				1865
	1864		1	PROCEEDINGS
UNITED ST	PATES DISTRICT COURT		2	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Dorris.
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		3	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
ELOUISE PEPION COBELL,	: Civil Action 96-1285		4	(The witness resumes the stand.)
et al. Plaintiffs	: : Washington, D.C.	00:00:03	5	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
٧.	: Wednesday, October 24, 2007		6	BY MR. DORRIS:
DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary of the Interior, et al.	:		7	Q. Mr. Pallais, final area. Defendants' Exhibit 2 is the
Defendants	: : AFTERNOON SESSION		8	responsive report from Ms. Caren Dunne, which is on the screen
TRANSCRIPT	OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 9		9	there. Do you see that?
	DAT 9 NORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	00:00:13	10	A. Yes.
APPEARANCES:			11	<b>Q.</b> Now, have you had an opportunity to review that report?
For the Plaintiffs:	DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQUIRE		12	A. Yes, I have.
	LAW OFFICES OF DENNIS GINGOLD 607 14th Street, NW Ninth Floor		13	Q. And would you please explain what maybe this is your
	Washington, DC 20005 (202) 824-1448		14	response to her response, but would you focus on what you've
	ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, ESQUIRE	00:00:33	15	identified to be the key difference between major difference
	WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.		16	between where you are and what she talks about in her report.
	1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 (404) 815-6450		17	A. The major difference is that Ms. Dunne concludes that the
	KEITH HARPER, ESQUIRE		18	opinions rendered by the various independent accountants, that
	JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.		19	is Arthur Andersen, Griffin, and KPMG, were not qualified. She
	607 14th Street, N.W. Suite 900	00:01:08	20	seems to believe that they provided assurance that the financial
	Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 585-0053		21	statements were fairly presented, and that the accountants were
	DANIEL R. TAYLOR, JR., ESQUIRE DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE		22	able to apply tests to the balances that got around their
	KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 1001 West Fourth Street		23	problems with internal control.
	Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101 (336) 607-7392		24	And as I read the reports, they explicitly say that they
		00:01:31	25	cannot give assurance on the financial statements because of the
	A. Wayne, RPR, CRR ial Court Reporter			Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	1864			Official Court Reporter
For the Defendants:	ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE			1866
	JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE		1	limitations caused by the internal control problems, and they
	J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE JOHN KRESSE, ESQUIRE		2 3	could not apply additional substantive procedures to get around the issue.
	U.S. Department of Justice 1100 L Street, N.W.		4	Q. Okay.
	Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010	00:01:44	5	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I have no further questions,
	JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE	00.01.44	6	but I would move to admit his report, which is Plaintiffs'
	Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice		7	Exhibit 4283.
	Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division		8	THE COURT: 4283 will be received.
	Ben Franklin Station		9	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
	P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044	00:02:03	10	(Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4283
	(202) 307-1104		11	received into evidence.)
Court Reporter:	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter		12	THE COURT: Mr. Siemietkowski.
	U.S. Courthouse, Room 6714 333 Constitution Avenue, NW		13	MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. And
	Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3186		14	before I begin, sir, I do want to correct on the record
		00:02:22	15	something that I said during one of my objections, and that
			16	regarded whether the meta-analysis reports reviewed by
			17	Mr. Pallais were in the administrative record. They were not.
			18	They were provided to plaintiffs but they were not in the
			19	administrative record.
		00:02:35	20	Also, Your Honor, I would like to introduce two individuals
			21	at counsel table. My Justice Department colleague, Mr. Tim
			22	Curley, as well as our witness who has provided a responding
			23	report to Mr. Pallais's report, and that is Ms. Caren Dunne of
			24	Albuquerque.
Proceedings reported by	achine shorthand transcript produced	00:02:54	24 25	Albuquerque.  THE COURT: Ms. Dunne.
by computer-aided transcr	nachine shorthand, transcript produced iption. A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00:02:54		

	1867		1869
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION	1	for again, please?
2	BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:	2	A. Statement on auditing standards.
3	Q. Mr. Pallais, you testified that you have not reviewed any	3	Q. Now, SAS standards apply to audits, correct?
4	government records underlying the IIM accounts, correct?	4	A. Correct.
00:03:11 <b>5</b>	A. Correct.	00:05:44 <b>5</b>	<b>Q.</b> And more specifically SAS 31 applies to audits, correct?
6	Q. And you also testified, did you not, that you have not	6	A. It did apply to audits, yes.
7	reviewed any government records underlying Interior's historical	7	Q. And again, what is G-A-A-S, GAAS?
8	accounting effort, correct?	8	A. That's generally accepted auditing standards.
9	A. Correct.	9	<b>Q.</b> And that applies to audits, does it not?
00:03:21 10	Q. Now, regarding what you call external corroborating	00:06:02 10	A. Primarily, yes.
11	evidence, you wouldn't consider a check to be inherently	11	Q. And what is G-A-A-P, GAAP?
12	unreliable, would you?	12	A. It's generally accepted accounting principles.
13	A. No.	13	<b>Q.</b> And that likewise applies to audits, right?
14	Q. Likewise, you wouldn't consider information in an oil and	14	A. Generally accepted accounting principles applies to a lot
00:03:40 15	gas lease to be inherently unreliable, would you?	00:06:16 15	more than audits. Audits may use generally accepted accounting
16	A. No.	16	principles, but its application is far broader than audits.
17	Q. How about information in a farming lease? Inherently	17	Q. Far broader. You did say in your report, though, did you
18	unreliable?	18	not, that GAAP principles do not apply to the summarization of
19	A. Probably not.	19	transactions reported in the HSAs. Correct?
00:03:51 <b>20</b>	<b>Q.</b> Likewise, a grazing lease, inherently unreliable?	00:06:36 <b>20</b>	A. That's correct. They are intended to be reported under
21	A. Information is a broad concept. Certainly the provisions	21	another basis of accounting.
22	in it would not be inherently unreliable.	22	Q. Now, an audit is not identical to an attestation
23	<b>Q.</b> Keeping within the context of this external corroborating	23	engagement, is it?
24	evidence, would you consider information in a timber contract	24	A. No.
00:04:12 <b>25</b>	inherently unreliable?	00:06:48 <b>25</b>	Q. Likewise, an audit is not identical to a consulting
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1868		1870
1	A. Probably not.	1	1870 engagement, correct?
1 2		1 2	
	A. Probably not.	_	engagement, correct?
2	<ul><li>A. Probably not.</li><li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you</li></ul>	_	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.
2 3 4 00:04:29 5	<ul><li>A. Probably not.</li><li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li></ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that if this were an audit do you remember using those words?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21 22	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?  A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider."
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that if this were an audit do you remember using those words?</li> <li>A. I don't, but I will trust that I used those words.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21 22 23	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?  A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider."  Q. I'm sorry. If a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that if this were an audit do you remember using those words?</li> <li>A. I don't, but I will trust that I used those words.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about some of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21 22 23 24	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?  A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider."  Q. I'm sorry. If a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that any reporting on that beneficiary's account should
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that if this were an audit do you remember using those words?</li> <li>A. I don't, but I will trust that I used those words.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about some of the terminology in your report. S-A-S, SAS, what does that stand</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21 22 23	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?  A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider."  Q. I'm sorry. If a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that any reporting on that beneficiary's account should take into consideration that mismanagement, correct?
2 3 4 00:04:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:05:15 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Probably not.</li> <li>Q. What about information in a court order? Would you consider that inherently unreliable?</li> <li>A. Again, probably not.</li> <li>Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a standard accounting service.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question.</li> <li>Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any government agencies; is that correct?</li> <li>A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency?</li> <li>Q. No, contracted.</li> <li>A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my resume doesn't list all of my clients.</li> <li>Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of government clients, does it?</li> <li>A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean I haven't done it; it just means it's not on my resume.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that if this were an audit do you remember using those words?</li> <li>A. I don't, but I will trust that I used those words.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about some of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 00:07:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:57 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:18 20 21 22 23 24	engagement, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on the history of independent audits, correct?  A. I think that's generally what I said.  Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct?  A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s.  Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending litigation. Is that not true?  A. Yes. That's true.  Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items that should have been included is insufficient, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct?  A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider."  Q. I'm sorry. If a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you believe that any reporting on that beneficiary's account should

	1871		1873
1	A. "Take into consideration" was not a lot better than	1	<b>Q.</b> All right. In the documents you have reviewed,
2	"consider." I'm not sure whether you're saying the reported	2	Mr. Pallais, have you seen any direct evidence of fraudulent
3	amount should consist of what actually happened in the account,	3	financial reporting?
4	what should have happened in the account, or whether the report	4	A. No.
0:09:01 <b>5</b>	to the recipient should say your account has been mismanaged.	00:12:02 <b>5</b>	Q. Likewise, have you seen any direct evidence of
6	I'm not sure or perhaps a fourth alternative. I'm not sure	6	misappropriation?
7	which one you're asking.	7	A. No.
8	Q. I think it was your second alternative. You would argue,	8	Q. Now, in assessing the 2007 Plan, Mr. Pallais, one must
9	would you not, Mr. Pallais, that any accounting statement should	9	consider the nature of the procedures called for in the plan,
0:09:18 10	consider whether the information was whether the actual	00:12:20 10	correct?
11	account amount was properly recorded, correct?	11	A. Correct.
12	THE COURT: Can you give the witness a verb different	12	Q. And it's also true, is it not, that in assessing the plan
13	from "consider"?	13	one must consider the government's proposed sampling approach,
14	MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: I'll try, Your Honor.	14	correct?
0:09:42 15	THE COURT: "Report"? "Reflect"?	00:12:26 15	A. I believe so. That wasn't part of my engagement, but I
16	MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: How about "reflect," Your Honor?	16	expect that is a true statement.
17	THE COURT: All right. How about "reflect"?	17	Q. And in fact, not being part of your engagement, you did not
18	BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:	18	actually analyze the government's sampling approach, correct?
19	Q. Mr. Pallais, would you agree that in your opinion if a	19	A. That's correct.
0:09:52 <b>20</b>	beneficiary's account was mismanaged, any accounting statement	00:12:44 20	<ul><li>Q. You mentioned the various accounting firms that have worked</li></ul>
21	provided to the beneficiary should reflect such mismanagement?	21	for Interior on this project. Is it your testimony,
22		22	
23	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I think	23	Mr. Pallais, that all five of those accounting firms contracted
24	this is beyond the scope of direct. I didn't ask him anything	24	by Interior have not applied sound professional judgment?  A. No.
0:10:11 25	about mismanagement of accounts. It's beyond the scope of what	00:13:04 25	
0:10:11 23	this hearing is about.	00:13:04 23	Q. Mr. Pallais, you're not familiar with the requirements of
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	THE COURT: Well, management and mismanagement has	1	the 1994 Trust Reform Act, are you?
2	become or people think it's become kind of a term of art in	2	A. No.
3	this court. I'm not sure that it is, and I'll let the witness	3	Q. You have not read the Court of Appeals decisions addressing
4	answer the question if he can. Overruled.	4	those acts' requirements, have you?
0:10:25 <b>5</b>	BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:	00:13:31 5	A. I don't believe so.
6	Q. Do you believe, Mr. Pallais, that any well, let's say an	6	Q. You have not interviewed those actually doing the
7	HSA to a particular beneficiary should reflect any mismanagement	7	accounting work, have you?
8	found by the accountants?	8	A. I may have to change the answer to the question I just
9	A. I haven't spent a lot of time thinking about what should be	9	answered previously. I may have read court opinions on that.
0:10:45	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		answered previously. I may have read court opinions on that.
0:10:45 I U		1 00 40 50 10	don't year II though hut in the name of fair play. I may have you
11	reflected in the HSA. My focus has been on whether the amounts	00:13:52 10	don't recall them, but in the name of fair play, I may have reach
11	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA	11	those.
12	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is	11 12	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.
12 13	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as	11 12 13	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.
12 13 14	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.	11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>those.</li> <li>Q. Thank you for that clarification.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.</li> <li>Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed</li> </ul>
12 13 14 0:11:14 15	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?
12 13 14 0:11:14 15 16	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16	<ul> <li>those.</li> <li>Q. Thank you for that clarification.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.</li> <li>Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
12 13 14 0:11:14 15 16 17	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on
12 13 14 0:11:14 15 16 17 18	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?
12 13 14 5:11:14 15 16 17 18 19	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.
12 13 14 0:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 0:11:32	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 0:11:32 20 21	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?
12 13 14 10:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 19:0:11:32 20 21 22	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21 22	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?  A. No.
12 13 14 00:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:32 20 21 22 23	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance about how the order should do that.	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21 22 23	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?
12 13 14 00:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:32 20 21 22 23 24	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance about how the order should do that.  Q. Do you remember stating in your report that Interior's	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21 22 23 24	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. The only documents you have reviewed are those provided to you by Plaintiffs' counsel, correct?
12 13 14 00:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:32 20 21 22 23 24	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance about how the order should do that.  Q. Do you remember stating in your report that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21 22 23	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. The only documents you have reviewed are those provided to
12 13 14 00:11:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:32 20 21 22 23	are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.  Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?  A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance about how the order should do that.  Q. Do you remember stating in your report that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect misappropriations?	11 12 13 14 00:14:08 15 16 17 18 19 00:14:18 20 21 22 23 24	those.  Q. Thank you for that clarification.  A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.  Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory responsibility for the project, have you?  A. No.  Q. The only documents you have reviewed are those provided to you by Plaintiffs' counsel, correct?

	1875		1877
1		1	
	Q. You have not reviewed any congressional appropriations		and referred to in his present report for sake of brevity at
2	documents, have you?	2	times.
3	A. No.	3	THE COURT: All right. Report's in, testimony's out.
4	<b>Q.</b> You have not reviewed any Interior budget requests, have	4	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
00:14:43 <b>5</b>	you?	00:16:56 <b>5</b>	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	A. No.	6	(Plaintiff Exhibit Nos. 4210
7	Q. In formulating your opinion, you did not estimate the cost	7	and 575 received into
8	of adopting your approach, did you?	8	evidence.)
9	A. No.	9	MR. LEVITAS: Your Honor, my name is Elliott Levitas.
00:14:51 10	Q. You haven't reviewed Dr. Angel's report on records, have	00:17:03 10	I'm one of the counsel for the Plaintiffs and I have not
11	you?	11	appeared before you at this proceeding yet, and I wanted to
12	A. No.	12	
			introduce myself. I have a proffer which was discussed by the
13	Q. Likewise, you've not had a chance to read a transcript of	13	Court with Mr. Smith at the pretrial hearing relative to
14	his testimony, correct?	14	possible testimony of former congressman Klinger, and a motion
00:15:02 15	A. I have not read it. I'm not sure whether it's accurate to	00:17:27 15	in limine filed by the Government in connection with that. A
16	say I haven't had a chance to read it, but I have not read it.	16	copy has been provided to the Government. May I pass this up?
17	Q. Understood. Yes, sir. You have not been to Lenexa, have	17	THE COURT: Yes, of course. You want to talk about it
18	you?	18	or just file a proffer?
19	A. No.	19	MR. LEVITAS: I just want to pass up the proffer at
00:15:17 <b>20</b>	Q. You've not been to OHTA, have you?	00:17:49 <b>20</b>	this point.
21	A. No.	21	THE COURT: All right, sir. The proffer will be
22	MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: No further questions, Your Honor.	22	marked as an exhibit and made part of the record of this case.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Pallais, I think that completes your	23	Thank you, sir.
24	testimony. You may step down, sir. Thank you.	24	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, we'd like to respond to
00:15:31 <b>25</b>	(The witness steps down.)	00:18:00 <b>25</b>	the proffer briefly, if we may? Or would you rather
00.13.31	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.10.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	·		·
	1876		1878
1	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we had two brief matters to	1	THE COURT: Well, to what end? The proffer has
2	raise before we call the next witness, if we might.	2	been the proffer is just that. It's a proffer of what the
3	THE COURT: All right.	3	testimony of Representative Klinger would be. I said I won't
4	MR. DORRIS: Yesterday I failed to move in the	4	hear him, so the proffer is really the record that the
00:15:43 <b>5</b>	exhibits for Mr. Homan's report, which was Plaintiffs' 4210, and	00:18:22 <b>5</b>	Plaintiffs are making that I should hear him. What do you want
6	the Arthur Andersen audit that we reviewed with Mr. Homan	6	to add to it?
7	yesterday, and it's been referred to again today, which is	7	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Well, I was not clear and that's
8	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 575, and I would move for those to be	8	fine if that's the status of it. I was not clear from our final
9	admitted.	_	
00:16:02 10	dufficted.	9	pretrial conference whether you would then view that in reaching
00:16:02	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.	00:18:36 10	pretrial conference whether you would then view that in reaching a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or
00:16:02 10			,
	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.	00:18:36 10	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or
11	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that	00:18:36 10	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in
11 12	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.	00:18:36 <b>10</b> 11 12	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly
11 12 13 14	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18	a determination on whether to grant the motion <i>in limine</i> or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Harper.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Harper. MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21 22	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21 22 23	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Harper. MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he prepared. I don't oppose any motion to not include the prior	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21 22 23 24	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.  MR. HARPER: I would like to call as our next witness
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he prepared. I don't oppose any motion to not include the prior testimony.	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21 22 23	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Harper. MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. MR. HARPER: I would like to call as our next witness Mr. Richard Fitzgerald.
11 12 13 14 00:16:14 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22 23 24	THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?  THE COURT: Yes.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.  THE COURT: Fair enough.  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he prepared. I don't oppose any motion to not include the prior testimony.  THE COURT: He's talking about his testimony.	00:18:36 10 11 12 13 14 00:18:47 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:59 20 21 22 23 24	a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.  MR. HARPER: I would like to call as our next witness  Mr. Richard Fitzgerald.  (The witness takes the stand.)

	1879		1881
1	you state your full name and spell your last name for the	1	law, if that was applicable, and certainly the principles that
2	record.	2	govern trusts in general.
3	THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Richard v. Fitzgerald.	3	A report was then written, and that report was several
4	F-I-T-Z-G-E-R-A-L-D.	4	pages depending on and many, many pages in the larger banks
00:20:10 <b>5</b>	MR. HARPER: Your Honor, briefly, the proffer for this	00:24:11 <b>5</b>	like Riggs and First National Bank of Maryland and those sorts
6	witness is that he is an expert witness. We filed an expert	6	of places. That report would have basically a balance sheet on
7	report, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285. And he's an expert, among	7	the front, indicating how big the department was. A second page
8	other things, on operations of trusts, standards of government	8	would list any violations of law and any violations of fiduciary
9	trusts and the systems necessary to manage and administer trust	9	principles. The rest of the report would then highlight those
00:20:38 10	assets. He's been previously designated and has been approved	00:24:50 10	problems with reference to the individual accounts, where those
11	as a witness in the trial 1.5 in this proceeding.	11	problems had been discovered.
12	THE COURT: All right.	12	That report was then forwarded to the regional office. It
13	RICHARD FITZGERALD, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN	13	was signed by the representative in trust, who is the person in
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION	14	charge of the examination. That report would then be filed with
00:20:54 15	BY MR. HARPER:	00:25:13 15	the forwarded to the Richmond office, where it would be
16	Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, I would like to go over briefly with the	16	reviewed by more senior and more experienced trust people, and
17	Court some of your background. Could you tell me you started	17	by the people who are in charge of the commercial side of the
18	at the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at some point.	18	bank, because the theory was that if there was a major default
19	Can you tell me what your first position there was?	19	in a trust account or in a trust department, that the
00:21:06 <b>20</b>	A. Yes. In 1963, after graduating from law school, I joined	00:25:40 <b>20</b>	reparations for that would have to come out of the capital of
21	the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency as a trust	21	the bank, which would then threaten the solvency of the larger
22	examiner at the entry level, and I was engaged for the next year	22	bank. That's why that why we did trust exams.
23	and a half or so in the examination of the trust departments of	23	And the reason that, back in the Kennedy administration,
24	various banks, national banks, here, in what was here in the	24	why lawyers were doing this prior to that it was commercial
00:21:39 <b>25</b>	Washington, D.C., area, in what was then known as the fifth	00:26:03 <b>25</b>	people who were doing it. But the reason that lawyers were
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1880		1882
1	national bank region.	1	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the
2	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and	2	
	national bank region.	_	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the
2	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and	2	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the
2 3 4 00:22:04 5	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina,  Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?	2 3 4 00:26:32 5	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.	2 3 4	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records,	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions. We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title,
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:23:18 20	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.  We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18 19 00:27:41 20	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.  The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks
2 3 4 00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:23:18 20 21	That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.  We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We would review the governing document, whether it was a will or a	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18 19 00:27:41 20 21	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.  The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks remained solvent, and when they were deemed to be insolvent they
00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:23:18 20 21 22 23 24	That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.  We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We would review the governing document, whether it was a will or a trust agreement or what have you. We would then go and we would	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18 19 00:27:41 20 21 22 23 24	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.  The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks remained solvent, and when they were deemed to be insolvent they closed the bank and, with the assistance of the FDIC, in most
00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:23:18 20 21 22 23	That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.  We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We would review the governing document, whether it was a will or a trust agreement or what have you. We would then go and we would review the administration by that institution of those accounts	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18 19 00:27:41 20 21 22 23	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.  The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks remained solvent, and when they were deemed to be insolvent they closed the bank and, with the assistance of the FDIC, in most cases were able to sell those insolvent banks to other banks.
00:22:04 5 6 7 8 9 00:22:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:22:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:23:18 20 21 22 23 24	national bank region.  That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks.  Do you want to know how those exams went at all?  Q. Yes.  A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning.  We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.  We would then, among other things many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions.  We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, I remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.  We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We would review the governing document, whether it was a will or a trust agreement or what have you. We would then go and we would review the administration by that institution of those accounts to see to it that the administration of those accounts agreed	2 3 4 00:26:32 5 6 7 8 9 00:26:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:27:15 15 16 17 18 19 00:27:41 20 21 22 23 24	doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.  Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.  Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?  A. Yes.  Q. Or this page, I guess?  A. That's the cover of my report.  Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?  A. Yes.  Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?  A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.  The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks remained solvent, and when they were deemed to be insolvent they closed the bank and, with the assistance of the FDIC, in most cases were able to sell those insolvent banks to other banks.  We were also engaged the office itself was engaged am

