a few weeks ago. Right? A. That's correct. Q. Sir, recently you didn't just plug in the additional data and rerun Professor Cornell's linear interpolation? A. The linear interpolation was done on the revenue side, and we did plug in the additional data, some of it was adjusted, and then did the linear interpolation. So the same methodology was used. Q. I'm sorry? A. So the same methodology was used. We did plug in the additional data points.

	1603		1605
1	A. I don't know that I did. I think he said that he had done a	1	Q. And if you want, we can refer to documents in your
2		2	
3	calculation, but I don't know that I ever saw any output or any	3	attachment if that helps you.
3	physical production of information. What was provided for	4	So basically what you did with 1887 is you took your
4 15:55:57 5	Dr. Scheuren was a SAS code that ran his multi-imputation, but I		.56 times .7736, and that's how you got your disbursements of
	don't know that there was any output that we ever were given		.44 million. Right?
6	about Dr. Scheuren calculating anything from Dr. Cornell. I	6	A. Correct.
7	mean, he testified to some numbers, but I didn't see any backup	7	Q. Delta on that, the nominal benefit is 1313 million.
8	that I could see and look at.	8	Right?
9	Q. So Dr. Scheuren testified that when he ran, he and his	9	A. Correct.
15:56:13 10	colleagues ran the model that Professor Cornell had run using	15:59:19 10	Q. And that went into your accumulated benefit. Right?
11	the data points that we had, the difference was about	11	A. That is correct.
12	31-and-a-half million dollars more than the currently reported	12	Q. Now, when did that .13 million get paid out under your
13	\$423.7 million. You haven't been asked to analyze that, have	13	model?
14	you?	14	A. That particular .13, I can't identify any particular dollar
15:56:31 15	A. No, I wasn't sure exactly what Dr. Scheuren had done, so I	15:59:37 15	when it gets paid out or not. There are funds that are
16	didn't.	16	available to the government and get paid out over time. At the
17	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ Now, Professor Cornell's model, the one that you've been	17	very end we subtract off what the balance of the fund was, so if
18	adapting, assumed a 70 percent	18	there were funds that were available that should have been in
19	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. There was no	19	there, then the benefit to the government would include that.
15:56:56 20	change in the model.	15:59:55 20	Q. Well, let's go to 1888. You started with your .13 million.
21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'm sorry, I'll rephrase the question,	21	Right?
22	Your Honor.	22	A. Correct.
23	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	23	Q. We go through this same analysis here, revenues less
24	Q. The model that you're here testifying to with regard to	24	disbursements.
15:57:04 25	refinement of data.	16:00:07 25	MR. WARSHAWSKY: You can blow this up a little bit.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1604		1606
1	A. Okay.	1	It's been a long day. Thank you.
2	Q. Fair enough? You'll recall Professor Cornell had a uniform	2	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
3	disbursement rate of approximately 70 percent?	3	Q. Revenues less disbursements, you've got your 1.07 minus .83,
4	A. There was a uniform rate. I'm not sure exactly what it was,	4	that's how you get and by the way, the .83, again, that's
15:57:22 5	but that sounds familiar.	16:00:22 5	77.36 percent of 1.07. Right?
6	Q. 69-point something percent?	6	A. That's correct.
7	A. Whatever.	7	Q. So you get your difference of .24?
8	Q. You don't know off the top of your head whether it was 69,	8	A. That's correct.
9	70 percent, in that range?	9	Q. Which gets added to .13, and I guess rounding gets you to
15:57:33 10	A. That sounds familiar, but I can't tell you the exact number.	16:00:36 10	.38. Right?
11			.30. Kight:
	Q. Now, implicit in his model, if I'm correct, because I	11	A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on
12	Q. Now, implicit in his model, if I'm correct, because I understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money	11 12	-
12 13			A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on
	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never	12	A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it
13 14	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money	12 13	A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero.
13 14 15:57:49 15	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No.	12 13 14 16:00:53 15	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your
13 14 15:57:49 15 16	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell	12 13 14	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right?
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure?	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year.
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right?
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20 21	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had reported information, calculated percentage for that time	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20 21	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right? A. In those particular two years that you mentioned, the
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20 21 22	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had reported information, calculated percentage for that time period, and then used that disbursement ratio for the years that	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20 21 22	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right? A. In those particular two years that you mentioned, the disbursements were less than the revenues, so therefore those
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20 21 22 23	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had reported information, calculated percentage for that time period, and then used that disbursement ratio for the years that were missing around that point, which included 1887.	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20 21 22 23	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right? A. In those particular two years that you mentioned, the disbursements were less than the revenues, so therefore those monies were still available.
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20 21 22 23 24	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had reported information, calculated percentage for that time period, and then used that disbursement ratio for the years that were missing around that point, which included 1887. Q. It came out to a disbursement rate of 77.36 percent. Right?	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20 21 22 23 24	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right? A. In those particular two years that you mentioned, the disbursements were less than the revenues, so therefore those monies were still available. Q. And we could keep going through this. Tell me when we get
13 14 15:57:49 15 16 17 18 19 15:58:28 20 21 22 23	understand it's implicit in yours as well, is that if money isn't disbursed in the year that it's collected, it's never disbursed. Is that right? A. No. Q. Well, let's go ahead and take a look at Attachment A. Tell me how you calculated the disbursements figure for 1887, the .44 million figure? A. For 1887, on the disbursement rate in that year, was based upon the average for the 1909 to 1911 time period, where we had reported information, calculated percentage for that time period, and then used that disbursement ratio for the years that were missing around that point, which included 1887.	12 13 14 16:00:53 15 16 17 18 19 16:01:14 20 21 22 23	 A. That's correct. There would be the interest benefit also on the .13, which was the balance from the beginning. And that would be added. With the number of significant digits here, it rounds to zero. Q. But the .38, that's your benefit from 1888 plus your carry-forward from 1887. Right? A. That's the funds that were available to the accumulated benefit at the end of the year. Q. So none of that .13 from 1887 has come out of your calculation at the end of 1888. Right? A. In those particular two years that you mentioned, the disbursements were less than the revenues, so therefore those monies were still available.

Page 1603 to 1606 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1607		1609
1	.13, some part of it comes out?	1	was kind of a run rate for several years, that he said should be
2	A. Well, I can't identify the specific 1887 dollars, but we	2	included. He did also not include the data that we had in the
3	talked about earlier, I think it was in the '30s, where there	3	1950s range. For several years there we had information, and
4	were disbursements greater than revenues, so the money was	4	that was not included as well.
16:01:50 5	disbursed at that point.	16:04:43 5	Q. But for the years depicted here and we can go through all
18.01.50 G	Q. So at the earliest, at the earliest some of the 1887 money	16.04.43 6	three pages, if you would, please where collections and
7	comes out around 1934?	7	disbursements are shown on this document, that's the
8	A. There were funds available. If we look at the balance	8	disbursements and collections and disbursements amounts that
9		9	
16:02:14 10	information of the IIM Trust, it was growing over time. So	16:05:01 10	you started with. Right?
16:02:14 10	where the 1887 dollar went, did it go out in 1934, is it still	16:05:01 10	A. I'm not for sure we used all these specific ones, but we
12	part of the balance? I can't identify each individual dollar.	12	talked about the data sources, and if he were to use the same
	It's not marked in the analysis.		data sources, then they would be the same.
13	What I can see is funds were flowing into it and those	13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And let's go ahead and pull up the
14	benefits were available. Some of the accumulated benefits at	14	highlighted version, please.
16:02:31 15	the end of the year, obviously if the government chose to hold	16:05:19 15	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
16	those funds instead of borrowing, that's not going to be a	16	Q. And if you would like, we can check it. I'll represent to
17	dollar that's going to be in the account that you identify	17	you that the collections figures that we just saw on DX-461,
18	because it's an opportunity that they decided to use, and that	18	those appear as the Column H figures in your receipts worksheet.
19	benefit accrues over time. It may not be a dollar sitting in	19	A. Okay.
16:02:47 20	the Treasury where they say, a-ha, here's this dollar of	16:05:29 20	Q. And similarly, the disbursements that we saw showed up as
21	benefit, but clearly that account balances, and then at the end	21	Column B figures in your disbursements worksheet. If you would
22	we subtract off all the interest and other information that was	22	like, we can check it. Or perhaps on redirect you'll get it
23	paid, as we talked about earlier today.	23	covered.
24	So your question is when does the 1887 dollar get	24	What I've done here with DX-461 here is I've
16:03:06 25	disbursed. There were some years when disbursements were	16:05:46 25	highlighted the years where disbursements exceeded collections.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1608		1610
1		1	1610 MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages,
1	1608	1	
	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and		MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages,
2	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not.	2	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please.
2	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887	2	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it?	2 3 4	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third
2 3 4 16:03:16 5	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct.	2 3 4 16:06:07 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right?
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right?	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes.	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461?	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989,
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right?	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct.	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 13 14 16:06:46 15 16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version.	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17 18	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A . I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18 19	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir?	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17 18 19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18 19 16:04:09 20	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? A. That is the input data that Dr. Scheuren used for his model.	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17 18 19 16:07:00 20	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A . I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18 19 16:04:09 20 21	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? A. That is the input data that Dr. Scheuren used for his model. Q. And the data that's reflected here, that reflects the	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17 18 19 16:07:00 20 21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A . I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements greater than revenues, when we actually look at the underlying checks and electronic funds transfers, it's significantly lower.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18 19 16:04:09 20 21 22	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? A. That is the input data that Dr. Scheuren used for his model. Q. And the data that's reflected here, that reflects the collections and disbursements data that you started with in your	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 16:07:00 20 21 22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q . And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A . I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements greater than revenues, when we actually look at the underlying checks and electronic funds transfers, it's significantly lower. Bo this data is different than my data, yes.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16 17 16 16 17 18 19 16:04:09 20 21 22 23	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? A. That is the input data that Dr. Scheuren used for his model. Q. And the data that's reflected here, that reflects the collections and disbursements data that you started with in your analysis. Right?	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 16:07:00 20 21 22 23	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements greater than revenues, when we actually look at the underlying checks and electronic funds transfers, it's significantly lower. B this data is different than my data, yes.
2 3 4 16:03:16 5 6 7 8 9 16:03:37 10 11 12 13 14 16:03:47 15 16 17 18 19 16:04:09 20 21 22 23 24	1608 greater than revenues, where monies would be going out, and there's some years where it was not. Q. Your model certainly doesn't pick a time when that 1887 dollar comes out, though, does it? A. That is correct. Q. And implicit in your model is if it isn't disbursed through some year when collections were exceeded by disbursements, it stayed in your calculation. Right? A. It's available for use, yes. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could you pull up Defendant's Exhibit 461? BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. You said earlier that there were a few years where disbursements exceeded collections. Right? A. That's correct. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up Defendants' 461, the un-highlighted version. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Have you seen this document before, sir? A. That is the input data that Dr. Scheuren used for his model. Q. And the data that's reflected here, that reflects the collections and disbursements data that you started with in your analysis. Right? A. We had more data than this. He did not include the 1968	2 3 4 16:06:07 5 6 7 8 9 16:06:25 10 11 12 13 14 16:06:46 15 16 17 18 19 16:07:00 20 21 22 23 24	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And go through the three pages, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And real roughly I'll tell you it works out to about a third of the years where disbursements in fact exceeded collections. That's inconsistent with your understanding of how the system worked. Is that right? A. I'm not sure what it was an understanding of the system. What I had testified to is we had examined data and examined it over time periods we had information. Particularly many of the years you have highlighted here, when you talk about 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, those are years for which we had CP&R data and electronic funds transfer data. In looking at what disbursements were, what actually went out of the accounts were much lower for those years. In fact, I believe, if you want to pull up my Schedule C, you'll see that the actual monies that flowed out for those years was less than 100 percent. So here you have one, two, three, four, five, six seven years of data of over 100 percent of disbursements greater than revenues, when we actually look at the underlying checks and electronic funds transfers, it's significantly lower. So this data is different than my data, yes. Q. And we already talked earlier this afternoon about instances where disbursements were made in non-check form, right, the BB

	1611		1613
1	A. We talked about the BB transfers, and I believe your	1	So the testimony was concerning whether or not there
2	representation was those were never in the IIM Trust.	2	were electronic funds transfers information included. He had
3	Q. That's not necessarily correct. But I'm sure your counsel	3	Dr. Cornell had not, I did. So they're quite different.
4	can cover it on redirect.	4	Q. I'm sorry, maybe I was not being clear. What I meant is
16:07:39 5	My question, though, is I believe you indicated you	16:10:35 5	Attachment C is your disbursement calculation for 1988 to 2002.
6	didn't include transfers BB transfers as disbursements?	6	Right?
7	A. What I included are all of the outputs, checks and EFTs.	7	A. That is correct.
8	Ms. Herman testified that transfers were not disbursements, so	8	Q. And that's what Attachment C was for Professor Cornell.
9	when I looked at this, I included specifically that which was	9	Right?
16:08:03 10	counted as disbursements, checks and EFTs.	16:10:43 10	A. A very different calculation.
11	Q. Now, you were here for quite a bit of the trial. Do you	11	Q. But it was his disbursement calculation for 1988 to 2002.
12	recall any trial testimony explaining why in certain years	12	Right?
13	collections would have been exceeded by disbursements?	13	A. Based upon the available data that he had at the time, yes.
14	A. I know from documents that I read that there were some	14	Q. Good.
16:08:22 15	years, for example after the war, where disbursements were	16:10:55 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's put Ms. Herman's testimony back
16	higher than they were before. So yeah, disbursements can be	16	up, please.
17	higher, and we noticed that in the data that I used.	17	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
18	Q. My question, Dr. Palmer, was whether you listened to any	18	Q. And so we're there. The answer: "Yes, I have."
19	testimony explaining why for certain years disbursements	19	Question: "And have you compared it to your
16:08:40 20	exceeded collections.	16:11:07 20	calculation of total disbursements in DX-371?"
21	A. I guess I 'm not sure of any specific testimony you're	21	Do you know what DX-371 was?
22	referring to that, yes, disbursements can exceed collections.	22	A. Yes.
23	In fact, in my Schedule C, in the final year, the 2002, even	23	Q. Answer: "Yes. Our disbursement rate, at least from 1972
24	with the check and EFT information that we have, we see in that	24	through 2007, ranges from approximately 83 percent to
16:09:04 25	year that the disbursements were greater than the receipts.	16:11:20 25	120 percent in any given year."
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1612		1614
1	Q. And I'm sorry, that was the one year in your 1988 to 2002	1	Dr. Palmer, did you consider her testimony when you
2	period where you had that happen. Right?	2	were revising Attachment C?
3	A. That is correct.	3	A. Yes. In fact, that's quite informative of the fact that we
4	Q. You mentioned Ms. Herman. Why don't we go ahead and look at	4	calculate this ratio. Because when we had the checks and EFT
16:09:16 5	some of her testimony.	16:11:40 5	information in a given year, we were able to look at what
6	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Pull up 567, page 21, to 568, 20.	6	Ms. Herman did and saw that her numbers were higher. So indeed
7	This is from June 12, 2008, morning session.	7	she had those numbers, but when we looked at the actual
8	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	8	disbursements out of the account, that her numbers were higher.
9	Q. So we're starting at 567, line 21. And you can read,	9	And that's the reason why we adjusted the other numbers, because
16:09:40 10 11	Question: "Ms. Herman, as far as Plaintiffs' Attachment C,	16:11:56 10 11	her numbers were higher, when we had actual information and she
12	what's marked as Plaintiffs' 56, have you had an opportunity to review that calculation?"	12	didn't. Q. Okay. Well, now, why don't we go to your disbursements
12	And just to back off a moment, Attachment C, that's	12	worksheet. This was Column E.
14	comparable to your Attachment C now?	14	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Yeah, scoot over to the disbursements
16:09:54 15	A. No.	16:12:26 15	worksheet.
16	Q. It's not?	16	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
17	A. No.	17	Q. And we're talking about the years 1972 to 1987. Right?
18	Q. Okay. Well, let's talk about Attachment C. Then we can get	18	You're with me?
19	back to Ms. Herman.	19	A. Okay.
16:10:03 20	A. Okay.	16:12:42 20	Q. And then 2003 to 2007.
21	Q. What is your Attachment C?	21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I know you can't highlight both sets.
22	-	22	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
	A. The difference between the Attachment C that I used and the		
23	A. The difference between the Attachment C that I used and the Attachment C that Dr. Cornell used is I included electronic	23	Q. But these are years where you adjusted the AR-171 data.
		23 24	
23	Attachment C that Dr. Cornell used is I included electronic		Q. But these are years where you adjusted the AR-171 data.
23 24	Attachment C that Dr. Cornell used is I included electronic funds transfer, which were not available to Dr. Cornell, as we	24	Q. But these are years where you adjusted the AR-171 data. Right?

Page 1611 to 1614 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1615		1617
1	Q. And this is where you applied your ratio, your 134.1 percent	1	Q. Is it your do you have an understanding as to whether the
2	ratio, basically reducing it by 74-and-a-half percent, to	2	figures that she utilized in the testimony that we just reviewed
3	74-and-a-half percent of what's in the AR-171?	3	are estimates?
4	A. Around in that neighborhood, yes.	4	A. I looked at her information. I do not know exactly where
16:13:14 5	Q. I think that's kind of what happens when you do the 134.1,	16:16:19 5	each information came from. When I had information for the same
6	the ratio?	6	time periods that she reported information, I used that to
7	A. The number, it's around that number.	7	inform me about other time periods.
8	Q. And explain the reason that you concluded that the reported	8	Q. Well, 2003 to 2007, Dr. Palmer, you know she took that from
9	information should be reduced to three-quarters of the amount	9	audit reports. Right?
16:13:29 10	for purposes of your analysis?	16:16:34 10	A. That's correct.
11	A. Okay. I'm happy to. We just talked about that. But when	11	Q. But you've concluded that the data she took from audit
12	we had actual information from the period 1988 to 2002, these	12	reports should be adjusted to three-quarters of the amount
13	are the checks and electronic funds transfers, so we had all of	13	reported?
14	the funds that were flowing out of the accounts, we looked at	14	A. If you'll look at the numbers that we estimated
16:13:46 15	those years and we compared those years with Ms. Herman's	16:16:47 15	Q. Yes or no, please.
16	numbers for those years.	16	A. Well, I was answering the question. If you look at the
17	And we saw that for all the years the numbers were	17	numbers we used from 2002, 2001, 2000, those are also from audit
18	different, so we took what the average difference was and	18	report information. And looking at the actual disbursements
19	applied that to years for which we didn't have information.	19	from the checks and EFTs, our numbers were different from hers
16:14:02 20	Because had we had the information, for 1987, if we had the CP&R	16:17:04 20	with the same source of data. So given it's the same source of
21	data, if it existed, or for 2003 onward we had the CP&R and the	21	data, we adjusted that.
22	EFT information, then that probably also would have a	22	Q. Let's take it a year at a time. 2003, and I'm going from
23	difference, because we noticed for all those years where we did	23	your schedule, sir, the report, 192-and-a-half million dollars,
24	have the identical information, so we took the average of the	24	did that come from an audit report?
16:14:23 25	information which we did have, when we could make an apples to	16:17:23 25	A. I believe it did.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1616		1618
1	apples comparison, and then for the years when we didn't have	1	Q. But you've only reported disbursements of 143.5 million.
2	that information, we used that average ratio to adjust	2	Right?
3	backwards.	3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. What was your understanding of the source of the data that	4	Q. What was the basis for your concluding that the number in an
16:14:37 5	Ms. Herman was using in her analysis?	16:17:36 5	audit report was off by 34 percent?
6	A. She had different sources of information.	6	A. From the information we had from audit reports, for years
7	Q. Okay. 1972 to 1985, I mean, were these estimates that she	7	when we had audit reports and Ms. Herman reported those numbers,
8	came up with?	8	2002, 2001, 2000, those are audit report information years, her
9	A. I don't know. I know that she was using lots of different	9	numbers were different than what we when we calculated from
16:15:01 10	data over time. I can't tell you exactly which item for which	16:17:59 10	the CP&R and from the EFT data.
11 12	years she used. She presumably had a consistent series of her	11 12	So we adjusted her numbers because when we had the same
13	estimated information, and we Q. I beg your pardon?	12	information from the same reports in those years, there was a difference.
14	A. I don't know exactly what she used.	14	Q. And if I asked you about the numbers for 2004, 2005, 2006,
16:15:18 15	Q. Well, do you know if she was using actual recorded data from	1 4 16:18:15 15	and 2007, you would give me the same answer. Right?
16	the accounting systems?	16	A. That is correct.
17	A. Well, when you're saying actual recorded data, there's a lot	17	Q. So in all those years, Ms. Herman took numbers from audit
18	of there's been a lot of issues in this trial about how	18	reports, you concluded those numbers were off by 34 percent?
19	accurate information is. The fact that there were not	19	A. For the years we had information and we saw there was a
16:15:34 20	balances	16:18:33 20	difference when we had the actual check and EFT information,
21	Q. I'm sorry, the afternoon is late. I'm trying to get through	21	we saw there was a difference, based upon that information, we
22	this. If you'll answer my question, did Ms. Herman use data	22	did adjust those years.
23	from the accounting systems for her numbers?	23	Q. Now, you're not here to testify as an accountant. I
24	A. The exact data she used, I do not remember where it came	24	understand that. Right?
16:15:54 25	from.	16:18:46 25	A. That is correct.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>

	1619		1621
1	Q. But you looked at audit reports and you've probably heard a	1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And if you'll pull up the government
2	lot of testimony during the course of this hearing about	2	brief, please, at pages 108 to 110.
3	qualified opinions. Right?	3	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
4	A. Yes, I have.	4	Q. Dr. Palmer, I'm asking you now about the section that began:
16:18:56 5	Q. Do you have any basis to believe that an auditor would issue	16:22:01 5	"The evidence at the October 2007 trial demonstrated that
6	a mere qualified opinion if disbursements were off by	6	virtually all revenue disbursed by check reached the
7	34 percent?	7	beneficiaries."
8	A. I'm just telling you what we did from our data and compared	8	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And you can flip to the next two pages
9	to the data that she reported for the years the same information	9	real quickly?
16:19:17 10	is reported, and when we looked at what was from the CP&R and	16:22:16 10	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
11	the EFT data.	11	Q. Did you review this section of the brief before forming your
12	Q. Do you know what the GLDL is?	12	opinions?
13	A. It's a ledger. Yes.	13	A. I do not remember anything specific about this brief.
14	Q. And what kind of ledger is it?	14	Q. Well, let's look at the bottom of 109 carrying on to 110.
16:19:32 15	A. I'm not specifically I don't know specifically how it's	16:22:36 15	One of your assumptions was that revenue from uncashed checks
16	used or what the particulars of it are.	16	benefitted the government. Right?
17	Q. Do you know if it's a ledger that Ms. Herman used in	17	A. Revenue from uncashed checks benefitted the government? If
18	preparing any of the numbers that you've adjusted by 34 percent?	18	the government did not pay out the money, then it was not
19	A. I don't know.	19	disbursed.
16:19:49 20	Q. If I represent to you that the GLDL was utilized by	16:22:57 20	Q. Well, explain again your adjustment to the CP&R data.
21	Ms. Herman for 1972 to 1985, do you have a basis to tell	21	A. The CP&R data lists the amount of checks, the check amount
22	Judge Robertson why	22	that was written in a given year. From a document that we
23	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. That was prepared	23	found, there was the amount of checks that were cashed, the
24	by CD&L and provided to Ms. Herman.	24	dollar amount, so we adjusted what was written versus what was
16:20:24 25	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll take it modified as Mr. Gingold	16:23:23 25	cashed to get an effective amount of what went out, a
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1620		1622
1	put it.	1	disbursement amount.
2	THE COURT: All right.	2	Q. And what happened to the uncashed amount in your analysis?
3	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	3	A. It was not distributed.
4	Q. Subject to Mr. Gingold's modification, do you have a basis	4	Q. It ended up being an amount that the government benefitted
16:20:33 5	to tell Judge Robertson why that data requires an adjustment of	16:23:37 5	from. Right?
6	basically 74-and-a-half percent applied against the amount	6	A. It's an amount of funds available to the government. We
7	reported?	7	looked at what was disbursed. If it wasn't disbursed, it was
8	A. Same as when we had information that we could compare	8	available.
9	directly from what information she reported, we calculated our	9	Q. When you were provided this brief in April of this year
16:20:50 10	ratio that way. I believe during the years you're indicating,	16:23:52 10	and I'm referring specifically to this section here which is
11	the '72 to '87, those years did not balance. I have no idea	11	highlighted, it says, quote, "Treasury recredits Interior for
12	what was the data specifically she used.	12	uncashed checks, citing testimony from the October 2007 hearing,
13	Again, the adjustment we did was based upon where we	13	and Interior in turn recredits the IIM accounts for those
14	could compare what the disbursements were with what the	14	uncashed checks," again citing testimony from last October's
16:21:11 15	information she reported.	16:24:14 15	hearing.
16	Q. Now, let me ask you about the CP&R data. Because you've	16	Did you look at any of the testimony cited in the brief
17	talked about your adjustment and you talked about this also	17	there?
18	talked about this adjustment where you knocked off about six	18	A. That's very consistent with what we did.
19	percent, where you went from the reported CP&R and adjusted it	19	Q. You looked at the testimony?
16:21:29 20	down. Right?	16:24:23 20	A. I had read this. I didn't focus on this, but this is very
21	A. That's correct.	21	consistent with what we did. It says that Treasury recredits
22	Q. You're with me?	22	the accounts so that the accounts are not charged with a
23	A. Lam.	23	disbursement. Those funds are still there. That's the way I
24	Q. We talked earlier about the government's brief filed in	24	read this, and that's consistent with what we did.
16:21:38 25	April.	16:24:41 25	Q. But your calculation, where you've adjusted the CP&R data,
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon net

25 of 54 sheets PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1623		1625
1	it reduces the disbursement rate, doesn't it, based upon	1	revenues.
2	uncashed checks?	2	If it was indeed credited back, which is exactly what
3	A. No. What we're looking at is we're looking at funds that	3	this says, it never left the Trust. So that's completely
4	were paid out. If a check was written but never cashed, that	4	consistent with what we did.
16:25:03 5	check was not paid out. So we added together all of the checks	16:27:49 5	Q. Let's move on.
6	that were cashed, i.e. paid out, and all of the electronic	10.27.49 6	THE COURT: Do you know, Dr. Palmer, whether a check
7	transfers. We looked at all of the funds that left. If a check	7	drawn payable to an IIM account holder is debited to the account
8		8	when the check is cut or when it's cashed?
9	was uncashed, it never left. The funds never left.	9	
-	And this is very consistent with that. The accounts		THE WITNESS: I don't know what it is. The document
16:25:21 10	are recredited, that says those funds are still there, the funds	16:28:26 10	that Treasury that government just said is the funds go right
11	were still in the account. They weren't cashed, they didn't	11	back in.
12	leave the system, they didn't leave the Trust. It's exactly	12	THE COURT: You're talking about the flow of money out
13	what we did.	13	and back, but I'm asking you about accounting practice,
14	Q. So how did you do that when you were adjusting the CP&R	14	bookkeeping practice. Do you know?
16:25:37 15	data?	16:28:38 15	THE WITNESS: I don't know the practice.
16	A. What we looked at the CP&R is the amount of funds that left,	16	THE COURT: Do you know, Mr. Warshawsky?
17	the amount of funds that were paid out. So if a check were	17	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'm sorry.
18	written but it was not cashed, then the funds didn't leave. And	18	THE COURT: You're not the witness here.
19	that's consistent exactly with what it says here, because it	19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I do not know, Your Honor.
16:25:54 20	says that uncashed checks were in turn credited to the account.	16:28:55 20	Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 238.
21	So they never left the IIM Trust.	21	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
22	So we looked at the cashed checks and we looked at the	22	Q. Now, you're familiar with this document. Right?
23	electronic funds transfers; i.e., the information, the data on	23	A. That's correct.
24	the funds that went out. So that's completely consistent with	24	Q. And what is it?
16:26:08 25	this.	16:29:10 25	A. This is the information that talks about disbursement
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1624		1626
1	Q. Are you saying your understanding is that the CP&R data was	1	activities for Individual Indian Money accounts.
2	only cashed checks?	2	Q. This is a document that you were looking at when you were
3	A. No, the CP&R data was not. It was all checks. That's why	3	trying to understand PACER data and CP&R and all that. Right?
4	we used the other document that was cited for the checks cashed,	4	A. That's correct.
16:26:22 5	the amount there, and that's what caused the adjustment. So	16:29:34 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And blow up the lower left-hand
6	that the uncashed checks amount was not counted as a	6	corner.
7	disbursement because it was sitting in the accounts. That's	7	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
8	exactly what this says, so we're consistent.	8	Q. Do you have an understanding as to what information is
9	Q. Now, you said that you didn't consider the DCV work	9	presented here?
16:26:38 10	presented to the Court last fall, I assume. I mean, you didn't	16:29:40 10	A. There's a row that represents the check amounts, the row
11	know what DCV was. Right?	11	that represents the ACH/EFT, and then there are several other
12	A. That's correct.	12	items that come to a total.
13	Q. So you don't know what the DCV report's findings were with	13	Q. And do you know what this number opposite it says FIN
13	regard to the recrediting of unpaid checks?	13	statement, I guess that's financial statement, 336.6 million.
14 16:26:54 15		16:30:11 15	-
16:26:54 13	A. I don't know what their findings were. If I look at the		Do you have an understanding as to what that refers to?
16	brief here that you're pointing to me, it was very consistent	16 17	A. I believe that is the number that Ms. Herman used as her
	with what we did.		disbursement number. But I'm not sure.
18	Q. But you're still including as a claimed amount the uncashed	18	Q. For 1999?
19	check amount. Right?	19	A. I think that's right, but I'm not sure.
16:27:10 20	A. No. I'm having a hard time what we did to the CP&R data	16:30:27 20	Q. And of that amount, we've talked about checks.
21	is the amount of checks that were written. A fraction of those	21	A. Correct.
22	were cashed. What we're trying to focus on here is how much	22	Q. 175.5 million. You understand that's the CP&R data?
23	money left the system. If a check was not cashed, it never left	23	A. That's the amount of checks cashed, so there's the
24	the trust fund. So we look at the fraction that left the trust	24	difference, that number would be used to adjust the CP&R data to
16:27:33 25	fund, we look at the amount, and we take that as a fraction of	16:30:49 25	get at the amount that was actually paid out.
10.21.00 20			

	1627		1629
1	Q. But it's taken from the CP&R data?	1	disbursements, so I did not include them. I'm sorry, she said
2	A. I don't know where that number came from.	2	that BB transfers were not disbursements. That's what I said.
3	Q. ACH/EFT, do you know what that is?	3	That was her testimony.
4	A. Those would be the electronic funds transfers.	4	Q. Okay. So you understand that BB transfers aren't money
16:31:03 5	Q. IPAC, do you know what that is?	16:33:49 5	
10.31.03 G	A. No, I do not.	16.33.49 6	coming out of the IIM system. Is that correct?
7		7	A. BB transfers were not disbursements as she said, so they were not checks or EFTs.
8	Q. BB transfers, we've talked about that. Refresh my	8	
9	recollection. Do you know what a BB transfer is?	9	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendants' Exhibit 480,
16:31:20 10	A. You had shown me today some Osage numbers that had a BB in	16:34:25 10	
16:31:20 10 11	the numbers.		BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up from the transcript last	11	Q. And specifically within this exhibit, I want to go to the
12	October, this is from October 16, 2007, the afternoon session,	12	last page, page nine.
13	page 888, lines 12 through 15 in particular is what I want to	13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: And blow it up a little bit for us
14	get to.	14	here.
16:31:54 15	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	16:34:42 15	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
16	Q. Dr. Palmer, did you review this testimony?	16	Q. This is pretty similar to a document that we looked at
17	A. What was it again?	17	earlier this afternoon. Right?
18	Q. I'm sorry, this is testimony of a witness named Rob Winter.	18	A. We looked at this form of a document earlier today.
19	Have you ever heard of Rob Winter?	19	Q. Do you remember when we were going through DX-372, the
16:32:07 20	A. Yes. He prepared the exhibit I believe you just showed.	16:34:58 20	binder stuff?
21	Q. Referring to Defendant's Exhibit 238?	21	A. Yes.
22	A. Correct.	22	Q. It's an intrabureau cash transaction authorization. And
23	Q. And did you review this testimony in particular in	23	again, if you look in the upper right-hand corner, the document
24	connection with understanding Exhibit 238?	24	number begins with BB?
16:32:21 25	A. I may have looked at it. I don't recall it directly.	16:35:11 25	A. That's correct.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1628		1630
1	Q. You see lines 12 through 15 on page 888, where he's	1	Q. And do you see it's disbursement coming out of 14X6039 of
2	discussing in fact that \$73 million figure that we were just	2	\$4.47 million?
3	looking at for BB transfers?	3	A. Yes.
4	A. Yes.	4	Q. And going into three 14X accounts beginning with 7s, do you
16:32:38 5	Q. Question: "Then you have a line of \$73 million plus for BB	16:35:31 5	see that on the right-hand side?
6	transfers. What do those represent?"	6	A. Yes, I do.
7	Answer: "That's basically transfers out of the IIM	7	Q. And do you have an understanding as to whether this kind of
8	trust fund to Tribal Trusts."	8	document backed up a check or electronic transfer disbursement
9	Did you consider that testimony as you were going about	9	or some other kind of transfer?
16:32:54 10	developing a disbursement rate?	16:35:46 10	A. I don't know.
11	A. I also the current trial that we are in, Ms. Herman	11	Q. Well, you know from that document that we were looking at a
12	testified that BB transfers were not	12	few moments ago, DX-238, that there was a line item for BB
13	Q. Dr. Palmer, please.	13	transfers. Right?
14	A. You're asking me and I'm telling you.	14	A. There was.
16:33:07 15	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. Can he let the	16:36:01 15	Q. And it was below the checks and below the electronic
16	witness answer?	16	transfers. Right?
17	THE COURT: I think he's asking for a yes or no answer.	17	A. That's correct.
18	I think the witness can answer the question yes or no and then	18	Q. Does that cause you to suspect at least that it might be
19	explain it.	19	something other than a check or an electronic transfer?
		16:36:16 20	
16:33:18 20	•		A. It if were a check of an electronic transfer if would be in
16:33:18 20 21	THE WITNESS: Okay.		A. If it were a check or an electronic transfer, it would be in the checks or electronic transfers
21	THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I did not use this. I used something else.	21	the checks or electronic transfers.
21 22	THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I did not use this. I used something else. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	21 22	the checks or electronic transfers. Q. Right. Thank you. And you see from the description, by the
21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I did not use this. I used something else. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Well, I know you want to tell us, so what else did you use	21 22 23	the checks or electronic transfers. Q. Right. Thank you. And you see from the description, by the way, below, transfer funds from IIM special deposit to tribal
21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I did not use this. I used something else. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Well, I know you want to tell us, so what else did you use instead of that?	21 22 23 24	the checks or electronic transfers. Q. Right. Thank you. And you see from the description, by the way, below, transfer funds from IIM special deposit to tribal receipt account. Do you see that?
21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I did not use this. I used something else. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Well, I know you want to tell us, so what else did you use	21 22 23	the checks or electronic transfers. Q. Right. Thank you. And you see from the description, by the way, below, transfer funds from IIM special deposit to tribal

Page 1627 to 1630 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1631		1633
1	${\bf Q}.\;$ Based on your review of documents in this case, do you have	1	Do you remember that testimony?
2	any understanding as to what that description means?	2	A. Yes. I also remember specific testimony about BB transfers,
3	A. I know the Special Deposit Account was something that I	3	and she said that those were not disbursements.
4	believe funds went into before they were distributed to	4	Q. My question, you remember this testimony. Right?
16:36:50 5	individual accounts.	16:39:49 5	A. Yes.
6	Q. I'm sorry?	6	Q. So you remember that disbursements included bookkeeping
7	A. I believe that the special deposit were funds that went into	7	transfers? Yes or no, please.
8	there before they were distributed to individual accounts.	8	A. There was confusion to what disbursements were. I recall
9	Q. But in this case it's a distribution to a tribal account.	9	that testimony, yes.
16:37:07 10	Right?	16:40:04 10	Q. But your disbursements calculation doesn't include
11	A. That's what it says.	11	bookkeeping transfers, does it?
12	Q. So it's transferring funds from the IIM to tribal. Right?	12	A. My disbursement calculation includes EFTs and CP&R checks,
13	A. It says to tribal receipt accounts. I don't know exactly	13	the money that went out of the fund.
14	what those are, so	14	Q. Thank you.
16:37:23 15	Q. And you remember earlier when we were talking about the	16:40:22 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481,
16	notion of money coming into the IIM system and then getting	16	please. And again let's go to page two now.
17	distributed to something other than an IIM account? Do you	17	THE COURT: Just hold it a minute. Not to be too blunt
18	remember that?	18	about this, but are you saying that your idea of disbursements
19	A. I know that the IIM system I believe is something that	19	just ignores all those other boxes that Ms. Herman drew on that
16:37:40 20	the defendants had talked about and Ms. Herman talked about.	16:40:53 20	flowchart that she made of third-party payments and Tribal IIM
21	Exactly where those funds are and what is credited to the IIM	21	monies and transfers?
22	for receipts for that group, I'm not sure of the accounting of	22	THE WITNESS: What I'm trying to capture is the bottom
23	all of that. I don't know.	23	box, effectively, what's disbursed to the individuals. She had
24	Q. But when we were talking about that 77 percent figure from	24	talked about all these different boxes and then she was asked on
16:37:58 25	DX-365, which was subject to revision you recall the document	16:41:08 25	her cross-examination, in 2007 can you identify what those
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	4020		1024
	1632		1634
1	said that. Right?	1	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been
1 2		1 2	
_	said that. Right?		disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been
2	said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one?	2	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were.
23	said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent	23	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to
2 3 4	said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment.	2 3 4	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it?
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in individual monies, then they wouldn't be included in our receipt
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in individual monies, then they wouldn't be included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in individual monies, then they wouldn't be included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony,
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 13 14 16:42:04 15 16	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in individual monies, then they wouldn't be included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in individual monies, then they wouldn't be included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18 19	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20 21	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total disbursements includes all disbursements?" 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20 21	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20 21 22	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Ma before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total disbursements includes all disbursements?" 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20 21 22	 disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20 21 22 23	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY? Q. And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total disbursements includes all disbursements?" Answer: "That's correct." Question: "And it includes things that are bookkeeping 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20 21 22 23	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. THE COURT: That may be where the 34 percent comes in.
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20 21 22 23 24	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total disbursements includes all disbursements?" Answer: "That's correct." Question: "And it includes things that are bookkeeping transfers as well as checks and other electronic transfers?" 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 16:42:04 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20 21 22 23 24	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: I five could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. THE COURT: That may be where the 34 percent comes in. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4 16:38:10 5 6 7 8 9 16:38:32 10 11 12 13 14 16:38:49 15 16 17 18 19 16:39:22 20 21 22 23	 said that. Right? A. I'm sorry, which one? Q. DX-365, the one used as a basis for your 77 percent adjustment. A. Yes. Q. You remember we were talking about what that 23 percent difference could be. Right? You assumed that it meant receipts were understated by 23 percent? A. I used that as a basis for my adjustment factor. Q. But in fact, isn't this kind of transfer the kind of transfer that would have been collected into the system but not distributed to an IIM beneficiary? A. I can't say specifically. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY? Q. And before we get to this, by the way, let me ask you I'm reading from the June 12, 2008 morning session when Ms. Herman was on the stand, specifically page 570, lines one through six. The testimony was, Question: "So your calculation of total disbursements includes all disbursements?" Answer: "That's correct." Question: "And it includes things that are bookkeeping 	2 3 4 16:41:24 5 6 7 8 9 16:41:47 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 16:42:22 20 21 22 23	disbursements are? And she said she couldn't. She hadn't been asked to, she didn't know what they were. So we're trying to capture what it is that's going to the individual Indians. THE COURT: But you're including as receipts everything in the top box, but you're taking out only what is a check, a CP&R check or an EFT payment. Is that basically it? THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure what's all in the top box of that system. If there are funds that go are flow-through funds to the tribal that aren't included in our receipt accounts. If it was included, then we're not including it. THE COURT: As I understood Ms. Herman's testimony, these BB fund transfers have to be deducted from total receipts if you're going to understand disbursements correctly. And you're telling me you're not deducting it. THE WITNESS: If we could identify them in receipts, then they would be deducted, because we're not including them in disbursements. THE COURT: Okay. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Let's pull up Defendant's Exhibit 481, please. THE COURT: That may be where the 34 percent comes in.

