	716
71	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, : Civil Action 96-1285	MICHELLE HERMAN
et al. : Plaintiffs :	By Mr. Smith 718
: Washington, D.C. V. : Tuesday, October 16, 2007	
: DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary : of the Interior, et al. :	
: Defendants : MORNING SESSION	EXHIBITS
TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING	EXHIBITS
DAY 4 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON	NUMBER ADMITTED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
APPEARANCES :	
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 HARPER, ESQUIRE JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQUIRE KILPARTICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 607 14th Street, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 585-0053	
DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 1001 West Fourth Street Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101 (336) 607-7392	
Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249kingreporter2@verizon.ne	t
715 For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE	/1/
JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE	1 PROCEEDINGS
J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE	2 MR. QUINN: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Quinn
U.S. Department of Justice	3 for the government. We thought it would aid the Court.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005	4 Plaintiffs had requested this. We put together another copy of
(202) 307-0010	09:33:49 5 the administrative record with the legends of the indexing that
	6 the defendants had indicated in their pretrial statement filing,
JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney	
U.S. Department of Justice	7 and have burned that to disk. The disk also contains an index,
Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division	8 so if you click on the link beside the document, it will take
Ben Franklin Station	9 you specifically to that document in the administrative record.
P.O. Box 975	09:34:06 10 THE COURT: Good.
Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104	11 MR. QUINN: We've got two copies for the Court, for
(,,,,	12 your reference.
	,
Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter	
Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse	14 Mr. Harper, good morning.
333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001	09:34:19 15 MR. HARPER: Good morning, Your Honor. We just wanted
(202) 354-3249	16 to say that we have finalized the glossary, and have it to
	17 provide to you. So should I just hand up a couple of copies?
Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produc	ed 18 THE COURT: Yes, yes, and a copy for everybody in the
by computer-aided transcription.	19 audience.
	09:34:42 20 MR. HARPER: Good. Thank you, Your Honor.
	21 THE COURT: Good grief. Do you have an index to this,
	22 too?
	23 All right. Ms. Herman?
	24 THE WITNESS: Good morning, Your Honor.
	09:35:01 25 THE COURT: Good morning.
of 40 sheets Page 71	4 to 717 of 825 10/16/2007 07·25·01 Pl

	718		720
1	MR. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor.	1	electronic postings."
2	THE COURT: Mr. Smith, you may continue with your	2	"Question: When you say transaction registers, you're
3	cross.	3	talking about paper form records?"
4	MR. SMITH: Thank you.	4	"Answer: Yes. It's a paper report that was printed
09:35:07 5	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION	09:37:33 5	out contemporaneously."
6	BY MR. SMITH:	6	"Question: And how many of those have you found to
7	Q. Good morning, Ms. Herman.	7	date?"
8	A. Good morning.	8	"Answer: As I mentioned, we have not gone out to OTR
9	Q. Ms. Herman, when we broke yesterday we were talking about	9	yet. We're anticipated to go out there"
09:35:13 10	the IRMS database that you were provided. Correct?	09:37:44 10	THE COURT: Is there a question today?
11	A. That's correct.	11	MR. SMITH: Excuse me?
12	Q. And you acknowledged to us that in the copy you were	12	THE COURT: Is there a question today?
13	provided, there were certain gaps in the data. Is that correct?	13	MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
14	A. That's correct.	14	THE COURT: What's the question today?
09:35:24 15	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	09:37:49 15	BY MR. SMITH:
16	significant gaps?	16	Q. Do you recall testifying to this Court and in fact, if
17	A. Yes, in that e-mail.	17	you go to line 10, the Court asked, "How many are missing?" Do
18	Q. I'm sorry?	18	you see that, line 10 at the bottom of the page?
19	A. In the e-mail we reviewed, yes.	19	A. Yes, I do.
09:35:34 20	Q. Okay. Now, yesterday you did not recall what percentages of	09:38:01 20	Q. And the answer, "I can only tell you the number that have no
21	the agencies had missing data. Do you recall that?	21	transactions, Your Honor. I believe there is approximately
22	A. That's correct.	22	40 percent of the agencies have at least one month missing
23	Q. Do you recall testifying in this case about three years ago	23	within the integrated records management system." Do you see
24	that there were approximately 40 percent of the agencies that	24	that?
09:35:53 25	had missing months in their data?	09:38:18 25	THE COURT: Mr. Smith, you could have gotten to that
	719		721
1	A. I don't recall, no.	1	since you're refreshing her recollection, you could have gotten
2	${\bf Q}.~$ If we could look at the morning transcript, page 60, line 13	2	to that by pointing at the bottom of the page instead of reading
3	to page 61, line 15.	3	the whole page.
4	Ms. Herman, this is a section from your testimony back	4	MR. SMITH: You're right, Your Honor. I apologize.
09:36:13 5	in Trial 1.5. And your answer to question was, "We were aware	09:38:26 5	BY MR. SMITH:
6	that there was electronic data missing from that database, yes."	6	Q. Was that your testimony back in 2003?
7	"Question"	7	A. Yes, that's what it reads.
8	A. I'm sorry, sir. What line are we on?	8	Q. And on top of that, as you indicated yesterday
9	Q . Looking at the top of the page, I'm sorry. "We were aware	9	THE COURT: Well, and therefore what? Is it still
09:36:30 10	that there was electronic data missing from that database, yes."	09:38:46 10	missing? Have you done anything in the last three years to
11	"Question: And what was the nature and scope of the	11	close the gaps? Have you fixed it, or is that still the case?
12	missing data?"	12	That's the question I thought you were going to ask.
13	"Answer: The database that we received then was	13	BY MR. SMITH:
14	consistent with the database that I have available today."	14	Q. So when you were provided the database, 40 percent of the
09:36:45 15	"Question: Describe some of the aspects that or to	09:39:00 15	agencies had months of missing data, based on this testimony.
16	the extent that you know so far, that there is missing data."	16	MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. Asked and answered.
17	"Answer: There are numerous agencies that have months	17	THE COURT: No, I don't think so. He's trying to ask
18	of missing information. One of the first steps that we are	18	the question I want him to ask.
19	going through is to determine whether or not there were periods	19	MR. SMITH: Okay.
09:37:01 20	of time where agencies didn't post transactions, or in fact we	09:39:12 20	BY MR. SMITH:
21	need to turn to hard copy records.	21	Q. Is that right?
22	"So the first step we took was to identify the months	22	A. As I mentioned, we've restored over 275,000 transactions to
23		1 22	
	where there were no transactions. And as I mentioned, we're now	23	date. I don't know how many specific agency months still have
24 09:37:19 25	where there were no transactions. And as I mentioned, we're now searching for the transaction registers for those agencies so	23 24	date. I don't know how many specific agency months still have no transactions within them.

1			
1	722		724
	40 percent you've been able to complete?	1	Q. But you have that information available, and you can at some
2	A. As I mentioned, we worked through this on a regional basis,	2	point in time provide that to us, is that correct, what agencies
3	and we've restored transactions in the regions we've been	3	for which you have found paper ledgers to fill in those gaps?
4	working on to date. We've received many transactions registers	4	A. I could provide that information, yes.
09:39:36 5	since our last trial, and have rekeyed those transactions.	09:41:59 5	Q. Okay. Thank you.
6	Q. Have you been able to identify registers for every agency	6	So you're certainly not telling us that the electronic
7	for which you had missing months?	7	database that you received from is it from OHTA, you received
8	A. We've requested them all. We have not yet received them	8	it from?
9	all.	9	A. We received it from OST.
09:39:49 10	Q. Is there any record that you have of what agencies you have	09:42:18 10	Q. OST, okay. The electronic database that you received from
11	received those ledgers for, for which you had missing months?	11	OST in 2001 was certainly not a complete record of the
12	A. Not within our report, no. I have a database that tracks	12	transactions after 1985. Is that correct?
13	our requests and the ones that we've received.	13	A. No, it was not.
14	Q. Do you have that with you?	14	Q. Ms. Herman, yesterday we were looking at a document, it's
09:40:05 15	A. No, I do not.	09:42:48 15	Bates stamp number 10-20-1, which is the IRMS database analysis
16	Q. Now, let's go a step further. Because you mentioned	16	prepared by Arthur Andersen. Do you recall that document?
17	yesterday that there were agencies for which you did not have	17	A. Yes, I do.
18	information on your database as of 1985, but were added some	18	Q. And were you at Arthur Andersen when this was prepared?
19	time later. Do you recall that?	19	A. Yes, I was.
09:40:21 20	A. I'm sorry, I'm not clear on the question.	09:43:09 20	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Okay}. \ {\rm I}$ want to just point to two sections of that. And I
21	Q. There were agencies when you got that database, you had	21	apologize because we did not get the complete record.
22	some agencies that had information in 1985, and some agencies	22	So if you could look at page five of that document, and
23	had information that were added some time later.	23	focus in on the highlighted section under "Data availability."
24	A. Not every agency was on IRMS in 1985, if that's your	24	It says, "Gaps in the data at the beginning of the system, as
09:40:38 25	question.	09:43:40 25	well as within the lifetime of the system, have limited some of
	723		725
1	Q. Right. But the database that you had, that you were	1	the analyses Andersen has performed. See attachment 1, schedule
2	provided, did not have information for every agency as of 1985?	2	A-3."
3			A-3.
	A. That's because every agency hadn't yet converted to IRMS in	3	A-3. Now, the document we were provided has no attachments.
4	A. That's because every agency hadn't yet converted to IRMS in 1985.	3 4	
4 09:40:49 5		3 4 09:43:58 5	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments.
	1985.		Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document?
09:40:49 5	1985.Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency	09:43:58 5	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't
09:40:49 5 6	1985.Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985?	09:43:58 5 6	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen
09:40:49 5 6 7	1985.Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985?A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not	09:43:58 5 6 7	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG.
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those?
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files.
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week,
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding?
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct.
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18 19	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18 19	Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well?
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper data? 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18	 Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well? A. I will.
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18 19	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper data? A. I haven't been looking for paper data prior to February of 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18 19	 Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well? A. I will. Q. And if you could look at also on page seven of that
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18 19 09:41:32 20	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper data? A. I haven't been looking for paper data prior to February of '85. 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18 19 09:44:50 20	 Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well? A. I will. Q. And if you could look at also on page seven of that document, and focus in on the highlighted section on the top of
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18 19 09:41:32 20 21	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper data? A. I haven't been looking for paper data prior to February of '85. Q. I'm sorry, paper data to fill in the gaps in the electronic 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18 19 09:44:50 20 21	 Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well? A. I will. Q. And if you could look at also on page seven of that document, and focus in on the highlighted section on the top of the page. It says, "Six regions, Albuquerque, Anadarko,
09:40:49 5 6 7 8 9 09:41:05 10 11 12 13 14 09:41:20 15 16 17 18 19 09:41:32 20 21 22	 1985. Q. Have you been able to locate paper records for every agency for which you did not have information as of 1985? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the IRMS data, not looking back to the paper data that would have come previous to that. Q. So you can't tell us today how many of those agencies you've located the paper records for? A. That wasn't the goal of my work in the past two years, no. Q. I'm sorry, it wasn't the goal of your work? A. I've been trying to fill in the gaps in the electronic data, not in the paper data. Q. Okay. But you don't have the information today to tell us how many of those agencies for which you have found that paper data? A. I haven't been looking for paper data prior to February of '85. Q. I'm sorry, paper data to fill in the gaps in the electronic data? 	09:43:58 5 6 7 8 9 09:44:16 10 11 12 13 14 09:44:30 15 16 17 18 19 09:44:50 20 21 22	 Now, the document we were provided has no attachments. Would you have a copy of this document? A. I don't know if we have a copy of that document. We weren't able to take all of the documents we created while at Andersen with us when we moved to KPMG. Q. But after you left Arthur Andersen, did you receive the Arthur Andersen files? Were you provided those? A. As I mentioned, we did not receive all of the Andersen files. Q. I understand you're willing to come back perhaps next week, after we've had a chance to review the 1,500 pages that were provided over the weekend. Is that your understanding? A. That's correct. Q. Can you look to see if you can find the attachments for this document, as well? A. I will. Q. And if you could look at also on page seven of that document, and focus in on the highlighted section on the top of the page. It says, "Six regions, Albuquerque, Anadarko, Eastern, Minneapolis, Navajo, and Sacramento, have at least one

10/16/2007 07:25:01 PM

		T	
_	726		728
1	affected data period. See attachment 1, schedule A-4."	1	Q . And you say you haven't gotten to that part of the test.
2	So again, there's an attachment to this document that	2	What is that test that you're going to do?
3	apparently describes what this transactional data is. Can you	3	A. Once we're looking from paper into electronic, that
4	look to see if you can find that, as well?	4	beginning balance will have to be evaluated.
09:45:35 5	A. And is this a part of the same report?	09:49:27 5	Q. Okay. And have you determined yet whether you have paper
6	Q . Part of the same report.	6	records for all of those accounts that appear on the IIM system
7	A. Yes, I will.	7	that existed prior to 1985?
8	Q. Ms. Herman, can you tell us how many account holders	8	A. As I mentioned, we've been focused on filling in the gaps in
9	actually had complete electronic records on the IRMS system	9	the electronic ledger, and are not going back to paper yet.
9:46:02 10	or IRMS database that you were provided from OST?	09:49:46 10	Q. Do you have any idea how long it would take to try to
11	A. No, I cannot.	11	identify those paper records for all of those accounts?
12	Q. Do you know how many, based on the work you've done to date,	12	A. Not as I sit here, no.
13	have complete account records?	13	${\bf Q}.~$ Are we talking about a matter of probably years? Is that
14	A. I would have to refer to one of the schedules in our report.	14	fair?
9:46:19 15	Q. Okay. And we'll get to that in just a little bit.	09:49:59 15	A. I can't answer that question today.
16	Is it fair to say that it was discovered that the	16	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ $ Is it fair to say you can't answer it because you really at
17	account balance information that was transferred over to IRMS	17	this point don't know how many of those paper records you have,
18	from other systems, whether it be manual systems or other	18	or how long it's going to take to find them?
19	systems that were being used, the balance information was often	19	A. Sir, our firm isn't charged with searching for those
9:46:52 20	incorrect?	09:50:15 20	records, and it's very dependent upon the number of people that
21	A. I don't have a basis for saying that.	21	you have searching as to how long it would take to locate
22	Q. Okay. If we could look at Exhibit 32-17-1.	22	records.
23	Ms. Herman, this is a report from Morgan Angel &	23	Q. So you're dependent on another contractor, over which you
24	Associates. And you referred to Morgan Angel yesterday as one	24	basically have no control. Is that correct?
9:47:15 25	of the companies that you relied on for your throughput	09:50:27 25	A. I'm sorry?
	727		729
1	analysis. Do you recall that?	1	Q. You're dependent for those paper records on another
2	A. Yes, I do.	2	contractor?
3	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{And if we could look at page 70 of that document. That's }$	3	A. Yes, that's correct.
4	actually the Bates stamp number 82, I'm sorry.	4	Q. Yesterday we looked at some historical account statements
9:47:55 5	And focus in on the highlighted section on the top of	09:50:44 5	that I believe you had prepared.
6	the page. It says, "Additionally, erroneous IIM balances were	6	A. That's correct.
7	transferred from manual ledger cards and entered into the	7	Q. Okay. And on all of those historical account statements,
8	computer system, thereby making it very difficult to locate the	8	had it been determined that there were in fact correct balances
9	errors." And there's a footnote reference to 239. And could	9	transferred to the electronic era?
0:48:18 10	you focus on the footnote reference? It's a reference to an	09:51:00 10	A. I don't recall if the beginning of all of those statements
11	Arthur Andersen report dated 1988.	11	were zero or not zero. But that's not a part of the test at the
12	Are you familiar with that report?	12	moment, as I mentioned.
13	A. No, I'm not.	13	Q. So that's down the road sometime?
14	Q. When you were working at Arthur Andersen, did you ever look	14	A. I'm sorry?
:48:38 15	at the reports prepared by Arthur Andersen regarding the IIM	09:51:13 15	Q. That's down the road sometime?
16	Trust?	16	A. Yes, it is.
17	A. I did see some reports while I was there, yes.	17	Q. If we could look at the May 31, 2007 plan, at page eight.
18	Q. If you could go back to the highlighted section, please.	18	That's Bates stamp number 33-2-1. And this actually would be
19	Based on your review of this database, did you discover that in	19	Bates stamp page 10, I'm sorry.
:48:56 20	fact there was erroneous IIM balances transferred from manual	09:51:50 20	Ms. Herman, you testified that you were familiar with
21	ledger cards and entered into the computer system?	21	the historical accounting project, and testified yesterday as to
22	A. I have discovered some, but I certainly couldn't tell you	22	pieces of it.
23	how many there were. We haven't gotten to that component of the	23	A. That's correct.
24	test. But one of the examples that we reviewed in court	24	Q. Are you familiar with this language? And if we could focus
9:49:13 25	demonstrated a balance being transferred incorrectly.	09:52:04 25	on the highlighted language.
		09:52:04 23 0 729 of 825	

	730		732
1	It says, "Interior plans to mail separately HSA's	1	Ms. Herman, this document begins with a letter dated
2	covering the post-1985 electronic ledger era to all 268,000	2	June 20, 2002 to a Mr. Andy Kane from the Department of the
3	land-based account holders. Interior also plans to mail a	3	Interior. And if we could look at page four, actually Bates
4	second HSA covering the pre-1985 paper ledger era to those	4	stamp number three. And there's a letter to Mr. Kane that
09:52:26 5	approximately 65,000 of the 268,000 account holders whose	09:55:39 5	mentioned your name, if we could focus on that.
6	accounts began prior to 1985."	6	It says, "This letter serves as a formal request by the
7	Ms. Herman, have you done anything to verify that	7	Department of the Interior to transfer all client documents and
8	65,000 number figure?	8	data in connection with the Cobell versus Norton litigation to
9	A. We have identified some accounts that go back to paper at	9	Robert L. Brunner at KPMG, at the address below." It has
09:52:44 10	this point, but not all accounts that go back to paper.	09:55:56 10	"Robert L. Brunner, care of Michelle Herman." Signed by Jeffrey
11	Q. So you don't know whether the 65,000 number is an accurate	11	Zippin. And Mr. Kane is with Arthur Andersen.
12	number or not at this point?	12	Have you seen this document before?
13	A. I think it's, as it says, an approximate number.	13	A. Yes, I have.
14	Q. Is that a number that you were provided?	14	${\bf Q}.~$ And in fact, were the Arthur Andersen records transferred to
09:52:59 15	A. I'm sorry?	09:56:10 15	you?
16	Q. I'm sorry, is that a number that you provided to OST?	16	A. Not all of them, no.
17	A. That's a number that NORC and our firm worked on and	17	Q. Okay. Is there a list of what records that you did receive?
18	provided to OHTA.	18	A. Sir, that was five years ago. I don't know if I have such a
19	Q . Provided to OHTA. Okay.	19	list, no.
09:53:14 20	The cutoff date is 1985. And can you tell me if that	09:56:22 20	${\bf Q}.~$ But the records that you did receive, are they with FTI now,
21	65,000 number is based on accounts that existed in the	21	or are they still at KPMG?
22	electronic era on the database that you were provided as of	22	A. They're at FTI.
23	1985?	23	Q. Are we talking about a small box full of records, or a
24	A. 1985 here is used as a date to indicate the electronic	24	fairly large number of records?
09:53:36 25	ledger era. So if an agency didn't start until 1988, and there	09:56:34 25	A. I don't recall, as I sit here.
	731		733
1	731 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper	1	733 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS
1		1	
_	were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper		Q . Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS
2	were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question?	2	Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all?
23	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6	were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question?Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number?	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database.
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair?	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point?
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the Arthur Andersen documents have in fact been transferred to you, 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period. Q. But that's what it is; it's just a starting point. Is that
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19 09:54:44 20	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19 09:57:42 20	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period.
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19 09:54:44 20 21	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the Arthur Andersen documents have in fact been transferred to you, 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19 09:57:42 20 21	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period. Q. But that's what it is; it's just a starting point. Is that
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19 09:54:42 20 21 22	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. Occasionally, yes. Q. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the Arthur Andersen documents have in fact been transferred to you, to your custody? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19 09:57:42 20 21 22	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period. Q. But that's what it is; it's just a starting point. Is that fair? A. Yes. As I mentioned, we have to restore records to that system.
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19 09:54:42 20 21 22 23	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. Occasionally, yes. Q. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the Arthur Andersen documents have in fact been transferred to you, to your custody? A. That's correct? A. That's correct? A. That is correct? A. That is correct? A. We do not have copies of everything that was created while 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19 09:57:42 20 21 22 23	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period. Q. But that's what it is; it's just a starting point. Is that fair? A. Yes. As I mentioned, we have to restore records to that system. Q. If we could look at Exhibit 4-2-1, please.
2 3 4 09:53:51 5 6 7 8 9 09:54:14 10 11 12 13 14 09:54:22 15 16 17 18 19 09:54:44 20 21 22	 were transactions in 1985, those would be considered paper ledger era. Is that your question? Q. Right. Okay. And are those agencies included in that 65,000 number? A. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. M. For the agencies that converted later, yes. Q. Right. Okay. Is it fair to say that when you were looking at the IRMS database, you're not just dealing with one system. You're dealing with 12 systems or 102 systems, based on the region or the agency. Is that fair? A. Yes. At least 12. Q. Because they deal with the IRMS database differently in each region? A. That's correct. Q. And sometimes in each agency? A. Occasionally, yes. Q. I asked you about some of the work done by your previous employer, Arthur Andersen. Is it fair to say that all of the Arthur Andersen documents have in fact been transferred to you, to your custody? A. That's correct? A. That's correct? 	2 3 4 09:57:01 5 6 7 8 9 09:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 09:57:28 15 16 17 18 19 09:57:42 20 21 22	 Q. Is it fair to say that some agencies didn't use the IRMS database at all? A. I'm not aware if every agency used the system. We have records for over 101 agencies within the database. Q. Now, there are different components to that database. Do you know if every agency used every component? A. As I mentioned, I don't believe every agency used every component. Q. And as you've noted, some agencies would continue to use paper records even though the IRMS database was in existence? A. I'm sorry? Q. Some agencies continued to use paper records even though there was an IRMS database? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. Would you agree that when you're trying to do a historical accounting, IRMS is just the starting point? A. IRMS is the best starting point for the '85 through '98 period. Q. But that's what it is; it's just a starting point. Is that fair? A. Yes. As I mentioned, we have to restore records to that system.

		734		736
	1	A. I do.	1	A. In the IIM transactional data.
	2	Q. And if we could look at Bates stamp number 221, which is	2	Q. So essentially, BIA relies on whatever MMS tells them. Is
	3	actually page five of that document, and focus on the	3	that correct?
	4	highlighted section.	4	A. As I mentioned, that's my understanding, but I have not
09:58:27	5	And in there you in fact state that, as you pointed	10:01:17 5	tested the system.
	6	out, "IRMS provides the complete and readily available	6	Q. Okay. You have not been tasked with testing that system?
	7	electronic listing of transactions, but the information should	7	A. No, I have not.
	8	be used as a starting point." Is that correct?	8	Q . Is it fair to say that if you want to look at collections of
	9	A. Yes, as I recognized that there were gaps in the data.	9	royalty and minerals, you've got to look at the MMS system? Is
09:58:44	10	Q. And if we could look to Bates stamp number 226 of that	10:01:34 10	that correct?
	11	section, and go to your conclusion at the bottom.	11	A. Sir, I haven't studied that system, so I don't feel
	12	The second sentence it states, "While we cannot limit	12	comfortable answering that question.
	13	our review of accounts or transactions to these systems, we can	13	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ But the IRMS system simply looks at what is posted, not what
	14	use them as a starting point to identify similar groups of	14	is collected for royalty (sic) and gas. Is that correct?
09:59:11	15	accounts, revenue streams, regional level idiosyncrasies, et	10:01:49 15	A. It's my understanding that MMS transfers all of the funds
	16	cetera."	16	collected. But as I've said, I haven't studied that system.
	17	What other systems were you talking about?	17	Q . Has it ever been suggested to you that there's a
	18	A. This is referring to the fact that I realized at this point	18	discrepancy I'm sorry.
	19	that there were gaps in the data that would have to be restored,	19	A. Sorry.
09:59:29	20	that you simply couldn't use it as it stood.	10:02:02 20	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Has}$ it ever been suggested to you that there may be a
	21	Q. Did you also recognize that there were other electronic	21	discrepancy between what MMS has on their system and what is
	22	systems that had data that you had to consider in trying to put	22	reported to BIA?
	23	your information together?	23	A. I don't believe I've seen that.
	24	A. Not from a transactional standpoint. I mean, different	24	${\bf Q}. \ \ $ In your testimony three years ago, there's a reference to a
09:59:42	25	systems were used historically.	10:02:23 25	document called the Tiger Team. Do you recall that?
		735		737
	1	Q. One of the systems at Interior is the MMS system. Is that	1	A. Yes, I do.
	2	correct?	2	Q. If we could look at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 607, and page two.
	3	A. I believe MMS has a system, yes.	3	What is the date on that document, August 1995?
	4	Q. And if we could look on 4-2-225 of that document. And focus	4	A. That's correct.
10:00:03	5	in on the highlighted language.	10:02:47 5	Q . And if we could look at page two of that document, focus in
	6	At that seminar and this is a seminar you gave. Is	6	on the highlighted section. It says that "In 1994, the
	7 0	that correct?	7	Department of Interior developed a reform plan to improve
	8	A. I was one of the participants in the seminar.	8	management of tribal and IIM Trust funds."
	9 10	Q. And you describe Minerals Management Service as one of the	9	And let's go ahead and focus on page seven of that
10:00:19	10	other relevant systems. Is that correct?	10:03:27 10 11	document, bottom of the page. It states that "Conditions for
	12	 A. That's what the caption says, yes. And MMS is relevant because it's the system that actually 	12	royalties collected by MMS on minerals leases are better in one
	12	Q. And MMS is relevant because it's the system that actually	12	regard, but not in another. On the one hand, internal control
	14	collects the revenue from oil and gas and minerals. Is that	13	over the accounting for royalties collected is greatly enhanced
10:00:35		correct?	14 10:03:49 15	through the MMS's automated systems and centralized functions.
	15 16	 A. That's my understanding, but I have not studied the system. O. Is it also your understanding that MMS reports those 	10:03:49 15	On the other hand, there's question as to whether sufficient assurance that the full amount due is in fact collected.
	17	Q. Is it also your understanding that MMS reports those collections to BIA?	10	"That assurance is dependent on MMS's automated review
	18	A. That's my understanding.	18	and field audit functions, which have been criticized as being
	19	Q. And those are in turn posted on the IRMS system?	10	less comprehensive than they should be, not completed within
10:00:52		A. I'm sorry, what's posted?	10:04:07 20	reasonably acceptable times, in some cases three to six years.
	20 21	 Q. What MMS tells BIA is supposed to be posted on the 	10:04:07 20 21	"Further complaints", if we could go to the next page,
	22	A. That's correct.	22	"have been registered over the accuracy of the data accompanying
	23	Q. I'm sorry?	23	payments that are passed on to BIA"
	24	A. That's correct.	24	THE COURT: What happened to the cover sheet of this
10:01:01		Q. So it's supposed to be posted on the IRMS system?	10:04:33 25	document Mr. Smith? What is it?
	-		1	

	738		740
1		1	testing has not been conducted on the current system of record,
2	5 5	2	TFAS."
3		3	So was it your understanding at least at that time that
4		4	that's what Wecker & Associates had been hired to do?
10:04:43 5		10:08:01 5	A. Sir, this was many years ago. If I recorded that in the
6		6	report, I'm sure that was my understanding.
7		7	Q. But nobody has discussed with you the conclusions from that
8	Q. And if we could look at page 34 of that document. It says	8	report?
9	that "25 to 30 percent of data submitted to MMS is erroneous and	9	A. No. I haven't spoken with Mr. Wecker in many years.
10:05:06 10		10:08:13 10	Q . And nobody at Interior has discussed with you the
11	A. I do.	11	conclusions of that report?
12	Q. Now, this is a document that you were examined on about	12	A. I believe that the report was actually I don't know who
13	three years ago. Do you recall that?	13	the report was prepared for, but I have not discussed it with
14	A. Yes, I do.	14	OHTA, no.
10:05:15 15	Q. But you have at this point not been tasked to determine	10:08:24 15	Q. Now, you said you have received memos from Mr. Wecker. What
16	whether the information provided by MMS is in fact correctly	16	were those about?
17	reported on IRMS?	17	A. This, as I mentioned, was many years ago. Initially, we
18	A. I've only been tasked with evaluating IRMS and TFAS.	18	were asked to explain to Mr. Wecker how the IIM component of the
19	Q. Are you familiar with something called the Wecker Report?	19	database worked.
10:05:34 20	A. I'm sorry?	10:08:38 20	Q. Was this about 2002?
21	Q. Are you familiar with something called the Wecker Report?	21	A. I don't recall if it was 2002 or earlier than that, but it
22	A. I'm familiar with Bill Wecker. I don't know if I'm familiar	22	was while I was at Arthur Andersen.
23	with that report.	23	Q. So as of today, you can't tell us whether the information
24	Q . I ask you that because the only reference I found to	24	received by BIA from MMS is accurate or not. Is that correct?
10:05:47 25	something called the Wecker Report was in a seminar you gave.	10:08:59 25	A. No, I cannot.
	739		741
1	And was Mr. Wecker tasked with looking at the data comparing	1	Q. How about Treasury? Have you ever been tasked with looking
2	what was on MMS systems to what was on IRMS?	2	at any discrepancy between what Treasury says should be in the
3	A. I don't recall what Mr. Wecker was tasked with. He didn't	3	IIM Trust and what is posted on the IRMS system?
4		4	A. No. My work with Treasury records has been limited to the
10:06:06 5		10:09:25 5	CP&R data and the Pacer data.
6		6	Q . So are you aware of concerns raised about the fact that
7		7	there may be a discrepancy between what Treasury says they have
8		8	on the system and what IRMS says is on the system?
9		9	A. It was my understanding that there was a difference between
10:06:17 10 11		10:09:41 10	the Interior record and the Treasury record, and that that has
12		12	been resolved.
12		12	 Q. Okay. And who indicated to you that that has been resolved? The line Trend that is a superball second.
14		14	 A. I believe I read that in a quarterly report. Do you know whether biotorically, leaking back over the term
10:06:35 15		10:10:08 15	Q. Do you know whether historically, looking back over the term of this Trust, whether that discrepancy between what may be on
10:06:35 13		10:10:08 15	the Treasury system and what may be on the Interior system has
10		10	the freasury system and what may be on the interior system has
	-	17	been resolved?
18	Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page	17 18	been resolved?
18 19	Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225.	18	A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My
19	 Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225. MR. SMITH: One second, Your Honor. 	18 19	A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My analysis was limited to CP&R and Pacer.
	 Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225. MR. SMITH: One second, Your Honor. BY MR. SMITH: 	18	 A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My analysis was limited to CP&R and Pacer. Q. So you can't today tell us whether the balances identified
19 10:07:13 20	 Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225. MR. SMITH: One second, Your Honor. BY MR. SMITH: Q. If you could focus on the last paragraph of that page. 	18 19 10:10:26 20	 A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My analysis was limited to CP&R and Pacer. Q. So you can't today tell us whether the balances identified by Treasury to be on that system, or the balances identified by
19 10:07:13 20 21 22	 Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225. MR. SMITH: One second, Your Honor. BY MR. SMITH: Q. If you could focus on the last paragraph of that page. You're talking about the MMS system, and it says, "Work has 	18 19 10:10:26 20 21	 A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My analysis was limited to CP&R and Pacer. Q. So you can't today tell us whether the balances identified by Treasury to be on that system, or the balances identified by the IIM system, are correct?
19 10:07:13 20 21	 Q. If we could look at 4-2 document 4-2-1. And it's on page nine of that document, which is Bates stamp number 225. MR. SMITH: One second, Your Honor. BY MR. SMITH: Q. If you could focus on the last paragraph of that page. You're talking about the MMS system, and it says, "Work has already been performed by Wecker & Associates to verify that 	18 19 10:10:26 20 21 22	 A. As I mentioned, I didn't analyze that discrepancy. My analysis was limited to CP&R and Pacer. Q. So you can't today tell us whether the balances identified by Treasury to be on that system, or the balances identified by