	1883		1885
1	THE COURT: Was that question addressed to me?	1	any, and many of them were local in nature in that they were not
2	(Laughter)	2	integrated or comprehensive.
3	It is a bit of a narrative. You can kind of bite off your	3	Q. And then you became in 2004 the director of the Office of
4	answers and make him ask you another question.	4	Trust Regulations Policies and Procedures?
00:28:30 <b>5</b>	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	00:32:21 <b>5</b>	A. Yes. That was several years later, because the review that
6	BY MR. HARPER:	6	we were doing was really a failure. I had to write a memo to
7	Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, it mentions here that in 1965 you were	7	one of the people there and said we need to do this differently,
8	commissioned as a representative of trust. And briefly, what is	8	because it was sort of like pushing a string.
9	a representative of trust?	9	But anyway, in '04 I guess it was, I was, apropos of the
00:28:42 10	A. The representative in trust was the bank examination is	00:32:54 10	reorganization that the Department did of the of both the BIA
11	an apprentice process, and there were three levels, and if I	11	and the special trustee's office, I became the director of the
12	remember correctly there was an assistant in trust, which is	12	Office of Trust Regulations Policies and Procedures, which was a
13	what I was originally, then an associate, and then a	13	new office but which was an office that was grafted onto an
14	representative. And the representatives were the most senior,	14	office that had existed for about 10 years.
00:29:03 15	most experienced field examiners.	00:33:14 15	Q. And very quickly, what was your principal duty as head of
16	I became a representative in trust when I became the	16	that office?
17	principal assistant to the deputy comptroller of the currency	17	A. We were supposed to assist and ensure that the various
18	for trusts, who oversaw the whole trust examination process.	18	offices within the Department that had anything to do with
19	<b>Q.</b> In that position, what were some of your responsibilities?	19	trusts, with Indian trusts, had, as the act requires, written,
00:29:24 <b>20</b>	THE COURT: Mr. Harper, I'm not sure we need all of	00:33:41 <b>20</b>	consistent, integrated policies and procedures.
21	that. I've just reviewed his resume and I see that he was in	21	Q. And when you say "the act," what act are you referring to?
22	the Office of Special Trustee from 1996 until 2004.	22	A. I'm referring to the '94 act, the American Indian Trust
23	THE WITNESS: That's correct.	23	Fund Management Reform Act. I hope I got that right.
24	THE COURT: Although I think the bank examiner part	24	<b>Q.</b> Have you been qualified as an expert to testify as an
00:29:45 <b>25</b>	bank trust examiner part of this is interesting, it's not nearly	00:34:02 <b>25</b>	expert in prior proceedings other than in the Cobell litigation?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	Cincial Court reporter		Official Gourt Reporter
	1884		1886
1	<u>'</u>	1	<u>'</u>
2	1884	1 2	1886
	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I	_	1886 A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times
2	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.	2	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits,
2 3 4 00:29:57 <b>5</b>	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.	2	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct? A. That's right. Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct? A. That's right. Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct? A. That's right. Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office? A. I was called down there to join that office because of my	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that. MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor. BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page. Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct? A. That's right. Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office? A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility,	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16 17	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16 17 18	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER: Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct? A. That's right. Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office? A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16 17 18 19	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide. In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an
00:29:57	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:31:21 20 21	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:29:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:30:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:30:55 15 16 17 18 19 00:31:21 20 21 22	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21 22	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.  Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of
00:29:57	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're interested in what we found, was that OTFM had pretty good	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.  Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of what is normally required in a fiduciary accounting?
00:29:57	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're interested in what we found, was that OTFM had pretty good policies and procedures, and they were continuing to develop	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.  Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of what is normally required in a fiduciary accounting?  A. What is normally required, expected in a fiduciary
00:29:57	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're interested in what we found, was that OTFM had pretty good policies and procedures, and they were continuing to develop those. But in many of the other departments, there were few, if	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.  Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of what is normally required in a fiduciary accounting?  A. What is normally required, expected in a fiduciary accounting is a statement given to the beneficiary which lists
00:29:57	so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.  MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.  Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?  A. That's right.  Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?  A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and I reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.  In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people 10, 12 people, maybe from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're interested in what we found, was that OTFM had pretty good policies and procedures, and they were continuing to develop	2 3 4 00:34:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:34:55 10 11 12 13 14 00:35:25 15 16 17 18 19 00:35:44 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and I then which I think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.  THE COURT: All right.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?  A. Yes.  Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?  A. Yes.  Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of what is normally required in a fiduciary accounting?  A. What is normally required, expected in a fiduciary

		1	
	1887		1889
1	and identifies all of the assets that are held in trust for that	1	Regulations, Policies and Procedures, which I think the function
2	particular beneficiary. That would include the money that's in	2	was somewhat different.
3	the account at that particular time, the securities or other	3	<b>Q.</b> If I could turn to this internal guidance, I just have a
4	assets that produce those funds, and also any property that is	4	brief question about it. That's your Exhibit 2 referred to, and
00:36:40 <b>5</b>	held in trust that doesn't produce income.	00:41:34 <b>5</b>	you prepared this document?
6	It was not uncommon, for instance it wasn't very common	6	A. Yes.
7	but you often saw a trust would hold a valuable painting, for	7	<b>Q.</b> For the reasons you just stated?
8	instance. So you would see you would expect to see that that	8	A. Yes.
9	was listed on the accounting that was given to the	9	<b>Q.</b> And it was it was intended to aid in the operation of
00:37:07 10	beneficiaries.	00:41:46 10	the Indian trust. Is that fair?
11	The best place I think to look for what I did was the	11	A. Yes.
12	accountings that had to be done for the common trust funds,	12	<b>Q.</b> If we can turn to the sixth page of this document. And I
13	which were relatively new back then. And those common trust	13	just have one question about No. 6 here. "Keep the Beneficiary
14	funds by regulation were required to give a report listing all	14	Informed." If you could just read that to yourself. I just
00:37:30 15	of those things to all of the participants in the common trust	00:42:23 15	have one question on this point in your document.
16	fund on a quarterly basis.	16	A. Yes. I'm familiar with it.
17	<b>Q.</b> If we can turn back to your expert report, Plaintiff's	17	<b>Q.</b> What is meant there by the fact that the records are trust
18	Exhibit 4285, page second page of that. Near the final line	18	assets?
19	at the bottom this section is called "Question One, what is a	19	A. It is a standard principle of the operation of any trust
00:38:00 <b>20</b>	fiduciary accounting?" Your second exhibit is what you call the	00:42:46 <b>20</b>	that the trustee must keep the beneficiaries informed, and the
21	internal general guidance. That's the title. Could you tell me	21	reason that you keep a beneficiary informed is so that the
22	what that document, why you prepared that document?	22	beneficiary is aware of the management of his property interests
23	A. Yes. In OTP, which is what we called the office that I	23	that are held in trust, so that he feels or she or it feels that
24	became the director of, what we were supposed to be doing was	24	the management is proper. And if you don't feel that it is
00:38:34 <b>25</b>	reviewing the regulations, policies, procedures, that the	00:43:24 <b>25</b>	proper, you can then take whatever action is appropriate to see
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1888	4	1890
1	1888 program people would put together, and they would then ship it	1	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or
2	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with	2	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to
2	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this	2 3	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.
2 3 4	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular	2 3 4	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an
2 3 4 00:39:11 5	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.	2 3 4 00:43:56 5	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us.	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us.  And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there.	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us.  And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things?	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us.  And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on
00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:47 20	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page actually the third page. We're still on this
00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:47 20 21	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us.  And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that  Q. And at the time you were the principal policies and	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:22 20 21	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page actually the third page. We're still on this first question in your report, what is a fiduciary accounting.
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:47 20 21 22	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that  Q. And at the time you were the principal policies and procedures person at the Office of Special Trustee, correct?	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:22 20 21 22	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page actually the third page. We're still on this first question in your report, what is a fiduciary accounting.  And you discussed that briefly. Let me ask you, what is
00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:47 20 21	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that  Q. And at the time you were the principal policies and procedures person at the Office of Special Trustee, correct?  A. I was, at that particular time, I was no longer the trust	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:22 20 21	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page actually the third page. We're still on this first question in your report, what is a fiduciary accounting. And you discussed that briefly. Let me ask you, what is required to be produced to the beneficiary in fiduciary
2 3 4 00:39:11 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:40:17 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:47 20 21 22 23	program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.  And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.  There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that  Q. And at the time you were the principal policies and procedures person at the Office of Special Trustee, correct?	2 3 4 00:43:56 5 6 7 8 9 00:44:24 10 11 12 13 14 00:44:46 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:22 20 21 22 23	to it to raise the question about whether it is proper or not, and then to allow the beneficiary to take action to see to it it is proper and to prevent a breach of trust.  Therefore, the information, the data in the records, is an asset that belongs to the trustee and it is valuable to the trustee. And it seems to me this is sort of a general principle that goes over into all other sorts of walks of life. If you take your automobile, for instance, to be repaired by the mechanic down the road, and he gives you a bill for \$300 or whatever it is, you will usually see on that bill, or you will certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the \$300? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.  So in that sense, that information is valuable to the beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.  Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page actually the third page. We're still on this first question in your report, what is a fiduciary accounting.  And you discussed that briefly. Let me ask you, what is

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

	1891		1893
1	conclusion.	1	among lawyers who are trustees, that there is a verification
2	THE COURT: Calls for a what?	2	process that the records that are being kept are accurate and
3	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Legal conclusion.	3	up-to-date and complete.
4	THE COURT: What in his experience? Go ahead.	4	Q. In your experience, have you ever seen an accounting where
00:45:57 <b>5</b>	BY MR. HARPER:	00:49:21 <b>5</b>	the source of the funds, the trust funds, has not been
6	Q. In your experience, Mr. Fitzgerald.	6	identified?
7	A. Repeat the question.	7	A. No. I don't think I have.
8	Q. What is required in the fiduciary accounting in your	8	<b>Q.</b> And in your experience where there is a fiduciary
9	experience?	9	accounting, if there is a lack of documentation, what is the
00:46:04 10	A. To be included in	00:49:50 10	result of a lack of documentation?
11	Q. Precisely.	11	A. The lack of documentation?
12	A in the information that is given to the beneficiary. I	12	Q. The lack of documentation to support a particular
13	thought we	13	transaction.
14	THE COURT: So far you've told us about listing and	14	A. You know, in my experience in banking, I really never saw
00:46:14 15	identifying assets held in trust, including money, securities,	00:50:10 15	that. Running a trust is really not rocket science. It's
16	and property.	16	really a pretty reasonable and obvious type of thing to do as
17	THE WITNESS: Right.	17	far as the records are concerned.
18	THE COURT: What else?	18	As I understand it, the scholarship says that where there
19	THE WITNESS: The other thing that goes into there are	19	are doubts about what the record lack of records or what the
00:46:25 <b>20</b>	the transactions that the trustee has engaged in and the	00:50:44 <b>20</b>	records mean, the doubts are resolved in favor of the
21	proceeds, if any, or the losses that have resulted from those	21	beneficiary. And the reason for that is that the trustee is
22	transactions. And the amount of time that that accounting	22	expected to know everything about the trust and its operation.
23	should cover is from the date of the last accounting. So it is	23	They're the only ones who are required to keep records.
24	with respect to the funds, I suppose, it would be the nature and	24	<b>Q.</b> I'd like to turn to your we've been talking about this
00:47:04 <b>25</b>	amount of the funds, the status of the funds, which means to me	00:51:11 <b>25</b>	notion of what is a fiduciary accounting. I'd like to turn to
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1892		1894
1	1892 where do those funds come from.	1	1894 your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to
1 2		1 2	
	where do those funds come from.		your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to
2	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust	2	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."
2	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the	2 3	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)
2 3 4	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.	2 3 4	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.
2 3 4 00:47:28 5	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:	2 3 4 00:51:37 5	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement,	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property, but it
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21 22	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21 22	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21 22 23	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it doesn't. So that is part of the verification process. There	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21 22 23	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in this case have been dismissed by the Court.
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21 22 23 24	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it doesn't. So that is part of the verification process. There are internal audits that go on all the time in institutions that	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21 22 23 24	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in this case have been dismissed by the Court.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, the precedents in this case,
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21 22 23	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it doesn't. So that is part of the verification process. There are internal audits that go on all the time in institutions that are trustees, and there should be audits that go on all the time	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21 22 23	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in this case have been dismissed by the Court.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, the precedents in this case, common law standards fill out the interstices of the duties
2 3 4 00:47:28 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:50 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:19 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:31 20 21 22 23 24	where do those funds come from.  And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust asset, the property that's held in trust in which the beneficiary has an equitable interest.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?  A. The records that they would need the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.  That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of those trust assets.  Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed in your experience?  A. Verification process?  Q. Yes.  A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it doesn't. So that is part of the verification process. There are internal audits that go on all the time in institutions that	2 3 4 00:51:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:52:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:52:41 15 16 17 18 19 00:53:12 20 21 22 23 24	your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."  (Witness reviewing document.)  Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.  A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.  So the and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.  Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in this case have been dismissed by the Court.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, the precedents in this case,

	1895		1897
1	applicable	1	regarding the historical accounting and how to perform it?
2	THE COURT: We're going to worry a lot about the law	2	A. I don't know that directly, except that I have now come to
3	later on, but let me hear the witness's answer to the question.	3	understand that the position is and I understand this back in
4	THE WITNESS: Would you restate the question?	4	'03 when the first historical plan was presented to the Court,
00:53:42 <b>5</b>	BY MR. HARPER:	00:59:12 5	that what the Department wished to do was to report essentially
6	Q. Your second question here is about whether or not the	6	on the monies, the funds, if you will, that had actually been
7	Secretary of Interior follows common law and traditional trust	7	posted to the various accounts.
8	principles to account to the individual Indian trust	8	That became even more clear to me after Mr. Swimmer became
9	beneficiaries, and I just wanted you to give a synopsis of your	9	the special trustee, because he said on at least one occasion
00:54:03 10	answer.	00:59:44 10	that the prior judge in this particular case had turned the case
11		11	from a funds case to an asset case. And we said it always was.
12	When I was there at the Interior Department, I had the opportunity to read a whole bunch of Indian trust cases, and all	12	
13		13	At another time in February out in Albuquerque, he restated
14	of those cases looked for guidance, let's say, to the restatement and to the other treatises on trust, Bogart and	14	that and said we only have to report on funds because that's  what the statute says and meaning the '94 Act and we don't
00:54:39 15	Scott.	01:00:17 15	have to do anything about non-income-producing assets. Both I
16	The Department under Secretary Babbitt put out an order	16	
17	which cited to a letter that the Department had produced when	17	and Donna Erwin, who was the head of OTFM, disagreed with him.  And if I remember correctly yeah, if I remember
18	Solicitor Krulitz was there, which cited to a whole lot of those	18	correctly, Donna Erwin actually asked me back in '03 to review
19	cases, and indeed, that particular solicitor's opinion said, if	19	what the Department was going to put together, and I verbally
00:55:11 20	I remember the verbiage correctly, was this was a trust, this	01:00:45 20	said to her, as acting special trustee, don't sign on to this,
21	Indian relationship was a trust, and that it was appropriate for	21	because if you do you will be trapped into saying, okay
22	the operation of that trust to be guided to some extent by those	22	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection on basis of hearsay,
23	things by those principles that guide private trustees.	23	Your Honor.
24	I found, however, that while there was some implication	24	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sustain the objection
00:55:50 <b>25</b>	that the Department does follow those principles, I came to	01:00:58 <b>25</b>	not because it's hearsay but because basically what the witness
00.00.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	01.50.50	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1896		1898
1	1896 realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told guite	1	1898
-	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite	_	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the
1 2 3	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some	1 2 3	
2	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the	2	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the  Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the  outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth
2 3 4	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the	2 3 4	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the  Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the  outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth  within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense
3	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.	3	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the  Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate
2 3 4 00:56:21 5	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the	2 3 4 01:01:18 5	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the  Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the  outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth  within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior	2 3 4 01:01:18 5	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on.
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21 22	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19 01:02:05 20	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?  A. No.
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21 22 23	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.  Q. Do you believe that	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19 01:02:05 20 21	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?  A. No.  Q. If we can turn to Question Three on your expert report,
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21 22 23 24	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.  Q. Do you believe that  A. However, we did stop making reference to the restatement,	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19 01:02:05 20 21 22 23 24	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?  A. No.  Q. If we can turn to Question Three on your expert report, page 5 at the bottom, this is in essence what this part of your report evaluates?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21 22 23	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.  Q. Do you believe that  A. However, we did stop making reference to the restatement, but we did continue to reference the general principles as I	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19 01:02:05 20 21 22 23	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?  A. No.  Q. If we can turn to Question Three on your expert report, page 5 at the bottom, this is in essence what this part of your report evaluates?
2 3 4 00:56:21 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:46 10 11 12 13 14 00:57:16 15 16 17 18 19 00:57:59 20 21 22 23 24	realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.  Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?  A. Nancy Jemison.  Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this the e-mail you were referring to?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?  A. Yes. There under the cc.  Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?  A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what I understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.  Q. Do you believe that  A. However, we did stop making reference to the restatement, but we did continue to reference the general principles as I understood them.	2 3 4 01:01:18 5 6 7 8 9 01:01:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:01:50 15 16 17 18 19 01:02:05 20 21 22 23 24	is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the Department of the Interior which I'm more interested in the outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.  Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on. BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007 accounting plan?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?  A. No.  Q. If we can turn to Question Three on your expert report, page 5 at the bottom, this is in essence what this part of your report evaluates?  A. Yes.

	1899		1901
1		1	
2	"Exclusions of beneficiaries and accounts." You talk about the	2	assets that produce those funds are trust funds, and therefore
3	accounts that are closed prior to 1994.	_	these proceeds are also trust funds. And I feel that way
_	A. That I think was probably inarticulately put, because going	3 4	because the trustee has an obligation to see to it, for
4	back and looking at that, it wasn't those closed prior to '94,		instance, that the lease, if that's what's producing the funds,
01:03:16 5	but I think it was the transactions that took place before '94.	01:07:18 5	is properly operating.
6	I think that's what that was.	_	So these to me are trust funds, and I believe the
7	Q. With respect to these accounts, do you think it's	7	government has usually considered that they were trust funds for
8	appropriate to exclude them from the accounting?	8	which the government was responsible. Therefore, they should be
9	A. No, because the Department's fiduciary responsibilities	9	accounted for.
01:03:38 10	with respect to these beneficiaries and the assets held in trust	01:07:38 10	Q. In your experience with respect to other trusts, are there
11	predates the Reform Act, which I think that that October 25th	11	times when beneficiaries receive proceeds directly from a source
	relates to not I think, I know it relates to. The Reform Act	12	other than the trustee?
13 14	didn't create the trust obligations. Those were already there.	13 14	A. Yes. Oh, yes. It is not, I suspect, uncommon for
01:04:18 15	Q. If we go down further to the next section here, it's called	01:08:04 15	businesses, for instance, that are run within a trust, to
01:04:18 15	"Direct pay."		produce funds for the beneficiary. As a matter of fact, I
17	THE COURT: Before you leave that, Mr. Harper, let's	16	remember one that I was over here at Riggs, and a fellow up
	straighten out with the witness and with me whether he meant	17	on Georgia Avenue died. The major business, his family business
18 19	accounts closed before October 25, 1994, or transactions. I	18 19	was a liquor store. And I was over at Riggs and I said well,
01:04:36 20	think accounts is what he did mean, and I think that's what I	01:08:24 20	how do you run that? Do you send one of your vice presidents in
01:04:36 20	understand it to be.	01:08:24 20	there to run the liquor store?
22	MR. HARPER: That's my understanding, Your Honor, as	22	He said of course not. We go over there and we see to it
23	well. BY MR. HARPER:	23	that the business is being run properly, that the place is being
24	Q. Is it accounts prior to 1994 or transactions, do you	24	stocked and that there's no fraud going on and all that sort of
01:04:44 25	understand?	01:08:43 <b>25</b>	stuff. But those funds went directly to the family. It didn't go through Riggs, because it was a family business. But because
01.04.44	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	01.06.43	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u>'</u>
			1002
1	1900  A. Yeah, I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.	1	1902 the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the
1 2	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.	1 2	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the
1 2 3	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page	1 2 3	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the
2	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.	2	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.
2 3 4	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:	2 3 4	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting
2	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.	2 3 4	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.
2 3 4 01:04:58 <b>5</b>	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the	2 3 4 01:09:04 5	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.</li> <li>BY MR. HARPER:</li> <li>Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?</li> <li>A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21 22	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that "but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21 22	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21 22 23	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that "but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of Indian trust assets." This second, could you explain a little	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21 22 23	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the administration of the trust and so that the heirs, if there are
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that "but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of Indian trust assets." This second, could you explain a little bit the second highlighted part there?	01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21 22 23 24	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the administration of the trust and so that the heirs, if there are any that have an interest in the property that is coming out of
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21 22 23	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that "but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of Indian trust assets." This second, could you explain a little bit the second highlighted part there?  A. Yes. I'd heard when I was over there that some people felt	2 3 4 01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21 22 23	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the administration of the trust and so that the heirs, if there are any that have an interest in the property that is coming out of that trust, can also look at that.
2 3 4 01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:06:01 15 16 17 18 19 01:06:17 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because yeah.  THE COURT: Okay. I think we're all on the same page then. Proceed.  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?  A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.  Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this section, the two highlighted areas here. See first, "That failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."  And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that "but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of Indian trust assets." This second, could you explain a little bit the second highlighted part there?  A. Yes. I'd heard when I was over there that some people felt that the funds, because they never came into the hands of the	01:09:04 5 6 7 8 9 01:09:30 10 11 12 13 14 01:09:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:10:21 20 21 22 23 24	the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.  Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?  A. I believe they would, yes.  Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?  A. I understand they do not intend to do that.  Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?  A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.  Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?  A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the administration of the trust and so that the heirs, if there are any that have an interest in the property that is coming out of that trust, can also look at that.  That again is the function of an accounting, as far as I'm

