
complete, which was I think in all cases, we don't have all the years. We interpolated the data we had and applied it to the revenues garnered off the reservation.

THE COURT: Can you tell me how you interpolated it?
I can understand straight-line interpolation of 6 to 10,8 in a
year, but how did you interpolate allottee ownership of land in a reservation?

THE WITNESS: We interpolated the percentage numbers.
In your example, Your Honor, you said if it's 6 and 8 and
there's an intervening year, we could put 7 in that number by a straight line, what they call linear interpolation. Then for that year, if it were 7 percent, we would apply the total revenues times 7 percent to determine the allottee revenue.

THE COURT: Where did the percentages came from? THE WITNESS: The same sources as other data, for example leasing, and that is the numerous books, periodicals, commissioners' reports and similar sourcing of that data.
THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. You said you took a percentage of the individual land
versus tribal land, and then you factored in the other revenue sources?
A. No. If I said that that wasn't right. I took a percentage of the total revenues for a particular reservation and applied the allottee ownership percentage.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Q. Okay. And you did that for each of the categories that we discussed previously?
3 A. Yes. Again, with one modification on oil and gas data,
but, yes, we applied the revenues by percentage from a reservation.
Q. And there was a difference you just noted with oil and gas. Could you describe that?
A. We did -- Oklahoma is unique in Indian history because originally Oklahoma, with the exception of three counties in the panhandle, were Indian territory, and of the remaining counties, only three did not have oil and gas on them. So we have a huge amount of territory there that was once all Indian lands. And Oklahoma is very highly allotted. The percentage is very high.

And another exception is the Osage. The Osage tribe and Osage County are the same thing. So that enabled us to treat Osage differently because we weren't mixing up counties. So that was the first exception. The second exception -- Osage also, via headrights and so forth, is almost all allottee land even today. Allottee interest.

The problem we had that was observable is I applied -- used the same technique of a percentage times a reservation for Oklahoma, and came out with expected revenues. But the BIA had produced reports in the '70s and early '80s for selected reservations and counties that told me exactly what the allottee income was derived for there. So I compared it to my data and I Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
was way low. And it sort if takes you back, because you say, 1 can't be that far off.

And then it occurred to me through further research that I was measuring surface rights to the land. And I found a BIA study that said there was actually, when they sold their land rights, they retained subsurface rights in over 50 percent of the county. So I developed from the numerous reports that I had data points that said in general what is the difference between surface rights that $I$ can measure versus subsurface rights where the ownership apparently is no longer in the name of an allottee?

So we got a factor that we applied to -- what we call a subsurface factor. You have to mark up what would otherwise be just the surface factor. So if there were, you know, a hundred barrels on the surface, there may be $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ barrels if you counted the subsurface rights still in the names of the allottees. So we had to treat that one differently.
Q. And you mentioned that you did research to evaluate the Osage tribe. Did you look at not just yearly studies but also statutes?
A. I obviously -- I mean, I was informed by counsel of their interpretation of the statutes, and $I$ have read the statutes, yes.
Q. Could we look at PPX 0894. And can you tell the Court -identify this document, please?
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A. I believe -- yes. I've seen this document. Again it's not something I'm real conversant with, but I've seen it, yes.
Q. Okay. Could we turn to page 7 of this, please, and if we could zoom in on the highlighted portion. And if you could read that to yourself, Mr. Fasold.
(Witness reviewing document.)
A. Yeah. I have read that.
Q. And is this representative of some of the information that

Plaintiffs' counsel provided to you and that you also found in your own research?
A. Yeah. Again, this is a legal document. What reinforced what I saw was, as I described especially in annual reports, the way they subdivided revenues from various reservations, they frequently had a column that would say "tribal" and a column that said "individuals," and there are, at least the way they were accounted for contemporaneously, there were monies in the individual column and not very many or any monies in the tribal column.
Q. Could we look at Defendants' Exhibit 26, please. If you could look at that. Have you seen this document also?
A. Yes.
Q. You were mentioning yearly reports. If we could turn to page 4 of this document, and look at the top so we can identify what this chart is. Does that appear to be the type of information you were referring to when you said yearly reports?
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21 A. I'm sure there were, but it escapes me at this point, yes.
22 Q. Is it possible that in some instances your allotted figure
23 does not accurately represent the percentages?
24 A. Yeah. The methodology, if we ever had superior knowledge, up, but if you zoom in on the bottom for a second, you'll see that that indicates Osage, and then if you could look at the
document, we're going to put them together so you can kind of understand what one column is and what the other column is. And now if you could --
A. Right. It would appear in this document that they have Osage Reservation designated with an $\$ 8.7$ million, what you realize over two pages is the column for individual funds.
Q. And do you see anything in the column for tribal funds?
A. Yeah. The tribal column fund contains no information. There is no zero or any information in that.
Q. You also said there were some other -- you were mentioning some unique reservations in terms of percentages and when you calculated. Were there other unique situations with the percentage of allotted ownership versus the total reservation area in other oil-producing areas? we would use it. And one comes to mind, and that would be
A. Right. This is in the same format that would -- same Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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phosphates on the Nez Perce reservation. If you did our methodology you would come up with one number. However, it was documented in several sources that the allottee percentage was much higher than my math would produce, so we used that number.

Conversely, where we had, for example, a coal mine on a reservation, and we knew from information from Pincock Allen \&
Q. So through your research you attempted to create the most accurate picture.
A. Yeah. The most accurate with the data available, which could change. As we get superior data, we would supplant the inferior data.
Q. If we could look at PPX 4208, and then look at page 3. If we could look at the bottom highlighted portion, and could you read that out loud? What is this portion of your report?
A. This is actually the last paragraph of my August 2007 expert report, and it reads, "For the period 1887 to 1938, the Nominal Dollar value of revenue derived from the sale or lease of IIM trust assets is $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 5}$ billion. The nominal dollars, including interest earned or accrued on such revenue through 2002 is $\$ 80.7$ billion. For the period 1887 to 2002, the Nominal Dollar value of revenue derived from the sale or lease of IIM Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
trust assets is $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 . 3}$ billion; the Nominal Dollars, including interest earned or accrued through 2002 is $\$ 154.5$ billion."
Q. And what do you mean by nominal dollars?
A. Nominal dollars is just our terminology to say if you receive a dollar in $\mathbf{1 8 8 7}$, it's a dollar. And if you receive a dollar in 2002, it's a dollar. In other words, its nominal value at the point of origin. There's no saying that there's an inflation factor or any other factor applied. Those were the dollars as they existed in the time period collected.
Q. Okay. And if we could look at PPX 4502, this is a document that we exchanged with Government counsel yesterday and --

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the use of this document. It was exchanged with us at 10:30 last night. This document's obviously a summary document. We've never been provided any of the detailed data that supports it. It's inadmissible. It doesn't qualify under Rule 1006.

MR. GUILDER: This is simply a summary of -THE COURT: Let's see what it is.

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Okay. Could you explain the right-hand column that says "Plaintiffs' total receipts," and where those numbers come from?
A. Yes. There is a right-hand column on this exhibit that is labeled "Plaintiffs' total receipts," and this is the product of the model that I have just described to the Court. And I tried to reflect comparable data to the document which is labeled, I Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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believe, AR-171, and displaying in comparable periods the data $I$ have from the data $I$ derived --
Q. We'll talk about the left-hand column in a minute, but the right-hand column, is that the same number we just discussed on page 3 of your report?
A. Yes, my expert report refers to $\mathbf{1 3 . 3}$ billion, and this is a slightly more refined number.
Q. And on the left-hand side, you were saying that that is a number that represents the Defendants' numbers from an Exhibit 171 that you were given by Plaintiffs' counsel.
A. Right. That was calculated from their document, yes.
Q. So this is just demonstrating their number that they've entered into court and the number that you've already provided in your expert report.
A. That's correct.

THE COURT: Counsel, I am totally lost. I don't know what any of these numbers are. I don't know how you got there. You've shown me about 25 moving parts and all of a sudden, boom, you're at the bottom line. You've left out something.

MR. GUILDER: Okay. I'll clean it up for you.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Could we go back to page 3 of 4802 . I'll try to explain how he got to the 13 billion. 13.3.

THE COURT: Well, let's start with the headings on the
columns. "Plaintiffs' total receipts," "Defendants' total
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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receipts." Let's have that thing back up in here again.
So on the left column, Defendants' total receipts is meant to be a total of what?

MR. GUILDER: This is a total that reflects --
THE COURT: No. The witness is testifying. That's part of my problem. You two are asking too many leading questions. What is this?

THE WITNESS: If you recall the multicolored AR-171, the document that was entered by I believe Ms. Herman, explained that document. That document on the left-hand columns, she had about five columns that added up to total receipts. The column that displayed total receipts is not -- she didn't do that math for you. And then she had disbursements, and then she had some reconciliation items on the right-hand column of that multicolored document.

What I did was total receipts from her document, and then put them in these time breaks as can you see here. In other words, 1909 to 1933. In her document you will see 886 in total receipts for that period of time. And so on down the line, meaning for each of these time breaks, her document, as you recall, went through from 1909 to 2005. My model ends at 2002, so I was subtracting three years off that, and then put them into her time breaks that Ms. Herman shared with the Court. And those are her numbers. And we later will have an exhibit, I hope, that explains where that column belongs in her exhibit. Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

THE COURT: Defendants' total receipts, 13 billion,

## 626.1 million, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs' total receipts, 13 billion
333.9.

THE WITNESS: That is correct, sir.
THE COURT: Is that number netted out for some purpose?

THE WITNESS: These are once again, in our parlance,
Your Honor, it's nominal dollars. These are the dollars that
that exhibit says were collected on behalf of individual Indian allottees. They're very comparable to what my model produces. And that is, when we say nominal dollars, a dollar in 1887 is a dollar. It's not marked up for anything. It is what they recorded as receipts versus what we found in our study as receipts.

THE COURT: So the total at the bottom of the page, what is that supposed to represent?

THE WITNESS: The second right-hand column that begins with 3.832.1, is an attempt to explain what our "other" category is. Our "other" category are those items that were not -- did not have reconcilable totals, such as the rights-of-way as I mentioned in the footnote, annuities and all of those other items that we were unable to quantify. We have a category called "other" that encompasses all of the categories not Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
previously given a dollar denomination.
THE COURT: Okay. Go on.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. If we could look at AR-171. You mentioned a color
document. Is this that color document?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And you mentioned collections. Could you describe that further?
A. Right. She has an opening balance and she has each of these columns lettered from $A$ through $K$ on what we see here. She has an opening balance that is reflected in column A. Then she has B, C, D, E, and F, which are interest, Osage Quarterly Annuity, judgment/per capita, tribal IIM, and other receipts.
The sum of those columns per year is what is in the previous exhibit.

THE COURT: All right. I don't know what we're going to do with that other exhibit. Maybe you're about to show me what you're going to do with that other exhibit.

> MR. GUILDER: Okay. Hopefully.

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Could we look back at that other exhibit just to explain
some of these things. If we could zoom in. There we go. And could you explain the two numbers, you said, briefly, that they were taken from Defendants' exhibit and taken from your model. Could you explain how they correlate in your mind.
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A. The two $\$ 13$ billion numbers. As the Court noted, my previous and attached study, where I went through the methodology for trial 1.5 , said $I$ got to the point of adding up all of the natural resources as I described, and then I had a whole host of categories that did not have a value that I could assign reliably. And that went into the "other" category in quotes.

That "other" category, the best information I had at the time was the $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ report filed by the Defendants and a report to Congress -- I believe that was July 2002 -- in which they said the total receipts are $\$ 13$ billion. So I trued up my number to $\$ 13$ billion as of that date. That report contained data through 2001.
Q. Okay. Could we look back at AR-171, please. Did you notice anything -- did you make any observations about this chart when you first looked at it?
A. Yes. First trying to understand, I didn't delve deeply into the meanings of the various colors, but this court said $I$ want to know throughput, and from my loose interpretation, throughput would be to show what the receipts are and what the disbursements are.

So the first thing that they don't show you here is what's confusing to the Court right now, is they don't have a column that would be between $F$ and $G$ that says what are the total receipts, so I could compare them to total disbursements. You
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can't -- I mean I can't possibly go through and add up columns B through $F$ and know what the total is for any year for receipts. They do have a column that represents to be total disbursements for each year, but they don't have a total receipts column.

Okay. That's one -- you would think that that would be a logical thing to show.

The second item is I don't see, for the periods ' 09 through '33 and '34 through '71, disbursements column, there are no numbers entered there, it's blank, as if either there's no data or it was zero. We couldn't possibly believe it's zero. But the problem there becomes, if you knew the total, which I did the total, it's $\mathbf{\$ 1 4}$ billion if you add up columns $B$ through $F$, through 2005, it's about $\$ 14.3$ billion.

That exhibit, then you would say, according to the totals at the bottom, they took in 14.3 and they paid out 10.6. And I'm not purporting to tell you that's what the message of this document is, but that's what the document says on its surface. And that's odd that we wouldn't -- I searched the record and I couldn't -- I didn't see anything that would give me a hint as to those early years -- and when I say early years, '09 through '71 -- that we haven't recorded, at least on this document, any disbursements whatsoever.

So you wind up with a disparity in totals, that it's apparent in this document that it's, at least from my search of the transcript, I didn't see an explanation of that disparity in Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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## what we should think about it.

THE COURT: So your message to me about Exhibit 171 is that on its face it shows that $\$ 4$ billion less was paid out than was taken in.

THE WITNESS: Yes, but I'm -- yeah. I am not here to
tell you anything other than that's what the document on its face says. I don't upon know the materiality of why we wouldn't have entered any disbursements. I couldn't say.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. How did you get to the number 14 billion again?

THE COURT: Does that extra $\$ 4$ billion all come from the top of the page?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It comes from the top of the page and it would be -- there's data entered into Osage Quarterly Annuity plus tribal IIM plus other receipts. The sum of all of those would be the missing -- the missing data, because we don't have a column --

THE COURT: Oh. So the $\$ 4$ billion is all up at the


THE WITNESS: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Well, may I revise that slightly? And that is on the bottom you have 11 and 10, so they aren't showing comparable periods, like take the "other" column at the very
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bottom, other receipts, it says 11,064 . That is inclusive of
-
'09 through '71. If you take column $G$, where it's a negative
$\$ 10.7$ billion, theoretically it would be only inclusive of ' 72
through 2005.

## THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Okay. And when you looked at -- did you find out where some of these numbers came from, other receipts or anything else, in all years did you look at this chart?
A. I mean, I've looked at this chart. I didn't spend a lot of time trying to discern the source of each of these data as is represented by the various colors, which system they may have derived these from.
Q. Could we look at Bates 60-27-2. We were looking at this earlier, and this is the second page of the document. And we were talking about the assumptions. If we could zoom in on the bottom of the page. And if you could read that to yourself, please.
(Witness reviewing document.)
A. Yes. I've read that.
Q. And as an expert financial modeler, what do you take from that statement?

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is not a -- by its own terms, this document is a statistical estimate. And this is not an area of expertise as to which Mr. Fasold's
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been qualified.
THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection. As an expert financial modeler, what do you take from that statement? I mean -- you mean what does he understand it to mean? What does he use from it in his own model?

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. The first sentence, that reads "Receipts and balances were roughly the same," and that was one of their assumptions, in your experience as a modeler, have you ever done that, used receipts and balances as an assumption for calculating receipts?
A. To me the point that $I$ pointed out is that there is no logical relationship from a balance to a receipt, and the example would be if $I$ told you my checking account balance had a thousand dollar balance --

THE COURT: Counsel, I need to step back a little bit and start asking a few questions myself, because frankly now he's criticizing somebody else's work, and I still don't what his own work says. I don't know what this man's conclusion is. You've shown me all the moving parts of this model. I don't know what the bottom line is.

MR. GUILDER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I can go back to that.

THE COURT: He took this GIS -- if you mean that one little paragraph at the end that says it's a billion dollars
here and there, is that his conclusion?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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MR. GUILDER: Yes, it is, but we could explain it further.

THE COURT: Well, let's explain it. Because we need to get that down before we start criticizing somebody else's work.

MR. GUILDER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. Sorry. We'll move back to 48-02. And let's look quickly at page 3, which is the results paragraph.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. If you could describe -- we started with GIS software. If you could just take us through how you got to this total number.

THE COURT: I think they put it in a big computer and built a big spreadsheet and that's what he came up with, right?

THE WITNESS: You're correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Now let's look at those numbers again
because I need to understand what you think they mean. Is there in fact a spreadsheet that supports all of this?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Has it been printed out and has the
Government had access to it?
THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. It comprises dozens of spreadsheets that get summed up, yes.

THE COURT: How can the Government cross-examine this conclusion if they don't have your worksheets, your work product?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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MR. GUILDER: I believe they've had the conclusions,
just not the underlying formulas of the spreadsheet.
THE COURT: My math teacher didn't let me get away with that. I give her the answer and she said well, I need to have your worksheets. I mean, I have no idea how this -- well, let's look at that paragraph again. You moved from all these GIS data and -- there must be 30 or 40 moving parts in this calculation, wouldn't you say?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Maybe if I could describe to you the subtotals and how they are arrived at toward these grandiose totals you're seeing --

THE COURT: "Grandiose" isn't a bad word. Put the numbers back on the screen. Let me look at them again. Just that last bottom-line paragraph.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may.
THE COURT: Let me look at the numbers before you may.
All right. The nominal dollar value of revenue derived
from the sale or lease of IIM trust assets you calculate as
$\$ 1-1 / 2$ billion between 1887 and 1938, right?
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
THE COURT: Now, 80.7 more dollars are added on for interest. Why? You assume this money was never paid out to anybody?

THE WITNESS: That is under the assumption of zero disbursements.
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THE COURT: Oh. Well, what's the basis of that
assumption?
THE WITNESS: That is what the Plaintiffs' counsel assigned me to do, and that is identify receipts. What I did is -- I don't know the valid disbursement numbers, Your Honor. What I did in my model is there's a provision in there that says you can assume, the user of my model can assume any number that represents valid disbursements. If you were to assume zero, this would be the number, the 80.7 would be under zero disbursements. If you were to assume 100 percent, that 80.7 number that you see in this exhibit would be zero. It all got paid out and there is no time value of money applied.

THE COURT: All right. And the interest you
calculated as earned, you plugged in actual interest earned and whatever you couldn't find as earned you accrued it at what rates of interest?

THE WITNESS: And this is --
THE COURT: Compounded over the years?
THE WITNESS: Right. Let me --
THE COURT: Never mind. That number just doesn't make
any sense in the context of this case. Does it, counsel?
MR. GUILDER: Well, we could explain how the interest calculation works, if that would help.

THE COURT: No, but I want to know why? Why would you use an interest calculation like that?
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MR. GUILDER: There's a certain period of time where the -- I could take the witness through part of the thinking if it would help.

THE COURT: Well, he says he got it from you.
MR. GUILDER: Well, we took a calculation of the
interest that was actually posted, and it tracked a certain interest rate, which is the long bond rate, and that would essentially be also the same rate that, if there were zero disbursements, and this money were sitting in Treasury's general account, that percentage would be what the Government would derive a benefit from, because they would not have to borrow that money, such that they wouldn't have to issue more long-term bonds.

THE COURT: Of course, but my question is of what utility is a number of $\$ 80.7$ billion, which assumes that no disbursements were made, when everybody knows that disbursements were made?

MR. GUILDER: Yes, Your Honor. It was simply to say that this model can show how much goes in from any percentage of disbursements. So if it were to calculate that there were 40 percent disbursements or 60 percent, this model could immediately calculate the total throughput there.

THE COURT: Well, just so we're all on the same page, the only number in this paragraph that I can make any use of is the number $\$ 13.3$ billion, which is this witness's calculation,
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estimate, estimated calculation, spreadsheet bottom line of all these moving parts, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. What years is that through?
A. 1887 to 2002.

THE COURT: Awfully close to the numbers the Government has come up with.

MR. GUILDER: Yes, Your Honor. That was what we attempted to show in the earlier demonstrative. I can move on, though.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. If we could --

THE COURT: But the earlier demonstrative, the one with the two columns that I got so confused about, I gather the point of that is to show that this witness thinks that the Government's number of 13 point whatever, 5 or 6 billion, is actually about $\$ 4$ billion low because of the other categories. Is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The sum of their exhibit from Ms. Herman is 13.6, as you pointed out. Using my model to reconstruct the same comparable data, is 13.3 billion.

THE COURT: Then you add another 4 billion.
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22 A. Yes, but I can't tell you which individual one.
23 Q. If we could have DX 365. Does this -- can you identify
24 this document for the record, please?
THE WITNESS: No, I don't. I'm trying to, if I might divert a second, we subtotal oil and gas through the process we've described to you, hard rock minerals, timber, we have land leases, land sales, and then we ran into a bunch of categories, rights-of-way being the most noteworthy, that we don't have numbers to. And that is a number that we called other. I cannot --

THE COURT: But if I'm trying to figure out throughput, do I add that other number to your 13.3 billion?

THE WITNESS: No. It is one of the subtotals that goes into the $\$ 13.3$ billion that I am showing from my model.

THE COURT: So basically you and the Government are \$300 million apart.

THE WITNESS: On these exhibits, yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Now I'm back on an even
keel.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Can we -- did you look at any other documents? You looked at AR-171, the color document. Did Plaintiffs' counsel provide you with any other documents that the Defendants produced regarding throughput?
A. Yes. I believe this document was discussed by Mr. Haspel,
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from what $I$ read in the record.
MR. WARSHAWSKY: Could we have a page number?
MR. GUILDER: I'm sorry. This is Defendants' Exhibit
365.