Page 1631 to 1634 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1635		1637
1	before, Dr. Palmer, but you've seen documents like this. Right?	1	was the 33.6 million. The 73 as a percentage of that is
2	A. Looks similar form as we looked at earlier today.	2	Q. Do you want me to do the math?
3	Q. And not to belabor it, but again document number in the	3	A. Sure.
4	upper right-hand corner, this is another one of these BB	4	Q. I come up with 21.7 percent. What you've done is
16:42:57 5	documents. Right?	16:46:39 5	A. That seems about right.
6	A. Correct.	6	Q. I'm sorry?
7	Q. And do you know you don't know, I assume, why there's a	7	A. That seems about right.
8	"T" following the number, 03T?	8	Q. 73.5 million divided by 336.6 million?
9	A. No, I do not.	9	A. Right.
16:43:08 10	Q. So you don't know if that refers to the fact that it has	16:46:46 10	Q. And that's, 21.7 percent in this case, those are transfers
11	anything to do with tribal?	11	your analysis disregards when you calculate a disbursement rate.
12	A. I do not know.	12	Correct?
13	Q. Looking at the disbursement here, this shows as a	13	A. Those transfers are not in our disbursement number.
14	disbursement coming from a tribe account. Right?	14	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. If I might
16:43:24 15	A. In the disbursement column it says Warm Springs Tribe.	16:47:06 15	have just a moment.
16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Why don't you blow it up with the	16	Thank you, Dr. Palmer. I have no more questions, Your
17	number above, please?	17	Honor.
18	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	18	THE COURT: Mr. Gingold?
19	Q. Yeah, looking at the disbursement side, you see there's a	19	MR. GINGOLD: Yes, Your Honor.
16:43:46 20	number above it, you know, I'm not positive about this, but	16:47:53 20	Let's start with the easy one first, Your Honor. You
21	certainly the fourth character is a "T." Do you see that	21	asked a question about what happens when a check is cut. Could
22	number?	22	we pull up Cobell V, please?
23	A. I do.	23	Your Honor, this Court has already made a finding in
24	Q. And below it it says Warm Springs Tribe, and it's disbursing	24	that regard. If we can focus on the highlighted portion, it
16:44:03 25	roughly \$8.76 million to Warm Springs Tribe. Do you see that?	16:48:13 25	states as follows: "When OTFM issues a check, the funds remain
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
1	1636 A. I do.	1	1638 in the TGA, so the United States still enjoys the benefit of the
2	Q. And if you look at the explanation below it, "Transfer of	2	Trust money; however, until the check is cashed, the amount is
3	funds from Special Deposit Account to the Tribe's proceeds of	3	debited from the invested fund, thereby depriving the
4	labor account, in accordance with OTFM policy memo 97-013,	4	beneficiary of any interest."
16:44:31 5	policy to prohibit the establishment of tribal accounts in the	16:48:42 5	Second, Your Honor, may I go on to the next point?
6	IIM system."	6	This issue was debated at length in Trial 1 in 1999, and this
7	Do you have any understanding as to what that	7	Court made a finding in that regard.
8	description is referring to?	8	THE COURT: All right. I'll take that as a finding. I
9	A. I do not know.	9	don't want to waste any more time with it. The funds remaining
16:44:45 10	Q. So you don't know if this is a transfer of Tribal IIM money	16:48:57 10	in the TGA is not quite the same thing as a bookkeeping entry
11	out of the IIM system?	11	debiting the account. But let's move on.
12	A. No.	12	MR. GINGOLD: Okay, Your Honor.
13	Q. You don't know what that OTFM policy referenced is, do you?	13	THE COURT: I mean, the funds remain in my bank when I
14	A. There was a policy that would prohibit tribal money in the	14	cut a check, too, but I write it down on my little actually,
16:45:07 15	IIM system.	16:49:20 15	I write it down on my electronic thingamajigger.
16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Now let's go back to DX-238. Just	16	MR. GINGOLD: That's because you write the check. The
17	blow up that box there.	17	government writes the check, so the beneficiary doesn't even
18	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	18	know when the check has been cut. The funds are debited from
19	Q. Approximately what percentage of the total amount of	19	the 14X6039 account
16:45:37 20	disbursements reflected here are BB transfers?	16:49:38 20	THE COURT: But when I decide how much more money I
21	A. The total of the FIN statement or the total of the total	21	have to write a check on, I look at my check register and I say,
22	column or what?	22	whoa, I've written that check and it hasn't cleared yet, so it's
23	Q. I'll take either one. Which number would be comparable to	23	debited to the account as a bookkeeping proposition even though
24	the disbursements figure that you're using in your analysis?	24 25	the bank doesn't know it and the guy who cut my lawn may have
16:46:06 25	A. I believe that the number that Ms. Herman used on her DX-371	16:49:56 25	lost the check. I don't know.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>	1638 of 165	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 0 06/26/2008 02:23:21 PM

29 of 54 sheets PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	(000		
1	1639	1	1641
2	MR. GINGOLD: But you wrote the check.	1 2	Q. And you see this includes a period 1985 to 2000, doesn't it?
3	THE COURT: But I wrote the check, and I know that I've	2	A. Yes, it does.
4	deducted it from my check register.	3	Q. I would like to talk about the Tribal IIM issue and the
	MR. GINGOLD: That's correct, Your Honor.		calculation of Tribal IIM.
16:50:07 5	THE COURT: But I'm not the TGA or anything close to	16:53:11 5	MR. GINGOLD: Can we bring up the Morgan Angel
7	it, so go on.	7	testimony in that regard, please?
8	MR. GINGOLD: That's true, Your Honor.	8	BY MR. GINGOLD:
9	Let's go to Defendant's 365. If we can make this a	9	Q. Do you recall questions from Mr. Warshawsky about how
9 16:50:19 10	little clearer, please.	16:53:41 10	Tribal IIM are calculated in your model?
16:50:19 10	I would like to keep this on the screen.	16:53:41 10 11	A. We did talk about Tribal IIM.
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD:	12	MR. GINGOLD: No, if we can have Dr. Angel's testimony. If we can focus it on the
12		12	
14	Q. Do you recall Mr. Warshawsky asking you questions regarding	13	BY MR. GINGOLD:
14 16:50:43 15	BB transfers in 1993 and 2000 and periods of that particular	14 16:54:09 15	Q. You sat through Dr. Angel's testimony, did you not?A. That's correct.
16:50:43 15	time, showing vouchers or statements of transactions?	16:54:09 15	
10	 A. Yes, that was the time period he asked me about. Q. Was it your understanding based on Mr. Warshawsky's 	10	Q. Did you have any understanding with regard to how Dr. Angel calculated the Tribal IIM?
18	questions that funds were being deposited into the Individual	17	A. It says Tribal IIM is part of the monies that entered the
19	Indian Trust account and then were being transferred to a tribal	19	IIM system. He said
16:51:04 20	account? Is that what your understanding is?	16:54:34 20	Q. Let me read his answer to the question. It would take an
21	A. I believe that's the inference he was making.	21	accounting to segregate those funds, wouldn't it?
22	Q. Beg your pardon?	22	A. That's what he testified to.
23	A. I believe that's the inference he was making.	23	Q. Has there ever been an accounting in this case?
24	Q. I would like to point your attention to Defendants' 365.	24	A. No, not that I'm aware of.
16:51:20 25	And if you look at the first of all, on the top, under item A	16:54:50 25	Q. Did you observe any evidence that was introduced to identify
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1640		1642
1	or portion A of this, you see various periods of time in the	1	with any specificity how tribal and IIM funds were to be
2	left column. Correct?	2	segregated?
3	A. That is correct.	3	A. No.
4	Q. You have 1909 to 1937, 1938 to 1984, 1985 to 2000, 2001 to	4	Q. Was there any documentation introduced in that regard in
16:51:42 5	2006, and then there are various columns from total collections,	16:55:03 5	this litigation?
6	et cetera, adjacent to that. Correct?	6	A. Not that I recall.
7	A. Correct.	7	Q. Does Ms. Herman testify with regard to how she quantified
8	Q. Do you see the heading in the column next to the period	8	Tribal IIM funds?
9	column?	9	A. No, I think she relied on Dr. Angel's estimate.
16:51:53 10	A. Total collections excluding Tribal IIM.	16:55:17 10	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace$ And Dr. Angel said it would take an accounting to segregate
11	${\bf Q}.~$ And do you see the collections on the bottom of that column?	11	the funds, wouldn't it?
12	Do you see under the entire period?	12	A. That's correct.
13	A. The 13.1 million, 13.2 million?	13	Q. Was there any quantification of Tribal IIM funds in any
14	Q. I think it's billion.	14	single year during the period of time that Ms. Herman was using
16:52:10 15	A. Billion.	16:55:36 15	her database to determine what disbursements or what receipts
16	Q. Do you know why funds would be transferred out of the	16	were in the IIM Trust?
17	Individual Indian Trust account to a tribe if Tribal if	17	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. Beyond the scope of cross.
18	Tribal IIM collections were not placed in the Trust?	18	BY MR. GINGOLD:
19	A. If	19	Q. Did she identify any calculation, any quantification for a
16:52:33 20	Q. If the collections excluded Tribal IIM	16:55:51 20	single year?
21	A. No, no, I'm just thinking that what we had looked at, if	21	A. Not that I'm aware of.
22	there were a tribal account in IIM and the funds were	22	MR. GINGOLD: Let's go to Defendants' 372. Your Honor,
23	transferred to the tribe, if this excludes Tribal IIM, I don't	23	this is Defendants' 372 and it starts on 120.
24	have any reason to believe that there would be that transfer as	24	BY MR. GINGOLD:
24 16:52:51 25	have any reason to believe that there would be that transfer as part of this. Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>	24 16:56:17 25	BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you in the courtroom when Ms. Herman testified? <i>Rebecca Stonestreet</i> (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net

	1643		1645
1	A. Yes.	1	on the CP&R database.
2	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace$. Were you in the courtroom when Ms. Herman testified about	2	THE COURT: Maybe you should just ask him the questions
3	the general ledger, questions related to what	3	directly instead of bringing up all this old testimony.
4	A. Yes, I was.	4	BY MR. GINGOLD:
16:56:30 5	Q what Mr. Warshawsky was asking you about?	16:59:26 5	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ You sat through the trial for the defendants' case. Why did
6	A. Yes.	6	you use the CP&R database and the PACER database to quantify the
7	${\bf Q}. $ This page 120 is one of the sheets that she was using or	7	disbursements from the Individual Indian Trust?
8	that was used in her examination, her cross-examination. And	8	A. During the trial it was brought out from many different
9	this deals with disbursement. This is disbursement data by	9	witnesses that there were issues regarding the underlying data,
16:56:50 10	fiscal year.	16:59:52 10	the fact that there was not a balance of the information and
11	You note in 1972, 1973 I would like you to look at	11	other information was potentially missing, or the disbursement
12	the first on the left two columns at the top, if we can focus in	12	information or the receipt information was not complete.
13	on this. Do you see 1972 and 1973 have identical disbursement	13	Because of that, we looked at a period of time when we believed
14	figures?	14	we had full disbursements from the checks and the EFTs, and
16:57:13 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Beyond the	17:00:12 15	looked at that and used that as a basis of comparison.
16	scope of cross.	16	Q. And do you believe that is more accurate information?
17	THE COURT: That is beyond the scope of cross. You're	17	A. We tried to estimate it using the best available information
18	just rehashing what we heard before.	18	to come up with our numbers.
19	MR. GINGOLD: Except that Mr. Warshawsky specifically	19	Q. And you stated earlier on direct examination, if you were
16:57:24 20	asked questions with regard to the 1972 to 1985 period based on	17:00:37 20	provided additional information that supported disbursements
21	the disbursement data that Ms. Herman was testifying to.	21	from the Trust, you would have used it. Correct?
22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, Dr. Palmer couldn't	22	A. Oh, absolutely. The model I believe is a good model, and
23	didn't know what the GLDL was.	23	different input, we saw that when we had the data from the first
24	THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection. Let's	24	time that this was presented with Dr. Cornell until now, the
16:57:41 25	move on. Let's not rehearse Ms. Herman's testimony through this	17:00:58 25	numbers went down by \$10 billion with the additional data. If
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1644		1646
1	witness.	1	there's additional data that we don't have or decisions about
2	BY MR. GINGOLD:	2	what should or shouldn't be in, the model is I believe a good
3	Q. You were in the courtroom when there was testimony with	3	model and can be used, that information can be utilized in the
4	regard to concerns about the disbursement data for 1972 through	4	model.
16:57:58 5	1985, were you not?	17:01:15 5	Q. With respect to the transfers that were identified by
6	A. I believe there were expressions of concern.	6	Mr. Warshawsky, was there any testimony that you can recall that
7	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ Is that one of the reasons you did not want to use the	7	
8			identified the fact that those funds were disbursed from the
9	reported disbursement data?	8	Treasury?
	A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for	9	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't
16:58:16 10	A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds	9 17:01:34 10	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain
16:58:16 10 11	A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the	9 17:01:34 10 11	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember.
16:58:16 10 11 12	A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it.	9 17:01:34 10 11 12	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky
16:58:16 10 11 12 13	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that?
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14	Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes.
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that?
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that.
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19 16:58:48 20	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was THE COURT: It's kind of like arguing what the other 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19 17:02:10 20	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that. Q. Now let me ask you a hypothetical. If the funds that are
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19 16:58:48 20 21	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was THE COURT: It's kind of like arguing what the other testimony means. 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19 17:02:10 20 21	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that. Q. Now let me ask you a hypothetical. If the funds that are held in the particular account identified as the Osage annuity
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19 16:58:48 20 21 22	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was THE COURT: It's kind of like arguing what the other testimony means. 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19 17:02:10 20 21 22	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that. Q. Now let me ask you a hypothetical. If the funds that are held in the particular account identified as the Osage annuity account at Treasury, and those funds belong to the individual
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19 16:58:48 20 21 22 23	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was THE COURT: It's kind of like arguing what the other testimony means. MR. GINGOLD: A substantial part of Mr. Warshawsky's cross-examination was raising concerns about the methodology 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19 17:02:10 20 21 22 23	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that. Q. Now let me ask you a hypothetical. If the funds that are held in the particular account identified as the Osage annuity account at Treasury, and those funds belong to the individual Osage Indians, and they are held in trust until the Treasury
16:58:16 10 11 12 13 14 16:58:32 15 16 17 18 19 16:58:48 20 21 22	 A. Again, we looked at what we could determine for disbursements in the years where we have information of funds that went out of the Trust, and we used those to adjust the other years of similar information and other years around it. Q. Did you review the testimony of Don Pallais in this litigation? A. I did. MR. GINGOLD: Can we please call up the testimony? THE COURT: Again, why are we using Dr. Palmer to sort of highlight other testimony that we've already heard? MR. GINGOLD: Because this was THE COURT: It's kind of like arguing what the other testimony means. 	9 17:01:34 10 11 12 13 14 17:01:52 15 16 17 18 19 17:02:10 20 21 22	 Treasury? A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were, but I don't remember specifically. I think the transfers, the funds remain in Treasury. But I don't remember. Q. You were asked a hypothetical question by Mr. Warshawsky with respect to the Osage annuity account. Do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. And he asked you if funds were disbursed out of that account to annuitants, whether or not you believed they were Individual Indian Trust funds or words to that effect. Do you recall that? A. I don't recall the specific question, but he did ask me questions about that. Q. Now let me ask you a hypothetical. If the funds that are held in the particular account identified as the Osage annuity account at Treasury, and those funds belong to the individual

³¹ of 54 sheets PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

				49
1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for a	1	recite them all. What I would like you to do is to reach	
2	legal conclusion.	2	agreement if you can on what's in evidence and what isn't in	
3	THE COURT: Sustained. I don't think his understanding	3	evidence and submit a list, and if there's any debate about	
4	is going to do it for me.	4	what's in evidence, let me hear that much of it tomorrow.	
17:02:52 5	BY MR. GINGOLD:	17:05:32 5	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.	
6	Q. But your answer to Mr. Warshawsky's hypothetical question	6	THE COURT: Thank you. We're adjourned until	
7	was dependent on whether or not those funds are legally the	7	2:00 o'clock tomorrow.	
8	property of the individuals or legally the property of the	8	(Proceedings adjourned at 5:05 p.m.)	
9	tribe?	9		
17:03:04 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. Leading.	10		
11	BY MR. GINGOLD:	11		
12	Q. Is that correct?	12		
13	THE COURT: I'll allow that.	13		
14	A. If the funds were for the individuals and included as funds	14		
17:03:16 15	for the individuals for the IMS (sic) Trust, then they would not	15		
16	be included. The question that was asked is conditional upon	16		
17	the fact that those never went into the Trust, never were	17		
18	available for the Trust, never was part of it.	18		
19	Q. If they're Individual Indian Trust funds held by the	19		
17:03:39 20	Treasury in trust.	20		
21	A. My previous answer	21		
22	THE COURT: That's the legal question. Right?	22		
23	MR. GINGOLD: Well, that is precisely the legal	23		
24	question, Your Honor.	24		
17:03:54 25	THE COURT: Then let's not bother this witness with	25		
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verize	on.net
	1648		16	50
1	that question.	1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
2	MR. GINGOLD: Okay. Your Honor, no further questions.	2		
3	THE COURT: All right. I think we've come to the end	3	I, Rebecca Stonestreet, certify that the foregoing is a	
4	of the day. Dr. Palmer, thank you, sir. That completes your	4	correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the	
17:04:07 5	testimony. You're excused. And we will be adjourned until	5	above-entitled matter.	
6	shall we say 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon? And at	6		
7	2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon we'll hear summaries of the	7		
8	evidence, and that will complete our business until we get	8		
9	findings let's talk, just while we're here and thinking about	9		
17:04:32 10	it, have you given any more thought about when we can have	10	SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE	
11	findings of fact and conclusions, proposed findings of fact?	11		
12	MR. DORRIS: It's fine with us to go with I think it	12		
13	was July 8th was the two weeks out, and that would be fine with	13		
14	us, Your Honor.	14		
17:04:47 15	THE COURT: Can you handle that, Mr. Kirschman?	15		
16	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, we would ask for a deadline	16		
17	of July 11th, Friday.	17		
18	THE COURT: Why do on Monday what you can put off until	18		
19	Friday, huh? All right, July 11th it is.	19		
17:05:04 20	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	20		
21	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we have a number of exhibits,	21		
22	I think both sides, to move in tomorrow. Would it be acceptable	22		
23	if both sides just submitted I think they've largely been	23		
24	agreed to a list before we start closing argument?	24		
17:05:22 25	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't want you to stand here and	25		
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verize</u>	on.net
	02·23·21 PM Page 1647 to			

Page 1647 to 1650 of 1650 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

1				
\$	11/29/00 [1] - 1565:6	1889 [6] - 1556:1,	1619:21, 1640:4,	2006 [3] - 1579:23,
Ψ	110 [2] - 1621:2,	1556:2, 1556:10,	1641:1, 1643:20,	1618:14, 1640:5
\$1.513 [2] - 1551:25,	1621:14	1557:10, 1557:20,	1644:5	2007 [14] - 1569:15,
1552:21	1100 [2] - 1523:16,	1558:5	1987 [6] - 1527:5,	1570:9, 1570:11,
\$10 [3] - 1528:10,	1524:4	189 [2] - 1549:3,	1527:17, 1527:18,	1571:8, 1583:1,
1528:11, 1645:25	11th [2] - 1648:17,	1573:23	1527:21, 1614:17,	1587:2, 1613:24,
\$2,419,814.14 _[1] -	1648:19	189-A [18] - 1541:7,	1615:20	1614:20, 1617:8,
1563:1	12 [4] - 1612:7,	1542:8, 1542:21,	1988 [9] - 1526:7,	1618:15, 1621:5,
\$2.26 [1] - 1567:19	1627:13, 1628:1,	1549:2, 1549:4,	1527:7, 1554:7,	1622:12, 1627:12,
\$23.62 [1] - 1574:9	, ,	1549:6, 1549:8,	1596:8, 1610:11,	1633:25
\$336 [1] - 1547:9	1632:18	1549:16, 1550:5,	1612:1, 1613:5,	2008 [7] - 1523:4,
\$4.47 [1] - 1630:2	12,037,147 [1] -	1549.10, 1550.3, 1550.1,	1613:11, 1615:12	1550:16, 1552:2,
\$58 [1] - 1577:24	1568:3	1559:1, 1568:5,	1989 [1] - 1610:11	1571:11, 1576:11,
\$73 [2] - 1628:2,	12.04 [4] - 1568:10,			1612:7, 1632:18
1628:5	1569:2, 1573:5,	1573:1, 1578:24,	1991 [1] - 1610:12	
\$8.76 [1] - 1635:25	1574:4	1589:12, 1597:9,	1992 [1] - 1610:12	2009 [1] - 1571:20
\$6.76 [1] - 1055.25	120 [3] - 1613:25,	1597:17	1993 [1] - 1639:14	2011 [2] - 1569:4,
	1642:23, 1643:7	189-C [1] - 1526:6	1994 [7] - 1532:25,	1569:20
	1242 [1] - 1545:11	1906 [1] - 1555:20	1533:1, 1533:6,	202 [5] - 1523:14,
'07 [1] - 1536:23	1243 [1] - 1547:8	1909 [8] - 1553:25,	1533:10, 1533:17,	1523:22, 1524:5,
'11 [1] - 1554:7	13 [9] - 1605:7,	1554:6, 1554:7,	1534:6, 1535:5	1524:10, 1524:17
'30s [1] - 1607:3	1605:12, 1605:14,	1579:23, 1596:3,	1998 [1] - 1610:12	202)887-4000 [1] -
'72 [1] - 1620:11	1605:20, 1606:9,	1596:4, 1604:20,	1999 [3] - 1610:12,	1524:13
'87 [1] - 1620:11	1606:12, 1606:19,	1640:4	1626:18, 1638:6	2025 [1] - 1559:21
'Tribal [1] - 1551:25	1607:1	1909-1911 [1] -		2026 [5] - 1560:19,
	13.1 [1] - 1640:13	1595:18	2	1560:23, 1565:4,
0	13.2 [1] - 1640:13	1911 [5] - 1553:25,	2,100 [1] - 1555:20	1565:8, 1565:16
0	1333 [1] - 1524:12	1554:6, 1596:3,	2,229 [4] - 1557:22,	2028 [4] - 1561:7,
03T [1] - 1635:8	134.1 [2] - 1615:1,	1596:4, 1604:20	1573:14, 1574:12,	1561:16, 1561:18,
0611 [1] - 1569:16	1615:5	192 [5] - 1529:8,	1575:2	1565:5
	143.5 [1] - 1618:1	1534:10, 1535:8,	2.4 [2] - 1563:6,	2029 [6] - 1560:19,
	14th (a) 1500.10	1548:14, 1548:16	Z. [2] 1000.0,	1561:7, 1562:4,
1	14th [2] - 1523:12,		1564.23	
	1523:20	192-and-a-half [1] -	1564:23 20 (2) - 1578:8	1565:6, 1566:12,
1 [1] - 1638:6	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23	20 [2] - 1578:8,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7,	1523:20	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23,	20 _[2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 _[6] - 1562:19,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19	. 1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] -	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1,	. 1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10,	. 1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9,	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3,	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13,	. 1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3,	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20,	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10 169.9 [1] - 1593:7	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1939 [5] - 1584:22,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10 169.9 [1] - 1593:7 175.5 [1] - 1626:22	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3,	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10 169.9 [1] - 1593:7 175.5 [1] - 1626:22 17th [1] - 1585:19	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1]-1630:4\\ 14X6039[2]-\\ 1630:1,1638:19\\ 15[3]-1552:9,\\ 1627:13,1628:1\\ 16[1]-1627:12\\ 161(a)[1]-1533:22\\ 169.6[2]-1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1]-1593:7\\ 175.5[1]-1626:22\\ 17th[1]-1585:19\\ 18[2]-1527:10,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9,	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1]-1630:4\\ 14X6039[2]-\\ 1630:1,1638:19\\ 15[3]-1552:9,\\ 1627:13,1628:1\\ 16[1]-1627:12\\ 161(a)[1]-1533:22\\ 169.6[2]-1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1]-1593:7\\ 175.5[1]-1626:22\\ 17th[1]-1585:19\\ 18[2]-1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4,
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9, 1576:11, 1599:20	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1]-1630:4\\ 14X6039[2]-\\ 1630:1,1638:19\\ 15[3]-1552:9,\\ 1627:13,1628:1\\ 16[1]-1627:12\\ 161(a)[1]-1533:22\\ 169.6[2]-1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1]-1593:7\\ 175.5[1]-1626:22\\ 17th[1]-1585:19\\ 18[2]-1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2]-1558:10,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:2, 1598:16,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, 1637:10
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9, 1576:11, 1599:20 10-minute [1] -	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1]-1630:4\\ 14X6039[2]-\\ 1630:1,1638:19\\ 15[3]-1552:9,\\ 1627:13,1628:1\\ 16[1]-1627:12\\ 161(a)[1]-1533:22\\ 169.6[2]-1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1]-1593:7\\ 175.5[1]-1626:22\\ 17th[1]-1585:19\\ 18[2]-1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2]-1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:2, 1598:16, 1598:18	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12,	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\ \end{bmatrix}$
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9, 1576:11, 1599:20 10-minute [1] - 1594:14	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1]-1630:4\\ 14X6039[2]-\\ 1630:1,1638:19\\ 15[3]-1552:9,\\ 1627:13,1628:1\\ 16[1]-1627:12\\ 161(a)[1]-1533:22\\ 169.6[2]-1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1]-1593:7\\ 175.5[1]-1626:22\\ 17th[1]-1585:19\\ 18[2]-1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2]-1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1]-1531:5\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\ \end{bmatrix}$
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9, 1576:11, 1599:20 10-minute [1] - 1594:14 10-year [2] -	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1531:5\\ 185[1] - 1533:22\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20,	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\ 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, \\ \end{bmatrix}$
1 [1] - 1638:6 1,496 [2] - 1557:7, 1557:21 1,500 [1] - 1555:19 1,708 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:4, 1557:10, 1557:20 1.07 [2] - 1606:3, 1606:5 1.25 [7] - 1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1 1.3 [1] - 1601:21 1.5 [3] - 1552:3, 1552:13, 1552:18 10 [4] - 1552:9, 1576:11, 1599:20 10-minute [1] - 1594:14 10-year [2] - 1534:16, 1535:19	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1531:5\\ 185[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1532:20\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8,	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\ 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, \\1573:12 \\ 1563$
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1532:20\\ 1880[1] - 1555:19\\ 1887[11] - 1604:17,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\ 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, \\ \end{bmatrix}$
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10 169.9 [1] - 1593:7 175.5 [1] - 1626:22 17th [1] - 1585:19 18 [2] - 1557:10, 1545:11 183 [2] - 1558:10, 1575:16 184 [1] - 1531:5 185 [1] - 1533:22 186 [1] - 1532:20 1880 [1] - 1555:19	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] -	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\ 2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\ 2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\ 2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\ 2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\ 2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\ 2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\ 21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\ 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\ 23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\ 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, \\1573:12 \\ 1563$
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	1523:20 14X [1] - 1630:4 14X6039 [2] - 1630:1, 1638:19 15 [3] - 1552:9, 1627:13, 1628:1 16 [1] - 1627:12 161(a) [1] - 1533:22 169.6 [2] - 1594:3, 1594:10 169.9 [1] - 1593:7 175.5 [1] - 1626:22 17th [1] - 1585:19 18 [2] - 1527:10, 1545:11 183 [2] - 1558:10, 1575:16 184 [1] - 1533:22 186 [1] - 1533:22 186 [1] - 1555:19 1887 [11] - 1604:17, 1604:19, 1604:23,	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20, 1644:4	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] - 1524:12	$1565:6, 1566:12, \\1566:16 \\2030 [6] - 1563:24, \\1565:8, 1565:15, \\1565:16, 1565:21, \\1565:22 \\2031 [1] - 1564:6 \\2033 [4] - 1563:13, \\1563:24, 1565:15, \\1566:9 \\2037 [1] - 1567:15 \\2039 [1] - 1567:18 \\2054 [1] - 1559:21 \\21 [4] - 1577:18, \\1578:5, 1612:6, \\1612:9 \\21.7 [2] - 1637:4, \\1637:10 \\23 [2] - 1632:6, \\1632:8 \\23.6 [2] - 1573:8, \\1573:12 \\238 [3] - 1625:20, \\1627:21, 1627:24 \\24 [5] - 1523:4, \\ \end{bmatrix}$
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1531:5\\ 185[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1532:20\\ 1880[1] - 1555:19\\ 1887[11] - 1604:17,\\ 1604:19, 1604:23,\\ 1605:3, 1606:16,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20, 1644:4 1973 [2] - 1643:11,	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] - 1524:12 2004 [1] - 1618:14	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, 1637:10 23 [2] - 1632:6, 1632:8 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, 1573:12 238 [3] - 1625:20, 1627:21, 1627:24 24 [5] - 1523:4, 1577:18, 1577:22,
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1555:19\\ 187[11] - 1604:17,\\ 1604:19, 1604:23,\\ 1605:3, 1606:16,\\ 1606:19, 1607:2,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:2, 1598:16, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20, 1644:4 1973 [2] - 1643:11, 1643:13	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] - 1524:12 2004 [1] - 1618:14 2004 [1] - 1524:9	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, 1637:10 23 [2] - 1632:6, 1632:8 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, 1577:12 238 [3] - 1625:20, 1627:21, 1627:24 24 [5] - 1523:4, 1577:18, 1577:22, 1585:20, 1606:7
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \mbox{[1]} - 1638:6 \\ 1,496 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1555:19\\ 1887[11] - 1604:17,\\ 1604:19, 1604:23,\\ 1605:3, 1606:16,\\ 1606:19, 1607:2,\\ 1607:6, 1607:10,\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:2, 1598:16, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20, 1644:4 1973 [2] - 1643:11, 1643:13 1984 [1] - 1640:4	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] - 1524:12 2004 [1] - 1618:14 2004 [1] - 1524:9 2005 [3] - 1569:4,	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, 1637:10 23 [2] - 1632:6, 1632:8 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, 1577:12 238 [3] - 1625:20, 1627:21, 1627:24 24 [5] - 1523:4, 1577:18, 1577:22, 1585:20, 1606:7 25 [5] - 1533:5,
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	$\begin{array}{c} 1523:20\\ 14X[1] - 1630:4\\ 14X6039[2] -\\ 1630:1, 1638:19\\ 15[3] - 1552:9,\\ 1627:13, 1628:1\\ 16[1] - 1627:12\\ 161(a)[1] - 1533:22\\ 169.6[2] - 1594:3,\\ 1594:10\\ 169.9[1] - 1593:7\\ 175.5[1] - 1626:22\\ 17th[1] - 1585:19\\ 18[2] - 1527:10,\\ 1545:11\\ 183[2] - 1558:10,\\ 1575:16\\ 184[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1533:22\\ 186[1] - 1555:19\\ 1887[11] - 1604:17,\\ 1604:19, 1604:23,\\ 1605:3, 1606:16,\\ 1606:19, 1607:2,\\ 1607:24, 1608:3\\ \end{array}$	192-and-a-half [1] - 1617:23 1923 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1933 [3] - 1534:24, 1535:2, 1535:4 1934 [5] - 1542:23, 1542:25, 1543:7, 1607:7, 1607:10 1937 [1] - 1640:4 1938 [1] - 1640:4 1949 [5] - 1584:22, 1588:7, 1589:23, 1591:9, 1594:5 1950s [1] - 1609:3 1955 [4] - 1596:22, 1598:2, 1598:16, 1598:18 1968 [1] - 1608:24 1972 [8] - 1613:23, 1614:17, 1616:7, 1619:21, 1643:11, 1643:13, 1643:20, 1644:4 1973 [2] - 1643:11, 1643:13	20 [2] - 1578:8, 1612:6 2000 [6] - 1562:19, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1639:14, 1640:4, 1641:1 20001 [1] - 1524:16 20005 [3] - 1523:13, 1523:21, 1524:4 2001 [8] - 1568:2, 1568:7, 1568:22, 1573:5, 1574:4, 1617:17, 1618:8, 1640:4 2002 [9] - 1554:7, 1596:8, 1611:23, 1612:1, 1613:5, 1613:11, 1615:12, 1617:17, 1618:8 2003 [4] - 1614:20, 1615:21, 1617:8, 1617:22 20036-1564 [1] - 1524:12 2004 [1] - 1618:14 2004 [1] - 1524:9	1565:6, 1566:12, 1566:16 2030 [6] - 1563:24, 1565:8, 1565:15, 1565:16, 1565:21, 1565:22 2031 [1] - 1564:6 2033 [4] - 1563:13, 1563:24, 1565:15, 1566:9 2037 [1] - 1567:15 2039 [1] - 1567:18 2054 [1] - 1559:21 21 [4] - 1577:18, 1578:5, 1612:6, 1612:9 21.7 [2] - 1637:4, 1637:10 23 [2] - 1632:6, 1632:8 23.6 [2] - 1573:8, 1577:12 238 [3] - 1625:20, 1627:21, 1627:24 24 [5] - 1523:4, 1577:18, 1577:22, 1585:20, 1606:7