	1903		1905
1	account, a second-guessing if you will.	1	accounting.
2	Q. Do you understand in the Indian probate process, do they	2	Q. And where there's never been an accounting provided, what
3	perform that type of an accounting?	3	is the when does the accounting begin?
4	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection. Lack of foundation.	4	A. Usually go back to the date when the trustee had
01:11:09 <b>5</b>	BY MR. HARPER:	01:14:54 <b>5</b>	responsibility for the trust property, back to the beginning.
6	Q. Do you have an understanding, Mr. Fitzgerald, of how the	6	<b>Q.</b> If we can go down to the next heading, which is Compacting
7	Indian probate process works?	7	and Contracting Tribes, will the 2007 Plan as you understand it
8	A. A general understanding, because that was one of the things	8	from your review provide accounting for assets and funds held in
9	that we were trying to address in the Office of the Special	9	trust by the United States but managed through compacts or
01:11:28 10	Trustee.	01:15:27 10	contracts by tribes?
11	Q. Based on your understanding, is there any accounting	11	A. As I understand it, there is to be no accounting for those
12	provided to the beneficiaries during that process?	12	funds.
13	A. As I understand it, BIA will provide information about the	13	Q. And in your view, in your experience, can you provide a
14	trust to the probate officials. And as I understand it, the	14	fiduciary accounting without accounting for those assets and
01:11:48 15	probate officials will accept that information without question.	01:15:46 15	funds?
16	It's also interesting to me that both the trustee and the	16	A. You can't, it seems to me, because those assets that are
17	probate people are within the body that is the trustee, so it is	17	being managed or administered, whatever word you want to use, by
18	one part of the trustee reporting to another part of the	18	an agent or a contractor, which these compacting and contracting
19	trustee. So it's the trustee reporting to itself.	19	tribes are, are acting on behalf of the trustee. And the
01:12:23 <b>20</b>	<b>Q.</b> Do you understand that there is or is not an accounting	01:16:12 <b>20</b>	trustee cannot escape its responsibility for the actions of
21	provided?	21	their agents, essentially.
22	A. I would not consider that an accounting, because it does	22	And we recite to the Leshy memo in there that well, let
23	not put any beneficiary in the position to raise questions about	23	me see. Yeah. The Leshy memo to Ken Rossman, "The fact that a
24	the administration of the trust.	24	tribe takes over federal duties by entering into one or more
01:12:40 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> So that would be a distinction with how probates sometimes	01:16:49 <b>25</b>	contracts or compacts does not extinguish the federal trust
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1904		1906
1	work in the private sector when accountings are provided.	1	responsibility." I was pleased to see that, because that's my
2	A. That's right.	2	understanding of what general trust practices would require.
3	<b>Q.</b> If we can turn to the next section on the next page.	3	${\bf Q.}$ In the private sector, are there times when there is an
4	Accounts Opened Prior to 1938.	4	agent or a contractor of a trustee that manages the trust
01:13:08 <b>5</b>	A. Yes.	01:17:20 <b>5</b>	assets?
6	<b>Q.</b> And this deals with the fact that the transactions are not	6	A. I wouldn't call it managing the trust assets, but there
7	being accounted for?	7	are because the management of the trust assets always
8	A. Yes. This is what I was getting mixed up with with the	8	remains or the responsibility for the management of the trust
9	other one when I was talking about that, yeah. This is where	9	assets always remains with the trustee.
01:13:22 10	it's not the account, it's the transactions.	01:17:38 10	There are innumerable instances, and you see them almost
11	<b>Q.</b> So your understanding of the 2007 Plan is that they are not	11	every place in the wider trust world, where a trustee will hire
12	intending to provide an accounting for transactions that predate	12	outside people to keep the records, to execute securities
13	1938?	13	transactions, to collect the funds and pay the funds out, all of
14	A. That's right.	14	that sort of thing. But everybody understands that those are
01:13:36 15	Q. And do you think	01:18:11 15	still the responsibility of the trustee for which the trustee is
16	A. And obviously as I wrote this, this is, as I said before,	16	responsible and liable if they go wrong.
17	inartfully done, I think, but this goes to the transactions,	17	<b>Q.</b> Would it be consistent, then, with general trust principles
18	yes.	18	to exclude the transactions that were administered by compacting
19	Q. And what is your view of that?	19	and contracting tribes?
01:13:54 20	A. Well, again, it is a situation where the beneficiary is	01:18:43 20	A. Not in my view, no.
21	getting less information through this accounting, as they call	21	<b>Q.</b> If we can turn our attention to the following page, page 9
22	it, than would be usual in any other trust context.	22	of your expert report. And there's a section called Additional
23	Q. Normally, for what period of time is an accounting	23	Exclusions, and I think you talked briefly about a number of
24	provided?	24	other parts of the 2007 Plan. One of those, in the top
01:14:29 <b>25</b>	A. Accounting is provided from the date of the last	01:19:13 <b>25</b>	second sentence, says talking about the plan, "It limits its
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
1	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter

	1907		1909
1	accounting only to monies actually collected and recorded in the	1	do you know what a what's commonly referred to as a Youpee
2	individual accounts." Do you see that?	2	interest?
3	A. Yes.	3	A. Yes. I learned about those when I was at Interior. As I
4	<b>Q.</b> Is that your understanding?	4	understand it, and I don't know the year, but Congress passed a
01:19:26 <b>5</b>	A. That's my understanding.	01:23:53 <b>5</b>	law apropos of I guess the correct me here, the Youpee
6	<b>Q.</b> And is that appropriate if one wants to complete a	6	Indians or was Youpee the plaintiff?
7	fiduciary accounting?	7	<b>Q.</b> I believe he was an individual plaintiff, for the record.
8	A. No. Again, where records are kept accurately and	8	A. An individual plaintiff. I don't remember the tribe. The
9	completely and up-to-date, you would see very, very few monies	9	upshot of the statute was that there was a large amount of land
01:19:51 10	that were collected but not recorded. Here that is not the	01:24:16 10	which was not producing very much money, if any, and Congress
11	case. When I first got there, there was I can't remember how	11	said, well, let's escheat that land to the tribe, whatever tribe
12	many millions it was, but it was quite large. I understand	12	it was.
13	they're working that number down. But there's still, as I	13	Youpee said the plaintiffs said you've taken my land
14	understand it, a large amount of money that the trustee does not	14	unconstitutionally. And the Supreme Court agreed with that. So
01:20:24 15	really know where that money is to go, and needs to do a great	01:24:45 15	there was then a project, I guess, going on about how do you get
16	deal of research to see to it that it gets to where it's	16	that land into its proper hands.
17	supposed to go, to the proper account, to the proper	17	Q. Do you understand that the 2007 Plan will or will not
18		18	account for funds generated from Youpee interests?
19	So here you've get accets funds that have been collected	19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
_	So here you've got assets, funds, that have been collected		A. That's as I understand it, yes.
01:20:51 20	but haven't been attributed to the right account. They should	01:25:09 20	Q. Excuse me, what is your understanding?
21	be accounted for, I believe. It'd be interesting to see how you	21	A. That they will not account for those funds.
22	would do that, however. It might be with an asterisk at the	22	Q. And do you think that's appropriate in light of
23	bottom of the statement, at the bottom of the beneficiary	23	A. No.
24	statement, which says we've got X number of funds, some of which	24	Q. In your experience, is it appropriate does a fiduciary
01:21:27 <b>25</b>	you may be entitled to, but I don't think I've ever seen that	01:25:24 <b>25</b>	accounting, does it require the identification of the assets, of
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Departure
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1908		Official Court Reporter
1	<u>'</u>	1	' '
1 2	1908	1 2	1910
_	1908 anyplace.	_	1910 the nonfund assets of the trust?
2	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have	_	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?
2	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?	_	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.
2 3 4	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.	2 3 4	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee
2 3 4 01:21:44 5	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies	2 3 4 01:25:45 <b>5</b>	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17 18	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17 18 19	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker,
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:27:15 20	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:27:15 20 21	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21 22	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee,	2 3 4 01:25:45 5 6 7 8 9 01:26:26 10 11 12 13 14 01:26:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:27:15 20 21 22	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.  Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21 22 23	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee, if you will, to pay the money in, and you're also relying on the	01:25:45	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.  Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it says well, it's up on the screen. I won't read it, but you
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21 22 23 24	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee, if you will, to pay the money in, and you're also relying on the accuracy of the local records, the individual records.	01:25:45	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.  Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it says well, it's up on the screen. I won't read it, but you can see that there. Two questions on this. First, do you
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21 22 23	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee, if you will, to pay the money in, and you're also relying on the	01:25:45	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.  Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it says well, it's up on the screen. I won't read it, but you
2 3 4 01:21:44 5 6 7 8 9 01:22:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:22:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:22:49 20 21 22 23 24	anyplace.  Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?  A. Absolutely.  Q. And what about monies so monies owed but also monies actually collected.  A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's owed, and they should.  Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the Interior, do you know if they have an accounts receivable system?  A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.  Q. And you were there till 2005; is that correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?  A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee, if you will, to pay the money in, and you're also relying on the accuracy of the local records, the individual records.	01:25:45	the nonfund assets of the trust?  A. The nonfund assets of the trust?  Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.  A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.  Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete.  And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.  So it is important for those assets, the non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.  Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it says well, it's up on the screen. I won't read it, but you can see that there. Two questions on this. First, do you

Official Court Reporter

Official Court Reporter

	1911		1913
1	implemented, will constitute a fiduciary accounting?	1	MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I have no further questions
2	A. No, because it doesn't give all of the information to which	2	for this witness. Thank you, Mr. Fitzgerald, for your
3	the beneficiary is entitled.	3	testimony.
4	Q. And second, given your experience at the Department of the	4	THE COURT: Cross-examine?
01:28:00 <b>5</b>	Interior and in light of what you know about the state of the	01:31:58 5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	policies and procedures and records, do you believe that the	6	BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
7	Department of the Interior can perform a fiduciary accounting?	7	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fitzgerald.
8	A. I don't think so. We know that the records are incomplete	8	A. Good afternoon. Nice to see you again.
9	to some extent. What I understand is that as time has gone on,	9	Q. Nice to see you too. Deja vu all over again. Just a
01:28:30 10	the records are becoming more complete, but they're still	01:32:14 10	couple of questions about your period of time at the OCC.
11	incomplete to some extent. And the fact that the Department has	11	A. Yes.
12		12	Q. You mentioned your concern there was about the
13	put forward this idea that their only responsibility is for the	13	·
14	funds actually collected, suggests to me that what they want to	14	administration of a trust through the trust department having
01:29:04 15	do is what they think they can do, as opposed to what they	01:32:33 15	the potential to bring down the bank.
	should do.		A. That's right.
16 17	Q. I'd like to turn your attention for a moment to Exhibit 19	16	Q. And why was that an issue?
18	of your expert report.	17	A. Why was it an issue?
19	A. Oh, yes.	19	Q. Right.
01:29:20 20	Q. Do you recognize this document?	_	A. The comptroller was concerned as a policy matter that the
	A. Ido.	01:32:47 20	office be fully aware of all of the risks that might affect the
21	Q. And who is Mr. Thomas Slonaker?	21	solvency of a particular institution. Prior to Mr. Saxon being
22	A. He was the special trustee in July of '02.	22	there, the examination of the trust departments was conducted by
23	Q. Did Mr. Slonaker ever deliver this testimony?	23	examiners who were experienced in the commercial side of the
24	A. I don't think he did.	24	bank and really didn't have any knowledge or experience with
01:29:38 <b>25</b>	Q. Do you know why not?	01:33:19 <b>25</b>	trusts or trust principles or trust law.
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	1912		1914
_	A. He was advised	1	Q. Well, that historical perspective is nice, but
2 3	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for	2	fundamentally what was the problem with a bank going under?
4	speculation.	3	A. If a
_	THE COURT: What's your basis of how do you know	5	Q. The depositors wouldn't get their money, correct?
01:29:49 <b>5</b>	what he was advised of?	01:33:37 5	A. Yes
7	THE WITNESS: He told me what he was advised of.	7	MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. Could he let the witness finish his answer.
8	THE COURT: And who is where is Thomas Slonaker	8	THE COURT: If he thinks it's a nonresponsive
9	NOW?	9	·
01:30:04 10	MR. HARPER: He was on our witness list, Your Honor, but I think he's in India.	01:33:49 10	question, he can I think he appropriately interrupted. I'll overrule the objection. Ask your question again,
11	THE COURT: I think I'll sustain the hearsay	11	Mr. Stemplewicz.
12	objection.	12	BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
13	BY MR. HARPER:	13	Q. The problem with the bank going under essentially is that
14	Q. If we could turn back to the front of your expert report to	14	the depositors would lose their money, correct?
01:30:33 15	page 10. And Question Four is "Is it justified and" "Is it	01:33:59 15	A. The depositors would lose their money. That was the first
16	unjustified and inconsistent with fiduciary principles for the	16	thing and most important thing, but the failure of banks,
17	government to bear the costs of the accounting for the IIM	17	particularly large banks, impacts the whole system. And we were
18	trust?" And you say the answer to this question is no. And why	18	concerned about that.
19	do you say that?	19	Q. If the trustee in the kinds of trusts you were looking at
01:31:09 20	A. I believe that the government as a trustee, as a fiduciary,	01:34:26 20	back then were to lose all the money of the beneficiary, where
01:31:09 20	owes the beneficiaries a complete and accurate accounting	01:34:26 20	did the beneficiary have to look for recourse?
22	statement.	22	A. To the trustee.
23	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object on	23	Q. The trustee's insolvent.
24	the basis of relevance.	24	A. Yes, that's exactly true, and they would probably lose all
	CONTRACTOR OF THE VALUE OF THE		13, that a chacky true, and they would probably lose di
01:31:33 25		01:34:42 25	of their money because the FDIC didn't insure any of that
01:31:33 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.	01:34:42 <b>25</b>	of their money because the FDIC didn't insure any of that.
01:31:33 <b>25</b>		01:34:42 <b>25</b>	of their money because the FDIC didn't insure any of that.  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter

	1915		1917
1	Q. What was the extent of FDIC insurance at that time, do you	1	accounting, you need to have confidence that the starting
2	remember?	2	balance of whatever current accounts are there are appropriate
3	A. I think it was a hundred thousand dollars per account.	3	and are accurate, and that relies on the accountings that should
4	Q. In the '80s?	4	have been done, and therefore, if they weren't done, you should
01:34:57 5	A. Savings account.	01:38:33 5	do them now.
6	Q. In the '80s?	01:38:33	Q. Okay. Over the course of many years, the administration of
7	A. What did I say, a hundred thousand dollars?	7	the individual Indian monies accounts, day to day, year to year,
8	Q. Yes.	8	administration of the accounts was conducted at the agency
9	A. No, I didn't mean a hundred thousand dollars. Thank you	9	level, correct?
01:35:07 10	for correcting me. A thousand dollars.	01:38:51 10	
11	Q. Now, also, while you were at the OCC, were you an associate	11	A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. Did you, in forming your opinions or instituting your
12	of Mr. Homan's, who was here before?	12	Q. Did you, in forming your opinions or instituting your policies, did you go back to the field agencies and talk with
13		13	any of the employees about their work?
14	•	14	A. I did not personally, no.
01:35:26 15	Washington. I think I preceded him in the Washington office, but whenever he came to Washington, I met him then. But he was	01:39:05 15	Q. So you weren't familiar with the kind of knowledge that BIA
16	on the commercial side rather than the trust side.	16	on-the-ground employees doing this work had with the accounts,
17	Q. And also Mr. Miller whom you mentioned is the deputy	17	with their constituents, the kind of familiarity they had with
18		18	
19	special trustee  A. That's right. He was in the law department when I was in	19	the problems of the account holders and that sort of thing?  A. As I was there, I became more aware of what was going on in
01:35:40 20	the law department.	01:39:35 20	the different offices, and what struck me was that there was
21	Q. And Mr. Gingold was there at the time?	21	very little understanding about what a trust really was and what
22	A. That's true.	22	sort of principles would apply to it. I did know that in many
23	Q. You indicated that you had provided some internal guidance	23	cases the people in those regional offices knew the
24	to the Department of the Interior regarding doing accountings	24	beneficiaries quite well, but that's a different question from
01:36:01 <b>25</b>	for Indian trust beneficiaries. Does that refer to current	01:40:13 <b>25</b>	about whether they appropriately managed the assets that they
01.00.01	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	01.40.10	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	·		·
	1916		1918
1		1	1918 were supposed to manage.
1 2	1916 accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?	1 2	were supposed to manage.
_	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical		
2	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?	2	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing
3	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the	3	were supposed to manage. Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?
2 3 4	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to	2 3 4	<ul><li>were supposed to manage.</li><li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li><li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had</li></ul>
2 3 4 01:36:28 5	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal	2 3 4 01:40:30 5	<ul> <li>were supposed to manage.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li> <li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6	<ul> <li>were supposed to manage.</li> <li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li> <li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI.
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.  Q. How many account documents, documents used in the
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.  Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.  Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21 22	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.  A. I'm not sure I understand that.	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21 22	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.  Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?  A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21 22 23	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.  A. I'm not sure I understand that.  Q. I mean, they couldn't be retroactively instituted. They	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li> <li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.</li> <li>Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?</li> <li>A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.</li> <li>Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?</li> <li>A. Yes, she was.</li> <li>Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?</li> <li>A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied on the information that was coming to us from other sources about the collection of and the well, the availability and the collection of and the condition of the records at that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21 22 23 24	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.  A. I'm not sure I understand that.  Q. I mean, they couldn't be retroactively instituted. They did what they did, correct?	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li> <li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.</li> <li>Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?</li> <li>A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.</li> <li>Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?</li> <li>A. Yes, she was.</li> <li>Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?</li> <li>A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied on the information that was coming to us from other sources about the collection of and the well, the availability and the collection of and the condition of the records at that particular time.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21 22 23	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.  A. I'm not sure I understand that.  Q. I mean, they couldn't be retroactively instituted. They did what they did, correct?  A. They did what they did, but in order to have a current	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21 22 23	were supposed to manage.  Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?  A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.  Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?  A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.  Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?  A. Yes, she was.  Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?  A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied on the information that was coming to us from other sources about the collection of and the well, the availability and the collection of and the condition of the records at that particular time.  Q. Now, on the subject of trust documents, would
2 3 4 01:36:28 5 6 7 8 9 01:36:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:37:22 15 16 17 18 19 01:37:46 20 21 22 23 24	accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?  A. As I remember it, there was and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out and I think it eventually did put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.  The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.  Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the 1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?  A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.  Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or '97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.  A. I'm not sure I understand that.  Q. I mean, they couldn't be retroactively instituted. They did what they did, correct?	2 3 4 01:40:30 5 6 7 8 9 01:40:50 10 11 12 13 14 01:41:13 15 16 17 18 19 01:41:32 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?</li> <li>A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.</li> <li>Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?</li> <li>A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.</li> <li>Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?</li> <li>A. Yes, she was.</li> <li>Q. How many account documents, documents used in the administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?</li> <li>A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied on the information that was coming to us from other sources about the collection of and the well, the availability and the collection of and the condition of the records at that particular time.</li> </ul>