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. And could you explain your understanding of this document?
A. I guess I feel empathetic to Your Honor being confused by financial documents. This document $I$ have a hard time grasping other than the fact that he apparently runs, $I$ believe each page represents a scenario that he is analyzing, and he has in each scenario groups of data that are labeled $A$ in the left-hand column and $B$ in the left-hand column.

And the difference $I$ see is it appears that $A$ deals with total collections and B deals with estimated credits to IIM accounts. Then the very bottom of that page, if we might go to it, the very last sentence, it said, "Estimated credits into IIM accounts is currently estimated as $\mathbf{7 7}$ percent of total collections and is subject to change upon further analysis."

I went through the individual pages, there's nine pages to this document, and that number, if you take the numbers from the --

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object again to this testimony. This is, Mr. Fasold's offering expert testimony, far beyond the scope of his expert report. We've had no disclosure of his opinions.
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MR. GUILDER: This document was disclosed after both affirmative and rebuttal expert reports were -- the deadlines for those reports. And as you indicated earlier at a pretrial hearing, Your Honor, that some things were going to come in later and our experts would have an opportunity to respond to them. This was provided to Plaintiffs' counsel well into trial, this exhibit.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, the point is simply that to the extent Mr. Fasold's offering new opinions, that should have been disclosed to us in advance.

MR. GUILDER: I think he's not offering really an opinion, just more reviewing this chart, and can he even express an opinion from this chart is what I'm asking.

THE COURT: I'll let him answer that. Can you express an opinion from this chart, about anything?

THE WITNESS: The only observation that I think I can say validly from this chart is they make distinctions between what was received -- in other words, and I believe the terminology here is collections -- versus what they say are receipts, which are estimated credits to IIM accounts.

And the point of this, Your Honor, would be I am trying to measure what would be in the A column, in other words, the receipts, as I said before, that came in the door to DOI. I am not in my model trying to estimate the groups of numbers labeled B, which would be those amounts credited to IIM accounts.
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THE COURT: Okay. Let's move on.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you added up the numbers that were in chart 171. What did you do with those numbers?
A. To help me understand what $I$ was looking at on 171, I inserted a column that did what the exhibit didn't do, and that was merely adding up columns, $I$ believe, $A$ through $H$.
Q. Could we look at PPX 4501. This is another exhibit that we exchanged with Government counsel last night, as -- the witness can testify to what these numbers are. Could you explain what that highlighted column is?
A. What I did, Your Honor, is enter the data that she had, and merely provided a column that I could use for total receipts because --

## THE COURT: Got it.

THE WITNESS: Total receipts are referred to in footnote 1, but there was no column to reflect total receipts. And this is the discrepancy I described earlier of the total receipts of 14.3 billion. And if you summarize the total disbursements, you get 10.7 billion. The logical difference is there are no disbursement numbers for those earlier periods.

THE COURT: Understood.
MR. GUILDER: No further questions, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fasold.
A. Good afternoon, Mr. Warshawsky.

3 Q. I just have a few questions for you.
A. Okay.
Q. First question, and I don't want to belabor this point, but it's in the transcript from the phase 1.5 trial, but just to put

7 it out there, you've had a business relationship with
8 Mr. Gingold for quite a few years, right?
9 A. Yes. I've known him since 1980, I believe.
Q. And you've been in business with him since then, basically?

11 A. Yes. Well, I have retained him as counsel on assignments, and we also were partners on a project.
Q. Okay. And you were the subject of a story in Forbes in the mid-'90s, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember what that was about?
A. Yes.
Q. Just tell Judge Robertson.
A. Mr. Gingold and I are old bankers, basically, and we for a client came up with an idea for a new financial product, a retail financial product, which would be an FDIC-insured deposit that would have annuity features. I developed that for a client of mine in common with Mr. Gingold, and they never used it. Years later I came back and bought that product from them and attempted to offer that product commercially. And in that Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. And you estimated prices that would be associated with Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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those allottees' interest, right?
A. The quest of petroleum engineers. I didn't personally, but yes, they were estimated or derived from historical documents that they have.
Q. And your supporting engineers estimated royalty rates?
A. Yes.
Q. You derived -- you used some kind of an allocation process to estimate the percentage of the reservation lands that would be associated with individuals; is that correct?
A. Yes. There was a percentage applied to the total reservation to represent allotted Indian interest.
Q. And you told Judge Robertson you came up with estimates for land leases and land sales, right?
A. I took the historical data, yes.
Q. And you generated estimates for the subsurface rights of the Osage?
A. Yes. The surface to subsurface ratio, yes.
Q. And in generating your estimates, basically you were trying to come up with some way -- you were estimating total receipts, right, into the trust?
A. As I explained, it's basically what crossed the door into the DOI.
Q. How does your model take into consideration direct pay?
A. Let me explain my understanding of direct pay to make sure it matches your question. Direct pay, I believe, was a
project Mr. Gingold and I were partners.
Q. And do you remember the name of the article in Forbes?
A. I know that it gets typified as a get rich quick something in either the article's heading or maybe one of the captions, I don't know.
Q. Okay. Whatever. Let's move on to your expert report.

Plaintiffs' Exhibit -- it was PPX 4208, I believe. Is that
right? The premise of your analysis, if I'm not mistaken,
Mr. Fasold, was to generate revenue estimates, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you said, you told Judge Robertson you disregarded Interior information wherever possible?
A. If we could get it in the first instance, we didn't use DOI numbers.
Q. So you included estimates of production; is that correct?
A. It would depend on the category. For example, if you regard the databases, the IHS database or PDS database, to typify that as an estimate, in the industry it's not regarded generally as an estimate. So I would say in that case, oil and gas, the production values were probably not estimates as I would call them estimates.
Q. But you certainly didn't have the values of production
associated with any individual allottee's interest?
A. That's correct.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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technique used to pay Indian beneficiaries from oil and gas revenues without passing the monies through a trust. In other words, the payment would go directly from the producer to the beneficiary. That is $\mathbf{m y}$ understanding of direct pays.
Q. Okay. So given your understanding of direct pay, how does your model -- that never went into trust; is that correct?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. How does your model exclude those revenues from your trust?
A. It does not. It would include those revenues.
Q. So your estimate would be overstated by that amount if those monies don't actually go into trust?

MR. GUILDER: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE COURT: Well, you could apply that to an awful lot of what we just heard. The objection's overruled, but I want to ask this witness a couple of questions before you proceed, Mr. Warshawsky.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You told me that your bottom line and the Government's bottom line are about $\$ 300$ million apart.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Your conclusion is based on a whole series of estimates, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you put plus and minus percentages on those estimates?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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THE WITNESS: We have in the past, yes.
THE COURT: What would you expect the bounds -- the
error bounds in your estimates to be with a $\$ 13.3$ billion estimate? 5 percent?

THE WITNESS: If I could answer probably not as directly as you'd like, because it's a rather complex answer. We don't pick, for example, each of these numbers and say what is the high estimate for each of these categories, what is the low estimate, and add up all the lows and then add up all the highs. That clearly, if that were done, would equal a plus or minus percentage of a very high number, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Huge number, of course.
THE WITNESS: There is a technique that we use that sort of eliminates that sort of simplistic approach, which we've done internally to try to get some estimates, but those calculations are rather complex, and I use functions available to me on a computer that I'm not really qualified to explain in detail how they work to you.

But the net result, Your Honor, is it gives you a plus or minus and then a probability that that occurs. In other words, if the number is 13.3 , we could say if you take plus or minus 5 percent, we would have 95 percent confidence that that number is correct.

THE COURT: What's 5 percent of $\$ 13.3$ billion? Quick. 650 million, isn't it?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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THE WITNESS: Yes. That sounds correct, a little more.

> THE COURT: Why are you cross-examining this witness, Mr. Warshawsky? It's the same number you have.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, there's more to Mr. Fasold's model I'd like to bring out. And it really won't be very long.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
Q. Mr. Fasold, let me ask you to look at PPX 4502. By the way, Mr. Fasold, when was this exhibit -- when did you prepare this exhibit?
A. It was originally prepared yesterday.
Q. Okay. When were you first asked to prepare it?
A. Actually, I prepared it and showed it to counsel saying this is difficult information to absorb so we should have just a real brief summary page. So I gave it to counsel. And I don't think I accomplished my objective.
Q. Your Plaintiffs' "other" categories, specifically under that you have an "other," and then a paren "3" after it. Do you see that?
A. You mean components?
Q. Right. The $\$ 2.6$ billion, right?
A. Oh, yes. Yes.
Q. You've never provided the Government with any of the detail supporting that number, have you?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

## A. There is no detail supporting that number.

Q. Okay. Going back, is that the "other" category that you had back in your 2003 analysis?
A. You're exactly right. The "other" category in the 2003 analysis would be the 3.8 number, if you can see that. 3.832.1. That's comparable to the "other" category about which we testified by this methodology in trial 1.5.
Q. Would you explain to Judge Robertson your methodology for calculating the other amount under your 2003 report?
A. Right. What we have is a series of subtotals that we gleaned from experts and from my own work. Again, those subtotals would be oil and gas, timber, hard-rock minerals, land leases, land sales, and that total would be, I believe, 9.6 billion, in that range.

We knew that we had an other category that was unquantifiable. So we took the historical accounting plan submitted to Congress, I believe that's what it was typified as, the 2002 July report submitted to Congress, which had the Government's estimates, and so I took the same periods. They went through 2001. And they came up with slightly more, I believe, than 13 billion.

So I said I know what I know. What I didn't know is the other, and the other is what the Government said in their report to Congress.
Q. So your model in 2003 quantified it as the difference

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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## A. I'm sorry, I didn't even hear you.

Q. Does the word "throughput" appear anywhere in your expert report?
A. No. My particular report doesn't have that word. calculated it as 5 billion, right?
21 A. That's what the math would do. We'd have to make an anywhere use the word "throughput"?
between 13 billion and whatever you calculated for oil and gas and hard rock and land sales and land leases, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And if it had been 7 billion instead of 9.6 , your model
would have calculated others as being 6 billion, right?
A. You're saying if my model -- I'm sorry, I would have to --
Q. We were never provided with any data for your calculations that came to 9.6 billion, right?
A. That's correct. It was -- 1.5 was merely a trial on methodology.
Q. But I'm asking you if, for example, your model had generated a figure of 8 billion instead of 9.6 billion, your model's calculation of other would have been 5 billion then, right? evaluation. If that case presented itself to me, I would have to evaluate the appropriateness of that number.
Q. Okay. Last question for you, Mr. Fasold. Does your report
$\square$

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Thank you. Your Honor, I have no more questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Guilder?
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Is there a reason why your expert report doesn't use the word "throughput"?
A. Yes, because that --

THE COURT: Because he's an English speaker.
(Laughter)
THE WITNESS: I'm surprised you say that after my testimony. Throughput implies to me, as I said, the receipts and disbursements, and we weren't charged with quantifying disbursements, so I couldn't address that subject. BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Could you address disbursements based on the information you have?
A. The only way that we addressed disbursements is as a percentage of receipts, and that's just merely a way to
mathematically quantify things.
Q. So your model only deals with inputs?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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A. Yeah. Of the throughput categories, I would say we dealt with one subset, which is credits.
Q. You were asked some questions on cross-examination about the confidence or the degree of difference. What's the Monte Carlo simulation? Can you explain that?
A. I will explain it the way $I$ use it, and again, it is a statistical feature that is --

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond the scope of cross. I didn't ask any of this.

THE COURT: Did you ask anything about Monte Carlo? MR. WARSHAWSKY: No.

MR. GUILDER: This is a simulation about the error
rates that he was explaining to Your Honor. If it doesn't add
anything to the testimony, we don't have to --
THE COURT: He told me what I needed to know. He said 5 percent -- he said 95 percent confidence rate at 5 percent plus or minus. That's close enough for me.

MR. GUILDER: Okay.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. And how would you describe your estimates of the total in
terms of percentage that -- I'm sorry. Can I rephrase that
question? Would you characterize your estimate as conservative?
A. Yeah. Absolutely. I mean, that is one of the reasons that we feel comfortable with our "other" number is -- and I've used the word, that's sort of the base that $I$ believe is in the realm
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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of probability.
Q. And one last point. Are you aware of whether the Government, per the Court's direction after trial 1.5, if they evaluated the methodology that you used?
A. I've seen they commissioned a group out of Boulder, I
believe, as I recall, because I had seen their work before, to give them a report regarding the use of GIS techniques.
Q. And if we could look at Bates 60-4-1.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
Beyond the scope of cross.
THE COURT: Can't see it.
MR. GUILDER: I'm sorry, if we could zoom in, please.
During cross-examination Mr. Warshawsky was attempting to characterize all the methodologies as estimates. I'm just trying to understand what the Government's evaluation of his methodology was.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
MR. GUILDER: All right. No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Fasold, thank
you, sir. That completes your testimony. You may step down.
(The witness steps down.)
Mr. Harper.
MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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MR. HARPER: The Plaintiffs would like to call as our
next witness Mr. Robert McCarthy.
(The witness takes the stand.)
MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Mr. McCarthy.
Your Honor, you have asked for a proffer for these witnesses,
and very briefly, Mr. McCarthy is presently the field solicitor
in Palm Springs, where, as we will get into in the testimony,
produces upwards of 10 percent of the income of the trust, or
approximately that amount, according to the Government's own
numbers, on Indian allottee land.
He will testify as to reliability of records, reliability
of data, failure to properly maintain records and general
mismanagement at Palm Springs.
THE COURT: All right.

## ROBERT MCCARTHY, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, could you please state your name and spell your last name for the record, please.
A. Robert McCarthy. M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y.
Q. What is your present position, Mr. McCarthy?
A. Palm Springs field solicitor in the United States

Department of the Interior.
Q. And what office do you presently work out of?
A. I presently work out of my home office.
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Q. And since when have you been working from your home office?
A. Since late April of 2007. Prior to that I worked out of an office for three and a half years that was in the same complex of offices as the Bureau of Indian Affairs Palm Springs Agency.

23 A. For $\mathbf{1 2}$ years, for the $\mathbf{1 2}$ years prior, I worked for a number 24 of legal aid programs that provide legal services to low-income
Q. So you were located for most of your tenure as a field solicitor at Palm Springs at the BIA agency office in Palm Springs; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I'd just like to touch on some of your background before we get into some of the substance, give the Court a sense of some of the other things you've done. Prior to your position as Palm Springs field solicitor, were you at the Department of the Interior?
A. I joined the Department of the Interior in 1999 as -- my first position was Tulsa field solicitor. And in that position I supervised about a 12-person field office that served Department of the Interior agencies in Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas, again primarily Bureau of Indian Affairs but also Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, mainly.
Q. And since your graduation from law school and prior to the time you joined as field solicitor in Tulsa, what generally -what was the nature of your practice? Native Americans. And those programs were in Montana, Idaho, Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

Oregon, Washington. And I served on the board of a program in Oklahoma, and thus I'm admitted to practice in all those states as well. I also during that time started Indian law clinics and taught Indian law at the University of Idaho and the University of Washington.
Q. So is it fair to say for your entire career you've
practiced Indian law?
A. That's fair to say.
Q. And what compelled you to take the field solicitor position in Palm Springs?
A. After 12 years of legal services practice, as probably most people know, legal services doesn't pay very well, so that was one factor. I expected that the job would be an opportunity to continue doing what $I$ considered public service work. I considered that the Department as trustee on behalf of Native Americans performs a similar role to the role that $I$ often played as an advocate for my clients, sort of a trust counsel position.

So I anticipated that in addition to making more money, having more responsibility, managing an office, that I would also probably have a lot more impact on the lives of Native Americans.
Q. And when you say that as solicitor you saw your job as trust counsel, what do you mean by that term?
A. Well, as I understand the duty of -- the Department's Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
fiduciary duty, and for an attorney working for the Department with respect to that duty, the duty goes to the beneficiary of the trust, to the extent that the activities of the agency are to further the trust responsibility. In addition to which, the Government attorney in any event has a broader responsibility to the public than to an individual client. Hopefully that answered your question.
Q. With respect to those fiduciary duties, could you sort of describe -- and your role in the management of the trust, could you describe some of the responsibilities you have as field solicitor?
A. In Tulsa, as I said, I supervised a 12-person office. We were responsible for advising the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife Service on an entire range of issues, from personnel matters to environmental issues, public land use issues.

With respect to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in particular, a lot of the work had to do with the Bureau's approval of land leases, transactions involving Indian lands, so we would advise with respect to that. Oklahoma also has a unique statutory provision with respect to tribes in eastern Oklahoma, the so-called five civilized tribes, where by statute the Tulsa field solicitor's office appears in state courts for any leases involving allotments of members of that tribe, mostly their oil and gas leases.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Indians in Palm Springs.

The nature of the work there was much more specifically, heavily involved in BIA lease approvals. There was some of all the other issues, but by far the lion's share of the work was advising the Bureau with respect to lease transactions and other transactions affecting Indian lands.
Q. And that would include the management of the assets. Is
that a fair statement?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. That would include the management of funds; is that correct?
A. It would include the collection of funds from leases, yes.
Q. And could you give the Court a sense of some of the sort of distinguishing characteristics of the Palm Springs Agency office and their dealings with respect to individual Indian trust assets and funds?
A. Yes. When I first arrived in Palm Springs, it was November of 2003. The first thing I learned was that $\mathbf{1 0}$ years, $\mathbf{1 2}$ years earlier there had been a report developed -- an investigation done by the Office of the Inspector General, and a report issued Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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When I transferred to Palm Springs, the nature of the work changed pretty dramatically. I served two BIA offices, the Palm Springs Agency and the Riverside Agency, which serves the rest of the Southern California tribes, some 30-some tribes. The Palm Springs Agency served the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla to be revised every five years, so get stagnant at an old level, because these are long-term leases. They found that routinely the Bureau would not enforce these rental increases, so these funds were never collected as a pretty much routine matter. So that was what I learned when I got there, that that was the history of the agency.
Q. And these problems, did they serve to the benefit or the detriment of individual Indians?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection, Your Honor, to that
question. The question posed is beyond the scope of this
hearing, and the case for that matter. As just described by the witness, it involves mismanaging leases, not collecting funds from leases. This is asset management issues that is outside the scope of this case. Might be another trial for another day, but not here.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can clarify and ask if it has to do with fund collection and other fund issues.

THE COURT: I'll overrule. We'll see where this is going.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Q. And part of the mismanagement identified had to do with those assets and the funds collection in other aspects of the fund management. Is that a fair statement?
A. The essential problem identified was that the Bureau was not collecting -- was not properly identifying the funds that were owed under these leases, was not collecting the proper amount of funds that was owed under these leases, and was not maintaining really any system of documentation or records that could be used to verify that the funds -- how much funds were owed to a particular allottee and how much funds were collected pursuant to those leases.
Q. So even if the funds were collected, because of the lack of documentation --

THE COURT: We're still talking about the report 10 years ago?

MR. HARPER: Yes, Your Honor. And we will -- I'm
sorry. I thought you were asking me.
THE COURT: Right?
THE WITNESS: The report 10 years ago said all of
those things. I guess I'm also saying that that situation has not changed in the slightest.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, in general, did these problems inure to the benefit or the detriment of individual Indians?
A. Well, certainly to the detriment.教
$\qquad$ foundation for that. That's a sweeping statement. I want some detail on that before you go there.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, of a similar nature, I also object to the leading nature of these questions.

THE COURT: Sustained. This is one witness who should not be led, Mr. Harper.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, let me turn your attention if I could to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4497. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what do you recognize it to be?
A. This is a draft audit by the Office of the Special Trustee at the Palm Springs Agency that was published in draft form on July 20, 2007, that was conducted in specific response to disclosures that $I$ had made regarding the allegations that the problems that existed in 1992 continued in exactly the same fashion.
Q. So those things that occurred in 1992, you had
discovered -- well, what did you discover about those problems that were set forth in the OIG report from 1992?
A. Well, the OIG report recommended essentially three remedies. The three remedies were that the agency establish an office of the field solicitor there. The agency did that. The second one was that they would ensure that all leases were Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
negotiated at fair market value, and that they included these required escalation clauses. And the third one was that they would actually enforce the leases, that they would have a system, develop a system and put it in place, to ensure that the funds were actually collected in the proper amounts.

And what I found was that, from my very first days there, as I said, I became familiar with this report. Obviously, they had done the first thing. I could find no system of records that would indicate that there was any procedure or policy in place any different than existed in 1992 with respect to the collection of the income, the identification of the income and the collection of the income.

In particular -- well, in fact the Department at the time in 1992 agreed to do all these three things. In addition, the Department issued a press release and a six-point plan and they added some other things that they promised to do to fully automate the lease collection process so that, for example, default notices would be sent out within, I think it was three weeks of when a default occurred; that they would actively market the leases. A couple of other things like that.

Virtually, the only thing that I found existed was the fact that there was a field solicitor's office there. There was no automated lease management system. There was no -- getting carried away, I guess.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, I renew my objection as Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
outside the scope of this case based on the witness's answer to that last question.

THE COURT: So far you're right. Mr. Harper? MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I think Mr. McCarthy is testifying as to the failure to collect funds, and also other mismanagement of funds. But I'm trying to lay the foundation for him to get to those things. The fact is that he's describing in his experience the pervasive nature of the lack of documentation, but it implicates all aspects of mismanagement.

THE COURT: All right. He's come here to say it. Go ahead. I'll allow it.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I respond to your -THE COURT: No. Answer his next question.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, this report, if we can turn your attention to the second page of this report, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4497. In the top paragraph, if you can read that top paragraph, and it says: "We initiated this review because of recent allegations of mismanagement." Whose allegations were those, if you know?
A. They were mine, and the report also says so.