1533:22, 1534:6 27101 [1] - 1523:25	4	66.8 [1] - 1597:6 66.814 [1] - 1598:3	1551:22 98.75 [2] - 1574:12,	accounting [9] - 1529:2, 1561:1,
2800 [1] - 1523:17	4,685,121 [1] -	69 [1] - 1604:8	1595:10	1616:16, 1616:23,
2:00 [3] - 1648:6,	1573:20		99 [2] - 1551:4,	1625:13, 1631:22,
2.00 [3] - 1048.0, 1648:7, 1649:7	404 [1] - 1523:18	69-point [1] - 1604:6	1551:7	1641:21, 1641:23,
1648:7, 1649:7	41 [1] - 1550:14		1001.7	1642:10
•	423.7 [1] - 1603:13	7	•	
3		70 [3] - 1603:18,	- A	accounts [33] -
3 [1] - 1525:3	44 [2] - 1604:18,	1604:3, 1604:9	a-ha [1] - 1607:20	- 1532:15, 1548:2,
3,008,161 [1] -	1605:5	73 [1] - 1637:1	able [9] - 1527:21,	1562:20, 1567:16,
1567:16	461 [2] - 1608:11,		1539:10, 1540:20,	1569:17, 1571:21,
	1608:16	73.5 [1] - 1637:8		1572:6, 1572:17,
3,152 [1] - 1566:11	480 [1] - 1629:8	7386706 [5] -	1551:19, 1554:14,	1579:20, 1581:18,
3,152,632.55 [2] -	481 [3] - 1632:14,	1561:23, 1562:9,	1558:5, 1586:1,	1581:23, 1582:8,
1560:25, 1562:1	1633:15, 1634:21	1563:5, 1564:7,	1586:3, 1614:5	1582:9, 1582:13,
3.152 [1] - 1564:18	484 [2] - 1556:7,	1570:19	above-entitled [1] -	1582:14, 1582:24,
3/12ths [1] - 1527:3	1556:19	74-and-a-half [4] -	1650:5	1583:11, 1610:14,
30 [1] - 1587:2	49.37 [1] - 1598:20	1602:7, 1615:2,	absence [1] -	1615:14, 1622:13,
30-page [1] -		1615:3, 1620:6	1553:22	1622:22, 1623:9,
1559:22	5	76 [1] - 1584:17	absolutely [1] -	1624:7, 1626:1,
30309-4530 [1] -	5	77 [18] - 1579:2,	1645:22	1630:4, 1631:5,
1523:17	517 [2] - 1559:14,	1579:21, 1580:5,	acceptable [1] -	
	1565:19		1648:22	1631:8, 1631:13,
307-0010 [1] - 1524:5	52 [1] - 1547:13	1580:11, 1581:8,		1634:12, 1636:5
307-1104 [1] -		1581:10, 1584:3,	accepting [1] -	accrues [1] -
1524:10	53 [4] - 1596:18,	1584:12, 1584:14,	1644:24	1607:19
30th [1] - 1579:8	1598:9, 1599:19,	1589:25, 1590:1,	accordance [1] -	Accumulated [1] -
31 [1] - 1531:7	1602:6	1590:3, 1590:10,	1636:4	1535:11
31-and-a-half [1] -	56 [2] - 1605:4,	1590:12, 1590:13,	According [1] -	accumulated [3] -
1603:12	1612:11	1590:16, 1631:24,	1546:5	1605:10, 1606:17,
33.6 [1] - 1637:1	567 [2] - 1612:6,	1632:3	accordingly [2] -	1607:14
330 [1] - 1547:13	1612:9	77.36 [2] - 1604:24,	1544:14, 1549:25	accurate [2] -
333 [1] - 1524:16	568 [1] - 1612:6	1606:5	account [55] -	1616:19, 1645:16
	570 [1] - 1632:19	7736 [1] - 1605:4	1527:14, 1561:23,	
334 [4] - 1576:10,	571 [1] - 1564:13	791 [2] - 1585:18,	1562:15, 1562:16,	ACH/EFT [2] -
1577:18, 1577:22	585-0053 [1] -		1563:5, 1563:18,	1626:11, 1627:3
335 [2] - 1577:18,		1585:20		acknowledged [1] -
1578:8	1523:22	792 [1] - 1585:18	1564:6, 1564:7,	1579:2
336 [1] - 1523:25	5:05 [1] - 1649:8	7s [1] - 1630:4	1564:10, 1566:3,	Act [2] - 1543:16,
336.6 [2] - 1626:14,	_		1570:21, 1570:23,	1543:22
1637:8	6	8	1571:6, 1571:9,	Action [1] - 1523:2
34 [5] - 1618:5,	C 4547:40		1571:12, 1572:8,	activities [1] -
1618:18, 1619:7,	6 [3] - 1547:13,	80 [1] - 1584:17	1572:14, 1572:23,	1626:1
1619:18, 1634:23	1547:14, 1547:21	815-6450 [1] -	1572:24, 1576:18,	actual [16] - 1526:12
	6.5 [2] - 1543:1,	1523:18	1576:20, 1576:21,	1544:10, 1544:12,
354-3249 [1] -	1543:7	824-1448 [1] -	1577:15, 1579:1,	
1524:17	6/23 [2] - 1589:17,	1523:14	1581:22, 1582:5,	1554:2, 1566:23,
365 [7] - 1579:6,	1597:21	83 [3] - 1606:3,	1583:2, 1587:1,	1581:11, 1601:13,
1579:13, 1583:15,	6039 [14] - 1562:11,	1606:4, 1613:24	1592:13, 1607:17,	1601:25, 1610:16,
1590:2, 1590:5,	1562:14, 1562:15,	888 [2] - 1627:13,	1607:21, 1614:8,	1614:7, 1614:10,
1639:8, 1639:24				1615:12, 1616:15,
1000.0, 1000.21	1563 18 1563 25	1628.1		
370 [1] - 1582:20	1563:18, 1563:25, 1564:20, 1565:12	1628:1	1623:11, 1623:20,	1616:17, 1617:18,
370 [1] - 1582:20	1564:20, 1565:12,	1628:1 8th [1] - 1648:13	1625:7, 1630:24,	1616:17, 1617:18, 1618:20
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8,	8th [1] - 1648:13	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17,	
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9,	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22,		1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4,	1618:20
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22,	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16,	8th [1] - 1648:13 9	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21,	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16,	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21,	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9 607 [2] - 1523:12,	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21, 1575:21	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9 607 [2] - 1523:12, 1523:20	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13, 1646:15, 1646:21,	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5 additional [12] -
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21,	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9 607 [2] - 1523:12, 1523:20 607-7392 [1] - 1523:25	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21 96-1285 [1] - 1523:2	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13, 1646:15, 1646:21, 1646:22	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5 additional [12] - 1529:1, 1546:10,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21, 1575:21	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9 607 [2] - 1523:12, 1523:20 607-7392 [1] - 1523:25 62 [1] - 1535:18	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9[1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21 96-1285 [1] - 1523:2 97-013 [1] - 1636:4 9702 [1] - 1531:7	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13, 1646:15, 1646:21, 1646:22 Account [2] -	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5 additional [12] - 1529:1, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1547:20,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21, 1575:21	$1564:20, 1565:12, \\1566:7, 1566:8, \\1567:16, 1567:22, \\1568:3, 1569:16, \\1571:9 \\ \textbf{607} [2] - 1523:12, \\1523:20 \\ \textbf{607-7392} [1] - \\1523:25 \\ \textbf{62} [1] - 1535:18 \\ \textbf{6511} [1] - 1524:15 \\ \end{array}$	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9 [1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21 96-1285 [1] - 1523:2 97-013 [1] - 1523:2 97013 [1] - 1531:7 975 [1] - 1524:9	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13, 1646:15, 1646:21, 1646:22 Account [2] - 1631:3, 1636:3	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5 additional [12] - 1529:1, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1547:20, 1564:9, 1586:7,
370 [1] - 1582:20 371 [1] - 1582:19 372 [4] - 1560:9, 1560:11, 1642:22, 1642:23 38 [3] - 1575:21, 1606:10, 1606:15 39 [2] - 1558:21, 1575:21	1564:20, 1565:12, 1566:7, 1566:8, 1567:16, 1567:22, 1568:3, 1569:16, 1571:9 607 [2] - 1523:12, 1523:20 607-7392 [1] - 1523:25 62 [1] - 1535:18	8th [1] - 1648:13 9 9[1] - 1523:8 9/12ths [1] - 1527:3 900 [1] - 1523:21 96-1285 [1] - 1523:2 97-013 [1] - 1636:4 9702 [1] - 1531:7	1625:7, 1630:24, 1631:9, 1631:17, 1635:14, 1636:4, 1638:11, 1638:19, 1638:23, 1639:19, 1639:20, 1640:17, 1640:22, 1646:13, 1646:15, 1646:21, 1646:22 Account [2] -	1618:20 adapting [1] - 1603:18 added [7] - 1548:4, 1574:15, 1585:22, 1586:7, 1606:9, 1606:13, 1623:5 additional [12] - 1529:1, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1547:20,

1		1		
1602:23, 1645:20,	AFTERNOON [1] -	1622:2, 1622:4,	1591:23, 1641:11,	approximation [3] -
1645:25, 1646:1	1523:7	1622:6, 1623:16,	1641:14, 1642:9	1528:19, 1535:20,
address [3] - 1588:3,	afternoon [16] -	1623:17, 1624:5,	annual [5] - 1531:15,	1536:3
1588:19, 1595:7	1526:3, 1536:13,	1624:6, 1624:18,	1531:17, 1547:10,	April [6] - 1552:2,
adequate [1] -	1536:14, 1545:12,	1624:19, 1624:21,	1554:25, 1555:1	1552:18, 1569:9,
1592:6	1576:11, 1585:19,	1624:25, 1626:20,	annuitants [13] -	1569:12, 1620:25,
adjacent [1] - 1640:6	1594:19, 1594:20,	1626:23, 1626:25,	1563:9, 1563:14,	1622:9
adjourned [3] -	1594:21, 1595:1,	1636:19, 1638:2	1564:23, 1565:13,	AR-171 [7] - 1526:10,
1648:5, 1649:6,	1610:23, 1616:21,	amounts [15] -	1566:10, 1567:19,	1551:24, 1552:19,
1649:8	1627:12, 1629:17,	1531:14, 1531:15,	1567:22, 1569:21,	1552:21, 1553:6,
adjust [13] - 1532:15,	1648:6, 1648:7	1533:4, 1565:1,	1571:18, 1572:6,	1614:23, 1615:3
1587:19, 1588:21,	Agency [1] - 1562:20	1565:2, 1567:21,	1572:18, 1577:14,	argue [1] - 1529:24
1592:20, 1592:24,	agency [1] - 1557:2	1572:6, 1577:5,	1646:16	arguing [1] - 1644:20
1592:25, 1600:15,	agent [1] - 1587:19	1577:6, 1577:8,	annuity [6] - 1559:7,	argument [1] -
1601:11, 1602:2,	ago [5] - 1548:18,	1580:3, 1587:5,	1561:2, 1572:14,	1648:24
1616:2, 1618:22,	1548:19, 1578:19,	1594:10, 1609:8,	1573:12, 1646:13,	
1626:24, 1644:11	1602:13, 1630:12	1626:10	1646:21	articles [1] - 1538:15
adjustable [1] -		analysis [47] -	Answer [13] -	aspect [1] - 1538:11
1576:2	agree [4] - 1547:3,	1529:9, 1529:15,	1545:16, 1545:18,	assets [1] - 1530:22
	1577:6, 1577:12,	1530:6, 1531:21,	1545.16, 1545.18, 1547:13,	assists [1] - 1597:8
adjusted [31] -	1584:12	1530:0, 1531:21, 1532:17, 1534:20,	1547:17, 1576:24,	associated [1] -
1544:14, 1579:1,	agreed [1] - 1648:24	1542:13, 1542:16,	1577:2, 1577:8,	1551:23
1586:16, 1586:20,	agreement [1] -	1542:19, 1543:24,	1577.2, 1577.8, 1578:3, 1613:23,	assume [4] -
1586:23, 1587:21,	1649:2	1546:2, 1546:7,		1583:14, 1589:1,
1592:9, 1592:22,	ahead [6] - 1593:14,	1546:8, 1548:9,	1628:7, 1632:22,	1624:10, 1635:7
1596:1, 1598:22,	1594:25, 1597:2,	1548:16, 1549:2,	1632:25	Assume [1] -
1598:25, 1599:6,	1604:16, 1609:13,	1549:8, 1550:21,	answer [24] -	1576:17
1599:7, 1599:10,	1612:4		1526:14, 1526:18,	assumed [5] -
1599:16, 1600:10,	aided [1] - 1524:19	1553:16, 1554:5,	1552:17, 1553:2,	1580:2, 1588:12,
1600:21, 1601:4,	AKIN [1] - 1524:11	1554:16, 1555:24,	1558:8, 1562:7,	1588:25, 1603:18,
1601:7, 1601:10,	al [2] - 1523:3,	1558:6, 1558:24,	1567:3, 1576:14,	1632:7
1601:20, 1602:18,	1523:6	1567:6, 1572:20,	1585:25, 1591:19,	assumptions [1] -
1614:9, 1614:23,	allow [1] - 1647:13	1579:17, 1580:1,	1592:5, 1592:6,	1621:15
1617:12, 1617:21,	alternate [1] -	1580:11, 1582:10,	1592:9, 1592:23,	Atlanta [1] - 1523:17
1618:11, 1619:18,	1530:19	1589:4, 1589:6,	1600:23, 1613:18,	attached [3] -
1620:19, 1621:24,	alternative [3] -	1589:14, 1597:5,	1616:22, 1618:15,	1550:9, 1569:8,
1622:25	1529:15, 1548:14,	1597:11, 1597:12,	1628:16, 1628:17,	1569:11
adjusting [1] -	1548:24	1598:13, 1599:5,	1628:18, 1641:20,	attachment [2] -
1623:14	amount [61] -	1602:24, 1605:23,	1647:6, 1647:21	1535:14, 1605:2
adjustment [20] -	1528:9, 1530:15,	1607:12, 1608:23,	answering [2] -	Attachment [33] -
1526:11, 1557:24,	1532:5, 1536:4,	1615:10, 1616:5,	1595:21, 1617:16	1529:8, 1529:17,
1579:10, 1586:17,	1547:2, 1547:24,	1622:2, 1636:24,	Antonio [1] - 1527:9	1532:10, 1534:15,
1586:19, 1586:22,	1551:19, 1552:3,	1637:11	appear [3] - 1566:4,	1535:13, 1537:15,
1591:8, 1591:12,	1552:25, 1557:17,	analytic [3] -	1599:21, 1609:18	1537:16, 1537:20,
1591:20, 1595:25,	1560:25, 1562:2,	1550:12, 1550:15,	APPEARANCES [1] -	1540:24, 1541:3,
1596:9, 1599:14,	1562:23, 1563:5,	1550:20	1523:10	1549:8, 1550:13,
1620:5, 1620:13,	1564:22, 1565:2,	analyze [1] - 1603:13	apples [4] - 1602:1,	1550:19, 1568:5,
1620:17, 1620:18,	1566:7, 1566:11,	analyzing [2] -	1615:25, 1616:1	1568:6, 1573:1,
1621:20, 1624:5,	1572:3, 1572:5,	1541:17, 1601:24	applications [1] -	1589:11, 1597:11,
1632:4, 1632:9	1573:14, 1573:17,	Angel [16] - 1544:6,	1600:16	1597:12, 1598:18,
adjustments [2] -	1574:13, 1581:11,	1544:16, 1552:6,	applied [11] - 1532:6,	1599:6, 1604:16,
1555:10, 1599:11	1581:12, 1585:21,	1555:17, 1556:20,	1532:7, 1533:12,	1612:10, 1612:13,
ADMITTED [1] -	1587:1, 1587:7,	1579:1, 1584:23,	1534:11, 1534:13,	1612:14, 1612:18,
1525:6	1587:10, 1600:15,	1585:13, 1585:21,	1535:24, 1583:23,	1612:21, 1612:22,
Affairs [2] - 1556:10,	1600:23, 1601:2,	1591:10, 1591:13,	1589:24, 1615:1,	1612:23, 1613:5,
1556:13	1601:10, 1601:12,	1592:10, 1608:25,	1615:19, 1620:6	1613:8, 1614:2
affect [4] - 1546:7,	1601:17, 1601:18,	1641:5, 1641:16,	apply [5] - 1532:25,	attachments [2] -
1587:1, 1587:3,	1615:9, 1617:12,	1642:10	1533:9, 1533:16,	1569:14, 1597:15
1595:22	1620:6, 1621:21,	Angel's [8] -	1534:25, 1535:3	attend [1] - 1539:11
affected [1] -	1621:23, 1621:24,	1555:16, 1557:23,	applying [1] -	attention [3] -
1588:22	1621:25, 1622:1,	1585:12, 1585:18,	1644:25	1526:7, 1534:2,
				1320.7, 1334.2,
1				

1639:24				
	backup [7] -	1610:24, 1611:1,	1531:21, 1542:13,	1600:12, 1605:25,
Attorney [1] - 1524:6	1560:13, 1560:15,	1611:6, 1627:7,	1546:1, 1607:14	1626:5, 1629:13,
attributable [1] -	1560:17, 1560:18,	1627:8, 1627:9,	benefitted [3] -	1635:16, 1636:17
1577:25	1560:22, 1561:9,	1628:3, 1628:5,	1621:16, 1621:17,	Blow [1] - 1571:13
attribute [1] -	1603:7	1628:12, 1628:25,	1622:4	blunt [1] - 1633:17
1543:14	backwards [1] -	1629:2, 1629:4,	best [4] - 1528:25,	bond [2] - 1534:16,
attributed [1] -	1616:3	1629:6, 1629:24,	1552:14, 1578:21,	1535:19
1546:10	balance [9] -	1630:12, 1633:2,	1645:17	bookkeeping [6] -
attributing [1] -	1546:24, 1546:25,	1634:14, 1635:4,	better [2] - 1557:12,	1625:14, 1632:23,
1543:21	1587:1, 1605:17,	1636:20, 1639:14	1591:24	1633:6, 1633:11,
audit [11] - 1596:21,	1606:12, 1607:8,	became [2] -	between [11] -	1638:10, 1638:23
1617:9, 1617:11,	1607:11, 1620:11,	1537:12, 1539:2	1530:12, 1532:8,	borrow [4] - 1545:14,
1617:17, 1617:24,	1645:10	become [4] -	1550:19, 1555:21,	1545:18, 1547:16
1618:5, 1618:6,	balances [3] -	1537:11, 1549:2,	1564:25, 1577:25,	borrowing [4] -
1618:7, 1618:8,	1545:19, 1607:21,	1558:15, 1579:6	1582:9, 1583:4,	1545:2, 1545:20,
1618:17, 1619:1	1616:20	becoming [1] -	1588:12, 1588:25,	1547:21, 1607:16
auditor [1] - 1619:5	bank [11] - 1530:12,	1538:10	1612:22	bother [1] - 1647:25
auditors [1] -	1530:15, 1532:7,	BEFORE [1] - 1523:9	Beyond [2] -	bottom [21] - 1528:1,
1554:13	1533:12, 1533:20,	Beg [1] - 1639:22	1642:17, 1643:15	1534:22, 1535:17,
authorization [1] -	1535:1, 1548:24,	beg [4] - 1545:24,	beyond [1] - 1643:17	1565:5, 1577:21,
1629:22	1548:25, 1638:13,	1551:16, 1560:10,	BIA [3] - 1533:19.	1577:24, 1578:3,
authorized [1] -	1638:24	1616:13	1534:8, 1535:6	1578:6, 1578:7,
1536:4	banks [9] - 1532:7,	began [2] - 1533:6,	big [4] - 1548:3,	1578:25, 1579:19,
available [34] -	1532:12, 1532:13,	1621:4	1582:18, 1582:20	1581:8, 1581:17,
1526:21, 1528:21,	1532:18, 1533:11,	begin [1] - 1548:15	Billion [1] - 1640:15	1585:20, 1587:1,
1529:4, 1529:5,	1533:14, 1533:15,	beginning [5] -	billion [13] - 1528:10,	1590:5, 1594:3,
1533:18, 1534:7,	1534:24, 1543:16	1547:8, 1555:19,	1528:11, 1535:18,	1596:24, 1621:14,
1535:6, 1542:16,	based [24] - 1528:16,	1594:18, 1606:12,	1545:18, 1545:21,	1633:22, 1640:11
1546:16, 1546:18,	1529:5, 1530:11,	1630:4	1551:25, 1552:3,	Box [1] - 1524:9
1546:19, 1546:22,	1531:22, 1536:1,	begins [1] - 1629:24	1552:18, 1552:21,	box [4] - 1633:23,
1546:24, 1547:5,	1541:3, 1542:14,	behalf [1] - 1533:5	1577:24, 1578:7,	1634:6, 1634:9,
1547:6, 1547:25,	1542:16, 1545:5,	behind [1] - 1535:23	1640:14, 1645:25	1636:17
1548:1, 1548:12,	1546:4, 1546:25,	belabor [1] - 1635:3	billions [7] - 1538:4,	boxes [2] - 1633:19,
1552:15, 1555:23,	1555:15, 1557:23,	belong [1] - 1646:22	1545:6, 1545:7,	1633:24
1605:16, 1605:18,	1558:6, 1568:15,	below [9] - 1551:22,	1546:4, 1546:5,	Branch [1] - 1524:7
1606:17, 1606:23,	1571:24, 1584:18,	1562:18, 1563:8,	1594:12	break [3] - 1526:16,
1607:8, 1607:14,	1604:19, 1618:21,	1565:24, 1630:15,	binder [4] - 1560:14,	1528:8, 1594:14
1608:9, 1612:24,	1620:13, 1623:1,	1630:23, 1635:24,	1560:15, 1561:9,	Breslin [1] - 1542:1
1613:13, 1622:6,	1639:17, 1643:20,	1636:2	1629:20	BRIAN [1] - 1525:3
1622:8, 1645:17,	1644:25	Below [1] - 1561:23	binders [5] -	brief [24] - 1537:22,
1647:18	Based [4] - 1528:21,	Ben [1] - 1524:8	1560:14, 1560:17,	1550:10, 1550:16,
Avenue [2] -	1545:7, 1613:13,	beneficial [1] -	1560:18, 1560:22,	1550:19, 1550:24,
1524:12, 1524:16	1631:1	1586:8	1561:13	1550:25, 1551:2,
average [14] -	basic [2] - 1538:6,	beneficiaries [2] -	bit [7] - 1547:7,	1551:5, 1551:11,
1527:4, 1530:14,	1548:6	1535:22, 1621:7	1579:4, 1590:8,	1551:22, 1558:15,
1530:16, 1530:19,	basis [20] - 1526:19,	beneficiary [3] -	1594:19, 1605:25,	1558:17, 1558:18,
1530:23, 1532:8,	1526:20, 1526:21,	1632:12, 1638:4,	1611:11, 1629:13	1569:9, 1569:12,
1534:21, 1535:19,	1526:23, 1526:24,	1632:12, 1638:4, 1638:17	blank [1] - 1526:10	1569:13, 1575:16,
1596:15, 1601:17,	1533:7, 1537:11,	benefit [21] - 1528:1,	blended [10] -	1620:24, 1621:2,
1604:20, 1615:18,	1537:13, 1547:23,	1528:5, 1528:18,	1530:11, 1530:12,	1621:11, 1621:13,
1615:24, 1616:2	1554:2, 1584:7,	1528:19, 1534:16,	1530:16, 1532:9,	1622:9, 1622:16,
aware [10] - 1538:21,	1596:3, 1600:14,	1528.19, 1534.16, 1534:20, 1542:25,	1532:12, 1532:13,	1624:16
1550:24, 1551:21,	1618:4, 1619:5,	1534.20, 1542.25, 1546:9, 1548:12,	1532:15, 1534:15,	bring [2] - 1526:6,
1552:2, 1552:18,	1619:21, 1620:4,	1546.9, 1546.12, 1558:6, 1593:5,	1535:23, 1596:13	1641:5
1558:15, 1579:6,	1632:3, 1632:9,	1594:8, 1605:7,	Blended [1] -	bringing [1] - 1645:3
1588:6, 1641:24,	1645:15		1530:13	brought [2] - 1529:1,
1642:21	batch [1] - 1565:4	1605:10, 1605:19, 1606:11, 1606:15	blending [1] -	1645:8
· ·=·= ·	BB [25] - 1566:19,	1606:11, 1606:15, 1606:18, 1607:19,	1530:18	business [1] -
В	1566:22, 1566:24,	1607:21, 1638:1	blow [10] - 1543:2,	1648:8
	1567:1, 1570:17,	benefits [5] -	1543:3, 1556:25,	but [2] - 1545:9,
backed [1] - 1630:8	, - ,	Dellelle [5] -	10-10.0, 1000.20,	Jul [2] = 1040.8,

				I
1593:12	1548:14, 1549:5,	case-in-chief [3] -	1638:17, 1638:18,	clearly [2] - 1586:3,
BY [78] - 1526:4,	1549:6, 1557:15,	1529:22, 1529:23,	1638:21, 1638:22,	1607:21
1527:12, 1528:3,	1558:9, 1559:6,	1538:7	1638:25, 1639:1,	close [2] - 1539:16,
1529:10, 1530:4,	1568:24, 1577:7,	cash [2] - 1570:15,	1639:2, 1639:3	1639:5
1530:17, 1531:6,	1577:9, 1577:15,	1629:22	checking [1] -	closing [2] - 1539:9,
1532:2, 1532:22,	1577:23, 1578:2,	cashed [14] -	1532:15	1648:24
1534:1, 1535:9,	1578:13, 1578:18,	1621:23, 1621:25,	checks [41] -	Coast [1] - 1539:10
1536:12, 1540:4,	1587:3, 1591:6,	1623:4, 1623:6,	1544:11, 1553:10,	Cobell [2] - 1536:21,
1540:14, 1543:4,	1593:3, 1594:8,	1623:11, 1623:18,	1554:2, 1554:8,	1637:22
1550:3, 1550:6,	1595:9, 1595:10,	1623:22, 1624:2,	1566:24, 1567:1,	COBELL [1] - 1523:2
1551:6, 1551:10,	1601:13, 1603:2,	1624:4, 1624:22,	1567:3, 1570:7,	code [1] - 1603:4
1556:8, 1557:1,	1606:20, 1608:8, 1612:12, 1613:5,	1624:23, 1625:8,	1572:23, 1601:14,	colleague [1] -
1557:6, 1559:15,	1613:10, 1613:11,	1626:23, 1638:2	1601:24, 1610:21,	1578:19
1560:1, 1564:16, 1568:9, 1569:25,	1613:20, 1622:25,	caused [1] - 1624:5	1611:7, 1611:10, 1614:4, 1615:13,	colleagues [2] -
1570:12, 1571:4,	1632:20, 1633:10,	CD&L [1] - 1619:24	1617:19, 1621:15,	1541:23, 1603:10
1571:14, 1574:1,	1633:12, 1641:4,	certain [4] - 1531:2, 1587:7, 1611:12,	1621:17, 1621:21,	collected [2] -
1575:15, 1576:4,	1642:19, 1644:25	1611:19	1621:23, 1622:12,	1604:13, 1632:11
1576:13, 1578:17,	calculations [20] -	Certainly [2] -	1622:14, 1623:2,	collection [1] -
1579:14, 1590:9,	1531:19, 1532:24,	1541:13, 1568:22	1623:5, 1623:20,	1562:11
1591:7, 1593:2,	1535:15, 1535:17,	certainly [9] -	1623:22, 1624:2,	collections [50] - 1543:25, 1544:9,
1593:23, 1595:5,	1540:17, 1540:18,	1529:22, 1529:24,	1624:3, 1624:4,	1543.25, 1544.9, 1544:18, 1553:24,
1598:1, 1598:19,	1540:23, 1541:2,	1550:12, 1584:20,	1624:6, 1624:14,	1554:10, 1571:25,
1599:22, 1600:13,	1541:5, 1541:10,	1586:5, 1586:7,	1624:21, 1626:20,	1573:17, 1574:7,
1602:4, 1603:23,	1541:12, 1554:3,	1602:5, 1608:3,	1626:23, 1629:7,	1574:15, 1574:17,
1606:2, 1608:12,	1557:25, 1588:10,	1635:21	1630:15, 1630:21,	1579:21, 1581:19,
1608:18, 1609:15,	1588:11, 1588:24,	CERTIFICATE [1] -	1632:24, 1633:12,	1582:4, 1582:13,
1610:3, 1612:8,	1593:19, 1595:16,	1650:1	1645:14	1583:12, 1583:15,
1613:17, 1614:16,	1595:17	certify [1] - 1650:3	chief [3] - 1529:22,	1583:17, 1584:25,
1614:22, 1620:3,	calendar [6] -	cetera [1] - 1640:6	1529:23, 1538:7	1585:14, 1586:17,
1621:3, 1621:10,	1526:19, 1526:20,	change [9] - 1538:8,	choose [1] - 1581:8	1587:21, 1588:8,
1625:21, 1626:7,	1526:21, 1526:23,	1538:9, 1541:3,	chose [1] - 1607:15	1588:13, 1589:12,
1627:15, 1628:22,	1527:2, 1527:16	1550:22, 1583:17,	CHRISTOPHER [1] -	1591:9, 1591:10,
1629:10, 1629:15, 1632:16, 1634:24,	cannot [1] - 1554:12	1595:19, 1596:5,	1524:2	1591:14, 1595:11,
1635:18, 1636:18,	caption [3] - 1559:4,	1596:10, 1603:20	circumstance [1] -	1597:3, 1597:5,
1639:12, 1641:7,	1580:12, 1581:4	changes [1] - 1538:5	1543:25	1597:11, 1597:12,
1641:13, 1642:18,	capture [3] - 1572:10, 1633:22,	character [1] -	cite [1] - 1561:10	1599:4, 1608:7,
1642:24, 1644:2,	1634:3	1635:21	cited [4] - 1579:2,	1608:14, 1608:22,
1645:4, 1647:5,	captured [1] - 1567:2	charged [1] -	1579:8, 1622:16, 1624:4	1609:6, 1609:8,
1647:11	care [4] - 1549:18,	1622:22	citing [2] - 1622:12,	1609:17, 1609:25, 1610:5, 1611:13
	1549:24, 1550:1	chart [3] - 1582:18,	1622:14	1610:5, 1611:13, 1611:20, 1611:22,
С	Carolina [1] -	1582:21, 1585:23 check [44] - 1561:17,	Civil [2] - 1523:2,	1640:5, 1640:10,
	1523:25	1563:2, 1563:4,	1524:8	1640:11, 1640:18,
calculate [3] -	carry [1] - 1606:16	1566:6, 1566:23,	claim [4] - 1529:21,	1640:20
1534:5, 1614:4, 1637:11	carry-forward [1] -	1570:4, 1592:21,	1529:24, 1533:4,	COLUMBIA [1] -
1637:11	1606:16	1596:8, 1599:13,	1533:8	1523:1
calculated [15] - 1526:21, 1526:23,	carrying [1] -	1609:16, 1609:22,	claimed [1] -	Column [24] -
1526:21, 1526:23, 1527:8, 1535:16,	1621:14	1610:24, 1611:24,	1624:18	1530:8, 1530:10,
1568:12, 1568:19,	case [20] - 1529:22,	1618:20, 1621:6,	Clarence [1] - 1542:5	1530:11, 1535:10,
1578:11, 1593:6,	1529:23, 1536:22,	1621:21, 1623:4,	clarification [1] -	1535:15, 1551:24,
1595:12, 1604:17,	1538:7, 1538:10,	1623:5, 1623:7,	1591:1	1556:2, 1559:1,
1604:21, 1618:9,	1538:18, 1538:24,	1623:17, 1624:19,	clarify [2] - 1536:18,	1568:6, 1568:10,
		4004.00 4005.0	1592:4	1577:5, 1578:1,
1620:9, 1641:9,	1538:25, 1539:4,	1624:23, 1625:6,		
	1539:16, 1540:16,	1625:8, 1626:10,	clean [1] - 1526:5	1578:11, 1589:24,
1620:9, 1641:9,	1539:16, 1540:16, 1570:7, 1576:25,	1625:8, 1626:10, 1630:8, 1630:19,	clean [1] - 1526:5 clear [4] - 1546:8,	1578:11, 1589:24, 1590:16, 1591:3,
1620:9, 1641:9, 1641:17	1539:16, 1540:16, 1570:7, 1576:25, 1580:24, 1587:17,	1625:8, 1626:10, 1630:8, 1630:19, 1630:20, 1634:6,	clean [1] - 1526:5 clear [4] - 1546:8, 1574:22, 1600:19,	1578:11, 1589:24, 1590:16, 1591:3, 1591:4, 1598:5,
1620:9, 1641:9, 1641:17 calculating [1] -	1539:16, 1540:16, 1570:7, 1576:25, 1580:24, 1587:17, 1631:1, 1631:9,	1625:8, 1626:10, 1630:8, 1630:19, 1630:20, 1634:6, 1634:7, 1637:21,	clean [1] - 1526:5 clear [4] - 1546:8, 1574:22, 1600:19, 1613:4	1578:11, 1589:24, 1590:16, 1591:3, 1591:4, 1598:5, 1598:20, 1609:18,
1620:9, 1641:9, 1641:17 calculating [1] - 1603:6	1539:16, 1540:16, 1570:7, 1576:25, 1580:24, 1587:17, 1631:1, 1631:9, 1637:10, 1641:23,	1625:8, 1626:10, 1630:8, 1630:19, 1630:20, 1634:6, 1634:7, 1637:21, 1637:25, 1638:2,	clean [1] - 1526:5 clear [4] - 1546:8, 1574:22, 1600:19, 1613:4 cleared [1] - 1638:22	1578:11, 1589:24, 1590:16, 1591:3, 1591:4, 1598:5, 1598:20, 1609:18, 1609:21, 1614:13
1620:9, 1641:9, 1641:17 calculating [1] - 1603:6 calculation [40] -	1539:16, 1540:16, 1570:7, 1576:25, 1580:24, 1587:17, 1631:1, 1631:9,	1625:8, 1626:10, 1630:8, 1630:19, 1630:20, 1634:6, 1634:7, 1637:21,	clean [1] - 1526:5 clear [4] - 1546:8, 1574:22, 1600:19, 1613:4	1578:11, 1589:24, 1590:16, 1591:3, 1591:4, 1598:5, 1598:20, 1609:18,