	742		744
1	A. That's correct.	1	A. That's correct.
2	Q. And is it your understanding that collections from IIM Trust	2	Q. And at times, money in those SDAs has not been disbursed for
3	property would often be deposited into an SDA before being	3	a very long period of time. Is that fair?
4	disbursed to individual Indian accounts?	4	A. In some instances.
10:11:08 5	A. Yes, in some cases.	10:13:50 5	Q. At times there has been 70, 80, 90 million dollars held in
6	Q. You saw instances where, for example, you had multiple	6	SDA accounts. Is that correct?
7	owners of a particular piece of property, it would be put into a	7	A. I would have to evaluate that.
8	special deposit account, you would determine who the owners	8	Q. That's not something you've evaluated?
9	were, and it would be then divided among their various accounts?	9	A. We've evaluated Special Deposit Accounts, but I haven't
10:11:26 10	A. That's correct.	10:14:07 10	specifically added up what the balances were at different points
11	Q. Did you also see occasions where Trust property was put into	11	in time.
12	an SDA, Interior charged a fee, they took their fee out of the	12	Q. If we could look at 60-34-1. This is an audit report from
13	SDA, and then the money was deposited into an individual	13	the OIG's office for 2001, for OST. Have you reviewed any of
14	Indian's account?	14	the audit reports of OST?
10:11:41 15	A. I wouldn't categorize it as Trust money. There were fees	10:14:32 15	A. I've reviewed subsections of some of the audit reports, yes.
16	deposited into SDAs, though.	16	Q. And this one was prepared by Griffin & Associates. Are you
17	Q. Fees that were charged by Interior?	17	familiar with Griffin & Associates?
18	A. Yes, fees charged by Interior, typically to a lessee or	18	A. Yes. I'm aware that they audited the Trust for several
19	permittee.	19	years.
10:11:55 20	Q. In your analysis, have you ever tried to determine for	10:14:49 20	Q. In fact, I think on one of the documents you showed us
21	particular account holders what the fees charged by Interior	21	yesterday, you referenced one of the Griffin audits?
22	were with respect to their accounts?	22	A. Yes, I did.
23	A. The fees weren't charged to the account holders. They were	23	Q. If we could look at Bates page 44, and paragraph eight on
24	charged to the lessees or the permittees.	24	the bottom. I'm sorry, paragraph H. It says, "There is
10:12:11 25	Q. So the collection came from the lessee into the SDA. And	10:15:19 25	approximately 81 million and 104 million held in approximately
	743		745
1	from that collection, Interior took out its fee and paid the	1	18,000 and 24,000 Special Deposit Accounts in the IIM subsidiary
2	balance?	2	ledger as of September 30, 1999 and 1998 respectively.
3	A. No, if you'll recall the range example that we evaluated	3	Have you seen this reference before?
4	yesterday, the permit called for a specific payment to the	4	A. I don't believe I have, no.
10:12:27 5	account holders. I believe it was 6234. And there was a	10:15:43 5	Q. Are those numbers consistent with what you've seen with
6	separate item on that permit that indicated the fee that was to	6	respect to amounts held in Special Deposit Accounts?
7	be collected.	7	A. As I mentioned, I haven't summed those amounts at different
8	Q. But from that collection that was paid by the lessee,	8	periods of time, but that wouldn't surprise me.
9	Interior got a fee?	9	MR. QUINN: Excuse me, Mr. Smith. Is this from the
10:12:39 10	A. Yes, there was a fee collected.	10:15:58 10	same 2001 report, or are you referring to an earlier one?
11	Q . But currently, to your knowledge, the account holders don't	11	MR. SMITH: No, this is from that same report. Yeah,
12	get an accounting of what that fee is that's charged. Is that	12	I'm sorry.
13	correct?	13 14	THE COURT: Is this from what you call the OIG report
14 10:12:53 15	 A. That's correct. And you haven't been tacked with identifying for the account. 	14 10:16:18 15	for 2001?
10:12:53 15 16	Q. And you haven't been tasked with identifying for the account	10:16:18 15 16	MR. SMITH: That's correct. It's attached to it, yeah.
10	holders what that fee is?	10	THE COURT: It's attached to it. All right. Would you
17	A. Because the fee isn't charged to the account holder. It's charged to the permittee or the lessee	17	take a moment and clarify what 81 million and 104 million, and
19	charged to the permittee or the lessee.	10	18,000 and 24,000 SDA accounts and ledger means? I mean, why are there two numbers?
19 10:13:19 20	Q. Would you agree that, based on your examination, SDAs have	19 10:16:38 20	are there two numbers?
10:13:19 20 21	been used for a long time?	10:16:38 20 21	MR. SMITH: My understanding is, Your Honor, that there
21	A. Yes, they have.Q. That a lot of money has gone through SDAs over decades?	21	were 18,000 accounts in 1999, with \$81 million in it; and 24,000 accounts, with \$104 million in it, in 1998.
22	 A. From the period that I've analyzed, yes, there's been quite 	22	THE COURT: Oh, I see. I see. The rest of the
23	a bit of money.	23	sentence refers to the respective two years. Okay. Understood,
10:13:33 25	 Q. And I guess you've only analyzed from 1985 forward? 	10:16:58 25	thank you.
10.10.00		10.10.00	

	746		748
1	MR. SMITH: It took me a while to figure that out.	1	A. That is correct.
2	Okay.	2	Q. Okay. Now, has anybody taken has anybody been tasked
3	BY MR. SMITH:	3	with determining exactly how much of that money belongs to
4	Q . Now, you mentioned yesterday that you were looking at SDAs.	4	individual Indians?
10:17:06 5	And do I understand it correctly that if money came in to an IIM	10:19:42 5	A. You could compute that based on some of the work that we're
6	account from an SDA, you would look at the Special Deposit	6	doing, but it's not a specific task that's been assigned.
7	Account and track it?	7	Q. You can compute what is actually being posted to the IIM
8	A. We discussed Special Deposit Accounts in two different ways	8	or IRMS or TFAS database. Correct?
9	yesterday. One was in our transaction mapping, and the other	9	A. You can compute what's being transferred out of the
10:17:23 10	was in the litigation support accounting examples that we	10:19:59 10	accounts.
11	covered.	11	Q . Out of the SDA accounts, into the IRMS database?
12	Q. And in transaction mapping, you would look to see where	12	A. The accounts exist within the IRMS database. It's funds
13	money came in to an IIM account from an SDA?	13	that are transferring down to other accounts or potentially out
14	A. Yes, we evaluate the transfers.	14	to the Tribal Trust, et cetera.
10:17:40 15	Q . And then, as part of your LSA, how would you look at the	10:20:11 15	Q. Okay. And is anybody making sure that all the money
16	Special Deposit Accounts?	16	belonging to individual Indians in a Special Deposit Account
17	A. As we saw in the example yesterday, we trace back to the	17	actually makes its way into IRMS?
18	Special Deposit Account where the funds were collected, and then	18	A. I think we're discussing again, sir, many different issues,
19	back to the initial collection into that account.	19	because not all of the money in Special Deposit Accounts is due
10:17:54 20	Q. So again, if money is in an IIM account, you would trace it	10:20:31 20	to individuals.
21	back into the Special Deposit Account, and then possibly in to	21	Q. That's exactly right. A lot of it is. Is that fair?
22	the collection as well?	22	A. I don't want to say what percentage is.
23	A. If the money had transferred in, yes.	23	Q . But has anybody gone through all those funds in SDA accounts
24	Q. Now, have you been tasked with the job of trying to	24	over the years, and segregated which belong to individual Indian
10:18:11 25	determine whether all money that goes in to an SDA account that	10:20:46 25	account holders?
	747		749
1	is intended for an individual Indian makes its way in to an	1	A. I don't believe that that's been a specific task. But as I
2	individual Indian's account on IRMS?	2	mentioned through the transaction mapping that we're doing, you
3	A. As I mentioned, we're mapping the transfers and reversals	3	can compute how much money has been transferred out to which
4	within those accounts, not necessarily every transaction within	4	sources.
10:18:33 5	the account.	10:20:57 5	Q. You can compute what was actually posted to an IRMS account?
6	Q. Okay. So if there's money in the Special Deposit Accounts	6	A. You can compute what was transferred from the Special
7	over the years that belongs to individual Indians, you're not	7	Deposit Account. The Special Deposit Account exists within the
8	charged with making sure that goes in to a specific individual	8	IRMS system.
9	Indian account?	9	Q. But that doesn't mean that all the individual money, Indian
10:18:48 10	A. I think we're discussing several different issues here. In	10:21:12 10	money in the Special Deposit Account, made it into IRMS, does
11	the context of the accounting project, yes, we make sure that	11	it?
12	the funds get to the appropriate account.	12	MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. The Special
13	In the account of the transaction mapping, we're	13	Deposit Accounts aren't on IRMS. The witness just testified to
14	looking at flows of money.	14	that. He keeps asking questions suggesting that the Special
10:19:01 15	And then there's a separate project that OHTA has	10:21:28 15	Deposit Accounts somehow are outside the IRMS system.
16	that's distributing remaining balances in Special Deposit	16	MR. SMITH: I'll rephrase the question.
17	Accounts. So I think we have three different topics that we're	17	THE COURT: Now that that's been clarified, can the
18	discussing.	18	witness answer the question?
19	Q. Maybe I'm discussing a fourth possibility. Is anybody	19	THE WITNESS: I don't recall the question.
10:19:14 20	tasked with looking at all the money that goes in to the SDAs,	10:21:41 20	MR. SMITH: Sure.
21	determining which belongs to individual Indians, and then making	21	THE COURT: He wants to know whether you can verify
22	sure that goes in to the IRMS or TFAS database?	22	that everything in the SDAs were in fact posted to IIM accounts.
23	A. I don't believe I understand the question.	23	THE WITNESS: Not all of the funds in SDAs are due to
24	Q. Sure. As we've seen, there's a lot of money that flows	24	IIM accounts, Your Honor. Some of them, as we mentioned
10:19:29 25	through SDAs.	10:21:54 25	earlier, are big deposits which would be returned to a lessee,

	750		752
1	some of them are tribal monies that would be distributed to the	1	THE WITNESS: No, the funds are still sitting there, in
2	tribe. Some of them are individual monies. So you wouldn't	2	some instances.
3	transfer all of the money in an SDA to individuals, because it	3	BY MR. SMITH:
4	doesn't belong to them.	4	Q. Do you agree that it is imperative, as part of a complete
10:22:10	THE COURT: How about all that should be posted to IIM	10:24:34 5	accounting, to make sure that Indian monies in SDAs get
6	accounts? Can you verify that it has been?	6	disbursed properly to individual beneficiaries?
7	THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. Some of those accounts	7	A. The funds in the SDAs need to be disbursed. That's correct.
8	still have balances within them that are being distributed	8	Q. If we could look at 4-2-216, at we've looked at this
g	today.	9	before. This is the seminar you gave. You were the presenter.
10:22:19 10	THE COURT: Does that answer your question, Mr. Smith?	10:25:04 10	And look at page 222 of that document. Actually, Bates stamp
11	MR. SMITH: I think it gets there.	11	number 222. And focus in on the highlighted section.
12	BY MR. SMITH:	12	It says, "While we cannot provide an account statement
13	Q. So if you want to look at the actual collections, you've got	13	to an administrative account, it is imperative to include a
14	to look at the SDA accounts. Is that correct?	14	review of these accounts in the historical accounting. This
10:22:28	A. Yes, you do.	10:25:29 15	review must include, at a minimum, all nonzero balance accounts
16	Q. Because if you just look at IRMS, you're just looking at the	16	as well as zero balance accounts with direct disbursements. A
17	postings?	17	review of the latter group will provide the requisite support
18	A. I'm sorry, sir. SDAs are within the IRMS system.	18	for payments to non-individual Indian accounts."
19	Q. You're exactly right. If you're just looking at the IIM	19	Is that what you're doing?
10:22:42 20	module, you're just looking at postings, not collections?	10:25:47 20	A. I'm sorry, we're providing some of this work but not all of
21	A. I'm sorry. Again, I don't understand. The SDAs are within	21	this work.
22	the IIM module. Some funds are posted to SDAs, and some funds	22	Q. Who is providing the rest of the work, do you know?
23	are posted to IIM accounts.	23	A. OHTA is working to distribute balances that were in Special
24	Q. You are just focusing on postings, not collections. Is that	24	Deposit Accounts as of 2002. Balances in those accounts after
10:22:59 25	correct?	10:26:01 25	2002 are being distributed by BIA and OST.
	751		753
1		1	
1	A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different	1	753
	A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA	-	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs?
2	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. 	2	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA
3	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated 	23	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002,
	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. 	2 3 4	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after
10:23:17	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002.
10:23:17	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to
10:23:17	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time?
10.23:17 10.23:17 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.23:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34 10.25:34	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10	753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been
10:23:17 (10:23:17 (10:23:34 (10:23:34	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that.
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to
10:23:17 () () () () () () () () () () () () ()	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that.
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:34 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35 10:25:35	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing.
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts. Two, there 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10:25 10	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate?
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system,
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project.
10:23:17 & 2 10:23:17 & 2 10:23:34 10 10:23:34 10 11 12 10:23:49 15 10:23:49 15 10:23:49 15 10:24:05 20	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. THE WITNESS: I believe it's the same question again, 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19 10:27:14 20	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project. Q. And that's limited to a transfer to an account in the
10.23:17 & 2 10.23:17 & 2 10.23:34 10 10.23:34 10 11 12 10.23:49 15 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. THE WITNESS: I believe it's the same question again, Your Honor. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19 10:27:14 20 21	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project. Q. And that's limited to a transfer to an account in the system. Okay.
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:24:40 10:23:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. THE WITNESS: I believe it's the same question again, Your Honor. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19 10:27:14 20 21 22	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project. Q. And that's limited to a transfer to an account in the system. Okay.
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:24:05 20 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 25 26 27 27 27 28 29 20 21 22 23 23 24 25 26 27 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. THE WITNESS: I believe it's the same question again, Your Honor. THE COURT: "You have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in the SDA accounts and the more. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19 10:27:14 20 21 22 23	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project. Q. And that's limited to a transfer to an account in the system. Okay. How about all the other monies in SDAs? Who's verifying that the distributions from SDAs are accurate?
10:23:17 10:23:17 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:34 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:49 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:23:40 10:24:40 10:23:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40 10:24:40	 A. As I mentioned, I think we're confusing many different issues again. Collections are being tested through the LSA work. We're looking at postings to the system in our DCV work. And postings that should have happened is being evaluated through the land to dollar work. So again, we're talking about many different things. Q. And let me try to be clear, because obviously we're going on different tracks here. As you indicated to Judge Robertson, there is money in the SDA accounts, has been over many years, that belongs to individual Indians. Correct? A. Yes. Some of the money in those accounts, yes. Q. But you have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in those SDA accounts actually gets transferred to an account of an individual Indian? A. No. Well, first, you have to remember, again, not all of the money in those accounts that are being distributed THE COURT: We've got that, Ms. Herman. THE WITNESS: I believe it's the same question again, Your Honor. THE COURT: "You have not been specifically tasked with making sure that all of that money that is in the SDA accounts actually guest transferred to an account of an individual. 	2 3 4 10:26:22 5 6 7 8 9 10:26:33 10 11 12 13 14 10:26:49 15 16 17 18 19 10:27:14 20 21 22	 753 Q. Have you reviewed all nonzero balance accounts in SDAs? A. As I mentioned, we're not doing that work right now. OHTA has been tasked with reviewing nonzero balance accounts at 2002, and OST and BIA are reviewing nonzero balance accounts after 2002. Q. So they're reviewing it beginning in 2002, but not prior to that time? A. If it had a nonzero balance at 2002, the funds haven't been distributed yet. Q. So is it fair to say that nobody is looking at the SDAs let me strike that. Neither OST or OHTA are looking at the SDAs prior to 2002? A. In terms of distributing balances, they would have had a zero balance. I thought that's what we were discussing. Q. You have a lot of people working on SDAs, obviously. Who is verifying if a historical distribution from an SDA is accurate? A. In terms of a transfer to another account within the system, that's being tested through the LSA project. Q. And that's limited to a transfer to an account in the system. Okay.

	754		756
1	Q. I'm talking about any transfers from SDAs. Who is verifying	1	Q. But you're not verifying that every transfer out of an SDA
2	that those transfers are accurate?	2	account goes to the right place?
3	A. As I mentioned, the transfers are being tested through the	3	A. No, we're not, through the data validation work. That's
4	LSA project.	4	only being tested through the LSA work.
10:27:38 5	Q. To the extent they go into an individual Indian account?	10:30:08 5	${\bf Q}.~$ So it's your understanding that the LSA work will verify
6	A. That's correct.	6	that every transfer out of an SDA account is going to the right
7	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm How}$ about the money that doesn't go into individual Indian	7	source?
8	accounts? Who is verifying that those accounts are accurate?	8	A. No, that's not what I if that's what I said, that's not
9	A. We're verifying through our transaction mapping that all of	9	what I intended. What I'm saying is that transfers into
10:27:51 10	the funds that were taken out of the SDA were re-credited within	10:30:25 10	individual accounts from Special Deposit Accounts are being
11	the system. We're not testing the accuracy through that test,	11	tested through the LSA project.
12	though.	12	Q. But that has nothing to do with transfers out of the SDA to
13	Q. You're not testing the accuracy of even the money that's	13	any other account, not an individual Indian's account. Is that
14	going into the account of an individual Indian, are you?	14	correct?
10:28:03 15	A. Not in the data completeness test. But it is being tested	10:30:39 15	A. That's correct, to the extent that sometimes transfers
16	in the LSA project.	16	happen multiple times. So if you transfer from SDA 1 to SDA 2
17	Q. And you're not testing the accuracy of any money going from	17	to SDA 3 to the individual account, all of those transfers will
18	an SDA into any other account that isn't going directly into the	18	be evaluated.
19	account of an individual Indian, are you?	19	Q. Okay. So to your knowledge, nobody is verifying transfers
0:28:16 20	A. Well, I think we need to be clear, because sometimes funds	10:31:02 20	or withdrawals from an SDA account that doesn't go into an
21	transfer multiple times from SDAs. So the final transfer into	21	individual Indian's account?
22	the individual account is being tested.	22	A. I've described all of the ways that it's being tested.
23	Q. Now, if there's money in an SDA on a historical basis I'm	23	That's all I can describe for you.
24	sorry. I'll slow down.	24	Q. Okay. If we could look at Bates stamp number 3-2-1. This
0:28:32 25	If there's money in an SDA that goes to Interior, not	10:31:45 25	appears to be a section from an OHTA accountants conference,
	755		757
1	to an IIM account holder but to Interior, are you verifying that	1	July 22 to 23, 2003 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Did you attend
2	that money does not belong to an individual Indian?	2	that conference?
3	A. If monies are transferred out of an SDA to the Tribal Trust	3	A. I believe I did.
4	or to another Interior account, we're requesting documentation	4	Q. And if we could go to Bates page seven, and focus on
:28:51 5	to determine why the funds were being transferred.	10:32:07 5	block 30. It says, "Leakage tests of IIM funds have IIM fund
6	Q. When did you request the documentation?	6	resources leaked to non-Indians inappropriately, direct
7	A. I'm sorry?	7	disbursement from admin account to non-IIM account."
8	Q. When did you request the documentation?	8	And your name is there. It says, "Medium priority.
9	A. As a component of our data validation.	9	Michelle Herman will work with Susan Hinkins to define the issue
:29:02 10	Q. Have you got all the documentation you requested?	10:32:41 10	and determine next steps to resolve."
11	A. We haven't completed our work yet, so no, we have not	11	Do you see that?
12	received all the documents we've requested.	12	A. I do.
13	Q. How much of the documentation have you received?	13	Q. So, have you been tasked with the job of making sure that
14	A. I would have to look at our records to tell you that.	14	IIM funds are not leaked to non-Indians inappropriately, and to
D:29:16 15	Q. Are you telling me that let's limit it to the period 1985	10:32:58 15	check direct disbursements from admin accounts to non-IIM
16	to the present, the period you're looking at.	16	accounts?
17	A. Okay.	17	A. As I mentioned, currently what we're testing are the
18	Q. Are you telling me that, for every transfer out of an SDA	18	transfers out of those accounts to outside of the IIM system.
19	account that doesn't go to an IIM account holder, you're	19	We're not currently testing disbursements from those accounts.
D:29:34 20	verifying that the transfer did not contain individual Indian	10:33:14 20	Q. So you are not currently doing what's described here?
21	money?	21	 A. We're doing part of it, not all of it.
22	A. No. What I said was transfers out of the IRMS system, that	22	Q. And do you know who is doing the rest of it?
23	we're requesting documentation for those.	23	 And do you know who is doing the rest of it. A. I don't believe the decision has been made as to whether or
24	Q. Transfers out of the IRMS system?	23	not the rest of that test will be performed.
10:29:47 25	A. That's correct.	10:33:28 25	Q. So it may not be performed at all?
1 of 40 she		0 757 of 825	

	758		760
1	A. I can't speak for Interior.	1	Q. And I believe you testified yesterday that you would look at
2	Q. Has anybody suggested to you that now it's not going to be	2	that system in order to get ownership information for your
3	performed?	3	historical account statements?
4	A. No, they have not.	4	A. No, that information was being used in the LSA project, not
10:33:37 5	Q. It just hasn't been done yet?	10:37:32 5	for the HSAs themselves.
6	A. We're focused on many things in order to complete the	6	Q. So for your LSA project, you would be looking toward
7	historical record. We can't do them all concurrently.	7	information that is on the LRIS system?
8	${\bf Q}.~$ And it looks like the date of this conference, I believe if	8	A. That's correct.
9	we could go back to the first page, was it 2002 or 2003?	9	Q. Has anybody are you aware of any problems with the LRIS
10:33:55 10	A. I don't recall.	10:37:53 10	system?
11	Q. July 2003. So over four years later, the work hasn't even	11	A. Yes, I am.
12	started yet on that aspect. Is that fair?	12	Q. And what types of problems are you aware of?
13	A. As I mentioned, half of it has, the other half has not.	13	A. I saw instances in the work that we were performing where
14	${\bf Q}.~$ If we could look at Exhibit 47-5-1, it's Bates stamp number	14	the total ownership didn't sum to one, for instance.
10:34:30 15	47-5-1. This is a copy of a NORC report, "Alaska region,	10:38:07 15	${\bf Q}.~$ Okay. So there are missing pieces of the ownership records?
16	Special Deposit Account, SDA, debit sample design report."	16	A. That it was incorrectly recorded.
17	Are you familiar with this document at all?	17	Q. Okay. What other problems did you notice?
18	A. I don't recall if I've seen this document or not.	18	A. I noticed a situation where it appeared that the land was
19	${\bf Q}. \ \ $ The document we just looked at previously indicated that you	19	distributed I'm sorry, given to the next heir, where the
10:35:09 20	would be working with Ms. Hinkins. And you understand	10:38:26 20	report didn't indicate that the person had inherited the land.
21	Ms. Hinkins is from NORC. Is that correct?	21	Q. Anything else?
22	A. That's correct.	22	A. Not that I can recall.
23	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm And} \ {\rm have} \ {\rm you} \ {\rm been} \ {\rm working} \ {\rm with} \ {\rm Ms.} \ {\rm Hinkins} \ {\rm on} \ {\rm SDA} \ {\rm accounts}?$	23	Q. Is it fair to say that not all regions or agencies have
24	A. I work with Ms. Hinkins in all kinds of different ways, on	24	consistently used the LRIS system?
10:35:24 25	all of the sampling issues.	10:38:38 25	A. That's correct.
	759		761
1	Q. Have you been working with her specifically on SDA accounts?	1	Q. I believe you noticed, in Alaska they didn't use it at all,
2	A. We may have at some point in time, but not recently.	2	did they?
3	Q. If we could look please at Bates stamp five. It states,	3	A. That's correct.
4	"OHTA recently proposed a series of effort (sic) to reconcile	4	Q. So you can't go just to the LRIS system to get an accurate
10:35:53 5	receipts in debits in IIM accounts in the Alaska region. Debits	10:38:47 5	record of ownership for the entire 12 regions, can you?
6	from Special Deposit Account, SDA, are beyond these efforts and	6	A. That's correct.
7	are regarded as a potential gap."	7	Q. If we could look at 21-4-1. Ms. Herman, this is a document
8	Do you know what is meant by that?	8	that was provided us in the administrative record. It's
9	A. I do not.	9	entitled, "Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians,
10:36:16 10	Q. Do you know if there actually has been sampling involving	10:39:17 10	Office of Trust Funds Management, Special Deposit Accounts
11	debits from SDA accounts?	11	project work plan."
12	A. Debits just mean a reduction from the SDA. So transfers	12	Have you ever seen this document before?
13	have been evaluated, as I mentioned.	13	A. I don't believe so.
14	Q. But nothing specifically with respect to sampling within an	14	Q . Let me ask you if you're familiar with some of the
10:36:34 15	SDA account?	10:39:30 15	information that's referenced in it. If we could look at page
16	A. Of which I'm aware, no.	16	seven of that document, and focus in on the highlighted
17	Q. Do you know how many SDA accounts are currently on the	17	language. It says, "BIA utilizes the land records information
18	electronic system?	18	system, LRIS, to maintain the official source of ownership for
19	A. No, but I believe it's included in our report.	19	the purposes of verifying and certifying title to Trust land,
10:37:01 20	Q. Another system that I believe you have not looked at yet	10:39:52 20	but does not maintain the system used for distribution of Trust
21 22	well, actually, you did. You talked about land systems	21	funds. Instead, BIA utilizes various systems, IRMS, MAD,
22	yesterday, LRIS. Is that correct?	22	et cetera, to determine the distribution of Trust funds."
23	A. Yes, that's correct. That's the Land Record Information System?	23	Have you looked at I take it you have not looked at
24 10:37:14 25	Q. That's the Land Record Information System?	24 10:40:14 25	the IRMS ownership database?
10.37:14 20	A. Yes, that's correct.	10.40:14	A. No, we have not.

		762		764
	1	Q. And what is MAD, do you know?	1	were testing through the LSA work.
	2	A. Yes, MAD was a system used by the Great Plains region to do	2	Q. In your work, did you go and verify and check with the land
	3	its distributions.	3	records, to make sure that the money got to the person who was
	4	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Okay}. \ \ {\rm Were}$ there other systems that BIA had that were used	4	the correct owner?
	10:40:27 5	to determine distribution?	10:43:02 5	A. Through the LSA project, we were testing that the funds were
	6	A. These are the two with which I am familiar, but I believe	6	distributed to the correct owner.
	7	there were others.	7	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm You}$ were testing that the funds were in fact distributed to
	8	Q . Were these systems consistent?	8	someone. Did you verify it with land records to make sure it
	9	A. I didn't test the systems, sir.	9	went to the correct owner in every instance?
	10:40:40 10	${\bf Q}.~$ Do you know if anybody has tested the LRIS, IRMS, and MAD	10:43:15 10	A. As I mentioned, we used the LRIS data to determine whether
	11	systems to determine whether the information on there is	11	or not it went to the correct and land owner.
	12	consistent?	12	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
	13	A. There's one there was a study done of the LRIS system	13	not. Is that correct?
	14	done by NORC; and two, they were tested through the sample.	14	A. Yes. But it's a cross-check between the distribution
	10:40:57 15	Because the initial distribution would have been made through	10:43:29 15	program that was used, as well as the LRIS records. And in some
	16	the monetary system, and we were using LRIS to check the	16	instances we had other probate records and things of that nature
	17	ownership.	17	that were made available.
	18	So in that regard they were cross-checked, but only	18	${\bf Q}. \ \ $ You would agree, would you not, that it's important for that
	19	through the sample in the NORC study.	19	ownership information to be correct?
	10:41:09 20	Q. And that was a very limited sample. Is that correct?	10:43:40 20	A. Yes, it is.
	21	A. I'm not familiar with the total size of the sample.	21	Q. Have you heard of anything called the TIME study?
	22	Q. But FTI has not been tasked with either determining the	22	A. I'm sorry?
	23	accuracy of the information on the LRIS system, or whether it is	23	Q. TIME, T-I-M-E. Have you heard of anything called the TIME
	24	consistent with other systems within BIA's records. Is that	24	study?
	10:41:27 25	fair?	10:43:49 25	A. I don't believe so.
		763		765
	1	A. Only to the extent we evaluated it through the LSA project.	1	Q. Has anybody suggested to you that studies have been done
	2	Q. So when you received information from the LRIS system	2	showing that 20, 25 percent of the information in LRIS may be
	3	regarding ownership, did you simply assume that information was	3	inaccurate?
	4	correct?	4	A. I don't recall hearing that, no.
	10:41:42 5	A. To the extent that there was any inconsistency within the	10:44:04 5	Q. If we could look at 50-2-1, which is another report from
	6	information, we went to outside sources to verify it.	6	NORC entitled, "NORC analysis of LRIS tract history reports."
	7	Q. But did you actually have anybody test the information you	7	Have you seen this document before?
	8	got, to make sure it was accurate?	8	A. I don't recall if I've seen this document.
	9	A. No. The information was the LTROs and the LRIS system	9	Q . And if we could look at page eight of that document, and
	10:41:59 10	was tested by NORC, as I mentioned, not by us.	10:44:43 10	focus on the highlighted language. "We particularly emphasize
	11 12	Q. And I take it the folks at NORC would be the people who	11 12	our positive results in view of the report on the findings of
		would have the best information regarding the testing they did		the TIME project carried out by Datacom in 2000. Datacom
	13	on the LRIS system. Is that fair?	13 14	asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in the postings."
	14	A. That's fair.		THE COURT: Mr. Smith, is this the best witness to be
	10:42:16 15 16	Q. Would you agree, Ms. Herman, that just as important as	10:45:02 15 16	asking these questions? She just said she doesn't know anything
	10	determining whether postings on LRIS and TFAS are correct, it's	17	about this.
		equally important that the postings, the money that is posted on		MR. SMITH: Okay. I'll move on, Your Honor.
	18 19	there gets to the right person?	18	BY MR. SMITH:
ļ	19 10:42:35 20	A. I'm sorry, LRIS and TFAS are different systems.	19 10:45:19 20	Q. Is it fair to say that that information is not something you
ļ	10:42:35 20 21	Q. I'm sorry. Yeah, I misspoke.	10:45:19 20 21	are familiar with? A. No, I was not familiar with the TIME report.
ļ	21	Just as important as determining whether the postings on IRMS and TFAS are correct, it's just as important to	21	Q. Were you actually provided a copy of the LTRO database?
ļ	23	determine whether the money posted gets to the right person. Is	22	A. No. We received a subset of the LRIS database for the
ļ	23	that correct?	23	particular account holders that had been sampled.
ļ	10:42:48 25	A. Well, that would define a correct posing. That's what we	10:45:41 25	Q. But you've never received an actual copy of the LTRO

		766		768
	1	database?	1	A. It made it more difficult, yes.
	2	A. Not our firm, no.	2	Q. In fact, if we could look at 54-5-1. This appears to be an
	3	Q. If we could look at 15-2-1. And you have not been copied on	3	e-mail from you to Steve Alcorn dated December 30, 2002, copy to
	4	this e-mail, but it references you. Let me ask if you're	4	Mr. Brunner. Mr. Brunner is your partner. Is that correct?
10:46:07	5	familiar with it. It's an e-mail from Joseph Walker to Crucita	10:48:55 5	A. He's my boss.
	6	Grover, copy to Harold Corley, Fritz Scheuren, and Bert Edwards.	6	Q. Okay. It says, "Comments on Draft 4." Do you recall you
	7	It says at the top, "Rob, Ryan, and Michelle came by after a	7	were making comments on the plan that was being proposed at that
	8	meeting with Bert."	8	point in time?
	9	Do you see that in the first sentence?	9	A. Yes, I did.
10:46:30	10	A. I do.	10:49:10 10	Q . And if we could look at it says let's see, go to the
-	11	Q . And then in the next paragraph, the highlighted language, it	11	next page.
-	12	says, "They also asked about procedures on LTRO data. I gave	12	Here we go. Under 19 of 46, you state, last paragraph,
-	13	them a copy of the e-mail whereby I responded to Bud on that	13	"We should choose a different revenue type for our example.
	14	same question."	14	Grazing funds are very difficult to prove out through a review
10:46:44	15	And then if you go down further - I don't want to read	10:49:43 15	of ownership records."
	16	all of this - it says, "Rob, Ryan, and Michelle are asking for a	16	What do you mean by that?
	17	copy CD of the LTRO's database, rather than access, which was	17	A. I don't recall, sir. I would need to look at page 19 of 46.
	18	the subject of the message to Bud. However, the process would	18	This was in 2002.
	19	be very similar."	19	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
10:47:02	20	Did you ever get a copy of that LTRO database?	10:49:58 20	records for grazing and range, that those had to be excluded
1	21	A. I didn't have a chance to read the entire e-mail, but I	21	A. I believe what this was referring to is a picture that they
1	22	believe this was referring to our trip to Alaska. And once we	22	were trying to draw. And what I was referring to as to why
2	23	arrived in Alaska, we learned that Alaska didn't use LRIS. I	23	range is more challenging wasn't because of the ownership
2	24	believe that that's what this is specifically referring to.	24	records. It was because of the transaction description.
10:47:21	25	Q. So to the best of your knowledge, you never got a copy of	10:50:17 25	Q. So what do you mean by "grazing funds are very difficult to
		767		769
	1	the LTRO database that you requested here?	1	prove out through a review of ownership records"?
	2	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and	2	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring
	2 3	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system.	2	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the
	2 3 4	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no?	2 3 4	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the
10:47:35	2 3 4 5	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated
10:47:35	2 3 4 5 6	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided.	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for;
10:47:35	2 3 4 5 6 7	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that
10:47:35	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time.	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH:	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10	prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling.
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct?
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: A. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded.
10:47:41 10:48:02	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled,
10:47:41 10:48:02	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample
10:47:41 10:48:02	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: A. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile.	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28,
10:47:41 10:48:02	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004.
10:47:41 10:48:02	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \end{array}$	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: A. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. And you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the
10:47:41 10:48:02 10:48:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: A. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19 10:51:28 20	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. And you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the reconciliation of the high-dollar accounts. Is that correct?
10:47:41 10:48:02 10:48:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 9 \\ 20 \\ 21 \end{array}$	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A. As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? A. Again, it varies by region depending on the system they were using. For instance, in Great Plains in the early '80s, the	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19 10:51:28 20 21	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. Man you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the reconciliation of the high-dollar accounts. Is that correct? A. That's correct.
10:47:41 10:48:02 10:48:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? A. Again, it varies by region depending on the system they were using. For instance, in Great Plains in the early '80s, the descriptions were less clear that than they were in the	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19 10:51:28 20 21 22	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. Man you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the reconciliation of the high-dollar accounts. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you seen this report before?
10:47:41	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: A Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? A Again, it varies by region depending on the system they were using. For instance, in Great Plains in the early '80s, the '80s, the '80s. 	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19 10:51:28 20 21 22 23	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. Mnd you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the reconciliation of the high-dollar accounts. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you seen this report before? A. NORC has published many reports. I've seen some of them,
10:47:41	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2	 the LTRO database that you requested here? A As I mentioned, I believe this is referring to Alaska, and they didn't use the LRIS system. THE COURT: So the answer is no? THE WITNESS: Correct. There was no copy to be provided. THE COURT: If you could just say no, we would save a lot of time. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Is it fair to say that you ran into certain transactions on the IRMS database that posed more problems than others? A. I'm sorry, in what sense? Q. Let's take, for instance, range leases and grazing. Was that a particularly difficult problem in investigating? A. It depends on the type of transaction. In earlier years the description references were less clear, and so it made them more difficult to reconcile. Q. When we're talking earlier years, what period are we talking about? The '80s, the '70s, how early are we getting? A. Again, it varies by region depending on the system they were using. For instance, in Great Plains in the early '80s, the descriptions were less clear that than they were in the	2 3 4 10:50:32 5 6 7 8 9 10:50:48 10 11 12 13 14 10:51:04 15 16 17 18 19 10:51:28 20 21 22	 prove out through a review of ownership records"? A. As I mentioned, I would have to see what this is referring to on page 19. But the challenge that we had in reconciling the range transactions was in the description as posted. So the description that we looked at in court the other day indicated specifically what range unit and what tract the funds were for; in earlier years the descriptions didn't include that information, which made it more challenging. Q. And because of some of those challenges that were experienced with ranging and grazing, at some point those transactions had to be excluded from the statistical sampling. Is that correct? A. Not the transactions I worked on. I'm not aware if there were other transactions that were excluded. Q. Let's look at 51-9-1. This is a NORC report entitled, "Reconciliation of the high-dollar and national sample transactions from land-based IIM accounts," dated December 28, 2004. And you testified yesterday, you actually worked on the reconciliation of the high-dollar accounts. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you seen this report before?