THE COURT: What is the status of this report? He's called it a draft.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, all we have is the draft report. This is a special trustee's report, and so I think even in draft form, we would argue that it's not hearsay because it
falls within the admission of a party opponent.
THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure about that, but go
ahead. Just as long as we're clear this is a draft. Go ahead.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. If we could turn to the third paragraph of that report, if
you can just read that to yourself.
(Witness reviewing document.)
And that is consistent with what you were reporting to the Department?
A. That's a pretty good summary of the disclosures that $I$ had been making to the Department over the course of the prior two or three years.
Q. And if I can turn your attention to page 6 of the report, but page 7 on the pdf. You heard the Government's objection that this was outside the scope. If I can ask you to turn your attention to the first full paragraph, beginning "Our review." If you can read that just to yourself and then tell me whether that's consistent with your understanding.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. Consistent with his understanding of what?

MR. HARPER: Of the facts.
THE WITNESS: What this says is that -- they pulled a
file, which is a major lessee, the Mission Hills Country Club. They found that one of the landowners, the lessors, it was a unitized lease with a number of lessors, somehow came to have a
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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## debt of $\$ 58,000$ to the lessee, Mission Hills, so instead of

making the normal lease payment, Mission Hills deducted the $\$ 58,000$ from the amount owed.

And when the BIA received the payment, instead of docking that particular owner the 58,000, they spread the shortage out among all the owners. So that they all received less than they should have, except for this one individual, who received more than he should have.
Q. And so just to synopsize, they actually took in and collected by the Department a certain amount, but then failed to properly distribute that amount.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. Leading.
THE COURT: Sustained. I get it, Mr. Harper. You
don't have to ask him what this means. I understand it.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, if I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs'

Exhibit 4498. This is the cover page of Plaintiffs' Exhibit
4498. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And it says "From field solicitor, Palm Springs." Is that during your tenure?
A. Yeah. I wrote this document.
Q. And could you tell the Court what this document sets out?
A. Well, in a last-ditch effort, I guess, to try and persuade
the regional solicitor and others in the Department that there
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was a complete lack of recordkeeping of income, identification of income that needed to be collected, and failure to have any system to record the collection of income, $I$ appended to this short, one-page memo a document that was given to me by the BIA staff and represented to me to be their recordkeeping system.

And as I say in the short memo, the document lists 135 master leases. It's my understanding there are more than a thousand. And it purports to be a kind of a spreadsheet about who the lessee is, how much money is owed in rent on an annual or monthly basis, when the payments are due, how much has been collected, if there's a cost of living adjustment, that sort of thing.

But as you can see by the last line, the document was essentially without any substantive information. There was a little bit of information filled in by hand in some of the columns, but it was basically a useless tool that would have been inaccurate the day after it was filled in by pencil because all of the -- even for those limited number of leases for which the information was provided.
Q. And you had mentioned that the OIG in ' 92 had asked that an automated system be put in. Was one ever put in?
A. In 1998 the office acquired an automated lease management system known as PC Lease, and that system was intended to be the automatic system that would be sort of an electronic tickler system that would automatically issue invoices, default notices, Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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that would keep track of cost of living increases, that would
keep track of how much money was owed on a lease, how much was collected. The system, however, was never put into use.
Q. Did you ask anybody about that system?
A. Well, it took -- when I first got there, I searched high and low for what kind of a system. This is what $I$ found. At some point I also learned about this PC Lease system, and I
found that it was in a locked room in the back of the office
that no one accessed. It was not plugged in. It had no -essentially it had no data in it.
Q. And so then, as you say, the only system was the manual system. This file here that's up says 135 master leases. Is that how many master leases are in existence in this agency?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. Lack of foundation.
THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection and
we're going to take a break. But could I see Mr. Harper and
Mr. Kirschman at the bench, please.
(Bench conference off the record.) (Recess from 3:14 p.m. to 3:28 p.m.)

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Harper.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HARPER: Your Honor, when we left we were talking about Exhibit 4498, and I realized that was the nonredacted version. There's some controversy regarding whether it should or shouldn't be redacted. So I'm just going to go ahead and use
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR } \\
& \text { Official Court Reporter }
\end{aligned}
$$

the redacted version, which is 4455 .
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, you say in this document that there's listed 135 master leases. How many master leases are there actually in the Palm Springs Agency, approximately?
A. There is no list. To this day there is no complete list of master leases, but it numbers in my estimation over $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$, just over $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$, plus $\mathbf{2 5 , 0 0 0}$ subleases.
Q. To the best of your knowledge is there a master list of subleases?
A. I don't believe there is.
Q. If we can turn to page 2 of the document. As you can see in this document, there are redactions on the left. Who made those redactions?
A. You know, frankly, I am not sure whether I did or I have -I typically redact identifying information on documents, and I honestly don't know whether I did that before I gave that to you or whether your staff did it. I don't know.
Q. Okay. And do you know -- is there supposed to be information on these pages?
A. Well, the only information that's redacted is the name of the lessee, and as we saw on the cover memo, there were a hundred and some lessees listed.

The idea was that this was the lease management system.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Q. And if we turn to page, say 5 , we can see here there is some data for some of these leases, correct?
A. Right.
Q. And this represents -- what does this represent as far as in concern -- with relation to the leases?
A. Well, on this sheet it's a point in time for, say the top lease, it indicates that they're supposed to pay quarterly, and $I$ can't quite read what it means. Oh, it's the term, how many years the lease is for. You can tell on the second one it's a 65-year lease. Cost of living, that looks like it says -- I can't tell what that says. Looks like 15 years. It's supposed to be every five years. It does say 15 years. It's supposed to be every five years. It doesn't have anything for the percent due date.

So really the next period, next quarter, next month, however periodic it is, this information, if it was filled in,

> Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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|  | 1695 |  | 1697 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | would be outdated since it's being filled in by hand. It's not | 1 | MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. |
| 2 | an automated system. | 2 | THE COURT: Sustained. There's no jury here, but I |
| 3 | Q. These problems that you identified, did you report them to | 3 | will let it be known that I'm disregarding that last part about |
| 4 | anybody at the Department of Interior? | 4 | what pretty good idea they may or may not have had or why they |
| 01:46:13 | A. Well, as you saw on the cover memo, I provided this to the | 01:50:00 5 | balked. |
|  | regional solicitor after years of trying to bring the problem to | 6 | BY MR. HARPER: |
|  | his attention. And this I thought would do the trick, that this | 7 | Q. If we can turn to page 8 of this document. Not the |
|  | is the lease management system, this is how they know how much | 8 | highlighted but under the highlighted. The next paragraph. If |
|  | money is owed and what's been collected, and it obviously is not | 9 | you can read that to yourself, Mr. McCarthy. |
| 01:46:34 10 | adequate. | 01:50:22 10 | Can you tell me what this specific issue is with respect -- |
|  | Q. And I'm going to just put up one other document and just | 11 | could you talk about that specific issue that you've identified? |
|  | ask you to identify it and say what it is without -- we won't go | 12 | A. There's been some testimony $I$ think in the last couple of |
|  | into any of the specifics of it. Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4494. Do | 13 | days about special deposit accounts. I think Ms. Redthunder in |
|  | you recognize this document? | 14 | particular talked about how sometimes the agency would put money |
| 01:46:58 | A. Yes. | 01:50:42 15 | into a special deposit account if it couldn't quickly tie it to |
|  | Q. And what is it? | 16 | a specific allotment and allottee, and thus a specific IIM |
|  | A. On April 22 of 2005, I wrote to the acting assistant | 17 | account. |
|  | secretary for Indian Affairs, Mr. James Cason, elevating the | 18 | In this case funds were put in this special deposit |
|  | types of concerns that I had been expressing in countless | 19 | account. The amount at the time that I saw the file was |
| 01:47:22 20 | memoranda over the previous couple of years at lower levels of | 01:51:07 20 | \$130,000. It turned out that the account had been established |
|  | the agency. And so I basically described that the agency was -- | 21 | in 1977, so this was -- '87, '97-- this was about 25 years |
|  | had not implemented the '92 OIG recommendations, did not have an | 22 | later, $\mathbf{2 0}$ years at least later. And by looking at some lease |
|  | automated lease management system, did not know how much income | 23 | records I was able to identify fairly easily who the account |
|  | was owed on leases, did not know -- was not collecting the | 24 | belonged to, which business lease it came from, and who it |
| 01:47:47 25 | proper amounts, had no records to show how much money was | 01:51:38 25 | should have been paid to. |
|  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |
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| 01:48:07 | 1696 |  | 1698 |
|  | collected, when it was due, how much was due. | 1 | In fact, it was a very prominent tribal official. It was |
|  | And then I included in this memo I think more than a dozen | 2 | no trouble at all to identify who that money should have been |
|  | specific examples with lease numbers, and then I would describe | 3 | paid to in 1977, or 1983 when the lease was canceled. |
|  | what was wrong. If an auditor came in and looked at that file, | 4 | Q. If I can turn your attention back to some larger picture |
|  | what they could look for to see that the income was underpaid. | 01:51:58 5 | issues, could you sort of -- could you tell me about how much |
|  | Q. And if we can turn to page 3 of this document. And if we | 6 | money in lease income the government estimates is involved at |
|  | can go down to the second paragraph. This mentions the PC Lease | 7 | Palm Springs Agency for individual Indians? |
|  | program that you discussed. And can you talk about what the | 8 | A. The government says that they collect \$30 million a year at |
|  | problem identified here is? | 9 | the Palm Springs Agency from leases. |
| 01:48:39 10 | A. This dealt with --I was quite insistent that the agency | 01:52:21 10 | Q. And do you know whether today there is a system for lease |
|  | needed to at least try to use the PC Lease program. And so | 11 | management? |
|  | finally it was placed -- brought out of the back room and it was | 12 | MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. Outside the scope of this |
|  | placed on the desktop of a new employee. The issue at the time | 13 | case. Irrelevant. |
|  | was there were I think 56 billboard permits, which are similar | 14 | MR. HARPER: Your Honor, it involves collections of |
| 01:49:00 15 | to leases, although technically they're terminable at will and | 01:52:35 15 | funds. |
|  | they don't have a term, but the agency tended to use them | 16 | MR. KIRSCHMAN: This case isn't about the collection |
|  | interchangeably. | 17 | of lease funds, Your Honor. |
|  | So there were 56 of these leases or permits. The company | 18 | THE COURT: I'm going to allow it. |
|  | that held all of them was getting out of the business in | 19 | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the |
| 01:49:16 20 | California and wanted to assign them all to another company. | 01:52:44 20 | question? |
|  | The second company was eager to take them over because they also | 21 | BY MR. HARPER: |
|  | had a big batch of these types of billboard leases, but they | 22 | Q. Do they have a system for lease collections, for accounts |
|  | balked at taking over these leases, because they had a pretty | 23 | receivable system? |
|  | good idea that a lot of money had not been collected on these | 24 | A. In the last year or so -- we've also had testimony I think |
| 01:49:35 25 | leases. | 01:52:55 25 | about the TAAMS system, and I'll probably butcher what the |
|  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |
|  | Official Court Reporter |  | Official Court Reporter |

acronym stands for, but trust accounting asset management system. The Palm Springs Agency was supposed to kind of convert its system of information to the -- and populate the TAAMS program with the asset information. And so as of this point, sometime within the last year, presumably there is such a system and it is TAAMS. I haven't seen it myself.
Q. But prior to that point --

THE COURT: Just before we move on past this point,
and in further response to Mr. Kirschman's objection that this trial is not about the collection of lease funds, he's right about that, but this trial is about the adequacy of the accounting and the question of whether the accounting is reaching into the question of lease funds is I think part of this case. Proceed, Mr. Harper.

## MR. HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Prior to that point, had there been any accounts receivable system at the Palm Springs Agency?
A. None whatsoever.
Q. And so how were -- how were agency officials -- how do they know to go out and collect funds?
A. Essentially fund collection was on the honor system. The agency depended entirely on the lessee to report how much money it owed, to report any increases because of cost of living increases, to report if it was a percentage of income rental Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
where the lessee would get a percentage of income, they would depend entirely on the lessee to report how much income there was. They had no proactive way of invoicing payments even when they were in default. I saw files that were years in default and no action was taken to issue even default notices, let alone invoices.
Q. You mentioned for a moment, and could you further explain what you meant by leases that required percentage-based payments?
A. The percentage -- the typical rental would be established according to an appraisal of the fee value of the land, and then typically in Palm Springs the appraisers say that the annual rental value is about 10 percent of the fee value. And so that would -- most often that would be the rent that would be agreed on.

In a lot of cases, and probably more often than not these days, there is in addition to that a percentage of income provision in the lease whereby the lessor, the allottee, the Indian landowner, receives a percentage of the revenues from the business that is operated on the leased land
Q. And so how does the trustee here determine that the beneficiary receives sufficient funds?
A. The Bureau does not play any role in monitoring the
payments, auditing the revenues, even measuring, comparing the amounts paid to the amounts that the lease would call for.
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Q. And what kind of percentages are we talking about Mr. McCarthy?
A. You know, it could be anything. It could be a percentage of gross revenue, it could be a percentage of net revenue, it could be anything from 2 percent to, the highest one I've ever seen was within the last few years. It was an amazingly generous, from the lessee's perspective, lease, where there was a guaranteed -- in all leases -- and I should back up a moment, there is a guaranteed minimum annual rent, so that the rent never falls below that. The percentage is always going to be above that amount. In this case $\mathbf{4 2}$ percent of gross revenues was the amount that the developer agreed to paid to the landowners.
Q. What kind of business was that?
A. It was a very large golf course, hotel, business complex, still under construction, although the business complex parts of it are done and generating income.
Q. If I can turn your attention, Mr. McCarthy, to Plaintiffs' PPX 508. Have you seen this document before?
A. Very briefly. I have a general idea of what it is.
Q. I will represent to you it's one of the two Government
plans submitted to this court in January 6, 2003, before the trial 1.5. And if I can turn your attention to page 12 of the document, but page 15 of the pdf. If we can go to that first highlight. I'm going to read a couple of these and then ask you Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
some questions about it.
It says, "Interior's trustee is mindful of the importance
of recognizing the unique circumstances of the beneficiaries and
the management of this trust. The trust that Interior manages
is" -- "The trust that Interior manages is not a typical corpus
managed by private sector trustees where fees are charged as
part of a normal business practice in the services delivered."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then if you go to the first paragraph, the next
paragraph, excuse me, the first sentence, it says "The federal
government bears the entire cost of administering the Indian
trust." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your experience, is that accurate?
A. Well, it's legally inaccurate, and it's factually
inaccurate. There's statutory authority for the federal government to charge fees for a wide range of services that it provides in the administration of Indian lands. And those fees are charged in Palm Springs, to my personal knowledge, on every lease.
Q. And could you give us a sense of how high these fees can get?
A. Well, by regulation the highest lease fee for a given lease, say a lease approval, is $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0}$. For the sale of land, Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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A. Yes.

15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Was that in conformity with the regulations, the $\$ 60,000$
17 fee?
18 A. No. The maximum fee in that case would have been $\$ 22.50$ by 19 regulation.
Q. And you saw -- how often were fees charged above what they 21 were allowed?
22 A. In virtually every case for virtually every type of
23 administrative act, the BIA, there was another statute -- if I
it's \$22.50, I think. However, those are not the fees that are charged in Palm Springs. Palm Springs charges 1 percent of the sale price, so if land sells for $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 0}, 000$, the fee would be $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 , 0 0 0}$. They essentially completely disregard the regulations in terms of the limits that are there.
Q. And if I can turn your attention, Mr. McCarthy, to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4489, and the last page of that exhibit. Do you recognize this document?
Q. And if we turn to the second paragraph. "Regarding a newly negotiated sale between the heirs of Ms. Andreas and the new purchaser, the realty officer indicated there is a 1 percent administrative fee, which in this case I understand to be some $\$ 60,000$." Do you see that?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

## 1704

1 administrative act with tribal funds. Then the tribe then
2 collects the fees, and it can set those fees under statute and fees, it turns them over directly to the United States Treasury.

7 Q. So this $\$ 60,000$ when collected would be deposited in the 8 United States Treasury?
A. Yes.
Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4488.

11 Mr. McCarthy, do you recognize this document?
12 A. Yes.

16 A. Essentially it is a memorandum written by the Palm Springs
17 Agency superintendent to the tribe's director of planning
Q. If we can turn your attention to the third -- well, maybe I can just ask you, what do you understand this document to be about?
shortly before August 31 of 2006 -- the document itself doesn't appear to have a date -- asking for the assistance of the tribe because of the looming deadline to install land data into the TAAMS system. The Agency determined that it needed assistance in particular because it discovered that of $\mathbf{9 0 0}$ rights-of-way that it had approved, $I$ think the term it used is that a great many have inaccurate legal descriptions.
Q. And let's look at the fourth paragraph beginning "The staff regulation at whatever levels it wants.

The BIA uses the tribal fee schedule, even though the tribe is not performing the functions, and then when it collects the
has conducted." "The staff has conducted an assessment of
rights-of-way and unfortunately they have discovered that there are errors with many of the legal description records." What could be the result of such errors?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection. Relevance. Outside the scope.

## THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The possibility is of course if you have
the wrong legal description, then you're getting paid for a
right-of-way, the potential is that you're then paying out that income to somebody who owns the legal description property that is described in the right-of-way, but that's not the property where the right-of-way is going through.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4487.

Mr. McCarthy, you can see this is a document from the director of Office of Trust Records at the Office of Special Trustee, to the acting director of Office of Trust Review and Audit. And it states that it contains as an attachment a letter from you, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could turn to the next page. And is that your memorandum?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we look at the first sentence of that memorandum. And
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based on your information that first sentence is accurate, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I just have a couple of more questions for you,

Mr. McCarthy. If you can turn to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4499.
Mr. McCarthy, do you recognize this e-mail?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And who is Mr. Matthew Kirkland who's sending this e-mail?
A. Mr. Kirkland is a realty specialist on the staff of the Palm Springs BIA agency.
Q. Can you see the date of this e-mail?
A. September 12, 2006.
Q. This is addressing some of the changes that are happening regarding TAAMS. Is that a fair statement?
A. Yes. And given the date, this would have been after the date that the previous document indicated was the deadline for converting the system to TAAMS.
Q. If you can go down to No. 4, and is this what you were talking about earlier, about not having this capability?
A. Well, what the author of the memo is saying is that what the agency, even after the implementation of TAAMS, still lacks, among other things on this item, is a tickler system that lets the staff know of changes that a lease provision requires, so that, for example, the rent is supposed to go up after every five years, or there's a term of development. The development Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter
has to be done within three years. Well, they should have a tickler within three years that says, okay, this lease should have been developed by now. If it's not developed they're in default. So that's the point that he's making.
Q. And if we can turn down to the highlighted sentence. I'm going to read that and ask you a question about it. "Without this capability, TAAMS is little more than a database of misinformation that does not allow us to effectively manage the revenue stream." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that statement there consistent with your understanding? THE COURT: Counsel, the words "this capability" have no referent in what you've shown me. I don't know what capability this is talking about.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, it's going through a list of the missing items.

THE COURT: Without these primary tools.
MR. HARPER: Precisely. I was trying to -THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Is this consistent with your understanding of the present conditions?
A. Yes. What the author I think is saying is they took some data that did not exist in any organized fashion, somehow populated TAAMS with some data about leases that does not Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

16 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. McCarthy.
17 A. Good afternoon. misinformation part. to document the collection of funds.
have no further questions.
THE COURT: Mr. Kirschman.

BY MR. KIRSCHMAN:
Q. I'd like to turn first if I could to Plaintiffs' Exhibit redacted and unredacted form.
A. Yes. reviewing this document with Mr. Harper?

THE COURT: You mean 10 minutes ago?
contain any real and reliable information about income owed, income collected, income paid, and then they put this data into this TAAMS system. And I think that explains the database of

And the second part of the phrase I think reflects more directly to the fact that TAAMS doesn't do any of these other things. It doesn't help them to better manage, to better identify funds that need to be collected, to collect the funds,

MR. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. Your Honor, I

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

 4498. This was previously shown to you, Mr. McCarthy, both inQ. I would like to use PX 4498 for purposes of my cross, just so we can see what's actually on the pages. Do you remember

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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MR. KIRSCHMAN: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: You mean 10 minutes ago? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Of course.
BY MR. KIRSCHMAN:
Q. The cover page and also then Mr. Harper showed you two specific pages --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from the attached tables. Do you recall Mr. Harper showed you a single page with no information on it? Do you recall that?
A. Perhaps. I don't recall. I think there are about 20 pages in the document.
Q. Okay. He also showed you page 10 of the document, with limited information in the top right-hand corner. Do you remember he showed you this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said just now that it's approximately a what, 20-page document?
A. I don't -- you have it, but as $I$ recall.
Q. Okay. What I'd like to do is go through the document so
that we can see actually what is in here and what's not. Could we please go to the second page of the exhibit?

Was there a reason you and Mr. Harper discussed only a blank page and a page with very little information in the top

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
right-hand corner?
A. I answered the question $I$ was asked.
Q. Do you think those two pages were representative of even this document that's attached to your memo?
A. I think they are -- well, I think my cover memo states very clearly that -- I mean, it defines exactly how many entries there are for each lease that's listed. There's maybe 10 percent of the total number of leases even listed, and for those there's very paltry information except on a couple of pages.
Q. What I asked you was whether you thought those two pages you reviewed with Mr. Harper were representative of the document that you put before the Court?
A. And I think I answered that --
Q. It's yes or no. Do you think those two pages are representative of the rest of the document?
A. They are part of the document. The document, I mean it speaks for itself. They show that most of the pages are blank, as I recall.
Q. Okay. Well, let's refresh your memory. Do you recognize this on the screen as the first page? There's a No. 1 on the bottom. Do you see that?
A. I see it.
Q. Is it blank?
A. Many of the columns are blank.
Q. Is the page blank, sir?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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mentioned in this paragraph, SDA No. 81, that the agency couldn't quickly tie it to an allotment and then to an IIM account. Correct?