	•	r	1	1
1535:10, 1557:3,	computer-aided [1] -	Constitution [1] -	1564:8, 1567:5,	1578:16, 1590:19,
1560:24, 1564:23,	1524:19	1524:16	1568:14, 1569:1,	1590:22, 1591:3,
1565:17, 1568:19,	concern [2] -	construction [1] -	1569:12, 1571:23,	1591:24, 1592:3,
1580:12, 1580:18,	1550:23, 1644:6	1583:2	1572:4, 1573:7,	1592:7, 1592:23,
1581:1, 1635:15,	concerned [5] -	contended [1] -	1573:10, 1574:8,	1593:17, 1594:14,
1636:22, 1640:2,		1552:18	1574:11, 1574:16,	1594:16, 1594:24,
1640:8, 1640:9,	1584:25, 1600:9,		1574:19, 1575:22,	1601:8, 1602:3,
1640:11	1601:3, 1601:7,	context [1] - 1543:16		
	1601:9	contingent [1] -	1577:1, 1577:3, 1577:16, 1578:22,	1620:2, 1625:6,
columns [8] -	concerning [1] -	1584:4	, , ,	1625:12, 1625:16,
1526:8, 1527:14,	1613:1	continue [2] -	1581:6, 1583:20,	1625:18, 1628:17,
1529:17, 1565:10,	concerns [9] -	1588:14, 1594:16	1584:14, 1585:6,	1633:17, 1634:5,
1565:16, 1594:1,	1542:17, 1584:20,	continued [2] -	1587:23, 1589:22,	1634:13, 1634:20,
1640:5, 1643:12	1584:21, 1599:8,	1550:20, 1550:23	1590:17, 1591:5,	1634:23, 1637:18,
combine [2] -	1599:9, 1599:10,	convention [2] -	1593:1, 1594:6,	1638:8, 1638:13,
1548:23, 1548:25	1600:20, 1644:4,	1527:1, 1530:23	1595:15, 1596:12,	1638:20, 1639:2,
coming [11] -	1644:23	conventional [1] -	1596:20, 1598:7,	1639:5, 1643:17,
1561:5, 1562:24,	concluded [3] -	1530:18	1598:12, 1599:17,	1643:24, 1644:17,
1563:4, 1572:13,	1615:8, 1617:11,	convert [1] - 1527:2	1602:14, 1604:11,	1644:20, 1645:2,
1582:4, 1582:22,	1618:18	Cornell [26] - 1537:2,	1604:25, 1605:11,	1647:3, 1647:13,
1583:7, 1629:5,	concluding [1] -	1537:3, 1537:6,	1606:6, 1606:8,	1647:22, 1647:25,
1630:1, 1631:16,	1618:4	1537:23, 1538:1,	1606:11, 1608:5,	1648:3, 1648:15,
1635:14	conclusion [2] -	1538:7, 1538:23,	1608:15, 1611:3,	1648:18, 1648:25,
comment [2] -	1578:15, 1647:2	1539:6, 1540:6,	1612:3, 1613:7,	1649:6, 1650:1,
1585:3, 1592:11	conclusions [1] -	1540:8, 1540:25,	1614:25, 1617:10,	1650:10
Commercial [1] -	1648:11	1550:14, 1576:12,	1618:3, 1618:16,	court [1] - 1540:1
1524:7	concurrently [1] -	1577:17, 1577:19,	1618:25, 1620:21,	Court [9] - 1524:14,
Commissioner [2] -	1549:4	1602:12, 1603:6,	1624:12, 1625:23,	1524:15, 1534:12,
1556:9, 1556:13	conditional [5] -	1603:10, 1604:2,	1626:4, 1629:5,	1540:8, 1551:22,
comparable [2] -	1528:22, 1528:24,	1612:23, 1612:24,	1629:25, 1630:17,	1578:15, 1624:10,
1612:14, 1636:23	1536:6, 1536:7,	1613:3, 1613:8,	1632:22, 1632:25,	1637:23, 1638:7
compare [4] -	1647:16	1645:24	1639:4, 1640:3,	Courthouse [1] -
1599:13, 1601:25,	conditioned [1] -	Cornell's [7] -	1641:15, 1642:12,	1524:15
1620:8, 1620:14	1542:14	1538:20, 1550:9,	1647:12, 1650:4	courtroom [4] -
compared [4] -	conferred [6] -	1550:19, 1576:6,	corrected [1] -	1528:16, 1642:25,
1601:14, 1613:19,	1528:1, 1528:5,	1602:16, 1602:25,	1577:5	1643:2, 1644:3
1615:15, 1619:8	1528:18, 1528:19,	1603:17	correctly [1] -	cover [2] - 1567:25,
comparing [1] -	1534:20, 1542:13	corner [5] - 1566:16,	1634:15	1611:4
1565:8	confess [1] -	1589:16, 1626:6,	counsel [9] -	coverage [3] -
comparison [2] -	1560:16	1629:23, 1635:4	1531:10, 1531:24,	1579:23, 1580:7,
1616:1, 1645:15			1532:23, 1535:24,	1581:1
complete [4] -	confirmed [1] -	Correct [16] -	1555:4, 1555:5,	Coverage [1] -
1527:6, 1552:16,	1589:8	1528:13, 1528:16, 1539:4, 1584:22,	1555:6, 1558:16,	1581:5
1645:12, 1648:8	confusion [2] -	, ,	1611:3	covered [1] -
	1565:14, 1633:8	1596:23, 1605:6, 1605:0, 1605:22	counted [3] -	1609:23
completely [3] -	connection [1] -	1605:9, 1605:22,	1553:10, 1611:10,	covers [1] - 1553:16
1596:4, 1623:24,	1627:24	1626:21, 1627:22,	1624:6	CP&R [31] - 1526:19,
1625:3	consider [6] -	1635:6, 1637:12,	couple [2] - 1526:5,	1526:22, 1527:6,
completes [1] -	1546:1, 1555:23,	1640:2, 1640:6,	1562:11	1526.22, 1527.6, 1567:2, 1567:4,
1648:4	1558:23, 1614:1,	1640:7, 1645:21	course [4] - 1556:14,	
complies [1] -	1624:9, 1628:9	correct [88] -	1576:5, 1588:11,	1567:9, 1572:8,
1566:13	consideration [1] -	1528:14, 1528:17,	1619:2	1596:7, 1610:12,
comprised [3] -	1546:15	1531:12, 1538:8,	COURT [64] - 1523:1,	1615:20, 1615:21,
1546:6, 1548:2,	considered [1] -	1539:5, 1539:19,		1618:10, 1619:10,
1548:4	1580:10	1539:25, 1542:10,	1526:2, 1530:1,	1620:16, 1620:19,
comprises [1] -	consistent [12] -	1544:2, 1544:3,	1530:13, 1531:23,	1621:20, 1621:21,
1547:1	1559:18, 1562:21,	1550:11, 1551:1,	1536:10, 1540:3,	1622:25, 1623:14,
Comptroller [3] -	1616:11, 1622:18,	1551:20, 1552:23,	1540:11, 1549:17,	1623:16, 1624:1,
1596:21, 1598:6,	1622:21, 1622:24,	1553:18, 1555:9,	1549:24, 1559:25,	1624:3, 1624:20,
1598:8	1623:9, 1623:19,	1555:17, 1555:25,	1574:22, 1575:5,	1626:3, 1626:22,
computer [1] -	1623:24, 1624:8,	1557:16, 1559:3,	1575:8, 1575:11,	1626:24, 1627:1,
1524:19	1624:16, 1625:4	1561:6, 1563:3,	1575:24, 1576:2,	1633:12, 1634:7,
1				1

r				
1645:1, 1645:6	1602:11, 1602:15,	debits [1] - 1566:2	Department [4] -	1584:8, 1586:24,
CRA ^[5] - 1528:6,	1602:18, 1602:23,	December [3] -	1524:3, 1524:7,	1587:8, 1593:22,
1537:4, 1538:19,	1602:25, 1603:11,	1536:23, 1562:19	1533:24, 1536:15	1601:18, 1610:22,
1541:23, 1542:9	1603:25, 1608:20,	decide [1] - 1638:20	dependent [1] -	1613:3, 1613:10,
create [1] - 1527:3	1608:21, 1608:22,	decided [3] - 1546:9,	1647:7	1615:18, 1616:6,
created [5] - 1532:8,	1608:24, 1609:2,	1546:11, 1607:18	depicted [1] - 1609:5	1616:9, 1617:19,
1570:5, 1579:16,	1609:11, 1609:12,	decides [1] -	deposit [2] -	1618:9, 1633:24,
1579:17, 1588:3	1610:9, 1610:13,	1546:18	1630:23, 1631:7	1645:8, 1645:23
credited [5] - 1580:3,	1610:19, 1610:22,	decision [6] -	Deposit [2] - 1631:3,	differential [3] -
1581:23, 1623:20,	1611:17, 1613:13,	1545:5, 1546:14,	1636:3	1587:6, 1587:7,
1625:2, 1631:21	1614:23, 1615:21,	1546:25, 1547:4,	deposited [5] -	1591:16
credits [5] - 1579:19,	1616:4, 1616:10,	1547:22, 1579:9	1533:4, 1533:10,	differentially [2] -
1581:18, 1581:22,	1616:15, 1616:17,	decisions [7] -	1533:16, 1534:6,	1588:15, 1588:22
1582:12, 1583:11	1616:22, 1616:24,	1545:2, 1545:14,	1639:18	differently [1] -
CROSS [2] - 1525:2,	1617:11, 1617:20,	1546:4, 1546:21,	deposition [7] -	1565:19
1536:11	1617:21, 1618:10,	1547:6, 1547:15,	1538:25, 1539:7,	difficulties [1] -
cross [7] - 1552:7,	1619:8, 1619:9,	1646:1	1539:8, 1539:10,	1574:3
1633:25, 1642:17,	1619:11, 1620:5,	decrease [1] -	1539:12, 1539:15,	digits [1] - 1606:13
1643:8, 1643:16,	1620:12, 1620:16,	1545:20	1540:1	direct [2] - 1551:18,
1643:17, 1644:23	1621:20, 1621:21,	deducted [3] -	depositions [1] -	1645:19
CROSS-	1622:25, 1623:15,	1634:14, 1634:18,	1539:24	DIRECT [1] - 1525:2
EXAMINATION [1] -	1623:23, 1624:1,	1639:3	deposits [2] -	directed [1] - 1564:1
1536:11	1624:3, 1624:20,	deducting [1] -	1532:14, 1551:24	directly [7] - 1572:6,
cross-examination	1626:3, 1626:22,	1634:16	depriving [1] -	1572:17, 1576:21,
[4] - 1552:7, 1633:25,	1626:24, 1627:1,	deduction [1] -	1638:3	1577:14, 1620:9,
1643:8, 1644:23	1643:9, 1643:21,	1535:18	describe [1] -	1627:25, 1645:3
cumulative [1] -	1644:4, 1644:8,	defendant's [1] -	1541:11	DIRK [1] - 1523:5
1547:24	1644:25, 1645:9,	1538:24	description [5] -	disbursed [16] -
current [2] - 1583:1,	1645:23, 1645:25,	Defendant's [14] -	1562:18, 1569:15,	1576:21, 1587:16,
1628:11	1646:1	1556:6, 1556:19,	1630:22, 1631:2,	1592:16, 1592:17,
cut [6] - 1566:24,	database [5] -	1559:13, 1579:6,	1636:8	1604:13, 1604:14,
1625:8, 1637:21,	1541:15, 1642:15,	1579:12, 1583:15,	destination [1] -	1607:5, 1607:25,
1638:14, 1638:18,	1645:1, 1645:6	1590:2, 1608:10,	1582:5	1608:6, 1621:6,
1638:24	DATE [1] - 1650:10	1625:20, 1627:21,	determination [3] -	1621:19, 1622:7,
CV [2] - 1536:16,	date [4] - 1533:6,	1632:14, 1633:15,	1545:20, 1546:9,	1633:23, 1646:7,
1538:20	1565:4, 1565:5,	1634:21, 1639:8	1546:13	1646:15
	1565:7	defendants [9] -	determine [2] -	disbursement [59] -
D	dates [1] - 1565:5	1534:8, 1573:19,	1642:15, 1644:9	1526:10, 1526:11,
	DAVID [1] - 1523:23	1576:1, 1579:18,	determined [1] -	1527:8, 1554:1,
D.C [6] - 1523:4,	DAY [1] - 1523:8	1583:10, 1584:9,	1546:11	1554:3, 1562:8,
1523:21, 1524:4,	days [3] - 1542:7,	1601:15, 1601:23,	developing [1] -	1570:19, 1570:25,
1524:9, 1524:12,	1548:18, 1548:19	1631:20	1628:10	1571:8, 1583:24,
1524:16	DC [1] - 1523:13	Defendants [2] -	difference [15] -	1584:15, 1586:2,
damages [1] -	DCV [6] - 1580:18,	1523:7, 1524:1	1535:14, 1575:25,	1586:3, 1592:18,
1529:23	1580:21, 1580:24,	Defendants' [7] -	1577:25, 1593:7,	1592:21, 1595:16,
dangerous [1] -	1624:9, 1624:11,	1582:19, 1582:20,	1594:2, 1603:11,	1595:17, 1595:22,
1593:17	1624:13	1608:16, 1629:8,	1606:7, 1612:22,	1596:2, 1596:10,
DANIEL [1] - 1523:23	deadline [1] -	1639:24, 1642:22,	1615:18, 1615:23,	1596:11, 1599:8,
data [85] - 1526:19,	1648:16	1642:23	1618:13, 1618:20,	1600:10, 1601:13,
1528:15, 1530:7,	deal [2] - 1534:10,	defendants' [3] -	1618:21, 1626:24,	1601:16, 1601:18,
1536:6, 1542:14,	1540:12	1540:19, 1541:8,	1632:7	1604:3, 1604:19,
1542:16, 1544:5,	dealing [1] - 1574:25	1645:5	different [34] -	1604:22, 1604:24,
1544:15, 1544:19,	deals [1] - 1643:9	defined [1] - 1577:2	1529:16, 1530:21,	1613:5, 1613:11,
1550:21, 1550:22,	debate [1] - 1649:3	definition [1] -	1532:16, 1535:15,	1613:23, 1622:1,
1555:23, 1559:2,	debated [1] - 1638:6	1570:3	1535:16, 1541:18,	1622:23, 1623:1,
1567:2, 1567:4,	debited [4] - 1625:7,	Delta [1] - 1605:7	1552:12, 1555:18,	1624:7, 1625:25,
1583:1, 1586:10,	1638:3, 1638:18,	demonstrated [1] -	1558:18, 1565:2,	1626:17, 1628:10,
1588:3, 1591:13,	1638:23	1621:5	1565:10, 1566:14,	1630:1, 1630:8,
4500 0 4500 5				
1596:3, 1596:7,	debiting [1] -	DENNIS [2] -	1570:13, 1573:20,	1633:12, 1635:13,
1596:3, 1596:7, 1601:14, 1601:16,	debiting [1] - 1638:11	DENNIS [2] - 1523:11, 1523:12	1570:13, 1573:20, 1576:16, 1580:2,	1633:12, 1635:13, 1635:14, 1635:15,

1635:19, 1637:11,	1634:15, 1634:19,	1571:20, 1571:22,	1580:1, 1580:9,	drew [1] - 1633:19
1637:13, 1643:9,	1636:20, 1636:24,	1573:19, 1573:20,	1593:9, 1593:22,	During [3] - 1526:16,
1643:13, 1643:21,	1642:15, 1644:10,	1573:21, 1573:24,	1593:24, 1602:17,	1552:5, 1645:8
1644:4, 1644:8,	1645:7, 1645:14,	1575:3, 1575:5,	1603:1, 1603:15,	during [11] -
1644:24, 1644:25,	1645:20	1579:8, 1579:15,	1609:24, 1637:4	1526:23, 1528:8,
1645:11	disbursing [7] -	1579:17, 1580:2,	DORRIS [6] -	1528:13, 1544:14,
disbursements [120]	1587:12, 1587:15,	1580:4, 1580:8,	1523:15, 1594:23,	1584:15, 1588:14,
- 1526:12, 1526:22,	1587:19, 1592:14,	1581:4, 1581:7,	1595:2, 1648:12,	1601:15, 1601:17,
1527:7, 1543:12,	1592:17, 1592:19,	1581:10, 1581:15,	1648:21, 1649:5	1619:2, 1620:10,
1543:17, 1543:25,	1635:24	1581:17, 1584:4,	down [21] - 1538:3,	1642:14
1544:9, 1544:11,	discovery [2] -	1584:6, 1584:11,	1543:10, 1543:12,	DX-238 [2] - 1630:12,
1544:17, 1553:9,	1539:9, 1539:16	1584:19, 1589:20,	1545:14, 1557:5,	1636:16
1554:2, 1566:23,	discuss [1] - 1540:5	1596:18, 1597:15,	1562:18, 1568:7,	DX-272 [2] - 1527:10
1572:7, 1572:12,	discussed [4] -	1597:23, 1598:23,	1571:17, 1578:5,	DX-365 [3] - 1579:3,
1572:13, 1572:22,	1534:14, 1535:5,	1599:8, 1600:3,	1578:6, 1578:25,	1631:25, 1632:3
1585:15, 1585:17,	1542:17, 1549:12	1601:3, 1601:6,	1597:2, 1598:2,	DX-365's [1] - 1579:9
1586:6, 1586:14,	discussing [1] -	1602:9, 1608:19,	1599:6, 1599:7,	DX-371 [3] - 1613:20
1586:16, 1586:20,	1628:2	1609:7, 1621:22,	1599:16, 1600:15,	1613:21, 1636:25
1586:21, 1587:4,	discussion [3] -	1624:4, 1625:9,	1620:20, 1638:14,	
1587:18, 1587:20,	1543:22, 1574:23,	1625:22, 1626:2,	1638:15, 1645:25	DX-372 [10] - 1559:2,
1587:21, 1588:13,	1543.22, 1574.23, 1574.23	1629:16, 1629:18,	Dr [77] - 1527:15,	1559:17, 1559:20,
1589:1, 1591:13,	discussions [1] -	1629:23, 1630:8,	1527:23, 1528:4,	1560:4, 1560:8, 1568:15, 1569:4,
1591:14, 1591:20,	1537:7	1630:11, 1631:25,	1528:12, 1530:5,	
1592:10, 1592:12,		1634:25, 1635:3	1533:13, 1536:13,	1573:6, 1574:5,
1592:20, 1592:24,	disregards [1] - 1637:11	documentary [1] -	1536:21, 1538:1,	1629:19
1593:6, 1597:3,		1552:10	1541:1, 1544:6,	DX-461 [2] - 1609:17
1598:9, 1598:10,	distinction [1] -	documentation [1] -	1544:16, 1547:3,	1609:24
1598:15, 1598:17,	1583:4	1642:4	1548:15, 1552:6,	_
1598:20, 1598:24,	distinguish [2] -	documents [18] -	1555:16, 1555:17,	E
1598:25, 1599:5,	1554:14, 1572:20	1553:7, 1554:13,	1556:9, 1556:20,	earliest [2] - 1607:6
1599:10, 1600:4,	distinguished [2] -	1554:25, 1560:4,	1557:23, 1560:2,	early [2] - 1555:18,
1600:15, 1600:16,	1572:5, 1582:9	1560:16, 1560:17,	1569:5, 1572:12,	1580:25
1600:18, 1600:19,	distributed [5] -	1560:20, 1561:2,	1577:17, 1578:18,	earn [1] - 1531:17
1600:20, 1600:21,	1622:3, 1631:4,	1567:12, 1568:15,	1579:15, 1584:23,	earned [2] - 1531:15,
1600:23, 1601:2,	1631:8, 1631:17,	1570:23, 1573:6,	1575:13, 1584:23, 1585:13,	1531:22
1601:3, 1601:7,	1632:12	1577:11, 1605:1,	1585:12, 1585:13, 1585:21,	easel [2] - 1582:18,
1601:10, 1601:25,	distributes [1] -	1611:14, 1631:1,	1587:24, 1588:8,	1582:20
1602:8, 1602:10,	1646:24	1635:1, 1635:5	1588:24, 1589:2,	Easier [1] - 1531:23
1604:17, 1605:4,	distribution [1] -		1589:8, 1591:10,	
1605:24, 1606:3,	1631:9	dollar [15] - 1545:18,		easier [1] - 1597:16
1606:22, 1607:4,	DISTRICT [3] -	1546:23, 1547:1,	1591:13, 1591:18,	easy [1] - 1637:20
, ,	1523:1, 1523:1,	1560:25, 1587:7,	1591:23, 1592:10,	economic [1] -
1607:25, 1608:7, 1608:14, 1608:22,	1523:9	1587:10, 1605:14,	1593:3, 1595:6,	1548:6
	divided [3] -	1607:10, 1607:11,	1595:8, 1596:19,	effect [3] - 1580:3,
1609:7, 1609:8,	1590:13, 1591:3,	1607:17, 1607:19,	1601:8, 1602:10,	1595:19, 1646:17
1609:20, 1609:21, 1609:25, 1610:5,	1637:8	1607:20, 1607:24,	1602:24, 1603:4,	effective [2] -
	dividing [2] -	1608:4, 1621:24	1603:6, 1603:9,	1565:7, 1621:25
1610:14, 1610:19,	1590:15, 1596:9	dollars [11] -	1603:15, 1608:20,	effectively [1] -
1610:24, 1611:6,	Division [1] - 1524:8	1534:17, 1545:6,	1608:25, 1611:18,	1633:23
1611:8, 1611:10,	Doctor [2] - 1576:11,	1545:7, 1545:21,	1612:23, 1612:24,	EFT [12] - 1526:20,
1611:13, 1611:15,	1592:4	1546:4, 1546:5,	1613:3, 1614:1,	1526:22, 1567:10,
1611:16, 1611:19,	document [68] -	1578:7, 1579:23,	1617:8, 1621:4,	1596:8, 1599:13,
1611:22, 1611:25,	1527:18, 1528:9,	1603:12, 1607:2,	1625:6, 1627:16,	1611:24, 1614:4,
1613:20, 1614:8,	1529:11, 1529:13,	1617:23	1628:13, 1635:1,	1615:22, 1618:10,
1614:12, 1614:14,	1553:15, 1555:12,	Dollars [1] - 1535:11	1637:16, 1641:11,	1618:20, 1619:11,
1617:18, 1618:1,	1556:10, 1556:22,	Don [1] - 1644:13	1641:14, 1641:16,	1634:7
1619:6, 1620:14,	1559:23, 1561:14,	don't [1] - 1560:6	1642:9, 1642:10,	EFTs [10] - 1544:11,
1629:1, 1629:2,	1562:5, 1566:17,	done [17] - 1537:17,	1643:22, 1644:17,	1553:10, 1554:2,
1629:6, 1632:21,	1569:4, 1569:5,	1550:21, 1550:23,	1644:24, 1645:24,	1554:8, 1611:7,
1633:3, 1633:6,	1569:8, 1570:2,	1554:20, 1554:22,	1648:4	1611:10, 1617:19,
1633:8, 1633:10,	1570:14, 1570:16,	1564:17, 1577:23,	drawn [1] - 1625:7	1629:7, 1633:12,
1633:18, 1634:1,	, . ,			
	1		1	1

1645:14	1564:25, 1570:20	1633:25, 1643:8,	experts [3] -	1602:13, 1608:13,
eight [1] - 1599:21	establishment [1] -	1644:23, 1645:19	1538:21, 1540:19,	1630:12
either [4] - 1527:22,	1636:5	examined [3] -	1541:8	fewer [1] - 1587:18
1564:5, 1588:23,	estates [1] - 1569:17	1599:11, 1610:9	explain [5] -	fields [1] - 1541:18
1636:23	estimate [24] -	example [8] -	1534:12, 1543:9,	figure [27] - 1542:25,
electronic [21] -	1529:3, 1533:14,	1529:2, 1541:1,	1615:8, 1621:20,	1543:7, 1554:11,
1541:16, 1572:9,	1552:4, 1552:5,	1559:11, 1570:10,	1628:19	1564:18, 1564:24,
1572:23, 1601:14,	1552:6, 1552:19,	1576:16, 1582:23,	explained [1] -	1568:13, 1573:5,
1601:24, 1610:13,	1555:22, 1558:5,	1583:8, 1611:15	1540:9	1573:8, 1573:11,
1610:21, 1612:23,	1559:8, 1578:10,	examples [1] -	explaining [2] -	1574:4, 1574:9,
1613:2, 1615:13,	1581:10, 1581:14,	1600:8	1611:12, 1611:19	1574:17, 1579:9,
1623:6, 1623:23,	1581:19, 1583:22,	exceed [2] - 1543:25,	explains [1] -	1580:11, 1581:8,
1627:4, 1630:8,	1583:23, 1584:2,	1611:22	1527:18	1589:25, 1590:1,
1630:15, 1630:19,	1584:6, 1584:7,	exceeded [6] -	explanation [3] -	1595:11, 1595:12,
1630:20, 1630:21,	1584:8, 1584:18,	1608:7, 1608:14,	1569:16, 1592:25,	1597:5, 1598:10,
1632:24, 1638:15	1642:9, 1645:17	1609:25, 1610:5,	1636:2	1598:20, 1604:17,
ELLIOTT [1] -	estimated [9] -	1611:13, 1611:20	expressed [1] -	1604:18, 1628:2,
1523:15	1535:1, 1555:18,	Excel [4] - 1589:20,	1584:20	1631:24, 1636:24
ELOUISE [1] -	1568:18, 1568:21,	1589:24, 1597:14,	expressions [1] -	figures [7] - 1588:9,
1523:2	1579:19, 1579:20,	1503.24, 1537.14,	1644:6	1590:15, 1609:17,
elsewhere [1] -	1616:12, 1617:14	Except [2] - 1531:13,	extent [1] - 1533:7	1609:18, 1609:21,
1527:17	estimates [2] -	1643:19	extent [1] - 1000.7	1617:2, 1643:14
employ [2] - 1532:3,	1616:7, 1617:3	except [2] - 1529:18,	F	filed [7] - 1537:21,
1532:17	estimation [3] -	1530:8	Г	1550:24, 1550:25,
employees [1] -	1588:14, 1588:16,	excess [1] - 1544:17	fact [27] - 1532:16,	1558:12, 1558:18,
1542:9	1589:5	excluded [1] -	1540:5, 1543:24,	1569:9, 1620:24
End [1] - 1535:11	et [3] - 1523:3,	1640:20	1552:21, 1567:1,	FIN [2] - 1626:13,
end [8] - 1542:12,	1523:6, 1640:6	excludes [1] -	1568:15, 1569:8,	1636:21
1595:14, 1605:17,	evening [1] - 1541:9	1640:23	1577:4, 1577:13,	Final [1] - 1589:17
1606:18, 1606:20,	event [2] - 1558:2,	excluding [1] -	1578:10, 1582:4,	final [1] - 1611:23
1607:15, 1607:21,	1564:12	1640:10	1586:25, 1594:9,	finalization [1] -
1648:3	eventually [1] -	excused [1] - 1648:5	1610:5, 1610:15,	1537:16
ended [4] - 1541:6,	1543:6	Exhibit [33] - 1529:8,	1611:23, 1614:3,	finalizing [2] -
1550:15, 1588:8,	evidence [7] -	1531:5, 1532:20,	1616:19, 1628:2,	1537:20, 1537:25
1622:4	1552:10, 1621:5,	1533:22, 1541:7,	1632:10, 1635:10,	financial [1] -
engaged [3] -	1641:25, 1648:8,	1542:8, 1548:16,	1645:10, 1646:7,	1626:14
1537:2, 1537:3,	1649:2, 1649:3,	1550:14, 1555:11,	1647:17, 1648:11	financing [1] -
1537:4	1649:4	1556:7, 1556:19,	factor [7] - 1531:18,	1545:13
engagement [1] -	Evidence [1] -	1559:14, 1568:5,	1543:21, 1586:24,	findings [5] -
1537:6	1525:8	1573:1, 1573:23,	1591:2, 1599:14,	1624:13, 1624:15,
enjoys [1] - 1638:1	EVIDENTIARY [1] -	1578:24, 1579:6,	1601:21, 1632:9	1648:9, 1648:11
entered [1] - 1641:18	1523:8	1579:13, 1583:15,	fair [4] - 1537:5,	Fine [2] - 1559:25,
entire [4] - 1530:22,	exact [6] - 1536:1,	1590:2, 1596:18,	1550:12, 1554:16,	1593:15
1535:14, 1562:5,	1545:9, 1555:20,	1597:9, 1598:9,	1584:3	fine [4] - 1563:22,
1640:12	1601:8, 1604:10,	1599:19, 1602:6,	Fair [1] - 1604:2	1594:22, 1648:12,
entitled [2] -	1616:24	1608:11, 1625:20,	fall [1] - 1624:10	1648:13
1551:24, 1650:5	exactly [16] -	1627:21, 1627:24,	familiar [12] -	finish [1] - 1549:16
entry [1] - 1638:10	1526:25, 1536:25,	1629:8, 1632:14,	1544:22, 1544:23,	finished [6] - 1549:2,
error [1] - 1547:25	1561:4, 1580:25,	1633:15, 1634:21	1545:23, 1545:25,	1549:4, 1549:6,
ESQUIRE [14] -	1584:18, 1603:15,	exhibit [8] - 1534:9,	1547:19, 1551:12,	1549:13, 1549:15,
1523:11, 1523:15,	1604:4, 1616:10,	1579:1, 1585:3,	1560:5, 1567:13,	1549:19
1523:15, 1523:19,	1616:14, 1617:4,	1590:4, 1596:25,	1583:9, 1604:5,	finishing [1] -
1523:19, 1523:23,	1623:12, 1623:19,	1599:21, 1627:20,	1604:10, 1625:22	1537:15
1523:23, 1524:1,	1624:8, 1625:2,	1629:11	far [2] - 1535:10,	firm [1] - 1537:3
1523.23, 1524.1, 1524:2,	1631:13, 1634:8	exhibits [1] -	1612:10	First [1] - 1586:1
1524:1, 1524:2, 1524:3,	Exactly [1] - 1631:21	1648:21	favors [2] - 1575:25,	first [16] - 1532:20,
1524:2, 1524:3, 1524:11	EXAMINATION [2] -	Exhibits [1] - 1525:8	1576:1	1536:21, 1538:17,
essentially [2] -	1536:11, 1639:11	existed [1] - 1615:21	FELD [1] - 1524:11	1556:25, 1560:14,
1527:2, 1529:23	examination [7] -	expenditures [1] -	few [6] - 1544:16,	1560:15, 1564:17,
established [2] -	1551:18, 1552:7,	1567:9	1548:13, 1578:19,	1566:19, 1571:1,
		1007.0		1000.10, 1071.1,
1	1	1	1	

9

1				
1573:1, 1579:6,	forward [7] - 1529:1,	1610:13, 1610:21,	1540:2, 1540:10,	1607:15, 1621:1,
1595:6, 1637:20,	1563:13, 1567:18,	1612:24, 1613:2,	1573:18, 1573:24,	1621:16, 1621:17,
1639:25, 1643:12,	1569:20, 1571:11,	1615:13, 1615:14,	1578:14, 1591:22,	1621:18, 1622:4,
1645:23	1594:9, 1606:16	1622:6, 1622:23,	1597:18, 1597:22,	1622:6, 1625:10,
fiscal [9] - 1526:24,	four [9] - 1526:7,	1623:3, 1623:7,	1603:19, 1619:23,	1638:17
1527:2, 1527:4,	1535:7, 1560:13,	1623:8, 1623:10,	1628:15, 1637:19,	government's [9] -
1567:14, 1568:2,	1560:18, 1560:21,	1623:16, 1623:17,	1638:12, 1638:16,	1551:5, 1552:25,
1568:7, 1568:22,	1563:24, 1564:3,	1623:18, 1623:23,	1639:1, 1639:4,	1569:1, 1569:9,
1573:5, 1643:10	1599:24, 1610:18	1623:24, 1625:10,	1639:7, 1639:12,	1569:12, 1578:1,
five [10] - 1531:17,	Fourth [1] - 1523:24	1627:4, 1630:23,	1641:5, 1641:7,	1578:13, 1602:25,
1531:18, 1532:1,	fourth [3] - 1527:25,	1631:4, 1631:7,	1641:11, 1641:13,	1620:24
1532:3, 1532:6,	1597:1, 1635:21	1631:12, 1631:21,	1642:18, 1642:22,	great [1] - 1594:23
1532:17, 1532:25,	fraction [7] -	1634:9, 1634:10,	1642:24, 1643:19,	greater [8] - 1543:12,
1533:9, 1535:4,	1527:20, 1532:8,	1636:3, 1637:25,	1644:2, 1644:16,	1543:17, 1543:19,
1610:18	1559:6, 1581:19,	1638:9, 1638:13,	1644:19, 1644:22,	1544:8, 1607:4,
flip [1] - 1621:8	1624:21, 1624:24,	1638:18, 1639:18,	1645:4, 1647:5,	1608:1, 1610:20,
floor [6] - 1531:18,	1624:25	1640:16, 1640:22,	1647:11, 1647:23,	1611:25
1532:1, 1532:6,	frame [1] - 1536:24	1641:21, 1642:1,	1648:2	Grippo [2] - 1544:20,
1532:17, 1532:25,	Franklin [1] - 1524:8	1642:8, 1642:11,	Gingold's [1] -	1547:20
1535:4	Friday [4] - 1541:15,	1642:13, 1644:10,	1620:4	Grippo's [3] -
Floor [1] - 1523:13	1542:3, 1648:17,	1646:7, 1646:10,	given [19] - 1543:25,	1545:11, 1547:7,
flow [4] - 1543:18,	1648:19	1646:15, 1646:17,	1544:9, 1548:20,	1547:25
1576:25, 1625:12,	full [6] - 1529:2,	1646:20, 1646:22,	1548:22, 1549:1,	gross [2] - 1547:10,
1634:10	1533:3, 1537:8,	1646:25, 1647:7,	1549:3, 1549:23,	1547:14
flow-through [1] -	1537:11, 1537:13,	1647:14, 1647:19	1558:20, 1558:22,	group [2] - 1545:13,
1634:10	1645:14		1582:25, 1583:24,	1631:22
flowchart [1] -	full-time [3] - 1537:8,	G	1595:20, 1595:24,	groups [1] - 1572:20
1633:20	1537:11, 1537:13	gain [1] - 1554:20	1603:5, 1613:25,	growing [1] - 1607:9
flowed [2] - 1577:8,	fund [12] - 1546:23,	Gary [1] - 1544:20	1614:5, 1617:20,	guardianships [1] -
1610:17	1546:25, 1581:13,	gather [2] - 1586:1,	1621:22, 1648:10	1569:17
flowing [2] -	1601:25, 1605:17,	1586:3	Glass [2] - 1543:16,	guess [5] - 1546:17,
1607:13, 1615:14	1624:24, 1624:25,	general [2] -	1543:22	1550:20, 1606:9,
focus [12] - 1526:6,	1628:8, 1633:13,	1581:13, 1643:3	Glass-Steagall [2] -	1611:21, 1626:14
1527:11, 1528:1,	1634:14, 1638:3		1543:16, 1543:22	guided [1] - 1549:24
1532:20, 1556:19,	fundamentally [1] -	General [3] -	GLDL [3] - 1619:12,	guided [1] - 1549:24 GUILDER [1] -
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23	_
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] -	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] -	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] -	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] -	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] -
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16,
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16,
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23,
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] -	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 hande [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1536:24 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1536:18,
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:24 Half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1,
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:16, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1538:24 half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11 hard [1] - 1624:20
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:18,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11 hard [1] - 1624:20 HARPER [1] -
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19, 1589:13	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13, 1592:15, 1599:12,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1530:3, 1530:4,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:2, 1557:22, 1557:25,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11 hard [1] - 1624:20 HARPER [1] - 1523:19
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 following [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19, 1589:13 form [3] - 1610:24,	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13, 1592:15, 1599:12, 1601:14, 1601:24,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1530:3, 1530:4, 1530:17, 1531:4,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:2, 1558:12, 1558:19,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1536:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 hande [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11 hard [1] - 1624:20 HARPER [1] - 1523:19 HAUER [1] - 1524:11
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 followig [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19, 1589:13 form [3] - 1610:24, 1629:18, 1635:2	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13, 1592:15, 1599:12, 1601:14, 1601:24, 1605:15, 1605:18,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1530:3, 1530:4, 1530:17, 1531:4, 1531:6, 1531:25,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:2, 1558:12, 1558:19, 1568:12, 1568:19,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{GUILDER} [1] - \\ 1523:19 \\ \textbf{GUMP} [1] - 1524:11 \\ \textbf{guy} [1] - 1538:24 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{H} \\ \textbf{half} [1] - 1556:25 \\ \textbf{Hampshire} [1] - \\ 1524:12 \\ \textbf{hand} [7] - 1566:16, \\ 1587:15, 1589:16, \\ 1626:5, 1629:23, \\ 1630:5, 1635:4 \\ \textbf{handed} [1] - 1560:2 \\ \textbf{handle} [1] - 1648:15 \\ \textbf{happy} [4] - 1536:18, \\ 1557:13, 1558:1, \\ 1615:11 \\ \textbf{hard} [1] - 1624:20 \\ \textbf{HARPER} [1] - \\ 1523:19 \\ \textbf{HAUER} [1] - 1524:11 \\ \textbf{head} [2] - 1555:2, \\ \end{array}$
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 followig [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19, 1589:13 form [3] - 1610:24, 1629:18, 1635:2 forming [1] -	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13, 1592:15, 1599:12, 1601:14, 1601:24, 1605:15, 1605:18, 1606:17, 1607:8,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1530:3, 1530:4, 1530:17, 1531:4, 1531:6, 1531:25, 1532:2, 1532:19,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:2, 1558:12, 1558:19, 1568:12, 1568:19, 1593:5, 1595:11,	GUILDER [1] - 1523:19 GUMP [1] - 1524:11 guy [1] - 1638:24 H half [1] - 1556:25 Hampshire [1] - 1524:12 hand [7] - 1566:16, 1587:15, 1589:16, 1626:5, 1629:23, 1630:5, 1635:4 handed [1] - 1560:2 handle [1] - 1648:15 happy [4] - 1536:18, 1557:13, 1558:1, 1615:11 hard [1] - 1624:20 HARPER [1] - 1523:19 HAUER [1] - 1524:11 head [2] - 1555:2, 1604:8
1532:20, 1556:19, 1560:22, 1579:22, 1622:20, 1624:22, 1637:24, 1641:12, 1643:12 focusing [1] - 1582:13 follow [3] - 1548:22, 1552:24, 1600:24 followig [2] - 1571:22, 1635:8 follows [2] - 1531:13, 1637:25 footnote [4] - 1578:25, 1579:19, 1580:4, 1580:5 FOR [1] - 1523:1 force [1] - 1588:17 foregoing [1] - 1650:3 forget [2] - 1582:19, 1589:13 form [3] - 1610:24, 1629:18, 1635:2	fundamentally [1] - 1529:24 Funds [2] - 1531:7, 1592:17 funds [97] - 1526:22, 1531:3, 1532:12, 1532:13, 1533:10, 1533:11, 1533:14, 1533:16, 1533:18, 1533:20, 1533:23, 1533:25, 1534:6, 1534:24, 1535:2, 1541:16, 1546:10, 1546:15, 1546:16, 1546:17, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1546:22, 1547:5, 1547:6, 1547:25, 1548:1, 1548:11, 1562:19, 1567:10, 1572:23, 1582:7, 1587:13, 1592:15, 1599:12, 1601:14, 1601:24, 1605:15, 1605:18,	General [3] - 1596:21, 1598:6, 1598:8 generally [1] - 1587:14 generate [1] - 1550:8 Georgia [1] - 1523:17 GILLETT [1] - 1524:3 Gingold [9] - 1525:3, 1526:2, 1542:12, 1552:22, 1567:25, 1595:3, 1596:19, 1619:25, 1637:18 GINGOLD [59] - 1523:11, 1523:12, 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1530:3, 1530:4, 1530:17, 1531:24, 1532:2, 1532:19, 1532:22, 1533:21,	GLDL [3] - 1619:12, 1619:20, 1643:23 GLENN [1] - 1524:3 god [1] - 1549:20 GODFREY [1] - 1524:11 government [47] - 1526:24, 1528:20, 1529:20, 1531:15, 1531:16, 1532:5, 1532:6, 1534:17, 1544:5, 1545:2, 1545:3, 1546:4, 1546:9, 1546:11, 1546:14, 1546:16, 1546:18, 1546:19, 1546:21, 1547:3, 1547:5, 1548:1, 1548:2, 1548:12, 1550:24, 1552:2, 1552:4, 1552:2, 1558:12, 1558:19, 1568:12, 1568:19,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{GUILDER} [1] - \\ 1523:19 \\ \textbf{GUMP} [1] - 1524:11 \\ \textbf{guy} [1] - 1538:24 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{H} \\ \textbf{half} [1] - 1556:25 \\ \textbf{Hampshire} [1] - \\ 1524:12 \\ \textbf{hand} [7] - 1566:16, \\ 1587:15, 1589:16, \\ 1626:5, 1629:23, \\ 1630:5, 1635:4 \\ \textbf{handed} [1] - 1560:2 \\ \textbf{handle} [1] - 1648:15 \\ \textbf{happy} [4] - 1536:18, \\ 1557:13, 1558:1, \\ 1615:11 \\ \textbf{hard} [1] - 1624:20 \\ \textbf{HARPER} [1] - \\ 1523:19 \\ \textbf{HAUER} [1] - 1524:11 \\ \textbf{head} [2] - 1555:2, \\ \end{array}$