	770		772
1	page. It says, "In addition, several classes of national sample	1	Q. If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-14. Do you
2	credit transactions were deferred until a later time, for	2	recognize this as part of your DCV?
3	operational reasons. They arose when it became clear that the	3	A. Yes, I do.
4	document search and collection was taking more resources and	4	Q. And it says, "As FTI's scope of work was limited to analysis
10:52:10 5	time than expected. OHTA decided that two classes of	10:55:31 5	of the IRMS and TFAS and electronic data, no external
6	transactions, for which alternative methods may facilitate the	6	validations were performed to determine if all individual
7	document collection and reconciliation process, would be	7	account holders have IRMS or TFAS accounts." Is that correct?
8	deferred: Transactions associated with payments from certain	8	A. Yes, that's what I stated.
9	types of range or grazing leases, and particular types of	9	Q. Do you know if anybody has been tasked with the job of
10:52:28 10	transfer transactions."	10:55:50 10	determining whether all account holders have IRMS or TFAS
11	Was this information ever provided to you?	11	accounts?
12	A. I believe that this is referring to grazing transactions in	12	A. I'm not aware, no.
13	the Rocky Mountain region, which is not a region that I worked	13	Q. Now, in your review, your DCV, you have added a number of
14	on reconciling.	14	account holders whose accounts were not originally on the
10:52:43 15	Q. So you do not know at this point in time whether this	10:56:14 15	electronic system that you were given of IRMS or TFAS. Is that
16	particular issue has been resolved. It says it's been deferred;	16	correct?
17	you don't know if it's been resolved?	17	A. That's correct.
18	A. I do not know, no.	18	Q. Do you have an idea of how many have been added?
19	Q. Okay. Thank you.	19	A. No, but I believe it's included in our report.
10:53:23 20	Let's turn directly to your DCV. You've had to look at	10:56:25 20	Q. It's thousands. Is that fair?
21	your DCV by region. Is that correct?	21	A. I believe so, yes.
22	A. As I mentioned, we have some tests that we performed	22	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm And} \ {\rm your} \ {\rm DCV} \ {\rm does} \ {\rm not} \ {\rm include} \ {\rm a} \ {\rm recollection} \ ({\rm sic}) \ {\rm of} \ {\rm some}$
23	overall, and some that we evaluate on a region basis.	23	of the things we discussed earlier. It does not reconcile MMS
24	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{And one of the reasons you've had to look at things on a }$	24	to IRMS?
10:53:41 25	regional basis is because the regions operated so much	10:56:43 25	A. No, it does not.
10:53:41 25	regional basis is because the regions operated so much 771	10:56:43 25	A. No, it does not. 773
1		10:56:43 25	
1 2	771	1	773
1 2 3	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes,	1 2 3	773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to
1 2	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances.	1	773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct?
1 2 3 4 10.53:53 5 6	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6	773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project?	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7	773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number?	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you?
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period?	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data?
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13	 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years?
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15	 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you?	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed?
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18 19	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able to tell us whether all account holders who should be on IRMS or	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18 19	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be completed by this year?
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18 19 10:54:55 20	 771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able to tell us whether all account holders who should be on IRMS or TFAS are actually on those systems. Is that correct? 	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18 19 10:57:37 20	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be completed by this year? A. I don't know if there was such a schedule.
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18 19	771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able to tell us whether all account holders who should be on IRMS or TFAS are actually on those systems. Is that correct? A. That's not a goal of the test, no.	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be completed by this year? A. I don't know if there was such a schedule. Q. I mentioned yesterday, we've only been provided two of your
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18 19 10:54:55 20 21	 771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able to tell us whether all account holders who should be on IRMS or TFAS are actually on those systems. Is that correct? 	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18 19 10:57:37 20 21	 773 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be completed by this year? A. I don't know if there was such a schedule. Q. I mentioned yesterday, we've only been provided two of your reports. And one was the one you did in June 2007; and then the
1 2 3 4 10:53:53 5 6 7 8 9 10:54:07 10 11 12 13 14 10:54:25 15 16 17 18 19 10:54:55 20 21 22	 771 differently. Is that correct? A. Yes, in some instances. Q. And having to look at things on a regional basis makes, obviously, it more time-consuming? A. That's correct. Q. Do you know how much FTI has been paid so far for the DCV project? A. No, not in total. Q. Do you have an approximate number? A. I would guess it's in excess of 15 million, but I can't give you an accurate number. Q. In excess of \$15 million over a four-year period? A. Sir, I would have to look at our billing records to give you a precise number. Q. Importantly, in performing your DCV, you are not performing any external validations of the IRMS or TFAS system, are you? A. No, we are not. Q. And after the DCV is completed, you will still not be able to tell us whether all account holders who should be on IRMS or TFAS are actually on those systems. Is that correct? A. That's not a goal of the test, no. Q. It's not a goal, which means you won't be able to tell us. 	1 2 3 4 10:56:56 5 6 7 8 9 10:57:15 10 11 12 13 14 10:57:26 15 16 17 18 19 10:57:37 20 21 22	 Q. Or Treasury to IRMS? A. No, it does not. Q. So at the completion of your DCV, you will not be able to tell us what individual Indian money may have been withheld in the MMS system and didn't get posted to IRMS. Is that correct? A. No, I will not. Q. Even today, you can't tell us what the population of accounts or transactions is for the historical accounting, even in the electronic era, can you? A. Not until we complete restoring the data, no. Q. Do you have any idea when you will be completed with your project for restoring the data? A. We're scheduled to be completed in two years. Q. In two years? A. That's correct. Q. Has that schedule been postponed? A. Not of which I'm aware. Q. Had there originally been a schedule that it would be completed by this year? A. I don't know if there was such a schedule. Q. I mentioned yesterday, we've only been provided two of your

Г

10/16/2007 07:25:01 PM

	774		776
1	status reports on your study over the years. Is that correct?	1	A. They didn't overlap. They were separate.
2	A. That's correct.	2	Q. Okay. And you were also provided something called master
3	Q. But a lot of the information that is in the June report is	3	files. Is that correct?
4	duplicated in the September 30 report. Is that correct?	4	A. That's correct.
10:58:13 5	A. I'm sorry, which June report?	11:01:21 5	Q. And you were provided 10 of those files?
6	Q . The June 12, 2007 report.	6	A. That's correct.
7	A. Yes, it is.	7	Q. And basically, those master files give you a snapshot at a
8	Q. I wanted to just point to one section of that report. If we	8	point in time as to what the balances were for all open
9	could look at 34-1-1. Is this a copy of your June 12 report?	9	accounts. Is that correct?
10:58:35 10	A. Yes, it is.	11:01:35 10	A. That's correct.
11	Q. And if we could look at Bates page 11, and focus on the	11	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
12	highlighted language. It says, "Including transactions restored	12	prior to that particular snapshot?
13	as of the date of this report, the combined IRMS and TFAS	13	A. It does include closed accounts, just not all closed
14	transaction data contains roughly 94 million credit	14	accounts.
10:59:03 15	transactions, totaling approximately 68.2 billion in credit	11:01:49 15	Q. So some closed accounts, it includes?
16	throughput; and over 17 million debit transactions, totaling	16	A. It does.
17	68.1 billion in debit throughput, for a total of 112,142,496	17	Q. Do you know why it includes some and doesn't include others?
18	transactions, and a total, absolute value, throughput of	18	A. I believe that the master file included the same accounts as
19	\$136.3 billion." Is that correct?	19	the I-Tran file, but I haven't performed that comparison.
10:59:27 20	A. That's correct.	11:02:03 20	Q. Now, all the balance files you had were 1996 or later?
21	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm And} \ {\rm did} \ {\rm that} \ {\rm number} \ {\rm increase} \ {\rm from} \ {\rm your} \ {\rm June} \ {\rm report} \ {\rm to} \ {\rm your}$	21	A. Electronically, yes.
22	September report?	22	Q. Electronic balance files. And when you went back when
23	A. Yes, it would have.	23	you testified in 2003, you said you were going to go look for
24	Q. And if we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152, Bates	24	hard copies of master files. Is that correct?
10:59:41 25	number 152-20. And in this report that number has been	11:02:20 25	A. Yes, that's correct.
	775		777
1	increased to \$139 billion. Is that right?	1	Q. And can you tell me how many hard copies of master files
2	A. It appears so, yes.	2	,
3	Q. So it's gone up significantly in that period of time?	3	······································
4	A. Well, we would have loaded probably two additional months of	4	
11:00:09 5	TFAS data. And as you'll recall, the TFAS system includes	11:02:33 5	
6	investment transactions. And these, again, are absolute	6	
7	dollars. So, all flows of money.	7	A. You'll see the references to different types of reports:
8	Q. I understand.	8	
9	When you testified in 2003, you told us about the	9	several different types of reports to find the balance
11:00:23 10	master files.	11:02:53 10	information.
11	A. Correct.	11	Q. I was talking specifically about master files. Were you
12	Q. Do you recall that?	12	
13	And you had just begun your analysis as part of your	13	,
14	DCV project of these master files at that time?	14 11:03:03 15	
11:00:35 15	A. I don't recall. But yes, we've had master files for some		
16	time.	16	
17 18	Q. And just for clarification, when you got that IRMS database,	17 18	you're referring to not just master files?
18	you had something called a hisTran file something called an	18	
19 11:00:53 20	I-Tran file. Is that correct, hisTran and I-Tran?	19 11:03:13 20	
11:00:53 20 21	 A. In the initial file we received, yes. And the L Trap file had giv months of trappactional history? 	11:03:13 20 21	
21	 Q. And the I-Tran file had six months of transactional history? A. That's correct. 	21	statements, we've used IM-600 reports, and master files. Q. What are IM-600 reports?
22	A. Inat's correct.Q. And hisTran files had transactional data prior to that?	23	
23	And his ran hies had transactional data prior to that?	23	-
11:01:07 25		11:03:42 25	
11:01:07 23	Q. So it had a more complete summary of the transactional data?	11:03:42 23	received were incomplete? Excuse me, the master files that you

10/16/2007 07:25:01 PM

	778		780
1	received?	1	A. Within this information's provided in a table structure,
2	A. They represented the accounts on the system at that point in	2	and there were a different number of fields within that table,
3	time.	3	different amounts of information.
4	${\bf Q}.~$ Okay. But the ones you received of those 10 you received	4	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And sometimes the information within those fields was not
11:03:55 5	after 1996 that were in the electronic format, those were	11:21:13 5	consistent?
6	incomplete?	6	A. I'm not sure that I'm understanding. The fields had
7	A. The files were meant to represent the accounts on the system	7	different names.
8	at that point in time, which they do. But it doesn't list every	8	Q. The fields had different names?
9	account that ever existed.	9	A. Yes, they did.
11:04:08 10	Q. If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-42.	11:21:23 10	Q. Between balance files?
11	THE COURT: Mr. Smith, how are you doing on time? How	11	A. Yes, they did.
12	much longer?	12	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Was}$ the information in those different fields, other than
13	MR. SMITH: I've got at least through lunch, Your	13	the name, was it consistent between balance files?
14	Honor.	14	A. Yes, for the most part it was.
11:04:28 15	THE COURT: At least through lunch?	11:21:34 15	Q. You say "for the most part."
16	MR. SMITH: Yeah.	16	A. Well, there were different numbers different fields were
17	THE COURT: I misunderestimated you. I thought I heard	17	available in different files, so we didn't have the same exact
18	you winding up, but I was wrong. So we're going to take the	18	fields in all the files. There's a chart in our report that
19	mid-morning break.	19	shows exactly what was available per file.
11:04:39 20	MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.	11:21:50 20	MR. SMITH: If we could look at 152-101?
21	THE COURT: Try to keep it to 10 minutes.	21	BY MR. SMITH:
22	(Recess taken at 11:04 a.m.)	22	Q. Is this a portion of your report as well?
23	THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Smith.	23	A. Yes, it is.
24	MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.	24	${\bf Q}.~$ And if we could focus on page 104, footnote one, and this
11:04:41 25	BY MR. SMITH:	11:22:11 25	may be what you just said, but tell me if it is: "These fields
	779		781
1	Q. Ms. Herman, before we broke we were talking about your	1	have been included in MASTER_ALL." What is MASTER_ALL?
2	master files, or balance files. And I asked you whether the	2	A. We aggregated all of the tables into one table.
3	master files you received electronically were after 1996 and I	3	Q . "Fields received in the 10 master files were inconsistent,
4	asked you whether there were gaps in those files.	4	MASTER_ALL reflects the most common name across the 10 master
11:19:42 5	MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 152-66?	11:22:29 5	files. When data was not available for one of these field, it
6	BY MR. SMITH:	6	was updated to null."
7	Q. Is this a copy of your DCV, or a portion of it?	7	What does that mean?
8	A. Yes, this is an excerpt from the table report that we	8	A. We left it blank so that there could be a difference between
9	provided.	9	a zero and not available.
11:19:53 10	Q. If we could focus on the highlighted language toward the	11:22:40 10	Q. Okay. I understand.
11	top. It says, "Master tables also contain account balance	11	And you went through the process of comparing the
12	information for the current month end, and, in many cases,	12	master files to the data in the transactional files. Is that
13	balance information for the previous six months. For the months	13	correct?
14	February 1996 through March 2000, balance information is	14	A. The balances in those files, yes.
11:20:16 15	available for all but five months. Currently, no electronic	11:22:55 15	Q. Now, the master file actually has individual account
16	information is available prior to February 1996."	16	information. Is that correct?
17	Then if you go down to the bottom of the page in the	17	A. It contains the account number, the area, the management
18	footnote seven and eight, it identifies specifically which time	18	that the account was receiving, address data, lots of different
19	periods and areas for which you do not have balance information.	19	information.
11:20:41 20	Is that correct?	11:23:08 20	Q. Now, does the master file contain balance information as of
21	A. That's correct.	21	the time that master file took that picture?
22	Q. And did you find that, in fact, even within the data within	22	A. Yes. Sometimes it includes more than one month's worth of
23	the master files, what you did get was sometimes inconsistent?	23	balances.
24	A. There were different fields provided in different files.	24	Q. Okay. And you went through the process of comparing those
11:21:01 25	Q. And what do you mean by that?	11:23:24 25	master files to the information on the transactional files?

		782		784
	1	A. Yes, we did. The balances.	1	A. That's correct.
	2	Q. Just the balances, not the individual transactions for	2	Q. And it says at the top, IRMS estimated difference. What do
	3	account holders?	3	you mean by estimated difference?
	4	A. The master file only has one record per account; it doesn't	4	A. That's the difference that we've computed between the first
11:23:38	5	include transactions.	11:26:25 5	balance file and the transaction file at that point in time.
	6	Q. So did you check the balances for individual accounts?	6	Q. Okay. And if you look at the totals on the bottom where
	7	A. For all accounts in the system that were in the file.	7	we've highlighted that, for the accounts for which you actually
	8	Q. And basically, you're comparing one file in IRMS, or in the	8	had balance files, you found no difference on 327,222?
	9	IIM module of IRMS, to another file in the IIM module. Is that	9	A. That would have been after restoring transactions, yes.
11:24:00	10	correct?	11:26:50 10	Q. After restoring transactions, at that point in time, you
	11	A. That's correct.	11	found there was no difference on that number?
	12	Q. And you found that there were inconsistencies between those	12	A. That's correct.
	13	two files within IRMS itself. Is that correct?	13	Q. Is there a different place I can go to find out what the
	14	A. That's how we identified the missing data, yes.	14	discrepancy was before you restored transactions?
11:24:09	15	Q. So there were inconsistencies between the master file and	11:27:08 15	A. I don't know if that's included in this report or not.
	16	the transactional file?	16	Q. Do you know what the difference was?
	17	A. I'd refer to it not as an inconsistency. That was how I was	17	A. Not off the top of my head, no.
	18	identifying missing data.	18	Q. Do you have a file back in - you work in Los Angeles - that
	19	Q. Well, but they were inconsistent, weren't they?	19	would show what the differences were between the balance file
11:24:23	20	A. The balance was different, yes, than the transactional	11:27:23 20	and the transactional file prior to you making those changes?
	21	balance.	21	A. In terms of the number of accounts, I don't know. But I
	22	Q. And at times, those differences were fairly significant,	22	could compute it.
	23	weren't they?	23	Q. I take it there were obviously more than one here that had a
	24	A. Yes, they were.	24	difference?
11:24:31	25	Q. I mean, they were supposed to be the same. Is that correct?	11:27:39 25	A. Correct.
		783		785
	1	A. That's correct.	1	Q. And then it looks like you have a category that says, "no
	2	MR. SMITH: If we could look at Exhibit 152-25, and	2	
			-	difference with calculated beginning balance." What does that
	3	focus on the chart at the top of the page.	3	difference with calculated beginning balance." What does that mean?
	3 4			
11:24:57	4	focus on the chart at the top of the page.	3	mean?
11:24:57	4	focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH:	3 4	mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of
11:24:57	4 5	focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that	3 4 11:27:53 5	mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for
11:24:57	4 5 6	focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct?	3 4 11:27:53 5 6	mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance
11:24:57	4 5 6 7	focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q . Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does.	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7	mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file.
11:24:57	4 5 6 7 8 9	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can
	4 5 6 7 8 9	focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct?	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning
	4 5 6 7 8 9	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance?
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed?
	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah.
11:25:10	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945.
11:25:10	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the
11:25:10	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file?
11:25:10	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16 17 18 19	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard
11:25:10	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. Q. That's the 92 plus the 48? 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16 17 18	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard copy balance file.
11:25:10 11:25:24	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. Q. That's the 92 plus the 48? A. That's correct. 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16 17 18 19	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard copy balance file. Q. Okay. I understand.
11:25:10 11:25:24	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. Q. That's the 92 plus the 48? A. That's correct. 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16 17 18 19 11:28:35 20	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard copy balance file. Q. Okay. I understand. And then the next column is the ones where you had one
11:25:10 11:25:24	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. Q. That's the 92 plus the 48? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Exhibit 152-271. Can we make that a little bit bigger? 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11:28:23 15 16 17 18 19 11:28:35 20 21	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard copy balance file. Q. Okay. I understand. And then the next column is the ones where you had one or more differences, and you found 55,436 accounts where you
11:25:10 11:25:24	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 focus on the chart at the top of the page. By MR. SMITH: Q. Now, this comes out of your overall report. Is that correct? A. Yes, it does. Q. And it lists those accounts for which you had balance files and those for which you had no balance file. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Now, in here where we're talking about balance files, are we just talking about master files or are we talking about those other files that you looked for in the paper era? A. I believe this includes all of the balance information that we gathered. Q. And roughly 20 percent had no balance file information? A. Yes, that's what's in the middle section of this chart. Q. That's the 92 plus the 48? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Exhibit 152-271. Can we make that a little bit bigger? 	3 4 11:27:53 5 6 7 8 9 11:28:14 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 22 13 16 17 18 19 11:28:35 20 21 22	 mean? A. As some of the agencies came online prior to February of '85, we don't have a balance as of February of '85 available for those accounts, so we've had to compute a beginning balance based on an early balance file. Q. So 35,945 had no difference with the beginning balance. Can you tell from here how many had a difference with the beginning balance? A. I'm sorry, a difference without that beginning balance computed? Q. Yeah. A. These 35,945. Q. These are the ones where the balance was consistent the beginning balance was consistent with the balance file? A. These, we had to compute a beginning balance using a hard copy balance file. Q. Okay. I understand. And then the next column is the ones where you had one or more differences?

	786		788
1	Q. And then in footnote one, you have something called the	1	necessarily missing transactions within.
2	total number of unresolved accounts is 104,130. What does that	2	Q . Have you made that determination yet, how many are beginning
3	refer to?	3	balance errors?
4	A. That's the sum of the column we were just discussing, the	4	A. No, I didn't say beginning balance errors, I said beginning
11:29:18 5	55,436, plus the nonzero balance column, the 48,694.	11:32:16 5	balances that weren't available.
6	Q. Okay. So if we go over to the NAANs with no balance file,	6	Q. Do you know how many of the 55,000 are beginning balances
7	transactions balances, unresolved is that number, 48,694 plus	7	that are not available?
8	35,945?	8	A. I would have to guess at that number. No, I don't know it
9	A. No. It's the 48,694 plus the 55,436.	9	specifically.
11:29:39 10	Q. I'm sorry, 55,436. Okay, thank you.	11:32:30 10	Q. And you do not know how many errors are in the 48,694, which
11	THE COURT: Mr. Smith, I'm sure you and the witness are	11	is on the right-hand side?
12	communicating perfectly, but I have completely lost you.	12	A. Not errors, missing data. No, I do not.
13	MR. SMITH: All right. Let me try it again.	13	Q. Missing data. Okay.
14	BY MR. SMITH:	14	And so are you going to go back and look through each
11:29:52 15	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm You} \ {\rm had} \ {\rm certain} \ {\rm accounts} \ {\rm that} \ {\rm had} \ {\rm a} \ {\rm balance} \ {\rm file} \ {\rm and} \ {\rm certain}$	11:32:46 15	of those transactions individually to determine whether there is
16	that didn't?	16	missing data?
17	A. That's correct.	17	A. The first step will be to find a balance file so we can
18	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm And} \ {\rm the \ first \ on \ the \ left \ side, \ you \ {\rm compare \ accounts \ that}$	18	narrow down the time frame that we need to evaluate.
19	have a balance file with the balance file?	19	Q. Do you know how long you've been looking for balance files
11:30:02 20	A. That's correct.	11:33:00 20	for those particular accounts?
21	Q. And you found 55,436 accounts that had a discrepancy between	21	A. Which specific accounts, sir?
22	the balance file and the actual transactional file?	22	Q . 48,694.
23	A. That's correct.	23	A. As I mentioned, we worked through this on a regional basis,
24	Q. And then, the second category on the right-hand side is	24	and as I mentioned the other day, we just recently found the
11:30:23 25	accounts where you do not have any balance file at all?	11:33:14 25	Great Plains balance files approximately two weeks ago.
	787	_	789
1	A. That's correct.	1	Q. Okay.
2	Q. So you have nothing to compare it with?	2	THE COURT: Where did you find them?
3	A. That's correct.	3	THE WITNESS: There was microfiche available at the
4	Q . And that's where the 104,130 number comes, the accounts	4	Great Plains regional office, so it wasn't stored in Lenexa.
11:30:38 5	where you've compared it to the balance file and found a	11:33:32 5	THE COURT: So what are you going to do with
7	discrepancy, and the other accounts where you have nothing to	7	microfiche?
8	compare it to? A. If you'll look on the chart, in the column headings, "one or	8	THE WITNESS: They'll be converted to images so that we
9	more difference" has a footnote of one, and the nonzero balance	9	can review those images. THE COURT: You don't look at a microfiche machine
11:30:57 10	also has a footnote of one. That's the column that we're	11:33:51 10	anymore?
11	summing to get to that 104,000 number.	11	THE WITNESS: No, I don't prefer to.
12	Q. And of those 55,436 accounts for which you had a balance	12	BY MR. SMITH:
13	file, how many of those differences have been resolved today?	13	Q. Do you treat missing data as not an error?
14	A. This is as of September 30.	14	A. I don't understand the question.
11:31:18 15	Q. So there remains today 55,436 for which you have a balance	11:33:58 15	Q . You made a distinction between when I said there was an
16	file which you haven't resolved yet?	16	error, you said, no, it was missing data. If you have missing
17	A. That's correct.	17	data, do you consider that an error?
18	Q. And are you going to resolve the 48,694 for which you do not	18	A. I consider an error a transaction that wasn't posted
19		19	correctly, not transactions that are missing from the record
19	have a balance file?		
11:31:34 20	have a balance file? A. We're searching for balance files for those accounts.	11:34:19 20	set.
		11:34:19 20 21	set. Q . Okay. Good.
11:31:34 20	A. We're searching for balance files for those accounts.		
11:31:34 20 21	A. We're searching for balance files for those accounts.Q. So is it fair to say, looking at this chart, that at least	21	Q. Okay. Good.
11:31:34 20 21 22	 A. We're searching for balance files for those accounts. Q. So is it fair to say, looking at this chart, that at least 55,436 accounts have some missing data based on the balance 	21 22	Q. Okay. Good. And in some of these regions, the I'm not going to

	790		792
1	Q. For example, if you go to Navajo, it looks like over half of	1	MR. SMITH: I'll move on.
2	the accounts had missing data?	2	If we could look on 152-272. And if we could make it a
3	A. Yes, it does.	3	little larger?
4	Q. And if you go to Eastern, it looks like I calculated	4	BY MR. SMITH:
11:35:00 5	87 percent. Does that look to be about right?	11:37:51 5	Q. And Ms. Herman, is this basically the same information, but
6	A. Yes, it does.	6	you're breaking it down by population?
7	Q. You go to Southern Plains, Anadarko, it's roughly a third?	7	A. These would be accounts that were opened between
8	A. That's correct.	8	October 25th, 1994 and December 31st, 2000.
9	Q. Were you able to determine why there were so many	9	Q. And that's because Interior has defined the accounting as
11:35:15 10	inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional	11:38:11 10	being within that time period. Is that correct?
11	records?	11	A. Yes, it has.
12	A. Those are three regions that we had not yet evaluated.	12	Q. And so if that, in fact, was the time period
13	Q. Okay. I understand.	13	A. This does include more than land-based and judgment per
14	So you don't know what those regions hold yet?	14	capita accounts, though. This includes special deposit accounts
11:35:29 15	A. No, I do not.	11:38:30 15	and all other accounts that would have been open at that time.
16	Q. Okay. So let me clarify. Those three regions you have not	16	Q . So the total accounts within that time period, post 1994, is
17	evaluated; the rest are ones where you determined you	17	355,320. Is that correct?
18	basically cleaned up some of the errors or cleaned up some of	18	A. That's correct.
19	the missing data?	19	Q. And as I recall in the prior chart, it was roughly 100,000
11:35:52 20	A. As I mentioned, we've restored 275,000 transactions. The	11:38:52 20	more. Is that correct?
21	majority of those were in Great Plains.	21	A. I believe so.
22	Q. Were there other regions where there was a greater than	22	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm So}$ that's the number of accounts that would be excluded in
23	50 percent difference between the balance file and the	23	the post 1985 period if you employ this accounting beginning in
24	transactional information?	24	1994?
11:36:09 25	A. I don't recall.	11:39:07 25	A. Yes. But as I mentioned, this isn't land-based and judgment
	791		793
1	Q. But you would have that data available on your system in	1	per capita accounts, these are all accounts in the system.
2	Los Angeles?	2	
		_	Q. I understand.
3	A. I would have to compute that number. It's not a schedule	3	And even in that short time period, you still have some
4	that I have prepared.	3	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts?
4 11:36:27 5	that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at	3 4 11:39:26 5	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct.
4 11:36:27 5 6	that I have prepared.Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on	3 4 11:39:26 5 6	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11?
4 11:36:27 5 6 7	that I have prepared.Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well.	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH:
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8	that I have prepared.Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct?	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that?
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 11 12	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do.
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 11 12 13	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar?
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 13 14 11:36:54 15	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier.
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 13 14 11:40:11 15	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good.
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 13 14 11:36:54 15	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier.
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16 17	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16 17	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16 17 18	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. Q. In that situation, did you see differences, or this large 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16 17 18	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can move on. It looks like our page numbers are different. I'm
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16 17 18 19	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. Q. In that situation, did you see differences, or this large amount of missing data? 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16 17 18 19	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can move on. It looks like our page numbers are different. I'm going to go ahead and move on.
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:37:14 20	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. Q. In that situation, did you see differences, or this large amount of missing data? A. I don't recall in that specific scenario we had to go 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16 17 18 19 11:40:40 20	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can move on. It looks like our page numbers are different. I'm going to go ahead and move on. BY MR. SMITH:
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:37:14 20 21	 that I have prepared. Q. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. Q. In that situation, did you see differences, or this large amount of missing data? A. I don't recall in that specific scenario we had to go back 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11:40:11 15 16 17 18 19 11:40:40 20 21	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q . Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can move on. It looks like our page numbers are different. I'm going to go ahead and move on. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Now, the master files are different than the IM500 files you
4 11:36:27 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:39 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 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 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 that I have prepared. a. Ms. Herman, in the work you've done, you've been looking at handling electronic data for over a decade now, a lot of it on this particular case. But you work on other matters as well. Is that correct? A. That's correct. a. Have you ever seen an electronic system that had so many inconsistencies between the balance file and the transactional file? A. I don't know that I've made that same comparison in other systems. Some of the other work that I've dealt with are, for instance, a bank that had multiple accounting systems that it had used over time, so the challenge in that situation was mapping those systems together. a. In that situation, did you see differences, or this large amount of missing data? b. I don't recall in that specific scenario we had to go back THE COURT: I think you can move on to something else. 	3 4 11:39:26 5 6 7 8 9 11:40:02 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 15 16 17 18 19 11:40:40 20 21 22	And even in that short time period, you still have some 54,000 unresolved accounts? A. Yes, that's correct. MR. SMITH: If we could look at 3-2-11? BY MR. SMITH: Q. Ms. Herman, this is a document received in the AR regarding a seminar that looks like you spoke at in July 2003. And the topic is system level reconciliation, non sample testing. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. Do you recall speaking at that seminar? A. I believe this is the Albuquerque seminar that we spoke about earlier. Q. Okay. Okay. Good. MR. SMITH: If we could go to 3-2-11 and 12. I can move on. It looks like our page numbers are different. I'm going to go ahead and move on. BY MR. SMITH: Q. Now, the master files are different than the IM500 files you talked about yesterday?