## A. I testified that a previous witness said that that is a

frequent practice in BIA. I don't know if that's exactly how
this money wound up in a special deposit account, but I
speculate -- I implied that that's a likely cause.
Q. In fact, Mr. McCarthy, you know, don't you, that this SDA
account was resolved and closed out well before you ever sent this memorandum to Mr. Cason?
A. It was resolved and closed out as a result of -- well, that's what it says, the field solicitor, referring to me, determined from lease records that the account -- I figured out whose money it was. That's what I told him.
Q. And in fact, that money was paid well before you ever presented your memo to Mr. Cason, wasn't it?
A. I don't know if the money was paid or not.
Q. You don't have a recollection that the account was then paid and closed?
A. I wouldn't have any -- I wouldn't know that. I wouldn't see that record. I wouldn't have that record.
Q. Wouldn't you follow up on it, considering you just
presented it as a problem to the acting assistant secretary and the Inspector General?
A. I didn't say that it wasn't paid. The implication is that Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. And I believe you may have heard, and I'm not quoting him exactly, but the Court mentioned that in this case we're concerned about accounting reaching into lease funds. Is that your understanding of why we're here today?
A. My understanding is that $\mathbf{I}$-- my understanding from prior rulings of the Court and what I've heard today is that the government must match up the leases to the allottee and to the allotment, identify the amount of income that is owed, and have records that show that the income was collected and paid.
Q. Okay. Now, this document indicates, does it not, that you received and used BIA's lease records and also journal vouchers to determine the correct ownership.
A. Correct.
Q. It also indicates that there were no Bank of America
records available to document the source of the funds
originally?
A. That's what it says.
Q. Okay. How did you come upon the journal vouchers and the BIA lease records that you used to determine ownership?
A. They were not in -- they had no -- they were not in the same place and in no way connected to the file dealing with special deposit account 81.
Q. Where were they?
A. They were in the leasing files.
Q. Whose leasing files?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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1 it was paid. I said that I had determined that after 20 years, for 25 years, are you?
7 A. Oh, absolutely. That's exactly what I'm saying.
8 Q. Okay. What is the name of the vice chairperson of the
9 tribe that you referenced?
A. Barbara Gonzalez Lyons.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, I'd like to present the witness with an exhibit for impeachment purposes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS: Go ahead.
BY MR. KIRSCHMAN:
Q. Your Honor, we have marked this as Defendants' Exhibit 368 just for identification.

Now, have you had a chance to review that?

21 Q. And this is a September 16, 2004, memorandum you prepared? $\mathbf{2 5}$, however long it was, $I$ had identified whose money it was. And to me the implication is that I'd identified the owner and therefore the agency would pay the money out at that point.
A. Yes, I'm familiar with it.
A. Correct.
Q. And it relates to this SDA account, the Date Palm

Commercial Association account?
A. Correct.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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A. The BIA's leasing files.

2 Q. And where were they located?
3 A. In the leasing files room in the back of the BIA.
4 Q. I'm sorry, geographically.
A. Palm Springs Agency.
Q. And how far is that from you?

7 A. I was in the agency.
8 Q. So they were down the hall?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't collect these documents.
A. The lease documents?
Q. Or the journal vouchers.
A. The Bureau -- I think we've had testimony that there was a cleanup of special deposit accounts project, and a Bureau employee presented this special deposit account to me and asked for my assistance to determine, after $\mathbf{2 0}$ or $\mathbf{2 5}$ years, who the money belonged to. And so I advised the Bureau employee how we would go about determining that, which involved identifying whatever records would help to track this to a specific lease, and therefore we could identify who owned that property and thus who the money should have been paid to.
Q. Okay. And after reviewing the BIA lease records that were right down the hall and the journal vouchers that you mentioned on the second page of this memo, you concluded that it is clear that those deposits consist of payments made by the lessees
under PSL-205, as well as PSL-205A and 205B. Correct?
A. I'm looking for that language.
Q. It's on the very last line.
A. Okay. Yes.

5 Q. And you also were able to determine that the owner was in
6 fact Ms. Gonzalez, correct?

12 BY MR. KIRSCHMAN:
13 Q. Before I leave your two-page memo dated September 16, 2004,
14 the previous document, I received last night about nine
02:29:29
15 documents from you that I had been told was produced by you to
16 Plaintiffs. Was there a reason I did not receive this September
17 16, 2004, memorandum?
18 A. Not that I'm aware of.
19 Q. Did you bring it with you to Washington?
02:29:47 $20 \quad$ A. $\quad$ I think $I$ did.
21 Q. You did?
22 A. I believe $I$ did. I don't know. I think it's in the files
23 that I gave to Plaintiffs' counsel.
24 Q. But you don't know if it was provided to us or not.
02:29:59 $\mathbf{2 5}$ A. I wouldn't have any idea.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Q. Looking at the next exhibit, it's a journal voucher dated

2 11/15/2004. Do you see that?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Are you familiar with this type of document?
A. You know, I probably have seen this document, but as a

6 rule, no, $I$ wouldn't be familiar with any kind of a payment
7 voucher.
8 Q. But you've seen this document, correct, because it related
9 to SDA 81?
A. I assume that I did.

11 Q. Okay.
12 A. I don't know if $I$ did. The date on it is $11 / 15 / 04$. So
13 it's after the date of my memo.
14 Q. Approximately two months after your memo.
A. So I don't know if $I$ would have seen it.

16 Q. And approximately six months before your memorandum to
17 Mr. Cason, correct?
18 A. Correct.
19 Q. Do you know who Ollie Bird is who signed this as acting
02:31:03 $\mathbf{2 0}$ director?
21 A. It's Ollie Beyal, B-E-Y-A-L.
22 Q. And who is Ollie Beyal?
23 A. According to the signature that she used that day, she's
24 the acting director, which was the same as the acting field
25 solicitor -- I mean, agency superintendent. They changed the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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Q. So what you're saying is you presented Mr. Cason and the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
name. It used to be called a director of the Palm Springs BIA office, and they changed it to superintendent. So at that time it was called director. So she signed as director.
Q. Physically, where was she located at this time? Where was her office?
A. In the same complex of offices that I'm in, not very far from me.
Q. And this document, does it not, refers back to SDA No. 81 that you referred to in your memorandum to Mr. Cason?
A. Yes.
Q. That is the Date Palm Commercial Association SDA, correct?
A. True.
Q. And it indicates, does it not, that a payment was being made to Barbara M. Gonzalez plus interest, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it also indicates at the very bottom that the account was closed, correct?
A. It says "close account" and "yes" is circled, so it looks like it was a direction to close the account. But I have not -I don't know that I've ever seen this. I don't know -- when you first handed it to me, I assumed it was a document that I used as part of reconciling this, but $I$ see the date is well after my memo. So I think it's very likely that I've never seen this document.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

## Inspector General with a situation and never checked to see if

 the account was actually paid to the beneficiary?
## A. I assumed that it had, and I don't think my memo says

 anything otherwise.Q. Why would you assume it had? Because it was followed up on?
A. Because I wrote a memo to the superintendent and identified who the money was owed to, and that was fairly soon after I had started there, and I had assumed that, knowing who the account belonged to, that they would pay the funds out.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, I have two more exhibits
I'd like to show the witness on this same issue.
THE COURT: Yes. Fine.
BY MR. KIRSCHMAN:
Q. This is a one-page printout. It is marked as DX 366 for identification. Do you know what this document is, sir?
A. I've never seen it before, but it appears to be a report of a transaction indicating funds, if $I$ understand it correctly, being paid out of that special deposit account.
Q. Yes. Let's look at the top part, the top portion of the document, if we could. Do you see where in the first section it makes reference to the account 584S0000?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm having trouble reading it. 81?
A. Yes.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
10



9
early in the process and they had not deposited it in the Treasury, because I don't know whether they'd get the money back if they had, but if it was fairly early in the process, $I$ believe, and I saw at least one case where they did refund a fee to a purchaser who got -- when he got beat out by another offer like fairly quickly after he made his deposit.
Q. Okay.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, one moment, please. We have no further questions for this witness.




THE WITNESS: Oh, I see. You're referring back to
Date Palm Commercial Association?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I understand. No, I was requested. THE COURT: And why is it that you're working from Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

## home since April 2007?

THE COURT: Mr. McCarthy, your memorandum of September 2004 begins with the words, addressed to the superintendent of the Palm Springs Agency: "You have requested an opinion regarding beneficial ownership." Did you dig this up on your own motion or were you asked to look it up?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I don't know which --

THE COURT: September 16, 2004.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if I have that document.
THE COURT: Put it up on the screen, would you,

THE WITNESS: I was kicked out of my office after I
made my disclosures to the -- well, beginning with the assistant secretary, within the next couple of days a hundred law books were removed from my library. Everyone stopped talking to me. I was shunned almost completely for the next several months. That continued. I made my disclosures to the Inspector General. It worsened.

Ultimately a redacted copy of the OIG memo appeared in a newspaper article, and at that point, within a couple of days, I was told to vacate my office within 24 hours, and that I would no longer have any responsibilities with respect to the BIA. THE COURT: Are you still being paid? THE WITNESS: I'm still being paid, although the day after I notified my employer that I was going to be a witness in this case, they issued a proposal to fire me.

THE COURT: And is there any litigation going on between you and the Department of the Interior about your employment situation?

THE WITNESS: I have filed a number of appeals with the Merit System Protection Board regarding the earlier action, the kicking me out of my office, that sort of thing. And I actually petitioned the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals for mandamus to try and get a decision on that. There was quite a bit of litigation. It was all pro se on my part.

$$
\begin{aligned}
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A. Yes.
Q. Are those kinds of fees routinely charged for sale in
leasing?
A. The 1 percent fee is charged for every sale. The other fees are charged according to the tribal fee schedule that was part of your exhibit, I believe. Those are not the amounts set forth in the regulation, but those are the amounts charged by the BIA for each and every administrative action. Say it's an amendment of a lease or an assignment or whatever.
Q. And are those routinely above what is allowed in the law?
A. Well, every sale one is, because $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 . 5 0}$ is the maximum for sale. There are some fees that can be as high as $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0}$. I think it's tied to a percentage of the annual rental value of the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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lease in question, say, for example, for approval of a lease.
But there's an absolute maximum fee for any activity of $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0}$.
And most of these fees, as you can see, are above $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0}$.
Q. With respect to -- you recall counsel asking you questions
with respect to the account for Ms. Gonzalez Lyons?
A. Yes.
Q. Would there be any reason, to your knowledge, say she's a
minor or non compos mentis, that they would hold her money for that period of time?

When I got the proposal to fire me, I retained counsel and counsel is in the process of -- we've responded to the proposal and we, as I understand it, are in negotiations.

> THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, couple questions on redirect.
THE COURT: Mr. Harper.
MR. HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. McCarthy, on cross-examination, counsel asked you questions about the $\$ 60,000$ administrative fee. Do you recall those?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
-
A. No. Presumably if they knew who the money belonged to, who
the account belonged to, they would have paid her. She was present in the community the entire $\mathbf{2 0}$ years.
Q. And she served on the tribal council, in fact, correct?
A. Very prominent person in the community.
Q. Counsel also asked you about the example for that special
deposit account. And you listed other examples in both the OIG
memo and the memo to Mr. Cason. Is that accurate -- of mismanagement?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those examples or were those all of the and the only issues at the agency?
A. Oh, no. They were examples. They were examples from files that I was familiar with. I certainly never saw all thousand
master leases. The files that I became aware of where there
were serious problems with documentation of collection of income
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
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in the proper amounts, penalties, bonds, late fees, those kinds of things, I selected I think about a dozen or maybe a little more examples.
Q. And counsel asked you also about the exhibit that was the only sort of documentation for leases. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. With the blank pages?
A. Yes.
Q. Or some blank pages and some with partially blank pages. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. There's a number of leases listed on there. Do you know about what percentage of leases are listed on there as to the total percentage of leases?
A. I can't remember what my memo said. I believe there were what, 130 or something. I can't remember how many were listed on there. The memo says. I'm going to guess it was 130 . So if there are a thousand master leases, then it's a little over 10 percent, maybe 12 percent, 13 percent of all of the leases are listed.
Q. And where are the other 90 percent of leases listed?
A. They're not listed anywhere. The OST report, the June '07 OST report says that the agency still does not have a complete list of master leases anywhere.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Honor.
step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
(The witness steps down.)
THE COURT: Next witness.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, regarding --
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, your next witness.
Mr. Kirschman?
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Regarding Mr. McCarthy's testimony,
Defendants would like to offer into evidence DX 368. That is
Mr. McCarthy's two-page memorandum that he drafted and discussed.

MR. HARPER: No objection, Your Honor.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: September 16, 2004, memorandum.
THE COURT: It's received.
(Defendant Exhibit No. DX 368 received into evidence.)

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Also, Your Honor, the others, 366, 367 and 369.

THE COURT: All received.
(Defendant Exhibit Nos. 366,
367 and 369 received into
evidence.)
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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MR. HARPER: Your Honor, for the record we'd like to say we do object to 366 , as it seems that the numbers on here aren't even internally consistent.

THE COURT: Which one is 366 ?
MR. HARPER: It's the Pacific Region document.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: It's the one-page printout,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, you can make what you want of that in final argument if anybody remembers this document by the time we get to the end of this case.

Mr. Smith, call your next witness.
MR. SMITH: Your Honor, our next witness is Ms. Mona Infield.
(The witness takes the stand.)
MR. SMITH: Your Honor, Ms. Infield is a 25 -year
employee of BIA. She's worked both at the agency level and at the regional level. She will testify specifically about the computer systems at Osage, and also her work on the data cleanup project with Mr. Homan, problems with the electronic systems and the paper records as well.

## MONA INFIELD, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN

 DIRECT EXAMINATIONBY MR. SMITH:
Q. Ms. Infield, can you state your full name for the Court, please?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
A. Yes, I did.
A. Mona Infield, I-N-F-I-E-L-D.
Q. Where do you live, Ms. Infield?
A. I live in Corrales, New Mexico.
Q. You actually drove here from New Mexico for trial?
Q. Arrived last night?
A. Yes, about midnight.
Q. What is your tribal affiliation?
A. I'm a member of the Citizen Potawatomi Nation of Oklahoma.
Q. And where are you employed?
A. I'm employed at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I work in the Office of Information Operations in Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Q. And how long have you been employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs?
A. With a brief stint working for the Osage tribe, since June 2, 1982.
Q. And at what locations at BIA have you worked?
A. I worked at the Osage Agency for both the Bureau and the tribe. I worked at Muskogee, at that time it was the area office. I've also worked at the data center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I did a three-year stint at home with no duties after providing testimony in this case. And now I'm back in the data center in Albuquerque where I perform as the manager for disaster recovery services for the computer systems.
Q. Is it fair to say that a lot of your work over that 25 -year

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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period dealt with the computer systems?
2 A. Yes. I worked with the computer systems since I was
3 about -- after the first three years I was at Osage, so probably 4 the last 22 years.
5 Q. And would that include the IRMS system?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And the RDRS?
A. Yes.

9 Q. And you worked as well with Mr. Homan on the data cleanup effort?

11 A. Yes, I did.
12 Q. And when was that?
13 A. That was in the mid-'80s, 1985, '86.
14 Q. Would that be the '90s?
15 A. I'm sorry. '95, '96. You're correct.
16 Q. I want to talk first about your work at the Osage Agency.
17 The Osage Agency is in Oklahoma.
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And during what period were you at the Osage Agency?
A. I was at the Agency in either capacity, as a BIA employee

21 or a tribal employee, on a 638 contract, where the government
22 contracts the tribe to perform certain services, from 1982, June
23 of ' 82 , to October of ' 87.
24 Q. What services were contracted to the tribe?
02:57:12 25 A. When I worked on the 638 contract, it was on the computer Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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1 systems, services that the tribe provided.
2 Q. Okay.
A. Mostly to the minerals branch.

4 Q. Is it fair to say that at the Osage Agency it's hard to 5 distinguish the tribal employees from the Bureau employees?
6 A. Yes, it is, because other than who signs your paycheck,
7 there really is no distinguishable difference. Everybody
8 answers to the superintendent and everybody works together as a
9 team in the agency.
10 Q. Okay. When you started at the Osage Agency, were there any
11 electronic systems there?
12 A. There was. The tribe had an IBM System 34 installed, where
13 they kept their oil accounting information, production
14 information and royalties that were collected, and where they

16 by quarter.
17 Q. You said the tribe had a system. Did the Bureau have a
18 system?
19 A. No.
20 Q. Did the Bureau use the tribe's system?
21 A. They did for oil and gas accounting purposes and tracking
22 and recording that, and for the distribution of those quarterly
23 annuity payments.
24 Q. Were there other lease interests besides oil and gas at
教

,
A. Yes, surface leasing.
Q. How were those handled at the Agency?
A. We did all those manually.
Q. Does MSN have anything to do with the Osage Agency, even
though it's oil and gas?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. MSN.
A. MMS?
Q. I'm sorry, MMS.
A. No. MMS came into being after the Osage -- the Osage has been doing their own oil and gas accounting for years.
Q. Is it fair to say that the Osage tribe is treated a little bit differently than some of the other allottees?
A. I think so.
Q. In what manner is it different?
A. Well, not only do they not use MMS for their oil and gas accounting, they don't use BLM for their field operations. They have their own field operations staff. As well as making those annuity payments. There's a different payment process for collecting that income from the oil and gas royalties, and then distributing the income amongst the shareholders, which are called the annuitants, and their share is one headright share, an allotment. They were all allotted, each member of the tribe was allotted one headright share.
Q. How many headright shares are there? Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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## A. 2,229.

Q. The money that's collected on the oil and gas, where is that deposited to?
A. Into the treasury. Into the tribal account's treasury.
Q. So it's actually deposited into an Osage tribal account?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. How long does it remain in the tribal account?
A. Well, if my memory is serving me correctly, for instance, the December quarterly payment that would be paid out the first part of December is for money that was collected from the March through June time frame. Or I'm sorry, April through June time frame. So it's about six months. There's about a six-month lag time after the money's collected before it's actually distributed.
Q. And where is it distributed from the tribal account to?
A. Into a special deposit account in IIM, and then it's distributed from there out to, for Osages and other Indians now, distributed into their IIM accounts. If there are non-Osage or non-Indian members, or non-Indian owners of headright shares, those people are cut a check from the Regional Disbursing Office in San Francisco Treasury.
Q. How would non-Osage get headright shares?
A. Well, now they can encode into -- we send an interface file over to TFAS, and it's all interfaced into the TFAS account for that non-Osage Indian. Back in the old days, whenever we had
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never had their own title plant until after 1991 or so.
2 Q. So if you wanted to look at ownership records for the other 3 tribes, the Osage and the Five Civilized Tribes, where would you have to go?
5 A. You'd go to a county courthouse for wherever the land was.
6 Q. So prior to those records being placed on LRIS, they were
filed with the courthouse?
A. That's correct.

9 Q. And how many counties are we talking about?
A. There's $\mathbf{7 7}$ counties in Oklahoma. So minus the eight Miami

11 tribes, which would encompass about five counties. So somewhere
12 around 70.
13 Q. Was Muskogee the only regional office that didn't use LRIS?
14 A. No. There were several others that didn't use the title

## 15 plants.

16 Q. When did the Muskogee office begin using IRMS?
17 A. In the late ' 80 s, sometime around ' 88 , ' 89 , Ross Swimmer
18 was the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs and he sent a 19 memorandum out to everybody that said you will use IRMS to its fullest. So we started a project to get everybody to start
21 encoding their data into IRMS.
22 Q. Had other regional offices used IRMS prior to that time?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. When is the first time IRMS was used?
03:07:35 $\mathbf{2 5}$ A. My understanding is IRMS was first installed in the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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1 Billings regional office, Rocky Mountain region now, in the late
2 '70s. When I first came to Osage in ' 82 , one of my first

8 A. Yes. It was on a B1900 in the Anadarko information
9 management center.
Q. How many B1900 systems were there across the country?

11 A. There were six information management centers, and each one

15 the Albuquerque area, or Albuquerque data center, onto a Unisys
16 Series A10.
17 Q. Do you know what the capacity of these computers was?
18 A. I don't know what the capacity of the B1900s was. I'm not

20 gigabytes of space on the A10s put together, and we had two A10s
21 at the data center.
22 Q. To your knowledge, to what extent was the information on
23 the IRMS system retained?
24 A. In '91 when I got to the data center in Albuquerque and with its own B1900.
Q. And were those systems later consolidated?
A. They were. In the early '90s we started consolidation into
A. 1985.
Q. When you got to Albuquerque, did you investigate IRMS further?
A. Well, it came to our attention that at some point in time, I think it was when we were doing an interest recalculation project, that we were missing whole months of transactions for certain regions. For instance, for Albuquerque, Eastern and Navajo, there were complete months, if we ran a stratification report that showed by year and month how many transactions were in the his-tran database, we would have zeros in some months for those three regions. And that went on for several years.
Q. Okay. Were you able to discover why that data was missing?
A. We couldn't really trace it back to any cause except that
the month-end process wasn't finished appropriately. So, because one of the last steps in the month-end processing was to Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

7 A. I had a programmer that $I$ assigned to go back and look at 8 all the tapes that we could gather from anywhere across the

15 Q. What was the condition of the mag tapes?
16 A. The mag tapes were -- we still have some of them. I am in

21 Q. What happened to the magnetic tapes from the Phoenix

23 A. Well, when we were moving, consolidating off the B1900s to
move transactions out of the transactions database into the his-tran database. So if the job ended abruptly before that step happened, then it never occurred. Those transactions never got moved to his-trans.
Q. At that time, what if anything did you do to try to fill the holes in the system? nation. If we had them in our library, fine, if we had to pull them from the IMCs, or if we didn't have their libraries in yet, that was fine, we'd get them wherever we can, find them, let's get them loaded back into the database.