	4040		4004
1	1919 correspondence and memos and things like that that go back and	1	1921  Q. You've testified and your opinion covers the scope of the
2	forth within the agency, in the administration of the IIM	2	historical accounting under the 2007 Plan. But I did not see
3	accounts, would they be trust documents?	3	any mention or hear any in your testimony, didn't see in your
4	A. If they have to do with trust administration, yes.	4	report or hear in your testimony anything regarding Section
2:21 5	Q. And you've testified that trust documents are trust assets.	01:46:15 <b>5</b>	102(a) of the 1994 Act, which is what this is about.
6	A. That's right.	6	A. 102
7	Q. Yet many of them are produced from your personal files in	7	MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. There's no
8	this case.	8	foundation that that's what this is about. There's a dispute on
9	A. Yes, but none of those have anything to do with individual	9	that specific question here.
2:34 10	accounts.	01:46:30 10	MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Well, the fact is
11	Q. Let's talk about the individual Indian trust. How does	11	THE COURT: Extract the words "that's what this is
12	that compare with the tribal trust in terms of the beneficiary	12	about" from the question and ask it again.
13	composition? I mean, individual Indian trust is not an	13	BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
14	aggregate trust, is it? It's a one-on-one. It's an account	14	<b>Q.</b> It is a fact that you did not quote Section 102(a) of the
2:59 15	holder by account holder trust?	01:46:43 15	1994 Act in your report?
16	A. The individuals yes. Right.	16	A. Tell me what 102(a) is, if you would.
17	Q. It's really hundreds of thousands of trusts.	17	Q. Well, that's the
18	A. That's right. Or hundreds of thousands of trust accounts,	18	THE COURT: I think it's probably an answer to his
19	yes.	19	question. If he doesn't know what it is, it's not in his
3:13 <b>20</b>	Q. But also hundreds of thousands of trusts. There's not one	01:46:54 20	report.
21	unitary individual Indian trust.	21	THE WITNESS: Well, it's been two years since I've
22	A. Oh, I see what you're saying. Yes, I would agree with	22	looked at that statute, so if you really want an answer to the
23	that.	23	question, whether I dealt with it or not without referring to
24	Q. So no single IIM beneficiary would necessarily have an	24	102
3:31 <b>25</b>	interest or a right to demand an accounting of the whole	01:47:06 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: It was a rhetorical question. He knows
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1920		1922
1	individual Indian trust.	1	it's not in your report. Ask the next question,
2	A. They have, the individual has and I guess I would agree	2	Mr. Stemplewicz.
3	with that. He does have, the individual Indian does have a	3	BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
4	right to an accounting for his account, or her account as the	4	<b>Q.</b> With regard to the question of statistical sampling, your
3:57 <b>5</b>	case may be.	01:47:18 <b>5</b>	opinion is that statistical sampling is inappropriate?
6	${\bf Q.}$ And what sort of an accounting is the common law right to	6	A. Inappropriate for an accounting, yes.
7	an accounting? Where does that come from? How does that	7	<b>Q.</b> And have you read what the Court of Appeals has written in
8	accounting get generated? What does it start with? Doesn't it	8	this case about that subject?
9	start with a request of the account holder?	9	A. I am aware of what they said.
4:14 10	A. It can, but there is a general obligation to keep the	01:47:32 10	<b>Q.</b> You disagree with that.
11	beneficiary informed, and indeed for the trustee to remain	11	A. I would say that I would have approached it differently
12	informed about the beneficiary so that the trustee can act in	12	<b>Q.</b> Direct pay. To your knowledge, direct pay money does not
13		13	go through IIM accounts, correct?
	the best interest of that particular beneficiary.		
14	Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described	14	A. That's as I understand it.
4:48 15		01:47:58 15	<ul><li>A. That's as I understand it.</li><li>Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of</li></ul>
4:48 <b>15</b> <b>16</b>	Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described	01:47:58 15	
4:48 <b>15</b> 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be</li> </ul>	01:47:58 <b>15</b> 16 17	<b>Q.</b> Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of
4:48 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18	<b>Q.</b> Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls
16 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19	<b>Q.</b> Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate
4:48 15 16 17 18 19 5:23 20	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> </ul>	01:47:58	<b>Q.</b> Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think
4:48 15 16 17 18 19 5:23 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21	<b>Q.</b> Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about?
14:48 15 16 17 18 19 5:23 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the common law, the common law is the default form of an accounting,</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21 22	Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about?  A. I don't see why it would necessarily slow down anythin
4:48 15 16 17 18 19 5:23 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the common law, the common law is the default form of an accounting, correct? In other words, if the trust instrument itself doesn't provide for direction to the trustee as to how to provide the accounting, then the law would look to the common law.</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21 22 23	Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about? A. I don't see why it would necessarily slow down anythin Q. I'm just asking you
14:48 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the common law, the common law is the default form of an accounting, correct? In other words, if the trust instrument itself doesn't provide for direction to the trustee as to how to provide the accounting, then the law would look to the common law.</li> <li>A. Yes. Or Scott or Bogart, the scholarship in the area.</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about?</li> <li>A. I don't see why it would necessarily slow down anythin Q. I'm just asking you MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for</li> </ul>
14:48 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the common law, the common law is the default form of an accounting, correct? In other words, if the trust instrument itself doesn't provide for direction to the trustee as to how to provide the accounting, then the law would look to the common law.</li> <li>A. Yes. Or Scott or Bogart, the scholarship in the area.</li> <li>Yeah.</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about?</li> <li>A. I don't see why it would necessarily slow down anythin</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking you         MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation. This witness doesn't know</li> </ul>
44:48 15 16 17 18 19 45:23 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. But in a shorthand way, I think you previously described the accounting under common law as an on-request right.</li> <li>A. It can be on request, but again, I say if the trustee wants to assure that it's doing a good job, it would to me be proactive in producing those accountings.</li> <li>Q. Now, the type of accounting you're referring to under the common law, the common law is the default form of an accounting, correct? In other words, if the trust instrument itself doesn't provide for direction to the trustee as to how to provide the accounting, then the law would look to the common law.</li> <li>A. Yes. Or Scott or Bogart, the scholarship in the area.</li> </ul>	01:47:58 15 16 17 18 19 01:48:24 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Assuming that to account for direct pay, the Department of the Interior would have to institute some sort of administrative controls that would enable them to identify payments and verify them and that sort of thing, and those administrative controls were to slow down the receipt or the payment, the ultimate receipt by the beneficiary, would that be something do you think the beneficiaries might have some concerns about?</li> <li>A. I don't see why it would necessarily slow down anythin Q. I'm just asking you         MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for</li> </ul>

	1923		1925
1	THE COURT: Sustained.	1	the accounting. That falls under the rubric of keeping the
2	BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:	2	beneficiary informed.
3	<b>Q.</b> You testified and your report I think indicates that no	3	Q. Turning to the issue of compacting and contracting tribes,
4	deceased beneficiaries will receive an accounting. Were you	4	is it your understanding that these tribes that do the
01:49:02 <b>5</b>	intending to include beneficiaries who died after October 25,	01:52:34 <b>5</b>	compacting and contracting are considered to be sovereign
6	1994?	6	nations?
7	A. Yeah. Yes, I suppose so. I haven't really considered that	7	A. Yes. I assume they are sovereign nations. They are
8	particular question, but yes. Any deceased beneficiary who	8	considered to be recognized tribes are considered to be
9	hasn't had an accounting should have an accounting.	9	sovereign nations.
01:49:26 10	<b>Q.</b> If you were to find out that the scope of the historical	01:52:44 10	<b>Q.</b> And is it also your understanding that the compacting and
11	accounting, the population of accounts from which the accounting	11	contracting is part of the U.S. policy to promote
12	is done would include accounts of beneficiaries who died after	12	self-governance by the tribes?
13	October 1994, would that affect your opinion any?	13	A. I understand that also. Indeed, I think there's a letter
14	A. That it would include those?	14	from John Miller to Mr. Sinclair on this very point in my
01:49:49 15	Q. Yes.	01:53:08 15	exhibits, and that letter, if I remember correctly, recites to
16	A. I would conclude that if the Department is giving an	16	those.
17	accounting to the apropos of the beneficiaries who have died,	17	<b>Q.</b> In your experience in the private sector, does that
18	that that would be consistent with fiduciary practice.	18	situation have any analogue in the private sector, where a
19	<b>Q.</b> And would the same hold true if the population of accounts	19	trustee delegates to a sovereign nation pursuant to a national
01:50:12 <b>20</b>	in the 2007 Plan included estate accounts that were open as of	01:53:29 <b>20</b>	policy?
21	October 25, 1994?	21	A. In the trust area, not that I am aware of. However, in the
22	A. I hope I understand what you're asking me. This would be	22	commercial banking area, there are similar sorts of situations.
23	for accounts for estates?	23	When I was back at the Comptroller of the Currency, for
24	Q. Yeah. A deceased account holder, the funds from the IIM	24	instance, there was a situation where some foreign nationals who
01:50:35 <b>25</b>	account are now in an estate IIM account, and that account is	01:53:58 <b>25</b>	were part of the royal family of some sovereign nation wanted a
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1001		4000
1	1924	1	1926
1	still open as of October 25, 1994.	1	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information
2	still open as of October 25, 1994.  A. And in probate I take it?	2	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And
3	still open as of October 25, 1994.  A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.		bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the
2 3 4	still open as of October 25, 1994.  A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?	2 3 4	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.	3	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee
2 3 4	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I	2 3 4 01:54:24 5	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right to an	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.  And that's standard trust principles.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21 22	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting?	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21 22	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary. And that's standard trust principles.  Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21 22 23	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting?  A. It would seem to me that that would be something that the	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21 22 23	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.  And that's standard trust principles.  Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it is to enlighten the Court about what happens in the private
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21 22 23 24	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting?  A. It would seem to me that that would be something that the trustee should inform the beneficiary of, that he does have the	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21 22 23 24	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.  And that's standard trust principles.  Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it is to enlighten the Court about what happens in the private sector, but not necessarily to say that's what would happen
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21 22 23	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting?  A. It would seem to me that that would be something that the trustee should inform the beneficiary of, that he does have the right to an accounting and has a right to raise questions about	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21 22 23	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary. And that's standard trust principles.  Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it is to enlighten the Court about what happens in the private sector, but not necessarily to say that's what would happen here.
2 3 4 01:50:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:51:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:51:26 15 16 17 18 19 01:51:48 20 21 22 23 24	A. And in probate I take it?  Q. Yes.  A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?  Q. Assume that's the case.  A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I understand it, fiduciary principles.  Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information to the probate official?  A. That's as I understand it, yes.  Q. But that the information does not constitute in your opinion an accounting.  A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate people on its face.  Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?  A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but  Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting?  A. It would seem to me that that would be something that the trustee should inform the beneficiary of, that he does have the	2 3 4 01:54:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:55:30 15 16 17 18 19 01:55:58 20 21 22 23 24	bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.  But here the trust information is are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.  Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?  A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.  Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?  A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.  And that's standard trust principles.  Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it is to enlighten the Court about what happens in the private sector, but not necessarily to say that's what would happen

	1927		1929
1	A. No. I don't agree with that. As I understand it, the	1	that
2	government is a trustee. The courts have said the government is	2	A. That's right.
3	a trustee. That the principles that apply to private trustees	3	Q those questions? Without a request for an accounting,
4	can be the guidance for the actions of the government as	4	does the trustee have to provide an accounting at regular
01:56:56 <b>5</b>	trustee, and I rely to a certain extent on that of what Mitchell	02:00:40 <b>5</b>	intervals?
6	said and particularly what the dissenting judges in Mitchell	6	A. I would say that a trustee needs to and is expected to
7	said, which was very, very interesting, it seemed to me.	7	provide an accounting on regular intervals, if that's yearly or
8	So this is a fiduciary obligation. I believe that the	8	whatever. As I understand the scholarship
9	congress knew exactly what it was doing. The government knew	9	THE COURT: You've answered the question. What's the
01:57:21 10	exactly what it was doing when these trusts were set up. In	02:01:08 10	next question?
11	prior generations I believe there was a good deal better	11	BY MR. HARPER:
12	knowledge about what a trust is and what it involves than today.	12	Q. Are the trust assets of individuals Indians, are they
13	Q. Well, wouldn't that concept of having to pay if you've lost	13	commingled?
14	the documents through negligence be a form of absolute	14	A. I understand some of them are through fractionization.
01:57:52 15	liability?	02:01:17 15	<b>Q.</b> What about the fund assets, are they commingled?
16	A. It would seem to me that it could be, but what I would	16	A. They are commingled at OTFM. As the money comes in, those
17	rather characterize it as, the admonition to keep good records	17	things are invested in a commingled fashion.
18	so that you don't lose them.	18	<b>Q.</b> The defense counsel asked you about whether or not a single
19	<b>Q.</b> Right. But in your analysis have you considered the	19	beneficiary has the right to seek an accounting of the entire
01:58:09 <b>20</b>	concept of absolute liability as applied to the United States?	02:01:40 <b>20</b>	IIM trust. Since the funds, as you've just testified, are
21	A. As I understand it, the United States has been held liable	21	commingled, how can a beneficiary receive a full accounting
22	for mismanagement of the trust in other cases.	22	without an accounting of the entire trust?
23	Q. On a showing of liability, correct, not on an absolute	23	A. They can, and that accounting would look very much like
24	liability theory?	24	what commercial banks do in the with common trust funds.
01:58:38 25	A. On a showing of liability, I suppose. I'm not sure	02:02:09 <b>25</b>	Q. Do you recall counsel asking you about compacting and
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1928		1930
1	Q. You haven't currently looked at Supreme Court cases like	1	contracting tribes?
2	the Dalehite case that talks about absolute liability?	2	A. Yes.
3	A. No, I have not.	3	Q. Have you reviewed the self-determination statute that
4	Q. Now, you indicated that it's your belief that the		
	Q. Now, you indicated that it's your belief that the	4	provides for the ability to compact and contract?
01:58:56 <b>5</b>	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM	02:02:25 <b>5</b>	provides for the ability to compact and contract?  A. Yes.
01:58:56 5		5	, ,
_	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM	02:02:25 <b>5</b>	A. Yes.
_	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?	02:02:25 5	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not</li></ul>
6 7 8 9	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony	02:02:25 <b>5 6 7</b>	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li></ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.	02:02:25 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 02:02:40 <b>10</b>	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li> <li>A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me?	02:02:25 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 02:02:40 <b>10</b> 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li> <li>A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?	02:02:25 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 02:02:40 <b>10</b> 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li> <li>A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is	02:02:25	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li> <li>A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting.	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to	02:02:25	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?</li> <li>A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.  Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.  Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view? A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting. Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.  Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.  Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.  REDIRECT EXAMINATION	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)  (Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view? A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting. Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.  REDIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. HARPER:	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)  (Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we expect to have three more
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view? A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting.  If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting. Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.  REDIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. HARPER: Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, you testified on cross regarding whether or	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)  (Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we expect to have three more witnesses. This afternoon Mr. Jeff Zippin from OST, OTFM, and
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?  A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting.  Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.  REDIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. HARPER:  Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, you testified on cross regarding whether or not a beneficiary must request an accounting. Do you recall	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)  (Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we expect to have three more witnesses. This afternoon Mr. Jeff Zippin from OST, OTFM, and then tomorrow we expect to have Sally Willett, who has been an
6 7 8 9 01:59:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:59:35 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?  A. I think my testimony Q. It's just impossible.  A. Excuse me? Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view? A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting.  If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, I suppose you could do an accounting. Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?  A. No. I've seen pictures of it.  MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.  MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect.  THE COURT: Okay.  REDIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. HARPER: Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, you testified on cross regarding whether or	02:02:25	A. Yes.  Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?  A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.  THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.  (Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285 received into evidence.)  (Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)  MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we expect to have three more witnesses. This afternoon Mr. Jeff Zippin from OST, OTFM, and

	1931		1933
1	administrative law judge in probate for the Department. And	1	whole.
2	then completing with Joe Christie, who, we think both witnesses	2	THE COURT: In the ordinary course of things, we don't
3	we should be able to complete first thing in the morning.	3	receive expert testimony just designated in written form, but if
4	I will go ahead and tell the Court both of those witnesses,	4	there's no objection to it, I guess I'll let it be part of the
02:19:38 <b>5</b>	whom we don't have control over, live in the West and both are	02:23:01 5	record as long as it doesn't cover the cost issue. I guess
6	traveling to Washington, D.C. today. So they will be available	6	that's where we are on that.
7	first thing in the morning. But upon the completion of those	7	Let's proceed with the witness you have yet this afternoon.
8	three witnesses, we plan to rest our case.	8	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. The Plaintiffs
9	THE COURT: All right. Then there will be some	9	call Mr. Jeff Zippin.
02:19:59 10	rebuttal witnesses from the government, right?	02:23:43 10	(The witness takes the stand.)
11	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Caren Dunne will be	11	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, if you would state your name
12	available to testify tomorrow. And as necessary, Dr. Hinkins	12	and spell your last name, please.
13	from NORC will also be available. At this point, it appears	13	THE COURT: Robertson. James Robertson. R-O-B
14	that Plaintiffs will not be presenting Robert Vaughn, correct?	14	(Laughter)
02:20:18 15	MR. DORRIS: We do not plan to present Mr. Vaughn.	02:24:00 15	MR. DORRIS: Sorry, Your Honor.
16	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Because of that, Your Honor, we	16	THE WITNESS: My name is Jeffrey Zippin. Z-I-P-P-I-N.
17	propose we had previously designated the prior testimony of	17	MR. DORRIS: And Your Honor, to tell you the areas we
18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	18	• • •
19	Professor Langbein. He wrote a subsequent report in 2007 to address Mr. Vaughn's. We proposed that his designated testimony	19	plan to cover, I cannot tell you what Mr. Zippin is going to say. I've never met him, and he obviously works for the
02:20:41 20		02:24:21 <b>20</b>	,
21	be offered to the Court because it is relevant to the testimony	21	government. But want to go through with his involvement in the
22	you just heard from Mr. Fitzgerald, but there's no reason to  bring him in to add anything new regarding Mr. Vaughn obviously,	22	2003 and 2007 Plan, including especially the assembly of the
23		23	administrative record here, and some of the documents there that
24	who's now not being presented, which is one reason we suggested	24	are in that record; in addition want to then address with him
02:21:02 <b>25</b>	he be treated as a responsive witness, so that we won't have to	02:24:44 <b>25</b>	questions regarding how the government is treating the
02:21:02 23	take the time to present testimony before Mr. Vaughn actually	02:24:44 23	calculation of interest with respect to the 2007 Plan.
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter 1932		Official Court Reporter
1			1934
	annoared	1 1	THE COURT: All right cir
	appeared.	1 2	THE COURT: All right, sir.
2	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins,	2	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN
3	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003	3	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION
2 3 4	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.	2 3 4	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DORRIS:
2 3 4 02:21:23 5	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.	2 3 4 02:24:52 <b>5</b>	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DORRIS: Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DORRIS: Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DORRIS: Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today. A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001. Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001. Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position? A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA. Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001. Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position? A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA. Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. And what were you doing then?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. And what were you doing then?  A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21 22	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21 22	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001. Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position? A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA. Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was. Q. And what were you doing then? A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the Department, sort of like the strategic planner for the
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21 22 23	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the determination at that point.	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21 22 23	JEFFREY ZIPPIN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay. Q. What is your present position? A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Q. And how long have you been with OHTA? A. Since the inception of the office in 2001. Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position? A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA. Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity? A. Yes, I was. Q. And what were you doing then? A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the Department, sort of like the strategic planner for the Department.
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21 22 23 24	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the determination at that point.  THE COURT: All right.	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21 22 23 24	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. And what were you doing then?  A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the Department, sort of like the strategic planner for the Department.  Q. As part of that, did you have any involvement in the
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21 22 23	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the determination at that point.  THE COURT: All right.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: We would submit his testimony as a	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21 22 23	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. And what were you doing then?  A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the Department.  Q. As part of that, did you have any involvement in the individual Indian trust issues?
2 3 4 02:21:23 5 6 7 8 9 02:21:39 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:57 15 16 17 18 19 02:22:26 20 21 22 23 24	So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.  THE COURT: Mr. Harper.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.  MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the determination at that point.  THE COURT: All right.	2 3 4 02:24:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:01 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:31 20 21 22 23 24	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.  A. Okay.  Q. What is your present position?  A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting.  Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?  A. Since the inception of the office in 2001.  Q. And prior to 2001, what was your position?  A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April 2001, until the creation of OHTA.  Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. And what were you doing then?  A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the Department, sort of like the strategic planner for the Department.  Q. As part of that, did you have any involvement in the

	4005		4007
	1935		1937
1	A. Only to the extent that those issues were reported on as	1	Q. And what about at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is there a
2	part of accountability reports that the government filed.	2	specific contact that is your primary contact there?
3	<b>Q.</b> Was that a significant part of the work you did prior to	3	A. Well, we were working with a fellow we work with a
4	going to the OST's office?	4	number of people, but one of the principal ones was Arch Wells,
02:26:04 5	A. No, sir.	02:29:24 5	who recently retired. We now work with Ms. Vicki Forrest. But
6	Q. Now, did your responsibilities and role change when you	6	we work through all the people that we need to deal with. Mike
7	moved from the OST's office to OHTA?	7	Jones is a person we deal with who deals with realty issues. We
8	A. Not terribly. A little bit.	8	just deal with a variety of people as the need arises.
9	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Would you tell us what your present responsibilities	9	We also deal directly with the regional offices and any of
02:26:24 10	have been since you became deputy director of the Office of	02:29:51 10	their suboffices as the agency offices, as we need to, to get
11	Historical Trust Accounting?	11	information.
12	A. Well, our office began with just two people, executive	12	<b>Q.</b> Are you the primary person that the various contractors
13	director Bert Edwards and myself, and we had a summer intern.	13	that are hired by OHTA report to?
14	So the first step was to build an office. By design, the office	14	A. No. We have, our staff are the contracting officer's
02:26:40 15	has a small number of federal employees but a large number of	02:30:15 15	representatives. They oversee the contract work and make sure
16	expert contractors who work for us.	16	the contractors are doing the work that we've assigned. Our
17	And so part of the task that I undertook was engaging	17	office works in many ways, rather than a typical contractor
18	experts and contractors to do this work. I would just generally	18	relationship, we view these people sort of as we use them
19	state that my duties now are to carry out the mission program of	19	almost as staff in effect, and so the day-to-day reporting
02:27:02 <b>20</b>	the office and oversee that work.	02:30:37 <b>20</b>	relationships are varied.
21	<b>Q.</b> And when you say oversee that work, what work are you	21	<b>Q.</b> Who from the office of the Secretary do you deal with, if
22	talking about, sir?	22	anyone?
23	A. The historical accounting for IIM trust, special deposit	23	A. Principally, two people. Dr. Abe Haspel and Jim Cason.
24	cleanup, as we refer to it, and tribal trust accounting.	24	Q. Okay. Now, who was the person we will look at it in a
02:27:21 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> And when you say your responsibility is to oversee that	02:30:58 <b>25</b>	minute, that you signed, I think it's called a certification
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1936		1938
1	1936 work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside	1	1938 regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily
1 2		1 2	
	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside	=	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily
2	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?	2	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record
3	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.	2	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?
2 3 4	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting	2 3 4	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some
2 3 4 02:27:44 5	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?	2 3 4 02:31:16 5	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct report	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct report most of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record.
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct report—most of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20 21	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?  A. Quite a number of people. The special Ross Swimmer, the	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20 21	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20 21 22	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?  A. Quite a number of people. The special Ross Swimmer, the special trustee, some of his Washington staff, particularly with	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20 21 22	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. It went to other levels in the Department. I don't recall
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20 21 22 23	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?  A. Quite a number of people. The special Ross Swimmer, the special trustee, some of his Washington staff, particularly with respect to budget office items or congressional items. We also	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20 21 22 23	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. It went to other levels in the Department. I don't recall the full extent of that, sir.
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20 21 22 23 24	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct reportmost of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?  A. Quite a number of people. The special Ross Swimmer, the special trustee, some of his Washington staff, particularly with respect to budget office items or congressional items. We also deal with the staff in Albuquerque, principally with Ms. Donna	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20 21 22 23 24	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. It went to other levels in the Department. I don't recall the full extent of that, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, it sounds like you were involved to some extent
2 3 4 02:27:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:06 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:25 15 16 17 18 19 02:28:42 20 21 22 23 24	work, is that work that's being performed primarily by outside contractors to the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. That's a fair statement.  Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?  A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.  Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?  A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct report—most of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.  Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?  A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?  A. Quite a number of people. The special — Ross Swimmer, the special trustee, some of his Washington staff, particularly with respect to budget office items or congressional items. We also deal with the staff in Albuquerque, principally with Ms. Donna Erwin and her deputies and her staff.	2 3 4 02:31:16 5 6 7 8 9 02:31:37 10 11 12 13 14 02:31:55 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:18 20 21 22 23 24	regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?  A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.  At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.  Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?  A. It went to other levels in the Department. I don't recall the full extent of that, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, it sounds like you were involved to some extent with the assembly of the administrative record. Is that fair to