[794		796
1	files?	1	Q . You can't tell us today how many of these years you've
2		2	
3	A. That's correct.Q. And they had done that work back in 2001. Is that correct?	3	filled in, have you? A. That's reported in the schedules that follow this report.
4	A. I don't recall specifically.	4	Q. And so is it fair to say that you had a number of years
11:41:05 5	Q. And the IM500 is just one more document that is generated by	11:43:52 5	where there were significant discrepancies?
6 II:41:05	IRMS?	6	A. Yes, that's correct.
7	A. That's correct.	7	
8		8	Q. Now, once again, you were not able to locate IM500 reports
9	Q. And on that file, you're just looking at total cash balances	9	for every agency for every year post-1985. Is that correct?
3 11:41:21 10	for a fiscal year. Is that correct?	9 11:44:10 10	A. We started with the reports that CD&L gathered for this
_	A. By agency, by general ledger account.		report that they had prepared, and we've subsequently requested
11	Q. So you're not looking at individual account balances, you're	11	additional balance files but have not yet received them all.
	just looking at total balances by agency?	12	Q. Do you know how many of the ones you requested you've
13	A. That's correct.		received?
14	Q. And CD&L began to compare those cash balances on the IM500	14	A. I do not recall.
11:41:45 15	to again the transactional data on IRMS itself?	11:44:23 15	Q. When was that request made?
16	A. That's correct.	16	A. My best estimate is six months ago.
17	Q . And so once again, sort of like the master file, you're just	17	MR. SMITH: If we could look at 152-224?
18	comparing one folder or one file in IRMS to another file in	18	BY MR. SMITH:
19	IRMS. Is that correct?	19	Q. And at the bottom of that page, does CD&L list the actual
11:41:59 20	A. This was actually a hard copy printout, not an electronic	11:44:52 20	IM500 reports that they could not locate?
21	report.	21	A. I'm sorry, I can't read it.
22	Q . It was generated from the IRMS system?	22	MR. SMITH: If we could focus on the bottom section?
23	A. That's correct.	23	BY MR. SMITH:
24	Q. And once again, those files should balance. Is that	24	Q . Control account reconciliation, IM500 reports could not be
25	correct?	11:45:06 25	located for the following, and it begins to break it down by
11:42:11 25		11.43.00 20	located for the following, and it begins to bleak it down by
	795		797
1	795 A. Yes, they were balances.	1	797 region. Is that correct?
1	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me?	1	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or
1 2 3	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances.	1 2 3	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was
1 2 3 4	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that	1 2 3 4	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data.	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct?	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself?
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should.	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies?	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did.	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region?
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221.	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH:	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct?
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed?	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14	795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report.	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14	797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year?
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. And CD&L is an accounting firm in Albuquerque, or was. 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. And CD&L is an accounting firm in Albuquerque, or was. 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L?
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. In CD&L is an accounting firm in Albuquerque, or was. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:43:14 20	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page, does this reflect the years where the electronic data 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19 11:46:09 20	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did. Q. For example
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:43:14 20 21	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page, does this reflect the years where the electronic data on the system was inconsistent with the IM500 report? 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19 11:46:09 20 21	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did. Q. For example MR. SMITH: If we could look at 152-228.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:43:14 20 21 22	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page, does this reflect the years where the electronic data 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19 11:46:09 20 21 22	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did. Q. For example M. SMITH: If we could look at 152-228.
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:43:14 20 21 22 23	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. M. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Mc CD&L is an accounting firm in Albuquerque, or was. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page, does this reflect the years where the electronic data on the system was inconsistent with the IM500 report? A. Yes. Prior to the restoration of data. Q. So this was done prior to your beginning to fill in the 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19 11:46:09 20 21 22 23	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did. Q. For example
1 2 3 4 11:42:24 5 6 7 8 9 11:42:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:42:54 15 16 17 18 19 11:43:14 20 21 22	 795 A. Yes, they were balances. Q. Excuse me? A. I said, yes, they were balances. Q. Yeah. And those files are supposed to balance. Is that correct? The IM500 should balance with the transactional data. Is that correct? A. Yes, it should. Q. And again, you noted significant discrepancies? A. Yes, we did. MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 152-221. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And is this a copy of the CD&L report you reviewed? A. This is a summary that we prepared of the CD&L report. Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Is that correct? A. Yes, they are. Q. And if you focus on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page, does this reflect the years where the electronic data on the system was inconsistent with the IM500 report? A. Yes. Prior to the restoration of data. 	1 2 3 4 11:45:18 5 6 7 8 9 11:45:39 10 11 12 13 14 11:45:55 15 16 17 18 19 11:46:09 20 21 22	 797 region. Is that correct? A. I don't know if they're referring to the region in total or the area office. Because in the data that we received, it was broken out by agency. Q. Okay. So you can't tell whether this is just the area office within a region or the region itself? A. Not based on these four lines, no. Q. If you could look to the next page as well. Does it appear to be broken down by region? A. Yes, it does. Q. But as you noted, within the IM 500s you had, you confirmed CD&L's research. Is that correct? A. Yes, we did. Q. And when did you start doing that, within the past year? A. I believe that we received that information approximately a your and a half ago. It may have been longer. Q. And for those IM 500s you had, you agreed with the discrepancies found by CD&L? A. Yes, we did. Q. For example M. SMITH: If we could look at 152-228.

21 of 40 sheets

	798		800
1	\$300,000 and over \$800,000. Is that correct?	1	A. I'm sorry, between the I don't understand.
2	A. That's correct.	2	MR. SMITH: Let's look at 152-224.
3	MR. SMITH: And let's go to 152-232.	3	BY MR. SMITH:
4	BY MR. SMITH:	4	Q. Focus on number four. It says, "during our work, we noticed
11:46:49 5	Q. Muskogee discrepancies of between four and five hundred	11:50:10 5	certain discrepancies in the IM500 reports between the cash
6	thousand dollars?	6	104XX accounts balances and the liability, 206XX accounts,
7	A. These could potentially be offsetting differences. As you	7	balances." And then they say they prepared a comparison of the
8	see, the first number is negative and the next number is	8	account balances?
9	positive.	9	A. This is an excerpt from CD&L's work. We didn't compare the
11:47:03 10	Q . With a year in between. Is that correct?	11:50:27 10	104 accounts to cash accounts.
11	A. Yes, that's correct.	11	Q. So you didn't do that comparison?
12	MR. SMITH: 152-232 I'm sorry, 233.	12	A. No, that was work done by CD&L.
13	BY MR. SMITH:	13	${\bf Q}.~$ So you only verified the IM500, comparing the IM500 to the
14	${\bf Q}.~~$ And in some of these areas, the discrepancies may be for	14	transactional information?
11:47:36 15	half or more of the years in which you made that comparison. Is	11:50:39 15	A. To the accounts in the IIM system, which are not the cash
16	that correct?	16	accounts.
17	A. Yes. And this was relative to the initial data set.	17	Q. And why did you not verify this part of their report?
18	Q. So again, anywhere from 73 dollars up to 500 plus thousand	18	A. Because my concern was in filling in the gaps in the IRMS
19	dollars. Is that correct?	19	IIM system data, not in reconciling the general ledger and the
11:47:54 20	A. Yes, relative to the initial data set.	11:50:55 20	detail ledger.
21	MR. SMITH: Let's look at 152-234.	21	Q. Okay. But you have used the general ledger in your work on
22	BY MR. SMITH:	22	the DCV as well. Is that correct?
23	Q. And some of those discrepancies were over \$1.5 million?	23	A. We've mapped transactions into the Tribal Trust accounts and
24	A. Yes, you'll see that on our report we were able to restore	24	used that work in the throughput analysis.
11:48:23 25	that information.	11:51:12 25	Q. Okay. But you haven't reconciled the differences in the
	799		801
1	Q. Okay.	1	IM500 reports?
2	A. It was the beginning balances for one of the agencies in	2	A. We have not evaluated the cash accounts, no.
3	that region.	3	MR. SMITH: Let's look at 152-239.
4	MR. SMITH: How about 152-236?	4	BY MR. SMITH:
11:48:29 5	BY MR. SMITH:	11:51:33 5	Q. 1989, CD&L identified a \$22 million variance in the IM500s.
6	Q . This is the Navajo region; again, variations of anywhere	6	A. This is between the yes, in the cash account. Most of
7	from over 100,000 to over 300,000 dollars?	7	December '89 was missing from the initial IRMS data. That could
8	A. That's correct.	8	account for some of this variance.
9	MR. SMITH: And 152-237.	9	Q. But you have not been tasked with reconciling that
11:48:48 10	BY MR. SMITH:	11:51:58 10	difference?
11	Q . I'm sorry, we're looking at the Portland area, and the	11	A. I don't know if this difference still exists today after
12	variances range 2.9 million, 1.8 million, 1.4 million; 1999 it	12	we've restored the transactions. As I mentioned, it's not
13	looks like 6.2 million, although that may be an overlap between	13	something that I checked.
14	1988 and 1989. Is that correct?	14	MR. SMITH: How about 152-241?
11:49:21 15	A. Yes. That's most likely a timing difference, not a data	11:52:05 15	BY MR. SMITH:
16	problem.	16	${\bf Q}. \ \ $ It looks like there's some minor differences, and then a
17	Q. And I take it you're still working on trying to reconcile	17	\$300,000 difference in 1993.
18	these discrepancies?	18	A. As I mentioned, I did not check the difference between the
19	A. The results of our work are contained in that same section	19	104 accounts and the 206 accounts.
11:49:31 20	of the report.	11:52:25 20	MR. SMITH: How about 152-244?
21	Q. Right. It hasn't been completed as of this point in time.	21	BY MR. SMITH:
22	Is that correct?	22	Q. It looks like in 1987 there was a \$1.9 million difference in
23	Is that correct? A. No, it is not.	23	Q. It looks like in 1987 there was a \$1.9 million difference in the IM500 in the Muskogee area. You haven't been tasked with

	802		804
1	Q. Has anybody suggested to you why there are discrepancies	1	differences between the audit and the IM500?
2	within the IM500's themselves?	2	A. No, I have not.
3	A. I have not asked that question.	3	Q. Or comparing the audit to the actual transactional records?
4	Q. But you're using these same IM500's for the throughput	4	A. No, I did not.
11:53:11 5	analysis?	11:55:53 5	Q. So there may be differences in the transactional records
6	A. For the balance files, yes, for some of the years.	6	that you have not looked at yet. Is that fair?
7	MR. SMITH: How about 152-246?	7	A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question. But I did not
8	BY MR. SMITH:	8	compare the audit to the transactional data.
9	Q. It looks like we've got discrepancies of in the	9	Q. So you haven't determined what information might be missing
11:53:26 10	Sacramento area of over \$600,000 in 1987 and \$2 million in 1990?	11:56:07 10	to arrive at that \$14 million figure?
11	A. Again, I did not look at the difference between the 104	11	A. I'd have to understand how the auditors compiled their
12	accounts and the 206 accounts.	12	number to determine the result how that difference was
13	Q. But you did use this data in your throughput analysis?	13	counted.
14	A. We used the IM500 balance file numbers, yes, for some of the	14	Q. Have you suggested to Interior that that's something that
11:53:50 15	years.	11:56:21 15	needs to be done?
16	THE COURT: It's getting a little redundant, Mr. Smith.	16	A. I have not, no.
17	MR. SMITH: I'll move on.	17	Q. And do you know if anybody's doing it?
18	THE COURT: In fact, it's getting very redundant.	18	A. I do not.
19	MR. SMITH: I can take a hint, Your Honor.	19	Q . Is it fair to say that there are questions about the
11:53:58 20	BY MR. SMITH:	11:56:33 20	accuracy of the information in the IM500's?
21	Q. How about comparing the IM500's to the actual audits? Did	21	A. Yes, there are differences.
22	you do that?	22	Q. And so there's questions about their accuracy?
23	A. In the audited years in our throughput numbers, we would	23	A. Yes, there could be differences between the reports. You
24	have used the audited numbers.	24	would want to understand why those differences exist.
11:54:12 25	Q. But were there differences between what was on the IM500's	11:57:00 25	
11:54:12 L J	Q. Dut were there unreferices between what was on the 145003	11.57.00 20	Q. Given the problems you found, the missing data, some of the
11:54:12 23	Dut were there differences between what was on the 14500's	11.57.00 20	Q. Given the problems you found, the missing data, some of the 805
11:54:12 23		1	805
	803		805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by
1	803 and what was in the audits?	1	805
1 2	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006	1	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was
1 2 3 4	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1.	1 2 3 4	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete.
1 2 3	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided.	1 2 3 4	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete?
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH:	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate?
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete.
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct?	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is.	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate?
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate.
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four?	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH:	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated.
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy?
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500?	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15	803 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes.	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test.
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16 17	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16 17 18	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? J. I'm sorry, these are very small numbers. It looks like 503 versus 488, the number I'm looking at. 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17 18	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that correct?
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:26 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16 17 18 19	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? A. I'm sorry, these are very small numbers. It looks like 503 versus 488, the number I'm looking at. Q. It says resulting in a difference of 14.6? 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17 18 19	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that correct? A Not as a component of that test, no.
1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16 17 18 19 11:55:24 20	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? A. I'm sorry, these are very small numbers. It looks like 503 versus 488, the number I'm looking at. Q. It says resulting in a difference of 14.6? A. There we go. 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17 18 19 11:58:01 20	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that correct? A Not as a component of that test, no. Q. Once again, it's fair to say that the database that you were
1 1 2 3 4 11:54:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11:55:07 15 16 17 18 19 11:55:24 20 21	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? A. I'm sorry, these are very small numbers. It looks like 503 versus 488, the number I'm looking at. Q. It says resulting in a difference of 14.6? A. There we go. Q. Okay. 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17 18 19 11:58:01 20 21	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that correct? A Not as a component of that test, no. Q. Once again, it's fair to say that the database that you were provided by OST, the IRMS database, was not accurate?
1 11:54:21 11:54:21 11:54:21 11:54:21 10 11 11:54:46 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11:55:24 20 21 22	 and what was in the audits? A. I don't recall. But that is a schedule in the June 2006 binder that was provided. MR. SMITH: Let's look at 56-2-1. BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is a document that you referred to yesterday in your throughput analysis. Is that correct? A. Yes, it is. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at page five of that document, and focus in on note four? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And did you, in fact, identify a \$14 million difference between what Griffin & Associates reported for 1995 and what was reported on the IM500? A. It looks like approximately a \$20 million difference, yes. Q. Approximately a \$20 million difference? A. I'm sorry, these are very small numbers. It looks like 503 versus 488, the number I'm looking at. Q. It says resulting in a difference of 14.6? A. There we go. Q. Okay. 	1 2 3 4 11:57:21 5 6 7 8 9 11:57:33 10 11 12 13 14 11:57:47 15 16 17 18 19 11:58:01 20 21 22	805 inconsistencies in the IRMS database that you were provided by OST, is it fair to say that information you were provided was not complete? A. No, it was not complete. Q. It was not accurate? A. I didn't say accurate, I said complete. Q. Was the information you provided in the IRMS database accurate? A. The data validation tests aren't going to tell you accurate. The litigation support accounting tests shows you accurate. And we did find some discrepancies in the transactions we evaluated. Q. There's two parts of that. First, you say the data completion test that you're doing doesn't show you accuracy? A. That's not the goal. We have discovered some posting errors as a result of that test, but it's not the goal of the test. Q. Because you're not determining the accuracy of the money coming in and the accuracy of the money going out. Is that correct? A. Not as a component of that test, no. Q. Once again, it's fair to say that the database that you were provided by OST, the IRMS database, was not accurate? A. Was not complete.

	806		808
1	Q. If it's not complete, could it be used for the purposes for	1	A. Yes.
2	which it was intended?	2	Q accounts. Is that correct?
3	A. We have to fill in the data gaps before we can issue	3	A. Yes.
4	statements, if that's the question.	4	Q. And does that represent the number of accounts in which data
11:58:35 5	Q. Okay. So the database that you were provided was not	12:01:55 5	has been changed or affected in some way by your work?
6	complete, and affected the ability to issue account statements?	6	A. Has been restored.
7	A. Yes, we have to fill in the gaps before we can issue	7	Q. Has been restored?
8	statements.	8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Have you been tasked with trying to find out why there are	9	Q. And then you have above that, you have 152,825 original
11:59:06 10	this degree of missing data or inaccuracies in the IRMS system?	12:02:08 10	accounts, and then for a total of 160. So the extra 7,300 is
11	A. I have not been tasked with discovering why the data is	11	what?
12	missing.	12	A. Accounts that were not in the initial electronic data set.
13	Q. So you can't tell us whether it was because of a clerical	13	Q. So you've identified an additional 7,300 accounts that were
14	error, an intentional error, fraud?	14	not originally in the electronic era?
11:59:24 15	A. I cannot, no.	12:02:25 15	A. Yes, that's correct.
16	Q. That's not something that is within your scope of	16	Q. And so it looks like you've identified an additional 7,400
17	responsibilities. Is that fair?	17	transactions?
18	A. Not to determine why the data is missing, no.	18	A. Yes, I did.
19	MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's	19	Q. And so far, if I'm reading this correct, you have at this
12:00:04 20	Exhibit 152-69?	12:02:41 20	point in time corrected 451,875 transactions?
21	BY MR. SMITH:	21	A. That we've restored that many transactions.
22	Q. I believe this is a document you looked at yesterday. It	22	Q. So either the data was incorrect and you fixed it, or it
23	comes from your report. Is that correct?	23	wasn't on the system and you put it on the system?
24	A. I don't believe we looked at it yesterday, but it is from my	24	A. No, I didn't say that we corrected data, I said that we
12:00:23 25	report, yes.	12:02:59 25	restored transactions that were not there.
	807		809
1	Q. They all start to look the same after a while. I apologize.	1	Q. So this is just the 451,875 is the ones you've identified
2	You have a column in there that talks about the ledger	2	so far that should have been on the system but weren't?
3	period. Do you see that?	3	A. That's correct.
4	A. Yes, I do.	4	Q. And so, so far you've identified \$30 million that wasn't on
12:00:31 5	Q. And are there certain accounts for which you're looking back	12:03:13 5	the system that should have been?
6	into the ledger period?		
7	5 1	6	A. That's correct.
	A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska.	6 7	A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: How about 152-276?
8		6 7 8	
8 9	A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska.	6 7 8 9	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276?
	A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska.Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing		MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH:
9	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those 	9	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of
9 12:00:51 10	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? 	9 12:03:33 10	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study?
9 12:00:51 10 11	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. 	9 12:03:33 10 11	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did.
9 12:00:51 10 11 12	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts?
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct.
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 13 14 12:03:45 15	MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review?
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have 786 remaining.
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17 18	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. Q. And when did you start that process? 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17 18	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have 786 remaining. Q. Okay. I got you.
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. Q. And when did you start that process? A. The Alaska work was done, I believe, approximately 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17 18 19	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: a I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A Yes, we did. a Regarding reused accounts? A That's correct. a And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have the premaining. a Okay. I got you. In your review of reused accounts, would it be common
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:23 20	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. Q. And when did you start that process? A. The Alaska work was done, I believe, approximately six months ago. Some of these other transactions were most 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17 18 19 12:04:00 20	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have 786 remaining. Q. Okay. I got you. In your review of reused accounts, would it be common that an account would be closed and then within just a few
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:23 20 21	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. Q. And when did you start that process? A. The Alaska work was done, I believe, approximately six months ago. Some of these other transactions were most likely a result of other projects within Interior excuse me, 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17 18 19 12:04:00 20 21	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have 786 remaining. Q. Okay. I got you. In your review of reused accounts, would it be common that an account would be closed and then within just a few months it would be opened again under someone else's name?
9 12:00:51 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:06 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:23 20 21 22	 A. Some of that work has started, in particular in Alaska. Q. And are you looking at accounts that are on the existing electronic system in trying to do a paper trail for those accounts? A. Yes, that's how this work started. Q. So far you've looked at 353 accounts? Or let me say A. Excuse me, in part. It doesn't mean that we looked at the account in its total. Q. You've identified 353? A. Those are accounts that have had transactions rekeyed, not all accounts that exist in the paper time frame. Q. And when did you start that process? A. The Alaska work was done, I believe, approximately six months ago. Some of these other transactions were most likely a result of other projects within Interior excuse me, within OHTA. 	9 12:03:33 10 11 12 13 14 12:03:45 15 16 17 18 19 12:04:00 20 21 22	 MR. SMITH: How about 152-276? BY MR. SMITH: Q. I believe you did look at this exhibit yesterday as part of your study? A. Yes, we did. Q. Regarding reused accounts? A. That's correct. Q. And so at this point in time, you still have about half of those accounts to review? A. No, we reviewed over 600,000 accounts already. We only have 786 remaining. Q. Okay. I got you. In your review of reused accounts, would it be common that an account would be closed and then within just a few months it would be opened again under someone else's name? A. In some instances, yes.

		810		812
	1	A. Not yet, no.	1	A. The statements?
	2	Q. And so you don't know how the process would be to identify	2	Q. Statements.
	3	reused accounts in the paper era?	3	A. Yes, I have seen some of them.
	4	A. I would presume we would use a similar process, but that	4	Q. You have seen some. Have you reviewed any of those
12:04:26	5	work has not yet begun.	12:07:16 5	statements?
	6	Q. But of course you do not have an electronic database to	6	A. Just the format of the statements.
	7	start with. Is that fair?	7	Q. Do you know if any of those statements involved transactions
	8	A. That's correct.	8	prior to 1985?
	9	MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's	9	A. I do not know if they did or not.
12:04:44	10	Exhibit 152-292?	12:07:25 10	Q. And you haven't been tasked with determining how many
	11	BY MR. SMITH:	11	judgment accounts existed prior to 1985?
	12	Q. Is this, again, a section from your DCV?	12	A. No, I have not.
	13	A. Yes, it is.	13	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Let}$ me ask you about some of your testing that was done.
	14	Q. And you have a section at the bottom entitled, "Accounts Not	14	You described some tests yesterday. One was called a mapping
12:05:04	15	Receiving Historical Accounting." Are these those accounts that	12:08:03 15	test, and that's where you're trying to identify actually,
	16	would be excluded from the post '94 period?	16	you had three types of mapping. Right? One was a reversal
	17	A. Accounts that were not opened between that time frame, yes.	17	mapping. Is that correct?
	18	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm So}$ under the Interior's definition of an accounting, whether	18	A. That's correct.
	19	accounting is required, these particular accounts would not be	19	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{And that}\mbox{'s where you tried to identify a reversal and try to}$
12:05:24	20	encompassed. Is that your understanding?	12:08:14 20	find the corresponding transaction?
	21	A. That's my understanding.	21	A. That's correct.
	22	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm So}$ it would be just between what you've defined as the	22	${\bf Q}. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
	23	beginning of the electronic era in 1994, you would be excluding	23	mapping?
	24	578,821 NAANs?	24	A. Transfers? Is that what we're referring to?
12:05:41	25	A. No, that's the total number of accounts. So if you're	12:08:25 25	Q. Right. Transfer mapping?
		811		813
	1	talking about accounts that wouldn't get a statement, it's the	1	A. Yes. That's correct.
	2	judgment per cap accounts, the 68,000, and the land-based	2	Q . That's where you're following the transactions from account
	3 4	accounts, the 51,767. The 578 is the total of the entire	3	to account?
	_	column.		A. That's correct.
12:05:59	6	Q. The subtotal is 159,249?	12:08:30 5	Q. But you're not verifying the information coming in?
	7	 A. That's correct. Q. So it's a total of 159,249 accounts that would be excluded? 	7	A. Not as a component of that test, no.
	8	 Q. So it's a total of 159,249 accounts that would be excluded? A. Yes. But not all of those accounts would be issued a 	8	Q. And as a component of that test, you're not verifying the
	9		9	information going out? A. Not in that test, no.
12:06:14		statement, regardless of when they were opened. Q. Because?	12:08:42 10	 Q. And is it fair that based on that analysis you've done so
12.00.14	11	 A. For instance, we're not issuing statements to special 	12.06.42	far on mapping, you've identified 378,843 potential posting
	12	deposit accounts.	12	errors?
	13	Q. And the total throughput of those accounts during that	13	A. No, that's groups of transactions that have errors. I
	14	period 1985 to 1994 was 3.1 billion?	14	believe the number is approximately 1,800 or 1,900.
12:06:33		A. Yes. But the more appropriate number to look at is the 367	12:09:01 15	Q. Okay. What do you mean by groups of errors?
12.00.00	16	and the 435, which pertains to the judgment per cap and the	16	 A. So for instance, if you have an interest distribution and
	17	land-based.	17	there are 100,000 postings in that interest distribution and two
	18	Q. Let me ask you about judgment and per capita. Have you	18	are wrong, there are two that were in error, but the group had
	19	looked at judgment accounts prior to 1985?	19	102,000 transactions.
12:06:49		A. I have not, no.	12:09:22 20	Q. And then you identified something called mapping to
	21	 Q. Do you know if anybody is looking at judgment accounts prior 	21	Treasury. And that's where you're taking transactions and
	22	to 1985?	22	comparing it to the CP&R. Is that correct?
	~~	A. I do not.	23	A. That's correct.
	23	A. I do hot.		A. That b contect
	23 24	 Q. Have you seen any of the judgment account summaries that 	24	Q. And what is a CP&R?

	814		816
1	Q. And who generates the CP&R?	1	A. We're reporting those to OHTA.
2	2 A. Treasury does.	2	Q. You're reporting those, not necessarily correcting them?
3	Q. Is it based on information provided by Interior?	3	A. We're not in a position to post transactions to the system.
4	A. I believe the initial check information is provided by	4	Q. Do you know if OHTA then corrects the transactions?
12:09:46 5	Interior, and the status of the check is provided by Treasury.	12:12:20 5	A. OHTA reports the transactions to OST. I don't know what
6	Q. And you are not mapping typically to the individual check	6	happens as that point.
7	itself. Is that correct?	7	Q. How about in the LSA? Are you just looking within the
8	A. No, we are.	8	population or are you just looking at inside the population as
9	Q. In some instances, you're looking at the individual check?	9	well?
12:10:00 10) A. Yes.	12:12:30 10	A. Within the population.
11	Q. Okay. And you only have CP&R data post 1998?	11	Q. So you're only looking at post-1994?
12	A. No, CP&R starts in 1987.	12	A. Not post-1994 transactions only, but accounts that were open
13	Q . So you only have it post 1987?	13	then.
14	A. Yes, from March of 1987 through December of 2002.	14	Q. And just an example, for the land-based accounts you found
12:10:19 15	Q . Do you know if anybody has been tasked with the job of	12:12:45 15	42,361; is that transactions that did not roll forward, or
16	determining the accuracy of the CP&Rs?	16	accounts?
17	A. I believe NORC conducted a sample of that test.	17	A. I believe that's accounts.
18	Q . In your experience, have you found discrepancies between	18	Q. Okay. So roughly what is that, 10 percent, nine percent?
19	CP&Rs and actual check data?	19	A. Roughly, yes.
12:10:34 20	A. Between the physical check and CP&R?	12:13:03 20	MR. SMITH: If we could look at 154-44?
21	Q . Uh-huh.	21	BY MR. SMITH:
22	A. I don't recall if I have.	22	Q. Which is an exhibit you looked at yesterday regarding
23	Q . Has anybody suggested to you that there might be	23	Mr. Andersen. Do you remember this?
24	discrepancies between what's on the CP&R and the actual check	24	A. Yes, I do.
12:10:45 25	data?	12:13:16 25	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{And Mr. Anderson's account was one that popped up as part of }$
	815		817
			817
1		1	the roll-forward test?
1	A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done.	1 2	
_	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's 		the roll-forward test?
2	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? 		the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is.
2	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5	the roll-forward test?A. Yes, it is.Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 12 13 14	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16	 the roll-forward test? A Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16 17	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17 18	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. I'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16 17 18	 the roll-forward test? A Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been acheck from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17 18 19	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. T'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16 17 18 19	 the roll-forward test? A Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17 18 19 12:11:54 20	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. T'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? Q. How about the data validation work? 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16 17 18 19 12:14:24 20	 the roll-forward test? A Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check was actually received by this gentleman. Is that correct?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17 18 19 12:11:54 20 21	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. I'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? Q. How about the data validation work? A. The data validation work looks at all of the electronic 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12:14:07 15 16 17 18 19 12:14:24 20 21	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been acheck from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check was actually received by this gentleman. Is that correct?
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 12:11:54 20 21 22	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. T'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? Q. How about the data validation work? A. The data validation work looks at all of the electronic transactions regardless of whether or not the account was open 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 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 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been acheck from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check was actually received by this gentleman. Is that correct? A. No. What I'm saying in this schedule is that I believe that there's a check missing on July 1st, 1986 in that dollar amount.
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12:11:41 15 16 17 18 19 12:11:54 20 21 22 23	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. T'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? Q. How about the data validation work? A. The data validation work looks at all of the electronic transactions regardless of whether or not the account was open as of '94. 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 21 22 23	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been a check from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check was actually received by this gentleman. Is that correct? A. No. What I'm saying in this schedule is that I believe that there's a check missing on July 1st, 1986 in that dollar amount. G. But you've done nothing to verify whether that check was
2 3 4 12:11:02 5 6 7 8 9 12:11:25 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 12:11:54 20 21 22	 A. No one has suggested that to me, but there was a test done. Q. Yesterday you described a roll forward test. And that's using the balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at DX 152-279? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And this is the roll-forward the results of your roll-forward test for those accounts which had balance files. Is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And this is limited to in the population. Is that correct? A. No, the out-of-population accounts are here as well. Q. Okay. I see. Okay. And again, in-the-population is post-1994? A. That's correct. Q. Now, are you reconciling discrepancies whether they're in the population or not? A. T'm sorry, reconciling in the LSA work or the data validation work? Q. How about the data validation work? A. The data validation work looks at all of the electronic transactions regardless of whether or not the account was open as of '94. Q. So if you find discrepancies that are outside the 	2 3 4 12:13:29 5 6 7 8 9 12:13:49 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 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 the roll-forward test? A. Yes, it is. Q. And there was a discrepancy of roughly \$1,100? A. That's correct. Q. And then you did some research on that. MR. SMITH: And if we could look at 154-58? BY MR. SMITH: Q. And based on that, you've made an adjusting entry of \$1,100. Is that correct? A. That record has not been added to the data set. That's where I believe the transaction is missing. Q. Okay. And this should have been a check to this gentleman for \$1,100? A. It should have been acheck from his account. I can't tell you if it would have been made out to him or someone else. Q. But you couldn't find the check? A. We don't have a check number. This is my presumption of where the data is missing. Q. So you found so you're not representing that this check was actually received by this gentleman. Is that correct? A. No. What I'm saying in this schedule is that I believe that there's a check missing on July 1st, 1986 in that dollar amount.