And we were successful with about 50 percent of the data at that point.
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the A10s, one of the last things we did was to move the tape libraries from those information management centers across the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
believe. And then they were reused.
Q. Okay. So if you didn't print your IM-500 within five weeks, what happens to it?
A. It's gone. The tape's already been written over and you can't get it back.
Q. I'm going to turn your testimony to the RDRS system.

THE COURT: How long is this going to go?
MR. SMITH: We probably have another 30 minutes, so
perhaps --
THE COURT: Let's finish. This lady's come all the way here from Oklahoma. Let's do it.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That sounds good.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. The RDRS system, what is that system?
A. That's the royalty distribution and reporting system.
Q. Okay. And have you been involved with that system as well?
A. When I went to Albuquerque in '91 I was the programmer for RDRS. That was my first position.
Q. And when did BIA start using an RDRS system?
A. They were using it in Muskogee when I went there in 1987.

I had no exposure to it before then. So it was already in use in October of '87.
Q. Did all of the regions use the RDRS system?
A. No. There are seven regions that have oil and gas leasing, and the Minneapolis region did not use RDRS. They only had a
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handful of leases, so they distributed that income manually.
Q. So if you wanted the RDRS records, you'd have to look both
at the RDRS system and at paper ledgers?
A. That's correct. Well, not just for Minneapolis. There were some leases in the Muskogee region that were distributed manually as well.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because they had a problem with matching the lease number in the MMS system with the lease number in RDRS. So when they came down to us in a distribution file from MMS, the computer would not -- would throw them into what we call an error recycle file. So it wouldn't distribute the money for that transaction.
Q. And what would happen to that recycle file?
A. Well, once the people of the region would do the manual distribution, then they would send us a fax at the data center and say please zero out my recycle file, because I've done my manual distributions for those records.
Q. Okay. By the way, how long would lease ownership records be maintained before they were overwritten?
A. Well, on a daily backup at least as an owner -- or a snapshot in time, because there's no historical database established for lease or owner. And so your daily backups are kept for 10 working days and then they're recycled. Weekly backups are kept in perpetuity now. Back in the old days, they were only kept for five weeks. And if you caught them on a Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

4 Q. When did that policy start?
A. I think we started that in 2003 when I came back in the 6 office.
7 Q. Okay. So prior to that time, unless you printed a copy of
8 the lease ownership record at that point in time, it would be gone after 13 months?
A. Exactly. If you caught it in a snapshot, and if you caught 11 it in a snapshot in time on a month-end backup. If it was only 12 on a daily backup, it was only good for two weeks. Two weeks 13 later it was gone.
14 Q. You mentioned that you began working with Mr. Homan in his
monthly backup, they were kept for 13 months. All of our weekly backups now are kept forever. We don't write over weekly backups.
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So we decided to go around the country and take testimony and do consultation with tribes and individual Indians. We did that. I think we had five or six stops across the country within a year's time. Then we gathered testimony and we talked about problems and gathered information from individual Indians and allottee associations and tribes and even agency superintendents, and regional directors and lease clerks, or whoever had a testimony to give. We were doing consultation so we had a court reporter in the session and we had a recording of everything that was given.
Q. And what were your principal conclusions from that --
A. From all of that testimony we distilled everything down to a list of issues that needed to be addressed. And then we brought the task force back together in Albuquerque. We went through the list of issues. We had the tribal people caucus amongst themselves to determine what their priorities would be in addressing this list. We had the government people caucus to put in priority their priority order, how to address these issues.

Then we brought them both back together again and worked on coming to consensus about what the priority list should be. And that's what we handed over to Mr. Homan.
Q. And based on your evaluation, what were some of the principal concerns that you had?
A. Lack of information. The biggest concern for all the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
allottees that I heard all over the country was I don't know what's in my account. When I get a check in the mail, I don't know what that money's from. Nobody tells me unless it's an oil and gas. And at that time we were sending out an explanation of payment with oil and gas checks.

But if they got a lease check, sometimes the clerk would have put on there what it was for, what lease number it was, and sometimes they didn't. And some allottees didn't even know what land they owned or whether it was leased or not.
Q. Okay. There's been discussions in this case about whether any accounting should include the hard assets. Did you have any thoughts about that?
A. Well, how do you come up with an accounting for the money
if you don't know what generated the money and whether it was right?
Q. Were you also involved in a project called Tiger Team?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was Tiger Team?
A. It was a group of, $\mathbf{I}$ think there was about $\mathbf{2 0}$ of us in OTFM, BIA, MMS, and it was led by one of the managers out of the MMS, Minerals Management Service. And we had a specific charge to look at, I think there were three different kinds of issues, which was are there policies and procedures currently in place designed to give us a -- are we doing things correctly based on the current policies and procedures. Are the accounting systems Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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adequate for what it is our job is and what we need to be doing, and are we providing appropriate information? Are we working through this -- through the different Interior agencies together in order to provide this information and to get this right?
Q. If we could see Plaintiffs' Exhibit 607. Ms. Infield, is this a copy of the Tiger Team report that was prepared on August 1995?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And if you could look at page 2 of that document and focus in on the area marked "Problems." And does this identify the problems you and your team identified after your investigation?
A. That's true. That's correct.
Q. Number 1, automated systems are costly to run and maintain and segments are inadequate. 2, data records are outdated and/or inaccurate. And No. 3, poor internal controls and inconsistent practices exist.

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection, Your Honor. This area
goes into trust reform, not historical accounting.
THE COURT: I'll allow it. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes. Those are the problems that the
team consolidated down to.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And this is a fairly lengthy document so I'm not going to
ask you that much about it. Do you recall specific concerns
that were had regarding MMS?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter the oil companies would report to MMS how much oil they sold and how much royalty they were supposed to pay, and they would pay that.

And then MMS would try to verify that back to a lease number and create the file that they would send to BIA for distribution for Indian allottees and tribes. And so they relied on the honor system to do that. And then if they couldn't verify that back to a particular lease, that got held in abeyance or in an error file up in MMS, and it never was sent to us for distribution, until they could clear it from their system.
Q. What if any concerns were raised regarding whether what MMS collected was actually reported to BIA?
A. We couldn't tell. There was no mechanism in place to determine whether or not, if MMS collected $\$ 5$ here, did they send $\$ 5$ to us for distribution.
Q. Okay. And if we could look at page 8 of this document,
please. And focus in on the highlighted section at the bottom of the page. And did you also identify problems with the real estate system, the LRIS system?
A. That's correct.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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## Q. And what were generally the nature of those problems?

A. Well, LRIS was so far backlogged with encoding data, there were lands that were sold or bought or moved from fee to trust, or had been distributed in estates, and they just -- the people that were in the LRIS business in the title plants just couldn't 6 keep up with the volume of records that needed to be recorded.

22 Q. And if we could see Exhibit 4154. This is a notice of
23 filing by the government of the HLIP. If we could turn to page
A. Well, some of the things that -- some of the problems with MMS is that we were never sure that when they got money it was being sent to us for distribution. For instance, they relied on the honor system with the oil companies to pay in royalties. So

And then not everybody had an LRIS activity going on. For instance, Five Civilized Tribes and Osage, none of their documents were ever recorded to LRIS.
Q. The last sentence says, "Instead, many office staff relied on their cuff records." What are cuff records?
A. Cuff records. In my experience, cuff records were either our manual records we kept, for instance at the Osage Agency, or the IRMS lease and owner, or if you were in Aberdeen it was MAD,

1 A. I believe it is, yes.

that would have been realty data cleanup at that time.
Q. Did you actually do some pilot agency studies on data cleanup?
A. We did on the IIM data cleanup. I'm sorry, this is July --
yeah, that would have been realty. When I was at OTFM in ' 95 and ' 96 we did some pilot work in the Billings region for IIM data cleanup.
Q. What are the areas of the country you did those pilots?
A. Just in the Billings area is when we did the pilots, just for those agencies.
Q. And what did you discover when you did those pilot studies?
A. Well, we went out to Flathead Agency and we brought the records back to Albuquerque to work on because the tribe was compacting the agency's function. So we brought all the IIM records into OTFM. And what we discovered was that they had jacket folders in file cabinets in the agency, but they also had mounds of records out in garages, that we had to have like six feet of drifts of snow moved in order to get to so that we could tape up what was left of the box so we could get it on a truck and ship it to Albuquerque.

When we got it down to Albuquerque, we started pulling reports in the system and trying to match the jacket folders to

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

1758
the accounts on the system.
Q. And when you say jacket folders, you're trying to compare the paper records to the electronic records?
A. That's correct. Only for the master records, for the master file database. Because these jacket folders had information in them about the account holder, name, date of birth, and they may have changed over time with a marriage or divorce or whatever. And whether or not they were a minor, and those kinds of things. And they had a lot of correspondence in them.

And some of them were controlled accounts so you would see some social services records in there where social services had approved expenditures out of the account for certain things. So that's what we were looking at. We were trying to determine if the data on the system in the master records was consistent with the paper records that were in the jacket file.
Q. Is that what is meant by data cleanup?
A. Yes. We were cleaning up the data in the systems based on the paper records.
Q. And did you find jacket files regarding account holders with no information on the electronic system?
A. We did.
Q. How about electronic records with no corresponding jacket
file?
A. We did.


| \$ | '97 [1] - 1697:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1664:9, 1664:11, } \\ & \text { 1672:3, 1672:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 1686:17, 1686:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1697:21, 1716:2, } \\ & \text { 1716:6, 1718:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$13 [3]-1654:1, 1654:11, 1654:12 \$130,000 [1] - | 0 | 1672:24 | 1687: | 1724:12 |
|  |  | 13.6 [1] - 1663:23 | $1995{ }_{[1]}$ - 1754:7 | 25,000 [1] - 1693:9 |
|  | 0894 [1] - 1645:24 | 30[2]-1731:17, | 1998 [1]-1691:22 | 25-year [2] - |
| 1697:20 | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1731: 18 \\ & 130,000{ }_{[1]}-1723: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 1999 [1] - 1680:14 | 1733:15, 1734:25 |
| \$14[1]-1655:12 |  |  |  | $26{ }_{[1]}$ - 1646:19 |
| \$22.50 [3]-1703:1, | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { [8]-1667:17, } \\ \text { 1703:2, 1703:12, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135[3]-1691: 6, \\ 1692: 12.1693: 5 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 27101 [1] - 1639:25 |
| 1703:18, 1729:23 |  | $14[1]-1656: 11$ | $2 \text { [5] - 1693:13, }$ | 2800 [1] - 1639:17 |
| \$30 [1] - 1698:8 $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1703:2, 1703:12, } \\ & \text { 1710:20, 1726:5, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2}[5]-1693: 13, \\ 1701: 5,1734: 16, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1671:19 | 1726:20, 1729:16, | 14.3 [3]-1655:13, $1655: 15,1667: 19$ | 1754:9, 1754:14 |  |
| \$35,570 [1] - 1723:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1754:13 } \\ & 1,000[2]-1693: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 14th [2]-1639:13, | 2,229 [1] - 1738:1 | 3 [7] - 1648:16 |
| \$500 [4]-1702:25, |  | 1639:20 | 2.6 [1]-1673:22 | 1650:5, 1650:22, |
| 1729:24, 1730:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1,000 [2]-1693:8, } \\ & \text { 1693:9 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 20 [8] - 1641:23, | 1659:7, 1673:19, |
| 1730:3 | 1-1/2 [1] - 1660:19 | $\begin{gathered} 15[3]-1694: 20 \\ 1694: 21,1701: 24 \end{gathered}$ | 1686:15, 1697:22, | 1696:6, 1754:15 |
| \$58,000 [2] - 1690:1, | $1.5[7]-1648: 22$ | $154.5_{[1]}-1649: 2$ | 1709:12, 1716:1, | 3.8 [1]-1674:5 |
| 1690:3 | 1654:3, 1668:6, | 16[6]-1716:21, | 1718:16, 1730:12, | 3.832.1 [2] - 1652:20, |
| \$60,000 [7] - 1703:4, | 1678:3, 1701:23 | 1719:13, 1719:17, | 1753:19 | 1674:5 |
| 1703:14, 1703:16, |  |  | 20-page [1] - | 30 [2] - 1660:7, |
| 1704:7, 1726:6, | $10 \text { [15] - 1643:5, }$ | 1725:7, 1727:17, 1732:16 | 1709:19 | 1749:8 |
| 1726:13, 1729:11 | 1656:24, 1679:8, | 1641 [1] - 1761:3 | 200 [1] - 1645:15 | 30-plus [1]-1747:18 |
| \$600,000 [1] - 1703:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1683:23, 1685:18, } \\ & \text { 1685:23, 1700:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 1667 [1] - 1761:4 | 20001 [1] - 1640:13 | 30-some [1] - 1683:4 |
| \$98,290 [1] - 1723:9 |  | $1676[1]-1761: 4$ | 20005 [3] - 1639:14, | 30309-4530 [1] - |
|  | 1708:25, 1709:2, |  | 1639:21, 1640:5 | 1639:17 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1709:14, 1710:7, } \\ & \text { 1712:23, 1731:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17[1]-1748: 4 \\ & 1708[1]-1761: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 1674:20, 1748:17 | 307-1104 [1] - |
| '07 [1] - 1731:23 |  | $171 \text { [4]-1650:10, }$ | 2002 [9]-1648:24 | 1640:10 |
| 1655:20, 1657:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 0 . 6}[1]-1655: 15 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 . 7}[2]-1657: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 1656:2, 1667:4, | 49:2 | [1]-1704: |
| '33 [1] - 1655:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10.7 [2]-1657:3, } \\ & \text { 1667:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 1667:5 | 1654:10, 1663: | [1] - 1640:13 |
| '34 [1] - 1655:8 | 10/3/3[1] - 1723:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 1729_{[1]}-1761: 6 \\ & 1732[2]-1761: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 1674:18 | $336$ |
| '50s [1] - 1742:5 | $100[1]-1661: 10$ |  | 2003 [7]-1674:3, | 34[2] - 1736:12, |
| '70s [2] - 1644:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 1001[1]-1639: 24 \\ & 1006[1]-1649: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 1733 [1] - 1761:6 | 1674:4, 1674:9, | 1739:21 |
| 1744:2 |  |  | 1674:25, 1683:23, | 354-3186 [1] - |
| '71 [3] - 1655:8, | 1006 [1] - 1649:16 10:30 [1] - 1649:13 11[1]-1656-24 | $1887 \text { [6] - 1648:20, }$ | 1701:22, 1751:5 | 1640:14 |
| 1655:21, 1657:2 |  | 1652:13, 1660:19, | 2004[8]-1716:21, | $36[3]-1740: 1$, |
| '72 [1] - 1657:3 |  | 1663:7 | 1719:13, 1719:17, | 1740:2, 1740:14 |
| '80s [2] - 1644:23, | 11,064 [1] - 1657:1 <br> 11/15/04 [1] - | $19[1]-1726: 3$ | 1725:6, 1725:7, | 365 [2] - 1664:23, |
| 1743:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1720:12 } \\ & \text { 11/15/2004 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1900s [1] - 1746:6 } \\ & \text { 1909 [2] - 1651:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 1727:11, 1727:17, | 1665:4 |
| '82 [2]-1735:23, |  |  | 1732:16 | 366 [5] - 1722:15, |
| 1744:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1720: 2 \\ & 11 / 18 / 04[1]- \\ & 1723: 13 \\ & 1100[2]-1639: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 1651:21 | 20044 [1] - 1640:10 | 1732:20, 1732:23, |
| '85 [1] - 1740:1 |  | 1933 [1]-1651:18 | 2005 [7]-1651:21, | 1733:2, 1733:4 |
| '86[3] - 1735:13, |  |  | 1655:13, 1657:4, | 367 [4]-1719:9, |
| 1740:1, 1740:16 |  | 1660:19 | 1695:17, 1713:9, | 1732:20, 1732:24, |
| '87 [4]-1697:21, |  |  | 1725:5, 1726:3 | 1761:10 |
| 1735:23, 1742:13, | $\begin{gathered} 12[7]-1680: 23 \\ \text { 1681:11, 1683:23, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1977\left[2^{2}\right] \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2006[2]-1704:18, | 368 [3]-1716:17, |
| 1749:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1980[1]-1668: 9 \\ & 1982[2]-1734: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 1706:12 | 1732:12, 1732:18 |
| '88 [1] - 1743:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1681:11, 1683:23, } \\ & \text { 1701:23, 1706:12, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2007 [5] - 1639:5, | 368............... |
| '89 [1] - 1743:17 | 12-person [2] 1680:16, 1682:12 | 1735:22 | 1648:19, 1680:2, | . [1] - 1761:9 |
| '90s [3] - 1735:14, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1735: 22 \\ & 1983[1]-1698: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 1686:15, 1728:1 | 369 [4]-1723:23, |
| 1744:14, 1747:20 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1985[3]-1735: 13, \\ & 1740: 1,1746: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 202 [5]-1639:14, | 1732:21, 1732:24, |
| '91[2]-1744:24, | 1680:16, 1682:12 <br> 13 [9]-1650:23, |  | 1639:22, 1640:5, | 1761:10 |
| 1749:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1652:1, 1652:4, } \\ & \text { 1663:19, 1674:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $1987 \text { [2] - 1742:10, }$ | 1640:10, 1640:14 | 3:14 [1] - 1692:19 |
| '92 [2] - 1691:20, |  | 1749:20 | 205B [1] - 1719:1 | 3:28[1] - 1692:19 |
| 1695:22 | 1751:1, 1751:9 | $1988 \text { [2] - 1740:8, }$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 2 [ 3 ] - 1 6 9 5 : 1 7 ,} \\ 1713: 9-1735: 4, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { '95 [2] - 1735:15, } \\ & 1757: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13.3[10]-1649:1, } \\ & \text { 1650:6, 1650:23, } \\ & \text { 1662:25, 1663:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 1740:20 | $\begin{array}{r} 1713: 9,1735: 4 \\ 23[1]-1639: 5 \end{array}$ | 4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { '96 [2]-1735:15, } \\ & \text { 1757:9 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1991[3]-1743: 1, \\ 1745: 14,1746: 9 \\ 1992[6]-1684: 1, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24[1]-1728: 11 \\ & 25[6]-1650: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4[7]-1646: 23 \\ \text { 1656:3, 1656:12, } \end{gathered}$ |