	1939		1941
1	say?	1	are stamped draft in the administrative record. You're aware of
2	A. Yes, sir.	2	that, right?
3	<b>Q.</b> And were you the one principally responsible for ensuring	3	A. Yes, sir.
4	that the administrative record was complete?	4	<b>Q.</b> Some of those are documents that it's hard to tell who
2:32:44 <b>5</b>	A. I guess that's a fair statement.	02:35:43 <b>5</b>	prepared them. Others it indicates, for example, some of the
6	Q. And did you review the administrative record when it was	6	Morgan Angel reports, are stamped draft. Or do you recall that?
7	assembled?	7	A. Not with any specificity, but I believe that that's
8	A. I reviewed a lot of the index of it and talked about it	8	correct.
9	with our staff who were working on it, to asking about where	9	Q. But all of the documents that were included were documents
:33:04 10	they looked, what they went through of my records, did they get	02:35:59 10	that were maintained by and in the custody of the Department of
11	things from other people, just making sure that the documents	11	the Interior. Is that right?
12	that we considered were included therein.	12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Okay. Other than the one memo that you mentioned that I	13	Q. So that if it's a draft report from Morgan Angel, it is a
14	think you said came from the solicitor's office, what steps were	14	report that Morgan Angel had actually furnished to the
33:22 15	implemented to ensure that all the documents that were	02:36:14 15	Department if it's included in the administrative record.
16	considered in making the 2003 and 2007 Plans were included in	16	A. That would be correct.
17	the administrative record?	17	Q. And the other documents that do not show who prepared them,
18	A. Looking it over and doing a review of that index, there	18	is there any way to determine who the preparer of the document
19	were a number of documents that I knew to be important,	19	was?
33:43 20		02:36:27 20	
21	certainly the NORC reports, which were provided in their	02:36:27 20	A. Some of them I might be able to recall or recollect who
22	entirety. We had accounting conferences that helped formulate	22	did, but I wouldn't say that that's true for all of them.
23	our approach. Those conferences took place in 2002 and 2003.	23	
_	We wanted to make sure those were in there.		administrative record coordinator appointed for purposes of this
24	So I looked for particular kinds of documents that I knew	24	administrative record assembly?
34:06 <b>25</b>	were important, as well as going through my own notes. And I	02:36:53 <b>25</b>	A. Yes.
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter	1	Official Court Reporter 1942
1	also know that our executive director, Bert Edwards, went	1	Q. And who was that?
2	through his notes and any relevant material well, not notes,	2	A. That was our chief of staff, Steve Alcorn.
3	but I should say e-mails and relevant materials as well.	3	Q. And can you spell his last name, please?
4	Q. We've seen a few examples when Mr. Cason were you here	4	A. A-L-C-O-R-N.
34:25 5	when Mr. Cason testified?	02:37:04 5	
6	A. Yes, I was.	6	<ul><li>Q. Okay. And does he report to you?</li><li>A. Yes, he does.</li></ul>
7		7	
-	Q. We've seen some examples when he was testifying of typed	_	Q. And did you and Mr. Alcorn attempt to follow the
8	notes that indicated they were transcriptions of your notes.	8	Departmental manuals and directives for the assembly of the
9	Did you have your notes then typed and included in the	9	administrative record?
34:40 10			
	administrative record?	02:37:26 10	A. We actually talked through with our solicitor's office, we
11	A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the	11	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the
11 12		11 12	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.
11 12 13	A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the	11 12 13	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the
11 12 13 14	A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then	11 12 13 14	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.
11 12 13 14	A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.	11 12 13	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow
11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?
11 12 13 14 34:58 15	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.
11 12 13 14 34:58 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.
11 12 13 14 34:58 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the
11 12 13 14 34:58 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> <li>A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record,
11 12 13 14 :34:58 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> <li>A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.</li> <li>Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:06 20	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 33515 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> <li>A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.</li> <li>Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't see notes from Mr. Edwards in the administrative record, you</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:06 20 21	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of September 19, 2007. And if you would look, would be the fourth
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 35:15 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> <li>A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.</li> <li>Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't see notes from Mr. Edwards in the administrative record, you think that's because he did not have notes. Is that fair?</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:06 20 21 22	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of September 19, 2007. And if you would look, would be the fourth page of this exhibit, please. And this is a declaration. And
11 12 13 14 2:34:58 15 16 17 18 19 22 21 22 23	A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.  Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?  A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.  Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't see notes from Mr. Edwards in the administrative record, you think that's because he did not have notes. Is that fair?  A. That's correct.	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:06 20 21 22 23	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of September 19, 2007. And if you would look, would be the fourth page of this exhibit, please. And this is a declaration. And if we can look at the next page and confirm that this is the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 23:35:16 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also included in the administrative record?</li> <li>A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.</li> <li>Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't see notes from Mr. Edwards in the administrative record, you think that's because he did not have notes. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Now, in the administrative record, we've looked at during</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 02:37:41 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:06 20 21 22 23 24	had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with the and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.  Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?  A. I believe we did, sir.  Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.  That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of September 19, 2007. And if you would look, would be the fourth page of this exhibit, please. And this is a declaration. And if we can look at the next page and confirm that this is the document you signed.

1	1943		1945
	Q. Okay. Now, let's go back to the prior page and look at	1	THE WITNESS: I believe we included all of them,
2	your certification. In your certification, you indicate that,	2	Your Honor.
3	this is the first bullet, that "The attached index reflects the	3	MR. DORRIS: Okay.
4	documents constituting the administrative record supporting the	4	BY MR. DORRIS:
39:10 <b>5</b>	plan for completing the historical accounting of individual	02:42:17 <b>5</b>	<b>Q.</b> Good. But there may be some in other offices that you
6	Indian money accounts of May 31, 2007," and then you also refer	6	don't know of whether they were included or not. Let me
7	to the January 2003 plan. Do you see that?	7	restate. You look puzzled so I better ask that one again. You
8	A. Yes, sir.	8	do not know if other offices in the Department of Interior
9	<b>Q.</b> So this is the administrative record for both plans; is	9	maintain documents that do not support these plans that have not
39:27 10	that correct?	02:42:39 10	been included in the administrative record?
11	A. Yes, sir.	11	MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. Asked and
12	<b>Q.</b> And where you indicate here that this is the documents	12	answered.
13	supporting the plan, those two plans, did you include documents	13	THE COURT: I'm not sure it's been answered.
14	in the administrative record that did not support the plans?	14	THE WITNESS: I don't know of other documents that
39:41 15	A. Included in the administrative record were documents we	02:42:53 15	other offices may have.
16	considered in developing both plans.	16	BY MR. DORRIS:
17	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Were there documents that were maintained by the	17	<b>Q.</b> Can you state in court here today and to Judge Robertson
18	Department of Interior that were not included in the	18	that a thorough effort was undertaken to locate all such
19	administrative record and that would show recommendations or	19	documents at other offices of the Department of Interior and
40:05 <b>20</b>	suggestions that something other than what was being proposed in	02:43:06 <b>20</b>	include them in the administrative record or not?
21	the 2003 and 2007 plans should be undertaken?	21	MR. QUINN: Objection. Vague, Your Honor.
22	A. I believe there may be some documents in the administrative	22	THE COURT: Well, may I see counsel at the bench on
23	record that do that. I believe you've used those as exhibits in	23	this one.
24	this trial.	24	(Bench conference off the record.)
:40:48 <b>25</b>	Q. Mr. Zippin, what I'm trying to find out is, you say in this	02:44:13 <b>25</b>	BY MR. DORRIS:
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1944		1946
1	declaration we included the documents that supported these	1	Q. Looking at the screen, at the last bullet that is there,
2			
2	plans. And I'm trying to find out if there were documents that	2	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are
3	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in	3	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in
3 4	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them,	3 4	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?
3 4 41:08 <b>5</b>	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.	3 4 02:44:44 <b>5</b>	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.
3 4 41:08 5 6	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a	3 4 02:44:44 <b>5</b> 6	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate
3 4 :41:08 5 6 7	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we	3 4 02:44:44 5 6 7	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background
3 4 5 6 7 8	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record	3 4 02:44:44 5 6 7 8	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and	3 4 02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.
3 4 4:41:08 5 6 7 8 9 4:41:24 10	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.	3 4 02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been
3 4 41:08 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a	3 4 02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11 12 13	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13 14	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department	02:44:44 5 6 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative
3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 14 138 15	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 14 13 15 16	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to
3 4 4 41:08 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11 12 13 14 41:38 15 16 17	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?
3 4 4 41:08 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11 12 13 14 41:38 15 16 17 18	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.
3 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative
3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13 14 138 15 16 17 18 19 14 153 20	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 41:24 10 11 12 13 14 4:41:38 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20 21	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?
441:08 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 141:53 20 21 22	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?  A. Sir, I believe that my answer is that we included documents	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20 21 22	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?  A. Yes. It's on the front page of that document, sir.
3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 12 12 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?  A. Sir, I believe that my answer is that we included documents of that nature in the administrative record.	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20 21 22 23	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?  A. Yes. It's on the front page of that document, sir.  Q. Correct. And we did not see any decisional documents that
241:08	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?  A. Sir, I believe that my answer is that we included documents of that nature in the administrative record.  THE COURT: The question is whether you included all	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20 21 22 23 24	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?  A. Yes. It's on the front page of that document, sir.  Q. Correct. And we did not see any decisional documents that he executed leading up to that plan. Are you aware of any in
2:41:08	the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them, that were not included in the administrative record.  A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a general way. I believe it should be documents that we considered, and I do believe there are documents in the record that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the limitations that have been discussed here.  Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that the Department maintains or any office of the Department maintains that have not been included in the administrative record that do not support these plans?  A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the Department of Interior may have to that regard.  Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?  A. Sir, I believe that my answer is that we included documents of that nature in the administrative record.	02:44:44 5 6 7 8 9 02:44:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:45:25 20 21 22 23	that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are those considered by the Department of the Interior in formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?  A. Yes, sir, I do.  Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?  A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.  Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?  A. Yes. It's on the front page of that document, sir.  Q. Correct. And we did not see any decisional documents that

	1947		1949
1	A. No. I don't believe there are any in the administrative	1	A. That's correct.
2	record, except for a document that I submitted that reflected	2	Q. And I take it you would also have been at that meeting,
3	issues that were being considered for the 2007 Plan, and I	3	inasmuch as you were taking notes?
4	believe I had an accompanying note that stated that these were	4	A. Yes, sir.
02:46:19 <b>5</b>	the last documents that Mr. Cason had seen in making the	02:49:28 5	Q. We're going to look at the next page. And this is a
6	decisions that were made. And that is included.	6	meeting in November 20, 2002. Right before, you see where it
7	Q. Okay. Let's look at the administrative record, Bates	7	says SID? There's a, right above that line, it says "How do we
8	document 63-2-1, and see if that is the note that you are	8	deal with missing data?" And then the last two lines of these
9	referring to.	9	notes talk about missing data and errors versus unsupported, and
02:46:38 10	A. That is correct.	02:49:53 10	it says T-R-A-N-S, I take it that would be transactions?
11	Q. So that the other documents that are part the other	11	A. That would be my recollection.
12	pages that are part of this document that's Bates numbered 63-2	12	Q. Do you recall what the discussion was at this point in
13	are the last documents that Mr. Cason reviewed prior to the 2007	13	dealing with missing data and the question of errors versus
14	Plan; is that correct?	14	unsupported transactions?
02:47:03 15	A. That's correct.	02:50:12 15	A. I don't have a distinct recollection in particular of this
16	Q. Now, let's just look, for example, over at Bates page 5 of	16	meeting, but ultimately as the decisions have evolved, we agreed
17	63-2. You see there are a number of options there. We're not	17	that in doing our transaction-by-transaction reconciliation, if
18	going to go through those. None of these, if you'll look at the	18	we could not find data to support reconciliation of the
19	bottom of the page, the decision, none of these are then signed,	19	transaction, it was treated as an error in the statistical
02:47:28 20	is that correct?	02:50:36 20	analysis.
21	A. That's correct.	21	Q. So that you're not saying that decision was made at this
22	Q. But you maintained these and included them in the	22	, -
23	administrative record as reflecting what?	23	particular meeting, but what you recall, that issue was being discussed at this meeting?
24	A. These reflect the discussions that we were having and the	24	MR. QUINN: Excuse me, Your Honor. I hate to
02:47:45 <b>25</b>	options that OHTA presented to Mr. Cason and to Dr. Haspel as	02:50:49 <b>25</b>	interrupt. The record reflects this is a telephone conference
02.47.45	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	02.50.49	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1948		1950
1		1	
1 2	well for the 2007 Plan.	1 2	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the
2	<ul><li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li><li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document</li></ul>	2	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.
_	<ul><li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li><li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get</li></ul>		call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the
2 3 4	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his	2	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.
2 3 4	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes,	2 3 4	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:
2 3 4 02:48:09 5	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?	2 3 4 5	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10,	2 3 4 5 6	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?</li> <li>A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.  Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.  Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?  A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?</li> <li>A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.</li> <li>Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good. This indicates the attendees, it appears to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question. BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic. Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20 21	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.  Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?  A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20 21	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each region or agency stand on its own?
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20 21 22	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?</li> <li>A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.</li> <li>Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good. This indicates the attendees, it appears to be the Secretary; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20 21 22	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question. BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic. Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20 21 22 23	well for the 2007 Plan.  Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?  A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.  Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Good. This indicates the attendees, it appears to be the Secretary; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20 21 22 23 24	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question. BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each region or agency stand on its own?  A. When the 2003 Plan was being formulated, my understanding
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?</li> <li>A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.</li> <li>Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good. This indicates the attendees, it appears to be the Secretary; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Griles, Mr. Cason, Mr. Bernhardt, and Mr. Jensen; is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20 21 22 23	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each region or agency stand on its own?  A. When the 2003 Plan was being formulated, my understanding and recollection is that the sample size was based on including
2 3 4 02:48:09 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:33 10 11 12 13 14 02:48:46 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:03 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well for the 2007 Plan.</li> <li>Q. Now, I want to look at we may come back to this document on a couple items. I want to look at some of your notes to get you I tried to ask Mr. Cason about some and they weren't his notes. I want to ask you about a few things in your notes, okay?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Let's look at administrative record document 63-10, beginning at page 10. And we'll look at the top. You recognize this document as being one of the documents that was typed of notes that you took at a meeting, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And did you take handwritten notes and then they were typed or did you actually type them on this form?</li> <li>A. I take handwritten notes in a series of notebooks that date back to the inception of the office, and then these were typed for the administrative record.</li> <li>Q. But these are accurate as to what notes you took while you were sitting in the meeting?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good. This indicates the attendees, it appears to be the Secretary; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Griles, Mr. Cason, Mr. Bernhardt, and Mr. Jensen; is that right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 02:51:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:51:38 15 16 17 18 19 02:52:09 20 21 22 23 24	call. He keeps referring to it as a meeting. But just so the record is clear.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question. BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. Yes. I'm just trying to find out, was that decision made at this meeting, or was this meeting one of the meetings where that was being discussed?  A. My recollection would be that, given this was 2002, it was a discussion topic as opposed to a decision topic. Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at, in the same document, Bates page 12. And this would then be let's make sure it's a meeting. Yes, it's a meeting with Mr. Cason and Mr. Haspel on December 6, 2002. Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. And if we look down toward the bottom of the page, it says "As a national program sample size below less than 1,000 to get a 99 percent conf with 2 percent, to get to level where each region or agency can stand on its own." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir. Q. What was the effort being undertaken here to have each region or agency stand on its own?  A. When the 2003 Plan was being formulated, my understanding and recollection is that the sample size was based on including a certain number of samples from each agency.

	1951		1953
1	Q. And why was that?	1	excuse me. It would be document 63-11-5. And if we come to the
2	A. Initially we wanted to provide coverage for a statistical	2	top of this, this is then a meeting with Mr. Cason on November
3	analysis, and thought that at that time that was an approach to	3	10, 2003 that Mr. Cason, Mr. Haspel, Bert that would be Bert
4	looking at it, to include some things so there would be	4	Edwards?
2:52:58 <b>5</b>	something from each agency, and that's why we had such a large	02:56:30 <b>5</b>	A. Yes, sir.
6	sample size in the 2003 Plan.	6	Q. Yourself and Alyce. Who was Alyce?
7	Q. And the thought underlying that was because there was, at	7	A. Alyce Schiess. Alyce Schiess is an employee in the office.
8	least at that time, there was a thought or concern that each	8	S-C-H-I-E-S-S.
9	region and each agency may be different from another one. Is	9	<b>Q.</b> Look down about halfway down the page where it talks about
53:18 10	that right?	02:56:53 10	third-party records. Let me give you a moment to review that.
11	A. That was a possibility to consider.	11	A. Could you go back to the top again, sir?
12	Q. In other words, that was part of what was driving what	12	Q. Yes, sir.
13	became the decision to make sure that there were samples coming	13	A. Okay.
14	from each agency, correct?	14	<b>Q.</b> Can you read it at that size?
53:30 15	A. At the time.	02:57:10 15	A. Starting with "for third-party records"?
16	Q. All right. Has that now changed?	16	Q. Yes.
17	A. It has changed in the 2007 Plan.	17	(Witness reviewing document.)
18	<b>Q.</b> And was there at some point a study or determination made	18	A. Okay.
19	that in fact there were not differences between the agencies	19	Q. What's your recollection of what was being discussed here?
53:48 <b>20</b>	that would necessitate having each agency stand on its own?	02:57:35 <b>20</b>	A. My recollection was one of the breaches that had been
21	A. In fact, what we relied on, the study was in fact the	21	that the Court had noted in an earlier ruling dealing with
22	litigation support accounting, which was undertaken initially as	22	third-party records, and this was a discussion of third-party
23	a separate component apart from what we had had in the 2003 Plan	23	records.
24	which, if you recall, was rejected by the Court, and we were in	24	Q. And what ended up being decided regarding obtaining
54:12 <b>25</b>	limbo in 2004 because Congress had barred us from pursuing any	02:57:59 <b>25</b>	third-party records?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
2 3	of what the judge had ordered, and so the litigation support accounting was, as it states, it was intended to provide information that could support settlement discussions that were	2 3	A. Well, I don't know specifically coming out of this. The  Department has a departmental manual release; our office  actually undertook to go out and survey some third-party records
4	being undertaken under the auspices of Congress.	4	and ultimately in the historical accounting, under LSA we use
		-	and ditiniately in the instorical accounting, under LoA we use
54:35 <b>ਹ</b>			·
54:35 <b>5</b>	Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency	5	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile
	<b>Q.</b> Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency	02:58:20 <b>5</b>	third-party records to reconcile transactions.
6	Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples	02:58:20 <b>5 6</b>	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile
6 7	<b>Q.</b> Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency	02:58:20 <b>5 6 7</b>	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in
6 7 8 9	Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was	02:58:20 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to
6 7 8 9	Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?	02:58:20 <b>5 6 7</b> 8	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to
6 7 8 9 55:00 10	Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?  A. That's a fair statement.	02:58:20 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 02:58:36 <b>10</b>	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an
6 7 8 9 :55:00 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA</li> </ul>	02:58:20 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 02:58:36 <b>10</b> 11	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going than attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling
6 7 8 9 555:00 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going than attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were
6 7 8 9 55:00 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was</li> </ul>	02:58:20 5 6 7 8 9 02:58:36 10 11 12 13	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going tan attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was
6 7 8 9 55:00 10 11 12 13 14 55:18 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going than attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 15:18 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 55:18 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party
55:00 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the
55:00 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?
55:00 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 55:35 20	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> <li>Q. And we know of that because that's where the</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?  A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 155:35 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> <li>Q. And we know of that because that's where the land-to-dollars test was done, and that was one of the reasons</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?  A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there may have been some others.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> <li>Q. And we know of that because that's where the land-to-dollars test was done, and that was one of the reasons they went to the Horton Agency, was because they figured they</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going than attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?  A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there may have been some others.  Q. But you don't recall them here. Now, look at this same
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> <li>Q. And we know of that because that's where the land-to-dollars test was done, and that was one of the reasons they went to the Horton Agency, was because they figured they weren't tired of providing information at that point, right?</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?  A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there may have been some others.  Q. But you don't recall them here. Now, look at this same document, Bates page 8, which appears to be a meeting on
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct that the decision to move from making sure that each agency could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?</li> <li>A. That's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. But the LSA was the LSA were there samples in the LSA from every agency?</li> <li>A. I don't know to the extent that coverage ended up including every agency. However, every account and every agency was subject to sampling.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do not know whether you do know, don't you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples taken, correct?</li> <li>A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.</li> <li>Q. And we know of that because that's where the land-to-dollars test was done, and that was one of the reasons they went to the Horton Agency, was because they figured they weren't tired of providing information at that point, right?</li> <li>A. That was one of the criteria for selecting Horton Agency.</li> </ul>	02:58:20	third-party records to reconcile transactions.  Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA?  A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made.  Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?  A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there may have been some others.  Q. But you don't recall them here. Now, look at this same document, Bates page 8, which appears to be a meeting on December 15, 2003, and you see the people that were in