10/16/2007 07:25:01 PM

818 8
1 reported here.1 Q. In the amount of \$6,234?
2Q. Okay. How long have you been researching this particular2A. I believe so. The number is pretty small. Yes.
3 account? 3 Q . And then toward the bottom of the page it says, "payment."
4 A. Probably two years. 4 It's got \$6,234, and then a prep fee of \$117.34. Is that
5 Q. So in two years you've not been able to find determine 12:17:55 5 correct?
6 whether the check was issued or he received a check? 6 A. That's correct.
7A. As I mentioned, this is my presumption as to what happened,7Q. And what is a prep fee?
8 that a check was issued. I don't know, in fact, that a check 8 A. That's a fee that the Bureau was charging for preparing
9 was issued. 9 lease.
10 Q . Do you know if anybody in addition to yourself is going to 12:18:08 10 MR. SMITH: And if we could look at Defendant's
11 try to verify that? 11 Exhibit 144?
12 A. I'm not aware, no. 12 BY MR. SMITH:
13 MR. SMITH: Let's look at 152-35, the corrected 13 Q. Is this the bill for collection for that same transaction?
14 version. 14 A. Yes, it is.
15 BY MR. SMITH: 12:18:27 15 Q . And it reflects under miscellaneous receipts where Interior
16 Q. Ms. Herman, this is one of the documents we received over 16 has taken out their portion of that fee?
17 the weekend. And this is the corrected version of your overall 17 A. Yes.
18 report. Is that correct? 18 THE WITNESS: If you could blow up that section a
19 A. Certain pages in the report were corrected, yes. 19 little bit, please?
20 THE COURT: Is that what that "C-O-R" in the bottom 12.18:39 20 A. The 6,234 is what's deposited into the IIM Trust, which i
21 right-hand corner means? 21 an agreement with the terms of the permit. The 117 is depo
22 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 22 into the BIA account.
23 BY MR. SMITH: 23 BY MR. SMITH:
24 Q . And one of the changes I noted was under the section marked 24 Q . Are they both deposited into the SDA?
25 unresolved transactions. Do you see that toward the top of the 12:18:56 25 A. No, they are not.
819 8
1 page? 1 MR. SMITH: If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 143
2 A. Yes, I do. 2 on page two.
3 Q. It says, "As of the date of this report, 2,597,306 3 BY MR. SMITH:
 4 transactions, or 2.7 percent of the total transactions analyzed, 4 Q. And does that reflect the fractionalization information you
 5 remain in the population for review." 12:19:36 4 a. And does that reflect the indecidinal addition with morthal on your
6 Okay. This was a change from roughly 700,000 before? 6 A. That's correct.
7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that
7A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number7Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that8that was reported in all of the supporting schedules.8information?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct.
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 12:19:45 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12:19:45 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 12:19:45 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 11 2:1945 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 12:19:45 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 15 electronic data. 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 17 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 18 information? 9 A. That's correct. 12 (9.40 what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58? 12:19:59 15 A. That's correct.
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 15 electronic data. 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 12:19:49 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58? 12:19:59 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the electronic data. 16 Q. So the population here means something different than 17 post-1994? 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 12 (19:45) 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58? 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it? 17 post-1994?
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 15 electronic data. 16 Q. So the population here means something different than 17 post-1994? 18 A. Yes, it does. 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 12:19:45 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58? 12:19:99 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it? 17 A. That he should have received \$0.58 and not another doll 18 A. Yes, it does.
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 15 electronic data. 16 Q. So the population here means something different than 17 post-1994? 18 A. Yes, it does. 17 J. Utimately and this was a lease, as we noted, that went through 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 16 Q. So the population here means something different than 17 post-1994? 18 A. Yes, it does. 19 Q. If you could look at Defendant's Exhibit 146, the one you
 7 A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number 8 that was reported in all of the supporting schedules. 9 Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of 9 Q. So this is the correct. 10 transactions that remain? 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that 13 the post-1994 period? 14 A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the 15 electronic data. 16 Q. So the population here means something different than 17 post-1994? 18 A. Yes, it does. 19 Q. If you could look at Defendant's Exhibit 146, the one you 10 looked at yesterday. 146-1, do you remember this as a grazing 7 Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that 8 information? 9 A. That's correct. 10 Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately 11 what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct? 12 A. I'm sorry? 13 Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction 14 received \$0.58? 12 19:59 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it? 17 post-1994? 18 A. Yes, it does. 19 Q. If you could look at Defendant's Exhibit 146, the one you 10 looked at yesterday. 146-1, do you remember this as a grazing 12 20:13 20 2002. Is that correct?
7A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number7Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that8that was reported in all of the supporting schedules.9A. That's correct.89Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of9A. That's correct.910transactions that remain?11k. That's correct.912Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that12A. I'm sorry?13the post-1994 period?13Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction14A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the14received \$0.58?15electronic data.1215A. That's correct.16Q. So the population here means something different than16Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it?17post-1994?17A. That he should have received \$0.58 and not another doll18A. Yes, it does.19Q. Okay. And this was a lease, as we noted, that went through20looked at yesterday. 146-1, do you remember this as a grazing1220:132002. Is that correct?21A. Yes, it did.
7A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number7Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that8that was reported in all of the supporting schedules.9A. That's correct.9Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of9A. That's correct.10transactions that remain?11what this came down to was trying to track ultimately11A. That's correct.12Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that13the post-1994 period?13Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction14A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the14received \$0.58?15electronic data.12:19:4915A. That's correct.16Q. So the population here means something different than16Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it?17post-1994?17A. That he should have received \$0.58 and not another doll18A. Yes, it does.19Q. Okay. And this was a lease, as we noted, that went through10looked at yesterday. 146-1, do you remember this as a grazing12:20:132002. Is that correct?21A. Yes, it did.22MR. SMITH: If we can look at Defendant's Exhibit 115?
7A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number7Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that8that was reported in all of the supporting schedules.9A. That's correct.9Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of9A. That's correct.10transactions that remain?12:18:4510Q. And what this came down to was trying to track ultimately11A. That's correct.11what this gentleman received, which was \$0.58. Is that correct?12Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that12A. T'm sorry?13the post-1994 period?13Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction14A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the12:19:991515electronic data.12:19:9915A. That's correct.16Q. So the population here means something different than16Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it?17post-1994?17A. That's correct.1818A. Yes, it does.19Q. Okay. And this was a lease, as we noted, that went through12:20:13202002. Is that correct?21permit?21A. Yes, it did.22M. SMITH: If we can look at Defendant's Exhibit 115?2223Q. And it's a permit that's supposed to end November 30, 2002.23
7A. I don't recall what it said previously. This is the number7Q. And you're relying on what BIA told you about that8that was reported in all of the supporting schedules.9A. That's correct.9Q. So this is the correct number as to the number of9A. That's correct.10transactions that remain?11what this came down to was trying to track ultimately11A. That's correct.12Q. And you talked about in the population for review. Is that13the post-1994 period?13Q. Ultimately, this particular gentleman on this transaction14A. No. As I mentioned, we review all transactions in the14received \$0.58?15electronic data.12:19:4915A. That's correct.16Q. So the population here means something different than16Q. And you tried to track that to make sure he got it?17post-1994?17A. That he should have received \$0.58 and not another doll18A. Yes, it does.19Q. Okay. And this was a lease, as we noted, that went through10looked at yesterday. 146-1, do you remember this as a grazing12:20:132002. Is that correct?21A. Yes, it did.22MR. SMITH: If we can look at Defendant's Exhibit 115?

	822		82	:4
1	bottom, it's dated December 9, 1998, "Range Lease Income," and	1	THE COURT: But before we go to lunch, I want to ask	
2	that's where you identified the \$0.58?	2	the witness, and if you can't answer this question, feel free to	
3	A. Yes, that's correct.	3	say "I don't know."	
4	Q. So you identified it for 1998?	4	We've been talking a lot yesterday and today about the	
12:21:20 5	A. I'm sorry, I don't recall. Was the transaction we were	12:24:16 5	search for \$0.58. Do you have a guesstimate of how many	
6	reconciling in '97 or '98?	6	billable hours your firm expended looking for that \$0.58?	
7	Q. I'm not sure. Do you recall if it was '97 or '98?	7	THE WITNESS: My best guess, Your Honor, would be at	
8	A. I don't. We would have to flip back to the work papers.	8	minimum 10, and that doesn't include the search time.	
9	I'm sorry.	9	THE COURT: And an average billable rate of a couple	
12:21:40 10	${\bf Q}.~$ Regardless of that fact, this gentleman should be receiving	12:24:40 10	hundred dollars?	
11	\$0.58 in 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000?	11	THE WITNESS: That's correct.	
12	A. Only if he still maintained his ownership of that allotment	12	THE COURT: So we're talking about \$2,000 looking for	
13	and the terms of the permit didn't change.	13	\$0.58. Did anybody, to your knowledge, question whether there	
14	Q. Okay.	14	should be cutoffs in this effort, or were your instructions to	
12:21:54 15	MR. SMITH: If we could go to page six of that	12:25:03 15	run everything down to the last penny?	
16	document?	16	THE WITNESS: We were to run it down to the last penny,	',
17	BY MR. SMITH:	17	Your Honor.	
18	Q. And do you see where the year 2000 starts, January 24, 2000,	18	THE COURT: I won't ask you to comment on that, I'll	
19	monthly income earned?	19	just ponder it.	
12:22:18 20	A. Yes, I do.	12:25:20 20	Thank you, Mr. Smith.	
21	Q. And it doesn't appear that he received his \$0.58 during the	21	MR. SMITH: Thank you.	
22	year 2000. Is that correct?	22	THE COURT: See you after lunch.	
23	A. It does not appear based on this, no.	23	(Recess taken at 12:25 p.m.)	
24	Q. Does your test go to determine whether something like that	24		
12:22:34 25	missing and why?	25		
	823		82	25
1	A. This could have posted in 2001, he could have sold his	1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
2	interest in this tract. There's lots of reasons why that may	2		
3	not be there.	3	I, Rebecca Stonestreet, certify that the foregoing is a	
4	${\bf Q}.~$ But your investigation would not determine why a transaction	4	correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the	
12:22:48 5	like that may be missing from an account?	5	above-entitled matter.	
6	A. I don't believe I understand your question. As a component	6		
7	of the LSA work?	7		
8	Q. Right. Or yeah , as a component of your LSA work.	8		
9	A. No, we only reconciled the component that was selected.	9		
12:23:06 10	${\bf Q}.~$ So on your last document, which you have called the	10	SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE	
11	statement of known differences, something like that, a missing	11		
12	transaction like that would not necessarily be reported?	12		
13	A. We haven't established that it is a missing transaction.	13		
14	${\bf Q}. \ \ {\rm Do}$ you know anybody that's going to work to establish	14		
12:23:24 15	whether there's a missing transaction or not?	15		
16	A. Not as a result of what we've discussed, no.	16		
17	THE COURT: Mr. Smith, we have a criminal matter that	17		
18	going to be teed up in this courtroom in about five minutes,	18		
19	and I think it is it a sealed matter, Al?	19		
12:23:47 20	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, sir, it is.	20		
21	THE COURT: It's a sealed matter, which means you're	21		
22	going to have to get out of here. And looking at the number of	22		
23	people involved. I dep't want to turn this into a fire drill. I	23		
	people involved, I don't want to turn this into a fire drill. I			
24	think it's time for us to recess for lunch.	24		
12:24:01 25	think it's time for us to recess for lunch. MR. SMITH: That would be great, Your Honor.	_	5 28 of 40 sł	

<u>^</u>	12:25 - 824:23 13 - 719:2, 785:24	778:5, 779:3, 779:14, 779:16	793:17 3.1 - 811:14	60-34-1 - 744:12
\$	13 - 719.2, 765.24 136.3 - 774:19	1997 - 822:11	30 - 738:9, 745:2,	600,000 - 809:16 607 - 714:13,
\$0.58 - 821:11,	14.6 - 803:19	1998 - 745:2,	757:5, 765:13, 768:3,	714:21, 737:2, 738:2
821:14, 821:17, 822:2, 822:11.	143 - 821:1 144 - 820:11	745:22, 814:11, 822:1, 822:4, 822:11	774:4, 787:14, 819:23 300,000 - 799:7	607-7392 - 714:25 61 - 719:3
822:21, 824:5, 824:6,	146 - 819:19	1999 - 745:2,	30309-4530 -	6234 - 743:5
824:13 \$1,100 - 817:3,	146-1 - 819:20 14th - 714:13,	745:21, 799:12, 822:11	714:18 307-0010 - 715:4	65,000 - 730:5, 730:8, 730:11,
817:8, 817:13	714:21	1st - 817:22	307-1104 - 715:9	730:21, 731:4
\$104 - 745:22 \$117.34 - 820:4	15 - 719:3, 771:10 15-2-1 - 766:3	0	30th - 773:23 31 - 729:17	6511 - 715:12 68,000 - 811:2
\$139 - 775:1	152 - 774:24	2	31st - 792:8	68.1 - 774:17
\$14 - 803:12, 804:10	152,825 - 808:9 152-101 - 780:20	2 - 756:16, 802:10	32-17-1 - 726:22 327.222 - 784:8	68.2 - 774:15
\$15 - 771:12 \$2,000 - 824:12	152-14 - 772:1	2,597,306 - 819:3 2.7 - 819:4	33-2-1 - 729:18	7
\$20 - 803:15, 803:16	152-20 - 774:25	2.9 - 799:12	333 - 715:12	-
\$22 - 801:5 \$30 - 809:4	152-221 - 795:11 152-224 - 796:17,	20 - 732:2, 733:25, 765:2, 783:16	336 - 714:25 34 - 738:8	7,300 - 808:10, 808:13
\$300,000 - 798:1,	800:2	2000 - 765:12,	34-1-1 - 774:9	7,400 - 808:16
801:17 \$6,234 - 820:1,	152-228 - 797:21 152-232 - 798:3,	779:14, 792:8, 822:11, 822:18,	35,945 - 785:8, 785:14, 786:8	70 - 727:3, 744:5 700,000 - 819:6
820:4	798:12	822:22	353 - 807:12, 807:15	718 - 716:3
\$600,000 - 802:10 \$800.000 - 798:1	152-234 - 798:21 152-236 - 799:4	20001 - 715:13 20005 - 714:14,	354-3249 - 715:13	73 - 798:18
\$800,000 - 798.1 \$81 - 745:21	152-237 - 799:9	714:22, 715:4	355,320 - 792:17 367 - 811:15	75,734 - 725:23 786 - 809:17
-	152-239 - 801:3	2001 - 724:11,	378,843 - 813:11	
•	152-241 - 801:14 152-244 - 801:20	744:13, 745:10, 745:14, 794:3, 823:1	4	8
'70s - 767:19	152-246 - 802:7	2002 - 732:2,	-	80 - 744:5
'80s - 767:19, 767:21, 767:23	152-25 - 783:2 152-271 - 783:20	733:25, 740:20, 740:21, 752:24,	4 - 714:9, 768:6 4-2 - 739:17	81 - 744:25, 745:17 815-6450 - 714:18
'85 - 723:20, 723:24,	152-272 - 792:2	752:25, 753:3, 753:5,	4-2-1 - 733:23,	82 - 727:4
733:17, 785:5 '89 - 801:7	152-276 - 809:7 152-279 - 815:5	753:6, 753:8, 753:13, 758:9, 768:3, 768:18,	739:17 4-2-216 - 752:8	824-1448 - 714:14 87 - 790:5
'94 - 810:16, 815:23	152-292 - 810:10	814:14, 819:23,	4-2-225 - 735:4	01 - 130.5
'97 - 822:6, 822:7	152-35 - 818:13	821:20	40 - 718:24, 720:22,	9
'98 - 733:17, 822:6, 822:7	152-42 - 778:10 152-66 - 779:5	2003 - 721:6, 757:1, 758:9, 758:11, 775:9,	721:14, 722:1 404 - 714:18	9 - 822:1
	152-69 - 806:20	776:23, 793:9	42,361 - 816:15	90 - 744:5
1	154-44 - 816:20 154-58 - 817:6	2004 - 769:18 20044 - 715:9	435 - 811:16 44 - 744:23	900 - 714:21 92 - 783:18
1 - 725:1, 726:1,	159,249 - 811:5,	2006 - 803:2, 803:22	451,875 - 808:20,	94 - 774:14
756:16 1,500 - 725:13	811:7 16 - 714:5	2007 - 714:5, 729:17, 773:22, 774:6	809:1 46 - 768:12, 768:17	96-1285 - 714:3 975 - 715:8
1,800 - 813:14	160 - 808:10	202 - 714:14,	47-5-1 - 758:14,	
1,900 - 813:14 1.4 - 799:12	160,206 - 807:25 17 - 774:16	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13	758:15 48 - 783:18	Α
1.5 - 719:5, 798:23	18 - 733:25	206 - 801:19, 802:12	48,694 - 786:5,	A-3 - 725:2
1.8 - 799:12	18,000 - 745:1,	206xx - 800:6	786:7, 786:9, 787:18,	A-4 -726:1
1.9 - 801:22 10 - 720:17, 720:18,	745:18, 745:21 19 - 768:12, 768:17,	21-4-1 - 761:7 22 - 757:1	788:10, 788:22 488 - 803:18	ability - 806:6 able - 722:1, 722:6,
729:19, 776:5, 778:4,	769:3	221 - 734:2		723:5, 725:6, 771:18,
778:21, 781:3, 781:4, 816:18, 824:8	1985 - 722:18, 722:22, 722:24,	222 - 752:10, 752:11 225 - 739:18	5	771:22, 773:3, 777:5, 777:12, 790:9, 796:7,
10-20-1 - 724:15	723:2, 723:4, 723:6,	226 - 734:10	50 - 790:23	798:24, 818:5
100,000 - 792:19, 799:7, 813:17	724:12, 728:7, 730:6, 730:20, 730:23,	23 - 757:1 23-13-3 - 731:25	50-2-1 - 765:5 500 - 798:18	above-entitled - 825:5
1001 - 714:24	730:24, 731:1,	233 - 798:12	500s - 797:11,	absolute - 774:18,
101 - 733:4 102 - 731:9	743:25, 755:15, 792:23, 811:14,	239 - 727:9 24 - 822:18	797:17 503 - 803:17	775:6 acceptable - 737:20
102,000 - 813:19	792:23, 811:14, 811:19, 811:22,	24,000 - 745:1,	503 - 803.17 51,767 - 811:3	access - 766:17
104 - 744:25,	812:8, 812:11	745:18, 745:21	51-9-1 - 769:15	accompanying -
745:17, 780:24, 800:10, 801:19,	1986 - 817:22 1987 - 801:22.	25 - 738:9, 765:2, 769:25	54,000 - 793:4 54-5-1 - 768:2	737:22 account - 726:8,
801:25, 802:11	802:10, 814:12,	25th - 792:8	55,000 - 788:6	726:13, 726:17,
104,000 - 787:11 104,130 - 786:2,	814:13, 814:14 1988 - 727:11,	26 - 769:25 268,000 - 730:2,	55,436 - 785:21, 786:5, 786:9, 786:10,	729:4, 729:7, 730:3, 730:5, 742:8, 742:14,
787:4	730:25, 799:14	730:5	786:21, 787:12,	742:21, 742:23,
104xx - 800:6	1989 - 797:25, 799:14, 801:5	27101 - 714:25 275 000 721:22	787:15, 787:22	743:5, 743:11, 743:15, 743:17,
11 - 774:11 1100 - 714:17, 715:3	799:14, 801:5 1990 - 797:25,	275,000 - 721:22, 790:20	56-2-1 - 803:4 578 - 811:3	743:15, 743:17, 746:6, 746:13,
112,142,496 -	802:10	28 - 769:17	578,821 - 810:24	746:19, 746:20,
774:17 115 - 821:22	1993 - 801:17 1994 - 737:6, 792:8,	2800 - 714:17	585-0053 - 714:22	746:25, 747:2, 747:5, 747:9, 747:12,
117 - 820:21	792:16, 792:24,	3	6	747:13, 748:25,
11:04 - 778:22 12 - 731:9, 731:11,	810:23, 811:14 1995 - 737:3, 738:5,	3 - 756:17	6,234 - 820:20	. 749:5, 751:14, 751:24, 752:12,
761:5, 774:6, 774:9,	803:13	3-2-1 - 756:24	6.2 - 799:13	752:13, 753:18,
793:17	1996 - 776:20,	3-2-11 - 793:6,	60 - 719:2	753:20, 754:5,

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net

754:14, 754:18,	784:7, 784:21, 785:6,	733:12, 760:23,	appear - 728:6,	726:19, 727:25,
754:19, 754:22,	785:21, 786:2,	785:4, 799:2	797:8, 822:21, 822:23	728:4, 743:2, 752:15,
755:1, 755:4, 755:19,	786:15, 786:18,	agency - 721:23,	Appearances -	752:16, 753:1, 753:3,
756:2, 756:6, 756:13, 756:17, 756:20,	786:21, 786:25, 787:4, 787:6, 787:12,	722:6, 722:24, 723:2, 723:3, 723:5, 723:25,	714:11 appeared - 760:18	753:4, 753:8, 753:15, 776:20, 776:22,
756:21, 757:7,	787:20, 787:22,	730:25, 731:10,	appropriate -	777:8, 777:9, 777:14,
759:15, 760:3,	788:20, 788:21,	731:15, 733:3, 733:6,	747:12, 811:15	777:16, 777:20,
765:24, 771:19,	790:2, 792:7, 792:14,	733:7, 794:10,	approximate -	777:24, 779:2,
771:24, 772:7, 772:10, 772:14,	792:15, 792:16, 792:22, 793:1, 793:4,	794:12, 796:8, 797:4 aggregated - 781:2	730:13, 771:9 Ar - 793:8	779:11, 779:13, 779:14, 779:19,
777:20, 777:23,	800:6, 800:10,	ago - 718:23,	area - 781:17,	780:10, 780:13,
778:9, 779:11,	800:15, 800:16,	732:18, 736:24,	797:3, 797:5, 797:23,	781:20, 782:20,
781:15, 781:17, 781:18, 782:3, 782:4,	800:23, 801:2, 801:19, 801:25,	738:13, 739:7, 740:5,	799:11, 801:23, 802:10	782:21, 783:8, 783:9,
794:10, 794:11,	802:12, 807:5, 807:8,	740:17, 788:25, 796:16, 797:16,	areas - 779:19,	783:11, 783:14, 783:16, 783:24,
796:24, 800:8, 801:6,	807:10, 807:12,	807:20	798:14	784:5, 784:8, 784:19,
801:8, 806:6, 807:14,	807:16, 807:17,	agree - 733:15,	arose - 770:3	785:2, 785:5, 785:6,
809:20, 811:24, 813:2, 813:3, 815:22,	807:24, 808:2, 808:4, 808:10, 808:13,	743:19, 752:4, 763:15, 764:18	arrive - 804:10	785:7, 785:8, 785:10, 785:11, 785:15,
816:25, 817:14,	809:12, 809:15,	agreed - 797:17	arrived - 766:23 Arthur - 724:16,	785:16, 785:17,
817:25, 818:3,	809:16, 809:19,	agreement - 820:21	724:18, 725:8, 725:9,	785:18, 786:5, 786:6,
820:22, 823:5	809:23, 810:3,	ahead - 737:9,	727:11, 727:14,	786:15, 786:19,
Account - 746:7, 746:18, 746:21,	810:15, 810:19, 810:25, 811:1, 811:2,	778:23, 793:19 aid - 717:3	727:15, 731:18, 731:19, 732:11,	786:22, 786:25, 787:5, 787:9, 787:12,
748:16, 749:7,	811:3, 811:7, 811:8,	aided - 715:15	732:14, 740:22	787:15, 787:19,
749:10, 758:16, 759:6	811:12, 811:13,	al - 714:3, 714:6	aspect - 758:12	787:20, 787:22,
accountants -	811:19, 811:21,	AI - 717:13, 823:19	aspects - 719:15	787:25, 788:3, 788:4,
756:25	812:11, 815:8, 815:12, 816:12	Alaska - 758:15, 750:5, 761:1, 766:22	asserts - 765:13	788:17, 788:19, 788:25, 790:10,
Accounting - 810:15	815:12, 816:12, 816:14, 816:16,	759:5, 761:1, 766:22, 766:23, 767:2, 807:7,	assigned - 748:6 associated - 770:8	790:23, 791:11,
accounting -	816:17	807:19	Associates -	794:24, 795:4, 795:5,
729:21, 733:16,	accuracy - 737:22,	Albuquerque-	726:24, 739:23,	796:11, 802:6,
733:24, 737:13, 738:5, 743:12,	754:11, 754:13, 754:17, 762:23,	725:21, 757:1, 793:14, 795:16	740:4, 744:16, 744:17, 803:13	802:14, 815:3, 815:8 Balances - 752:24
746:10, 747:11,	804:20, 804:22,	Alcorn - 768:3	assume - 763:3	balances - 727:6,
752:5, 752:14, 773:8,	805:13, 805:16,	allotment - 822:12	assurance - 737:16,	727:20, 729:8,
791:15, 792:9,	805:17, 814:16	alternative - 770:6	737:17	741:20, 741:21,
792:23, 795:16, 805:10, 810:18,	accurate - 730:11, 740:24, 753:17,	American - 761:9 amount - 737:16,	Atlanta - 714:18 attached - 745:15,	744:10, 747:16, 750:8, 752:23,
810:19	753:23, 754:2, 754:8,	791:19, 817:22,	745:16	753:14, 776:8,
Accounts - 741:25,	761:4, 763:8, 771:11,	820:1, 821:18	attachment - 725:1,	777:23, 781:14,
744:9, 745:1, 745:6,	805:5, 805:6, 805:8,	amounts - 745:6,	726:1, 726:2	781:23, 782:1, 782:2,
746:8, 746:16, 747:6, 747:17, 748:19,	805:9, 805:10, 805:21 acknowledged -	745:7, 780:3 Anadarko - 725:21,	attachments - 725:3, 725:16	782:6, 786:7, 788:5, 788:6, 794:8, 794:11,
749:13, 749:15,	718:12	790:7, 797:23	attend - 757:1	794:12, 794:14,
752:24, 756:10,	Action - 714:3	analyses - 725:1	attending - 733:24	795:1, 795:3, 799:2,
761:10, 808:12,	actual - 750:13,	analysis - 724:15,	Attorney - 715:6	799:24, 800:6, 800:7,
810:14, 810:17 accounts - 725:24,	765:25, 786:22, 796:19, 802:21,	727:1, 741:19, 742:20, 765:6, 772:4,	audience - 717:19 audit - 737:18,	800:8 bank - 791:15
725:25, 728:6,	804:3, 814:19, 814:24	775:13, 800:24,	744:12, 744:14,	based - 721:15,
728:11, 730:6, 730:9,	added - 722:18,	802:5, 802:13, 803:7,	744:15, 804:1, 804:3,	726:12, 730:3,
730:10, 730:21,	722:23, 744:10,	813:10	804:8	730:21, 731:9,
734:13, 734:15, 739:25, 742:4, 742:9,	772:13, 772:18, 817:10	analyze - 741:18 analyzed - 743:23,	audited - 744:18, 802:23, 802:24	743:19, 748:5, 769:17, 785:7,
742:22, 744:6,	addition - 770:1,	743:25, 819:4	auditors - 804:11	787:22, 792:13,
745:18, 745:21,	818:10	Andersen - 724:16,	audits - 744:21,	792:25, 797:7, 811:2,
745:22, 747:4, 748:10, 748:11,	additional - 775:4, 796:11, 808:13,	724:18, 725:1, 725:6, 725:8, 725:9, 725:10,	802:21, 803:1	811:17, 813:10, 814:3, 816:14, 817:8,
748:12, 748:13,	808:16	727:11, 727:14,	August - 737:3 automated -	819:25, 822:23
748:23, 749:22,	Additionally - 727:6	727:15, 731:18,	737:14, 737:17	Based - 727:19
749:24, 750:6, 750:7,	address - 732:9,	731:19, 731:24,	availability - 724:23	basis - 722:2,
750:14, 750:23, 751:9, 751:11,	781:18 adjusting - 817:8	732:11, 732:14, 740:22, 816:23	available - 719:14, 724:1, 725:23, 734:6,	726:21, 754:23, 770:23, 770:25,
751:13, 751:16,	admin - 757:7,	Anderson's - 816:25	764:17, 779:15,	771:3, 788:23
751:17, 751:23,	757:15	Andy - 732:2	779:16, 780:17,	Bates - 724:15,
752:14, 752:15,	administrative -	Angel - 726:23,	780:19, 781:5, 781:9,	727:4, 729:18,
752:16, 752:18, 752:24, 753:1, 753:3,	717:5, 717:9, 752:13, 761:8	726:24 Angeles - 784:18,	785:5, 788:5, 788:7, 789:3, 791:1	729:19, 732:3, 734:2, 734:10, 739:18,
753:4, 754:8, 756:10,	Admitted - 716:6	791:2	Avenue - 715:12	744:23, 752:10,
757:15, 757:16,	affected - 725:24,	answer - 719:5,	average - 824:9	756:24, 757:4,
757:18, 757:19, 758:23, 759:1, 759:5,	726:1, 806:6, 808:5 agencies - 718:21,	720:20, 728:15, 728:16, 749:18,	aware - 719:5, 719:9, 733:3, 741:6,	758:14, 759:3, 774:11, 774:24
759:11, 759:17,	718:24, 719:17,	750:10, 767:4, 824:2	744:18, 759:16,	became - 770:3
769:17, 769:20,	719:20, 719:24,	Answer - 719:13,	760:9, 760:12,	began - 730:6,
772:7, 772:11,	720:22, 721:15,	719:17, 720:4, 720:8	769:13, 772:12,	793:24, 794:14
772:14, 773:8, 776:9, 776:11, 776:13,	722:10, 722:17, 722:21, 722:22,	answered - 721:16 answering - 736:12	773:17, 818:12	beginning - 724:24, 728:4, 729:10, 753:6,
776:14, 776:15,	723:10, 723:17,	anticipated - 720:9	В	785:2, 785:6, 785:8,
776:18, 778:2, 778:7,	724:2, 731:3, 731:5,	apologize - 721:4,		785:9, 785:11,
782:6, 782:7, 783:8,	733:1, 733:4, 733:9,	724:21, 807:1	balance - 726:17,	785:16, 785:17,