| 1656:19, 1663:20, | 607 [3] - 1639:13 | 1746:6, 1747:24 | 1723:18, 1724:9, | 1681:19, 1682:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1663:25, 1706:18 | 1639:20, 1754:5 | Aberdeen [1] | 1736:13, 1736:21, | 1687:14, 1700:17 |
| 0 [5] - 1660:7, | 607-7392 [1] | 1756:1 | 1737:11, 1737:17 | address [5] |
| 1662:20, 1744:19, | 1639:25 | abeyance [1] | 1741:10, 1741:12, | 1676:18, 1676:20, |
| 1751:19 | 626.1 [1] - 1652:2 | 1755:13 | 1741:13, 1741:14, | 1725:13, 1751:24 |
| 404 [1] - 1639:18 | 638 [2] - 1735:21, | able [4]-1642:22, | 1746:1, 1753:11, | 1752:18 |
| 4154 [1] - 1756:22 | 1735:25 | 1697:23, 1719:5 | 1753:13, 1753:25, | dressed [4] |
| 42 [1] - 1701:11 | 65-year [1] - 1694:19 | 1746:22 | 1754:18 | 1676:22, 1726:4 |
| 4208 [2]-1648:16, | $650[1]$ - 1672:25 | above-entitled [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { accounts [27] - } \\ \text { 1665:15, 1665:17, } \end{gathered}$ | 1727:11, 1752:13 <br> addresses [1] - |
| 1669:7 | 6714 [1] - 1640:12 | ```1762:5 abruptly [1] - 1747:2 absolute [1] - 1730:2 absolutely [1] - 1716:7``` |  |  |
| 4455 [1] - 1693:1 |  |  | 1666:20, 1666:2 | 1713:16 <br> addressing [2] |
| 4487 [1] - 1705:15 | 7 |  | 1697:13, 1698:2 |  |
| $4488{ }^{[1]}$ - 1704:10 |  |  | 1699:17, 1714:21, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1706:13, 1752:17 } \\ \text { adequacy }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 4489 [3] - 1703:7, |  |  | 1718:14, 1738:18, |  |
| 1725:14, 1726:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1643:12, 1643:13, } \\ & \text { 1646:3, 1675:4, } \end{aligned}$ | Absolutely [2] 1677:23, 1714:12 absorb [1] - 1673:15 | 1740:16, 1740:19, $1740 \cdot 21,1741.7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1699:11 } \\ & \text { adequate [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4494 [3]-1695:13, |  |  | 1740:21, 1741:7, 1741:8, 1741:13, |  |
| $4497 \text { [2] - 1686:10, }$ | 1689:14 | absorb [1] - 1673:15 <br> access [1] - 1659:20 | 1741:8, 1741:13, 1741:14, 1741:20 | 1695:10, 1754:1 |
| 1688:16 | 77 [2]-1665:17,1743:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accessed [1] - } \\ & \text { 1692:9 } \\ & \text { accomplished [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 1741:21, 1742:5, | 1760:18 |
| 4498 [5] - 1690:17, |  |  | 1745:24, 1746:1, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1690:18, 1692:23, } \\ & \text { 1708:19, 1708:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1756:17, 1758:1 } \\ & \text { 1758:11, 1759:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1691:11, 1694:5 } \\ & \text { administering }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4499 [1] - 1706:5 | 8 [7]-1639:9 | according [5] 1655:14, 1679:9 | 1759:24 accrued [3] - | 1702:12 <br> administration [1] - |
| 4501[1] - 1667:8 | 1643:5, 1643:9, |  |  |  |
| 4502 [2]-1649:10, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1655:14, 1679:9, } \\ & \text { 1700:11, 1726:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1648:23, 1649:2, } \\ & \text { 1661:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 1702:19 <br> administrative [9] - |
| 1673:9 | 1714:18, 1755:21 | 1729:17 <br> According [1] - | accurate [5] - |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48-02[1]-1659: 7 \\ & 48-3-1[1]-1641: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $8.7[1]-1647: 11$ | 1720:23 | 1648:12, 1648:13, | 1703:13, 1703:23, |
| 4802 [1] - 1650:22 |  |  | 1702:15, 1706:1, | 1726:5, 1726:20,1726:25, 1729:11, |
|  | $80.7 \text { [5] - 1648:24, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { account [48] - } \\ & \text { 1658:13, 1662:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 1730:17 |  |
| 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1660:21, 1661:9, } \\ & \text { 1661:10, 1662:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 1697:15, 1697:17 | accurately [2] - 1647:23, 1714:11 | 1729:20 |
| 5 [14] - 1647:3, | $\begin{gathered} 81[6]-1715: 1, \\ 1717: 22,1720: 9, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1697:23, 1714:19, } \\ & \text { 1714:25, 1715:3, } \end{aligned}$ | acquired [1] | 1689:1 <br> admitted [1] - 1681:2 |
| 1663:19, 1672:4, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1691:22 } \\ & \text { acronym [1] - 1699:1 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | 1721:8, 1722:24, | 1715:6, 1715:9, |  | advance [1] - |
| 1675:13, 1675:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 1724: 8 \\ & 815-6450[1]- \end{aligned}$ | 1715:13, 1715:18, <br> 1716:5, 1716:23, | acronym [1]-1699:1 act $[2]-1703: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1666:10 } \\ & \text { advise }[1]-1682: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1675:20, 1677:16, |  |  | 1704:1 |  |
| 1694:10, 1755:19, | 1639:18 | 1716:24, 1717:22, | acting [7] - 1695:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { advised }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 1718:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1755:20, 1756:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 1639: 14 \\ & 886[1]-1651: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1718:15, 1721:16, } \\ & \text { 1721:18, 1721:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1705:18, 1713:10, } \\ & \text { 1715:23, 1720:19, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1747:13, 1751:19 |  |  |  | 1718:17 advising [2] - |
|  |  | 1722:2, 1722:9, | 1720:24 <br> Action [1] - 1639:3 | ```1682:13, 1683:10 advocate [1] - 1681:17 Affairs [9] - 1680:4,``` |
| 508 [1]-1701:19 | 9 | 1722:19, 1722:22, | Action [1] - 1639:3 <br> action [3]-1700:5, |  |
| ,000 [1]-1690 | 9 [1] - 1641:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1724:4, 1724:12, } \\ & \text { 1724:23, 1725:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 1728:21, 1729:20 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Affairs [9]-1680:4, } \\ \text { 1680:18, 1682:13, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $584 \mathrm{S0000}{ }^{[1]}$ - | 9.6[4]-1674:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1724:23, 1725:4, } \\ & \text { 1730:5, 1730:11, } \end{aligned}$ | actively [1] - 1687:19 activities [2] - | 1682:17, 1695:18, |
| 1722:22 | 1675:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1730:16, 1738:5, } \\ & \text { 1738:7, 1738:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1682:3, 1712:3 } \\ & \text { activity }[2]-1730: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 1713:10, 1734:11,1734:14, 1743:18 |
| 585-0053 [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 1639:22 | 90 [1] - 1731:22 | 1738:16, 1738:24, | 1756:7 | affecting [1] - |
| 5:17 [1] - 1760:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 900 \text { [2]-1639:21, } \\ & \text { 1704:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1741:24, 1741:25, } \\ & \text { 1742:7, 1746:3, } \\ & 1753: 2,1758: 6, \end{aligned}$ | actual [1] - 1661:14 <br> add [7]-1655:1, |  |
| 6 | 95 [2] - 1672:22, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1683:11 } \\ & \text { affiliation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 1758:13, 1758:20account's [1] - | 1664:9, 1672:9, | afternoon [10] - |
| 6[6]-1643:5 | 96-1285 [1] - 1639:3 $\mathbf{9 7 5}[1]-1640: 9$ |  | 1677:13added [4] - 1651:11, | 1641:4, 1641:5,1641:9, 1668:1, |
| 1643:9, 1663:19, $1675: 5,1689: 13$, | 9:30[1] - 1760:16 | 1738:4 |  |  |
| 1675:5, 1689:13, 1701.22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accounted [1] - } \\ & \text { 1646:16 } \\ & \text { accounting [20] - } \\ & \text { 1674:16, 1699:1, } \\ & \text { 1699:12, 1717:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1660:21, 1667:3, } \\ & \text { 1687:16 } \\ & \text { adding [2]-1654:3, } \\ & \text { 1667:7 } \\ & \text { addition [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1668:2, 1678:24, } \\ & \text { 1678:25, 1679:4, } \\ & \text { 1708:16, 1708:17 } \\ & \text { AFTERNOON }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 1639:7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{6 0}[1]-1662: 21 \\ & \mathbf{6 0 - 2 7 - 2}[1]-1657: 14 \\ & \mathbf{6 0 - 4 - 1}[1]-1678: 8 \end{aligned}$ | A |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A10 }[1]-1744: 16 \\ & \text { A10s }[4]-1744: 20, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |



| ```assumes [1] - 1662:15 assumption [3] - 1658:10, 1660:24, 1661:2 assumptions [2] - 1657:16, 1658:8 Atlanta [1] - 1639:17 attached [4] - 1654:2, 1709:9, 1710:4, 1712:25 attachment [1] - 1705:19 attempt [1] - 1652:20 attempted [3] - 1648:11, 1663:11, 1668:25 attempting [1] - 1678:13 attention [15] - 1686:9, 1688:15, 1689:13, 1689:16, 1690:16, 1695:7, 1698:4, 1701:18, 1701:23, 1703:6, 1704:10, 1704:13, 1705:15, 1713:6, 1746:14 Attorney [1] - 1640:7 attorney [2]-1682:1, 1682:5 attributable [1] - 1642:21 Audit [1] - 1705:18 audit [1] - 1686:13 auditing [1] - 1700:24 auditor [1] - 1696:4 August [3] - 1648:19, 1704:18, 1754:6 aunt [1] - 1739:7 author [2]-1706:20, 1707:23 authority [1] - 1702:17 automate [1] - 1687:17 automated [6] - 1687:23, 1691:21, 1691:22, 1695:2, 1695:23, 1754:13 automatic [1] - 1691:24 automatically [1] - 1691:25 available [3] - 1648:13, 1672:16, 1717:15 Avenue [1] - 1640:13``` |  | ```beat [1] - 1727:5 became [2] - 1687:7, 1730:24 becomes [1] - 1655:11 BEFORE [1] - 1639:9 began [1] - 1751:14 begin [1] - 1743:16 beginning [5] - 1689:16, 1704:25, 1728:3, 1742:6, 1742:7 begins [2] - 1652:19, 1727:11 behalf [3] - 1652:11, 1681:15, 1759:16 behind [1] - 1723:19 belabor [1] - 1668:5 belonged [5] - 1697:24, 1718:17, 1722:10, 1730:10, 1730:11 belongs [1] - 1651:25 below [1] - 1701:10 Ben [1] - 1640:9 bench [1]-1692:17 Bench [1] - 1692:18 beneficial [1] - 1727:13 beneficiaries [2] - 1671:1, 1702:3 beneficiary [4] - 1671:4, 1682:2, 1700:22, 1722:2 benefit [3] - 1662:11, 1684:13, 1685:3 best [2] - 1654:8, 1693:10 better [3] - 1708:7, 1726:23 between [7] - 1645:8, 1654:24, 1660:19, 1666:17, 1675:1, 1703:11, 1728:18 Beyal [2] - 1720:21, 1720:22 Beyond [1] - 1678:10 beyond [3] - 1665:24, 1677:9, 1684:16 BIA [25] - 1644:22, 1645:4, 1680:6, 1683:2, 1683:8, 1690:4, 1691:4, 1703:23, 1704:4, 1706:10, 1715:5, 1717:19, 1718:3, 1718:22, 1721:1,``` | ```1728:12, 1729:20, 1733:16, 1734:17, 1735:20, 1749:19, 1751:18, 1753:20, 1755:9, 1755:17 BIA's [2] - 1717:11, 1718:1 big [3] - 1659:12, 1659:13, 1696:22 biggest [1] - 1752:25 billboard [2] - 1696:14, 1696:22 Billings [3] - 1744:1, 1757:9, 1757:12 billion [44]-1648:22, 1648:24, 1649:1, 1649:2, 1650:6, 1650:23, 1652:1, 1652:4, 1654:1, 1654:11, 1654:12, 1655:12, 1655:13, 1656:3, 1656:11, 1656:12, 1656:19, 1657:3, 1658:24, 1660:19, 1662:15, 1662:25, 1663:19, 1663:20, 1663:24, 1663:25, 1664:9, 1664:11, 1667:19, 1667:20, 1672:3, 1672:24, 1673:22, 1674:14, 1674:21, 1675:1, 1675:4, 1675:5, 1675:8, 1675:12, 1675:13, 1675:17, 1675:20 Bird [1] - 1720:19 birth [1] - 1758:7 bit [6] - 1658:15, 1691:15, 1713:18, 1728:25, 1737:13, 1739:19 blank [22]-1655:9, 1709:25, 1710:17, 1710:23, 1710:24, 1710:25, 1711:2, 1711:3, 1711:4, 1711:12, 1711:13, 1711:14, 1711:15, 1711:23, 1712:4, 1712:6, 1712:14, 1712:23, 1713:2, 1731:8, 1731:10 BLM [6] - 1641:10, 1641:11, 1641:12, 1641:19, 1642:6, 1737:17 board [2] - 1681:1, 1745:12 Board [1] - 1728:21``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





| 1686:3 | 1752:7 | distinction [1] - | 1686:10, 1689:7, | 1652:13, 1658:24, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| detailed [1] - | DIRK [1] - 1639:6 | 1739:17 | 1690:18, 1690:22, | 1660:21 |
| 1649:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { disaster }{ }_{[1]}- \\ 1734: 24 \end{gathered}$ | distinctions [1] -1666-17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1690:23, 1691:4, } \\ & \text { 1691:6, 1691:13, } \end{aligned}$ | Dollars [1] - 1649:1 |
| 1643:13, 1700:21, | disbursement [2] - | distinguish [1] - | 1693:4, 1693:13 | 1672:10, 1672:15 |
| 1717:12, 1717:19, | 1661:5, 1667:21 | 1736:5 | 1693:14, 1695:11, | 1680:11, 1683:25, |
| 1718:16, 1719:5, | disbursements [22] - | distinguishable [1] - | 1695:14, 1696:6, | 1687:8, 1701:17, |
| 1741:23, 1752:16, | 1651:13, 1654:21, | 1736:7 | 1697:7, 1701:19, | 1707:1, 1750:16, |
| 1755:19, 1758:14, $1760: 4$ | 1654:25, 1655:3, | distinguishing [1] - | 1701:24, 1703:8, 1704:11, 1704:14, | $1760: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1760:4 } \\ & \text { determined }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1655:8, 1655:22, } \\ & \text { 1656:8, 1660:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 1683:19 distribut | 1704:11, 1704:14, 1704:18, 1705:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { door [3]-1666:23, } \\ & \text { 1670:21, 1760:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1704:21, 1715:13, | 1661:8, 1661:10, | 1690:11, 1750:12, | 1706:16, 1708:9, | DORRIS [1] - |
| 1716:1 <br> determining [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1662:9, 1662:16, } \\ & \text { 1662:20, 1662:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1759:24 } \\ & \text { distributed }[11] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 1708:24, 1709:13, <br> 1709:14, 1709:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1639:16 } \\ & \text { down [19] - 1651:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1718:18 | 1667:20, 1676:17, | 1736:15, 1738:14, | 1709:19, 1709:21, | 1659:4, 1678:21 |
| detriment [3] - 1684:14, 1685:3, | 1676:18, 1676:20, 1676:22, 1723:8, | 1738:15, 1738:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1710:4, 1710:11, } \\ & \text { 1710:15, 1710:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 1678:22, 1696:7, |
| 1685:4 | 1723:21 | 1740:12, 1750:1 | 1712:22, 1712:25, | 1718:8, 1718:23, |
| develop [1] - 1687:4 | Disbursing [1] - | 1750:5, 1756:4 | 1713:1, 1713:16, | 1732:4, 1732:6, |
| developed [5] - | 1738:20 | 1759:23 | 1713:17, 1713:19, 1714:19, 1717:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1741:22, 1748:4, } \\ & \text { 1748:6, 1750:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1683:24, 1707:3 | disclosed [2] - | 1739:16 | 1717:15, 1719:14, | 1752:12, 1754:21 |
| developer [1] - | 1666:1, 1666:10 | distributing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1720:4, 1720:5, } \\ & \text { 1720:8, 1721:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $1757: 24,1760: 6$ |
| 1701:12 <br> developmen | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disclosure [1] - } \\ & \text { 1665:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1737:21 } \\ & \text { distribu } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1720:8, 1721:8, } \\ & \text { 1721:21, 1721:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dozen [2] - 1696:2, } \\ & \text { 1731:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1706:25 | disclosures [4] - | 1736:22, 1749:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1722:16, 1722:21, } \\ & \text { 1723:19, 1723:22, } \end{aligned}$ | dozens [1] - 1659:21 |
| difference [7] 1644:6, 1645:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 1686: 16,1689: 1 \\ & 1728: 3,1728: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 1750:10, 1750:15, 1755:3, 1755:10, | 1723:23, 1724:2, | $\begin{gathered} \text { draft [6] - 1686:13, } \\ \text { 1686:14, 1688:22, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1665:13, 1667:20 | discover $[4]$ | 1755:14, 1755:20, | $1727: 18,1733: 5$ $1733: 9,1754: 9$ | 1688:23, 1688:25 |
| $1674: 25,1677: 4$, $1736: 7$ | 1686:20, 1746:22, | 1760:2, 1760:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1733:9, 1754:9, } \\ & \text { 1754:23, 1755:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 1689:3 |
| 1736:7 <br> different $[7]$ $\qquad$ | 1751:21, 1757:14 discovered [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { distributions [1] - } \\ & \text { 1750:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 1756:24 | drafted [1] - 1732:13 <br> dramatically [1] - |
| 1642:17, 1687:10, | 1686:20, 1704:22, | DISTRICT [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Document }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 1725:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 1683:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1737:15, 1737:19 } \\ & 1753: 22,1754: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1705:2, 1745:14, } \\ & \text { 1745:18, 1757:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1639:1, 1639: } \\ & 1639: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1725:22 document's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { draw [1] - 1713:6 } \\ & \text { drifts [1] - 1757:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1756:17 | discrepancy [1] - | ditch [1] - 1690:24 | 1649:14 <br> documentation [5] - | dropping [1] - |
| 1644:16, 1645:17 | discussed [7] | Division [1] - 1640:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1685:12, 1685:17, } \\ & \text { 1688:9, 1730:25, } \end{aligned}$ | drove [1] - 1734:4 |
| 1737:13 | 1644:2, 1650:4, 1664:25, 1696:8 | divorce [1] - 1758:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1688:9, 1730:25, } \\ & \text { 1731:5 } \end{aligned}$ | due [5] - 1691:10, 1694:3, 1694:23 |
| $\operatorname{dig}_{[1]}-1727: 13$ | 1709:24, 1714:20, | docking [1] - 1690:4 document [105] - | documented [1] - | 1694:3, 1694:23 1696:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { direct [4]-1670:23, } \\ & \text { 1670:24, 1671:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1732:14 } \\ & \text { discussion [1] } \end{aligned}$ | 1641:10, 1641:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1648:3 } \\ & \text { documents [12] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { during }[3]-1681: 3, \\ 1690: 21,1735: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| 1671:5 | 1713:18 | 1645:25, 1646:1, | 1642:6, 1664:18, <br> 1664:20, 1665:8, | During [1] - 1678:13 |
| DIRECT [3]-1641:7, 1679:16, 1733:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discussions }[1] \text { - } \\ & 1753: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1646:6, 1646:11, | 1664:20, 1665:8, 1670:3, 1693:17 | duties [2]-1682:8, |
| 1679:16, 1733:22 <br> Direct [4]-1670:25, | 1753:10 dispar | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1646:20, 1646:23, } \\ & \text { 1647:7, 1647:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 1713:4, 1718:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1734:21 } \\ & \text { duty }[4]-1681: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| 1761:3, 1761:5, | 1655:23, 1655:25 | 1649:10, 1649:13, | 1718:11, 1719:15, 1723:15, 1756:9 | 1682:1, 1682:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1761:6 } \\ & \text { directi } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { displayed [1] - } \\ & \text { 1651:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1649:14, 1649:25, } \\ & \text { 1650:11, 1651:9, } \end{aligned}$ | DOI [3] - 1666:23, | $\begin{gathered} \text { DX }[7]-1664: 23, \\ \text { 1719:9, 1722:15, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1678:3, 1721:19 | playing [1] - | 1651:10, 1651:15, | 1669:13, 1670:22 | 1732:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { directly }[5]-1671: 3 \text {, } \\ & \text { 1672:6, 1704:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 1650:1 | 1651:16, 1651:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dollar [2]-1648:21, } \\ & \text { 1648:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 1732:18, 1761:9 |
| 1708:6, 1739:2 director [9] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1703:4 } \\ & \text { disregarded } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1655:17, 1655:21, } \\ & \text { 1655:24, 1656:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { dollar [9] - 1649:5, } \\ \text { 1649:6, 1652:13, } \end{gathered}$ | E |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1704:17, 1705:16, } \\ \text { 1705:18, 1720:20, } \\ \text { 1720:24, 1721:1, } \\ \text { 1721:3, 1745:23 } \\ \text { directors }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1669:11 } \\ & \text { disregarding }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 1697:3 } \\ & \text { distilled }[1] \text { - } \\ & 1752: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1657:15, 1657:19, } \\ & \text { 1657:24, 1664:19, } \\ & \text { 1664:24, 1664:25, } \\ & \text { 1665:6, 1665:8, } \\ & \text { 1665:20, 1666:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1652:14, 1653:1, } \\ & \text { 1658:14, 1660:17 } \\ & \text { dollars [9]-1648:22, } \\ & \text { 1649:3, 1649:4, } \\ & \text { 1649:9, 1652:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { e-mail }[3]-1706: 6, \\ \text { 1706:8, } 1706: 11 \\ \text { eager }[1]-1696: 21 \\ \text { earliest }[1]-1746: 9 \\ \text { early }[7]-1644: 23, \end{gathered}$ |