	1955		1957
1	looking at. You see where it says "Dollars in and dollars out,	1	A. Yes, sir, I have.
2	preferred reporting, 13 billion in"? Do you see that?	2	Q. And are any of those included in the administrative record?
3	A. Yes, sir.	3	A. My understanding, they were presented as an exhibit.
4	Q. And what was the discussion as to why it was preferred to	4	Q. Okay. But were they prepared after the administrative
03:00:00 <b>5</b>	report that amount?	03:03:34 5	record?
6	A. What we refer to as the blue document, the report to	6	A. Yes, sir.
7	Congress, that first surfaced and had a table referencing the 13	7	Q. But none were prepared as of the time you put together this
8	billion actually referred to that as throughput. Throughput	8	administrative record?
9	in the parlance that we use means you're counting the money as	9	A. I don't believe they were, sir.
03:00:21 10	it comes in and you're counting it again as it goes out.	03:03:43 10	Q. Other than those that had been presented as an exhibit, are
11	Whereas what I think has been referred to in this case,	11	you aware of any draft historical statements of account for
12	Your Honor, as collections is just the money coming in, and so	12	land-based account holders?
13	it's the preferred reporting should have been and going	13	A. No.
14	forward should be 13 billion in collections, using the data that	14	Q. All right. And are you aware of even the ones that were
03:00:40 15	we had at that time.	03:04:00 15	presented as an exhibit that contained a statement from the
16	Q. Okay. So that was what, the best you recall as to why	16	paper record with an opening balance that cannot be verified?
17	that's preferred reporting, is to make it clear that that's the	17	A. I don't recall what that refers to.
18	money coming in, at least as far as the Department saw.	18	Q. The note here in this meeting, you don't recall what that's
19	A. Yes, sir.	19	referring to?
03:00:54 20	Q. Let me ask you to look let's start in this same	03:04:17 20	A. No, sir.
21	document, Bates page 10. And look up at the date of the	21	Q. Is it expected that there will be land-based accounts that
22	meeting, and it appears to be a meeting from June 17, 2004, that	22	go back into the paper record era where the Department will not
23	you had with Mr. Cason. Do you see that?	23	be able to verify the opening balance?
24	A. Yes, sir.	24	A. I believe that if we have an account that goes back to
03:01:21 <b>25</b>	Q. And could you just scroll down the page so he can get the	03:04:34 <b>25</b>	1938, and if we follow what the courts have said about using the
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
		1	
	1956		1958
1	1956 context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next	1	1958 act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then
1 2		1 2	
	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next	_	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then
2	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.	2	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.
3	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.	3	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is
2 3 4	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.	2 3 4	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for
2 3 4 03:01:50 <b>5</b>	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?	2 3 4 03:05:01 5	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements.	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't,
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:62 20	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20 21	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:56 20 21	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:62 20	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20 21 22	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different beneficiaries, some of whom have land-based accounts, correct?	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:56 20 21 22	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?  A. At this time, this part of the LSA was only partially
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20 21 22 23	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different beneficiaries, some of whom have land-based accounts. Have you	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:56 20 21 22 23	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?  A. At this time, this part of the LSA was only partially completed in 2004, and I believe we included an interim report
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20 21 22 23 24	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different beneficiaries, some of whom have land-based accounts, correct? And my question just goes to the land-based accounts. Have you seen draft statements of historical accounts for land-based	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:56 20 21 22 23 24	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?  A. At this time, this part of the LSA was only partially completed in 2004, and I believe we included an interim report by NORC about it. So this is while it was ongoing. And
2 3 4 03:01:50 5 6 7 8 9 03:02:06 10 11 12 13 14 03:02:23 15 16 17 18 19 03:02:56 20 21 22 23 24	context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next page, if we may.  A. Okay.  Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?  A. I believe so.  Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting such as that ever prepared?  A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements. I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical statements of account we pulled together just an example of all the transactions that might exist in an account. But at this time we did not have anything like that, I believe.  Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different beneficiaries, some of whom have land-based accounts, correct? And my question just goes to the land-based accounts. Have you seen draft statements of historical accounts for land-based beneficiaries?	2 3 4 03:05:01 5 6 7 8 9 03:05:19 10 11 12 13 14 03:05:34 15 16 17 18 19 03:05:56 20 21 22 23 24	act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.  Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?  A. Yes. It says so.  Q. And would you let's look do you see where it says "draft by July 9" toward the bottom of the page?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?  A. I see that.  Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.  Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?  A. At this time, this part of the LSA was only partially completed in 2004, and I believe we included an interim report by NORC about it. So this is while it was ongoing. And ultimately it's the final report on LSA that contains the

	1959		1961
1	conclusions that were made and describes the process.	1	A. Yes. And I do believe, although I don't have a specific
2	Q. So this was at some point while LSA had not yet been	2	recollection of who prepared this, I do believe this came from
3	completed; is that correct?	3	one of our accounting conferences.
4	A. Yes, sir.	4	Q. So you do not even know if this document was prepared by
03:06:36 <b>5</b>	Q. Now, let me ask you to look at one it'll be the last	03:10:44 <b>5</b>	somebody within the Department of Interior or a contractor. Is
6	note that we'll look at is going to be Bates page from the	6	that right?
7	administrative record 63-13-2. And this is a July 21, 2006,	7	A. I think it would have been by a contractor, but I can't be
8	document that indicates it's a contemporaneous note of yours,	8	certain.
9	and the subject is "Paper era accounts." And it appears that it	9	Q. And likewise, in light of what you said, you wouldn't know
03:07:18 10	was a meeting just between you and Mr. Cason. Do you see that?	03:10:58 10	which contractor prepared it.
11	A. Mm-hmm.	11	A. No, sir.
12	Q. It says under "Notes," "Paper era accounts needed. If 200	12	Q. And you do not know when it was prepared, do you?
13	yields 75, is that enough?" What was being discussed, if you	13	A. Short of going back and looking through the accounting
14		14	conference books and seeing if that copy exists in there, no, I
03:07:38 15	A. My recollection of this is that we did not at this time	03:11:11 15	would not.
16	•	16	Q. And did you make the decision to include this document in
17	historical accounting population went back into the paper	17	the administrative record?
18	records era. I think that's been referred to both as a paper	18	A. I made the decision that we should include all of our
19	records tail and a paper records antecedent.	19	accounting conference binders, because of material like this
03:08:06 <b>20</b>	Q. I don't think they said antecedent the way you said	03:11:26 20	that was presented at those meetings, which recall that these
21	A. I think they said antisedent. That was new to me too.	21	were mostly held prior to even the first plan being developed.
22		22	This is part of what I would call the formative information that
23	·	23	·
24	were to draw a certain sample, how many would likely be in the population. And we didn't do it at that time because we didn't	24	we considered in developing the plans.
03:08:28 25	F-F	03:11:49 25	Q. Okay. Let me ask you, in the administrative record there
03:08:28 23	have enough information.	03:11:49 23	were a number of exhibits where there were, on the front it
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	Q. Okay. So the 200, would that be if 200,000 accounts	1	would make it clear it was from an accounting conference. Okay?
2		2	And this, as you will see, is page 1 of this particular
3	tail?	3	document.
4	A. Actually, I think it might have just been 200 and 75. I	4	A. I'm sorry. This is page 1 of
03:08:46 <b>5</b>	don't know I don't recall more than that.	03:12:07 5	Q. If we look at the Bates number down at the bottom, and if
6	Q. That's fair. Look at the first subparagraph there. It	6	you can blow that up at all, or at least where we can read it.
	. That's fair. Look at the first subparagraph there. It		
7	cave find best of remaining accounts and de minimis. What de	7	
7 8	says find best of remaining accounts and do minimis. What do	7 8	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates
8	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?	8	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?
8 9	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.	8 9	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.
8 9 03:09:12 <b>10</b>	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you	8 9 03:12:22 <b>10</b>	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular
8 9 03:09:12 10 11	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?	8 9 03:12:22 10 11	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this,
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.
03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on
03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21 22	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.  A. In that case I don't who the author is.	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21 22	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?  Q. Yes, sir.
03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21 22 23	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.  A. In that case I don't who the author is.  Q. Okay. But you do know this was a document that was	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21 22 23	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?  Q. Yes, sir.  (Witness reviewing document.)
03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21 22 23 24	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.  A. In that case I don't who the author is.  Q. Okay. But you do know this was a document that was maintained by the Department of Interior and was considered in	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21 22 23 24	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?  Q. Yes, sir.  (Witness reviewing document.)  Are you able to see that, Mr. Zippin?
03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21 22 23 24	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.  A. In that case I don't who the author is.  Q. Okay. But you do know this was a document that was maintained by the Department of Interior and was considered in connection with the development of the plans.	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21 22 23	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?  Q. Yes, sir.  (Witness reviewing document.)  Are you able to see that, Mr. Zippin?  A. With glasses I can.
8 9 03:09:12 10 11 12 13 14 03:09:37 15 16 17 18 19 03:10:06 20 21 22 23	you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?  A. I don't recall how that applies.  Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if we'll blow up the top there. This is one of those documents that did not clearly indicate to us who had prepared it. Do you know where this document came from?  A. Is there anything further down below, sir?  Q. Yes. We can  A. I think my guess is this would probably be from one of the accounting conferences.  Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.  A. In that case I don't who the author is.  Q. Okay. But you do know this was a document that was maintained by the Department of Interior and was considered in	8 9 03:12:22 10 11 12 13 14 03:12:39 15 16 17 18 19 03:12:59 20 21 22 23 24	You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?  A. I know those numbers, but I couldn't tell you what that is.  Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?  A. Yes, sir.  Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?  Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.  A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?  Q. Yes, sir.  (Witness reviewing document.)  Are you able to see that, Mr. Zippin?

	1963		1965
1	(Witness reviewing document.)	1	necessary to undertake a recalculation of the interest for each
2	Okay.	2	and every account?
3	Q. The highlighted part says this is after talking about	3	A. I wouldn't characterize it as such a the way you have.
4	there being a small error rate on the disbursement side, it says	4	I think it was just something as part of our due diligence in
03:13:58 5	"although there were problems in locating all the support	03:17:14 <b>5</b>	presenting account holders with as complete a historical
6	documents," I want you to focus on this sentence that says "this	6	statement of account as practicable, that we could do this.
7	warns us that we need to have a strategy that resolves the	7	<b>Q.</b> You said that you were going to use the stated interest
8	missing record problem for disbursements in a way that does not	8	factors, or words to that effect. Did I get it right?
9	treat the failure to find the supporting documentation as an	9	A. Yes.
03:14:14 10	error in the account." Do you see that?	03:17:30 10	Q. What interest factors, who states them, and what are those
11	A. I do.	11	that are being used?
12	<ul><li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to the origin of</li></ul>	12	A. My understanding is that whenever there is an interest
13	this document or the timing that this document was prepared?	13	period, interest is moved into a special deposit account,
14	A. I don't know exactly when it was prepared, but given what	14	interest that's been earned by the pooled funds, and that
03:14:32 15	it's talking about, it was obviously one of the things we	03:17:51 15	divided by the dollars that are being in the accounts to which
16		16	·
17	considered, because someone was presenting it to us as what you could learn from the tribal reconciliation.	17	this interest is applicable, generates a decimal fraction.
18		18	That's the factor that is then applied to calculating interest
19		19	in all accounts that are eligible to receive interest.
03:14:46 20		03:18:10 20	Q. And who is making that calculation?
03:14:46 20	Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Zippin, have you been involved with the		A. That's the it's in the Office of the Special Trustee.
	issue of how interest is going to be handled in the 2007 Plan?	21 22	And prior to that it would have been the Bureau of Indian
22	A. Yes.	22	Affairs.
23	Q. And can you describe for the Court how interest is going to	_	Q. So that's a historical calculation that's been done?
24	be handled in the 2007 Plan?	24	A. Yes, sir.
03:15:03 <b>25</b>	A. Yes. All of the interest postings in an account that are	03:18:21 <b>25</b>	Q. So there has been a calculation done over the course of
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	1964	1	1966 time as to what an effort to determine what interest was
	part of our population are going to be recalculated using the		
2		2	
2	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian	2	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that
3	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a	3	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?
3 4	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.	3 4	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used
3 4 03:15:33 5	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction. Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind	3 4 03:18:35 5	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an
3 4 03:15:33 5 6	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction. Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?	3 4 03:18:35 5 6	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction. Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it? A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction. Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it? A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction. Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it? A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?	03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?	03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated.	03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17 18	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of	03:18:35	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17 18 19 03:19:29 20 21	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21 22	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.  Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17 18 19 03:19:29 20 21 22	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.  Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21 22 23	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.  Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on anecdotal evidence, that there was sufficient concern by the	03:18:35	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.  Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security or bond that pays a dividend or interest, correct?
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21 22 23 24	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.  Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on anecdotal evidence, that there was sufficient concern by the Department of Interior that the interest had not been correctly	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17 18 19 03:19:29 20 21 22 23 24	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.  Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security or bond that pays a dividend or interest, correct?
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21 22 23	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.  Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on anecdotal evidence, that there was sufficient concern by the Department of Interior that the interest had not been correctly calculated and posted to the accounts, that it thought it	03:18:35	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.  Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security or bond that pays a dividend or interest, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you have a pooled amount that has a certain amount
3 4 03:15:33 5 6 7 8 9 03:15:53 10 11 12 13 14 03:16:21 15 16 17 18 19 03:16:39 20 21 22 23 24	interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.  Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?  A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.  Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.  Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?  A. No. Other than the results that we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.  Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on anecdotal evidence, that there was sufficient concern by the Department of Interior that the interest had not been correctly	3 4 03:18:35 5 6 7 8 9 03:18:47 10 11 12 13 14 03:19:07 15 16 17 18 19 03:19:29 20 21 22 23 24	actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?  A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.  Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.  A. I apologize.  Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how what these interest factors are?  A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.  Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?  A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.  Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security or bond that pays a dividend or interest, correct?

	1967		1969
1	of dollars in it, correct? And then there's a certain amount	1	Q. And when are you going to report on that?
2	earned on that pool of funds, correct?	2	A. There is, in the information accompanying the historical
3	A. On those investments of the pool, yes.	3	statement of account, there would be information about any
4	Q. Now, how then is the interest well, you're not calling	4	limitations about what is included.
03:20:08 5	it interest factor. How is the factor, the stated factor then	03:23:38 5	Q. And have you ever seen that written up?
6	determined based on that?	6	A. We've been working on drafts as we move towards doing that,
7	A. My understanding is that the interest earned during the	7	but nothing has been put into final form.
8	period, the applicable period, is in an interest account, it's	8	Q. Okay. Now, the interest that was applied to the individual
9	referred to as, and then the sum that is available there is	9	postings, that was done at the agency level for most of these
03:20:29 10	divided by all the dollars that are represented in the	03:23:57 10	periods of time, correct?
11	individual accounts that are entitled to earn interest, and that	11	A. I'm not sure exactly where it was done. I just don't know.
12	division yields a factor then that is applied to the dollars in	12	Q. And you have seen indications that it was not consistently
13	each account.	13	done between the various regions or agencies that did it,
14	Q. Okay. And that calculation assumes, doesn't it, that the	14	correct?
03:20:47 15	pooled funds that were invested reflects accurately the total of	03:24:10 15	A. I don't think I'm aware of that. I just, from the results
16	all of the individual IIM accounts, correct?	16	that we've seen, we see that there are rounding errors, there
17	A. I'll have to say that that would be my understanding. I	17	are just some mathematical errors that have taken place. I'm
18	don't have direct knowledge of that.	18	not aware of any major differences that have been recalculated.
19	Q. Okay. Now, what's the basis for your understanding?	19	Q. But to make sure we're clear, the method by which interest
03:21:05 <b>20</b>	A. The discussions that we've had about recalculating	03:24:34 <b>20</b>	is going to be recalculated here does not necessarily reflect
21	interest.	21	the amount of interest that was actually earned on any
22	Q. Okay. And do you know whether or not the amount of the	22	individual particular account?
23	pooled investments always reflected the same total as the sum of	23	MR. QUINN: Objection. Asked and answered,
24	all of the individual accounts?	24	Your Honor.
03:21:26 <b>25</b>	A. Well, the investments vary because there's a cash need	03:24:51 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: Overruled.
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1968		1970
1	1968  every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available,	1	1970 THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?
1 2		1 2	
1	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available,		THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?
2	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually	2	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again? I'm sorry.
2	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed	2	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:
3 4	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan
2 3 4 03:21:48 5	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used	2 3 4 03:25:05 5	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question again?  I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you,
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you, Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20 21	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20 21	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you, Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor?
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?  A. I believe that's correct.	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you, Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor? (Plaintiff counsel conferring.)
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20 21 22 23	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?  A. I believe that's correct.  Q. All right. And how is what the Department is doing today	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20 21 22 23	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you,  Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor?  (Plaintiff counsel conferring.)  MR. DORRIS: I have nothing further, Your Honor.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20 21 22 23 24	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?  A. I believe that's correct.  Q. All right. And how is what the Department is doing today going to solve that problem?	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20 21 22 23 24	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you, Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor?  (Plaintiff counsel conferring.)  MR. DORRIS: I have nothing further, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Stemplewicz?
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20 21 22 23	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?  A. I believe that's correct.  Q. All right. And how is what the Department is doing today going to solve that problem?  A. I don't know that it's going to cure the problem. It's one	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20 21 22 23	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you,  Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor?  (Plaintiff counsel conferring.)  MR. DORRIS: I have nothing further, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Stemplewicz?  MR. QUINN: Michael Quinn for the government.
2 3 4 03:21:48 5 6 7 8 9 03:22:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:22:42 15 16 17 18 19 03:23:06 20 21 22 23 24	every day, there's a liquidity amount that has to be available, and those are invested in an overnighter. So what is actually invested in longer-term instruments I don't know. It's managed by another office.  Q. But can you state that the factor that's going to be used to calculate interest for particular times reflects the interest rate or the earnings or dividend rate that the funds were actually earning during that time?  A. I don't understand the question, really.  Q. Okay. You have seen in some of the documents where there's indications that the amount of funds that are being pooled for investment are not as large as the total of the sum of the amounts in the individual accounts, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So, if that occurred, and you only use the amount of money, the interest that was available that was earned at that time to spread among all of the accounts, each of the beneficiaries is then getting less than what it should have actually earned on its particular account, correct?  A. I believe that's correct.  Q. All right. And how is what the Department is doing today going to solve that problem?  A. I don't know that it's going to cure the problem. It's one of the things that we intend that we would report on as part	2 3 4 03:25:05 5 6 7 8 9 03:25:25 10 11 12 13 14 03:25:44 15 16 17 18 19 03:26:00 20 21 22 23 24	I'm sorry.  BY MR. DORRIS:  Q. I'll try. The method that is being used in the 2007 Plan for, quote, recalculating interest, does not end up reflecting then on the historical statement of account the actual amount of interest that was earned by the dollars in a particular individual's account. Is that correct?  A. I think it does.  Q. Okay. You're saying it reflects the dollars that were earned off the investment pool, where the funds were pooled together, correct?  A. If that's what you're asking, yes.  Q. And it does not reflect what interest for a particular individual's account was earned for that account?  A. Again, I'm confused by where you're going. I'm sorry.  Q. Okay. I think we've already gotten there. Thank you, Mr. Zippin. I have no further questions.  MR. DORRIS: Well, can I have one moment, Your Honor?  (Plaintiff counsel conferring.)  MR. DORRIS: I have nothing further, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Stemplewicz?  MR. QUINN: Michael Quinn for the government.  THE COURT: Sorry, Mr. Quinn.