(202) 354-3249

787:25, 788:2, 788:4,	breaking - 792:6	783:3, 783:17,	781:11, 781:24,	774:14, 781:17
788:6, 792:23,	broke - 718:9, 779:1	783:23, 787:8,	782:8, 791:24,	contemporaneousl
795:23, 799:2, 810:23	broken - 797:4,	787:21, 792:19	794:18, 800:13,	y - 720:5
begins - 732:1,	797:9	check - 757:15,	802:21, 804:3, 813:22	context - 747:11
796:25	Brunner - 732:9,	762:16, 764:2,	comparison - 776:19, 791:13,	continue - 718:2,
begun - 775:13, 810:5	732:10, 768:4 Bud - 766:13,	764:14, 782:6, 801:18, 813:25,	798:15, 800:7, 800:11	733:9 continued - 733:12
belong - 748:24,	766:18	814:4, 814:5, 814:6,	compiled - 804:11	Continued - 718:5
750:4, 755:2	Bureau - 820:8	814:9, 814:19,	complaints - 737:21	contractor - 728:23,
belonging - 748:16	burned - 717:7	814:20, 814:24,	complete - 722:1,	729:2
belongs - 747:7,	-	817:12, 817:14,	724:11, 724:21,	Control - 796:24
747:21, 748:3, 751:10 below - 732:9	С	817:16, 817:17, 817:19, 817:22,	726:9, 726:13, 734:6,	control - 728:24, 737:12
Ben - 715:8	calculated - 785:2,	817:23, 818:6, 818:8	752:4, 758:6, 773:10, 775:25, 805:3, 805:4,	converted - 723:3,
beneficiaries -	790:4	checked - 762:18,	805:6, 805:22,	723:25, 731:5, 789:7
752:6	California - 739:11	801:13	805:24, 806:1, 806:6	copied - 766:3
Bert - 766:6, 766:8	cannot - 726:11,	checks - 753:24	completed - 737:19,	copies - 717:11,
beside - 717:8	734:12, 740:25,	choose - 768:13	755:11, 771:18,	717:17, 731:23,
best - 733:17, 763:12, 765:14,	752:12, 777:3, 806:15 cap - 811:2, 811:16	Christopher - 715:2 Civil - 714:3, 715:7	773:11, 773:13, 773:19, 799:21	776:24, 777:1 copy - 717:4,
766:25, 796:16, 824:7	capita - 792:14,	clarification -	completely - 786:12	717:18, 718:12,
better - 737:11	793:1, 811:18	775:17	completeness -	719:21, 725:4, 725:5,
Between - 780:10,	caption - 735:11	clarified - 749:17	754:15	758:15, 765:22,
814:20	cards - 727:7,	clarify - 745:17,	completion - 773:3,	765:25, 766:6,
between - 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:9,	727:21 care - 732:10	790:16 classes - 770:1,	805:13 component -	766:13, 766:17, 766:20, 766:25,
741:2, 741.7, 741.9, 741:15, 764:14,	Carolina - 714:25	770:5	727:23, 733:6, 733:8,	767:5, 768:3, 774:9,
780:13, 781:8,	carried - 765:12	cleaned - 790:18	740:18, 755:9,	779:7, 785:18,
782:12, 782:15,	case - 718:23,	clear - 722:20,	805:19, 813:6, 813:7,	794:20, 795:13
784:4, 784:19,	721:11, 791:7	751:7, 754:20,	823:6, 823:8, 823:9	Cor-818:20
786:21, 789:15, 790:10, 790:23,	cases - 737:20,	767:16, 767:22, 770:3	components - 733:5	Corley - 766:6
790.10, 790.23, 791:11, 792:7, 798:5,	742:5, 779:12 cash - 794:8,	clerical - 806:13 click - 717:8	comprehensive -	corner - 818:21 Correct - 718:10,
798:10, 799:13,	794:14, 800:5,	client - 732:7	737:19	748:8, 751:10, 767:5,
799:24, 800:1, 800:5,	800:10, 800:15,	close - 721:11	compute - 748:5,	775:11, 784:25
801:6, 801:18,	801:2, 801:6, 801:25	closed - 776:11,	748:7, 748:9, 749:3,	correct - 718:11,
802:11, 802:25,	categorize - 742:15	776:13, 776:15,	749:5, 749:6, 784:22,	718:13, 718:14,
803:13, 804:1, 804:23, 810:17,	category - 785:1, 786:24	809:20 Cobell - 714:3,	785:6, 785:17, 791:3 computed - 784:4,	718:22, 724:2, 724:12, 725:15,
810:22, 814:18,	Cd - 766:17	732:8	785:12	728:24, 729:3, 729:6,
814:24	Cd&I - 793:25,	collected - 736:14,	computer - 715:15,	729:8, 729:23,
beyond - 759:6	794:14, 795:13,	736:16, 737:11,	727:8, 727:21	731:14, 731:21,
Bia - 735:17,	795:14, 795:16,	737:13, 737:16,	computer-aided -	731:22, 733:14,
735:21, 736:2, 736:22, 737:23,	796:9, 796:19, 797:18, 800:12, 801:5	743:7, 743:10, 746:18 collection - 742:25,	715:15 concern - 800:18	734:8, 735:2, 735:7, 735:10, 735:14,
740:24, 752:25,	Cd&l's - 797:12,	743:1, 743:8, 746:19,	concerning -	735:22, 735:24,
753:4, 761:17,	800:9	746:22, 770:4, 770:7,	739:16	736:3, 736:10,
761:21, 762:4,	center - 807:24	820:13	concerns - 741:6	736:14, 737:4,
820:22, 821:7	centralized - 737:14	collections -	conclusion -	740:24, 741:22,
Bia's - 762:24 big - 749:25	Certain - 818:19 certain - 718:13.	735:17, 736:8, 739:24, 742:2,	734:11 conclusions -	742:1, 742:10, 743:13, 743:14,
bigger - 783:21	767:10, 770:8,	750:13, 750:20,	740:7, 740:11	744:1, 744:6, 745:15,
Bill - 738:22	786:15, 800:5, 807:5	750:24	concurrently -	748:1, 750:14,
bill - 820:13	certainly - 724:6,	Collections - 751:2	758:7	750:25, 752:7, 754:6,
billable - 824:6,	724:11, 727:22	collects - 735:13	Conditions - 737:10	755:25, 756:14,
824:9 billing - 771:13	Certificate - 825:1 certify - 825:3	Columbia - 714:1 column - 785:20,	conducted - 740:1, 814:17	756:15, 758:21, 758:22, 759:22,
billion - 774:15,	certifying - 761:19	786:4, 786:5, 787:8,	conference -	759:23, 759:25,
774:17, 774:19,	cetera - 734:16,	787:10, 807:2, 811:4	733:24, 756:25,	760:8, 760:25, 761:3,
775:1, 811:14	748:14, 761:22	combined - 774:13	757:2, 758:8	761:6, 762:20, 763:4,
binder - 803:3	challenge - 769:3,	comfortable -	confirmed - 797:11	763:16, 763:22,
bit - 726:15, 741:24, 743:24, 783:21,	791:16 challenges - 769:9	736:12 coming - 805:17,	confusing - 751:1 connection - 732:8	763:24, 763:25, 764:4, 764:6, 764:9,
820:19	challenging -	813:5	consider - 734:22,	764:11, 764:12,
blank - 781:8	768:23, 769:8	comment - 824:18	789:17, 789:18	764:13, 764:19,
block - 757:5	chance - 725:13,	Comments - 768:6	considered - 731:1	767:25, 768:4,
blow - 820:18	766:21	comments - 768:7	consistent - 719:14,	769:12, 769:20,
boss - 768:5 bottom - 720:18,	change - 819:6, 822:13	Commercial - 715:7 common - 781:4,	745:5, 762:8, 762:12, 762:24, 780:5,	769:21, 770:21, 771:1, 771:5, 771:20,
721:2, 734:11,	changed - 808:5	809:19	780:13, 785:15,	771:23, 772:7,
737:10, 744:24,	changes - 784:20,	communicating -	785:16	772:16, 772:17,
779:17, 784:6,	818:24	786:12	consistently -	773:5, 773:15, 774:1,
795:19, 796:19,	charged - 728:19,	companies - 726:25	760:24	774:2, 774:4, 774:19,
796:22, 810:14,	742:12, 742:17,	company - 739:12	Constitution - 715:12	774:20, 775:19, 775:22, 775:24
818:20, 820:3, 822:1 Box - 715:8	742:18, 742:21, 742:23, 742:24,	compare - 786:18, 787:2, 787:7, 794:14,	consuming - 771:4	775:22, 775:24, 776:3, 776:4, 776:6,
box - 732:23	743:12, 743:17,	800:9, 804:8	contain - 755:20,	776:9, 776:10,
Branch - 715:7	743:18, 747:8	compared - 783:24,	779:11, 781:20	776:24, 776:25,
break - 778:19,	charging - 820:8	787:5	contained - 799:19	777:18, 779:20,
796:25	chart - 780:18,	comparing - 739:1,	contains - 717:7,	779:21, 781:13,

(202) 354-3249

781:16, 782:10,				
	818:20, 823:17,	801:7, 802:13, 804:8,	deferred - 770:2,	801:22, 801:24,
782:11, 782:13,	823:21, 824:1, 824:9,	804:25, 805:9,	770:8, 770:16	802:11, 803:12,
782:25, 783:1, 783:6,	824:12, 824:18,	805:12, 806:3,	define - 757:9,	803:15, 803:16,
783:9, 783:10,	824:22, 825:1, 825:10	806:10, 806:11,	763:25	803:19, 804:12
783:19, 783:25,	court - 727:24,	806:18, 808:4,	defined - 792:9,	differences -
784:1, 784:12,	769:5	808:12, 808:22,	810:22, 812:22	782:22, 784:19,
785:23, 786:17,	Courthouse- 715:12	808:24, 814:11,	definition - 810:18	785:21, 785:22,
786:20, 786:23, 787:1, 787:3, 787:17,	courtroom - 823:18	814:19, 814:25, 815:18, 815:20,	degree - 806:10 demonstrated -	787:13, 791:18, 798:7, 800:25,
790:8, 791:8, 791:9,	Courtroom - 823:20	815:21, 817:10,	727:25	801:16, 802:25,
792:10, 792:17,	cover - 737:24	817:18, 819:15	Dennis - 714:12	803:23, 804:1, 804:5,
792:18, 792:20,	covered - 746:11	Data - 724:23	Department - 715:3,	804:21, 804:23,
793:5, 794:2, 794:3,	covering - 730:2,	database - 718:10,	715:6, 732:2, 732:7,	804:24, 823:11
794:7, 794:9, 794:13,	730:4	719:6, 719:10,	733:25, 737:7, 738:5	different - 733:5,
794:16, 794:19,	Cp&r - 741:5,	719:13, 719:14,	dependent -	734:24, 744:10,
794:23, 794:25, 795:5, 795:6, 795:17,	741:19, 813:22,	721:14, 722:12, 722:18, 722:21,	728:20, 728:23, 729:1, 737:17, 764:12	745:7, 746:8, 747:10, 747:17, 748:18,
795:25, 796:6, 796:8,	813:24, 813:25, 814:1, 814:11,	723:1, 724:7, 724:10,	Deposit - 741:24,	751:1, 751:6, 751:8,
797:1, 797:12,	814:12, 814:20,	724:15, 726:10,	744:9, 745:1, 745:6,	758:24, 763:19,
797:23, 798:1, 798:2,	814:24	727:19, 730:22,	746:6, 746:8, 746:16,	768:13, 777:7, 777:9,
798:10, 798:11,	Cp&rs - 814:16,	731:8, 731:12, 733:2,	746:18, 746:21,	779:24, 780:2, 780:3,
798:16, 798:19,	814:19	733:4, 733:5, 733:10,	747:6, 747:16,	780:7, 780:8, 780:12,
799:8, 799:14,	created - 725:6,	733:13, 740:19,	748:16, 748:19,	780:16, 780:17,
799:22, 799:25, 800:22, 803:7,	731:23	747:22, 748:8, 748:11, 748:12,	749:7, 749:10, 749:13, 749:15,	781:18, 782:20, 784:13, 793:18,
805:18, 806:23,	credit - 770:2, 774:14, 774:15	761:24, 765:22,	749.13, 749.15, 752:24, 756:10,	793:21, 819:16
808:2, 808:15,	credited - 754:10	765:23, 766:1,	758:16, 759:6, 761:10	differently - 731:12,
808:19, 809:3, 809:6,	criminal - 823:17	766:17, 766:20,	deposit - 742:8,	771:1
809:13, 810:8, 811:6,	criticized - 737:18	767:1, 767:11,	792:14, 811:12	difficult - 727:8,
812:17, 812:18,	Cross - 716:2, 718:5	775:17, 805:1, 805:7,	deposited - 742:3,	767:14, 767:17,
812:21, 813:1, 813:4,	cross - 718:3,	805:20, 805:21,	742:13, 742:16,	767:24, 768:1,
813:22, 813:23, 814:7, 815:3, 815:4,	762:18, 764:14 cross-check -	806:5, 810:6 Datacom - 765:12	820:20, 820:21, 820:24	768:14, 768:25 direct - 752:16,
815:9, 815:10,	764:14	Date - 825:10	deposits - 749:25	757:6, 757:15
815:11, 815:15,	cross-checked -	date - 720:7,	Deputy - 823:20	Direct - 716:2
817:4, 817:9, 817:20,	762:18	721:23, 722:4,	Describe - 719:15	directly - 754:18,
818:18, 818:22,	Cross-examination	726:12, 730:20,	describe - 735:9,	770:20
819:9, 819:11, 810:24 820:5 820:6	- 718:5	730:24, 737:3, 758:8, 774:13, 819:3	756:23	Dirk - 714:6
819:24, 820:5, 820:6, 821:6, 821:9, 821:11,	Crucita - 766:5 current - 740:1,	dated - 727:11,	described - 718:15, 756:22, 757:20,	disbursed - 742:4, 744:2, 752:6, 752:7
821:15, 821:20,	779:12	732:1, 768:3, 769:17,	812:14, 815:2	disbursement -
822:3, 822:22,	custody - 731:20	773:23, 822:1	describes - 726:3	757:7
824:11, 825:4	cutoff - 730:20	David - 714:23	description -	disbursements -
corrected - 738:10,	cutoffs - 824:14			
	cutons = 024.14	Dc - 714:4, 714:14,	767:16, 768:24,	752:16, 757:15,
808:20, 808:24, 818:13, 818:17		714:22, 715:4, 715:9,	769:4, 769:5	752:16, 757:15, 757:19
818:13, 818:17,	D	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13	769:4, 769:5 descriptions -	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19
818:13, 818:17, 818:19		714:22, 715:4, 715:9,	769:4, 769:5	752:16, 757:15, 757:19
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination -	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering -
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies -
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 deal ing - 731:8, 731:9	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:14, 723:15, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debt - 758:16,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:14, 723:15, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debits - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:14, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:22, 736:1, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 736:12, 766:12, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:12, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 766:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining -	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debits - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 766:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 756:3, 764:10, 766:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 756:5, 781:12, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:14, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:24,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decade - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 775:25, 779:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:12, 788:13,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 773:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decade - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determing - 747:21, 748:3, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrests - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:16, 789:13,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:16, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's -	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 804:13 couple - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 749:21, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10, 751:19, 751:22,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:12, 788:13, 788:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:17,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 772:22, 773:3, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's - 772:1, 774:24,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9, 781:8, 784:2, 784:3,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7 distinction - 789:15
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrests - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:16, 789:13,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:16, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's -	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10, 751:19, 751:22, 765:14, 767:4, 767:7, 778:11, 778:21,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 75:5, 775:10, 764:12, 766:12, 775:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 773:10, 775:5, 773:10, 775:5, 773:10, 775:5, 773:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:12, 788:13, 789:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:17, 789:23, 790:2, 790:19, 791:1, 791:6, 791:19, 794:15,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dcv - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:16, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's - 772:1, 774:24, 778:10, 795:10, 806:19, 810:9, 819:19, 820:10,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9, 781:8, 784:2, 784:3, 784:4, 784:8, 784:24, 785:2, 785:8, 785:9,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7 distinction - 789:15 distribute - 750:1, 750:8, 751:18,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10, 751:19, 751:22, 765:14, 767:4, 767:7, 778:11, 778:15, 778:11, 778:21, 778:23, 786:11,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 775:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 773:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:12, 788:13, 788:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:17, 789:23, 790:2, 790:19, 791:1, 791:6, 791:19, 794:15, 795:5, 795:20,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:16, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's - 772:1, 774:24, 778:10, 795:10, 806:19, 810:9, 819:19, 820:10, 821:1, 821:22	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9, 781:8, 784:2, 784:3, 784:4, 784:8, 784:11, 784:16, 784:24, 785:2, 785:8, 785:9, 785:11, 787:9,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 784:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7 distinction - 789:15 distribute - 750:1, 750:8, 751:18, 752:25, 753:9,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corrects - 816:4 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 717:17, 824:9 course - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 755:5, 750:10, 751:19, 751:22, 765:14, 767:4, 767:7, 778:11, 778:21, 778:23, 786:11, 789:2, 789:5, 789:9,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:14, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 738:9, 739:1, 741:5, 754:15, 755:9, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 764:12, 776:12, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 775:23, 775:25, 779:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 782:24, 788:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:17, 789:23, 790:2, 790:19, 791:1, 791:6, 791:19, 794:15, 795:22, 797:3,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:6, 771:15, 771:18, 772:22, 773:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 791:6 decades - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's - 772:1, 774:24, 778:10, 795:10, 806:19, 810:9, 819:19, 820:10, 821:1, 821:22 Defendants - 714:7,	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9, 781:8, 784:2, 784:3, 784:4, 784:8, 784:11, 784:16, 784:24, 785:2, 785:8, 785:9, 785:11, 787:9, 790:23, 799:15,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 787:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 740:13, 746:8, 772:23, 823:16 discussing - 747:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7 distribute - 752:23 distribute - 750:1, 750:8, 751:18, 752:25, 753:9, 753:25, 760:19,
818:13, 818:17, 818:19 correcting - 815:25, 816:2 correctly - 738:16, 746:5, 789:19 corresponding - 812:20 counted - 804:13 couple - 804:13 couple - 810:6 Court - 714:1, 715:11, 717:3, 717:10, 717:11, 717:13, 717:18, 717:10, 717:11, 717:21, 717:25, 718:2, 720:10, 720:12, 720:14, 720:16, 720:17, 720:25, 721:9, 721:17, 737:24, 738:2, 745:13, 745:16, 745:23, 749:17, 749:21, 750:5, 750:10, 751:19, 751:22, 765:14, 767:4, 767:7, 778:11, 778:15, 778:11, 778:21, 778:23, 786:11,	D data - 718:13, 718:21, 718:25, 719:6, 719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 721:15, 723:7, 723:8, 723:14, 723:15, 723:18, 723:19, 723:21, 723:22, 724:24, 725:23, 726:1, 726:3, 732:8, 734:9, 734:19, 734:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 737:22, 736:1, 756:3, 764:10, 764:12, 766:12, 772:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 775:23, 775:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 773:10, 773:12, 774:14, 775:5, 773:22, 781:5, 781:12, 781:18, 782:14, 782:18, 787:22, 788:12, 788:13, 788:16, 789:13, 789:16, 789:17, 789:23, 790:2, 790:19, 791:1, 791:6, 791:19, 794:15, 795:5, 795:20,	714:22, 715:4, 715:9, 715:13 Dev - 751:3, 770:20, 770:21, 771:16, 771:15, 771:18, 772:2, 772:13, 775:14, 779:7, 793:25, 800:22, 810:12 deal - 731:12 dealing - 731:8, 731:9 dealt - 791:14 debit - 758:16, 774:16, 774:17 debits - 759:5, 759:11 Debits - 759:5, 759:12 decade - 743:22 December - 768:3, 769:17, 792:8, 801:7, 814:14, 822:1 decided - 770:5 decision - 757:23 Defendant's - 772:1, 774:24, 778:10, 795:10, 806:19, 810:9, 819:19, 820:10, 821:1, 821:22	769:4, 769:5 descriptions - 767:22, 769:7 design - 758:16 detail - 800:20 determination - 788:2 determine - 719:19, 719:25, 738:15, 742:8, 742:20, 746:25, 755:5, 757:10, 761:22, 762:5, 762:11, 763:23, 764:10, 772:6, 777:12, 788:15, 790:9, 804:12, 806:18, 818:5, 822:24, 823:4 determined - 728:5, 729:8, 790:17, 804:9 determining - 747:21, 748:3, 762:22, 763:16, 763:21, 772:10, 805:16, 812:10, 814:16 developed - 737:7 difference - 741:9, 781:8, 784:2, 784:3, 784:4, 784:8, 784:11, 784:16, 784:24, 785:2, 785:8, 785:9, 785:11, 787:9,	752:16, 757:15, 757:19 discover - 727:19 discovered - 726:16, 727:22, 805:14 discovering - 806:11 discrepancies - 795:8, 796:5, 797:18, 797:25, 798:5, 798:14, 798:23, 799:18, 800:5, 802:1, 802:9, 805:11, 814:18, 814:24, 815:16, 815:24 discrepancy - 736:18, 736:21, 741:2, 741:7, 741:15, 741:18, 784:14, 786:21, 784:6, 817:3 discussed - 740:7, 740:10, 747:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 747:19, 748:18, 753:15, 753:24, 786:4 disk - 717:7 distinction - 789:15 distribute - 750:1, 750:8, 751:18, 752:25, 753:9,

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net

32 of 40 sheets

747:16, 753:14	early - 767:19,	784:3	732:14, 734:5,	775:14, 775:15,
distribution -	767:21, 785:7	et - 714:3, 714:6,	734:18, 737:16,	775:23, 776:3, 776:5,
753:17, 761:20,	earned - 822:19	734:15, 748:14,	738:16, 741:6,	776:7, 776:20,
761:22, 762:5, 762:15, 764:14,	Eastern - 725:22, 790:4	761:22 evaluate - 744:7,	744:20, 749:22, 764:7, 768:2, 779:22,	776:22, 776:24, 777:1, 777:8, 777:11,
813:16, 813:17	Edwards - 766:6	746:14, 770:23,	792:12, 802:18,	777:13, 777:17,
distributions -	effort - 759:4,	788:18, 801:25	803:12, 818:8, 822:10	777:21, 777:24,
753:23, 762:3	824:14	evaluated - 728:4,	fair - 726:16,	777:25, 778:7, 779:2,
District - 714:1, 714:10	efforts - 759:6 eight - 729:17,	743:3, 744:8, 744:9, 751:4, 756:18,	728:14, 728:16, 731:7, 731:10,	779:3, 779:4, 779:23, 779:24, 780:10,
divided - 742:9	744:23, 765:9, 779:18	759:13, 763:1,	731:18, 733:1,	780:13, 780:17,
Division - 715:7	either - 762:22,	790:12, 790:17,	733:20, 736:8, 744:3,	780:18, 781:3, 781:5,
document - 717:8,	801:24, 808:22	801:2, 805:11	748:21, 753:10,	781:12, 781:14,
717:9, 724:14, 724:16, 724:22,	Electronic - 776:22 electronic - 719:6,	evaluating - 738:18 Evidence - 716:8	758:12, 760:23, 762:25, 763:13,	781:25, 782:13, 783:8, 783:11,
725:3, 725:4, 725:5,	719:10, 720:1,	Evidentiary - 714:8	763:14, 765:19,	783:12, 783:13,
725:17, 725:20,	723:14, 723:21,	exact - 780:17	767:10, 768:19,	783:24, 783:25,
726:2, 727:3, 732:1,	724:6, 724:10, 726:9,	exactly - 748:3,	772:20, 777:24,	784:8, 787:20,
732:12, 734:3, 735:4, 736:25, 737:3, 737:5,	728:3, 728:9, 729:9, 730:2, 730:22,	748:21, 750:19, 780:19, 805:24	787:21, 789:24, 796:4, 804:6, 804:19,	788:19, 788:25, 793:21, 794:1,
737:10, 737:25,	730:24, 734:7,	examination -	805:2, 805:20,	794:24, 795:4,
738:8, 738:12,	734:21, 759:18,	718:5, 743:19	806:17, 810:7, 813:10	796:11, 802:6, 815:3,
739:17, 739:18,	772:5, 772:15, 773:9,	examined - 738:12	fairly - 732:24,	815:8
752:10, 758:17, 758:18, 758:19,	778:5, 779:15, 791:6, 791:10, 794:20,	example - 742:6, 743:3, 746:17,	782:22, 789:23 familiar - 727:12,	filing - 717:6 fill - 723:7, 723:14,
761:7, 761:12,	795:20, 807:9,	768:13, 790:1,	729:20, 729:24,	723:21, 724:3,
761:16, 765:7, 765:8,	808:12, 808:14,	797:20, 816:14	738:19, 738:21,	795:23, 806:3, 806:7
765:9, 770:4, 770:7, 793:8, 794:5, 803:6,	810:6, 810:23, 815:21, 819:15	examples - 727:24, 746:10	738:22, 744:17, 758:17, 761:14,	filled - 796:2
803:10, 806:22,	Electronically -	excerpt - 779:8,	762:6, 762:21,	filling - 728:8, 800:18
821:24, 822:16,	776:21	800:9	765:20, 765:21, 766:5	final - 754:21
823:10	electronically -	excess - 771:10,	far - 719:16, 771:6,	finalized - 717:16
documentation - 755:4, 755:6, 755:8,	779:3 Elliott - 714:15	771:12 excluded - 768:20,	807:12, 808:19, 809:2, 809:4, 813:11	findings - 765:11 fire - 823:23
755:10, 755:13,	Elouise - 714:3	769:11, 769:14,	February - 723:19,	firm - 728:19,
755:23	emphasize - 765:10	792:22, 810:16, 811:7	723:24, 779:14,	730:17, 739:4, 766:2,
documents - 725:6,	employ - 792:23	excluding - 810:23	779:16, 785:4, 785:5	795:16, 824:6
731:19, 732:7, 744:20, 755:12,	employer - 731:18 encompassed -	excuse - 807:21 Excuse - 720:11,	fee - 742:12, 743:1, 743:6, 743:9, 743:10,	first - 719:18, 719:22, 751:15,
818:16	810:20	745:9, 777:25, 795:2,	743:12, 743:16,	758:9, 766:9, 784:4,
dollar - 751:5,	end - 779:12,	807:13	743:17, 820:4, 820:7,	786:18, 788:17,
769:16, 769:20,	819:23	Exhibit - 726:22,	820:8, 820:16	793:24, 798:8
817:22, 821:17 dollars - 744:5,	enhanced - 737:13 entered - 727:7,	731:25, 733:23, 737:2, 738:2, 758:14,	fees - 742:15, 742:18, 742:21,	First- 805:12 fiscal - 794:9
775:7, 798:6, 798:18,	727:21	772:1, 774:24,	742:23	five - 724:22,
798:19, 799:7, 824:10	entire - 761:5,	778:10, 783:2,	Fees- 742:17	732:18, 734:3, 759:3,
done - 721:10, 726:12, 720:7	766:21, 811:3	783:20, 795:11,	few - 809:20	779:15, 798:5, 803:9,
726:12, 730:7, 731:17, 758:5,	entitled - 761:9, 765:6, 769:15,	806:20, 810:10, 819:19, 820:11,	field - 737:18, 781:5 fields - 779:24,	821:24, 823:18 fixed - 721:11,
762:13, 762:14,	810:14, 825:5	821:1, 821:22	780:2, 780:4, 780:6,	808:22
765:1, 785:25, 791:5,	entry - 817:8	exhibit - 809:9,	780:8, 780:12,	flip - 822:8
793:25, 794:3, 795:23, 800:12,	equally - 763:17 era - 729:9, 730:2,	816:22 Exhibits - 716:8	780:16, 780:18, 780:25	Floor- 714:13 flows - 747:14,
804:15, 807:19,	730:4, 730:22,	exist - 748:12,	Fields- 781:3	747:24, 775:7
812:13, 813:10,	730:25, 731:2, 773:9,	804:24, 807:17	figure - 730:8,	Focus- 800:4
815:1, 817:23	783:13, 808:14, 800:23, 810:3, 810:23	existed - 728:7, 730:21 778:0 812:11	746:1, 804:10	focus - 724:23, 725:20, 727:5
Dorris - 714:16 down - 729:13,	809:23, 810:3, 810:23 erroneous - 727:6,	730:21, 778:9, 812:11 existence - 733:10	file - 775:18, 775:19, 775:20,	725:20, 727:5, 727:10, 729:24,
729:15, 748:13,	727:20, 738:9	existing - 807:8	775:21, 776:18,	732:5, 734:3, 735:4,
754:24, 766:15,	error - 765:13,	exists - 749:7,	776:19, 780:19,	737:5, 737:9, 739:21,
779:17, 788:18, 792:6, 796:25, 797:9,	789:13, 789:16, 789:17, 789:18,	801:11 expected - 770:5	781:15, 781:20, 781:21, 782:4, 782:7,	752:11, 757:4, 761:16, 765:10,
807:24, 821:10,	789:23, 806:14,	expended - 824:6	782:8, 782:9, 782:15,	774:11, 779:10,
824:15, 824:16	813:18	experience - 814:18	782:16, 783:9,	780:24, 783:3,
Draft - 768:6	errors - 727:9,	experienced -	783:16, 784:5,	795:19, 796:22,
draw - 768:22 drill - 823:23	788:3, 788:4, 788:10, 788:12, 790:18,	769:10 explain - 740:18	784:18, 784:19, 784:20, 785:7,	803:10 focused - 728:8,
due - 737:16,	805:14, 813:12,	extent - 719:16,	785:16, 785:18,	758:6
748:19, 749:23,	813:13, 813:15	723:24, 754:5,	786:6, 786:15,	focusing - 750:24
751:16	Esquire - 714:12, 714:15, 714:16,	756:15, 763:1, 763:5	786:19, 786:22, 786:25, 787:5	folder - 794:18 folks - 763:11
duplicated - 774:4 during - 800:4,	714:15, 714:16, 714:19, 714:20,	external - 771:16, 772:5	786:25, 787:5, 787:13, 787:16,	follow - 796:3
811:13, 822:21	714:23, 715:1, 715:2,	extra - 808:10	787:19, 787:23,	following - 796:25,
Dx - 815:5	715:5		788:17, 790:10,	813:2
	essentially - 736:2 establish - 823:14	F	790:23, 791:11, 791:12, 794:8,	footnote - 727:9, 727:10, 779:18,
E	established -	facilitate - 770:6	794:17, 794:18,	780:24, 786:1, 787:9,
e-mail - 718:17,	823:13	fact - 719:20,	802:14, 813:25	787:10
718:19, 766:4, 766:5, 766:13, 766:21, 768:3	estimate - 796:16 estimated - 784:2,	720:16, 727:20, 729:8, 731:19,	files - 725:9, 725:11, 775:10,	foregoing - 825:3 form - 720:3
100.10, 100.21, 100.3	estimated - /04.2,	120.0, 101.10,	120.11, 110.10,	IUIII - 720.3