| explained [2] - | 1720:6, 1723:18, | 1680:16, 1680:21, | 1687:8, 1689:16, | forth [3]-1644:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1651: 9,1670: 21$ | 1730:23 | 1681:9, 1682:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1692:5, 1701:24, } \\ & \text { 1702:10, 1702:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 1686:21, 1729:19 |
| 1677:13 | 1665:24, 1683:9, | 1687:22, 1690:20, | 1705:25, 1706:1, | 1686:2, 1688:6, |
| explains [2] - | 1688:3, 1694:13, | 1715:12, 1720:24, | 1708:18, 1710:20, | 1692:14 |
| 1651:25, 1708:3 | 1718:6, 1721:6, | 1737:17, 1737:18 | 1713:7, 1713:13, | Fourth [1] - 1639:24 |
| explanation [2] - | 1740:4, 1740:24, | figure [3]-1647:22, | 1721:21, 1722:21, | fourth [1]-1704:25 |
| $\begin{gathered} 1655: 25,1753: 4 \\ \text { exposure }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1756:2 } \\ & \text { fashion [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1664:8, 1675:12 } \\ & \text { figured }[1]-1715: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1726:11, 1735:3, } \\ & \text { 1735:16, 1738:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { frame [2] - 1738:11, } \\ & 1738: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1749:21 | 1686:18, 1707:24 | $\begin{gathered} \text { file [18]-1689:23, } \\ \text { 1692:12, 1696:4, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1743:24, 1743:25, } \\ & \text { 1744:2, 1749:18, } \end{aligned}$ | Francisco [2] - |
| 1666:12, 1666:14 | 1642:9, 1646:5, | 1697:19, 1717:2 | 1751:25 | $9$ |
| expressing [1] - | 1668:1, 1669:9, | 1738:23, 1748:22 | Fish [2]-1680:19, | frankly [2]-1658:16, |
| 1695:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1673:9, 1673:10, } \\ & \text { 1675:24, 1678:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 1750:10, 1750:12, 1750:13, 1750:16, | 1682:14 <br> five [14] - 1651:11 | 1693:16 |
| 1682:3, 1744:22 | 1761:3 | 1755:9, 1755:13 | 1682:22, 1684:7, | frequently [2] - |
| extra [1] - 1656:12 | Fasold's [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1757:19, 1758:5, } \\ & \text { 1758:16, 1758:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1694:21, 1694:22, } \\ & \text { 1706:25, 1725:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 1646:14, 1694:3 |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1666:9, 1673:5 } \\ & \text { father }[1]-1739: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1759:5 } \\ & \text { filed [3] - 1654:S } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1743:11, 1748:23 } \\ & 1748: 25,1749: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 1733:24, 1746:1 |
| face [2] - 1656:3, | fax [1] - 1750:15 | 1728:20, 1743:7 | 1750:25, 1752:3 | fully [1] - 1687:16 |
| 1656:7 | FDIC ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1668:21 | files [10] - 1700:4, 1717.24 1717:25, | Five [3] - 1742:16, 1743:3, 1756:8 | function [1] |
| $\text { 1665:9, } 16$ | FDIC-in 1668:21 | 1717:24, 1717:2 1718:1, 1718:3, | $174$ | 1757:17 |
| 1687:21, 1688:7 | feature [1] - 1677:7 | 1719:22, 1724:2 | Flathead [1] - | 1672:16, 1704:5 |
| 1698:1, 1708:6, | features [1] - | 1730:22, 1730:24 | 1757:1 | fund [5] - 1647:14, |
| 1712:14, 1713:23, 1715:8. 1715:15. | 1668:22 | 1758:20 | Floor [1] - 1639:13 | 1684:23, 1685:7, |
| 1719:6, 1723:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Federal [3] - } \\ & \text { 1728:23, 1751:15, } \end{aligned}$ | fill [2] - 1747:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { focus }[3]-1714 \\ 1754: 9,1755: 22 \end{gathered}$ | 1699:22 |
| $1724: 8,1725: 1$, $1726: 10,1726 \cdot 13$, | 1756:19 | 1748:18 | folder [1] - 1759:8 | 1647:13, 1683:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1726:10, 1726:13, } \\ & \text { 1726:16, 1730:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { federal [2] - 1702:11, } \\ & \text { 1702:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { filled }[5] \text { - 1691:15 } \\ \text { 1691:17, 1694:25, } \end{gathered}$ | folders [5] - 1757:19, | 1683:17, 1683:21, |
| 1739:7 | fee [21] - 1700:11, | 1695:1, 1711:22 | 1758:5, 1759:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1684:3, 1684:4, } \\ & \text { 1684:10, 1684:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| factor [6] - 1645:12 | 1700:13, 1702:24, | final [2]-1733:9 | follow [3] - 1715:22, | 1685:6, 1685:9, |
| 1645:13, 1645:14, | 1703:3, 1703:13 | 1759: | 1724:24, 1724:25 | 1685:11, 1685:13, |
| 1649:8, 1681:13 factored [1] - | 1703:17, 1703:18, <br> 1703:25, 1704:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { finalized }{ }^{[1]} \\ & \text { 1726:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { follow-up [1] - } \\ & \text { 1724:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 1685:14, 1685:16, |
| 1643:21 | $1726: 5,1726: 7$ | finally [1] - 1696:12 | followed [1] - 1722:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1687:5, 1688:5, } \\ & \text { 1688:6, 1697:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| facts [1] - 1689:21 factually [1] - | 1726:9, 1726:13, | finance [1] - 1741:10 | Following [1] - | 1698:15, 1698:17, |
| factually [1] - 1702:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1726:20, 1726:25, } \\ & \text { 1727:4, 1729:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { financial [5] - } \\ \text { 1657:21, } 1658: \end{array}$ | 1724:12 | 1699:10, 1699:13, 1699:21, 1700:22 |
| failed [1] - 1690:10 | 1729:16, 1729:17, | 1665:8, 1668:20, | 1652:23, 1667:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1699:21, 1700:22, } \\ & \text { 1704:1, 1708:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| failure [5] - 1679:12, | 1730:2, 1756:3 | 1668:21 | FOR [3] - 1639:1, | 1708:9, 1717:3, |
| 1688:5, 1691:2, | fees [15]-1702:6, | fine [2] - 1747:9 | 1679:15, 1733:21 | 1717:15, 1722:10, |
| 1713:18, 1713:19 | 1702:18, 1702:19, | 1747:11 | Forbes [2]-1668:13, | 1722:18, 1724:9, |
| Failure [1] - 1714:21 | 1702:22, 1703:1, | Fine [2]-1664:15, | 1669:2 | 1726:15, 1726:17, |
| $\text { fair }[10]-1681: 6,$ 1681:8, 1683:13 | 1703:20, 1704:2, 1704:6. 1725:16. | 1722:13 | Force [2] - 1751:16, | 1741:11, 1741:12 |
| 1685:7, 1687:1, | 1729:14, 1729:17, | finished [1] | force [2] - 1751:17, | G |
| 1706:14, 1726:6, | 1729:24, 1730:3 | 1746:24 | 1752:14 |  |
| 1734:25, 1736:4, 1737:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1731:1 } \\ & \text { feet }[1]-1757: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fire [2]-1728:16, } \\ & 1729: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { foregoing }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 1762:4 } \end{aligned}$ | gaps [1] - 1748:18 garages [1] - |
| fairly [6] - 1697:23, | few [5] - 1658:16, | First [2]-1654:17, | forever [2] - 1748:11, | 1757:20 |
| 1722:8, 1726:25, | $1668: 3,1668: 8$ | 1668:5 | 1751:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { garnered [1] - } \\ & 1643 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1727:3, 1727:6, } \\ & 1754: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 1694:8, 1701:6 fiduciary [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { first [35] - 1641:18, } \\ \text { 1644:17, 1654:16, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { form [3] - 1686:14, } \\ & \text { 1688:25, 1708:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 1643:3 <br> gas [22] - 1644:3, |
| falls [2] - 1689:1, | 1682:1, 1682:8 | 1654:22, 1658:7, | format [2] - 1647:1, | 1644:6, 1644:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1701:10 } \\ & \text { familiar [6] - 1687:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { field [17] - 1679:6, } \\ \text { 1679:22, 1680:5, } \end{gathered}$ | 1669:13, 1673:13, 1680:15, 1683:22. | 1647:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1664:2, 1669:20, } \\ & \text { 1671:1, 1674:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1716:20, 1720:4, | 1680:12, 1680:15, | 1683:23, 1687:6, | formulas [1] - 1660:2 | 1675:1, 1682:25, |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1736:21, 1736:24, } \\ & \text { 1737:5, 1737:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1752:17, 1756:23 } \\ \text { Government [12] - } \end{gathered}$ | H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1650:24 } \\ & \text { headright [12] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1750:21, } 1754: 18 \\ & \text { history }[4]-1644: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1737:16, 1737:20 | 1649:11, 1659:20, | half [1] - 1680:3 | 1736:15, 1737:22, | 1684:12, 1723:25, |
| 1738:2, 1739:14, | 1659:23, 1662:10 | hall [2]-1718:8, | 1737:24, 1737:25 | 1724 |
| 1749:24, 1753:4, | 1663:9, 1664:12, | 1718:23 | 1738:19, 1738:22, | HLIP [1] - 1756:23 |
| 1753:5, 1759:20, | 1667:9, 1673:24, | hand [16] - 1649:20, | 1739:3, 1739:6, | hold [4] - 1730:8, |
| 1759:21 | 1674:23, 1678:3, | 1649:22, 1650:3, | 1739:9, 1739:1 | 1739:19, 1745:8 |
| gather [2] - 1663:17, | 1682:5, 1701:2 | 1650:4, 1650:8 | 1740:10, 1740:12 | 1759:2 |
| 1747:8 | Government's [6] | 1651:10, 1651:14, | headrights [1] - | holder [1] - 1758:6 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { gathered [2] - } \\ \text { 1752:4, 1752:5 } \end{array}$ | 1663:19, 1671:19, 1674:19, 1678:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1652:19, 1665:11, } \\ & \text { 1665:12, 1691:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 1644:18 <br> hear [1] - 1676:1 | holders [1] - 1758:20 |
| General [6] - | 1679:9, 1689:14 | 1695:1, 1709:15, | heard [6]-1671:14, | Holt [1] - 1648:7 |
| 1683:25, 1714:5, | graduation [1] | 1710:1, 1712:11, | 1689:14, 1717:1, | Homan [5] - 1733:19, |
| 1714:14, 1715:24 | 1680:20 | 1712:24 | 1717:6, 1748:20, | 1735:9, 1751:14, |
| 1722:1, 1728:7 | grandiose [1] | handed [3] | 1753:1 | 1751:24, 1752:22 |
| general [7]-1645:8, | 1660:10 | 1721:21, 1725:22, $1752 \cdot 2$ | ${ }_{\text {HEARING }}{ }^{\text {[1] - }}$ | home [4]-1679:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1662:9, 1679:12, } \\ & \text { 1685:2, 1701:20, } \end{aligned}$ | Grandiose [1] - 1660:12 | 1752:22 | 1639:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1680:1, 1728:1, } \\ & \text { 1734:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1741:14 | grasping [1] - 1665:8 | ndle [1] - 1740:11 | 1684:17 | honestly [1] - |
| generally [5] - <br> 1669:19, 1680:21 | Great [1] - 1756:15 | handled [1] - 1737:2 | hearsay [1] | 1693:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1669:19, 1680:21, } \\ & \text { 1684:5, 1713:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { great [2]-1704:23, } \\ & \text { 1739:14 } \end{aligned}$ | hard [7] - 1664:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1688:25 } \\ & \text { heavily }[1]-16 \end{aligned}$ | honor [3] - 1699:22, |
| 1756:1 | gross [2] - 1701:4 | 1675:2, 1725:23, | heirs [1] - 1703:11 | Honor [73]-1641:4, |
| generate [1] - 1669:9 generated [3] - | 1701:11 grossly [1] - 1684 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1736:4, 1753:1 } \\ \text { hard-rock [1] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { held [3]-1696:19, } \\ & \text { 1745:2, 1755:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1642:8, 1643:9, } \\ & \text { 1649:12, 1652:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1670:15, 1675:12 | group [3] - 1678:5 | 1674:12 | help [5] - 1661:23, | 1657:23, 1658:21, |
| 1753: | 1751:23, 1753:1 | rper [16] | 1662:3, 1667:5, | 1659:6, 1659:14, |
| generating [2] - | groups [2] - 1665:11, | 1678:23, 1686:7, | 1708:7, 1718:19 | 1659:21, 1660:15, |
| 1670:18, 1701:17 | 1666:24 | 1688:3, 1690:13, | Herman [4]-1651:9, | 1661:5, 1662:18, |
| generous [1] | guaranteed [2] | 1692:16, 1692:20, | 1651:23, 1663:23, | 1663:3, 1663:10, |
| 1701:7 | 1701:8, 1701:9 | 1699:14, 1708:24, | 1759:10 | 1665:7, 1665:22, |
| geographically [1] - | guess [5] - 1665:7, | 1709:6, 1709:9, | high [8] - 1644:13, | 1666:4, 1666:8 |
| 1718:4 | 1685:24, 1687:24, | 1709:24, 1710:11, | 1672:8, 1672:11, | 1666:21, 1667:12, |
| Georgia [1] | 1690:24, 1731:18 | 1712:10, 1714:19, | 1692:5, 1702:22 | 1667:23, 1671:17, |
| 1639:17 | GUI [1] - 1744:4 | 1726:2, 1729:6 | 1729:24, 1756:20, | 1671:20, 1672:11, |
| gigabytes [1] - | GUILDER [43] | HARPER [35] - | 1756:24 | 1672:19, 1676:5, |
| 1744:20 | 1639:19, 1641:4, | 1639:19, 1678:24 | high-level [1] - | 1677:8, 1677:13, |
| GINGOLD ${ }_{[2]}$ | 1641:8, 1642:13, | 1679:1, 1679:4, | 1756:20 | 1678:9, 1678:19, |
| 1639:12, 1639:12 | 1643:19, 1649:17, | 1679:17, 1684:22, | higher [1] - 1648:4 | 1678:24, 1679:5, |
| Gingold [4] - 1668:8, | 1649:19, 1650:20, | 1685:1, 1685:20, | highest [2] - 1701:5, | 1684:15, 1684:22, |
| 1668:19, 1668:23, | 1650:21, 1651:4, | 1686:8, 1688:4 | 1702:24 | 1685:20, 1686:4, |
| 1669:1 | 1653:3, 1653:19, | 1688:14, 1688:23 | highlight [1] - | $1687: 25,1688: 4,$ |
| GIS [5] - 1642:19, | 1653:20, 1656:10, | 1689:4, 1689:21, | 1701:25 | 1688:12, 1688:23, |
| 1658:23, 1659:10, | 1657:6, 1658:6, | 1690:15, 1692:22 | ghlighted [9] - | 1692:21, 1692:22, |
| 1660:7, 1678:7 | 1658:21, 1659:1, | 1693:3, 1697:6, | 1641:18, 1642:2, | 1698:14, 1698:17, |
| given [7]-1650:10, | 1659:6, 1659:9, | 1698:14, 1698:21, | 1646:4, 1648:17, | 1699:15, 1707:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1653:1, 1671:5, } \\ & \text { 1691:4, 1702:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1660:1, 1661:22, } \\ & \text { 1662:1, 1662:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1699: 15,1699: 16 \\ & 1705: 14,1707: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 1667:11, 1697:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1708:10, 1708:13, } \\ & \text { 1716:11, 1716:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1706:15, 1752:10 | 1662:18, 1663:5, | 1707:18, 1707:20, | highly [1] - 1644:13 | 1719:8, 1722:11, |
| GLAD ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1756:15 | 1663:10, 1663:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1708:10, 1725:10, } \\ & \text { 1729:5, 1729:7, } \end{aligned}$ | highs [1] - 1672:10 | 1725:10, 1725:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { gleaned [1] - } \\ & \text { 1674:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1664:17, 1665:3, } \\ & \text { 1665:5, 1666:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1729: 5,1729: 7 \\ & 1729: 9,1732: 1 \end{aligned}$ | Hills [3]-1689:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1725:23, 1726:12, } \\ & \text { 1727:8, 1727:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| golf $^{[1]}$ - 1701:15 | 1666:11, 1667:2, | 1732:15, 1733:1, 1733:5 | hint [1] - 1655:19 | 1729:5, 1729:7, |
| Gonzalez [4] - 1716:10, 1719:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1667:23, 1671:12 } \\ & \text { 1676:9, 1676:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 1733:5 <br> Haspel [1] - 1664:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { his-tran [2] - } \\ & 1746.20 \quad 1747.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1732:2, 1732:5, } \\ & \text { 1732:8, 1732:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1721:14, 1730:5 | 1677:12, 1677:18 | headed [1] - 1748:4 | 1746:20, 1747:2 | 1732:20, 1733:1, |
| government [8] | 1677:19, 1678:12 | heading [5] - 1669:4, | 1745:4, 1747: | 1733:7, 1733:12, |
| 1698:6, 1698:8, | 1678:18 | 1713:24, 1713:25, | historical [6] - | 1733:15, 1754:17, |
| 1702:12, 1702:18, | Guilder [2] - 1641:2, 1676:7 | 1714:21, 1714:22 | 1670:3, 1670:14 | 1760:11, 1760:17 <br> HONORABLE [1] |


| 1639:9 | 1697:16, 1715:2, | 1691:1, 1691:2, | 1690:7, 1698:7, | $\text { stall }{ }_{[1]}-1704: 20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hope [1] - 1651:25 | 1738:16, 1738:18, | 1691:3, 1695:23, | 1711:6, 1752:2 | installed [2] - |
| Hopefully [2] - | 1740:15, 1740:18, | 1696:5, 1698:6 | 1752:5, 1759:16 | 1736:12, 1743:25 |
| 1653:19, 1682:6 | 1740:19, 1740:21 | 1699:25, 1700:1 | uals [3] - | tance [7] - |
| $\text { host }[1]-1654: 5$ | 1741:5, 1744:25, $1745: 9,1746.2$ | $1700: 2,1700: 17$, $1701: 17,1705: 11$ | 1646:15, 1670:9 $1760 \cdot 5$ | 1669:13, 1738:8, |
| hotel [1] - 1701:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 1745: 9,1746: 2 \\ & 1757: 7,1757: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 1701:17, 1705:11 <br> 1708:1, 1708:2, | 1760: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1739:6, 1746:17, } \\ & \text { 1755:3, 1756:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Huge [1] - 1672:12 | 1757:17 | 1713:18, 1713:19, | 1669:18 | 1756:13 |
| huge [1] - 1644:11 | IM-500 [2]-1748:22, 1749.2 | 1713:20, 1717:8, $1717.9,1730 \cdot 25$, | inferior [1] - 1648:15 | instances [4] |
| hundred [4] - | 1749:2 IM-500s [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1717:9, 1730:25, } \\ & \text { 1737:20, 1737:21, } \end{aligned}$ | Infield [8] - 1733:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1647:22, 1748:15, } \\ & 1760: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1645:14, 1693:2 1728:4, 1760:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IM-500s [2] - } \\ & \text { 1748:20, 1748:21 } \\ & \text { IMCs }[1]-1747: 10 \\ & \text { immediately }[1]- \\ & \text { 1662:22 } \\ & \text { impact }[1]-1681: 21 \\ & \text { impeachment }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1737:20, 1737:21, } \\ & \text { 1750:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1733:15, 1733:24, } \\ & \text { 1734:1, 1734:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 1760:1 <br> instead [4]-1675:4, |
| hypothetical [1] - |  | inconsistent [1] - | 1734:1, 1734:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1675:12, 1690:1, } \\ & \text { 1690:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1675:15 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1754:16 } \\ & \text { increases [4] - } \\ & \text { 1684:10, 1692:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 1761:6INFIELD ${ }_{[1]}$ - |  |
|  |  |  |  | Instead [1] - 1756:10 |
|  |  |  | 1733:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { instructed [1] - } \\ & \text { 1740:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1699:24, 1699:25 } \\ & \text { INDEX }[1]-1761: 1 \end{aligned}$ | inflation [1]-1649:8 |  |
| I-N-F-I-E-L-D [1] - 1734:1 | 1716:12, 1719:9 implementatio |  | 1734:12 | insured [1] - 1668:21 intended [1] - |
| 140 [2] - 1748:4 | 1706:21, 1756:20, | 1644:10, 1644:12, | information [52] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intended [1] - } \\ & \text { 1691:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1748:5 | 1756:25 | 1652:11, 1670:11, | 1641:10, 1641:13, | interchangeably [1] |
| IBM [4]-1736:12, | mplemented | 1671:1, 1679:10, | 1642:14, 1646:8, | $\begin{aligned} & -1696: 17 \\ & \text { interest [18] }- \end{aligned}$ |
| 1739:21, 1740:1, | 1695:22 | 1680:4, 1680:18 | 1646:25, 1647:14, |  |
| 1741:5 | mplicates [1] | 1681:3, 1681:4 | 1647:15, 1648:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1642:23, 1644:19, } \\ & \text { 1648:23, 1649:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Idaho [2] - 1680:25, | 1688:9 | 1681:7, 1682:13 | 1654:8, 1669:12, |  |
| 1681:4 | plic | 1682:17, 1682:19, | 1673:15, 1676:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1648:23, 1649:2, } \\ & \text { 1653:12, 1660:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| idea [8] - 1660:5, | 1715:25, 1716: | 1683:11, 1683:20 | 1691:14, 1691:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1653:12, 1660:22, } \\ & \text { 1661:13, 1661:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1668:20, 1693:25, | mplied [1] - 1715:7 | 1695:18, 1700:19 | 1691:19, 1693:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1661:13, 1661:14, } \\ & \text { 1661:16, 1661:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1696:24, 1697:4, | implies [1] - 1676:16 | 1702:12, 1702:19 | 1693:21, 1693:22, | $1661: 25,1662: 6$ |
| 1701:20, 1719:25, | implying [1] - 1716:5 | 1713:10, 1713:15, | 1694:25, 1699:3 | 1662:7, 1669:23, |
| 1724:2 | importance [1] - | $1734: 11,1734: 13$, $1738: 19,1738: 25$, | 1699:4, 1706:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1670:1, 1670:11, } \\ & \text { 1721:14, 1746:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| identification [5] <br> 1687:11, 1691:1, | 1702:2 | 1738:19, 1738:25, 1743:18, 1751:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1708:1, 1709:10, } \\ & \text { 1709:15, 1709:25 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1687:11, 1691:1, } \\ & \text { 1716:18, 1722:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { importa } \\ \text { 1714:14 } \end{gathered}$ | 1755:10 | 1710:9, 1712:11, | interests [3] - |
| 1723:23 | inaccurate | Indians [10]-1683:6, | 1712:24, 1713:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1736:24, 1739:3, } \\ & 1740: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { identified [13] - } \\ \text { 1642:19, 1685:5, } \end{array}$ | 1691:17, 1702:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1684:14, 1685:3, } \\ & \text { 1698:7, 1738:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1713:5, 1714:3, } \\ & \text { 1714:4, 1714:9, } \end{aligned}$ | interface [2] - |
| 1685:8, 1695:3, | 1754:15 | 1739:1, 1751:24, | 1724:6, 1724:17 | $23,$ |
| 1696:9, 1697:11, | in | 1752:2, 1752:5, | 1724:20, 1736:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interfaced [1] - } \\ & \text { 1738:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1716:2, 1716:3, | 1713:1, 1754:14 | 1759:17 | 1736:14, 1740:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1738:24 } \\ & \text { Interior [12] - 1639:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1722:7, 1724:13, | inadmissible [1] - | indicate [2] - 1642:6 | 1744:8, 1744:11, | 1669:12, 1679:23, |
| 1724:19, 1724:23, | 1649:16 | 1687:9 | 隹:22, 1746:9, | 1680:13, 1680:14, |
| 1754:11 <br> identify [13] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { include [8] - 1671:9, } \\ & \text { 1683:12. 1683:15. } \end{aligned}$ | indicated [5] - 1641:22, 1641:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1747:25, 1748:2, } \\ & \text { 1752:5, 1752:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1680:17, 1695:4, } \\ & \text { 1702:4, 1702:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1645:25, 1646:23, | 1683:12, 1683:15 | 1666:3, 1703:12, | $1754: 2,1754: 4$ | 1714:15, 1728:18, |
| 1661:4, 1664:23, |  | 1706:1 | 1758:6, 1758:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1714:15, 1728:18, } \\ & \text { 1754:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1694:1, 1695:12, | 17 | indicates [8] - | informed [1] | Interior's [1] - 1702:2 <br> internal [1] - 1754:15 |
| 1697:23, 1698:2, |  | 1647:6, 1694:16 | 1645:2 |  |
| 1708:8, 1717:8, | 1669:15, 1687: | 1711:5, 1711:8 | inherited [1] - 1739:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { internally [2] - } \\ \text { 1672:15, 1733:3 } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1718:20, 1754:10, | 1696:2 | 1717:10, 1717:14, | initiated [1] - |  |
| 1755:23 |  | 1721:13, 1721:16 | 1688:18 | interpolate [1] - |
| identifying [3] - | 1713:1 | indicating [1] | nput [1] - 1756:20 |  |
| 1685:9, 1693:17, |  | 1722:18 | nputs [1] - 1676:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1643:6 } \\ & \text { interpolated } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1718:18 | 1648:23, 1649: | dividual [18] | inserted [1] - 1667:6 | 1643:2, 1643:4, |
| IHS [1] - 1669:17 | clusive [2] | 1642:16, 1643:20, | insistent [1] - | 1643:8 |
| IIM [24]-1648:22, | 1657:1, 1657:3 | 1646:17, 1647:12, | 1696:1 | interpolation [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1648:25, 1653:13, } \\ & \text { 1656:16, 1660:18, } \end{aligned}$ | income [31] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1652:11, 1664:22, } \\ & \text { 1665:19, 1669:23, } \end{aligned}$ | Inspector [6] 1683:25, 1714:5, | 1642:25, 1643:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1656:16, 1660:18, } \\ & \text { 1665:14, 1665:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 1642:21, 1644:25, 1679:8, 1680:24, | 1682:6, 1683:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1683:25, 1714:5, } \\ & \text { 1714:13, 1715:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 1643:11 interpretation [2] - |
| 1666:20, 1666:25, | 1687:11, 1687:12, | 1684:14, 1685:3, | 1722:1, 1728:7 | 1645:22, 1654:19 |