10

heading [1] - 1640:8	1582:15, 1585:2,	1647:6	1585:23, 1586:8,	incorporate [2] -
headnote [1] -	1613:15, 1615:15,	hypothetically [1] -	1607:9, 1611:2,	1557:13, 1585:10
1533:23	1634:13, 1643:25	1578:20	1622:13, 1623:21,	incorporated [3] -
headright [11] -	high [1] - 1590:24		1625:7, 1628:7,	1541:17, 1546:3,
1554:21, 1555:2,	higher [20] - 1528:5,		1629:5, 1630:23,	1554:5
1555:15, 1555:17,	1528:10, 1534:19,	Law 4000-0	1631:12, 1631:16,	incorrect [4] -
1557:15, 1557:18,	1534:22, 1534:23,	i.e [2] - 1623:6,	1631:17, 1631:19,	1584:7, 1584:13,
1572:1, 1572:10,	1535:19, 1544:13,	1623:23	1631:21, 1632:12,	1586:23, 1596:1
1572:16, 1574:18,	1549:21, 1558:4,	idea [3] - 1552:4,	1633:20, 1636:6,	increase [1] -
1576:22	1587:6, 1587:9,	1620:11, 1633:18	1636:10, 1636:11,	1545:20
headrights [6] -	1587:10, 1590:23,	identical [4] -	1636:15, 1640:10,	increased [4] -
1554:19, 1555:8,	1596:16, 1611:16,	1529:18, 1530:9,	1640:18, 1640:20,	1590:15, 1590:20,
1574:24, 1574:25,	1611:17, 1614:6,	1615:24, 1643:13	1640:22, 1640:23,	1593:7, 1594:9
1575:1, 1575:6	1614:8, 1614:10	identification [5] -	1641:3, 1641:4,	Increased [1] -
hear [4] - 1530:2,	highlight [4] -	1529:8, 1531:5,	1641:9, 1641:10,	1590:21
1592:7, 1648:7,	1543:3, 1597:2,	1532:20, 1533:22, 1598:24	1641:17, 1641:18,	increasing [3] -
1649:4	1614:21, 1644:18	identified [9] -	1641:19, 1642:1,	1588:8, 1593:5,
heard [9] - 1528:16,	highlighted [10] -		1642:8, 1642:13,	1593:6
1541:20, 1544:21,	1551:21, 1560:24,	1529:8, 1533:8, 1533:11, 1534:20,	1642:16	increments [1] -
1555:7, 1582:3,	1561:19, 1562:12,		imagine [1] -	1545:18
1619:1, 1627:19,	1608:17, 1609:14,	1539:3, 1599:12, 1646:5, 1646:7,	1537:18	indeed [4] - 1562:18,
1643:18, 1644:18	1609:25, 1610:11,	1646:21	impact [5] - 1547:15,	1578:22, 1614:6,
HEARING [1] -	1622:11, 1637:24	identify [12] -	1577:19, 1593:4,	1625:2
1523:8	hired [1] - 1536:21	1578:22, 1582:25,	1594:8, 1595:16	Indian [14] - 1533:3,
hearing [4] -	Hirshleifer [1] -	1583:4, 1599:13,	implicit [3] -	1533:7, 1538:11,
1594:17, 1619:2,	1542:1	1605:14, 1607:2,	1604:11, 1604:12,	1538:15, 1556:10,
1622:12, 1622:15	hold [3] - 1588:17,	1607:11, 1607:17,	1608:6	1556:13, 1598:10,
held [19] - 1531:14,	1607:15, 1633:17	1633:25, 1634:17,	important [2] - 1540:1, 1581:7	1626:1, 1639:19,
1532:4, 1532:6,	holder [1] - 1625:7	1641:25, 1642:19		1640:17, 1645:7,
1532:7, 1532:12,	holding [1] - 1547:1	ignores [1] - 1633:19	imputation [1] - 1603:4	1646:17, 1646:25,
1532:13, 1532:14,	Honor [43] - 1529:19,	IIM [99] - 1546:10,	imputed [1] - 1558:6	1647:19
1533:11, 1533:14,	1530:3, 1531:20,	1546:15, 1546:18,	IMS [1] - 1647:15	Indians [4] -
1533:25, 1534:24,	1531:25, 1536:9,	1547:10, 1547:14,	inception [1] -	1533:25, 1564:2,
1535:2, 1548:2, 1587:17, 1592:17,	1540:2, 1540:10,	1547:21, 1551:8,	1537:10	1634:4, 1646:23
1646:21, 1646:23,	1540:13, 1550:2, 1559:22, 1573:18,	1551:13, 1551:14,	include [6] -	indicated [7] -
1647:19	1575:22, 1578:14,	1551:15, 1551:17,	1605:19, 1608:24,	1529:14, 1530:7, 1531:2, 1543:11,
help [2] - 1543:3,	1573.22, 1578.14, 1591:22, 1593:21,	1551:19, 1551:25,	1609:2, 1611:6,	1560:25, 1568:12,
1597:10	1594:22, 1595:2,	1552:19, 1553:11,	1629:1, 1633:10	1611:5
helps [3] - 1561:19,	1597:13, 1603:19,	1553:12, 1553:17,	included [15] -	indicating [2] -
1562:6, 1605:2	1603:22, 1619:23,	1553:19, 1553:21,	1571:25, 1577:4,	1561:5, 1620:10
hence [1] - 1535:18	1625:19, 1628:15,	1553:24, 1554:11,	1604:23, 1609:2,	indicative [1] -
Herman [32] -	1637:14, 1637:17,	1559:7, 1561:3,	1609:4, 1611:7,	1600:2
1544:6, 1544:13,	1637:19, 1637:20,	1562:16, 1563:16,	1611:9, 1612:23,	individual [21] -
1544:16, 1559:5,	1637:23, 1638:5,	1565:11, 1565:15,	1613:2, 1633:6,	1533:3, 1533:4,
1559:19, 1568:18,	1638:12, 1639:4,	1565:17, 1565:22,	1634:10, 1634:11,	1533:5, 1533:25,
1582:12, 1583:10,	1639:7, 1642:22,	1565:24, 1569:17,	1634:12, 1647:14,	1546:6, 1546:25,
1611:8, 1612:4,	1643:15, 1643:22,	1571:9, 1571:21,	1647:16	1554:15, 1562:15,
1612:10, 1612:19,	1647:1, 1647:24,	1571:22, 1572:5,	includes [5] -	1562:20, 1564:2,
1614:6, 1616:5,	1648:2, 1648:14,	1572:7, 1572:16,	1574:17, 1632:21,	1564:4, 1576:18,
1616:22, 1618:7,	1648:16, 1648:20,	1572:24, 1577:1,	1632:23, 1633:12,	1594:2, 1601:5,
1618:17, 1619:17,	1648:21, 1649:5	1577:8, 1577:13,	1641:1	1607:11, 1631:5,
1619:21, 1619:24,	HONORABLE [1] -	1578:12, 1579:20,	including [6] -	1631:8, 1634:4,
1626:16, 1628:11,	1523:9	1582:4, 1582:5, 1582:7, 1582:0	1531:15, 1577:20,	1634:11, 1646:22
1628:25, 1631:20,	hope [1] - 1568:7	1582:7, 1582:9, 1582:11, 1582:12	1624:18, 1634:5,	Individual [11] -
1632:18, 1633:19,	hoped [1] - 1586:7	1582:11, 1582:12, 1582:13, 1582:14,	1634:12, 1634:18	1533:7, 1538:11,
1636:25, 1642:7,	hoping [1] - 1538:25	1582:23, 1582:24,	incomplete [2] -	1538:15, 1598:10,
1642:14, 1642:25,	hypothetical [5] -	1583:2, 1583:8,	1527:19, 1527:21	1626:1, 1639:18,
1643:2, 1643:21	1576:17, 1578:22,	1583:9, 1583:11,	inconsistent [1] -	1640:17, 1645:7,
Herman's [6] -	1646:12, 1646:20,	1583:12, 1583:17,	1610:6	1646:16, 1646:25,
		,,		
·				

r				
1647:19	1618:8, 1618:12,	introduced [2] -	к	1599:20, 1613:23,
individuals [10] -	1618:19, 1618:20,	1641:25, 1642:4		1630:18
1554:22, 1561:3,	1618:21, 1619:9,	invested [5]	Kate [1] - 1542:6	leave [3] - 1623:12,
1564:18, 1572:10,	1620:8, 1620:9,	1531:16, 1533:5,	keep [2] - 1606:24,	1623:18
1576:21, 1576:22,	1620:15, 1623:23,	1533:16, 1533:19,	1639:10	leaving [2] - 1595:8,
1633:23, 1647:8,	1625:25, 1626:8,	1638:3	Kehoe [1] - 1533:13	1599:12
1647:14, 1647:15	1644:10, 1644:12,	investing [1] -	KEITH [1] - 1523:19	ledger [4] - 1619:13,
inference [2] -	1645:10, 1645:11,	1533:6	KEMPTHORNE [1] -	1619:14, 1619:17,
1639:21, 1639:23	1645:12, 1645:16,	Investment [1] -	1523:5	1643:3
inflate [1] - 1587:8	1645:17, 1645:20,	1531:7	KILPATRICK [3] -	left [15] - 1587:21,
inflated [4] -	1646:3	investment [1] -	1523:16, 1523:20,	1589:16, 1597:20,
1590:12, 1590:14,	informative [1] -	1533:24	1523:24	1623:7, 1623:8,
1590:19, 1590:22	1614:3	involved [9] -	kind [10] - 1541:18,	1623:16, 1623:21,
inflow [1] - 1543:19	initial [1] - 1537:7	1537:7, 1537:9,	1578:20, 1609:1,	1624:23, 1624:24,
influence [1] -	input [6] - 1530:7,	1537:11, 1537:12,	1615:5, 1619:14,	1625:3, 1626:5,
1547:21	1542:16, 1550:21,	1537:24, 1538:10,	1630:7, 1630:9,	1640:2, 1643:12
inform [1] - 1617:7	1550:22, 1608:20,	1538:11, 1555:7	1632:10, 1644:20	left-hand [2] -
information [110] -	1645:23	IPAC [1] - 1627:5	Kirschman [1] -	1589:16, 1626:5
1526:20, 1527:6,	inputs [1] - 1542:19	is [1] - 1637:1	1648:15	legal [4] - 1578:14,
1527:17, 1527:18,	instances [4] -	issue [4] - 1578:15,	KIRSCHMAN [4] -	1647:2, 1647:22,
1527:19, 1527:22,	1544:2, 1544:3,	1619:5, 1638:6,	1524:1, 1594:22,	1647:23
1528:12, 1528:21,	1544:8, 1610:23	1641:3	1648:16, 1648:20	legally [2] - 1647:7,
1528:23, 1528:24,	instead [8] -	issued [1] - 1570:4	knocked [1] -	1647:8
1528:25, 1529:1,	1534:15, 1534:18,	issues [4] - 1598:23,	1620:18	length [1] - 1638:6
1529:4, 1529:6,	1540:6, 1557:9,	1616:18, 1637:25,	knowing [2] -	less [6] - 1573:12,
1533:12, 1540:20,	1594:20, 1607:16,	1645:9	1555:20, 1585:21	1575:1, 1605:23,
1540:21, 1541:4,	1628:24, 1645:3	item [4] - 1594:2,	knowledge [1] -	1606:3, 1606:22,
1541:14, 1541:16,	instruction [2] -	1616:10, 1630:12,	1585:11	1610:17
1541:17, 1541:19,	1549:1, 1549:3	1639:25	KOHN [1] - 1524:2	letters [1] - 1566:19
1542:18, 1542:20,	instructions [5] -	items [3] - 1526:5,		LEVITAS [1] -
1544:11, 1544:12,	1548:20, 1548:22,	1562:11, 1626:12	L	1523:15
1552:14, 1552:15,	1549:23, 1558:20,	itself [1] - 1534:11	L L D	life [2] - 1553:17,
1552:16, 1553:5,	1558:22		L.L.P [3] - 1523:16,	1553:23
1553:25, 1554:1,	instruments [1] -	J	1523:20, 1523:24	likely [1] - 1592:18
1556:16, 1557:11,	1532:16		labor [1] - 1636:4	limitations [1] -
1557:12, 1558:1,	interest [19] -	JAMES [1] - 1523:9	lands [1] - 1576:17	1586:10
1558:19, 1561:10,	1529:16, 1529:18,	January [1] - 1579:8	largely [1] - 1648:23	limited [4] - 1585:21,
1564:9, 1568:18,	1531:11, 1531:15,	jig [1] - 1577:21	larger [2] - 1587:10,	1586:4, 1586:5
1583:21, 1584:1,	1531:17, 1531:22,	John [3] - 1536:15,	1591:1	line [21] - 1529:20,
1584:23, 1585:7,	1533:4, 1533:25,	1542:1, 1542:4	last [14] - 1526:7,	1534:22, 1535:17,
1585:9, 1585:11,	1534:5, 1534:11,	JOHN [2] - 1524:1,	1536:25, 1539:1,	1542:23, 1542:25,
1585:22, 1586:2,	1535:14, 1535:21,	1524:6	1539:4, 1539:17,	1543:5, 1547:8,
1586:3, 1587:12,	1536:4, 1558:6,	journal [1] - 1556:17	1541:8, 1563:19,	1555:15, 1555:21,
1587:14, 1588:15,	1580:13, 1594:8,	JR [2] - 1523:23,	1563:23, 1589:21,	1557:9, 1573:4,
1591:17, 1592:13,	1606:11, 1607:22,	1524:1	1595:20, 1622:14,	1578:5, 1578:7,
1596:5, 1596:6,	1638:4	Judge [5] - 1554:10,	1624:10, 1627:11,	1578:8, 1585:20,
1596:8, 1603:3,	interests [2] -	1595:7, 1602:6,	1629:12	1587:1, 1598:2,
1604:21, 1607:9,	1557:18, 1576:22	1619:22, 1620:5	late [2] - 1589:21, 1616:21	1598:9, 1612:9,
1607:22, 1609:3,	interim [1] - 1537:8	JUDGE [1] - 1523:9		1628:5, 1630:12
1610:10, 1611:24,	Interior [3] - 1523:6,	Judge's [1] - 1579:7	LAW [1] - 1523:12	linear [5] - 1589:5,
1612:25, 1613:2,	1622:11, 1622:13	July [3] - 1648:13,	lawn [1] - 1638:24	1602:12, 1602:16,
1614:5, 1614:10,	interpolation [8] -	1648:17, 1648:19	leader [1] - 1570:17	1602:17, 1602:19
1615:9, 1615:12,	1555:15, 1555:21,	jump [1] - 1597:8	Leading [1] -	lines [5] - 1577:18,
1615:19, 1615:20,	1557:10, 1589:5,	June [6] - 1523:4,	1647:10	1578:25, 1627:13,
1615:22, 1615:24,	1602:13, 1602:16,	1545:11, 1576:11,	learn [1] - 1538:17	1628:1, 1632:19
1615:25, 1616:2,	1602:17, 1602:19	1585:19, 1612:7,	learned [1] - 1540:15	link [1] - 1564:25
1616:6, 1616:12,	interpret [1] -	1632:18	learning [1] -	links [1] - 1565:3
1616:19, 1617:4,	1581:20	Justice [3] - 1524:3,	1540:20	list [2] - 1648:24,
1617:5, 1617:6,	intrabureau [2] -	1524:7, 1536:15	least [6] - 1531:17,	1649:3
1617:18, 1618:6,	1570:15, 1629:22	JUSTIN [1] - 1523:19	1545:21, 1557:24,	listed [3] - 1599:8,

1599:9, 1599:10	1623:3, 1626:2,	1570:1, 1631:2,	misstate
listen [2] - 1531:23,	1628:3, 1630:11,	1644:21	1591:22
1578:6	1635:19	meant [5] - 1561:21,	misunde
listened [3] -	Looking [2] -	1579:25, 1580:6,	1584:11
1581:25, 1587:24,	1580:11, 1635:13	1613:4, 1632:7	model [3
1611:18	Looks [1] - 1635:2	memo [1] - 1636:4	1528:9, 15
listening [1] -	looks [1] - 1593:16	memorize [1] -	1530:7, 15
1595:13	lost [1] - 1638:25	1561:12	1536:1, 15
lists [1] - 1621:21	low [1] - 1549:20	mentioned [7] -	1540:22, 1
litigation [2] -	lower [6] - 1528:5,	1537:25, 1553:1,	1550:8, 15
1642:5, 1644:14	1528:11, 1534:19,	1583:20, 1585:12,	1550:22, 1
Litigation [1] -	1610:15, 1610:21,	1595:19, 1606:21,	1558:7, 15
1524:7	1626:5	1612:4	1584:21, 1
live [1] - 1593:18	lowered [2] -	mere [1] - 1619:6	1602:25, 1
LLP [1] - 1524:11	1557:14, 1558:24	MERRILL [1] -	1603:17, 1
look [38] - 1527:5,		1524:11	1603:24, 1
1528:8, 1532:4,	M	methodology [3] -	1605:13, 1
1543:5, 1548:3,	machine [1] -	1602:19, 1602:22,	1608:6, 16
1551:7, 1560:19,	1524:18	1644:23	1641:9, 16
1560:21, 1562:5,	magnitude [1] -	MICHAEL [1] -	1646:2, 16
1562:18, 1562:23,	1578:23	1524:2	1646:4
1565:4, 1565:5,	manner [1] - 1534:13	Michelle [6] - 1544:6,	Model [1]
1566:12, 1566:16,	March [5] - 1537:22,	1544:13, 1544:15,	modeler
1570:16, 1573:4,	1537:24, 1538:6,	1582:11, 1583:10,	1586:9 modifica
1575:17, 1597:20,	1550:16, 1550:25	1585:2	1620:4
1599:19, 1603:8, 1604:16, 1607:8,	mark [4] - 1529:7,	middle [1] - 1596:13	modifica
1610:20, 1612:4,	1531:4, 1532:19,	might [5] - 1538:17,	1528:15
1614:5, 1617:14,	1533:21	1559:23, 1564:10, 1630:18, 1637:14	modified
1617:16, 1621:14,	marked [3] -	million [40] - 1543:1,	1597:18, 1
1622:16, 1624:15,	1548:14, 1607:12,	1543:7, 1547:9,	1619:25
1624:24, 1624:25,	1612:11	1547:13, 1547:14,	modify [1
1629:23, 1636:2,	match [1] - 1526:25	1547:21, 1552:13,	moment
1638:21, 1639:25,	material [1] -	1563:6, 1564:23,	1612:13, 1
1643:11	1540:17	1567:19, 1573:5,	moment
Look [1] - 1600:11	materials [2] -	1573:8, 1574:4,	1630:12
looked [34] -	1580:24, 1580:25	1574:9, 1593:7,	Monday
1544:15, 1547:9,	math [1] - 1637:2	1594:3, 1594:10,	1648:18
1553:2, 1553:7,	mathematical [1] -	1597:6, 1598:11,	money [3
1553:9, 1560:16,	1591:5	1598:20, 1603:12,	1543:14, 1
1565:18, 1566:6,	matter [4] - 1538:19,	1603:13, 1604:18,	1553:8, 15
1580:3, 1583:25,	1539:8, 1558:18,	1605:5, 1605:7,	1553:19, 1
1584:14, 1586:18,	1650:5	1605:12, 1605:20,	1553:22, 1
1588:24, 1595:25,	matters [2] - 1537:8,	1617:23, 1618:1,	1554:3, 15
1611:9, 1614:7,	1539:18	1626:14, 1626:22,	1554:11, 1
1615:14, 1617:4,	Matthew [2] -	1628:2, 1628:5,	1577:13, 1
1619:1, 1619:10,	1575:19, 1593:11	1630:2, 1635:25,	1582:22, 1
1622:7, 1622:19,	maturities [1] -	1637:1, 1637:8,	1604:12, 1
1623:7, 1623:16,	1533:24	1640:13	1607:6, 16
1623:22, 1627:25,	mean [15] - 1542:15,	millions [3] - 1538:4,	1624:23, 1
1629:16, 1629:18,	1546:13, 1548:9,	1579:23	1629:4, 16
1635:2, 1640:21,	1553:16, 1559:4,	mine [1] - 1541:23	1633:13, 1
1644:9, 1645:13, 1645:15	1559:8, 1572:1, 1574:18, 1590:19,	minors [1] - 1569:17	1636:14, 1
looking [16] -	1597:15, 1603:7,	minus [3] - 1542:25,	1638:20, 1
1534:17, 1538:21,	1616:7, 1624:10,	1543:6, 1606:3	Money [2 1626:1
1543:5, 1545:19,	1638:13	minute [2] - 1574:22,	monies
1547:24, 1560:23,	meaning [1] -	1633:17	1533:12, 1
1565:8, 1565:16,	1551:13	missing [5] - 1588:3, 1596:3, 1596:7,	1553.12, 1
1610:13, 1617:18,	means [5] - 1566:21,	1604:23, 1645:11	1553:2, 15
- · · · · · , · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1004.20, 1040.11	1000.2, 10
		I	

ed [1] lerstood [1] -34] - 1528:6, 1530:5, 534:14, 538:9, 1550:7, 550:9, 1641:5 1558:3, 1584:12, 1595:9, 1603:10. 1603:20, 1604:11, 1608:3, 608:20, 645:22, 646:3, 1] - 1589:17 ers [1] ation [1] ations [1] ed [3] -1597:22, [1] - 1530:5 **t** [2] -1637:15 ts [1] **y** [1] -[30] -1551:23, 553:12, 1553:21, 1553:24, 554:9, 1565:22, 1582:3, 1583:7, 1607:4, 621:18, 1625:12, 631:16, 1636:10, 1638:2, 1646:24 [2] - 1538:11, [17] - 1532:4, 1546:6, 1551:17, 1559:22, 1560:1, 553:6,

1576:20, 1576:25, 1587:16, 1606:23, 1608:1, 1610:16, 1633:21, 1634:11, 1641:18 Monies [2] - 1533:7, 1598:10 months [1] - 1536:25 Morgan [2] - 1579:1, morning [25] -1549:10. 1549:11. 1549:12, 1552:22, 1554:13, 1554:19, 1571:24, 1573:23, 1574:23, 1575:4, 1579:4, 1583:20, 1590:11, 1595:24, 1596:19, 1597:17, 1598:21, 1599:11, 1599:15, 1600:5, 1600:7, 1600:9, 1601:22, 1612:7, 1632:18 most [1] - 1583:1 motion [2] - 1558:12 move [9] - 1526:5, 1550:2, 1559:24, 1563:13, 1571:11, 1625:5, 1638:11, 1643:25, 1648:22 Moved [1] - 1525:8 moving [2] -1569:20, 1594:8 MR [189] - 1526:3, 1526:4, 1527:9, 1527:12, 1527:24, 1528:3, 1529:7, 1529:10, 1529:19, 1530:3, 1530:4, 1530:17, 1531:4, 1531:6, 1531:20, 1531:25, 1532:2, 1532:19, 1532:22, 1533:21, 1534:1, 1535:7, 1535:9, 1536:9, 1536:12, 1540:2, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:13, 1540:14, 1543:2, 1543:4, 1549:22, 1550:1, 1550:3, 1550:5, 1550:6, 1551:4, 1551:6, 1551:9, 1551:10, 1556:6, 1556:8, 1556:24, 1557:1, 1557:5, 1557:6, 1559:13, 1559:15,

T				
1564:13, 1564:16,	1644:2, 1644:16,	Ninth [1] - 1523:13	1635:20, 1635:22,	1621:5, 1622:12,
1568:7, 1568:9,	1644:19, 1644:22,	nobody [1] - 1549:18	1636:23, 1636:25,	1627:12
1569:23, 1569:25,	1645:4, 1647:1,	nominal [4] -	1637:13, 1648:21	October's [1] -
1570:11, 1570:12,	1647:5, 1647:10,	1534:17, 1542:25,	numbers [42] -	1622:14
1571:1, 1571:4,	1647:11, 1647:23,	1593:5, 1605:7	1535:16, 1538:3,	OF [5] - 1523:1,
1571:13, 1571:14,	1648:2, 1648:12,	non [1] - 1610:24	1538:6, 1538:8,	1523:8, 1523:12,
1573:18, 1573:22,	1648:16, 1648:20,		1544:13, 1544:14,	1650:1, 1650:10
1573:24, 1573:25,	1648:21, 1649:5	non-check [1] -	1552:12, 1553:3,	
		1610:24		officer [1] - 1592:19
1574:1, 1575:13, 1575:15, 1575:19,	multi [1] - 1603:4	none [1] - 1606:19	1559:17, 1559:19,	officers [5] -
1576:4, 1576:10,	multi-imputation [1]	nonscheduled [2] -	1569:1, 1587:8,	1587:13, 1587:15,
1576:13, 1578:14,	- 1603:4	1561:17, 1563:4	1587:9, 1591:3, 1595:10, 1597:4,	1592:13, 1592:14,
	multiple [2] -	NORC [1] - 1588:8		1592:17
1578:17, 1579:12,	1538:21, 1586:1	North [1] - 1523:25	1601:23, 1603:7,	OFFICES [1] -
1579:14, 1590:8,	multiplied [2] -	note [4] - 1527:16,	1614:6, 1614:7,	1523:12
1590:9, 1591:7, 1591:22, 1592:1,	1557:18, 1557:20	1583:16, 1590:5,	1614:8, 1614:9,	OFFICIAL [1] -
	must [1] - 1565:23	1643:11	1614:10, 1615:16,	1650:1
1593:2, 1593:20,		nothing [5] -	1615:17, 1616:23,	Official [1] - 1524:15
1593:23, 1594:22,	N	1554:18, 1565:3,	1617:14, 1617:17,	often [1] - 1544:13
1594:23, 1595:2,	N.W [3] - 1523:20,	1571:20, 1602:5,	1617:19, 1618:7,	old [1] - 1645:3
1595:3, 1595:5,	1524:4, 1524:16	1602:9	1618:9, 1618:11,	once [5] - 1567:15,
1597:13, 1597:18,	name [3] - 1536:15,	noticed [2] -	1618:14, 1618:17,	1569:16, 1584:14,
1597:20, 1597:22,	1557:2, 1564:7	1611:17, 1615:23	1618:18, 1619:18,	1586:18, 1592:21
1597:24, 1598:1,	named [1] - 1627:18	notion [2] - 1582:3,	1627:9, 1627:10,	Once [1] - 1583:23
1598:17, 1598:19,	Nation [4] - 1524:11,	1631:16	1645:18, 1645:25	one [54] - 1527:3,
1599:18, 1599:22,		NUMBER [1] -	Numerous [1] -	1531:10, 1531:16,
1600:12, 1600:13,	1558:12, 1558:13,	1525:6	1542:6	1549:12, 1549:13,
1602:4, 1603:19,	1575:16	number [76] -	NW [2] - 1523:12,	1549:18, 1552:10,
1603:21, 1603:23,	nature [1] - 1554:20	1527:21, 1528:8,	1524:12	1555:14, 1556:19,
1605:25, 1606:2,	necessarily [2] -	1528:10, 1529:5,		1559:11, 1563:2,
1608:10, 1608:12,	1600:19, 1611:3	1529:16, 1535:11,	0	1565:2, 1565:12,
1608:16, 1608:18,	need [1] - 1546:23	1536:16, 1543:10,	o'clock (3) - 1648.6	1566:6, 1567:21,
1609:13, 1609:15,	needed [3] - 1540:9,	1536:16, 1543:10, 1544:16, 1549:20,	o'clock [3] - 1648:6, 1648:7, 1649:7	1566:6, 1567:21, 1567:22, 1569:3,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7		1648:7, 1649:7	
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22	1544:16, 1549:20,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20,	1567:22, 1569:3,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] -	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] -	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1590:5, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22, 1599:1, 1599:2,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16, 1636:18, 1637:14,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1637:14, 1637:19, 1638:12,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16, 1636:18, 1637:14, 1638:12, 1639:1,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1637:14, 1637:19, 1638:12, 1639:4, 1639:7,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16, 1636:18, 1637:14, 1639:12, 1641:5,	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new[3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1604:10, 1606:13,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18 obviously [3] -	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:1, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1637:14, 1637:19, 1638:12, 1638:16, 1639:1, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:12, 1641:5, 1641:7, 1641:11, 161000000000000000000000000000000000	needed [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8, 1638:5, 1640:8	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1590:5, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1590:5, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1590:20, 1590:20, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:10, 1600:13, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1500:20, 1615:7, 1500:20, 1605:10, 1600:10, 150, 150, 150, 150, 150, 150, 150, 1	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18 obviously [3] - 1557:12, 1602:11,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1637:14, 1637:19, 1638:12, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:12, 1641:5, 1641:7, 1642:17,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8, 1638:5, 1640:8 night [3] - 1589:21,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1618:4, 1626:13,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observe [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18 obviously [3] - 1557:12, 1602:11, 1607:15	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9 ones [6] - 1540:24,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1633:18, 1637:14, 1633:14, 1639:1, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:12, 1641:5, 1641:7, 1642:17, 1642:18, 1642:22,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8, 1638:5, 1640:8 night [3] - 1589:21, 1595:21, 1595:24	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1626:16, 1626:17,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observed [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18 obviously [3] - 1557:12, 1602:11, 1607:15 October [9] - 1533:5,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9 ones [6] - 1540:24, 1560:21, 1567:13,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1633:18, 1637:14, 1633:18, 1639:1, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:12, 1641:5, 1641:7, 1641:11, 1642:18, 1642:22, 1642:24, 1643:15,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8, 1638:5, 1640:8 night [3] - 1589:21,	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1564:6, 1565:24, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1626:16, 1626:17, 1626:24, 1627:2,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observed [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1594:18 obvious[1] - 1557:12, 1602:11, 1607:15 October [9] - 1533:5, 1533:10, 1533:17,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9 ones [6] - 1540:24, 1560:21, 1567:13, 1569:6, 1600:4,
1609:13, 1609:15, 1610:1, 1610:3, 1612:6, 1612:8, 1613:15, 1613:17, 1614:14, 1614:16, 1614:21, 1614:22, 1619:23, 1619:25, 1620:3, 1621:1, 1621:3, 1621:8, 1621:10, 1625:17, 1625:19, 1625:21, 1626:5, 1626:7, 1627:11, 1627:15, 1628:15, 1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13, 1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16, 1636:18, 1637:14, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:4, 1639:7, 1639:12, 1641:5, 1641:7, 1641:11, 1642:18, 1642:22,	neede [3] - 1540:9, 1583:22, 1584:7 needs [1] - 1546:22 negative [1] - 1543:17 neighborhood [1] - 1615:4 never [14] - 1539:3, 1555:7, 1577:8, 1604:13, 1611:2, 1623:4, 1623:8, 1623:21, 1624:23, 1625:3, 1647:17, 1647:18 New [1] - 1524:12 new [3] - 1529:21, 1541:4, 1585:22 next [17] - 1562:4, 1562:23, 1563:1, 1564:6, 1567:14, 1567:24, 1571:20, 1573:8, 1574:9, 1577:18, 1580:18, 1581:1, 1585:25, 1599:24, 1621:8, 1638:5, 1640:8 night [3] - 1589:21, 1595:21, 1595:24	1544:16, 1549:20, 1549:21, 1552:9, 1552:12, 1555:20, 1556:1, 1557:9, 1557:18, 1558:7, 1558:24, 1559:5, 1562:12, 1563:25, 1566:17, 1570:16, 1570:23, 1571:25, 1572:2, 1573:20, 1575:11, 1581:10, 1581:11, 1581:13, 1584:17, 1586:4, 1586:7, 1590:3, 1591:4, 1596:25, 1598:21, 1598:22, 1599:1, 1599:2, 1599:4, 1599:5, 1600:10, 1600:11, 1601:19, 1601:22, 1602:2, 1602:7, 1604:10, 1606:13, 1608:25, 1615:7, 1618:4, 1626:17, 1626:24, 1627:2, 1629:24, 1635:3,	1648:7, 1649:7 object [2] - 1529:20, 1531:20 objection [2] - 1531:24, 1643:24 Objection [13] - 1530:2, 1540:2, 1540:10, 1573:18, 1578:14, 1591:22, 1603:19, 1619:23, 1628:15, 1642:17, 1643:15, 1647:1, 1647:10 obligation [2] - 1535:21, 1535:24 obligations [1] - 1531:16 observed [1] - 1641:25 observed [1] - 1544:12 obvious [1] - 1594:18 obviously [3] - 1557:12, 1602:11, 1607:15 October [9] - 1533:5,	1567:22, 1569:3, 1569:4, 1570:16, 1575:6, 1575:9, 1575:12, 1578:25, 1588:16, 1588:21, 1589:19, 1590:2, 1590:5, 1590:10, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1597:16, 1597:22, 1598:5, 1599:2, 1599:23, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1600:22, 1601:1, 1603:17, 1610:18, 1612:1, 1632:2, 1632:3, 1632:19, 1635:4, 1636:23, 1637:20, 1643:7, 1644:7 One [4] - 1542:1, 1566:6, 1602:10, 1621:15 one's [1] - 1587:9 one-and-a-quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9 ones [6] - 1540:24, 1560:21, 1567:13, 1569:6, 1600:4, 1609:10