(202) 354-3249

formal - 732:6	Grazing - 768:14	historically -	796:20, 796:24,	721:8, 741:12, 743:6,
format - 778:5,	Great - 762:2,	734:25, 741:14	800:5, 800:13, 801:1,	751:8, 758:19, 769:5,
812:6	767:21, 788:25,	history - 765:6,	801:23, 802:14,	773:25
forward - 723:24,	789:4, 790:21	775:21	803:14, 804:1	individual - 739:25,
743:25, 815:2, 815:7,	great - 823:25 greater - 790:22	histran - 775:18,	Im500's - 802:2,	742:4, 742:13, 747:1,
815:8, 816:15, 817:1 four - 732:3, 758:11,	greatly - 737:13	775:19, 775:23 hold - 790:14	802:4, 802:21, 802:25, 804:20	747:2, 747:7, 747:8, 747:21, 748:4,
771:12, 797:7, 798:5,	grief - 717:21	holder - 743:17,	Im500s - 799:25,	748:16, 748:24,
800:4, 803:10	Ğriffin - 744:16,	755:1, 755:19	801:5	749:9, 750:2, 751:10,
four-year - 771:12	744:17, 744:21,	holders - 726:8,	_images - 789:7,	751:14, 751:24,
Fourth 714:24	803:13	730:3, 730:5, 742:21,	789:8	752:6, 752:18, 754:5,
fourth - 747:19 fractionalization -	group - 752:17, 813:18	742:23, 743:5, 743:11, 743:16,	immediately - 776:11	754:7, 754:14, 754:19, 754:22,
821:4	groups - 734:14,	748:25, 765:24,	imperative - 752:4,	755:2, 755:20,
frame - 788:18,	813:13, 813:15	771:19, 772:7,	752:13	756:10, 756:13,
807:17, 810:17	Grover - 766:6	772:10, 772:14, 782:3	important - 763:15,	756:17, 756:21,
Franklin- 715:8 fraud - 806:14	guess - 743:25, 771:10, 788:8, 824:7	Honor - 717:2, 717:15, 717:20,	763:17, 763:21, 763:22, 764:18	772:6, 773:4, 781:15, 782:2, 782:6, 794:11,
free - 824:2	guesstimate - 824:5	717:24, 718:1,	Importantly -	814:6, 814:9
Fritz- 766:6	Guilder - 714:20	720:13, 720:21,	771:15	individually -
Fti- 732:20, 732:22,		721:4, 721:16,	improve - 737:7	788:15
762:22, 771:6	Н	739:19, 745:20,	in-the-population - 815:14	individuals -
Fti's- 772:4 full - 732:23, 737:16	half - 758:13, 790:1,	749:12, 749:24, 750:7, 751:21,	inaccuracies -	748:20, 750:3, 751:16 Information -
functions - 737:14,	797:16, 798:15,	765:17, 778:14,	806:10	759:24
737:18	809:14	778:20, 778:24,	inaccurate - 765:3	information -
fund - 757:5	Hand - 717:13	802:19, 823:25,	inappropriately -	719:18, 722:18,
Funds- 761:10 funds - 736:15,	hand - 717:17, 737:12, 737:15,	824:7, 824:17 Honorable - 714:9	757:6, 757:14 include - 752:13,	722:22, 722:23, 723:2, 723:6, 723:16,
737:8, 746:18,	786:24, 788:11,	hours - 824:6	752:15, 769:7,	724:1, 724:4, 725:24,
747:12, 748:12,	818:21	Hsa - 730:4	772:22, 776:13,	726:17, 726:19,
748:23, 749:23,	handling - 791:6	Hsa's - 730:1	776:17, 782:5,	734:7, 734:23,
750:22, 751:17, 752:1, 752:7, 753:8,	hard - 719:21, 776:24, 777:1,	Hsas - 760:5 hundred - 798:5,	792:13, 824:8 included - 731:3,	738:16, 740:23, 760:2, 760:4, 760:7,
754:10, 754:20,	785:17, 794:20	824:10	759:19, 772:19,	761:15, 761:17,
755:5, 757:5, 757:14,	Harold - 766:6		776:18, 781:1, 784:15	762:11, 762:23,
761:21, 761:22,	Harper - 714:19,		includes - 775:5,	763:2, 763:3, 763:6,
764:5, 764:7, 768:14, 768:25, 769:6	717:14, 717:15, 717:20	I-tran - 775:19,	776:15, 776:17, 781:22, 783:14,	763:7, 763:9, 763:12, 764:19, 765:2,
100.20, 100.0	head - 784:17	775:21, 776:19	792:14	765:19, 767:25,
G	headings - 787:8	idea - 728:10,	Including - 774:12	769:8, 770:11,
-	heard - 764:21,	772:18, 773:11	Income - 822:1	773:24, 774:3,
gap - 759:7 Gaps- 724:24	764:23, 778:17 Hearing - 714:8	identified - 730:9, 741:20, 741:21,	income - 822:19 incomplete -	777:10, 779:12, 779:13, 779:14,
gaps - 718:13,	hearing - 765:4	777:15, 782:14,	777:25, 778:6	779:16, 779:19,
718:15, 718:16,	heir - 760:19	801:5, 807:15,	inconsistencies -	780:3, 780:4, 780:12,
721:11, 723:7, 723:14, 723:21,	held - 744:5, 744:25, 745:6	808:13, 808:16, 809:1, 809:4, 813:11,	782:12, 782:15, 790:10, 791:11,	781:16, 781:19, 781:20, 781:25,
723:24, 724:3,	helpful - 791:25	813:20, 822:2, 822:4	799:24, 805:1	783:14, 783:16,
725:24, 728:8, 734:9,	Herman - 716:3,	identifies - 779:18	inconsistency -	783:24, 790:24,
734:19, 779:4,	717:23, 718:7, 718:9,	identify - 719:22,	763:5, 782:17	792:5, 797:15,
795:24, 800:18, 806:3, 806:7	719:4, 724:14, 726:8, 726:23, 729:20,	722:6, 728:11, 734:14, 803:12,	inconsistent - 779:23, 781:3,	798:25, 800:14, 804:9, 804:20, 805:2,
	730:7, 732:1, 732:10,	810:2, 812:15, 812:19	782:19, 795:21	805:7, 813:5, 813:8,
gas - 735:13, 736:14	751:19, 757:9, 761:7,	identifying -	incorrect - 726:20,	814:3, 814:4, 821:4,
gathered - 783:15,	763:15, 779:1, 791:5,	743:15, 782:18	808:22	821:8
796:9 general - 794:10,	792:5, 793:8, 818:16 high - 769:16,	idiosyncrasies - 734:15	incorrectly - 727:25, 760:16	information's - 780:1
800:19, 800:21	769:20	lim - 727:6, 727:15,	increase - 774:21	inherited - 760:20
generated - 794:5,	high-dollar -	727:20, 728:6, 736:1,	increased - 775:1	initial - 746:19,
794:22	769:16, 769:20	737:8, 739:14,	index - 717:7,	762:15, 775:20,
generates - 814:1 gentleman - 817:12,	highlighted - 724:23, 725:20,	739:25, 740:18, 741:3, 741:22, 742:2,	717:21 indexing - 717:5	798:17, 798:20, 801:7, 808:12, 814:4
817:20, 821:11,	727:5, 727:18,	745:1, 746:5, 746:13,	Indian - 742:4,	inside - 816:8
821:13, 822:10	729:25, 734:4, 735:5,	746:20, 748:7,	747:1, 747:9, 748:24,	instance - 760:14,
Georgia - 714:18	737:6, 752:11,	749:22, 749:24,	749:9, 751:14,	764:9, 767:13,
Gingold - 714:12 given - 760:19,	761:16, 765:10, 766:11, 774:12,	750:5, 750:19, 750:22, 750:23,	751:25, 752:5, 752:18, 754:5, 754:7,	767:21, 791:15, 811:11, 813:16
772:15	779:10, 784:7, 795:19	755:1, 755:19, 757:5,	754:14, 754:19,	instances - 742:6,
Given - 804:25	Hinkins - 757:9,	757:14, 757:18,	755:2, 755:20, 773:4	744:4, 752:2, 760:13,
glossary - 717:16	758:20, 758:21,	759:5, 769:17, 777:8,	Indian's - 742:14,	764:16, 771:2,
goal - 723:12, 723:13, 771:21,	758:23, 758:24 hint - 802:19	782:9, 800:15, 800:19, 820:20	747:2, 756:13, 756:21 indians - 757:6,	787:24, 809:22, 814:9 Instead - 761:21
771:22, 805:14,	hired - 740:4	iim - 757:7, 757:15	757:14	instead - 721:2
805:15	historical - 729:4,	lm-600 - 777:21,	Indians - 747:7,	instructions -
government - 717:3	729:7, 729:21,	777:22	747:21, 748:4,	824:14
grazing - 767:13, 767:25, 768:20,	733:15, 752:14, 753:17, 754:23,	Im500 - 793:21, 793:25, 794:5,	748:16, 751:10, 761:9 indicate - 730:24,	integrated - 720:23 intended - 747:1,
768:25, 769:10,	758:7, 760:3, 773:8	794:14, 795:5,	760:20	756:9, 806:2
770:9, 770:12, 819:20	Historical - 810:15	795:21, 796:7,	indicated - 717:6,	intentional - 806:14

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net

10/16/2007 07:25:01 PM

34 of 40 sheets

interest - 813:16,	Judge- 714:10,	ledger - 727:7,	777:3, 778:10, 779:5,	
813:17, 823:2	751:8	727:21, 728:9, 730:2,	780:20, 783:2,	machine - 715:15,
Interior - 714:6,	judgment - 792:13,	730:4, 730:25, 731:2,	783:20, 784:6, 787:8,	789:9
730:1, 730:3, 732:3,	792:25, 811:2,	745:2, 745:18,	788:14, 789:9, 790:5,	Mad - 761:21,
732:7, 733:25, 735:1,	811:16, 811:18,	794:10, 800:19,	792:2, 793:6, 793:25,	762:1, 762:2, 762:10
737:7, 738:5, 740:10,	811:19, 811:21,	800:20, 800:21,	795:10, 796:17,	mail - 718:17,
741:10, 741:16, 742:12, 742:17,	811:24, 812:11 July- 757:1, 758:11,	807:2, 807:6 ledgers - 722:11,	797:8, 797:21, 798:21, 800:2, 801:3,	718:19, 730:1, 730:3, 766:4, 766:5, 766:13,
742:18, 742:21,	793:9, 817:22	724:3	802:11, 803:4, 803:9,	766:21, 768:3
743:1, 743:9, 754:25,	June- 732:2,	left - 725:8, 781:8,	806:19, 807:1,	maintain - 761:18,
755:1, 755:4, 758:1,	773:22, 774:3, 774:5,	786:18	807:23, 809:9, 810:9,	761:20
792:9, 804:14,	774:6, 774:9, 774:21,	legends - 717:5	811:15, 815:5,	maintained - 822:12
807:21, 811:25,	803:2, 803:22	Lenexa- 789:4	816:20, 817:6,	majority - 790:21
814:3, 814:5, 820:15	Justice- 715:3,	less - 737:19,	818:13, 819:19,	management -
Interior's - 810:18	715:6	767:16, 767:22	820:10, 821:1,	720:23, 737:8, 781:17
internal - 737:12 investigating -	Justin- 714:20	lessee - 742:18, 742:25, 743:8,	821:22, 821:24, 821:25	Management - 735:9, 761:10
767:14	K	743:18, 749:25	looked - 729:4,	manual - 726:18,
investigation -	K	lessees - 742:24	752:8, 758:19,	727:7, 727:20
823:4	Kane - 732:2, 732:4,	letter - 732:1, 732:4,	759:20, 761:23,	mapped - 800:23
investment - 775:6	732:11	732:6	769:5, 783:13,	mapping - 746:9,
involved - 812:7,	keep - 778:21	level - 734:15,	783:23, 804:6,	746:12, 747:3,
823:23	keeps - 749:14	793:10	806:22, 806:24,	747:13, 749:2, 754:9,
involving - 759:10	Keith - 714:19	Levitas- 714:15	807:12, 807:13,	791:17, 812:14,
Irms - 718:10, 722:24, 723:3, 723:7,	Kempthorne - 714:6 Kilpatrick - 714:16,	liability - 800:6 lifetime - 724:25	809:23, 811:19, 816:22, 819:20	812:16, 812:17, 812:23, 812:25,
723:25, 724:15,	714:20, 714:24	likely - 799:15,	looking - 723:8,	813:11, 813:20, 814:6
726:9, 726:10,	kind - 739:14	807:21	723:19, 724:14,	March - 733:25,
726:17, 731:8,	kinds - 758:24	limit - 734:12,	728:3, 731:7, 739:1,	779:14, 814:14
731:12, 733:1,	Kirschman - 715:1	755:15	741:1, 741:14, 746:4,	marked - 807:23,
733:10, 733:13,	knowledge -	limited - 724:25,	747:14, 747:20,	818:24
733:16, 733:17,	743:11, 756:19,	741:4, 741:19,	750:16, 750:19,	master - 775:10,
734:6, 735:19, 735:25, 736:13,	766:25, 824:13 known - 823:11	753:20, 762:20, 772:4, 815:11	750:20, 751:3, 753:10, 753:12,	775:14, 775:15, 776:2, 776:7, 776:18,
738:17, 738:18,	Kohn - 715:2	line - 719:2, 719:3,	755:16, 760:6,	776:24, 777:1,
739:2, 739:25, 741:3,	Kpmg- 725:7,	719:8, 720:17, 720:18	787:21, 788:19,	777:11, 777:12,
741:8, 747:2, 747:22,	732:9, 732:21	lines - 797:7	791:5, 794:8, 794:11,	777:17, 777:21,
748:8, 748:11,		link - 717:8	794:12, 799:11,	777:25, 779:2, 779:3,
748:12, 748:17,	L	list - 732:17,	803:18, 807:5, 807:8,	779:23, 781:3, 781:4,
749:5, 749:8, 749:10,	Land 720-2 751-5	732:19, 777:23,	811:21, 814:9, 816:7,	781:12, 781:15,
749:13, 749:15, 750:16, 750:18,	land - 730:3, 751:5, 759:21, 760:18,	778:8, 796:19 listed - 803:23	816:8, 816:11, 823:22, 824:6, 824:12	781:20, 781:21, 781:25, 782:4,
755:22, 755:24,	760:20, 761:17,	listing - 734:7	Looking- 719:9	782:15, 783:12,
761:21, 761:24,	761:19, 764:2, 764:8,	lists - 783:8	looks - 736:13,	793:21, 794:17
762:10, 763:22,	764:11, 769:17,	litigation - 732:8,	758:8, 785:1, 785:25,	Master - 777:8,
767:11, 771:16,	792:13, 792:25,	746:10, 805:10	790:1, 790:4, 793:9,	779:11
771:19, 772:5, 772:7,	811:2, 811:17, 816:14	Litigation-715:7	793:18, 799:13,	Master_all - 781:1,
772:10, 772:15,	Land- 759:24	Llp- 714:16, 714:20, 714:24	801:16, 801:22,	781:4
772:24, 773:1, 773:5, 774:13, 775:17,	land-based - 730:3, 769:17, 792:13,	loaded - 775:4	802:9, 803:15, 803:17, 808:16,	math - 785:25 matter - 728:13,
782:8, 782:9, 782:13,	792:25, 811:2,	locate - 723:5,	815:21	823:17, 823:19,
784:2, 794:6, 794:15,	811:17, 816:14	727:8, 728:21, 796:7,	Los- 784:18, 791:2	823:21, 825:5
794:18, 794:19,	language - 729:24,	796:20	lost - 786:12	matters - 791:7
794:22, 800:18,	729:25, 735:5,	located - 723:11,	Lris- 759:22, 760:7,	mean - 734:24,
801:7, 805:1, 805:7,	761:17, 765:10,	777:2, 777:13, 796:25	760:9, 760:24, 761:4,	745:18, 749:9,
805:21, 806:10, 807:23	766:11, 774:12, 779:10	look - 719:2, 724:22, 725:16.	761:18, 762:10, 762:13, 762:16.	759:12, 768:16, 768:25, 779:25.
issue - 757:9,	large - 732:24,	725:19, 726:4,	762:23, 763:2, 763:9,	781:7, 782:25, 784:3,
770:16, 806:3, 806:6,	791:18	726:22, 727:3,	763:13, 763:16,	785:3, 805:25,
806:7	larger - 792:3	727:14, 729:17,	763:19, 764:10,	807:13, 813:15
issued - 811:8,	last - 721:10, 722:5,	731:25, 732:3,	764:12, 764:15,	means - 745:18,
817:24, 818:6, 818:8,	739:21, 768:12,	733:23, 734:2,	765:2, 765:6, 765:23,	771:22, 818:21,
818:9 issues - 747:10,	823:10, 824:15, 824:16	734:10, 735:4, 736:8, 736:9, 737:2, 737:5,	766:23, 767:3, 821:5 Lsa- 746:15, 751:2,	819:16, 823:21 meant - 759:8,
748:18, 751:2, 758:25	late - 767:23	738:8, 739:17,	753:19, 754:4,	778:7
issuing - 811:11	latter - 752:17	744:12, 744:23,	754:16, 756:4, 756:5,	Medium - 757:8
item - 743:6	Law- 714:12	746:6, 746:12,	756:11, 760:4, 760:6,	meeting - 766:8
itself - 782:13,	Leakage- 757:5	746:15, 750:13,	763:1, 764:1, 764:5,	memos - 739:6,
794:15, 797:6, 814:7	leaked - 757:6,	750:14, 750:16,	815:18, 816:7, 823:7,	740:15
	757:14 learned - 766:23	752:8, 752:10, 755:14, 756:24	823:8	mentioned -
J	lease - 820:9,	755:14, 756:24, 758:14, 759:3, 760:1,	Ltro- 765:22, 765:25, 766:12,	719:23, 720:8, 721:22, 722:2,
James- 714:9	821:19	761:7, 761:15, 765:5,	766:20, 767:1	722:16, 723:23,
January- 822:18	Lease- 822:1	765:9, 766:3, 768:2,	Ltro's- 766:17	725:10, 728:8,
Jeffrey- 732:10	leases - 737:11,	768:10, 768:17,	Ltros- 763:9	729:12, 732:5, 733:7,
job - 746:24,	767:13, 767:25, 770:9	769:15, 769:25,	lunch - 778:13,	733:21, 736:4,
757:13, 772:9, 814:15	least - 720:22,	770:20, 770:24,	778:15, 823:24,	740:17, 741:18,
John- 715:1, 715:5 Joseph- 766:5	725:22, 731:11, 740:3, 778:13,	771:3, 771:13, 772:1, 774:9, 774:11,	824:1, 824:22	745:7, 746:4, 747:3, 749:2, 749:24, 751:1,
Jr- 715:1	778:15, 787:21	774:24, 776:23,	М	753:2, 754:3, 757:17,
			11/1	

(202) 354-3249

758:13, 759:13,	737:17	necessarily - 747:4,	numbers - 745:5,	operational - 770:3
763:10, 764:10,	module - 750:20,	788:1, 816:2, 823:12	745:19, 777:23,	order - 758:6, 760:2
767:2, 769:2, 770:22,	750:22, 782:9	need - 719:21,	780:16, 793:18,	original - 808:9
773:21, 777:20, 788:23, 788:24,	moment - 729:12, 745:17	752:7, 754:20, 768:17, 788:18	802:14, 802:23, 802:24, 803:17	originally - 772:14, 773:18, 808:14
790:20, 792:25,	monetary - 762:16	needs - 804:15	numerous - 719:17	Ost - 724:9, 724:10,
801:12, 801:18,	money - 742:13,	negative - 798:8	Nw - 714:13,	724:11, 726:10,
803:22, 818:7, 819:14	742:15, 743:22,	never - 738:10,	714:21, 715:3, 715:12	730:16, 744:13,
message - 766:18 methods - 770:6	743:24, 744:2, 746:5, 746:13, 746:20,	765:25, 766:25 New - 757:1	0	744:14, 752:25, 753:4, 753:12, 805:2,
Mexico - 757:1	746:23, 746:25,	next - 725:12,	0	805:21, 816:5
Michael - 715:2,	747:6, 747:14,	737:21, 757:10,	Objection - 721:16,	Otr - 720:8
717:2 Michelle - 716:3,	747:20, 747:24, 748:3, 748:15,	760:19, 766:11, 768:11, 769:25,	749:12 obtained - 821:5	out-of-population - 815:12
732:10, 757:9, 766:7,	748:19, 749:3, 749:9,	785:20, 797:8, 798:8	obviously - 751:7,	outside - 749:15,
766:16	749:10, 750:3, 751:9,	nine - 739:18,	753:16, 771:4, 784:23	757:18, 763:6, 815:24
microfiche - 789:3,	751:11, 751:13,	816:18	Occasionally-	overall - 770:23,
789:6, 789:9 mid - 778:19	751:16, 751:23, 754:7, 754:13,	Ninth - 714:13 ninth - 821:25	731:16 occasions - 742:11	783:5, 818:17 overlap - 776:1,
mid-morning -	754:17, 754:23,	nobody - 740:7,	October - 714:5,	799:13
778:19	754:25, 755:2,	740:10, 753:10,	792:8	owner - 764:4,
middle - 783:17	755:21, 763:17, 763:23, 764:3, 773:4,	756:19	office - 744:13,	764:6, 764:9, 764:11
might - 804:9, 814:23	765.25, 764.5, 775.4, 775:7, 805:16, 805:17	non - 752:18, 757:6, 757:7, 757:14,	789:4, 797:3, 797:6 Office - 761:9,	owners - 742:7, 742:8
million - 744:5,	monies - 750:1,	757:15, 793:10	761:10	ownership - 760:2,
744:25, 745:17,	750:2, 752:5, 753:22,	non-iim - 757:7,	Offices - 714:12	760:14, 760:15,
745:21, 745:22, 771:10, 771:12,	755:3 month - 720:22,	757:15 non-indians -	Official - 715:11, 825:1	761:5, 761:18, 761:24, 762:17,
774:14, 774:16,	725:23, 779:12	757:6, 757:14	official - 761:18	763:3, 764:19,
798:23, 799:12,	month's - 781:22	non-individual -	offsetting - 798:7	768:15, 768:19,
799:13, 801:5,	monthly - 822:19	752:18	often - 726:19, 742:3	768:23, 769:1, 822:12
801:22, 802:10, 803:12, 803:15,	months - 718:25, 719:17, 719:22,	nonzero - 752:15, 753:1, 753:3, 753:4,	Ohta - 724:7,	Р
803:16, 804:10, 809:4	721:15, 721:23,	753:8, 786:5, 787:9	730:18, 730:19,	•
Minerals - 735:9	722:7, 722:11, 775:4,	Norc - 730:17,	740:14, 747:15,	Pacer - 741:5,
minerals - 735:13, 736:9, 737:11	775:21, 779:13, 779:15, 796:16,	758:15, 758:21, 762:14, 762:19,	752:23, 753:2, 753:12, 756:25,	741:19 page - 719:2, 719:3,
minimum - 752:15,	807:20, 809:21	763:10, 763:11,	759:4, 770:5, 807:22,	719:9, 720:18, 721:2,
824:8	Morgan - 726:23,	765:6, 769:15,	816:1, 816:4, 816:5	721:3, 724:22,
Minneapolis - 725:22	726:24 morning - 717:2,	769:23, 814:17 North - 714:25	Oig - 745:13 Oig's - 744:13	725:19, 725:21, 727:3, 727:6, 729:17,
minor - 801:16	717:14, 717:15,	Norton - 732:8	oil - 735:13	729:19, 732:3, 734:3,
minutes - 778:21,	717:24, 717:25,	note - 803:10	Once- 728:3,	737:2, 737:5, 737:9,
823:18 miscellaneous -	718:1, 718:7, 718:8, 719:2, 778:19	noted - 733:9,	805:20 once - 766:22,	737:10, 737:21, 738:8, 739:17,
820:15	Morning - 714:7	795:8, 797:11, 818:24, 821:19	794:17, 794:24, 796:7	739:21, 744:23,
missing - 718:21,	Most - 801:6	nothing - 756:12,	one - 720:22,	752:10, 757:4, 758:9,
718:25, 719:6,	most - 780:14,	759:14, 787:2, 787:6,	725:22, 725:25,	761:15, 765:9,
719:10, 719:12, 719:16, 719:18,	780:15, 781:4, 799:15, 807:20	817:23 notice - 760:17	726:14, 726:24, 727:24, 731:8, 735:8,	768:11, 768:17, 769:3, 769:25, 770:1,
720:17, 720:22,	Mountain - 770:13	noticed - 760:18,	735:9, 737:11,	774:11, 779:17,
721:10, 721:15,	move - 765:17,	761:1, 800:4	737:12, 744:16,	780:24, 783:3,
722:7, 722:11, 760:15, 782:14,	791:22, 792:1, 793:18, 793:19,	November - 819:23 null - 781:6	744:20, 744:21, 745:10, 760:14,	793:18, 795:20, 796:19, 797:8, 803:9,
782:18, 787:22,	802:17	Number - 716:6	762:13, 770:24,	819:1, 819:25, 820:3,
787:25, 788:1,	moved - 725:7	number - 720:20,	773:22, 773:23,	821:2, 821:24, 822:15
788:12, 788:16, 780:13, 780:16	Moved - 716:8	724:15, 727:4, 728:20, 729:18,	774:8, 780:24, 781:2, 781:5, 781:22, 782:4	pages - 725:13, 818:19
789:13, 789:16, 789:19, 789:23,	multiple - 742:6, 754:21, 756:16,	730:8, 730:11,	781:5, 781:22, 782:4, 782:8, 784:23,	paid - 743:1, 743:8,
790:2, 790:19,	791:15	730:12, 730:13,	785:20, 785:22,	771:6
791:19, 801:7, 804:9,	Muskogee - 798:5,	730:14, 730:16,	786:1, 787:8, 787:9,	paper - 720:3,
804:25, 806:10, 806:12, 806:18,	801:23 must - 752:15	730:17, 730:21, 731:4, 732:4, 732:24,	787:10, 793:24, 794:5, 794:18, 799:2,	720:4, 723:5, 723:8, 723:11, 723:15,
817:11, 817:18,		734:2, 734:10,	815:1, 816:25,	723:17, 723:19,
817:22, 822:25,	Ν	739:18, 752:11,	818:16, 818:24,	723:21, 724:3, 728:3,
823:5, 823:11, 823:13, 823:15	Naans - 786:6,	756:24, 758:14, 771:9, 771:11,	819:19 One - 719:18, 735:1,	728:5, 728:9, 728:11, 728:17, 729:1, 730:4,
Missing - 788:13	810:24	771:14, 772:13,	739:19, 746:9,	730:9, 730:10, 731:1,
misspoke - 763:20	name - 732:5,	774:21, 774:25,	812:14, 812:16	733:10, 733:12,
misunderestimated - 778:17	739:12, 757:8, 780:13, 781:4, 809:21	780:2, 781:17, 784:11, 784:21,	ones - 722:13, 778:4, 785:15,	783:13, 807:9, 807:17, 809:23, 810:3
- 776.17 Mms - 735:1, 735:3,	names - 777:23,	786:2, 786:7, 787:4,	785:20, 790:17,	papers - 822:8
735:12, 735:16,	780:7, 780:8	787:11, 788:8, 791:3,	796:12, 809:1	paragraph - 739:21,
735:21, 736:2, 736:9,	narrow - 788:18	792:22, 796:4, 798:8,	online - 785:4	744:23, 744:24,
736:15, 736:21, 737:11, 738:9,	national - 769:16, 770:1	800:4, 803:18, 804:12, 808:4,	open - 776:8, 792:15, 815:22,	766:11, 768:12 Pardon - 739:9
738:16, 739:2,	nature - 719:11,	810:25, 811:15,	816:12	part - 726:5, 728:1,
739:22, 739:24,	764:16	813:14, 817:17,	opened - 792:7,	729:11, 746:15,
740:24, 772:23, 773:5 Mms's - 737:14,	Navajo - 725:22, 790:1, 799:6	819:7, 819:9, 820:2, 823:22	809:21, 810:17, 811:9 operated - 770:25	752:4, 757:21, 771:25, 772:2,
	100.1, 100.0		Operateu - //0.20	····

(202) 354-3249

775:13, 780:14,	784:13	potentially - 725:24,	Provided - 730:19	772:2
780:15, 800:17,	Plains - 762:2,	748:13, 798:7	provides - 734:6	recognized - 734:9
807:13, 809:9, 816:25	767:21, 788:25,	pre-1985 - 730:4	providing - 752:20,	recollection -
Part - 726:6	789:4, 790:7, 790:21	precise - 771:14	752:22	721:1, 772:22
participants - 735:8	Plaintiffs - 714:4,	prefer - 789:11	published - 769:23	reconcile - 759:4,
particular - 742:7, 742:21, 765:24,	714:12, 717:4 Plaintiffs' - 737:2.	prep - 820:4, 820:7 prepared - 724:16.	purposes - 761:19, 806:1	767:17, 772:23, 799:17
770:9, 770:16,	738:2	724:18, 727:15,	put - 717:4, 734:22,	reconciled - 800:25,
776:12, 788:20,	plan - 729:17,	729:5, 738:4, 739:5,	742:7, 742:11, 808:23	823:9
791:7, 807:7, 810:19,	737:7, 739:15,	740:13, 744:16,		reconciliation -
818:2, 821:13	761:11, 768:7	791:4, 795:14,	Q	769:20, 770:7,
particularly -	plans - 730:1, 730:3	796:10, 800:7,		793:10, 796:24
765:10, 767:14 partner - 768:4	plus - 783:18, 786:5, 786:7, 786:9,	803:23, 811:25 preparing - 820:8	quarterly - 741:13 questions - 749:14,	Reconciliation- 769:16
parts - 805:12	798:18	present - 755:16	765:15, 804:19,	reconciling - 769:3,
passed - 737:23	Pm - 824:23	presenter - 752:9	804:22	770:14, 800:19,
past - 723:12,	Po - 715:8	presume - 810:4	Quinn - 715:2,	801:9, 801:24,
797:14	point - 721:25,	presumption -	717:2, 717:11,	815:16, 815:18, 822:6
payment - 743:4, 820:3	724:2, 724:20, 728:17, 730:10,	817:17, 818:7	721:16, 745:9, 749:12 quite - 743:23	record - 717:5,
payments - 737:23,	730:12, 733:16,	pretrial - 717:6 pretty - 820:2	quite - 745.25	717:9, 719:25, 722:10, 724:11,
752:18, 770:8	733:17, 733:19,	previous - 723:8,	R	724:21, 740:1,
Peachtree - 714:17	734:8, 734:14,	731:17, 779:13		741:10, 758:7, 761:5,
penny - 824:15,	734:18, 738:15,	previously - 758:19,	raised - 741:6	761:8, 782:4, 789:19,
824:16	759:2, 768:8, 769:10,	819:7	ran - 767:10	817:10, 825:4
people - 728:20, 753:16, 763:11,	770:15, 774:8, 776:8, 778:2, 778:8, 784:5,	printed - 720:4 printout - 794:20	Range- 822:1	Record- 759:24 recorded - 740:5,
823:23	784:10, 799:21,	priority - 757:8	range - 743:3, 767:13, 767:25,	760:16
Pepion - 714:3	808:20, 809:14, 816:6	probate - 764:16	768:20, 768:23,	records - 719:21,
per - 780:19, 782:4,	pointed - 734:5	problem - 767:14,	769:4, 769:6, 770:9,	720:3, 720:23, 723:5,
792:13, 793:1, 811:2,	pointing - 721:2	799:16	799:12	723:11, 726:9,
811:16, 811:18	points - 744:10	problems - 760:9,	ranging - 769:10	726:13, 728:6,
percent - 718:24,	ponder - 824:19	760:12, 760:17,	rate - 765:13, 824:9	728:11, 728:17,
720:22, 721:14, 722:1, 738:9, 765:2,	popped - 816:25 population - 773:7,	767:11, 768:19, 804:25	rather - 766:17 re - 754:10	728:20, 728:22, 729:1, 732:14,
765:13, 783:16,	792:6, 815:11,	procedures -	re-credited - 754:10	732:17, 732:20,
785:24, 790:5,	815:12, 815:14,	766:12	read - 741:13,	732:23, 732:24,
790:23, 816:18, 819:4	815:17, 815:25,	proceedings -	766:15, 766:21,	733:4, 733:10,
percentage -	816:8, 816:10, 819:5,	825:4	796:21	733:12, 733:21,
748:22	819:12, 819:16	Proceedings - 715:15	readily - 734:6	741:4, 755:14,
percentages - 718:20	portion - 779:7, 780:22, 820:16	process - 766:18,	reading - 721:2, 808:19	760:15, 761:17, 762:24, 764:3, 764:8,
perfectly - 786:12	Portland - 799:11	770:7, 781:11,	reads - 721:7	764:15, 764:16,
performed - 725:1,	posed - 767:11	781:24, 807:18,	realized - 734:18	768:15, 768:20,
739:23, 757:24,	posing - 763:25	810:2, 810:4	really - 728:16	768:24, 769:1,
757:25, 758:3,	position - 816:3	produced - 715:15	reasonably - 737:20	771:13, 790:11,
770:22, 772:6, 776:19	positive - 765:11, 798:9	program - 764:15	reasons - 770:3, 770:24, 823:2	804:3, 804:5, 813:25
performing - 760:13, 771:15	possibility - 747:19	project - 729:21, 739:14, 747:11,	Rebecca - 715:11,	Recross- 716:2 Redirect- 716:2
perhaps - 725:12,	possibly - 746:21	747:15, 753:19,	825:3	reduction - 759:12
783:23	post - 719:20,	754:4, 754:16,	receipts - 759:5,	redundant - 802:16,
period - 726:1,	792:16, 792:23,	756:11, 760:4, 760:6,	820:15	802:18
733:18, 743:23,	810:16, 814:11,	761:11, 763:1, 764:5,	receive - 725:8,	refer - 726:14,
744:3, 755:15, 755:16, 767:18,	814:13, 816:3 post-1985 - 730:2,	765:12, 771:7, 773:12, 775:14	725:10, 732:17, 732:20	777:16, 782:17, 786:3 reference - 717:12,
771:12, 775:3,	796:8	projects - 807:21	received - 719:13,	727:9, 727:10,
792:10, 792:12,	post-1994 - 815:14,	properly - 752:6	722:4, 722:8, 722:11,	736:24, 738:24, 745:3
792:16, 792:23,	816:11, 816:12,	property - 742:3.	722:13, 724:7, 724:9,	referenced -
793:3, 807:3, 807:6,	819:13, 819:17	742:7, 742:11	724:10, 740:15,	744:21, 761:15
810:16, 811:14, 810:12	post-1996 - 777:24	proposed - 759:4,	740:24, 755:12,	references - 766:4,
819:13 periods - 719:19,	posted - 735:19, 735:20, 735:21,	768:7 prove - 768:14,	755:13, 763:2, 765:23, 765:25,	767:16, 777:7 referred - 726:24,
745:8, 779:19	735:25, 736:13,	769:1	775:20, 777:4,	803:6
permit - 743:4,	741:3, 748:7, 749:5,	provide - 717:17,	777:25, 778:1, 778:4,	referring - 734:18,
743:6, 819:21,	749:22, 750:5,	724:2, 724:4, 752:12,	779:3, 781:3, 793:8,	745:10, 766:22,
819:23, 820:21,	750:22, 750:23,	752:17	796:11, 796:13,	766:24, 767:2,
822:13	763:17, 763:23, 760:4, 773:5, 780:18	provided - 718:10, 718:13 721:14	797:3, 797:15, 817:20, 817:24,	768:21, 768:22,
permittee - 742:19, 743:18	769:4, 773:5, 789:18, 823:1	718:13, 721:14, 723:2, 725:3, 725:9,	817:20, 817:24, 818:6, 818:16,	769:2, 770:12, 777:17, 777:19,
permittees - 742:24	posting - 805:14,	725:14, 726:10,	821:11, 821:14,	797:2, 812:24
person - 760:20,	813:11	730:14, 730:16,	821:17, 822:21	refers - 745:24,
763:18, 763:23, 764:3	postings - 720:1,	730:18, 730:22,	Receiving- 810:15	777:14
pertains - 811:16	750:17, 750:20,	738:16, 761:8,	receiving - 781:18,	reflect - 795:20,
physical - 814:20	750:24, 751:3, 751:4,	765:22, 767:6, 770:11, 773:21,	822:10	821:4
picture - 768:21, 781:21	763:16, 763:17, 763:21, 765:13,	773:23, 776:2, 776:5,	recently - 759:2, 759:4, 788:24	reflects - 781:4, 820:15
piece - 742:7	813:17	779:9, 779:24, 780:1,	recess - 823:24	reform - 737:7
pieces - 729:22,	postponed - 773:16	803:3, 805:1, 805:2,	Recess- 778:22,	refreshing - 721:1
760:15	potential - 759:7,	805:7, 805:21, 806:5,	824:23	regard - 737:12,
place - 756:2,	813:11	814:3, 814:4, 814:5	recognize - 734:21,	762:18