1971 Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR 1 No cross, Your Honor. 1973 2 \* \* \* \* \* \* THE COURT: Perfect timing. It's 5:00. You may step 3 down, Mr. Zippin. CERTIFICATE (The witness steps down.) I, BRYAN A. WAYNE, Official Court Reporter, certify that 03:26:52 5 Unless the game goes into extra innings, in which case -the foregoing pages are a correct transcript from the record of 6 we'll see you all here at 9:30 tomorrow morning. proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 7 (Proceedings adjourned at 4:59 p.m.) 8 BRYAN A. WAYNE 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter 1972

1		INDEX	1972
2	WITNESS:	<u>PAGE</u> :	
3			
4	Donald Pallais	Direct Examination Cont'	
5	Richard Fitzgerald	Direct Examination  Cross-Examination	
6	Jeffrey Zippin	Redirect Examination  Direct Examination	
7		****	
8		EXHIBITS RECEIVED	
9	Plaintiff Exhibit No.	4283	1866
10		. 4210 and 575	1877
11	Plaintiff Exhibit No.	4285	1930
12		****	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			

•	<b>1963</b> [1] - 1879:20	1963:21, 1963:24,	<b>575</b> [4] - 1876:8,	1954:14, 1957:23,
\$	<b>1965</b> [1] - 1883:7	1970:4	1876:10, 1877:7,	1962:24
<b>\$300</b> [2] - 1890:9,	<b>1980s</b> [1] - 1870:10	<b>202</b> [5] - 1864:14,	1972:10	above-entitled [1] -
1890:12		1864:22, 1864:5,	<b>58</b> [1] - 1870:10	1973:5
1030.12	<b>1990s</b> [1] - 1916:15	1864:10, 1864:14		
•	<b>1994</b> [10] - 1874:1,	<b>21</b> [1] - 1959:7	<b>585-0053</b> [1] -	absolute [4] -
	1899:2, 1899:18,		1864:22	1927:14, 1927:20,
<b>'02</b> [1] - 1911:22	1899:24, 1921:5,	<b>24</b> [2] - 1864:5, 1958:1	<b>5:00</b> [1] - 1971:2	1927:23, 1928:2
<b>'03</b> [2] - 1897:4,	1921:15, 1923:6, 1923:13, 1923:21,	<b>25</b> [4] - 1899:18,	<u> </u>	<b>Absolutely</b> [1] - 1908:4
1897:18	1923.13, 1923.21, 1924:1	1923:5, 1923:21,	6	accept [1] - 1903:15
<b>'04</b> [1] - 1885:9	<b>1996</b> [2] - 1883:22,	1923.5, 1923.21,	<b>6</b> [4] - 1889:13,	-
<b>'80s</b> [2] - 1915:4,	19 <b>36</b> [2] - 1003.22, 1916:19	25th [1] - 1899:11	1896:9, 1898:25,	acceptable [1] - 1872:11
1915:6	1910.19		1950:14	
<b>'94</b> [4] - 1885:22,	_	<b>27101</b> [1] - 1864:25	<b>607</b> [2] - 1864:13,	accepted [5] -
1897:14, 1899:4,	2	<b>2800</b> [1] - 1864:17	1864:20	1869:8, 1869:12, 1869:14, 1869:15,
1899:5	<b>2</b> [4] - 1865:7,	2	<b>607-7392</b> [1] -	1924:14
<b>'97</b> [1] - 1916:19	1889:4, 1950:18,	3	1864:25	accompanying [2] -
	1958:4	<b>3</b> [2] - 1956:8,	<b>63-10</b> [1] - 1948:8	1947:4, 1969:2
1	<b>20</b> [1] - 1949:6	1962:16	<b>63-11-11</b> [1] - 1956:4	accordance [1] -
	<b>200</b> [3] - 1959:12,	<b>30309-4530</b> [1] -	<b>63-11-5</b> [1] - 1953:1	1966:6
<b>1</b> [4] - 1882:10,	1960:1, 1960:4	1864:17	<b>63-11-8</b> [1] - 1954:25	
1962:2, 1962:4,	<b>200,000</b> [1] - 1960:1	<b>307-0010</b> [1] - 1864:5	<b>63-13-2</b> [1] - 1959:7	account [64] - 1870:19, 1870:23,
1962:10	<b>20001</b> [1] - 1864:13	<b>307-1104</b> [1] -	<b>63-2</b> [2] - 1947:12,	1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:3,
<b>1,000</b> [1] - 1950:17	<b>20005</b> [3] - 1864:14,	1864:10	1947:17	1870.24, 1871.5, 1871:4, 1871:5,
<b>1.5</b> [1] - 1879:11	1864:21, 1864:5	<b>31</b> [2] - 1869:5,	<b>63-2-1</b> [1] - 1947:8	1871:11, 1871:20,
<b>10</b> [6] - 1884:20,	<b>2001</b> [4] - 1934:13,	1943:6	<b>6714</b> [1] - 1864:12	1880:11, 1881:19,
1885:14, 1912:15,	1934:14, 1934:16,	<b>333</b> [1] - 1864:13	0714[1] - 1004.12	1887:3, 1895:8,
1948:9, 1953:3,	1934:17	<b>336</b> [1] - 1864:25	7	1898:19, 1900:13,
1955:21	<b>2002</b> [4] - 1939:22,	<b>35</b> [1] - 1936:6	1	1900:19, 1900:13,
<b>1001</b> [1] - 1864:24	1949:6, 1950:9,	<b>354-3186</b> [1] -	<b>75</b> [2] - 1959:13,	1900:19, 1903:1,
<b>102</b> [2] - 1921:6,	1950:14	1864:14	1960:4	1907:20, 1908:3,
1921:24	<b>2003</b> [12] - 1932:3,	<b>3:35</b> [1] - 1930:22	<b>75,000</b> [1] - 1960:2	1909:18, 1909:21,
<b>102(a</b> [3] - 1921:5,	1933:21, 1939:16,	<b>3:51</b> [1] - 1930:22	, .,	1915:3, 1915:5,
1921:14, 1921:16	1939:22, 1940:15,	0.01[1] = 1000.22	8	1917:18, 1918:8,
<b>1100</b> [2] - 1864:17,	1943:7, 1943:21,	4		1918:11, 1918:13,
1864:4	1950:23, 1951:6,	7	<b>8</b> [1] - 1954:23	1918:17, 1919:14,
<b>12</b> [3] - 1884:20,	1951:23, 1953:3,	<b>4</b> [1] - 1956:8	<b>815-6450</b> [1] -	1919:15, 1920:4,
1888:13, 1950:12	1954:24	<b>400</b> [1] - 1936:6	1864:18	1920:9, 1922:15,
<b>13</b> [4] - 1882:9,	<b>2004</b> [6] - 1883:22,	<b>404</b> [1] - 1864:18	<b>824-1448</b> [1] -	1923:24, 1923:25,
1955:2, 1955:7,	1885:3, 1951:25,	<b>4210</b> [4] - 1876:5,	1864:14	1952:14, 1956:17,
1955:14	1955:22, 1958:4,	1876:10, 1877:6,		1956:18, 1957:11,
<b>14th</b> [2] - 1864:13,	1958:23	1972:10	9	1957:12, 1957:24,
1864:20	<b>20044</b> [1] - 1864:10	<b>4283</b> [3] - 1866:7,	<b>0</b> 4004.0	1963:10, 1963:25,
<b>15</b> [2] - 1930:16,	<b>2005</b> [1] - 1908:14	1866:8, 1866:10	<b>9</b> [3] - 1864:9,	1964:21, 1965:2,
1954:24	<b>2006</b> [2] - 1959:7,	4283	1906:21, 1958:9	1965:5, 1965:6,
<b>17</b> [1] - 1955:22	1960:11	[1] - 1972:9	900 [1] - 1864:21	1965:13, 1966:6,
<b>1865</b> [1] - 1972:3	<b>2007</b> [30] - 1864:5,	<b>4285</b> [6] - 1879:7,	<b>96-1285</b> [1] - 1864:3	1966:20, 1967:8,
<b>1866</b> [1] - 1972:9	1873:8, 1876:17,	1882:4, 1887:18,	<b>975</b> [1] - 1864:9	1967:13, 1968:19,
<b>1867</b> [1] - 1972:4	1898:15, 1902:8,	1930:13, 1930:15,	<b>99</b> [1] - 1950:18	1968:25, 1969:3,
<b>1877</b> [1] - 1972:10	1904:11, 1905:7,	1930:20	<b>9:30</b> [1] - 1971:6	1969:22, 1970:6,
<b>1879</b> [1] - 1972:4	1906:24, 1909:17,	4285	_	1970:8, 1970:15
<b>19</b> [2] - 1911:16,	1910:25, 1921:2,	[1] - 1972:10	A	accountability [1] -
1942:21	1923:20, 1931:18,	<b>4504</b> [1] - 1942:16	A L C O P N rat	1935:2
<b>1913</b> [1] - 1972:5	1933:21, 1933:25,	<b>4:59</b> [1] - 1971:7	<b>A-L-C-O-R-N</b> [1] - 1942:4	accountant [1] -
<b>1928</b> [1] - 1972:5	1939:16, 1940:15,			1872:12
<b>1930</b> [1] - 1972:10	1942:21, 1943:6,	5	Abe [1] - 1937:23	accountants [4] -
<b>1934</b> [1] - 1972:6	1943:21, 1946:21,		ability [1] - 1930:4	1865:18, 1865:21,
<b>1938</b> [4] - 1904:4,	1947:3, 1947:13,	<b>5</b> [2] - 1898:22,	<b>able</b> [10] - 1865:22,	1872:8, 1874:15
1904:13, 1957:25,	1948:1, 1951:17,	1947:16	1882:23, 1888:7,	accounted [3] -
1958:1	1952:8, 1956:20,	<b>57-30-1</b> [1] - 1960:13	1888:9, 1928:13,	1901:9, 1904:7,
			1931:3, 1941:20,	
	_	_		

1907:21	1004:25 1024:11	acting to: 1907:20	1945:10, 1945:20,	1919:22, 1920:2,
	1904:25, 1934:11, 1935:11, 1936:2,	acting [2] - 1897:20, 1905:19	1945.10, 1945.20, 1946:14, 1946:19,	1919.22, 1920.2,
accounting [120] -	1936:4, 1938:8,		1946:14, 1946:19, 1946:25, 1947:1,	
1867:8, 1868:6,	1938:21, 1944:19	<b>action</b> [2] - 1889:25,	1940.25, 1947.1, 1947:7, 1947:23,	<b>agreed</b> [4] - 1880:17,
1869:12, 1869:14,	,	1890:2	1947.7, 1947.23,	1880:24, 1909:14, 1949:16
1869:15, 1869:21,	accountings [7] -	Action [1] - 1864:3		
1871:9, 1871:20,	1886:17, 1887:12,	actions [2] -	1957:2, 1957:4,	agreement [1] -
1872:19, 1873:20, 1873:22, 1874:7,	1902:15, 1904:1,	1905:20, 1927:4	1957:8, 1959:7, 1961:17, 1961:24,	1880:22
1886:20, 1886:23,	1915:24, 1917:3, 1920:18	acts' [1] - 1874:4	1962:7	ahead [3] - 1874:13,
1886:25, 1887:9,		actual [2] - 1871:10,		1891:4, 1931:4
1887:20, 1890:21,	<b>Accounts</b> [1] - 1904:4	1970:6	<b>Administrator</b> [1] - 1882:17	aid [1] - 1889:9
1890:24, 1891:8,		add [3] - 1878:6,		aided [1] - 1864:25
1891:22, 1891:23,	<b>accounts</b> [61] - 1867:4, 1871:24,	1890:13, 1931:22	<b>admission</b> [1] - 1876:16	AIRR [1] - 1928:16
1892:7, 1892:20,	1880:16, 1880:20,	addition [1] -		<b>al</b> [2] - 1864:3,
1893:4, 1893:9,	1880:23, 1880:24,	1933:23	<b>admissions</b> [1] - 1898:6	1864:6
1893:25, 1894:16,	1881:10, 1897:7,	additional [1] -	admit [1] - 1866:6	Alaska [1] - 1954:12
1897:1, 1898:16,	1899:1, 1899:2,	1866:2	• •	Albuquerque [4] -
1899:8, 1900:14,	1899:7, 1899:18,	Additional [1] -	admitted [2] - 1876:9, 1932:4	1866:24, 1888:10,
1902:4, 1902:9,	1899:19, 1899:24,	1906:22	admonition [1] -	1897:12, 1936:24
1902:19, 1902:24,	1900:1, 1907:2,	address [6] -	1927:17	Alcorn [2] - 1942:2,
1903:3, 1903:11,	1908:10, 1908:13,	1876:11, 1878:12,		1942:7
1903:20, 1903:22,	1908:10, 1908:13,	1903:9, 1931:19,	adopting [1] - 1875:8 advised [3] - 1912:1,	allottee [1] - 1954:10
1904:12, 1904:21,	1916:21, 1917:2,	1932:16, 1933:23	1912:5, 1912:6	allow [1] - 1890:2
1904:23, 1905:1,	1917:7, 1917:8,	addressed [2] -	<i>'</i>	almost [2] - 1906:10,
1905:2, 1905:3,	1917:16, 1918:9,	1883:1, 1932:15	advisory [1] -	1937:19
1905:8, 1905:11,	1918:18, 1919:3,	addressing [1] -	1918:12	alternative [4] -
1905:14, 1907:1,	1919:10, 1919:18,	1874:3	<b>Affairs</b> [4] - 1936:18,	1871:6, 1871:8,
1907:7, 1909:25,	1922:13, 1923:11,	adjourned [1] -	1937:1, 1964:3, 1965:22	1944:9, 1944:10
1910:8, 1911:1,	1923:12, 1923:19,	1971:7	<b>affect</b> [2] - 1913:20,	<b>Alyce</b> [4] - 1953:6,
1911:7, 1912:17,	1923:20, 1923:23,	administer [1] -	1923:13	1953:7
1912:21, 1916:1,	1943:6, 1956:21,	1879:9	afternoon [8] -	American [2] -
1916:2, 1916:7,	1956:22, 1956:23,	administered [3] -	1866:13, 1878:20,	1885:22, 1928:17
1916:8, 1916:10,	1956:24, 1957:21,	1905:17, 1906:18, 1918:10	1878:21, 1878:25,	amount [18] -
1916:12, 1917:1,	1959:9, 1959:12,	administering [1] -	1913:7, 1913:8,	1871:3, 1871:11, 1891:22, 1891:25,
1918:19, 1919:25,	1959:16, 1960:1,	1916:21	1930:24, 1933:7	1907:14, 1909:9,
1920:4, 1920:6,	1960:2, 1960:7,	administration [12] -	<b>AFTERNOON</b> [1] -	1957:14, 1969:9, 1954:9, 1955:5,
1920:7, 1920:8,	1964:11, 1964:16,	1880:23, 1880:24,	1864:7	1966:15, 1966:25,
1920:15, 1920:19,	1964:18, 1964:25,	1881:23, 1884:18,	agencies [6] -	1967:1, 1967:22,
1920:20, 1920:23,	1965:15, 1965:18,	1902:21, 1903:24,	1868:9, 1868:12,	1968:1, 1968:11,
1921:2, 1922:6,	1966:17, 1967:11,	1913:13, 1917:6,	1917:12, 1951:19,	1968:15, 1969:21,
1923:4, 1923:9,	1967:16, 1967:24,	1917:8, 1918:18,	1952:17, 1969:13	1970:6
1923:11, 1923:17,	1968:13, 1968:17	1919:2, 1919:4	Agency [3] -	amounts [4] -
1924:4, 1924:12,	accuracy [1] -	administrative [51] -	1952:19, 1952:22,	1870:16, 1870:21,
1924:18, 1924:22,	1908:24	1866:17, 1866:19,	1952:24	1872:10, 1968:13
1924:25, 1925:1,	accurate [6] -	1922:16, 1922:18,	agency [18] -	analogue [1] -
1928:5, 1928:12,	1875:15, 1893:2,	1931:1, 1933:22,	1868:13, 1868:15,	1925:18
1928:15, 1928:25,	1894:13, 1912:21,	1938:1, 1938:2,	1917:8, 1919:2,	analysis [4] -
1929:3, 1929:4,	1917:3, 1948:18	1938:13, 1938:17,	1937:10, 1950:19,	1866:16, 1927:19,
1929:7, 1929:19,	accurately [2] -	1938:25, 1939:4,	1950:22, 1950:25,	1949:20, 1951:3
1929:21, 1929:22,	1907:8, 1967:15	1939:6, 1939:17,	1951:5, 1951:9,	analyze [1] - 1873:18
1929:23, 1932:9,	acquired [1] - 1900:9	1940:10, 1940:18,	1951:14, 1951:20,	Andersen [2] -
1935:23, 1935:24,	act [7] - 1885:19,	1940:21, 1940:24,	1952:6, 1952:8,	1865:19, 1876:6
1936:15, 1939:21,	1885:21, 1885:22,	1941:1, 1941:15,	1952:12, 1952:14,	anecdotal [2] -
1943:5, 1951:22,	1902:13, 1920:12,	1941:23, 1941:24,	1969:9	1964:12, 1964:23
1952:2, 1954:4,	1958:1	1942:9, 1942:19,	agent [3] - 1905:18,	<b>Angel</b> [3] - 1941:6,
1956:13, 1958:1,	Act [8] - 1874:1,	1943:4, 1943:9,	1906:4, 1926:7	1941:13, 1941:14
1959:17, 1960:20, 1961:3, 1961:13,	1884:16, 1885:23,	1943:14, 1943:15,	agents [1] - 1905:21	Angel's [1] - 1875:10
1961:19, 1962:1,	1897:14, 1899:11,	1943:19, 1943:22,	aggregate [1] -	answer [11] - 1872:4,
1961:19, 1962:1,	1899:12, 1921:5,	1944:5, 1944:15,	1919:14	1874:8, 1894:20,
Accounting [8] -	1921:15	1944:21, 1944:23,	agree [4] - 1871:19,	1895:3, 1895:10,
Accounting [o]				

1912:18, 1914:7, 1921:18, 1921:22, 1944:12, 1944:22 answered [5] -1874:9, 1929:9, 1945:12, 1945:13, 1969:23 answering [1] -1872:13 answers [1] - 1883:4 antecedent [2] -1959:19, 1959:20 antisedent [1] -1959:21 anyplace [2] -1902:13, 1908:1 anyway [1] - 1885:9 apart [1] - 1951:23 apologize [1] -1966:9 Appeals [2] - 1874:3, 1922:7 APPEARANCES [1] -1864:11 appeared [2] -1877:11, 1932:1 applicable [6] -1881:1, 1895:1, 1932:17, 1965:16, 1966:6, 1967:8 application [2] -1869:16, 1926:4 applied [8] -1873:23, 1916:15, 1927:20, 1964:2, 1965:17, 1966:5, 1967:12, 1969:8 applies [6] - 1869:5, 1869:9, 1869:13, 1869:14, 1926:9, 1960:9 apply [9] - 1865:22. 1866:2, 1869:3, 1869:6, 1869:18, 1917:22, 1927:3, 1964:20, 1966:17 appointed [1] -1941:23 apprentice [1] -1883:11 approach [5] -1873:13, 1873:18, 1875:8, 1939:22, 1951:3 approached [1] -1922:11 approaches [1] -1944:9 appropriate [10] -1888:8, 1889:25,

1895:21, 1899:8, 1902:11, 1907:6, 1909:22, 1909:24, 1916:11, 1917:2 appropriately [2] -1914:9, 1917:25 appropriations [1] -1875:1 approved [1] -1879:10 April [2] - 1934:15, 1934:17 apropos [3] - 1885:9, 1909:5, 1923:17 Arch [1] - 1937:4 area [7] - 1865:7, 1879:25, 1900:16, 1920:24, 1925:21, 1925:22, 1932:9 areas [2] - 1900:12, 1933:17 argue [1] - 1871:8 arguments [2] -1898:3, 1898:7 arises [1] - 1937:8 Arizona [2] - 1954:9, 1954:11 art [1] - 1872:2 Arthur [2] - 1865:19, 1876:6 aspects [1] -1932:21 assembled [1] -1939:7 assembly [4] -1933:21, 1938:25, 1941:24, 1942:8 assessing [2] -1873:8, 1873:12 asset [8] - 1890:5, 1890:17, 1892:3, 1897:11, 1900:9, 1910:6, 1910:9, 1924:8 assets [29] -1879:10, 1887:1, 1887:4, 1889:18, 1890:18, 1891:15, 1892:15, 1897:15, 1899:10, 1900:8, 1900:21, 1901:1, 1905:8, 1905:14, 1905:16, 1906:5, 1906:6, 1906:7, 1906:9, 1907:19, 1909:25, 1910:1, 1910:2, 1910:3,

1910:16, 1917:25,

1919:5, 1929:12,

1929:15

assigned [1] -1937:16 assist [1] - 1885:17 assistance [1] -1882:22 assistant [2] -1883:12. 1883:17 associate [2] -1883:13, 1915:11 Assume [1] - 1924:5 assume [3] - 1925:7, 1958:6, 1958:11 assumed [1] -1958:17 assumes [1] -1967:14 Assuming [2] -1922:15, 1924:6 assumption [1] -1870:4 assurance [2] -1865:20, 1865:25 assure [2] - 1888:7, 1920:17 asterisk [1] -1907:22 **Atlanta** [1] - 1864:17 attached 131 -

1876:14, 1876:21, 1943:3 attempt [1] - 1942:7 attendance [1] -1954:25 attendees [2] -1948:21, 1958:5 attention [6] -1882:4, 1890:19, 1900:5, 1900:11, 1906:21, 1911:16 attestation [1] -1869:22 **Attorney** [1] - 1864:7 attorney [1] -1954:10

attorneys [1] 1934:5
attributed [1] 1907:20
audit [5] - 1868:22,
1869:22, 1869:25,
1870:8, 1876:6
auditing [2] - 1869:2,

1869:8 **audits** [10] - 1869:3, 1869:5, 1869:6, 1869:13, 1869:15, 1869:16

1869:9, 1869:13, 1869:15, 1869:16, 1870:5, 1892:24, 1892:25

Audits [1] - 1869:15

auspices [1] -1952:4 author [1] - 1960:22 automobile [1] -1890:8 availability [1] -1918:22 available [7] -1931:6, 1931:12, 1931:13, 1966:16, 1967:9. 1968:1. 1968:16 Avenue [2] -1864:13, 1901:17 aware [14] - 1889:22, 1913:20, 1917:19, 1922:9, 1925:21, 1941:1, 1944:13, 1946:24, 1954:8, 1954:17, 1957:11, 1957:14, 1969:15, 1969:18