14

r				
opinion [5] -	P.O [1] - 1524:9	1595:6, 1595:8,	1634:7	1526:24, 1544:14,
1542:14, 1579:7,	PACER [3] -	1601:8, 1602:10,	payments [13] -	1554:7, 1565:3,
1585:5, 1585:23,	1541:15, 1626:3,	1611:18, 1614:1,	1533:3, 1562:19,	1584:15, 1588:7,
1619:6	1645:6	1617:8, 1621:4,	1566:7, 1567:14,	1591:9, 1595:18,
opinions [3] -	page [50] - 1527:10,	1625:6, 1627:16,	1567:22, 1567:25,	1595:22, 1596:3,
1585:4, 1619:3,	1527:11, 1527:13,	1628:13, 1635:1,	1568:2, 1569:17,	1596:4, 1596:13,
1621:12	1527:25, 1528:2,	1637:16, 1643:22,	1572:1, 1572:11,	1601:15, 1604:20,
opportunity [2] -	1535:7, 1542:24,	1644:17, 1644:24,	1577:14, 1633:20	1604:22, 1612:2,
1607:18, 1612:11	1545:11, 1547:8,	1648:4	Peachtree [1] -	1615:12, 1639:16,
opposite [1] -	1551:22, 1556:23,	PALMER [1] - 1525:3	1523:16	1640:8, 1640:12,
1626:13	1558:21, 1562:2,	paragraph [6] -	penny [1] - 1545:15	1641:1, 1642:14,
order [1] - 1578:23	1562:4, 1562:5,	1532:21, 1534:2,	people [4] - 1542:5,	1643:20, 1645:13
original [2] -	1562:23, 1563:1,	1534:3, 1600:11,	1542:6, 1542:8,	periods [9] -
1540:24, 1599:20	1565:4, 1566:9,	1600:14, 1600:22	1578:6	1583:24, 1583:25,
originally [2] -	1566:10, 1569:15,	paragraphs [1] -	PEPION [1] - 1523:2	1584:2, 1586:20,
1538:19, 1595:24	1570:11, 1571:1,	1599:23	per [4] - 1557:17,	1610:10, 1617:6,
Osage [46] -	1571:2, 1571:20,	pardon [5] - 1545:24,	1572:2, 1573:14,	1617:7, 1639:14,
1524:11, 1554:19,	1571:22, 1573:1,	1551:16, 1560:10,	1574:12	1640:1
1554:20, 1555:2,	1573:3, 1573:4,	1616:13, 1639:22	percent [60] -	persons [1] - 1542:1
1555:8, 1555:10,	1575:21, 1576:10,	Part [1] - 1572:16	1526:12, 1531:17,	phrase [1] - 1601:1
1557:5, 1557:7,	1577:18, 1578:8, 1579:10, 1580:4,	part [14] - 1540:18,	1531:18, 1532:1,	physical [1] - 1603:3
1557:15, 1558:2,		1546:19, 1572:17,	1532:3, 1532:6,	pick [1] - 1608:3
1558:12, 1558:13,	1589:13, 1596:24, 1596:25, 1597:1,	1578:12, 1579:17, 1579:18, 1580:1,	1532:17, 1532:25,	picked [2] - 1567:6, 1567:8
1558:19, 1558:24,	1599:3, 1599:21,		1533:9, 1535:4,	
1558:25, 1559:2,	1599:24, 1612:6,	1580:9, 1607:1,	1552:9, 1552:11,	picture [2] - 1548:3
1559:6, 1561:2,	1627:13, 1628:1,	1607:11, 1640:25, 1641:18, 1644:22,	1573:13, 1573:15, 1574:12, 1574:20,	PL [5] - 1561:23, 1562:9, 1563:5,
1562:20, 1564:7, 1568:13, 1568:19,	1629:12, 1632:19,	1647:18	1574:12, 1574:20, 1574:20, 1574:24, 1575:1,	1564:6, 1570:19
1570:20, 1570:23,	1633:16, 1643:7	partial [1] - 1527:19	1575:9, 1579:2,	place [3] - 1539:12,
1571:9, 1571:12,	pages [22] - 1551:4,	particular [16] -	1579:21, 1580:5,	1539:13, 1539:15
1572:1, 1572:10,	1559:20, 1560:2,	1526:7, 1543:21,	1580:11, 1581:8,	placed [1] - 1640:18
1572:13, 1572:14,	1560:3, 1561:7,	1556:21, 1571:6,	1581:10, 1584:3,	Plaintiffs [8] -
1573:12, 1574:18,	1561:8, 1563:13,	1585:24, 1599:3,	1584:12, 1584:14,	1523:3, 1523:11,
1575:16, 1576:16,	1563:19, 1563:24,	1601:1, 1601:6,	1589:25, 1590:1,	1529:7, 1529:14,
1576:17, 1577:5,	1563:25, 1564:3,	1605:14, 1606:21,	1590:10, 1590:12,	1531:1, 1531:4,
1578:1, 1595:9,	1564:4, 1566:2,	1627:13, 1627:23,	1595:10, 1602:7,	1532:19, 1533:21
1595:25, 1596:5,	1569:4, 1580:2,	1634:25, 1639:14,	1603:18, 1604:3,	plaintiffs [5] -
1627:9, 1646:13,	1585:18, 1599:20,	1646:21	1604:6, 1604:9,	1536:7, 1550:15,
1646:21, 1646:23	1609:6, 1610:1,	Particularly [1] -	1604:24, 1606:5,	1550:25, 1575:25,
OTFM [3] - 1636:4,	1621:2, 1621:8	1610:10	1610:17, 1610:19,	1597:14
1636:13, 1637:25	pages [1] - 1563:23	particularly [1] -	1613:24, 1613:25,	Plaintiffs' [29] -
outflow [1] - 1543:18	paid [15] - 1531:3,	1567:13	1615:1, 1615:2,	1526:6, 1534:10,
output [2] - 1603:2,	1554:8, 1562:1,	particulars [1] -	1615:3, 1618:5,	1535:8, 1541:6,
1603:5	1567:16, 1567:19,	1619:16	1618:18, 1619:7,	1542:8, 1548:14,
outputs [1] - 1611:7	1572:17, 1605:12,	party [1] - 1633:20	1619:18, 1620:6,	1548:16, 1549:2,
outset [1] - 1602:11	1605:15, 1605:16,	Pat [2] - 1542:1,	1620:19, 1631:24,	1549:8, 1549:16,
overruled [1] -	1607:23, 1623:4,	1542:4	1632:3, 1632:6,	1550:14, 1555:5,
1530:2	1623:5, 1623:6,	pay [2] - 1535:21,	1632:8, 1634:23,	1555:6, 1555:11,
Overruled [2] -	1623:17, 1626:25	1621:18	1637:4, 1637:10	1558:10, 1559:1,
1531:24, 1578:16	Pallais [1] - 1644:13	payable [1] - 1625:7	percentage [8] -	1572:25, 1573:23,
overstated [3] -	Palmer [35] -	payees [5] - 1563:8,	1526:11, 1587:9,	1575:16, 1578:24,
1558:2, 1600:23,	1527:15, 1527:23,	1563:14, 1569:21,	1591:4, 1596:2, 1596:6, 1604:21	1589:12, 1596:18,
1601:2	1528:4, 1528:12, 1530:5, 1536:13,	1571:17, 1572:21	1596:6, 1604:21, 1636:19, 1637:1	1597:8, 1597:17,
own [1] - 1574:2	1530.5, 1536.13, 1536:21, 1547:3,	payment [14] -		1598:8, 1599:19,
owners [1] - 1572:10	1536.21, 1547.3, 1548:15, 1556:9,	1564:17, 1564:20,	percentages [1] - 1574:25	1602:5, 1612:10,
	1560:2, 1569:5,	1564:22, 1565:12,	perform [1] - 1530:5	1612:11
Р	1572:12, 1578:18,	1565:14, 1565:15,	perhaps [2] - 1570:7,	plaintiffs' [5] -
p.m [2] - 1594:15,	1579:15, 1589:2,	1568:3, 1570:20,	1609:22	1529:23, 1531:10, 1532:23, 1537:21,
1649:8	1591:18, 1593:3,	1571:8, 1571:11,	period [24] -	1550:10
		1572:14, 1572:16,		1000.10

plug [3] - 1602:15,	1619:23, 1627:20	1602:25, 1603:10,	1527:24, 1551:4,	1603:9, 1603:10
1602:18, 1602:22	preparing [8] -	1603:17, 1604:2,	1556:9, 1557:22,	range [3] - 1586:19,
plus [3] - 1527:3,	1537:12, 1541:5,	1613:8	1558:7, 1564:13,	1604:9, 1609:3
1606:15, 1628:5	1541:11, 1548:15,	prohibit [2] - 1636:5,	1564:20, 1564:23,	ranges [1] - 1613:24
point [14] - 1529:19,	1549:5, 1549:14,	1636:14	1567:21, 1575:13,	rate [56] - 1526:10,
1539:2, 1549:21,	1550:13, 1619:18	project [2] - 1537:5,	1595:11, 1613:15,	1526:11, 1527:8,
1553:19, 1553:22,	present [2] -	1541:24	1620:1, 1648:18	1529:16, 1529:18,
1554:9, 1568:8,	1544:20, 1576:5		putting [1] - 1541:13	1530:8, 1530:10,
		proper [1] - 1529:25	PX-189A [1] -	
1597:7, 1602:6,	presented [13] -	properly [1] - 1578:12	1527:24	1530:11, 1530:12, 1530:19, 1530:22,
1604:23, 1606:25,	1529:22, 1532:9,		-	, ,
1607:5, 1638:5,	1537:23, 1537:24,	property [2] - 1647:8	PX-189s [1] -	1531:17, 1532:7,
1639:24	1538:1, 1538:7,	proposed [1] -	1597:25	1532:9, 1532:12,
pointed [2] - 1552:8,	1550:13, 1576:15,	1648:11	•	1532:14, 1532:15,
1566:9	1586:4, 1586:5,	proposition [2] -	Q	1533:9, 1533:12,
pointing [1] -	1624:10, 1626:9,	1584:5, 1638:23	qualified [2] -	1533:16, 1533:19,
1624:16	1645:24	proven [5] - 1579:22,	1619:3, 1619:6	1533:20, 1534:7,
points [4] - 1555:21,	presenting [2] -	1580:7, 1580:12,	quality [1] - 1542:18	1534:8, 1534:11,
1602:11, 1602:23,	1548:10, 1548:11	1580:18, 1581:1	quantification [5] -	1534:15, 1534:16,
1603:11	presumably [1] -	Proven [1] - 1581:4	1535:25, 1536:1,	1534:18, 1534:24,
policy [4] - 1636:4,	1616:11	provide [1] - 1559:23	1552:25, 1642:13,	1535:1, 1535:2,
1636:5, 1636:13,	pretty [3] - 1538:1,	provided [22] -	1642:19	1535:6, 1535:19,
1636:14	1587:15, 1629:16	1528:13, 1531:1,	quantified [2] -	1535:23, 1536:8,
population [2] -	previous [11] -	1531:11, 1532:23,	1552:3, 1642:7	1548:23, 1548:24,
1557:3, 1557:7	1527:3, 1528:6,	1533:13, 1534:7,	quantify [4] -	1548:25, 1584:15,
portfolio [3] -	1528:9, 1562:2,	1534:8, 1535:24,	1529:15, 1551:19,	1586:22, 1595:16,
1530:20, 1530:22,	1566:11, 1570:22,	1536:8, 1544:5,	1577:19, 1645:6	1595:17, 1595:22,
1530:23	1591:19, 1592:3,	1558:16, 1558:17,		1596:11, 1604:3,
portion [2] -	1592:5, 1595:23,	1573:19, 1581:14,	quarter [2] - 1575:6, 1575:9	1604:4, 1604:19,
1637:24, 1640:1	1647:21	1584:10, 1584:24,		1604:24, 1609:1,
position [1] -	principal [1] - 1562:1	1585:7, 1600:14,	quarterly [3] -	1613:23, 1623:1,
1590:23	problem [2] -	1603:3, 1619:24,	1562:19, 1567:14, 1568:1	1628:10, 1637:11
positive [1] -	1574:23, 1588:19	1622:9, 1645:20		rates [16] - 1530:18,
1635:20	problems [2] -	public [4] - 1570:1,	quarters [2] -	1530:21, 1531:2,
possibility [1] -	1598:23, 1600:4	1570:2, 1570:5,	1615:9, 1617:12	1531:11, 1534:19,
1538:22	Proceedings [2] -	1570:13	questioning [1] -	1534:20, 1534:22,
possible [2] -	1524:18, 1649:8	published [2] -	1529:20	1535:14, 1535:18,
1555:23, 1575:18	proceedings [1] -	1538:14	questions [12] -	1536:4, 1549:14,
potentially [3] -	1650:4	Pull [2] - 1608:16,	1526:9, 1536:9,	1583:24, 1592:18,
1538:21, 1587:17,	proceeds [1] -	1612:6	1548:13, 1637:16,	1592:21, 1596:14,
1645:11	1636:3	pull [25] - 1542:21,	1639:13, 1639:18,	1596:16
practice [3] -	process [8] -	1556:6, 1558:11,	1641:8, 1643:3,	rather [1] - 1557:20
1625:13, 1625:14,	1530:18, 1541:11,	1559:13, 1572:25,	1643:20, 1645:2,	ratio [16] - 1526:11,
1625:15	1541:18, 1549:14,	1575:17, 1576:10,	1646:19, 1648:2	1584:15, 1586:18,
practiced [1] -	1588:20, 1588:21,	1577:18, 1579:12,	quick [2] - 1558:9,	1596:10, 1598:22,
1593:20	1588:23, 1588:24	1585:18, 1589:11,	1569:3	1599:11, 1601:18,
precise [1] - 1570:3	produced [2] -	1592:1, 1598:17,	quicker [1] - 1559:24	1601:19, 1602:1,
precisely [2] -	1524:18, 1528:6	1608:10, 1609:13,		1604:22, 1614:4,
1584:18, 1647:23	production [1] -	1610:16, 1621:1,	1567:12, 1597:9,	1615:1, 1615:2,
premised [1] -	1603:3	1625:20, 1627:11,	1621:9	1615:6, 1616:2,
1588:11	Professor [26] -	1629:8, 1632:14,	QUINN [1] - 1524:2	1620:10
preparation [4] -	1537:2, 1537:3,	1633:15, 1634:21,	quite [5] - 1544:16,	ratios [2] - 1583:24,
1531:11, 1540:18,	1537:6, 1537:23,	1637:22	1611:11, 1613:3,	1601:16
1548:21, 1549:23	1538:7, 1538:20,	pulled [4] - 1558:9,	1614:3, 1638:10	rattled [1] - 1558:8
prepare [4] -	1538:23, 1539:6,	1569:1, 1575:22,	quote [2] - 1551:22,	reach [1] - 1649:1
1529:11, 1529:13,	1540:6, 1540:8,	1575:24	1622:11	reached [1] - 1621:6
1540:16, 1548:19	1540:25, 1550:9,	purpose [2] -	<u> </u>	read [14] - 1538:14,
prepared [8] -	1550:14, 1550:19,	1584:11, 1585:10	R	1544:21, 1547:7,
1529:12, 1559:16,	1576:6, 1576:12,	purposes [1] -	raising [1] - 1644:23	1551:3, 1554:23,
1559:19, 1564:15,	1577:17, 1577:19,	1615:10	-	1576:14, 1578:5,
	1577:17, 1577:19, 1602:12, 1602:16,	1615:10 put [15] - 1527:9,	ran [5] - 1602:12, 1602:24, 1603:4,	1576:14, 1578:5, 1579:7, 1601:6,

1			1	
1611:14, 1612:9,	1609:18, 1611:25,	1559:8, 1560:8,	1589:1	report's [1] - 1624:13
1622:20, 1622:24,	1631:22, 1632:7,	1561:16, 1582:15	relationships [1] -	reported [23] -
1641:20	1634:5, 1634:14,	referring [9] -	1588:11	1524:18, 1544:19,
reading [8] -	1634:17, 1642:15	1530:24, 1540:24,	relatively [2] -	1553:25, 1554:1,
1545:11, 1554:22,	received [6] -	1541:21, 1548:18,	1567:11, 1585:21	1583:25, 1600:23,
1555:1, 1565:23,	1541:4, 1541:15,	1568:19, 1569:15,	relevance [2] -	1601:16, 1601:19,
1585:25, 1600:25,	1541:19, 1597:14,	1611:22, 1622:10,	1549:19, 1585:23	1603:12, 1604:21,
1601:3, 1632:18	1597:17, 1612:25	1636:8	relevant [1] -	1615:8, 1617:6,
reads [2] - 1533:2,	recently [2] -	Referring [4] -	1580:11	1617:13, 1618:1,
1533:23	1602:15, 1612:25	1563:24, 1569:11,	relied [4] - 1528:12,	1618:7, 1619:9,
real [3] - 1597:9,	Recess [1] - 1594:15	1598:2, 1627:21		1619:10, 1620:7,
1610:4, 1621:9	recite [1] - 1649:1	refers [8] - 1562:14,	1534:5, 1585:7, 1642:9	1620:9, 1620:15,
really [9] - 1538:8,	recognize [6] -	1563:11, 1571:6,	relief [4] - 1529:9,	1620:19, 1644:8,
1549:18, 1552:15,	1555:11, 1560:2,	1571:21, 1581:2,	1529:14, 1530:6,	1644:24
1556:24, 1578:11,	1560:3, 1560:4,	1583:16, 1626:15,	1529.14, 1550.0, 1548:16	REPORTER [2] -
1578:12, 1583:9,	1570:13, 1589:15	1635:10		1650:1, 1650:10
1588:19, 1591:18	recollection [5] -	refinement [1] -	relying [1] - 1552:14	Reporter [2] -
reason [9] - 1539:3,	1526:16, 1552:6,	1603:25	remain [3] - 1637:25,	1524:14, 1524:15
1543:12, 1582:8,	1560:8, 1571:5,	reflected [6] -	1638:13, 1646:10	reports [11] -
1587:11, 1592:11,		1536:4, 1551:24,	remaining [2] -	1554:24, 1554:25,
1598:23, 1614:9,	1627:8	1552:21, 1584:21,	1568:1, 1638:9	
1615:8, 1640:24	reconciliation [2] -	1608:21, 1636:20	remedies [1] -	1556:13, 1556:16, 1617:9, 1617:12,
	1580:9, 1580:13 record [1] - 1650:4		1585:24	1618:6, 1618:7,
reasonable [14] -		reflects [2] -	remember [50] -	1618:12, 1618:18,
1528:19, 1528:22, 1535:20, 1536:3,	recorded [2] -	1554:11, 1608:21	1534:21, 1536:24,	1619:1
, ,	1616:15, 1616:17	refresh [2] - 1526:16,	1538:5, 1542:24,	
1536:8, 1584:1,	records [1] - 1527:14	1571:5	1543:6, 1544:21,	represent [5] -
1584:2, 1584:16,	recredited [1] -	Refresh [1] - 1627:7	1544:24, 1544:25,	1573:11, 1593:13,
1586:19, 1587:19,	1623:10	refreshes [1] -	1545:1, 1545:9,	1609:16, 1619:20, 1628:6
1589:8, 1592:16,	recrediting [1] -	1560:7	1545:22, 1547:18,	
1592:20, 1592:22	1624:14	regard [12] - 1527:9,	1551:11, 1553:14,	representation [1] -
reasons [6] -	recredits [3] -	1529:21, 1603:24,	1555:1, 1556:15,	1611:2
1599:15, 1600:1,	1622:11, 1622:13,	1624:14, 1637:24,	1556:18, 1556:20,	represents [2] -
1600:2, 1600:6,	1622:21	1638:7, 1641:6,	1556:21, 1557:11,	1626:10, 1626:11
1600:9, 1644:7	RECROSS [1] -	1641:16, 1642:4,	1558:10, 1566:6,	request [3] -
Rebecca [1] - 1650:3	1525:2	1642:7, 1643:20,	1569:9, 1575:21,	1561:17, 1563:4,
REBECCA [1] -	redirect [4] - 1568:1,	1644:4 	1580:22, 1582:18,	1566:6
1524:14	1595:4, 1609:22,	regarding [7] -	1582:21, 1582:22,	requests [1] - 1563:2
rebuttal [5] -	1611:4	1538:15, 1541:16,	1582:25, 1583:6,	required [3] -
1529:21, 1529:25,	REDIRECT [2] -	1551:8, 1558:10,	1583:7, 1586:11,	1531:2, 1531:13,
1538:18, 1539:2,	1525:2, 1639:11	1584:21, 1639:13,	1588:2, 1588:6,	1538:17
1540:16	reduce [1] - 1602:7	1645:9	1596:14, 1596:21,	requires [1] - 1620:5
recalculation [1] -	reduced [2] -	register [2] -	1599:23, 1616:24,	rerun [1] - 1602:16
1580:13	1573:15, 1615:9	1638:21, 1639:3	1621:13, 1629:19,	rescheduled [2] -
recalled [1] -	Reduced [1] -	regression [4] -	1631:15, 1631:18,	1538:25, 1539:9
1552:10	1574:20	1589:3, 1589:6,	1632:6, 1633:1,	research [1] - 1585:8
receipt [6] - 1586:2,	reduces [1] - 1623:1	1589:7	1633:2, 1633:4,	respect [6] -
1630:24, 1631:13,	reducing [2] -	regressive [2] -	1633:6, 1646:9, 1646:10, 1646:11	1542:24, 1548:20,
1634:11, 1645:12	1595:14, 1615:2	1588:21, 1588:23	1646:10, 1646:11	1563:19, 1599:16,
receipts [31] -	refer [7] - 1555:10,	regular [1] - 1533:7	remembers [1] - 1568:8	1646:5, 1646:13
1526:11, 1543:13,	1556:23, 1564:10,	rehashing [1] -		response [1] -
1547:10, 1547:15,	1578:24, 1580:16,	1643:18	remove [1] - 1553:24	1550:24
1547:21, 1551:8,	1580:19, 1605:1	rehearse [1] -	rephrase [2] - 1536:18, 1603:21	rest [1] - 1594:25
1551:23, 1553:9,	reference [4] -	1643:25		result [2] - 1535:25,
1567:9, 1579:1, 1586:6, 1586:13	1564:2, 1580:7,	reiterate [1] -	report [12] - 1555:1,	1588:10
1586:6, 1586:13, 1587:4, 1589:13,	1585:16, 1585:17	1572:22	1556:10, 1596:21,	retained [1] -
1587:4, 1589:13, 1589:20,	referenced [2] -	related [1] - 1643:3	1598:6, 1598:8,	1538:19
	1583:15, 1636:13	relates [1] - 1583:5	1599:16, 1599:18,	retroactive [1] -
1590:15, 1591:8, 1592:25, 1593:5,	referencing [1] -	relationship [5] -	1617:18, 1617:23, 1617:24, 1618:5	1533:6
1592.25, 1593.5, 1597:24, 1599:9,	1563:18	1588:12, 1588:14,	1617:24, 1618:5, 1618:8	return [1] - 1538:24
1001.27, 1000.0,	referred [5] - 1559:2,	1588:17, 1588:25,	1010.0	revenue [6] - 1593:7,

1595:25, 1597:3,	1610:4, 1635:25	1527:25, 1561:19,	1641:1, 1643:13	side [3] - 1602:17,
1602:17, 1621:6,	rounding [4] -	1639:10	See [1] - 1593:4	1630:5, 1635:19
1621:15	1538:3, 1547:24,	scroll [2] - 1557:5,	seeing [1] - 1552:12	sides [2] - 1648:22,
Revenue [1] -	1550:18, 1606:9	1590:8	seem [4] - 1553:3,	1648:23
1621:17	rounds [1] - 1606:14	Second [1] - 1638:5	1560:5, 1565:9,	sign [1] - 1543:17
revenues [33] -	row [4] - 1526:7,	second [5] -	1565:18	SIGNATURE [1] -
1526:23, 1543:18,	1601:9, 1626:10	1542:24, 1557:3,	segregate [2] -	1650:10
1557:15, 1558:2,	ruled [1] - 1578:15	1564:22, 1564:23,	1641:21, 1642:10	significance [1] -
1571:25, 1574:18,	run [2] - 1603:10,	1565:14	segregated [1] -	1543:11
1576:17, 1577:5,	1609:1	Secretary [4] -	1642:2	significant [2] -
1579:2, 1581:9,	rushed [1] - 1594:19	1523:5, 1533:2,	Senior [1] - 1524:6	1543:9, 1606:13
1581:15, 1581:20,		1533:6, 1533:24	sense [2] - 1577:23,	significantly [1] -
1583:18, 1583:21,	S	Section [1] - 1533:22	1594:7	1610:21
1584:5, 1584:9,	coid #1. 1641:10	section [8] - 1551:8,	separate [1] -	similar [12] -
1585:3, 1585:16,	said [1] - 1641:19	1551:11, 1551:21,	1565:25	1530:20, 1535:13,
1586:21, 1586:22,	Salem [1] - 1523:25	1597:2, 1600:3,	September [1] -	1560:6, 1565:9,
1587:20, 1589:1,	sanity [1] - 1592:21	1621:4, 1621:11,	1587:2	1566:10, 1569:6,
1590:11, 1592:10,	SAS [1] - 1603:4	1622:10	series [4] - 1588:3,	1586:16, 1591:8,
1592:12, 1592:20,	sat [6] - 1538:23, 1540:10, 1544:24	see [88] - 1527:14,	1588:7, 1588:20,	1591:12, 1629:16,
1595:14, 1605:23,	1540:19, 1544:24, 1581:24, 1641:14	1543:8, 1544:3,	1616:11	1635:2, 1644:12
1606:22, 1607:4,	1581:24, 1641:14, 1645:5	1544:8, 1544:16,	serve [1] - 1538:17	similarly [1] -
1608:1, 1610:20, 1625:1	satisfaction [1] -	1551:21, 1551:25,	SESSION [1] -	1609:20
	1533:3	1552:1, 1556:3,	1523:7	single [2] - 1642:14,
Revenues [1] -	Saturday [5] -	1556:5, 1557:2,	session [4] -	1642:20
1606:3	1548:17, 1549:4,	1557:4, 1557:7,	1545:12, 1612:7,	sitting [4] - 1578:10,
review [13] - 1551:2, 1556:13, 1556:17,	1549:13, 1549:14,	1557:8, 1558:8,	1627:12, 1632:18	1594:7, 1607:19,
1560:15, 1569:3,	1595:24	1559:1, 1559:11,	set [1] - 1570:23	1624:7
1569:11, 1580:24,	save [1] - 1567:24	1559:17, 1559:18,	Seth [1] - 1542:5	situation [1] - 1599:2
1612:12, 1621:11,	saw [20] - 1552:19,	1560:7, 1561:16,	sets [1] - 1614:21	six [6] - 1536:25,
1627:16, 1627:23,	1558:24, 1562:1,	1562:8, 1562:10, 1562:12, 1562:24,	seven [1] - 1610:19	1547:8, 1596:24,
1631:1, 1644:13	1562:2, 1564:6,	1563:1, 1563:8,	several [5] - 1556:15,	1610:18, 1620:18,
reviewed [15] -	1564:7, 1564:18,	1563:10, 1563:18,	1580:2, 1609:1,	1632:19
1540:17, 1540:23,	1564:22, 1573:5,	1563:25, 1564:2,	1609:3, 1626:11	slightly [1] - 1596:15
1541:2, 1541:13,	1599:12, 1602:5,	1564:4, 1564:17,	shall [4] - 1531:16,	small [1] - 1575:11
1544:5, 1552:22,	1602:24, 1603:2,	1565:6, 1565:14,	1533:2, 1648:6	SMITH [1] - 1523:23
1554:13, 1556:15,	1609:17, 1609:20,	1565:21, 1566:17,	share [4] - 1557:17,	smoothing [1] -
1560:5, 1561:7,	1614:6, 1615:17,	1566:19, 1567:15,	1572:2, 1573:14,	1588:20
1569:13, 1596:19,	1618:19, 1618:21,	1567:18, 1567:21,	1574:13	so [3] - 1570:24,
1617:2	1645:23	1567:23, 1568:2,	shares [9] - 1555:2,	1595:4, 1631:14 Sometime [1] -
reviewing [2] -	scenario [1] -	1568:4, 1568:10,	1555:15, 1555:18,	
1551:11, 1560:4	1577:10	1569:15, 1569:20,	1556:1, 1556:4, 1572:2, 1573:14,	1536:24 sometime [1] -
revising [1] - 1614:2	Schedule [3] -	1569:22, 1570:17,		
revision [1] -	1601:21, 1610:16,	1571:15, 1571:17,	1574:12	1537:19 somewhat [3] -
1631:25	1611:23	1574:4, 1577:20,	sheets [1] - 1643:7 shorthand [1] -	1532:13, 1544:22,
right-hand [4] -	schedule [2] -	1578:4, 1578:8,	snortnand [1] - 1524:18	1532.13, 1544.22, 1544:23
1566:16, 1629:23,	1560:8, 1617:23	1578:25, 1579:23,		sorry [25] - 1544:24,
1630:5, 1635:4	Scheuren [7] -	1580:13, 1581:17,	show [2] - 1566:8, 1569:23	1549:12, 1549:17,
Rob [2] - 1627:18,	1588:8, 1589:8,	1585:20, 1589:16,	showed [5] - 1569:6,	1549.12, 1549.17, 1560:13, 1561:20,
1627:19	1603:4, 1603:6,	1593:16, 1593:24,	1570:22, 1577:24,	1563:21, 1564:14,
ROBERT [1] - 1524:1	1603:9, 1603:15,	1595:18, 1598:2,	1609:20, 1627:20	1565:21, 1565:23,
Robertson [4] -	1608:20	1598:15, 1603:7,	showing [4] -	1568:6, 1572:25,
1554:10, 1602:6,	Scheuren's [4] -	1603:8, 1607:13,	1562:8, 1572:12,	1573:22, 1586:21,
1619:22, 1620:5	1541:1, 1587:24,	1610:16, 1611:24,	1599:23, 1639:15	1591:9, 1602:21,
ROBERTSON [1] -	1588:24, 1602:24	1628:1, 1630:1,	shown [6] - 1565:1,	1603:21, 1612:1,
1523:9	scoot [1] - 1614:14	1630:5, 1630:22,	1568:17, 1575:5,	1613:4, 1616:21,
Room [1] - 1524:15	scope [4] - 1586:5,	1630:24, 1635:19,	1609:7, 1627:9	1625:17, 1627:18,
roughly [6] -	1642:17, 1643:16,	1635:21, 1635:25,	shows [2] - 1563:13,	1629:1, 1631:6,
	1643:17	1640:1, 1640:8,		1632:2, 1637:6
1547:13, 1552:3,				
1547:13, 1552:3, 1567:18, 1586:25,	screen [4] - 1527:10,	1640:11, 1640:12,	1635:13 sic [1] - 1647:15	sort [2] - 1555:14,