(202) 354-3249

regarded - 759:7	796:3, 803:13,	812:19	754:18, 754:23,	seven - 725:19,
regarding - 727:15,	803:14, 818:1, 819:8,	reversals - 747:3	754:25, 755:3,	737:9, 757:4, 761:16,
738:5, 763:3, 763:12, 793:8, 816:22	823:12 Benerter 715:11	review - 725:13,	755:18, 756:1, 756:6, 756:12, 756:16,	779:18
Regarding- 809:12	Reporter - 715:11, 825:1, 825:10	727:19, 734:13, 737:17, 752:14,	756:17, 756:20,	several - 744:18, 747:10, 770:1, 777:9
Regardless- 822:10	reporting - 816:1,	752:15, 752:17,	758:16, 758:23,	sheet - 737:24
regardless - 811:9,	816:2	768:14, 769:1,	759:1, 759:6, 759:11,	short - 793:3
815:22 region - 731:9,	reports - 727:15, 727:17, 735:16,	772:13, 789:8, 809:15, 809:19,	759:12, 759:15, 759:17, 820:24	shorthand - 715:15 show - 776:11,
731:13, 758:15,	744:14, 744:15,	819:5, 819:12, 819:14	Sdas - 741:24,	784:19, 805:13
759:5, 762:2, 767:20,	765:6, 769:23,	reviewed - 718:19,	742:16, 743:19,	showed - 744:20
770:13, 770:21, 770:23, 797:1, 797:2,	773:22, 773:25, 774:1, 777:7, 777:8,	727:24, 744:13, 744:15, 753:1,	743:22, 744:2, 746:4, 747:20, 747:25,	showing - 765:2 shows - 780:19,
797:6, 797:9, 799:3,	777:9, 777:14,	795:13, 809:16, 812:4	749:22, 749:23,	805:10
799:6	777:16, 777:20,	reviewing - 753:3,	750:18, 750:21,	sic - 736:14, 759:4,
regional - 722:2, 734:15, 770:25,	777:21, 777:22, 796:7, 796:9, 796:20,	753:4, 753:6 right-hand - 786:24,	750:22, 752:5, 752:7, 753:1, 753:10,	772:22 side - 786:18,
771:3, 788:23, 789:4	796:24, 800:5, 801:1,	788:11, 818:21	753:12, 753:16,	786:24, 788:11
regions - 722:3,	804:23, 816:5	road - 729:13,	753:22, 753:23,	Signature - 825:10
725:21, 760:23, 761:5, 770:25,	represent - 778:7, 808:4	729:15 Rob - 766:7, 766:16	753:25, 754:1, 754:21 sealed - 823:19,	Signed - 732:10 significant -
789:22, 790:12,	represented - 778:2	Robert- 715:1,	823:21	718:16, 782:22,
790:14, 790:16,	representing -	732:9, 732:10	search - 770:4,	789:23, 795:8, 796:5
790:22 registered - 737:22	817:19	Robertson- 714:9, 751:8	824:5, 824:8 searching - 719:24,	significantly - 775:3 similar - 734:14,
registers - 719:24,	request - 732:6, 755:6, 755:8, 796:15	Rocky- 770:13	728:19, 728:21,	766:19, 810:4
720.2, 722:4, 722:6,	requested - 717:4,	roll - 815:2, 815:7,	787:20	Similar - 739:25
723:23	722:8, 723:23,	815:8, 816:15, 817:1	second - 730:4,	simply - 734:20,
rekeyed - 722:5, 807:16	755:10, 755:12, 767:1, 796:10, 796:12	roll-forward - 815:7, 815:8, 817:1	734:12, 739:19, 786:24	736:13, 763:3, 787:24 sit - 728:12, 732:25
relative - 798:17,	requesting - 755:4,	Room - 715:12	Secretary - 714:6	sitting - 751:17,
798:20	755:23	roughly - 774:14,	section - 719:4,	752:1
relevant - 735:10, 735:12	requests - 722:13 required - 810:19	783:16, 785:24, 790:7, 792:19,	724:23, 725:20, 727:5, 727:18, 734:4,	situation - 760:18, 791:16, 791:18
reliable - 805:23,	requisite - 752:17	816:18, 817:3, 819:6	734:11, 737:6,	six - 737:20, 775:21,
805:25	research - 797:12,	Roughly- 816:19	752:11, 756:25,	779:13, 796:16,
relied - 726:25 relies - 736:2	817:5 researching -	royalties - 737:11, 737:13	774:8, 783:17, 795:19, 796:22,	807:20, 822:15 Six - 725:21
relying - 821:7	817:25, 818:2	royalty - 736:9,	799:19, 807:23,	size - 762:21
remain - 819:5,	resolve - 757:10, 787:18	736:14	807:24, 810:12,	slow - 754:24
819:10				
remaining - 747.16		run - 824:15, 824:16 Ryan- 766:7, 766:16	810:14, 818:24, 820:18	small - 732:23, 803:17 820:2
remaining - 747:16, 809:17	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17,	run - 824:15, 824:16 Ryan- 766:7, 766:16	810:14, 818:24, 820:18 sections - 724:20	small - 732:23, 803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23,
809:17 remains - 787:15	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17,	Ryan - 766:7, 766:16	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16	Ryan - 766:7, 766:16	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11,
809:17 remains - 787:15	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17,	Ryan - 766:7, 766:16	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19, 738:21, 738:25	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13 responsibilities -	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report- 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:20, 762:21, 762:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 759:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 respectively - 745:2 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:20, 762:21, 762:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:20, 762:21, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 793:14, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:20, 762:21, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responded - 766:13 responded - 766:13 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 745:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respectively - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 721:22, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 741:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:22, 803:22,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 793:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responded - 766:13 responded - 766:13 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:25,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:10	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 scheduled - 773:13 schedules - 726:14,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777;7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separate - 743:6,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 745:11, 745:13, 745:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:21, 774:22, 774:25, 777:14, 779:8,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respectively - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result - 804:12,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777.7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separate - 743:6, 747:15, 776:1	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:6, 793:7, 793:17,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:11, 740:12, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:25,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:10	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 scheduled - 773:13 schedules - 726:14,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777;7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separate - 743:6,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:21, 774:22, 774:25, 777:14, 779:8, 780:18, 780:22, 793:5, 784:15, 794:21, 795:13,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result - 804:12, 805:15, 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:21, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777.7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separate - 743:6, 747:15, 776:1 september - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 79:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:60, 793:7, 793:17, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 796:17, 796:18, 796:22,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 745:11, 745:13, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:3, 774:21, 744:12, 795:13, 795:14, 795:21,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respectively - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 74:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result - 804:12, 805:15, 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19 results - 765:11,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16 Sda - 742:3, 742:12,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 793:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separately - 730:1 September - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4, 74:22, 787:14	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 796:17, 795:23, 707:21,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:21, 774:22, 774:25, 777:14, 779:8, 780:18, 780:22, 793:5, 784:15, 794:21, 795:13,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result - 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:21, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777.7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separate - 743:6, 747:15, 776:1 september - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4,	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:6, 779:6, 780:20, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 793:6, 793:7, 793:17, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 796:4, 796:23, 797:21, 796:43, 796:4, 798:44, 789:12, 796:43, 796:4, 796:43, 796:4, 798:44, 798:13,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:22, 774:25, 777:14, 779:8, 780:18, 780:22, 783:5, 784:15, 794:21, 795:13, 795:14, 795:21, 796:3, 796:10, 798:24, 799:20, 800:17, 803:22,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result = 804:12, 803:15, 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19 resulting - 803:19 results - 765:11, 799:19, 815:7 returned - 749:25 reused - 809:12,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16 Sda - 742:3, 742:12, 744:6, 745:18, 746:6, 746:13, 746:25,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separately - 730:1 September - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4, 74:22, 787:14 serives - 735:9	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 79:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:6, 793:7, 793:17, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 798:4, 798:12, 798:13, 798:12, 798:13, 798:21, 798:22,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:21, 769:15, 769:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:13, 774:21, 774:13, 774:21, 774:23, 774:4, 774:5, 777:14, 779:8, 780:18, 780:22, 783:5, 786:10, 795:21, 795:21, 795:24, 799:20, 800:23, 806:25,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respectively - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 74:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result - 804:12, 805:15, 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19 results - 765:11, 799:19, 815:7 returned - 749:25 reused - 809:12, 809:19, 809:23, 810:3	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampling - 739:15, 758:25, 759:10, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16 Sda - 742:3, 742:12, 744:6, 745:18, 746:6, 746:13, 746:25, 748:11, 748:23,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 793:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separately - 730:1 September - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4, 774:22, 787:14 series - 759:4 service - 735:9 Session - 714:7	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:10, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:13, 778:16, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 779:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 796:17, 796:18, 796:22, 796:23, 797:21, 798:12, 798:13, 788:12, 798:22, 799:4, 799:5, 799:9,
809:17 remains - 787:15 remember - 751:15, 816:23, 819:20 rephrase - 749:16 Report - 738:19, 738:21, 738:25 report - 720:4, 722:12, 726:5, 726:6, 726:14, 726:23, 727:11, 727:12, 738:1, 738:4, 738:23, 739:5, 740:6, 740:8, 740:13, 741:13, 744:12, 745:10, 745:11, 745:13, 745:11, 745:13, 758:15, 758:16, 759:19, 760:20, 765:5, 765:11, 765:22, 772:19, 774:3, 774:4, 774:5, 774:6, 774:8, 774:9, 774:22, 774:25, 777:14, 779:8, 780:18, 780:22, 783:5, 784:15, 794:21, 795:13, 795:14, 795:21, 796:3, 796:10, 798:24, 799:20, 800:17, 803:22,	resolved - 741:11, 741:12, 741:17, 770:16, 770:17, 787:13, 787:16 resources - 757:6, 770:4 respect - 742:22, 745:6, 759:14 respective - 745:24 responded - 766:13 responsibilities - 806:17 rest - 745:23, 752:22, 757:22, 757:24, 790:17 restoration - 795:22 restore - 733:21, 798:24 restored - 721:22, 722:3, 734:19, 774:12, 784:14, 790:20, 801:12, 808:6, 808:7, 808:21, 808:25 restoring - 773:10, 773:12, 784:9, 784:10 result = 804:12, 803:15, 807:21, 823:16 resulting - 803:19 resulting - 803:19 results - 765:11, 799:19, 815:7 returned - 749:25 reused - 809:12,	Ryan- 766:7, 766:16 S Sacramento - 725:22, 802:10 salem - 714:25 sample - 758:16, 762:14, 762:19, 762:20, 762:21, 769:16, 770:1, 793:10, 814:17 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24 sampled - 765:24, 759:14, 769:11 save - 767:7 saw - 742:6, 746:17, 760:13 scenario - 791:20 schedule - 725:1, 726:1, 773:16, 773:18, 773:20, 791:3, 803:2, 803:22, 817:21 schedules - 726:14, 796:3, 819:8 Scheuren - 766:6 scope - 719:11, 772:4, 806:16 Sda - 742:3, 742:12, 744:6, 745:18, 746:6, 746:13, 746:25,	820:18 sections - 724:20 see - 720:18, 720:23, 725:16, 726:4, 727:17, 738:10, 742:11, 745:23, 746:12, 757:11, 766:9, 768:10, 769:2, 777:3, 777:7, 791:18, 793:11, 798:8, 798:24, 807:3, 815:13, 818:25, 822:18 See - 725:1, 726:1, 824:22 segregated - 748:24 selected - 823:9 seminar - 735:6, 735:8, 738:25, 752:9, 793:9, 793:13, 793:14 Senior - 715:6 sense - 767:12 sentence - 734:12, 745:24, 766:9 separately - 730:1 September - 745:2, 773:23, 774:4, 74:22, 787:14 serives - 735:9	803:17, 820:2 Smith - 714:23, 716:3, 718:1, 718:2, 718:4, 718:6, 720:11, 720:13, 720:15, 720:25, 721:4, 721:5, 721:13, 721:19, 721:20, 737:25, 738:1, 738:4, 738:7, 739:19, 739:20, 745:9, 745:11, 745:15, 745:20, 746:1, 746:3, 749:16, 749:20, 750:10, 750:11, 750:12, 750:11, 750:12, 752:3, 765:14, 765:17, 765:18, 767:9, 778:11, 778:20, 778:23, 778:24, 778:25, 79:5, 779:6, 780:20, 780:21, 783:2, 783:4, 783:20, 783:22, 786:11, 786:13, 786:14, 789:12, 791:23, 792:1, 792:4, 793:6, 793:7, 793:17, 793:20, 795:10, 795:12, 798:4, 798:12, 798:13, 798:12, 798:13, 798:21, 798:22,

(202) 354-3249

801:21, 802:7, 802:8,	779:18, 788:9, 794:4	subsidiary - 745:1	781:2	800:24, 802:4,
802:16, 802:17,	spoken - 740:9	subtotal - 811:5	talks - 807:2,	802:13, 802:23,
802:19, 802:20,	stamp - 724:15,	sufficient - 737:15	807:24	803:7, 811:13
803:4, 803:5, 803:9, 803:11, 806:19,	727:4, 729:18, 729:19, 732:4, 734:2,	suggested - 736:17, 736:20, 758:2, 765:1,	task - 748:6, 749:1 tasked - 736:6,	Tiger - 736:25, 738:1, 738:4
806:21, 809:7, 809:8,	734:10, 739:18,	802:1, 804:14,	738:15, 738:18,	time-consuming -
810:9, 810:11, 815:5,	752:10, 756:24,	814:23, 815:1	739:1, 739:3, 741:1,	771:4
815:6, 816:20,	758:14, 759:3	suggesting -	743:15, 746:24,	timing - 799:15
816:21, 817:6, 817:7, 818:13, 818:15,	standpoint - 734:24 start - 730:25,	749:14 Suite - 714:17,	747:20, 748:2, 751:12, 751:22,	title - 761:19 today - 719:14,
818:23, 820:10,	797:14, 807:1,	714:21	753:3, 757:13,	720:10, 720:12,
820:12, 820:23,	807:18, 810:7	sum - 760:14, 786:4	762:22, 772:9, 801:9,	720:14, 723:10,
821:1, 821:3, 821:22,	started - 758:12, 796:9, 807:7, 807:11	summaries - 811:24	801:23, 803:25,	723:16, 728:15, 740:23, 741:20,
821:23, 822:15, 822:17, 823:17,	starting - 733:16,	summary - 775:25, 795:14	806:9, 806:11, 809:25, 812:10,	750:9, 773:7, 787:13,
823:25, 824:20,	733:17, 733:19,	summed - 745:7	814:15	787:15, 796:1,
824:21	734:8, 734:14	summing - 787:11	Team- 736:25	801:11, 824:4
snapshot - 776:7, 776:12	starts - 814:12, 822:18	support - 746:10, 752:17, 805:10	teed - 823:18 term - 741:14,	together - 717:4, 734:23, 791:17
sold - 823:1	state - 734:5,	supporting - 819:8	777:16	took - 719:22,
someone - 764:8,	768:12	supposed - 735:21,	terms - 753:14,	742:12, 743:1, 746:1,
809:21, 817:15	statement - 717:6,	735:25, 782:25,	753:18, 784:21,	781:21
sometime - 729:13, 729:15	731:21, 752:12, 811:1, 811:9, 823:11	795:4, 819:23 surprise - 745:8	820:21, 822:13 test - 727:24, 728:1,	top - 719:9, 721:8, 725:20, 727:5, 766:7,
Sometimes - 781:22	statements - 729:4,	Susan - 757:9	728:2, 729:11,	779:11, 783:3, 784:2,
sometimes -	729:7, 729:10, 760:3,	system - 720:23,	754:11, 754:15,	784:17, 818:25
731:15, 754:20,	777:8, 777:21, 806:4,	724:24, 724:25,	757:24, 762:9, 763:7,	topic - 793:10
756:15, 779:23, 780:4 somewhere - 777:5	806:6, 806:8, 811:11, 812:1, 812:5, 812:6,	726:9, 727:8, 727:21, 728:6, 731:8, 733:3,	771:21, 771:25, 805:13, 805:15,	topics - 747:17 total - 760:14,
sorry - 718:18,	812:7	733:22, 735:1, 735:3,	805:19, 812:15,	762:21, 771:8,
719:8, 719:9, 722:20,	Statements - 812:2	735:12, 735:15,	813:6, 813:7, 813:9,	774:17, 774:18,
723:13, 723:21,	States - 714:1,	735:19, 735:25,	814:17, 815:1, 815:2,	785:24, 786:2,
727:4, 728:25, 729:14, 729:19,	714:10 states - 734:12,	736:5, 736:6, 736:9, 736:11, 736:13,	815:8, 817:1, 822:24 tested - 736:5,	792:16, 794:8, 794:12, 797:2,
730:15, 730:16,	737:10, 759:3	736:16, 736:21,	751:2, 753:19, 754:3,	807:14, 807:24,
733:11, 735:20,	Station - 715:8	739:22, 739:24,	754:15, 754:22,	808:10, 810:25,
735:23, 736:18, 738:20, 744:24,	statistical - 769:11 statistician - 739:11	739:25, 740:1, 741:3, 741:8, 741:16,	756:4, 756:11, 756:22, 762:10,	811:3, 811:7, 811:13, 819:4
745:12, 750:18,	status - 774:1,	741:21, 741:22,	762:14, 763:10	totaling - 774:15,
750:21, 752:20,	813:25, 814:5	749:8, 749:15,	testified - 729:20,	774:16
753:24, 754:24,	Stemplewicz -	750:18, 751:3,	729:21, 749:13,	totals - 784:6
755:7, 760:19, 763:19, 763:20,	715:5 step - 719:22,	753:18, 753:21, 754:11, 755:22,	760:1, 769:19, 775:9, 776:23	toward - 760:6, 779:10, 818:25, 820:3
764:22, 767:12,	722:16, 788:17	755:24, 757:18,	testifying - 718:23,	trace - 746:17,
774:5, 785:11,	steps - 719:18,	759:18, 759:20,	720:16	746:20
786:10, 796:21,	757:10	760:2, 760:7, 760:10,	testimony - 719:4, 721:6, 721:15, 736:24	traced - 739:24
798:12, 799:11, 800:1, 803:17, 804:7,	Steve - 768:3 still - 721:9, 721:11,	760:24, 761:4, 761:18, 761:20,	testing - 736:6,	track - 746:7, 821:10, 821:16
815:18, 821:12,	721:23, 732:21,	762:2, 762:13,	740:1, 754:11,	tracks - 722:12,
822:5, 822:9	750:8, 751:17, 752:1,	762:16, 762:23,	754:13, 754:17,	751:8
Sorry - 736:19 sort - 751:25,	771:18, 793:3, 799:17, 801:11,	763:2, 763:9, 763:13, 767:3, 767:20,	757:17, 757:19, 763:12, 764:1, 764:5,	tract - 765:6, 769:6, 823:2
794:17	809:14, 817:25,	771:16, 772:15,	764:7, 793:10, 812:13	trail - 807:9
source - 756:7,	822:12	773:5, 775:5, 778:2,	tests - 757:5,	tran - 775:19,
761:18	Stockton - 714:16,	778:7, 782:7, 791:1,	770:22, 805:9,	775:21, 776:19
sources - 749:4, 763:6	714:20, 714:24 Stonestreet -	791:10, 793:1, 793:10, 794:22,	805:10, 812:14 Tfas- 738:18, 740:2,	transaction - 719:24, 720:2,
Southern - 790:7	715:11, 825:3	795:21, 800:15,	747:22, 748:8,	723:23, 746:9,
speaking - 793:13	stood - 734:20	800:19, 806:10,	763:16, 763:19,	746:12, 747:4,
Special - 741:24, 744:9, 745:1, 745:6,	stored - 789:4 streams - 734:15	807:9, 808:23, 809:2, 809:5, 816:3	763:22, 771:16, 771:20, 772:5, 772:7,	747:13, 749:2, 754:9, 767:15, 768:24,
746:6, 746:8, 746:16,	Street - 714:13,	System - 759:24	772:10, 772:15,	774:14, 784:5,
746:18, 746:21,	714:17, 714:21,	systems - 726:18,	774:13, 775:5	789:18, 812:20,
747:6, 747:16, 748:16, 748:19,	714:24, 715:3 strike - 753:11	726:19, 731:9, 734:13, 734:17,	themselves - 760:5, 799:25, 802:2	812:22, 817:11, 820:13, 821:13,
749:6, 749:7, 749:10,	structure - 780:1	734:22, 734:25,	thereby - 727:8	821:25, 822:5, 823:4,
749:12, 749:14,	studied - 735:15,	735:1, 735:10,	therefore - 721:9	823:12, 823:13,
752:23, 756:10,	736:11, 736:16,	737:14, 738:6, 739:2,	third - 790:7	823:15
758:16, 759:6, 761:9, 761:10	741:23 studies - 765:1	759:21, 761:21, 762:4, 762:8, 762:9,	thousand - 798:6, 798:18	transactional - 725:23, 726:3,
special - 742:8,	study - 762:13,	762:11, 762:24,	thousands - 772:20	734:24, 736:1,
792:14, 811:11	762:19, 764:21,	763:19, 771:20,	three - 718:23,	775:21, 775:23,
specific - 721:23, 743:4, 747:8, 748:6,	764:24, 774:1, 809:10	791:14, 791:15, 701:17	721:10, 732:4,	775:25, 781:12,
749:1, 788:21, 791:20	subject - 766:18 submitted - 738:9	791:17	736:24, 737:20, 738:13, 747:17,	781:25, 782:16, 782:20, 783:25,
specifically - 717:9,	subsections -	Т	790:12, 790:16,	784:20, 786:22,
744:10, 751:12,	744:15		812:16	790:10, 790:24,
751:22, 759:1, 759:14, 766:24,	subsequently - 796:10	table - 779:8, 780:1, 780:2, 781:2	throughput - 726:25, 774:16,	791:11, 794:15, 795:5, 800:14, 804:3,
769:6, 777:11,	subset - 765:23	tables - 779:11,	774:17, 774:18,	804:5, 804:8
i i i			· · · ·	

(202) 354-3249

transactions -	742:15, 744:18,	various - 742:9,	740:9, 740:17,
719:20, 719:23,	748:14, 755:3,	761:21	744:19, 745:24,
720:21, 721:22, 721:24, 722:3, 722:4,	761:10, 761:19, 761:20, 761:22,	verified - 800:13 verify - 730:7,	747:7, 748:24, 751:9, 758:11, 767:15,
722:5, 724:12,	800:23, 820:20	739:23, 749:21,	767:18, 769:7,
725:25, 731:1, 734:7,	Trustee- 761:9	750:6, 756:5, 763:6,	773:13, 773:14,
734:13, 767:10,	Try- 778:21	764:2, 764:8, 800:17,	774:1, 795:20, 796:1,
769:4, 769:11, 769:13, 769:14,	try - 728:10, 751:7, 786:13, 812:19,	817:23, 818:11 verifying - 753:17,	796:4, 798:15, 802:6, 802:15, 802:23,
769:17, 770:2, 770:6,	818:11	753:23, 754:1, 754:8,	818:4, 818:5
770:10, 770:12,	trying - 721:17,	754:9, 755:1, 755:20,	Yesterday - 729:4,
773:8, 774:12,	723:7, 723:14,	756:1, 756:19,	815:2
774:15, 774:16, 774:18, 775:6, 782:2,	733:15, 734:22, 746:24, 768:22,	761:19, 813:5, 813:7 version - 818:14,	yesterday - 718:9, 718:20, 721:8,
782:5, 784:9, 784:10,	799:17, 803:25,	818:17	722:17, 724:14,
784:14, 786:7, 788:1,	806:9, 807:9, 812:15,	versus - 732:8,	726:24, 729:21,
788:15, 789:19, 790:20, 800:23,	821:10 Tuesday - 714:5	803:18 view - 765:11	741:24, 743:4, 744:21, 746:4, 746:9,
801:12, 805:11,	turn - 719:21,	view - 763.11	746:17, 759:22,
807:16, 807:20,	735:19, 770:20,	W	760:1, 769:19,
808:17, 808:20,	823:23		773:21, 783:23,
808:21, 808:25, 812:7, 813:2, 813:13,	Two - 751:16 two - 717:11,	Walker - 766:5 wants - 749:21	793:22, 803:6, 806:22, 806:24,
813:19, 813:21,	723:12, 724:20,	Warshawsky-	809:9, 812:14,
815:22, 816:3, 816:4,	737:2, 737:5, 745:19,	715:1	816:22, 819:20, 824:4
816:5, 816:12,	745:24, 746:8, 762:6,	Washington -	yourself - 718:15,
816:15, 818:25, 819:4, 819:10, 819:14	762:14, 770:5, 773:13, 773:14,	714:4, 714:14, 714:22, 715:4, 715:9,	818:10
Transactions-	773:21, 775:4,	715:13	Z
770:8	782:13, 788:25,	ways - 746:8,	
Transcript- 714:8 transcript - 715:15,	805:12, 813:17, 813:18, 818:4, 818:5,	756:22, 758:24 Wecker - 738:19,	zero - 729:11, 752:16, 753:15, 781:9
719:2, 825:4	821:2	738:21, 738:22,	Zippin - 732:11
transcription -	type - 767:15,	738:25, 739:1, 739:3,	
715:15	768:13	739:5, 739:6, 739:8, 739:10, 739:23,	
Transfer- 812:25 transfer - 732:7,	types - 760:12, 770:9, 777:7, 777:9,	740:4, 740:9, 740:15,	
739:24, 750:3,	812:16	740:18	
753:18, 753:20, 754:21, 755:18,	typically - 742:18,	week - 725:12	
		weekend 705.14	
	814:6	weekend - 725:14, 773:24 818:17	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10		weekend - 725:14, 773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 _transferred	U	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West- 714:24	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7,	U ultimately - 821:10	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23,	U ultimately - 821:10	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under stood - 745:24	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals -	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfersng - 748:13 Transfers- 755:24,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under - 768:12 Under - 769:6	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - salem - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers- 755:24, 812:24	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under stood - 745:24	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston-salem - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 withness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfering - 748:13 Transfers- 755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 withess - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers- 755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfering - 748:13 Transfers- 755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 withess - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfers-755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under - 768:12 Under - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasure - 741:1	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfers-755:24, 812:24 transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under - 768:12 United - 714:1, 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfers, 746:14, 748:13 Transfers, 755:24, 812:24 transfers, 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury, 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:2, 756:15, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury - 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers -	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transfers, 746:14, 748:13 Transfers, 755:24, 812:24 transfers, 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury, 741:1, 741:20, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat, 789:13 trial, 722:5, 777:8, 777:20	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 766:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 776:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury - 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial- 715:6, 719:5	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury- 741:1, 741:21, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial- 745:6, 719:5 Tribal- 748:14,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 766:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 776:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury - 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial- 715:6, 719:5	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 workh - 781:22 Y year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury- 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial - 715:6, 719:5 Tribal - 748:14, 755:3, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 790:18, 798:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Y year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 756:12, 756:15, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury- 741:1, 741:20, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 745:6, 719:5 Tribal - 745:14, 755:3, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1 tribe - 750:2	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6 value - 774:18	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Y year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10, 822:18, 822:22	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury - 741:1, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 742:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial- 715:6, 719:5 Tribal - 748:14, 755:3, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1 tribe - 750:2 tribal - 742:20, 812:19, 821:16	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validations - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6 value - 774:18 variance - 801:5,	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10, 822:18, 822:22 years - 718:23,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 766:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:14, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial: 715:6, 719:5 Tribal - 748:14, 755:3, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1 triba - 737:8, 750:1 triba - 737:8, 750:1 triba - 737:8, 750:1 triba - 742:20, 812:19, 821:16 trip - 766:22 Trust-727:16,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under- 768:12 United - 714:1, 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6 value - 774:18 variance - 801:5, 801:8 variances - 799:12	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10, 822:18, 822:22 years - 718:23, 721:10, 723:12, 728:13, 732:18,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 756:12, 756:15, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury- 741:1, 741:20, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 745:3, 800:23 tribal - 745:4, 750:1 tribal - 745:0, 750:13, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1 tribe - 750:2 Trubal - 742:20, 812:19, 821:16 trip - 766:22 Trust - 727:16, 737:8, 741:3, 741:15,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Understood - 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 714:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 816:25, 820:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6 value - 774:18 variances - 799:12 variations - 799:6	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Y year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10, 822:18, 822:22 years - 718:23, 721:10, 723:12, 728:13, 732:18, 736:24, 737:20,	
755:20, 756:1, 756:6, 756:16, 770:10 transferred - 726:17, 727:7, 727:20, 727:25, 729:9, 731:19, 732:14, 746:23, 748:9, 749:3, 749:6, 751:14, 751:24, 755:3, 755:5 transferring - 748:13 Transfers - 736:15, 746:14, 747:3, 753:24, 754:1, 754:2, 754:3, 755:22, 756:9, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:12, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:14, 756:17, 756:19, 756:12, 756:15, 756:17, 756:19, 757:18, 759:12 Treasury- 741:1, 741:2, 741:4, 741:7, 741:10, 741:16, 741:21, 773:1, 813:21, 814:2, 814:5 treat - 789:13 trial - 722:5, 777:8, 777:20 Trial- 715:6, 719:5 Tribal- 748:14, 755:3, 800:23 tribal - 737:8, 750:1 triba - 727:16,	U ultimately - 821:10 Ultimately - 821:13 under - 724:23, 807:23, 809:21, 810:18, 818:24, 820:15 Under - 768:12 Under- 768:12 United - 714:1, 745:24 unit - 769:6 United - 714:1, 744:10 unresolved - 786:2, 786:7, 793:4, 818:25 up - 717:17, 744:10, 775:3, 778:18, 823:18 updated - 781:6 utilizes - 761:17, 761:21 V Vague - 749:12 validation - 755:9, 756:3, 805:9, 815:19, 815:20, 815:21 validations - 771:16, 772:6 value - 774:18 variance - 801:5, 801:8 variances - 799:12	773:24, 818:17 weeks - 788:25 West - 714:24 whereby - 766:13 whole - 721:3 William - 714:16 willing - 725:12 winding - 778:18 Winston - 714:25 Winston - 714:25 withdrawals - 756:20 withheld - 773:4 witness - 749:13, 749:18, 765:14, 786:11, 824:2 Witness - 716:2, 717:24, 749:19, 749:23, 750:7, 751:20, 752:1, 767:5, 789:3, 789:7, 789:11, 818:22, 820:18, 824:7, 824:11, 824:16 word - 789:23 workpapers - 777:3, 777:5 worth - 781:22 Year - 771:12, 773:19, 794:9, 796:8, 797:14, 798:10, 822:18, 822:22 years - 718:23, 721:10, 723:12, 728:13, 732:18,	

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net

40 of 40 sheets