| intervening [1] - | J | KILPATRICK [3]- | $\operatorname{lag}_{[1]}-1738: 12$ | leading [2] - 1651:6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1643:10 inure [1] - 1685:2 | jacket [10]-1757:19, | 1639:16, 1639:20, 1639:24 | Lakes [1] - 1756:15 <br> land [28]-1642:16, | 1686:5 |
| investigate [1] - | 1757:25, 1758:2, | kind [9] - 1642:22, | 1643:6, 1643:20, | 1690:12 |
| 1746:12 | 1758:5, 1758:16 | 1647:7, 1670:7, | 1643:21, 1644:18 | learn [1] - 1745:18 |
| investigation [2] - | 1758:20, 1758:23 | 1691:8, 1692:6 | 1645:4, 1645:5, | learned [4] - |
| 1683:24, 1754:11 | 1759:3, 1759:5, | 1699:2, 1701:1 | 1648:8, 1664:3, | 1683:23, 1684:11, |
| invoices | 1759:8 | 1701:14, 1720:6 | 1664:4, 1670:13, | 1692:7, 1745:21 |
| $1691: 25,1700: 6$ | James [3] - 1695:18, <br> 1713:10, 1714:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { kinds [4] - 1729:14, } \\ & 1731 \cdot 11753 \cdot 2 ? \end{aligned}$ | 1674:12, 1674:13, 1675:2, 1679:10 | Lease [5] - 1691:23, |
| invoicing [1] - <br> 1700:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1713:10, 1714:13 } \\ & \text { JAMES [1] - 1639:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1731:1, 1753:22, } \\ & 1758: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1675:2, 1679:10, } \\ & \text { 1682:16, 1682:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1692:7, 1696:7, } \\ & \text { 1696:11, 1756:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| involved | January [1] - | Kirkland [2] - | 1700:11, 1700:20, | lease [67] - 1648:21, |
| 1683:8, 1698:6, | 1701:22 | 1706:8, 1706:9 | 1702:25, 1703:3, | 1648:25, 1660:18, |
| 1718:18, 1749:16, | job [4]-1681:13, | KIRSCHMAN [32] - | 1704:20, 1726:4, | 1683:8, 1683:10, |
| 1753:16 | 1681:23, 1747:2 | 1640:1, 1684:15, | 1726:19, 1743:5, | 1684:6, 1687:17, |
| involvement [1] - | 1754:1 | 1686:4, 1687:25, | 1753:9 | 1687:23, 1689:25, |
| 1723:20 | JOHN [3] - 1640:2, 1640:3, 1640:6 | 1689:19, 1690:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land [2] - 1680:19, } \\ & \text { 1682:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1690:2, 1691:22, } \\ & \text { 1692:2, 1693:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1667:8, 1669:7, | Principal [1] - 1723:4 | 1671:3 | 1724:5, 1734:22, | quarterly [4] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1673:9, 1701:19 | principal [2]- | produces [2] 1652:12 1679:8 | 1754:2 | 1694:16, 1711:20, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { practice [5] - } \\ \text { 1680:22, 1681:2, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1752:11, 1752:24 } \\ \text { print [2] - 1748:22, } \end{gathered}$ | 1652:12, 1679:8 producing [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { provision [4] - } \\ \text { 1661:6, 1682:21 } \end{gathered}$ | 1736:22, 1738:9 quest ${ }^{11]}$ - 1670:2 |
| 1681:11, 1702:7, | 1749:2 | 1647:20 | 1700:18, 1706:23 | questions [17] - |
| 1715:5 | printed [2] - 1659:19, | product [6] | PSL-205 [1] - 1719:1 | 1651:7, 1658:16, |
| practice | 1751:7 | 1649:23, 1659:25 | PSL-205A [1] - | 1667:23, 1668:3 |
| 1681:7 | printout [2] - | 1668:20, 1668:21 | 1719:1 | 1671:15, 1676:6 |
| practices [1] | 1722:15, 1733 | 1668:24, 1668:2 | public [3]-1681:14, | 1677:3, 1678:18 |
| 1754:16 | priorities [1] | production [4] - | 1682:6, 1682:16 | 1686:5, 1702:1, |
| Precisely [1] - | 1752:16 | 1669:15, 1669:20, | published [1] | 1706:4, 1708:11, |
| 1707:18 | priority | 1669:22, 1736:13 | 1686:14 | 1727:9, 1729:5, |
| premise [1] - 1669:8 | 1752:18, 1752:21 | proffer [1]-1679:5 | $\text { pull }[1]-1747: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1729:11, 1730:4, } \\ & 1760: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1673:10, | $\text { pro } 11 \text { - } 172$ | $16$ | pulling [1] - 1757:24 | Quick [1] - 1672:24 |
| prepared [5] - | proactive [1] | 1696:11, 1699:4, | purchase [1] - | quick [1] - 1669:3 |
| 1673:12, 1673:14, | 1700:3 | 1740:18 | 1726:20 | quickly [4]-1659:7, |
| 1713:9, 1716:21, | probability [2] | programmer [2] - | urchaser [4] | 1697:15, 1715:2 |
| 1754:6 | 1672:20, 1678: | 1747:7, 1749:17 | 1703:12, 1726:15, | 1727:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { prepares [1] - } \\ & \text { 1723:15 } \end{aligned}$ | problem [8] 1644:20, 1651:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { programs [2] - } \\ \text { 1680:24, 1680:2 } \end{gathered}$ | 1726:17, 1727:5 | QUINN [1] - 1640:2 |
| preparing [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1644:20, 1651:6, } \\ & \text { 1655:11, 1685:8 } \end{aligned}$ | 1680:24, 1680:25 <br> project [7]-1668:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { purporting [1] } \\ & \text { 1655:16 } \end{aligned}$ | quite [6]-1642:11, 1668:8, 1694:17, |
| 1724:5 | 1695:6, 1696:9 | 1669:1, 1718:14, | purports [1] - 1691:8 | 1696:10, 1713:18, |
| present [4] | 1715:23, 1750:8 | 1733:19, 1743:20, | purpose [1] - 1652:8 | 1728:24 |
| 1679:21, 1707:21, <br> 1716:11, 1730:12 | Problems [1] - | 1746:16, 1753:16 | purposes [3]- | quotes [1] - 1654:7 |
| 1716:11, 1730:12 presented [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1754:10 } \\ & \text { problems [14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { prominent [2] - } \\ 1698: 1,1730: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1708:22, 1716:12, } \\ & 1736: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1675:22, 1714:10, | 1684:13, 1685:2, | promised [1] - | pursuant [1] - | R |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1715:16, 1715:23, } \\ & 1718: 15,1721: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1686:17, 1686:20, <br> 1695:3, 1730:25 | 1687:16 proper | 1685:15 | raised [1] - 1755:16 |
| presenting [1] | 1733:19, 1751:22 | 1687:5, 1695:25, | 1647:7, 1651:17, | ran [2]-1664:4 |
| 1714:9 presently [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1752:5, 1754:11, } \\ & \text { 1754:20, 1755:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 1731:1 | 1651:22, 1659:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1746:18 } \\ & \text { range }[3]-1674: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 1679:6, 1679:24 | 1755:23, 1756: | 1679:12, 1685:9, | 1687:4, 1691:21, | 1682:15, 1702:18 |
| 1679:25 | proced | 1690:11 | 1692:3, 1695:11, | rate [4]-1662:7, |
| press [1] - 1687:15 | 1687:9 | property [3]- <br> 1705:11, 1705:12 | 1697:14, 1697:18, | 1662:8, 1677:16 <br> rates [3]-1661:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { presumably [1] - } \\ & \text { 1699:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { procedures [2] - } \\ \text { 1753:23, 1753:25 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1705:11, 1705:12, } \\ & \text { 1718:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 1708:2, 1710:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rates [3]-1661:16, } \\ & 1670: 5,1677: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| Presumably [1] | Proceed [1] - | proposal [3] | 1748:3, 1748:15, | rather [2]-1672:6, |
| 1730:10 | 1699:14 | 1728:16, 1729:1, | 1748:24, 1751:17, | 1672:16 |
| presume [1] - 1724:3 | proceed [1] | 1729:2 | 1752:18, 1753:7 | ratio [1] - 1670:17 |
| pretrial [1] - 1666:3 | 1671:15 | protect [1] - 1714:21 | Put [2] - 1660:12, | RDO [1] - 1739:2 |
| pretty [5] - 1683:2, | Procee | Protection [1] | 1727:19 | RDRS [10]-1735:7, |
| 1684:11, 1689:10, | 1640:25, 1760:18 | 1728:21 | PX [1] - 1708:22 | 1749:6, 1749:14, |
| 1696:23, 1697:4 | proceedings [1] | provide [5] |  | 1749:18, 1749:19, |
| Pretty [1] - 1714:8 | 1762:5 | 1664:19, 1680:24, | Q | 1749:23, 1749:25, |
| previous [8] - | proces | 1725:8, 1725:11, |  | 1750:2, 1750:3, |
| 1653:14, 1654:2, | 1664:2, 1670:7, | 1754:4 | qualified [2] - <br> 1658:1, 1672:17 | 1750:9 |
| $1695: 20,1706: 16$ 1711:6, 1715:4. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1687:17, 1727:1 } \\ & \text { 1727:3, 1729:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { provided [16] - } \\ \text { 1646:9, 1649:15 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1658:1, 1672:17 } \\ & \text { qualify [1] - } 1649: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { re [2]-1748:12, } \\ & \text { 1748:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $1719: 14,1745: 3$ | $1737: 19,1745: 8$ | 1650:13, 1666:6, | quantified [1] - | re-create [2] |
| previously [3] - | 1745:9, 1746:24 | 1667:13, 1673:24, | 1674:25 | 1748:12, 1748:14 |
| 1644:2, 1653:1, | processing [1] | 1675:7, 1691:19, | quantify [2] - <br> 1652:24, 1676:24 | reaching [3] - <br> 1699:13, 1717:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1708:19 } \\ & \text { price [2] - 1703:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1746:25 } \\ & \text { produce [2]-16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1695:5, 1714:3, } \\ & \text { 1714:4, 1719:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 1652:24, 1676:24 quantifying [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1699:13, 1717:3, } \\ & \text { 1724:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1726:21 | 1648 | 1724:18, 1724:21, | 1676:1 | read [23]-1641:11, |
| prices [1] - 1669:25 | produced [4] - | 1725:9, 1736:1 | quarter [2] - | 1641:13, 1641:19, |
| primarily [1] - | 1640:25, 1644:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provides [1] - } \\ & \text { 1702:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 1694:24, 1736:16 <br> Quarterly [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1641:22, 1642:3, } \\ & 1645: 22,1646: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1680:18 } \\ & \text { primary }{ }_{[1]}-1707: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1664:20, 1719:15 } \\ \text { producer }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | 1702:19 providing [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quarterly [2] - } \\ & \text { 1653:12, 1656:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 1646:7, 1648:18, |


| 1657:17, 1657:20, | 1719:16 | 1746:7, 1750:2, | regarded [1] - | 1731:16, 1731:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1665:1, 1688:17, | ceived [11] - | 1750:17, 1750:18, | 1669:18 | 1740:24, 1744:19 |
| 1689:6, 1689:17 | 1666:18, 1690:4, | 1754:14, 1756:6 | Regarding [2] - | nembers [1] - |
| 1694:17, 1697:9, | 1690:6, 1690:7, | 1756:11, 1756:12, | 1703:10, 1732:11 | 1733: |
| 1701:25, 1707:6, | 1717:11, 1719:14 | 1756:13, 1756:17 | garding [15]- | moved [1] - 1728:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1723:9, 1747:19, } \\ & \text { 1748:11, 1759:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1726:9, 1732:17, } \\ & \text { 1732:19, 1732:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1757:16, 1757:18, } \\ & \text { 1757:20, 1758:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 1641:12, 1664:21, 1678:7, 1686:16, | renew [1] - 1687:25 |
| reading [2] - | 1732:24 | 1758:4, 1758:12 | 1692:24, 1706:14, | 1694:2, 1700:14, |
| 1722:24, 1759:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RECEIVED [1] - } \\ & 1761 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | $1758: 15,1758: 16$ <br> 1758:19, 1758:23, | 1714:25, 1726:4, | $1701: 9,1706: 24$ |
| 1658:7 | receive | $1759: 4,1760: 7$ | 32:8, 1754:25, | re |
| real [4]-1646:2, | 1700:19, 1700:22 | 1760:9, 1760:10 | 1755:16, 1758:20, | 1700:10, 1700:13, |
| 1673:16, 1708:1, | recent [1] - 1688:18 | Records [1] - | 1759:10 | 1711:19, 1729:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1755:23 } \\ & \text { realize }{ }_{[1]}-164 \end{aligned}$ | Recess [1] - 1692:19 recognize [8]- | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1705:17 } \\ \text { recove } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { region [6] - 1739:1, } \\ & \text { 1744:1, 1749:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1748: 4,1748: 6, \\ & 1748: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| realized [1] | 1686:10, 1686:12 | 1734:24, 1747:17 | 1750:5, 1750:14, | repeat [1] - 1698:19 |
| 1692:23 | 1690:18, 1695:14 | recycle [3]-1750:11, | 1757:9 | rephrase [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { really }[10]-1666: 11, \\ & 1672: 17,1673: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1703:8, 1704:11, } \\ & \text { 1706:6, 1710:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1750:13, 1750:16 } \\ \text { recycled }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Region [2]-1723:16, } \\ & \text { 1733:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1677:21 } \\ & \text { report }[46] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1685:12, 1694:24 | recognizing [1] | 1750:23 | regional [7] - | 1647:2, 1648:18, |
| 1723:20, 1726:21 | 1702:3 | redact [1] - 1693:17 | 1690:25, 1695:6, | 1648:20, 1650:5, |
| 1736:7, 1746:23 | recollectio | redacted [5] - | 1733:17, 1743:13, | 1650:6, 1650:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { realm }[1]-1677: 25 \\ & \text { realty }[4]-1703: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 1715:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1692:25, 1693:1 } \\ & \text { 1693:22, 1708:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1743:22, 1744:1, } \\ & \text { 1752:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 1654:9, 1654:12, |
| 1706:9, 1757:4, | recommenda | 1728:9 |  | 1665:24, 1669:6, 1674:9, 1674:18, |
| 1757:8 | recommended [1] - | redactions [2] | 1738:20 | 1674:23, 1675:24, |
| reason [8] - 1676:10, | 1686:22 | 1693:14, 1693:1 | regions [4] - | 1676:3, 1676:4, |
| 1709:24, 1719:16, | reconcilable [1] - | REDIRECT [2] | 1746:17, 1746:21, | 1676:10, 1678:7 |
| 1724:19, 1724:22, | 1652:22 | 1676:8, 1729:8 | 1749:23, 1749:24 | 1683:24, 1683:25, |
| 1726:24, 1730:7 |  | direct [1] - 1729:5 | gulation [4] | 1685:18, 1685:23, |
| reasonable [1] | 1651:14 | Redirect [2] | 1702:24, 1703:19 | 1686:21, 1686:22, |
| 1675:18 | reconciling [1] | 1761:4, 1761: | 1704:3, 1729:19 | 1687:7, 1688:15, |
| reasons [1] | 172 | Redthunder [1] | regulations [3] - | 1688:16, 1688:20, |
| 1677:23 | reconstruct [1] - | 1697:13 | 1684:6, 1703:4, | 1688:21, 1688:24, |
| rebuttal [1] - 1666:2 recalculation [1] - | 1663:24 record | reel [1]-1747:19 reference [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1703:16 } \\ & \text { reinforced }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1689:5, 1689:13, } \\ & \text { 1695:3, 1699:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1746:15 | $1655: 18,1664: 24$ | 1722:22 | 1646:11 | 1699:24, 1699:25, |
| receipt ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1658:12 receipts [34] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1665:1, 1679:19, } \\ & \text { 1691:3, 1692:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { referenced [1] - } \\ & \text { 1716:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { related }[1]-1720: 8 \\ & \text { relates [2] - 1716:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1700:2, 1722:17, } \\ & \text { 1731:23, 1731:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1649:21, 1649:23, | 1715:21, 1733:1, | referent [1] - 1707:13 | 1725:13 | 1746:19, 1754:6, |
| 1650:25, 1651:1, | 1751:8, 1759:1, | referred [3] - | relation [1] - 1694:14 | 1755:5 |
| 1651:2, 1651:11, | 1762:4 | $1641: 25,1667: 16$ | relationship [2] 1658:12, 1668.7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported [2] - } \\ \text { 1640:25, 1755:17 } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1651:12, 1651:16 } \\ & \text { 1651:19, 1652:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { recorded }[4] \text { - } \\ \text { 1652:15, 1655:21 } \end{gathered}$ | 1721:9 <br> referring | 1658:12, 1668:7 <br> release [1] - 1687:15 | Reporter [3] - |
| 1652:4, 1652:15 | 1756:6, 1756:9 | 1646:25, 1715:1 | levance [2] | 1640:11, 1640:12, |
| 1652:16, 1653:13 | recording | 1727:21 | 1705:5, 1759:13 | 1762:3 |
| 1654:11, 1654:20 <br> $1654 \cdot 25,1655 \cdot 2$ | $1736: 22,1752: 9$ | refers [2]-1650:6, | reliability [2] - | reporter [1] - 1752:9 reporting [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1654:25, 1655:2, } \\ & \text { 1655:4, 1656:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recordkeeping [3] - } \\ & \text { 1684:2, 1691:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 1721:8 | 1679:11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reporting [2] - } \\ \text { 1689:8, } 1749: 15 \end{gathered}$ |
| 1657:1, 1657:8, | 1691:5 | reflect [2]-1649:25, | liably [1] - 1654:6 | reports [11] - |
| 1658:10, 1661:4, | records | 1667:17 | relied [3]-1755:3, | 1641:12, 1643:17, |
| 1666:20, 1666:23, | 1679:11, 1679:12, | reflected [1] | 1755:11, 1756:10 | 1644:23, 1645:7, |
| 1667:13, 1667:16, | 1684:4, 1685:12, | 1653:11 | remain [1] - 1738:7 | 1646:12, 1646:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1667:17, 1667:19, } \\ & \text { 1670:19, 1676:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1687:8, 1695:25, } \\ & 1697: 23,1705: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reflects [2] - 1651:4, } \\ & \text { 1708:5 } \end{aligned}$ | remaining [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1646:25, 1666:2, } \\ & \text { 1666:3, 1741:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1676:23 | 1715:13, 1717:9, | reform [2] - 1751:15 |  | 1757:25 |
| Receipts [1] - 1658:7 | 1717:11, 1717:15, <br> 1717:19, 1718:19 | 1754:18 | 1686:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { represent [5] - } \\ \text { 1647:23, 1652:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { receivable [2] - } \\ \text { 1698:23, 1699:17 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1717:19, 1718:19, } \\ & \text { 1718:22, 1733:20, } \end{aligned}$ | refresh [1] - 1710:19 | remember [8] 1668:16 1669-2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1647:23, 1652:18, } \\ & \text { 1670:11, 1694:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| receive [3] - 1649:5, | 1743:2, 1743:6, | regard [1] - 1669:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1668:16, 1669:2, } \\ & \text { 1708:23, 1709:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 1701:21 |
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