1644:17	1537:16, 1541:9,	stuff [2] - 1593:17,	1629:5, 1631:16,	1547:18, 1547:23,
sound [1] - 1593:8	1549:14, 1605:20,	1629:20	1631:19, 1632:11,	1552:5, 1555:16,
sounds [8] -	1608:22, 1609:9	subcategory [1] -	1634:9, 1636:6,	1556:22, 1557:24,
1545:23, 1545:25,	starting [1] - 1612:9	1569:16	1636:11, 1636:15,	1571:24, 1576:6,
1547:19, 1577:2,	starts [1] - 1642:23	Subject [1] - 1620:4	1641:19	1576:11, 1582:3,
1593:4, 1604:5,	statement [7] -	subject [2] -	systems [2] -	1582:15, 1583:22,
1604:10, 1604:25	1527:13, 1581:20,	1542:12, 1631:25	1616:16, 1616:23	1585:12, 1585:18,
source [3] - 1616:4,	1583:18, 1601:6,	submit [1] - 1649:3	1010110, 1010.20	1586:11, 1586:13,
1617:20	1626:14, 1636:21	submitted [2] -	т	1587:24, 1588:2,
sources [3] -	statements [1] -	1550:16, 1648:23	•	1591:23, 1592:4,
1609:11, 1609:12,	1639:15	subsequent [1] -	table [1] - 1586:8	1600:7, 1611:12,
1616:6	STATES [2] - 1523:1,	1549:6	tabs [1] - 1589:13	1611:19, 1611:21,
spaces [1] - 1526:10	1523:9		talks [3] - 1582:12,	1612:5, 1613:1,
special [2] - 1630:23,	states [2] - 1531:13,	substantial [1] - 1644:22	1598:23, 1625:25	1613:15, 1614:1,
1631:7	1637:25		TAYLOR [1] -	1617:2, 1619:2,
Special [2] - 1631:3,	States [3] - 1531:14,	subtract [2] -	1523:23	1622:12, 1622:14,
1636:3	1638:1	1605:17, 1607:22	team [1] - 1542:4	1622:16, 1622:19,
specific [14] -		suggest [1] -	technical [1] -	1627:16, 1627:18,
Specific [14] - 1529:9, 1529:14,	Station [1] - 1524:8	1590:22	1574:2	1627:23, 1628:9,
	statisticians [1] -	Suite [2] - 1523:17,	technique [5] -	1629:3, 1632:20,
1530:6, 1538:5, 1548:16, 1560:3,	1586:9	1523:21	1588:17, 1588:20,	1633:1, 1633:2,
· · ·	statute [4] - 1531:22,	sum [2] - 1530:15,	1589:4, 1589:7	1633:4, 1633:9,
1561:10, 1585:8,	1532:23, 1533:2,	1594:1	techniques [2] -	1634:13, 1641:6,
1607:2, 1609:10, 1611:21, 1621:13	1536:5	summaries [2] -	1588:3, 1588:7	1641:11, 1641:14,
1611:21, 1621:13,	statutes [2] - 1531:1,	1594:17, 1648:7	term [2] - 1541:21,	1643:25, 1644:3,
1633:2, 1646:18	1531:10	summed [1] - 1594:2	1564:4	1644:13, 1644:16,
specifically [13] -	statutory [8] -	Sunday [2] -	terms [6] - 1547:12,	1644:18, 1644:21,
1533:2, 1534:21,	1530:11, 1530:15,	1549:15, 1595:24	1547:25, 1550:21,	1645:3, 1646:6,
1585:16, 1611:9,	1530:24, 1530:25,	supervision [1] -	1572:22, 1575:6	1648:5
1619:15, 1620:12,	1534:18, 1535:21,	1529:12	testified [27] -	testing [1] - 1580:13
1622:10, 1629:11,	1535:23, 1548:23	support [5] -	1528:12, 1528:15,	TGA [3] - 1638:1,
1632:13, 1632:19,	stayed [1] - 1608:8	1540:18, 1552:8,	1536:16, 1539:18,	1638:10, 1639:5
1643:19, 1646:10	Steagall [2] -	1552:13, 1553:2,	1539:20, 1539:24,	THE [82] - 1523:1,
specificity [1] -	1543:16, 1543:22	1553:4	1544:10, 1579:4,	1523:9, 1526:2,
1642:1	STEMPLEWICZ [1] -	supported [2] -	1585:2, 1585:8,	1530:1, 1530:13,
specifics [1] -	1524:6	1600:16, 1645:20	1585:13, 1590:11,	
1561:1	steps [1] - 1561:4	supposed [1] -	1591:10, 1591:13,	1530:14, 1531:23, 1536:10, 1540:3,
spreadsheet [13] -	still [9] - 1547:25,	1573:22	1598:21, 1599:15,	
1558:9, 1559:16,	1584:14, 1606:23,	suspect [3] -	1600:1, 1603:7,	1540:11, 1549:17,
1564:14, 1566:7,	1607:10, 1622:23,	1600:25, 1630:18,	1603:9, 1608:25,	1549:24, 1559:25,
1568:25, 1589:11,	1623:10, 1623:11,	1634:25	1610:9, 1611:8,	1574:22, 1575:3,
1589:20, 1589:24,	1624:18, 1638:1	sustain [2] -	1628:12, 1628:25,	1575:5, 1575:7,
1593:4, 1593:12,	STOCKTON [3] -	1531:24, 1643:24	1641:22, 1642:25,	1575:8, 1575:10,
1593:18, 1595:20,	1523:16, 1523:20,	Sustained [3] -		1575:11, 1575:22,
1597:15	1523:24	1540:3, 1540:11,	1643:2 testify [7] - 1532:11,	1575:24, 1576:1,
Springs [3] -	Stonestreet [1] -	1647:3		1576:2, 1578:16,
1635:15, 1635:24,	1650:3	system [37] -	1540:9, 1545:3,	1590:19, 1590:21,
1635:25	STONESTREET [1] -	1538:12, 1538:15,	1555:17, 1618:23,	1590:22, 1590:25,
stand [3] - 1592:3,	1524:14	1543:14, 1543:15,	1642:7	1591:3, 1591:5,
1632:19, 1648:25	stop [1] - 1574:22	1548:8, 1553:6,	testifying [10] -	1591:24, 1592:3,
standard [3] -	straight [3] -	1553:8, 1553:10,	1539:1, 1540:5,	1592:5, 1592:7,
1527:1, 1530:23,	1555:15, 1555:21,	1553:12, 1553:17,	1540:11, 1540:15,	1592:9, 1592:23,
1532:3	1557:9	1553:19, 1553:21,	1545:1, 1547:20,	1593:1, 1593:17,
standing [1] - 1584:4	STRAUSS [1] -	1553:23, 1554:4,	1556:20, 1558:10,	1594:14, 1594:16,
stands [2] - 1580:22,	1524:11	1554:9, 1578:12,	1603:24, 1643:21	1594:24, 1601:8,
1591:19	Street [5] - 1523:12,	1582:4, 1582:10,	testimony [69] -	1601:12, 1602:3,
start [6] - 1541:5,	1523:16, 1523:20,	1582:11, 1582:23,	1533:13, 1540:19,	1620:2, 1625:6,
1549:5, 1559:20,		1583:8, 1583:9,	1541:1, 1541:20,	1625:9, 1625:12,
1040.0, 1000.20,	1523:24 1524 4			
1585:19, 1637:20,	1523:24, 1524:4 strong (1) - 1553:4		1544:20, 1544:25,	1625:15, 1625:16,
	strong [1] - 1553:4	1583:12, 1583:17,	1545:9, 1545:11,	1625:18, 1628:17,
1585:19, 1637:20,				

16348, 1634-13, 163417, 16342, 1634-12, 163417, 16342, 16342, 163417, 163413, 16342, 16342, 16342, 16454, 16342, 16454, 16342, 16454, 16342, 16454, 16342, 16454, 16344, 16457, 16344, 16457, 16344, 16457, 16344, 16457, 16344, 16457, 16344, 16457, 164420, 16452, 164420, 16452, 16444, 164419, 16524, 16532, 16544, 16451, 16542, 16542, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16451, 16544, 16541, 16544, 16541, 165544, 165541, 165544, 16554, 16544, 16554, 16544, 16554, 16544, 16		1		1	
1634/17, 1634/20, 1637.18, 1562/20, 1636.23, 1632.11, 1638.11, 1638.12, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.13, 1638.14, 1639.13, 1638.14, 1639.13, 1638.14, 1639.14, 1642.24, 1642.14, 1638.14, 1639.12, 1568.14, 1639.12, 1568.14, 1639.12, 1568.14, 1569.12, 1569.12, 1569.12, 1569.12, 1569.12, 1569.12, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.1, 1567.24, 1617.6, 1562.24, 1565.13, 1575.25, 1568.5, 1661.14, 1567.6, 1562.24, 1565.13, 1575.23, 1568.14, 1561.15, 1567.1, 1567.24, 1617.6, 1562.24, 1565.13, 1557.23, 1567.24, 1567.1, 1567.24, 1617.5, 1562.24, 1565.13, 1557.23, 1567.24, 1567.1, 1567.24, 1	1634:8, 1634:13,	1548:4, 1623:5	1630:9, 1630:19,	1582:23, 1630:23,	1647:17, 1647:18,
16342.3, 1637.18, 16347, 1643.2, 1632.11, 1633.1, 1634.31, 1634.1, 1633.11, 1636.31, 1636.31, 1600.24 1633.11, 1636.31, 1636.31, 1636.32, 1633.8, 1633.2, 1639.2, 1649.4, 1649.7, 1561.3, 1651.91, 1691.24, 1639.11, 1628.8, 1642.23, 1643.2, 1647.2, 1657.2, 1553.3, 153.31, 153, 154, 1551.13, 1547.23, 1561.3, 1657.13, 1557.24, 1563.13, 1757.10, 1590.2, 1551.3, 1657.13, 1557.1, 1557.2, 1557.23, 1553.24, 1564.11, 1557.23, 1553.24, 1564.11, 1557.23, 1553.24, 1564.11, 1557.24, 1566.17, 1567.2, 1557.23, 1553.24, 1564.11, 1557.24, 1566.17, 1567.2, 1557.24, 1567.23, 1557.24, 1567.23, 1557.24, 1566.13, 1557.24, 1566.13, 1567.24, 1567.23, 1557.24, 1567.23, 1	1634:17, 1634:20,				
1638.8, 1638.13, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1638.20, 1639.2, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1643.24, 1644.14, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1644.25, 1643.24, 1645.2, 1643.24, 1645.2, 1644.24, 1645.2, 1644.24, 1645.2, 1644.24, 1645.2, 1645.24, 1645.2, 1645	1634:23, 1637:18,				trust [9] - 1532:5,
16325, 1643:17, 1643:24, 1644:17, 1633:24, 1647.3, 1557:17, 1575.7, 1642:26, 1646:25, 1647.20, 1645.2, 1647.3, 1677.13, 1575.77, 1557.7, 1648:3, 1648:15, 1647.3, 1647.13, 1575.77, 1557.7, 1648:3, 1648:15, 1647.20, 1645.2, 1657.21, 1557.2, 1568.1, 1551.12, 1551.4, 1551.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1577.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1577.3, 1557.2, 1577.3, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1557.2, 1	1638:8, 1638:13,	1648:7, 1648:22,	1636:10, 1640:24	1635:11, 1636:5,	
1642.20, 1644.17, 1642.20, 1647.22, 1647.23, 1647.23, 1647.22, 1647.25, 1647.22, 1647.25, 1648.3, 1648.15, 1669.6, 1649.25, 1648.5, 1648.25, 1648.5, 16	1638:20, 1639:2,	1649:4, 1649:7	transferred [4] -	1636:14, 1639:19,	1576:21, 1624:24,
i644/20, 1645/2, 1657:17, 1575.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1675.7, 1551.8, 1551.17, 1651.7, 1675.8, 1551.17, 1551.17, 1551.2, 1551.8, 1551.17, 1551.2, 1551.8, 1551.17, 1551.2, 1551.2, 1551.2, 1551.2, 1551.2, 1551.2, 1557.2,	1639:5, 1643:17,	took [17] - 1532:5,	1561:3, 1639:19,	1640:22, 1642:1,	1628:8, 1646:23,
1647.3, 1647.13, 1647.22, 1647.25, 1647.22, 1647.25, 1647.22, 1647.25, 1647.23, 1647.15, 1647.23, 1647.15, 1647.24, 1647.15, 1647.25	1643:24, 1644:17,	1539:13, 1539:15,	1640:16, 1640:23	1646:25	1647:20
1647.22, 1647.25, 1598.5, 1598.2, 1688.2, 1567.23, 1551.14, 1551.14, 1551.14, 1551.24, 1551.14, 1551.24, 1551.14, 1551.24, 1551.14, 1551.24, 1551.14, 1551.24, 1551.24, 1557.23, 1558.24, 1564.11, 1567.24, 1567.23, 1567.23, 1567.24, 1567.14, 1567.24,	1644:20, 1645:2,	1557:17, 1575:7,	transferring [1] -	Tribal [36] - 1533:23,	Trusts [1] - 1628:8
i648.3. i648.13. i66117.	1647:3, 1647:13,	1575:10, 1590:2,	1631:12	1551:8, 1551:13,	try [2] - 1559:17,
1648:18, 1648:25, 1649:6 1605:3, 1617:18, 1617:11, 1618:17, 1677:21, 1677:6, 1677:11, 1618:17, 1677:21, 1618:17, 1677:21, 1618:17, 1677:21, 1618:17, 1677:21, 1618:17, 1617:11, 1618:17, 1572:24, 1601:14, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1617:11, 1618:17, 1572:24, 1601:14, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1617:11, 1618:17, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1617:12, 1618:25, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1617:12, 1618:25, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1567:24, 1618:18, 1613:2, 1568:24, 1571:2, 1628:24, 1628:25, 1628:14, 1638:20, 1628:14, 1638:22, 1628:14, 1638:20, 1628:14, 1638:22, 1628:14, 1638:22, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:16, 1638:22, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:14, 1640:16, 1628:14, 1640:17, 1628:14, 1640:17, 1628:14, 1640:10, 1628:14, 1640:17, 1628:14, 1640:10, 1641:16, 1640:20, 1628:14, 1640:17, 1628:14, 1640:10, 1641:16, 1640:10, 1628:14, 1640:14, 1641:14, 1640:17, 1628:14, 1640:12, 1628:14, 1639:25, 1638:24, 1639:25, 1638:24, 1639:25, 1638:24, 1639:21, 1638:24, 1638:22, 1638:24, 1638:21, 1646:16, 1640:21, 1646:16, 1640:21, 1640:24, 1644:28, 1657:2, 1577:13, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1656:24, 1656:2, 1657:2, 1577:13, 1557:2, 1577:13, 1557:2, 1577:14, 1557:2, 1577:13, 1557:2, 1577:14, 1557:2, 1577:14, 15	1647:22, 1647:25,	1598:5, 1599:2,	transfers [45] -	1551:14, 1551:17,	1567:11
1649.6 1615.24, 1617.8, the. (p. 1641.12, there (p. 1601.14, there	1648:3, 1648:15,	1601:17, 1601:19,	1566:22, 1566:24,	1551:19, 1551:23,	trying [11] - 1549:22,
the(m 1641:12) 1677:11, 1518:17 1572:24, 1807:14, 1610:21, 1610:25, 1560:17, 1562:24, 1560:17, 1562:24, 1561:17, 1562:24, 1561:17, 1562:24, 1561:17, 1562:24, 1561:17, 1562:24, 1563:4, 1565:11, 1560:21, 1571:2, 1563:4, 1563:1, 1563:4, 1565:11, 1563:4, 1565:11, 1563:24, 1562:3, 1564:3, 1569:23, 1571:2, 1562:34, 1563:24, 1569:23, 1571:2, 1562:34, 1563:2, 1562:42, 1522:4, 1562:42, 1562:4, 1562:42, 1562:4, 1562:41, 1562:4, 1562:41, 1562:4, 1562:41, 1562:4, 1565:41, 1565:41, 1565:17, 1565:11, 1565:17, 1565:11, 1565:17, 1565:11, 1565:17, 1565:11, 1565:17, 1565:13, 1565:41, 1565:14, 1565:41, 1565:17, 1565:13, 1565:14, 1565:17, 1565:14, 1565:14, 1565:14, 1565:17, 1565:14, 1565:17, 1565:14, 1565:17, 1565:18, 1572:4, 1573:13, 1565:14, 1565:14, 1565:14, 1565:14, 1566:		1605:3, 1615:18,	1567:1, 1567:6,	1552:19, 1553:12,	1557:22, 1557:23,
theirs (n) = 1601:18 top (m) = 1527:11, 1548:9 1610:21, 1610:25, 1611:1, 1611:6, 1553:2, 1556:25, 1611:13, 1612:2, 1548:6 1661:27, 1562:24, 1563:22, 1563:23, 1566:16, 1566:27, 1561:16, 1565:7, 1611:13, 1612:2, 1562:15, 1566:23, 1579:22, 1597:20, 1569:24, 1569:25, 1569:24, 1569:24, 1569:24, 1569:14	1649:6	1615:24, 1617:8,	1567:8, 1572:9,	1553:24, 1554:11,	1557:24, 1565:19,
theoretical [1]- 152713, 155625, theory [2] - 153523, 1568:6 16113, 16132, 1568:7, 1668:16, 156920, 1568:17, 1568:3, 1568:6, 165820, 156923, 15712, 157022, 157720, 16048, 16345, 156923, 15712, 16048, 16345, 166923, 15712, 16048, 16345, 166923, 15712, 16048, 16345, 166923, 15712, 16048, 16345, 16286, 16287, 160418, 164017, 15655, 160210, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 16282, 160418, 164012, 164411, 164417, 15555, 160210, 164414, 16419, 153016, 153116, 15321, 154318, 154219 16332, 16343, 16284, 16322, 16322, 16282, 16322, 16282, 16322, 16332, 164110, 164017, 164118, 16422, 164113, 16422, 164213, 16422, 153517, 163511, 164118, 16422, 153517, 163511, 164118, 16422, 153517, 163511, 154219 153517, 163214, 16422, 153517, 16311, 154219 153517, 16322, 15311, 153517, 16311, 153517, 16311, 154219 153517, 163214, 16422, 153517, 16311, 153517, 16311, 154219 153517, 16322, 15311, 153517, 16311, 153517, 16311, 153512, 16471, 153512, 15471, 153512, 15471, 153713, 153716, 15413, 15473, 15414, 155123, 15413, 15471, 155115, 154717, 155124, 15413, 15471, 155115, 154717, 15521, 155117, 15521, 155271, 15414, 155123, 15414, 155123, 15414, 155123, 15414, 155124, 155125, 155271, 155125, 155127, 155127, 15		1617:11, 1618:17	1572:24, 1601:14,		1580:10, 1616:21,
1548:9 1561:16, 1565:7, 1566:17, 1566:3, 1566:17, 1566:3, 1566:16, 1569:20, 1571:2, 1566:16, 1569:20, 1571:2, 1562:3, 1562:3, 1623:2, 1623:2, 1623:2, 1623:2, 1623:2, 1640:10, 1640:10, 1640:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1602:10, 1565:6, 1628:7, 1564:14, 1464:3, 1552:10, 1550:1, 1565:24, 1565:2, 1565:24, 1563:25, 1562:24, 1563:2, 1628:12, 1628:25, 1644:14, 1642:3, 1552:10, 1555:24, 1552:1, 1528:5, 1562:24, 1563:1, 1641:10, 1641:17, 1562:9, 1555:24, 1565:2, 1565:24, 1563:2, 1633:7, 1633:11, 1565:14, 1567:2, 1555:24, 1565:2, 1565:24, 1565:2, 1565:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1566:19, 1567:24, 1568:14, 1565:26, 1567:14, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1563:23, 1565:14, 1565:24, 1563:23, 1565:14, 1565:24, 1563:23, 1565:14, 1565:24, 15652:24, 1562:24, 1562:24, 1562:24, 1562:24, 1562:24,	theirs [1] - 1601:18	top [17] - 1527:11,	1610:21, 1610:25,	1561:17, 1562:24,	1624:22, 1626:3,
theory [g] - 1535:23, 1548:6 1666:16, 1669:20, 1569:23, 1571:2, 1569:23, 1571:2, 1623:23, 1627.4, 1533:20, 1638:10, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1535:17, 1543:18, 1643:9, 1639:25, 1642:12, 1628:5, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:12, 1628:25, 1642:14, 1641:19, 1653:22, 1601:0, 1641:10, 1641:17, 1532:21, 1532:22, 1535:17, 1543:18, 1542:10 1523:4, 1539:10, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1532:21, 1532:22, 1532:12, 1528.5, 1532:24, 1633:2, 1542:19 1523:4, 1539:10, 1542:19 1523:4, 1539:10, 1552:2, 1532:12, 1528.5, 1532:24, 1533:2, 1532:12, 1528.5, 1532:24, 1533:24, 1532:12, 1558.5, 1532:24, 1533:24, 1557:22, 1573:13, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1567:24, 1566:2, 1567:24, 1568:1, 1567:24, 1568:1, 1568:24, 1568:23, 1568:1, 1568:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:24, 1569:24, 1562:2	theoretical [1] -	1527:13, 1556:25,			
1548:6 1569:23, 1571:2, therefore [r]- 1623:23, 1527:4, 1627:7, 1628:3, 1579:22, 1597:20, 1628:6, 1628:7, 1628:6, 1628:7, 1640:16, 1640:17, 1542:12, 1628:25, 1535:17, 1543:18, 1535:22, 1600:10, 1565:22, 1507:20, 1562:7, 1522:10, 1565:22, 1507:20, 1562:12, 1528:5, 1535:22, 1600:10, 1565:24, 1558:5, 1532:24, 1533:2, 1542:19 1633:20, 1530:10, 1640:20, 1640:17, 1542:13, 1542:14, 1641:17, 1565:21, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1555:2, 1552:2, 1552:1, 1552:2, 1555:2, 1552:2, 1552:1, 1552:2, 1555:2, 1552:2, 1551:1, 1552:2, 1552:1, 1552:2, 1552:1					
thereby (n) - 1638:3 1579:22, 1597:20, 1604.8, 1634.9, 1639.25, 1628.6, 1628.7, 1527.7, 1527.20, 1535.17, 1543.18, 1542.17, 1527.20, 1535.17, 1543.18, 1543.22, 1600:10, 1643.18, 1634.9, 1639.25, 1543.22, 1600:10, 1643.9, 1639.25, 1543.22, 1600:10, 1643.9, 1639.25, 1640.23, 1644.3, 1644.23, 1644.14, 1641.17, 1560.22, 1644.3, 1644.14, 1644.17, 1552.24, 1552.2, 1542.19 1542.19 1528.6, 1532.25, 1532.24, 1528.2, 1535.12, 1547.1, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1535.12, 1547.1, 1565.24, 1568.2, 1565.21, 1557.2, 1565.21, 1555.21, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.21, 1557.2, 1565.21, 1555.21, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.21, 1557.2, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.21, 1557.2, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.24, 1558.2, 1565.24, 1568.1, 1567.24, 1568.1, 1567.24, 1568.1, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1539.14, 1567.24, 1568.1, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1539.14, 1567.24, 1568.1, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1577.13, 1539.14, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1587.13, 1587.17, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1572.20, 1577.13, 1587.13, 1587.16, 1572.2, 1577.13, 1572.20, 1577.13, 1587.13, 1587.17, 1587.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1577.24, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1567.24, 1567.24, 1567.24, 1566.14, 1577.24, 1577.24, 1577.24, 1587.24, 1567.24, 1567.24, 1567.24, 1557.24, 1567.24, 1557.24, 15		, ,			
therefore(n)- 1604:8, 1634:6, 1628:6, 1628:7, 1640:18, 1640:20, 1622:13, 1623:20 1527.7, 1527:20, 1634:9, 1639:25, 1528:12, 1628:25, 1640:13, 1640:20, 1640:14, 1641:9, 1536:17, 1543:18, 1633:12, 1628:6, 1628:7, 1640:14, 1641:9, 1622:13, 1623:20 1536:17, 1543:18, 1532:2, 1629:4, 1641:10, 1641:17, 1632:14, 1640:20, 1632:14, 1641:17, 1532:16, 1532:15, 1532:24, 1632:2, 1631:16, 1630:21, 1642:13 1552:10, 1555:2, 1552:1, 1552:10, 1555:2, 1555:2, 1565:3, 1542:19 1528:6, 1532:5, 1633:2, 1633:11, 1642:14, 1657:2, 1555:2, 1565:18, 1565:24, 1566:18, 1536:17, 1530:20, 1551:1, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1632:20, 1637:10, 1635:14, 1567:21, 1557:20, 1565:17, 1567:24, 1566:18, 1536:12, 1563:20, 1561:1, 1532:2, 1581:1, 1646:5, 1646:10 Tribe's 0 - 1565:18, 1572:2, 0, 1577:19, 1572:2, 0, 1577:19, 1572:2, 0, 1577:19, 1572:2, 0, 1577:19, 1572:2, 1567:2, 1567:4, 1535:2, 1581:13, 1592:4, 1606:2, 1569:13, 1592:4, 1568:2, 1582:14, 1532:2, 1587:14, 1533:2, 1531:16, 1532:2, 1582:14, 1532:2, 1587:14, 1533:2, 1582:14, 1532:2, 15					
1527.7, 1527.20, 1538.22, 1643.13, 1538.22, 1600.10, 1538.22, 1600.10, 1538.22, 1600.10, 1538.22, 1600.10, 1538.22, 1528.1, 1538.12, 1528.5, 1538.22, 1537.10, 1538.22, 1547.1, 1538.22, 1557.1, 1538.22, 1557.1, 1538.22, 1557.1, 1538.22, 1557.1, 1610.24, 1638.20, 1638.21, 1640.5, 1599.21, 1648.9, 1547.1, 1548.18, 1557.2, 1577.13, 1547.2, 1547.1, 1547.2, 1547.1, 1547.1, 1547.1, 154				, ,	
153517, 154318, 153517, 154318, 156322, 160010, 160622 16312, 16412, 164117, 16292, 163013, 164110, 1641117, 16292, 163013, 164110, 1641117, 16292, 163013, 1641118, 164218, 1641117, 163211, 155521, 153212, 155521, 155521, 155521, 155622, 155514, 153223, 155514, 153223, 153224, 157121, 157220, 15719, 157223, 159224, 160621, 15322, 153123, 153524, 157121, 157220, 15322, 153121, 15322, 153121, 15322, 155113, 15322, 155114, 15322, 155213, 155114, 15322, 15413, 155114, 15413, 155115, 155114, 15413, 155114, 153214, 15322, 155213, 155114, 153214, 15322, 155114, 15413, 154113, 154114, 155125, 15423, 155114, 15413, 15411, 154215, 15424, 155114, 15424, 155214, 155424, 155114, 15424, 155214, 155424, 155114, 15424, 155		, ,			
1583:22, 1600:10, 1606:22 Total (n) - 1640:10 total (27) - 1526:22, 1528:1, 1528:1, 1528:2, 1528:5, 1542:19 1629:6, 1630:13, 1632:24, 1633:2, 1632:24, 1633:2, 1632:24, 1633:2, 1641:10, 1642:3, 1642:13 1641:10, 1641:17, 1642:3, 1662:3, 1662:3, 1642:13 1530:20, 1551:7, 1642:13, 1652:4, 1662:3, 1655:24, 1665:14, 1655:24, 1666:12, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1565:24, 1568:14, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1565:24, 1568:14, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1565:24, 1568:14, 1566:24, 1568:14, 1567:21, 1571:12, 1572:13, 1572:20, 1572:13, 1572:20, 1577:19, 1583:12, 1583:15, 1530:20, 1591:11, 1530:20, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1591:10, 1530:22, 1583:15, 1530:20, 1591:10, 1530:21, 1530:20, 1530:11, 1551:23, 1551:12, 1551:23, 1551:23, 1551:24, 1551:23, 1551:24, 1551:24, 1552:27, 1551:24, 1552:27,				, ,	,
1606.22 total (27 - 1526:22) 1630:16, 1630:21, 1641:18, 1642:8, 1552:10, 1555:21, 1563:13, 1565:11, 1528:6, 1532:5, 1533:11, 1583:2, 1533:12, 1547:1, 1633:24, 1633:2, 1642:13, 1565:22, 1565:3, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1633:24, 1562:24, 1568:4, 1572:2, 1573:19, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1572:2, 1573:19, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:54, 1565:24, 1568:24, 1568:25, 1569:14, 1568:23, 1567:14, 1568:24, 1563:24, 1563:24, 1563:24, 1563:24, 1563:24, 1636:24, 1648:13, 1577:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1566:4, 1646:11, 1645:17, 1568:10, 1647:20, 1522:14, 1622:14, 1622:14, 1622:14, 1623:14, 1535:22, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1561:4, 1562:14, 1646:14, 1646:17, 1524:15, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1534:14, 1535:12, 1534:14, 1535:12, 1534:14, 1535:12, 1534:14, 1535:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:14, 1532:17, 1534:14,			, ,		, ,
Therefore [1] - 1528:1, 1528:5, 1542:19 1632:24, 1633:2, 1633:11, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1633:21, 1633:11, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1633:21, 1633:14, 1635:14, 1647:9 1636:14, 1667:9, 1657:2, 1573:13, 1665:17, 1565:18, 1665:17, 1565:18, 1665:19, 1567:21, 1566:19, 1567:21, 1566:19, 1567:21, 1567:22, 1573:13, 1567:21, 1568:14, 1567:22, 1573:13, 1567:21, 1568:14, 1567:22, 1573:13, 1567:21, 1568:14, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1567:24, 1568:14, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1567:24, 1568:14, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1568:14, 1566:24, 1566:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1668:24, 1569:24, 1666:21, 1663:25 1568:14, 1568:24, 1569:24, 1666:21, 1569:24, 1666:21, 1569:24, 1666:24, 1569:24, 1666:24, 1569:24, 1666:24, 1569:24, 1666:24, 1569:24, 1666:24, 1569:24, 1660:24, 1563:24, 1569:24, 1563:24, 1569:24, 1563:24, 1569:24, 1563:24, 1569:24, 1563:24, 1569:24, 1564:21, 1660:5, 1599:217, tried [9] 1558:23, 1564:13, 1577:4 U 1599:24, 1601:9, 1599:24, 1601:9, 1599:24, 1601:9, 1599:24, 1601:9, 1551:25, 1599:271, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1599:271, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1599:17, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1552:17, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1551:17, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1551:17, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1559:17, 1541:9, 1572:15, 1559:17, 1541:9, 1577:14, 1551:17, 1541:9, 1542:17, 1552:5, 1542:8, 1582:4, 1582:4, 1582:4, 1551:17, 1542:4, 1582:4, 1582:4, 1582:4, 1563:10, 1577:13, 1532:20, 1111:11, 1611:12, 1552:5, 1532:8, 1633:10, 1567:10, 1111:11, 1611:12, 1552:15, 1552:5, 1532:8, 1633:10, 1623:21, 1623:21, 1553:13, 1553:13, 1633:21, 1643:22,			, ,		
1542:19 1528.6, 1532.5, 1533:12, 1547:1, 1533:21, 1547:1, 1565:24, 1568:2, 1565:24, 1568:14, 1572:21, 1581:1, 1564:21, 1562:2, 1567:21, 1567:29, 1572:21, 1582:15, 1572:21, 1582:16, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1582:12, 1572:21, 1572:13, 1598:13, 1596:25, 1599:24, 1606:2, 1633:20, 1633:20, 1633:20, 1633:21, 1548:18, 1566:23, 1563:19, 1566:23, 1563:19, 1566:24, 1562:23, 1566:24, 1566:24, 1566:25, 1583:14, 1566:25, 1583:14, 1566:26, 1646:11, 1566:27, 1568:18, 1577:4 1566:27, 1565:2, 1584:4, 1585:10, 1564:4, 1554:27, 1584:4, 1585:10, 1564:8, 1577:4 1600:8, 1660:1, 1566:23, 1563:19, 1677:12, 1560:4, 1566:24, 1562:23, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1677:14, 1574:14, 1555:27, 1574:14, 1557:74, 1574:14, 1557:74, 1574:15, 1551:77, 1524:15, 1577:4 1600:8, 1661:1, 1600:8, 1677:10, 1541:10, 1571:10, 1541:10, 1571:10, 154		,			
they've [t] - 1648:23 1535:12, 1547:1, 1535:12, 1547:1, 1535:12, 1547:1, 1535:12, 1537:19, 1535:12, 1537:19, 1535:12, 1537:19, 1537:13, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1557:2, 1573:13, 1555:14, 1640:17, 1640:23, 1647:9 1557:2, 1573:13, 1640:23, 1647:9 1558:17, 1565:18, 1558:17, 1565:18, 1558:14, 1640:17, 1540:23, 1647:9 1530:20, 1591:1, 1530:20, 1591:1, 1640:21, 1648:9 1579:21, 1581:15, 1598:10, 1613:20, 1598:10, 1613:20, 1635:21, 1580:12, 1633:21, 1580:12, 1633:21, 1580:12, 1640:1, 1633:20 1587:13, 1587:16, 1533:24, 1532:24, 1633:15, 1635:24, 1633:15, 1635:24, 1633:15, 1635:24, 1633:15, 1635:24, 1633:16, 1643:12, 1646:11, 1646:11, 1646:11, 1646:11, 1646:11, 1646:11, 1646:12, 1646:11, 1646:13, 1577:4 1633:16, 1635:24, 1633:16, 1636:31, 1633:16, 1636:31, 1646:13, 1677:4 1633:24, 1601:9, 1633:24, 1601:9, 1633:24, 1601:9, 1647:24, 1601:9, 1647:24, 1601:9, 1647:24, 1601:9, 1649:15, 1657:14, 1649:16, 1657:10, 1649:17, 1649:17, 1649:16, 1657:10, 1649:17, 1649:17, 1649:17, 1649:17, 1649:18, 1627:11, 1649:17, 1649:18, 1627:12, 1649:14, 1649:12, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1659:16, 1657:10, 1649:14, 1659:16, 1657:10, 1649:14, 1659:17, 1649:14, 1652:13, 1640:14, 1649:16, 1657:10, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1657:10, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:17, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1649:16, 1649:14, 1640					
thingamajigger [1] 1565:24, 1568:2, 1572:2, 1573:19, 1572:2, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:13, 1572:20, 1577:14, 1583:20, 1572:13, 1572:20, 1577:14, 1583:20, 1587:3, 1587:16, 1562:23, 1585:14, 1563:24, 1640:17, 1572:14, 1582:4, 1572:15, 1582:17, 1566:23, 1581:4, 1563:24, 1640:12, 1566:23, 1581:4, 1566:23, 1581:4, 1563:24, 1640:12, 1646:2, 1646:21, 1566:23, 1581:4, 1563:24, 1640:14, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1563:24, 1601:9, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1563:24, 1601:9, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1571:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1571:21, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1571:21, 1579:15, 1581:17, 1571:21, 1571:21, 1571:21, 1571:21, 1572:13, 1572:15, 1591:17, 1571:21, 1571:21, 1571:21, 1572:13, 1572:15, 1581:17, 1572:12, 1577:13, 1572:14, 1582:24, 1563:16, 1567:10, 1572:12, 1577:13, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1581:4, 1652:4, 1551:55, 1582:71, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1581:4, 1652:4, 1551:4, 1572:15, 1551:4, 1551:5, 1551:4, 1551:5, 1551:4, 1551:5, 1551:4, 1551:24, 1551:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:14, 1552:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552:13, 1582:5, 1552					
1638:15 1572:2, 1573:19, 1637:13, 1639:14, 1640:23, 1647:9 1567:24, 1586:1, 1538:15 1579:21, 1581:1, 16465, 1646:10 Tribe (a) - 1564.7, 1577:20, 1571:9, 1530:20, 1591:1, 1585:23, 1595:14, 1585:23, 1535:14, 1570:20, 1571:9, 1587:8, 1596:25, 1640:21, 1648:9 1585:23, 1585:12, 1588:10, 1613:20, 1535:2, 1581:13, 1535:25, 1581:13, 1592:24, 1506:21, 1610:4, 1633:20 1626:12, 1632:20, 1535:1, 1587:16, 1635:25, 1581:13, 1635:15, 1635:24, 1599:24, 1606:21, 1633:10, 1638:10, 1636:21, 1640:5 1592:15, 1592:17, 170be's(1) - 1586:3, 1633:16, 1643:12, 1633:16, 1643:12, 1648:13, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1561:23, 1565:14, 1561:24, 1528:10, 1584:8, 1586:10, 1561:8, 1577:4 1561:8, 1577:4 1569:24, 1601:9, 1648:12, 1582:11, 1564:22, 1646:23, 1561:12, 1533:11, 1531:14, 1535:22, 1561:15, 1551:17, 1531:14, 1532:24, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1670:15, 1550:17, 1532:14, 1532:20, 1551:23, 1553:11, 1561:24, 1532:24, 1561:24, 1533:17, 1532:4, 1532:2, 1561:4, 1562:4, 1532:2, 1561:4, 1562:43, 1532:1, 1562:43, 1532:1,					
thinking [4] - 1530:20, 1591:1, 1640:21, 1648:9 1579:21, 1581:1, 1538:12, 1583:15, 1538:11, 1580:12, 1585:10, 1512:0, 1538:21, 1583:15, 1538:21, 1583:12, 1538:21, 1580:12, 1610:4, 1633:20 1579:21, 1581:1, 1583:23, 1593:14, 1538:24, 1533:24, 1538:24, 1533:24, 1538:24, 1538:24, 1538:24, 1538:24, 1635:25 1570:20, 1571:9, 1577:12, 1572:13, 1596:13, 1596:25, 1598:10, 1613:20, 1636:21, 1640:5 1577:17, 1587:18, 1587:17, 1587:18, 1635:25 1577:13, 1597:20, 1587:13, 1587:16, 1635:25 1577:13, 1597:20, 1587:13, 1587:16, 1635:25 1577:13, 1597:20, 1587:13, 1587:16, 1635:25 1599:13, 1596:25, 1599:14, 1533:14, 1635:25 1599:13, 1596:25, 1638:12, 1566:21, 1640:5 1577:17, 1587:18, 1637:12, 1557:17, 1556:23, 1567:14, 1599:24, 1601:9, 1609:6, 1610:1, 1509:24, 1601:9, 1609:6, 1610:1, 1509:15 1580:12, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1577:14, 1551:17, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1551:17, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1551:17, 1577:14, 1577:13, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1577:13, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1577:14, 1577:13, 1581:14, 1582:27, 1582:15, 1551:17, 1582:4, 1582:27, 1594:17, 1524:15, 1577:14, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:15, 1551:17, 1594:7, 1594:17, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:17, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:17, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:17, 1577:14, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1577:13, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1594:27, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1594:27, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1594:27, 1594:7, 1594:27, 1594:27, 1594:7, 1595:20, 1594:14, 1565:21, 1594:14, 1565:38, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1594:14, 1565:14, 1594:14, 1565:14, 1594:14, 1565:18, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1594:14, 1635:22, 1627:17, 1627:15, 1622:17, 1627:15, 1622:17, 1627:15, 1622:17, 1627:16, 1627:17, 1627:16, 1627:17, 1627:16, 1					
1530:20, 1591:1, 1640:21, 1648:9 1583:12, 1583:15, 1598:10, 1613:20, 1598:10, 1613:20, 1626:12, 1632:20, 1633:20 Treasury (19) - 1533:23, 1533:24, 1533:23, 1533:24, 1533:24, 1571:12, 1572:13, 1635:2, 1581:13, 1635:2, 1581:13, 1635:2, 1581:13, 1635:2, 1581:13, 1635:2, 1581:13, 1635:2, 1582:13, 1633:20 1587:14, 1636:24, 1635:2, 1626:12, 1636:21, 1640:5 1587:17, 1587:18, 1635:2, 1582:15, 1592:17, 1636:21, 1640:5 1587:17, 1587:18, 1635:2, 1582:13, 1646:13, 1635:21, 1640:5 1587:17, 1587:18, 1635:23, 1563:19, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1563:23, 1567:14, 1551:25 1646:19, 1646:2, 1646:21, 1625:10, 1646:8, 1646:11, 1645:17 1633:16, 1643:12, 1648:13 1648:13 1648:13 1600:15, 9, 1600:6, 1610:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1617:12, 1630:4 1557:15, 1580:12, 1629:22 1646:2, 1646:23, 1646:22, 1646:23, 1647:20 17uet [4] - 1639:7, 17uet [4] - 1531:7, 1531:4, 1535:27, 1531:4, 1535:17, 1532:4, 1532:6 U 1610:18, 1615:9, 1617:12, 1630:4 1629:22 treated [1] - 1565:19, 1639:15 1537:12, 1539:20, 1537:12, 1539:20, 1541:9, 1542:3 1551:23, 1553:11, 1532:4, 1532:6 U.S [6] - 1524:3, 1532:4, 1532:6 1541:9, 1542:3, 1615:9, 167:12 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1542:13, 1627:11, 1611:11, 1611:12, 1628:11, 1645:5, 1582:4, 1582:13, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1544:10, 1532:21, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1544:10, 1532:21, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1544:16, 1532:21, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1544:10, 1532:21, 1628:11, 1645:5, 1582:4, 1582:13, 1640:18, 1642:16, 1628:11, 1645:5, 1628:11, 1640:17, 1628:11, 1645:5, 1628:12, 1628:21, 1608:17 1646:8, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1628:14, 1645:7, 1628:14, 1645:7, 1628:14, 1645:7, 1628:14, 1646:17, 1628:14, 1645:21, 1640:18, 1642:16, 1627:14, 1623:2,					
1640:21, 1648:9 1585:23, 1595:14, 1533:23, 1533:24, 1571:12, 1572:13, 1596:13, 1566:25, 1610:4, 1633:20 1626:12, 1632:20, 1535:2, 1581:13, 1635:15, 1635:24, 1599:24, 1606:21, 1633:20 1636:21, 1640:5 1592:17, 1587:18, Tribe's (I) - 1586:3 1635:23, 1636:19, 1636:21, 1640:5 1635:22, 1685:10, 1563:23, 1563:19, 1036:14, 1636:19, 1552:18, 1607:20, 1622:11, tribe's (I) - 1586:3, 1648:13 1563:23, 1567:14, 1551:25, 1646:22, 1646:23, true (I) - 1639:7, 1561:8, 1577:4 1561:8, 1577:4 1609:6, 1610:1, 1639:15, 1639:15, 1637:12, 1531:13, 1531:14, 1535:22, 1561:8, 1577:4 1524:3, 1524:3, 1524:3, 1524:3, 1524:15, 1533:19, 1617:12, 1630:4 1639:15, 1639:15, 1537:12, 1539:20, 1551:25, 1551:17, U.S [6] - 1524:3, 1524:2, 1524:3, 1524:7, 1524:3, 1524:7, 1524:15, 1533:22, 1616:9, 1617:12 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1542:17, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1551:21, 1557:10, 1551:21, 1577:11, 1541:13, 1582:24, 1582:7, 1561:4, 1551:21, 1582:7, 1541:19, 1524:5, 1578:21, 1582:7, 1541:19, 1577:13, 1541:13, 1582:13, 1582:13, 1561:14, 1565:4, 1567:10, 11-559:17, 1524:15, 1578:21, 1582:7, 1561:4, 1565:4, 1565:4, 1565:4, 1562:13, 1562:4, 1577:14, 1565:5, 1578:21, 1582:7, 1561:4, 1565:4, 1565:4, 1565:4, 1562:4, 1577:14, 1565:5,	• • •				
third [3] - 1580:12, 1610:4, 1633:20 1598:10, 1613:20, 1626:12, 1632:20, 1636:14, 1636:19, 1633:20 1535:2, 1581:13, 1635:15, 1635:24, 1635:25 1635:14, 1640:51, 1635:25 1599:24, 1606:21, 1610:18, 1621:8, 1633:30 three [i3] - 1548:18, 1556:23, 1567:14, 1556:23, 1567:14, 1559:24, 1601:1, 1609:6, 1610:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1560:23, 1567:14, 1559:24, 1601:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1609:6, 1610:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1617:12, 1630:4 1635:12, 1587:13, 1648:124, 1582:10, 1646:23, 1646:11, 1646:22, 1646:23, 1646:23, 1646:11, 1646:22, 1646:23, 1646:23, 1646:11, 1646:22, 1646:23, 1646:23, 1646:21, 1646:22, 1646:23, 1646:24, 1646:11, 1645:17 1648:13 types [3] - 1500:4, 1561:8, 1577:4 1609:6, 1610:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1617:12, 1630:4 1639:15, 1635:19, 1639:15, 1580:12, 1639:15, 1580:12, 1639:15, 1580:12, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1543:19, 1639:15, 1542:43, 1639:15, 1543:10, 1541:6, 1582:20, 1551:17, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1609:17, 1561:4, 1541:6, 1582:23, 1600:17, 1623:12, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1562:6, 1553:10, 1562:6, 1553:10, 1562:1, 1562:13, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1562:14, 1562:13, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1562:14, 1562:13, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1562:14, 1623:21, 1623:21, 1608:17, 1608:17, 1608:17, 1608:17, 1608:17, 1608:17, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1608:17, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1608:17, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1608:17, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1623:14, 1623:2, 1623:14, 1623:2,			• • •		
Interior 1626:12, 1632:20, 1636:12, 1632:20, 1637:13, 1587:16, 1635:25 1635:25 1610:18, 1621:8, 1633:12, 1643:12, 1633:32 third-party [i] - 1636:21, 1640:5 1587:17, 1587:18, 1592:17, 1592:17, 1592:17, 1592:17, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1551:25 1648:13 1648:13 three [i] - 1548:18, 1556:23, 1563:19, 1551:25 totally [i] - 1548:1 totally [i] - 1528:18, 1666:23, 1646:21, 1646:23, 1646:23, 1646:24, 1601:9, 1577:4 1541:25 1646:8, 1646:11, 1645:17 1647:20 True [i] - 1639:7 U 1610:1, 1599:24, 1601:9, 1570:15, 1580:12, 1647:20 treated [i] - 1555:19 1531:14, 1535:22, 1646:23, 1531:14, 1535:22, 1551:17, 1524:15, 1577:4 U U 1617:12, 1630:4 1629:22 treaty [i] - 1531:13 1531:14, 1535:22, 1553:11, 1551:17, 1524:15, 1553:77, 1524:15, 1553:77, 1524:15, 1553:77, 1524:15, 1553:77, 1524:15, 1553:77, 1561:4, 1533:22, 1553:11, 1551:17, 1553:11, 1553:12, 1553:11, 1553:12, 1553:11, 1553:12, 1553:11, 1553:12, 1553:11, 1553:12, 1553:11, 1553:22, 1553:11, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1554:15, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1559:17, 1554:12, 1557:13, 1554:5, 15572:1, 15571:14, 1558:22, 11582:13, 15571:14, 1579:1571:13, 1541:6, 1562:19, 1564:14, 1579:15, 15571:14, 1579:1571:13, 1541:6, 1562:14, 1638:6 1622:12, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1628:13, 1608:17 1608:17 11608:17 three					
third-party [1] - 1634:14, 1636:19, 1587:17, 1587:18, Tribe's [1] - 1636:3 1633:16, 1643:12, three [13] - 1548:18, totally [1] - 1548:2 1607:20, 1622:11, tribe's [1] - 1583:8 tribe's [1] - 1583:8 1648:13 three [13] - 1548:18, totals [2] - 1528:18, 1622:21, 1646:23, tried [4] - 1555:23, 1648:13 types [3] - 1560:4, 1559:24, 1601:9, towards [1] - 1528:1 1646:22, 1646:23, true [1] - 1639:7 U.S [5] - 1524:3, 1609:6, 1610:1, transaction [3] - 1647:20 Trust [42] - 1531:7, 1531:14, 1535:22, U.S [5] - 1524:3, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1570:15, 1580:12, treated [1] - 1528:13, trial [16] - 1528:13, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1524:7, 1524:15, 1617:12 transactions [1] - trial [16] - 1528:13, 1551:17, 1557:17, 1532:4, 1532:6 U.S.C [2] - 1531:7, 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [3] - 1581:24, 1584:24, 1563:16, 1567:10, Ulimate [1] - 1582:5 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [3] - 1524:17, 1552:5, 1557:9, 1577:13, 1541:6, 1582:23 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [1] - 1524:11, 1645:5, 1582:8, 1582:10, 1688:17, 1688:17, 1616:18					
1633:20 1636:21, 1640:5 1592:15, 1592:17, 1636:23, 1563:19, tribes (1) - 1583:8 tried (4) - 1555:23, 1566:23, 1563:19, 1648:13 types (3) - 1560:4, 1564:8, 1585:10, 1566:23, 1563:19, 1569:24, 1601:9, 1599:24, 1601:9, totals (2) - 1528:18, 1551:25 1646:8, 1646:11, 1646:8, 1646:23, 1646:22, 1646:23, tribes (1) - 1583:8 tried (4) - 1555:23, 1584:8, 1585:10, 1648:13 types (3) - 1560:4, 1561:8, 1577:4 1609:6, 1610:1, 1509:6, 1610:1, 1610:18, 1615:9, 1617:12, 1630:4 transaction (3) - 1629:22 treated (1) - 1565:19 treaty (1) - 1531:13, 1647:20 true (1) - 1639:7, 1531:14, 1535:22, 1651:15, 1551:17, 1615:9, 1617:12 U.S [5] - 1524:3, 1524:7, 1524:15, 1532:4, 1532:6, 1551:25, 1559:7, 1561:4, U.S.C [2] - 1531:7, 1541:9, 1542:3, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1541:9, 1542:3, 1541:9, 1542:3, 1541:9, 1542:3, 1551:17, 1524:18, 1627:11, 1616:18, 1621:5, 1568:25 U.S.C [2] - 1531:7, 1541:9, 1542:3, 1541:13, 1545:24, 1551:11, 1645:5, 1582:8, 1582:13, 1641:12, 1577:9, 1577:13, 1645:8, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1623:21, 1623:12, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1641:12, 1638:6, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1594:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:10, 1578:10, 1544:110, 1532:4, 1553:6, 1553:8, 1640:12, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1625:3, 1638:2, 1640:13, 1642:17, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1622:12, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1622:1				Tribe's [1] - 1636:3	
three transactions totally totalls totalls totally totaly totally totally					
Tisbe 19, 1563; 19, 1563; 19, 1563; 19, 1551; 25 totals [2] - 1528; 18, 1521; 25 1622: 21, 1625: 10, 1646; 23, 1646; 11, 1645; 17 1561: 8, 1577; 4 1599: 24, 1601: 9, 1599; 24, 1601: 9, 1609; 6, 1610; 1, 1609; 6, 1610; 1, 1610; 18, 1615; 9, 1617; 12, 1630; 4 transaction [3] - 1647; 20 true [1] - 1639; 7 Trust [42] - 1531; 7, 1531; 7, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 14, 1535; 22, 1531; 15, 1543; 19, 1542; 13, 1551; 15, 1551; 15, 1551; 15, 1551; 15, 1551; 15, 1551; 17, 1524; 15, 1531; 12, 1539; 20, 1551; 23, 1553; 11, 1532; 4, 1532; 6 U.S [5] - 1524; 3, 1524; 15, 1524; 15, 1532; 6, 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 1532; 2, 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 1539; 10, 1541; 16, 1562; 19, 1551; 15, 1551; 15, 1551; 17, 1532; 4, 1532; 6 U.S.C [2] - 1531; 7, 1532; 6, 1569; 7, 1561; 4, 1533; 22, 1151; 1551; 15, 1552; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1621; 15, 1552; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1621; 15, 1552; 1552; 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1621; 15, 1552; 1552; 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1621; 15, 1552; 1552; 1552; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1622; 13, 1161; 11, 1611; 12, 1577; 1, 1577; 1, 1541; 16, 1582; 23 11511; 1531; 7, 1542; 15, 1552; 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 11542; 15, 1552; 1552; 1552; 1559; 7, 1561; 4, 11661; 1622; 14, 1645; 5, 1552; 8, 1562; 13, 11612; 14, 1645; 7, 1562; 13, 11612; 15, 1621; 17, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 12, 1554; 14, 1576; 18, 1645; 17, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1622; 14, 1623; 2, 1624; 1624; 18 <td></td> <td>totally [1] - 1548:2</td> <td>1607:20, 1622:11,</td> <td>tried [4] - 1555:23,</td> <td></td>		totally [1] - 1548:2	1607:20, 1622:11,	tried [4] - 1555:23,	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		• • • •	1622:21, 1625:10,	1584:8, 1585:10,	
1599:24, 1601:9, towards [1] - 1528:1 1646:22, 1646:23, 1647:20 true [1] - 1639:7 U 1609:6, 1610:1, transaction [3] - 1610:18, 1615:9, 1570:15, 1580:12, treated [1] - 1565:19 1531:14, 1535:22, 1524:3, 1617:12, 1630:4 1629:22 treaty [1] - 1531:13 1538:15, 1543:19, 1524:7, 1524:15, Three [1] - 1548:19 transactions [1] - trial [16] - 1528:13, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1532:4, 1532:6 three-quarters [2] - 1639:15 1537:12, 1539:20, 1551:23, 1553:11, U.S. [2] - 1531:7, 1615:9, 1617:12 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1542:17, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, Using tent [1] - 1582:5, 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [3] - 1585:11, 1585:24, 15571:21, 15771:1, 1541:6, 1582:23, tie [1] - 1559:17 1524:18, 1627:11, 1611:11, 1611:12, 1577:9, 1577:13, 1411mate [1] - 1582:5, title [1] - 1531:7 transcription [1] - 1628:11, 1645:5, 1582:8, 1582:13, 1608:17 title [1] - 1570:15 transcripts [1] - 1544:8 1607:9, 1611:2, un-highlighted [1] - title [1] - 1570:15 transcripts [1] - T		1551:25	1646:8, 1646:11,	1645:17	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		towards [1] - 1528:1	1646:22, 1646:23,	true [1] - 1639:7	U
1610:18, 1615:9, 1570:15, 1580:12, treated [1] - 1565:19 1531:14, 1535:22, U.S [5] - 1524:3, 1617:12, 1630:4 1629:22 treaty [1] - 1531:13 1538:15, 1543:19, 1524:7, 1524:15, Three [1] - 1548:19 transactions [1] - trial [16] - 1528:13, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1532:4, 1532:6 three-quarters [2] - 1639:15 1537:12, 1539:20, 1551:23, 1553:11, 1532:4, 1532:6 1615:9, 1617:12 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1542:17, 1552:5, 15597, 1561:4, 1533:22 three-quarters [2] - 1523:8 1581:24, 1584:24, 1563:16, 1567:10, ultimate [1] - 1582:5 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [3] - 1585:11, 1585:24, 1571:21, 1577:1, 1541:6, 1582:23 tie [1] - 1559:17 1524:18, 1627:11, 1611:11, 1611:12, 1577:9, 1577:13, ultimate [1] - 1582:23 ties [1] - 1531:7 transcription [1] - 1628:11, 1645:5, 1582:8, 1582:13, 1508:17 title [1] - 1531:7 transcripts [1] - Trial [2] - 1524:6, 1607:9, 1611:2, un-highlighted [1] - title [1] - 1538:10, Transfer [1] - 1636:2 tribal [22] - 1551:14, 1607:9, 1611:2, 1596:5 1608:17 title [1] -			1647:20	Trust [42] - 1531:7,	
1617:12, 1630:4 1629:22 treaty [1] - 1531:13 1538:15, 1543:19, 1524:7, 1524:15, Three [1] - 1548:19 transactions [1] - trial [16] - 1528:13, 1551:15, 1551:17, 1532:4, 1532:6 three-quarters [2] - 1639:15 1537:12, 1539:20, 1551:23, 1553:11, 1533:22 1615:9, 1617:12 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1542:17, 1552:5, 1559:7, 1561:4, 1533:22 Thursday [2] - 1523:8 1581:24, 1584:24, 1563:16, 1567:10, ultimate [1] - 1582:5 1541:9, 1542:3 transcript [3] - 1585:11, 1585:24, 1577:9, 1577:13, ultimately [2] - 1568:25 1650:4 1616:18, 1621:5, 1578:21, 1582:7, 1608:17 title [1] - 1531:7 transcription [1] - 1628:11, 1645:5, 1582:8, 1582:13, unfightighted [1] - title [1] - 1534:14, transcripts [1] - 1638:6 1607:9, 1611:2, unaffected [1] - 1539:6, 1539:13, 1541:13 1638:6 1625:3, 1638:2, 1596:5 uncashed [10] - 1544:10, 1578:10, Transfer [1] - 1636:2 tribal [2] - 1551:14, 1639:19, 1640:17, 1622:15, 1621:17, 1622:2, 1622:12, 159:7, 1595:20, transfer [14] -		1570:15, 1580:12,	treated [1] - 1565:19	1531:14, 1535:22,	
Three [1] - 1548:19transactions [1] -trial [16] - 1528:13,1551:15, 1551:17,1532:4, 1532:6three-quarters [2] -1639:151537:12, 1539:20,1551:12, 1553:11,U.S.C [2] - 1531:7,1615:9, 1617:12TRANSCRIPT [1] -1542:17, 1552:5,1559:7, 1561:4,U.S.C [2] - 1531:7,Thursday [2] -1523:81581:24, 1584:24,1563:16, 1567:10,ultimate [1] - 1582:51541:9, 1542:3transcript [3] -1585:11, 1585:24,1571:21, 1577:1,ultimate [1] - 1582:3tie [1] - 1559:171524:18, 1627:11,1611:11, 1611:12,1577:9, 1577:13,ultimately [2] -ties [1] - 1568:251650:41616:18, 1621:5,1578:21, 1582:7,un-highlighted [1] -title [1] - 1531:7transcription [1] -1628:11, 1645:5,1582:8, 1582:13,un-highlighted [1] -title [1] - 1534:14,transcripts [1] -Trial [2] - 1524:6,1623:12, 1623:21,unaffected [1] -title [1] - 1539:13,1541:131638:61625:3, 1638:2,uncashed [10] -1544:10, 1578:10,Transfer [1] - 1636:2tribal [2] - 1551:14,1639:19, 1640:17,1621:15, 1621:17,1594:7, 1595:20,transfer [1] -1554:3, 1554:8,1644:11, 1645:7,1622:2, 1622:12,1607:23, 1627:9,1541:16, 1562:19,1554:3, 1554:8,1644:11, 1645:7,1622:2, 1622:12,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1554:14, 1576:18,1645:21, 1646:17,1623:8, 1623:20,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1554:14, 1576:18,1645:21, 1646:17,1624:6, 1624:18 <td></td> <td>1629:22</td> <td>treaty [1] - 1531:13</td> <td>1538:15, 1543:19,</td> <td></td>		1629:22	treaty [1] - 1531:13	1538:15, 1543:19,	
three-quarters [2] -1639:151537:12, 1539:20,1551:23, 1553:11,U.S.C [2] - 1531:7,1615:9, 1617:12TRANSCRIPT [1] -1542:17, 1552:5,1559:7, 1561:4,1533:22Thursday [2] -1523:81581:24, 1584:24,1563:16, 1567:10,ultimate [1] - 1582:51541:9, 1542:3transcript [3] -1585:11, 1585:24,1577:9, 1577:13,ultimate [1] - 1582:5tie [1] - 1559:171524:18, 1627:11,1611:11, 1611:12,1577:9, 1577:13,ultimately [2] -ties [1] - 1568:251650:41616:18, 1621:5,1578:21, 1582:7,un-highlighted [1] -title [1] - 1531:7transcription [1] -1628:11, 1645:5,1582:8, 1582:13,un-highlighted [1] -title [1] - 1570:151524:191645:81607:9, 1611:2,unaffected [1] -today [11] - 1534:14,transcripts [1] -Trial [2] - 1524:6,1623:12, 1623:21,1596:5today [11] - 1534:13,1541:131638:61625:3, 1638:2,uncashed [10] -1544:10, 1578:10,Transfer [1] - 1636:2tribal [22] - 1551:14,1639:19, 1640:17,1621:15, 1621:17,1594:7, 1595:20,transfer [1] -1553:6, 1553:8,1640:18, 1642:16,1622:2, 1622:12,1607:23, 1627:9,1541:16, 1562:19,1554:3, 1554:8,1644:11, 1645:7,1622:14, 1623:2,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1554:14, 1576:18,1645:21, 1646:17,1623:8, 1623:20,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1576:20, 1577:14,1646:25, 1647:15,1624:6, 1624:18		transactions [1] -	,	1551:15, 1551:17,	
1615:9, 1617:12TRANSCRIPT [1] -1542.17, 1532.5,1539.7, 1501.4,Thursday [2] -1523:81581:24, 1584:24,1563:16, 1567:10,1541:9, 1542:3transcript [3] -1585:11, 1585:24,1571:21, 1577:1,tie [1] - 1559:171524:18, 1627:11,1611:11, 1611:12,1577:9, 1577:13,ultimately [2] -ties [1] - 1568:251650:41616:18, 1621:5,1578:21, 1582:7,un-highlighted [1] -title [1] - 1570:151524:191645:81607:9, 1611:2,unaffected [1] -today [11] - 1534:14,transcripts [1] -Trial [2] - 1524:6,1623:12, 1623:21,1596:5today [11] - 1534:14,transcripts [1] -Trial [2] - 1524:6,1625:3, 1638:2,uncashed [10] -today [11] - 1534:14,transcripts [1] -Trial [2] - 1551:14,1639:19, 1640:17,1621:15, 1621:17,1594:7, 1595:20,transfer [1] - 1636:2tribal [22] - 1551:14,1640:18, 1642:16,1622:2, 1622:12,1607:23, 1627:9,1541:16, 1562:19,1554:3, 1554:8,1644:11, 1645:7,1622:14, 1623:2,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1554:14, 1576:18,1645:21, 1646:17,1623:8, 1623:20,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1554:14, 1576:18,1645:21, 1646:17,1623:8, 1623:20,1629:18, 1635:21610:13, 1612:24,1576:20, 1577:14,1646:25, 1647:15,1624:6, 1624:18		1639:15			
Thursday [2] - 1523.8 1501.24, 1004.24, 1004.24, 1004.24, 1000.10, 10000.10, 1000.10, 1000.10, 10000.10, 1000.10,	1615:9, 1617:12	TRANSCRIPT [1] -		, ,	
1541:9, 1542:3 transcript[3] - 1600:141, 1000:14, 1000:14, 1011;1	Thursday [2] -	1523:8			
tie [1] - 1559:17 1524, 18, 1027, 11, 1611, 17, 1011, 12, 1617, 13, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1617, 15, 1517	1541:9, 1542:3				• · · ·
ties [1] - 1568:25 1650.4 1610.16, 102116, 102116, 10211, 100211,	tie [1] - 1559:17				
Title [1] - 1531:7 transcription [1] - 1626.11, 10165, 1022.11, 10165, 1002.1	ties [1] - 1568:25			, ,	•••
title [1] - 1570:15 1524:19 Trial [2] - 1524:6, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1596:5 today [11] - 1534:14, transcripts [1] - Trial [2] - 1524:6, 1623:12, 1623:21, 1596:5 1539:6, 1539:13, 1541:13 1638:6 1625:3, 1638:2, uncashed [10] - 1544:10, 1578:10, Transfer [1] - 1636:2 tribal [22] - 1551:14, 1639:19, 1640:17, 1621:15, 1621:17, 1594:7, 1595:20, transfer [14] - 1553:6, 1553:8, 1640:18, 1642:16, 1622:2, 1622:12, 1607:23, 1627:9, 1541:16, 1562:19, 1554:3, 1554:8, 1644:11, 1645:7, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1629:18, 1635:2 1610:13, 1612:24, 1554:14, 1576:18, 1645:21, 1646:17, 1623:8, 1623:20, together [2] - 1627:8, 1630:8, 1576:20, 1577:14, 1646:25, 1647:15, 1624:6, 1624:18					
today [11] - 1534:14, transcripts [1] triat [2] total [2] total [3] total [1] total [3] total [3] <thtotal [3]<="" th=""> total [3] <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<></thtotal>					
1539:6, 1539:13, 1541.13 16000 16000, 160000, 16000, 16000, 16000, 16000, 16000, 16000, 16000,		• • • •			
1544:10, 15/8:10, transfer [1] - 1636.2 transfer [1] - 1656.2 1622:2, 1622:12, 1594:7, 1595:20, transfer [14] - 1553:6, 1553:8, 1640:18, 1642:16, 1622:2, 1622:12, 1607:23, 1627:9, 1541:16, 1562:19, 1554:3, 1554:8, 1644:11, 1645:7, 1622:14, 1623:2, 1629:18, 1635:2 1610:13, 1612:24, 1554:14, 1576:18, 1645:21, 1646:17, 1623:8, 1623:20, together [2] - 1627:8, 1630:8, 1576:20, 1577:14, 1646:25, 1647:15, 1624:6, 1624:18					
1594:7, 1595:20, transler [14] 1605:0, 1605:0, 1612:10, 161					
1607:23, 1627:9, 1541.16, 1562.19, 1601.16, 1601.16, 1601.16, 1611.11, 1611.17, 1623:8, 1623:20, 1629:18, 1635:2 1610:13, 1612:24, 1554:14, 1576:18, 1645:21, 1646:17, 1623:8, 1623:20, together [2] - 1627:8, 1630:8, 1576:20, 1577:14, 1646:25, 1647:15, 1624:6, 1624:18					
1629:18, 1635:2 1610.13, 1612.24, 160 mm, 161616, 16161, 1					
torether [2] - 1027.0, 1030.0, 1010120, 101000, 101000, 101000, 101000, 101000, 101000, 1000000, 10000000, 100000000					
	together [2] -	1021.0, 1030.0,			

r	1			
1588:3	1589:11, 1589:16,	1570:2, 1570:5,	1606:2, 1608:10,	1600:17
under [11] - 1526:10,	1592:1, 1595:14,	1570:14	1608:12, 1608:16,	witness [14] -
1529:12, 1560:24,	1596:11, 1596:12,	vouchers [2] -	1608:18, 1609:13,	1538:18, 1539:2,
1564:20, 1564:23,	1597:20, 1598:17,	1556:17, 1639:15	1609:15, 1610:1,	1539:4, 1540:12,
1565:24, 1566:8,	1600:12, 1600:24,	1000.11, 1000.10	1610:3, 1612:6,	1540:16, 1545:1,
1571:17, 1605:12,	1602:1, 1605:25,	W	1612:8, 1613:15,	1545:3, 1559:23,
1639:25, 1640:12	1608:10, 1608:16,	••	- 1613:17, 1614:14,	1625:18, 1627:18,
underlying [2] -	1609:13, 1609:20,	wait [1] - 1594:6	1614:16, 1614:21,	1628:16, 1628:18,
1610:20, 1645:9	1610:16, 1612:6,	walk [2] - 1559:11,	1614:22, 1619:25,	1644:1, 1647:25
understated [19] -	1613:16, 1616:8,	1600:25	1620:3, 1621:1,	WITNESS [20] -
1581:9, 1581:16,	1621:1, 1622:4,	wants [1] - 1567:25	1621:3, 1621:8,	1525:2, 1530:14,
1581:21, 1583:19,	1625:20, 1626:5,	war [1] - 1611:15	1621:10, 1625:17,	
	1627:11, 1629:8,	Warm [3] - 1635:15,	1625:19, 1625:21,	1575:3, 1575:7,
1583:22, 1584:5,	1629:13, 1630:8,	1635:24, 1635:25	1626:5, 1626:7,	1575:10, 1575:22,
1584:9, 1584:25,	1632:14, 1633:15,	Warshawsky [13] -	1627:11, 1627:15,	1576:1, 1590:21,
1585:3, 1585:5,		1525:4, 1530:2,		1590:25, 1591:5,
1586:14, 1586:25,	1634:21, 1635:16,	1536:15, 1549:17,	1628:22, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1629:13,	1592:5, 1592:9,
1587:4, 1587:12,	1636:17, 1637:4,	1593:17, 1594:25,		1593:1, 1601:12,
1588:16, 1591:14,	1637:22, 1641:5,	1625:16, 1639:13,	1629:15, 1632:14, 1632:16, 1633:15,	1625:9, 1625:15,
1592:11, 1592:12,	1644:16, 1645:3, 1645:18	1641:8, 1643:5,	1632:16, 1633:15, 1634:21, 1634:24,	1628:20, 1633:22,
1632:8		1643:19, 1646:6,	, , ,	1634:8, 1634:17
understatement [4] -	updating [1] -	1646:12	1635:16, 1635:18, 1636:16, 1636:18,	Witness [1] -
1579:2, 1581:12,	1541:18	WARSHAWSKY		1566:13
1585:13, 1585:15	upper [3] - 1589:16,	[125] - 1524:1,	1637:14, 1642:17,	witnesses [1] -
understood [3] -	1629:23, 1635:4	1529:19, 1531:20,	1643:15, 1643:22,	1645:9
1553:16, 1586:9,	upward [1] - 1587:21	1536:12, 1540:4,	1647:1, 1647:10	wonder [1] - 1594:19
1634:13	utilize [5] - 1558:20,	1540:13, 1540:14,	Warshawsky's [4] -	word [2] - 1601:1,
unfortunately [1] -	1579:9, 1579:18,	1543:2, 1543:4,	1592:23, 1639:17,	1601:5
1577:20	1588:23, 1589:3	1549:22, 1550:1,	1644:22, 1647:6	words [2] - 1601:9,
uniform [2] - 1604:2,	utilized [5] -	1550:3, 1550:5,	Washington [7] -	1646:17
1604:4	1559:12, 1588:7,	1550:6, 1551:4,	1523:4, 1523:13,	works [1] - 1610:4
United [3] - 1531:14,	1617:2, 1619:20,	1551:6, 1551:9,	1523:21, 1524:4,	worksheet [9] -
1638:1	1646:3	1551:10, 1556:6,	1524:9, 1524:12,	1555:10, 1558:25,
UNITED [2] - 1523:1,	utilizing [1] - 1588:2	1556:8, 1556:24,	1524:16	1589:15, 1589:20,
1523:9		1557:1, 1557:5,	waste [1] - 1638:9	1597:24, 1609:18,
unknown [1] -	V	1557:6, 1559:13,	week [2] - 1539:1,	1609:21, 1614:13,
1569:18	validated [1] -	1559:15, 1559:22,	1539:4	1614:15
unless [1] - 1558:11	1541:19	1560:1, 1564:13,	weekend [1] -	write [4] - 1638:14,
unpaid [1] - 1624:14	value [2] - 1573:12,	1564:16, 1568:7,	1549:18	1638:15, 1638:16,
unusual [1] -	1587:7	1568:9, 1569:23,	weekly [3] - 1547:12,	1638:21
1543:24	values [1] - 1588:4	1569:25, 1570:11,	1547:14, 1547:23	writes [1] - 1638:17
up [80] - 1526:5,	various [10] -	1570:12, 1571:1,	weeks [3] - 1578:19,	written [6] - 1621:22,
1526:6, 1526:25,		1570:12, 1571:13,	1602:13, 1648:13	1621:24, 1623:4,
1527:24, 1533:13,	1562:20, 1563:8, 1563:14, 1566:10	1571:14, 1573:22,	weighted [3] -	1623:18, 1624:21,
1534:24, 1535:4,	1563:14, 1566:10,	1571:14, 1573:22, 1573:25, 1574:1,	1530:14, 1530:16,	1638:22
1541:6, 1542:21,	1567:19, 1569:21,	1575:13, 1575:15,	1532:8	wrote [2] - 1639:1,
1543:2, 1543:3,	1571:18, 1572:17,	1575:13, 1575:15, 1575:19, 1576:4,	West [2] - 1523:24,	1639:2
1548:25, 1549:13,	1640:1, 1640:5	1575.19, 1576.4, 1576:10, 1576:13,	1539:10	
1551:4, 1552:7,	verification [1] -	, , ,	whereabouts [1] -	Y
1552:24, 1556:6,	1580:22	1578:17, 1579:12, 1570:14, 1590:8	1569:18	
1556:25, 1558:11,	version [11] -	1579:14, 1590:8,	whoa [1] - 1638:22	year [43] - 1526:19,
1558:25, 1559:13,	1537:21, 1537:22,	1590:9, 1591:7, 1592:1, 1593:2	whole [1] - 1600:3	1526:20, 1526:21,
1564:13, 1567:6,	1537:24, 1537:25,	1592:1, 1593:2, 1593:20, 1593:23	WILLIAM [1] -	1526:24, 1527:2,
1567:8, 1568:2,	1538:6, 1550:9,	1593:20, 1593:23, 1595:3, 1595:5	1523:15	1527:3, 1527:4,
1569:2, 1569:20,	1595:23, 1597:21,	1595:3, 1595:5, 1597:13, 1597:20	Winston [1] -	1527:8, 1527:14,
1571:13, 1572:25,	1608:17, 1609:14	1597:13, 1597:20, 1507:24, 1508:1	1523:25	1527:16, 1527:19,
1574:22, 1575:14,	versus [5] - 1533:14,	1597:24, 1598:1,	Winston-Salem [1] -	1534:21, 1534:22,
1575:17, 1576:10,	1544:12, 1578:1,	1598:17, 1598:19, 1599:18, 1599:22	1523:25	1536:24, 1543:13,
1577:18, 1579:12,	1583:2, 1621:24	1599:18, 1599:22,	Winter [2] - 1627:18,	1543:19, 1543:20,
	view [1] - 1576:16	1600:12, 1600:13,	1627:19	1544:1, 1544:9,
1579:22, 1585:18,	· · · · · · · ·	1602.1 1602.24	1021.10	450745 1500 5
1579:22, 1585:18, 1586:23, 1588:8,	virtually [1] - 1621:6	1602:4, 1603:21, 1603:23, 1605:25	withdrawal [1] -	1567:15, 1568:2,
	virtually [1] - 1621:6 voucher [4] - 1570:1,	1602:4, 1603:21, 1603:23, 1605:25,		1567:15, 1568:2, 1568:22, 1573:5,

1588:6, 1604:13,
1604:19, 1606:18,
1606:25, 1607:15,
1608:7, 1611:23,
1611:25, 1612:1,
1613:25, 1614:5,
1617:22, 1621:22,
1622:9, 1642:14,
1642:20, 1643:10
Year [1] - 1535:11
years [63] - 1544:17,
1548:23, 1568:17,
1584:21, 1584:23,
1585:1, 1585:5,
1585:8, 1585:14,
1586:4, 1588:4,
1588:12, 1588:13,
1588:15, 1589:23,
1591:14, 1591:21,
1593:6, 1594:5,
1594:9, 1601:17,
1604:22, 1606:21,
1607:25, 1608:2,
1608:13, 1609:1,
1609:3, 1609:5,
1609:25, 1610:5,
1610:11, 1610:12,
1610:15, 1610:17,
1610:19, 1611:12,
1611:15, 1611:19,
1614:17, 1614:23,
1615:15, 1615:16,
1615:17, 1615:19,
1615:23, 1616:1,
1616:11, 1618:6,
1618:8, 1618:12,
1618:17, 1618:19,
1618:17, 1618:19, 1618:22, 1619:9,
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11,
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] -
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] -
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z
1618:22, 1619:9, 1620:10, 1620:11, 1644:10, 1644:12 yellow [1] - 1543:5 yesterday [1] - 1539:15 you-all [1] - 1594:17 Z