В

Babbitt [1] - 1895:16 background [4] -1879:17, 1884:13, 1946:7, 1946:17 balance [5] - 1881:6, 1917:2, 1956:11, 1957:16, 1957:23 balances [1] -1865:22 Bank [1] - 1881:5 bank [19] - 1880:1, 1880:9, 1880:10, 1880:15, 1881:18, 1881:21, 1881:22, 1882:22, 1883:10, 1883:24, 1883:25, 1886:16, 1913:14, 1913:24, 1914:2, 1914:13, 1926:1, 1954:13 banker [1] - 1910:19 banking [3] - 1886:2, 1893:14, 1925:22 banks [13] - 1879:24, 1880:4, 1881:4, 1882:18, 1882:20, 1882:23, 1892:11, 1914:16, 1914:17, 1929:24 Banks [1] - 1882:17 barred [1] - 1951:25 base [1] - 1870:3 Based [1] - 1903:11

based [11] - 1870:4,

1892:13, 1950:24,

1956:22, 1956:23, 1956:24, 1957:12, 1957:21, 1964:14, 1964:22, 1967:6 basic [1] - 1910:4 basis [8] - 1869:21, 1870:7, 1887:16, 1892:12. 1897:22. 1912:4. 1912:24. 1967:19 Bates [12] - 1947:7, 1947:12. 1947:16. 1950:11, 1954:23, 1955:21, 1956:4, 1959:6, 1960:13, 1962:5, 1962:7, 1962:16 bear [1] - 1912:17 became [11] -1883:16, 1885:3, 1885:11, 1887:24, 1897:8, 1917:19, 1935:10, 1938:12, 1951:13 become [3] - 1872:2, 1910:11 becomes [2] -1910:12, 1910:13 becoming [1] -1911:10 **BEFORE** [1] - 1864:9 began [2] - 1935:12, 1964:17 begin [2] - 1866:14, 1905:3 beginning [6] -1894:2, 1905:5, 1916:11, 1916:17, 1948:9, 1956:16 behalf [2] - 1868:17, 1905:19 behind [2] - 1926:2, 1964:5 belief [1] - 1928:4 believes [1] -1898:10 **belongs** [1] - 1890:5 below [3] - 1936:10, 1950:17, 1960:17 Ben [1] - 1864:9 **bench** [1] - 1945:22 Bench [1] - 1945:24 beneficiaries [24] -1887:10, 1889:20, 1892:21, 1895:9, 1899:1, 1899:10, 1901:11. 1902:5. 1902:9, 1903:12, 1908:3, 1912:21,

1915:25, 1917:24,

1895:18, 1930:10 **Civil** [2] - 1864:3,

claims [1] - 1894:22 clarification [1] -

**clear** [8] - 1878:7, 1878:8, 1897:8, 1926:20, 1950:2, 1955:17, 1962:1, 1969:19

**clearly** [1] - 1960:15 **clients** [2] - 1868:16,

close [1] - 1884:1 closed [4] - 1882:22, 1899:2, 1899:4, 1899:18

**COBELL** [1] - 1864:3 **Cobell** [2] - 1885:25,

collect [1] - 1906:13 collected [5] -1907:1, 1907:10, 1907:19, 1908:6, 1911:13

collection [2] -1918:22, 1918:23 collections [2] -1955:12, 1955:14 COLUMBIA [1] -

1864:1
coming [8] 1878:11, 1888:8,
1902:22, 1918:21,
1951:13, 1954:1,
1955:12, 1955:18
Commercial [1] -

1864:8

1929:21

1883:8

1886:5

commercial [8] 1881:17, 1881:24,
1882:3, 1886:2,
1913:23, 1915:16,
1925:22, 1929:24
commingled [5] 1929:13, 1929:15,
1929:16, 1929:17,

commissioned [1] -

committee [1] -

**common** [16] - 1887:6, 1887:12, 1887:13, 1887:15, 1892:12, 1894:22,

1864:8

1874:12 **cleanup** [1] -1935:24

1868:18

1918:15 **colleague** [1] -1866:21

1922:21, 1923:4,	<b>billion</b> [3] - 1955:2,	1936:9	cases [7] - 1882:23,
1923:5, 1923:12,	1955:8, 1955:14	<b>business</b> [5] -	1895:12, 1895:13,
1923:17, 1928:6,	<b>binders</b> [1] - 1961:19	1901:17, 1901:22,	1895:19, 1917:23,
1936:16, 1956:22,	<b>bit</b> [8] - 1868:24,	1901:25, 1902:1	1927:22, 1928:1
1956:25, 1968:18	1870:14, 1883:3,	businesses [1] -	cash [1] - 1967:25
beneficiary [46] -	1900:22, 1926:12,	1901:14	Cason [16] -
1871:21, 1872:7,	1930:16, 1930:19,	<b>buyer</b> [1] - 1900:8	1937:23, 1940:4,
1886:25, 1887:2,	1935:8	<b>BY</b> [29] - 1865:6,	1940:5, 1946:20,
1889:21, 1889:22,	<b>bite</b> [1] - 1883:3	1867:2, 1871:18,	1947:5, 1947:13,
1890:2, 1890:17,	<b>blow</b> [3] - 1942:17,	1872:5, 1879:15,	1947:25, 1948:4,
1890:23, 1891:12,	1960:14, 1962:6	1883:6, 1884:4,	1948:24, 1950:13,
1892:4, 1892:22,	<b>blue</b> [1] - 1955:6	1886:14, 1891:5,	1953:2, 1953:3,
1893:21, 1894:8,	board [2] - 1918:13,	1892:5, 1895:5,	1955:23, 1958:5,
1894:12, 1894:14,	1918:15	1898:14, 1899:23,	1959:10, 1960:11
1900:10, 1901:15,	<b>body</b> [1] - 1903:17	1900:4, 1903:5,	caused [1] - 1866:1
1902:16, 1903:23,	Bogart [3] - 1895:14,	1912:13, 1913:6,	cc [1] - 1896:13
1904:20, 1907:18,	1896:4, 1920:24	1914:12, 1921:13,	centered [1] -
1907:23, 1910:13,	<b>bond</b> [1] - 1966:23	1922:3, 1923:2,	1888:12
1910:18, 1911:3,		1928:23, 1929:11,	century [1] - 1916:16
1914:20, 1914:21,	bonds [1] - 1880:19	1934:4, 1945:4,	certain [7] - 1927:5,
1919:12, 1919:24,	books [1] - 1961:14	1945:16, 1945:25,	1950:25, 1952:7,
1920:11, 1920:12,	<b>bottom</b> [9] - 1884:5,	1950:5, 1970:3	1959:23, 1961:8,
1920:13, 1922:20,	1887:19, 1898:22,	1000.0, 1070.0	1966:25, 1967:1
1923:8, 1924:16,	1907:23, 1947:19,	С	Certainly [2] -
1924:20, 1924:21,	1950:16, 1958:9,		1867:21, 1932:18
1924:24, 1925:2,	1962:5	calculate [1] -	certainly [4] -
1926:20, 1928:25,	Box [1] - 1864:9	1968:6	1878:13, 1881:1,
1929:19, 1929:21	Branch [1] - 1864:8	calculated [3] -	1890:11, 1939:20
Beneficiary [1] -	breach [1] - 1890:3	1964:8, 1964:19,	CERTIFICATE [1] -
1889:13	breaches [1] -	1964:25	1973:2
hanafiaiam/a./	1953:20	calculating [1] -	
beneficiary's [4] -	hrook (4) 1066:10		certification [4] -
1870:19, 1870:23,	break [1] - 1966:18	1965:17	certification [4] - 1937:25 1942:19
• • •	brevity [1] - 1877:1	=	1937:25, 1942:19,
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20	<b>brevity</b> [1] - 1877:1 <b>brief</b> [3] - 1876:1,	1965:17	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2
1870:19, 1870:23,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4	1965:17 <b>calculation</b> [5] -	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 <b>certify</b> [1] - 1973:3
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 <b>benefit</b> [2] - 1894:8,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4	1965:17 <b>calculation</b> [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 <b>certify</b> [1] - 1973:3 <b>chance</b> [2] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 <b>benefit</b> [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12,	1965:17 <b>calculation</b> [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] -	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5,	1965:17 <b>calculation</b> [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8,
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8,	1965:17 <b>calculation</b> [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14 <b>cannot</b> [6] - 1865:25,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14,	1965:17  calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14  cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] -	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] -	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] -	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capital [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capital [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] -	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capital [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18,
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capital [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11 Carolina [2] -	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3,	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1861:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capital [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] -	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4,	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3,	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13, 1916:20, 1917:15,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3, 1946:1	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5, 1922:8, 1924:5,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10 Christie [1] - 1931:2
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13, 1916:20, 1917:15, 1918:2, 1924:8 bidding [1] - 1878:16 big [1] - 1881:7	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3, 1946:1	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5, 1922:8, 1924:5, 1924:6, 1928:2,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10 Christie [1] - 1931:2 CHRISTOPHER [1] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13, 1916:20, 1917:15, 1918:2, 1924:8 bidding [1] - 1878:16	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3, 1946:1 bunch [1] - 1895:12 Bureau [4] -	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5, 1922:8, 1924:5, 1924:6, 1928:2, 1931:8, 1932:18,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10 Christie [1] - 1931:2 CHRISTOPHER [1] - 1864:3
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13, 1916:20, 1917:15, 1918:2, 1924:8 bidding [1] - 1878:16 big [1] - 1881:7	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3, 1946:1 bunch [1] - 1895:12 Bureau [4] - 1936:18, 1937:1,	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5, 1922:8, 1924:5, 1924:6, 1928:2, 1931:8, 1932:18, 1955:11, 1960:22,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10 Christie [1] - 1931:2 CHRISTOPHER [1] - 1864:3 circumstances [1] -
1870:19, 1870:23, 1870:24, 1871:20 benefit [2] - 1894:8, 1894:11 Bernhardt [1] - 1948:24 Bert [4] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1953:3 best [5] - 1887:11, 1920:13, 1946:13, 1955:16, 1960:7 better [4] - 1871:1, 1926:12, 1927:11, 1945:7 between [6] - 1865:15, 1865:16, 1951:19, 1959:10, 1960:10, 1969:13 beyond [2] - 1871:23, 1871:24 BIA [7] - 1885:10, 1896:2, 1903:13, 1916:20, 1917:15, 1918:2, 1924:8 bidding [1] - 1878:16 big [1] - 1881:7 bill [2] - 1890:9,	brevity [1] - 1877:1 brief [3] - 1876:1, 1882:14, 1889:4 briefing [1] - 1958:4 briefly [7] - 1876:12, 1877:25, 1879:5, 1879:16, 1883:8, 1890:22, 1906:23 bring [2] - 1913:14, 1931:22 bringing [1] - 1894:22 broad [1] - 1867:21 broader [2] - 1869:16, 1869:17 brokers [1] - 1892:11 Bryan [1] - 1864:11 BRYAN [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 budget [2] - 1875:4, 1936:23 build [1] - 1935:14 bullet [2] - 1943:3, 1946:1 bunch [1] - 1895:12 Bureau [4] -	1965:17     calculation [5] - 1933:25, 1965:19, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1967:14     cannot [6] - 1865:25, 1905:20, 1928:5, 1933:18, 1956:11, 1957:16     capacity [1] - 1934:18     capita [1] - 1964:18     capita [1] - 1881:20     Caren [3] - 1865:8, 1866:23, 1931:11     Carolina [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3     carry [1] - 1935:19     case [22] - 1877:22, 1884:1, 1894:23, 1894:24, 1896:5, 1896:20, 1897:10, 1897:11, 1907:11, 1919:8, 1920:5, 1922:8, 1924:5, 1924:6, 1928:2, 1931:8, 1932:18,	1937:25, 1942:19, 1943:2 certify [1] - 1973:3 chance [2] - 1875:13, 1875:16 change [2] - 1874:8, 1935:6 changed [2] - 1951:16, 1951:17 character [1] - 1900:17 characterize [2] - 1927:17, 1965:3 charge [2] - 1881:14, 1881:17 charter [2] - 1882:18, 1926:1 chartered [1] - 1886:6 check [1] - 1867:11 chief [2] - 1938:10, 1942:2 chiefs [1] - 1936:10 Christie [1] - 1931:2 CHRISTOPHER [1] - 1864:3

1928:6, 1931:14, 1940:23, 1941:8, 1941:16, 1943:10, 1946:13, 1946:21, 1947:10, 1947:14, 1947:15, 1947:20, 1947:21, 1948:11, 1948:22, 1949:1, 1951:14, 1952:5, 1952:18, 1956:5, 1956:22, 1958:6, 1959:3, 1960:11, 1960:12, 1966:3, 1966:20, 1966:23, 1967:1, 1967:2, 1967:16, 1968:13, 1968:19, 1968:20, 1969:10, 1969:14, 1970:8, 1970:12,

1973:4

1940:12
correctly [8] 1883:12, 1895:20,
1897:17, 1897:18,
1925:15, 1964:11,
1964:16, 1964:24
correspondence [1]

- 1919:1

**correcting** [1] - 1915:10

corrections [1] -

corroborating [2] 1867:10, 1867:23
cost [7] - 1875:7,
1900:9, 1932:9,
1932:16, 1932:19,
1932:20, 1933:5
costs [1] - 1912:17
counsel [8] 1866:21, 1874:24,
1877:10, 1929:18,
1929:25, 1932:10,
1945:22, 1970:20
counting [3] 1880:19, 1955:9,
1955:10

country [1] - 1916:6 couple [3] - 1913:10, 1928:20, 1948:3 course [11] -1877:17, 1892:20, 1900:25, 1901:21, 1917:6, 1918:6, 1918:12, 1933:2, 1940:25, 1964:18,

**courses** [1] - 1918:4 **Court** [19] - 1864:11, 1864:12, 1874:3, 1877:13, 1879:17,

1965:25

				_
1894:25, 1895:7,	1867:21, 1926:9,	1870:21, 1870:22,	continuing [1] -	
1920:6, 1920:15,	1927:13, 1927:20	1871:2, 1871:10,	1884:24	
1920:20, 1920:23,	concern [3] -	1871:13, 1873:9,	contract [3] -	
1924:17, 1929:24	1913:12, 1951:8,	1873:13, 1903:22,	1867:24, 1930:4,	
commonly [1] -	1964:23	1951:11	1937:15	ı
1909:1	concerned [4] -	consideration [3] -	contracted [2] -	
compact [1] - 1930:4	1893:17, 1902:25,	1870:25, 1871:1,	1868:14, 1873:22	
Compacting [1] -	1913:19, 1914:18	1932:8	Contracting [1] -	
1905:6	concerns [3] -	considered [17] -	1905:7	
compacting [7] -	1922:21, 1964:7,	1901:7, 1923:7,	contracting [8] -	
1905:18, 1906:18,	1964:10	1925:5, 1925:8,	1905:18, 1906:19,	
1925:3, 1925:5,	conclude [1] -	1927:19, 1939:12,	1925:3, 1925:5,	
1925:10, 1929:25,	1923:16	1939:16, 1943:16,	1925:11, 1930:1,	
1930:9	concludes [1] -	1944:8, 1946:3,	1930:9, 1937:14	
compacts [2] -	1865:17	1946:10, 1946:15,	contractor [6] -	
1905:9, 1905:25	concluding [2] -	1947:3, 1960:24,	1905:18, 1906:4,	
compare [1] -	1894:1, 1910:22	1961:23, 1963:16	1937:17, 1961:5,	
1919:12	conclusion [2] -	consist [1] - 1871:3	1961:7, 1961:10	
compiled [1] -	1891:1, 1891:3	consistent [6] -	contractors [7] -	
1938:13	conclusions [1] -	1880:25, 1884:17, 1885:20, 1906:17,	1874:17, 1935:16,	
complete [9] -	1959:1	1923:18, 1924:6	1935:18, 1936:2,	
1893:3, 1894:13,	condition [1] -	consistently [1] -	1936:7, 1937:12, 1937:16	
1900:14, 1907:6, 1911:10, 1912:21,	1918:23	1969:12	contracts [2] -	
1931:3, 1939:4,	conducted [2] -	consists [1] -	1905:10, 1905:25	
1965:5	1913:22, 1917:8 <b>conf</b> [1] - 1950:18	1902:18	contrary [2] - 1944:4,	
completed [2] -	conference [6] -	constituents [1] -	1944:20	
1958:23, 1959:3	1878:9, 1945:24,	1917:17	control [3] - 1865:23,	
completely [1] -	1949:25, 1961:14,	constitute [2] -	1866:1, 1931:5	
1907:9	1961:19, 1962:1	1911:1, 1924:11	controls [2] -	
completeness [1] -	conferences [5] -	constituting [1] -	1922:17, 1922:18	l.
1870:15	1898:11, 1939:21,	1943:4	conversations [1] -	
completes [1] -	1939:22, 1960:20,	Constitution [1] -	1898:11	
1875:23	1961:3	1864:13	coordinator [1] -	
completing [2] -	conferring [1] -	consulting [2] -	1941:23	
1931:2, 1943:5	1970:20	1868:15, 1869:25	<b>copy</b> [3] - 1877:16,	
completion [1] -	confidence [1] -	Cont'[1] -	1942:11, 1961:14	
1931:7	1917:1	1972:3	Correct [9] - 1867:5,	
compliance [1] -	confirm [2] -	contact [2] - 1937:2	1867:9, 1869:4,	
1888:2	1942:23, 1954:14	contacts [1] -	1869:19, 1870:2,	
complies [1] -	confused [1] -	1936:14	1870:18, 1873:11,	
1898:10	1970:16	contained [1] -	1941:12, 1946:23	
comply [1] - 1898:10	congress [1] -	1957:15	correct [73] -	
component [1] -	1927:9	contains [1] -	1866:14, 1867:4,	
1951:23	Congress [5] -	1958:25	1867:8, 1868:9, 1868:12, 1869:3,	
composition [1] -	1909:4, 1909:10,	contemporaneous	1869:5, 1869:20,	
1919:13	1951:25, 1952:4, 1955:7	context [3] -	1870:1, 1870:5,	
comprehensive [1] - 1885:2	congressional [2] -	1867:23, 1904:22,	1870:8, 1870:17,	
comptroller [2] -	1875:1, 1936:23	1956:1	1870:21, 1870:25,	
1883:17, 1913:19	congressman [1] -	contingent [2] -	1871:11, 1873:10,	
Comptroller [6] -	1877:14	1870:8, 1870:9	1873:14, 1873:18,	
1879:18, 1879:21,	connection [3] -	Contingent [1] -	1873:19, 1874:24,	ĺ
1882:1, 1882:14,	1877:15, 1940:15,	1870:11	1875:14, 1883:23,	ĺ
1882:16, 1925:23	1960:25	continuation [1] -	1884:7, 1888:22,	ı
computer [1] -	connotation [2] -	1956:5	1908:14, 1909:5,	ĺ
1864:25	1958:12, 1958:19	continue [1] -	1914:4, 1914:14,	ĺ
computer-aided [1] -	consider [13] -	1896:23	1916:16, 1916:24,	ĺ
1864:25	1867:11, 1867:14,	Continued [1] -	1917:9, 1920:21,	ĺ
concept [4] -	1867:24, 1868:3,	1865:5	1922:13, 1927:23,	ĺ
				1

1006:22 1004:22	Cross (0) 1012:4	debate (4) 1000:E	1000.7 1000.0	1959:1
1886:22, 1894:23, 1897:4, 1909:14,	<b>Cross</b> [3] - 1913:4, 1972:4, 1972:5	debate [1] - 1898:5	1898:7, 1908:9, 1911:4, 1911:7,	
	*	debates [1] - 1898:1	· ·	design [1] - 1935:14
1922:7, 1926:23, 1928:1, 1931:4,	CROSS-	deceased [4] -	1911:11, 1915:24, 1916:4, 1922:15,	designated [6] - 1879:10, 1931:17,
1931:20, 1932:11,	EXAMINATION [2] -	1902:9, 1923:4,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1951:24, 1953:21,	1867:1, 1913:5	1923:8, 1923:24	1923:16, 1924:4,	1931:19, 1932:3,
1963:23, 1973:3	Cross-Examination	December [2] -	1928:5, 1928:12, 1931:1, 1934:17,	1932:22, 1933:3
court [5] - 1868:2,	[2] -	1950:14, 1954:24	1931:1, 1934:17,	designation [1] -
1872:3, 1874:9,	1972:4, 1972:5	<b>decided</b> [3] - 1898:9,	1934.22, 1934.23,	1932:7
1902:17, 1945:17	Cross-examine [1] -	1953:24, 1964:20	1941:10, 1941:15,	details [1] - 1892:14
COURT [61] - 1864:1,	1913:4	decimal [1] -	1943:18, 1944:3,	<b>detect</b> [2] - 1872:17,
1865:2, 1866:8,	CRR [1] - 1864:11	1965:16	1944:14, 1944:18,	1872:23
1866:12, 1866:25,	cure [1] - 1968:23	decision [10] -	1945:8, 1945:19,	determination [4] -
1871:12, 1871:15,	Curley [1] - 1866:22	1878:11, 1947:19,	1946:3, 1946:11,	1878:10, 1930:3,
1871:17, 1872:1,	Currency [5] -	1949:21, 1950:6,	1946:15, 1954:2,	1932:23, 1951:18
1875:23, 1876:3,	1879:18, 1879:21,	1950:10, 1951:13,	1955:18, 1957:22,	determine [3] -
1876:10, 1876:13,	1882:14, 1882:16,	1952:6, 1958:20,	1960:24, 1961:5,	1941:18, 1964:15,
1876:19, 1876:24,	1925:23	1961:16, 1961:18	1964:24, 1968:21	1966:1
1877:3, 1877:17,	currency [1] -	decisional [1] -	department [7] -	<b>determined</b> [1] - 1967:6
1877:21, 1878:1,	1883:17	1946:23	1880:12, 1881:7,	
1878:15, 1878:19,	current [3] -	decisions [5] -	1881:19, 1884:18,	<b>determining</b> [1] - 1918:18
1878:21, 1879:12,	1915:25, 1916:25,	1874:3, 1896:25,	1913:13, 1915:19,	
1883:1, 1883:20,	1917:2	1938:17, 1947:6, 1949:16	1915:20	<b>develop</b> [2] - 1884:24, 1916:18
1883:24, 1886:13,	custody [1] -	declaration [2] -	Department's [2] -	developed [1] -
1891:2, 1891:4,	1941:10	1942:22, 1944:1	1899:9, 1900:14	1961:21
1891:14, 1891:18,		deemed [1] -	department-wide [1]	
1895:2, 1897:24,	D	1882:21	- 1884:18	<b>developing</b> [2] - 1943:16, 1961:23
1899:16, 1900:2,	<b>D.C</b> [7] - 1864:4,	default [2] - 1881:18,	departmental [1] -	development [2] -
1912:4, 1912:7,	1864:21, 1864:5,	1920:20	1954:2	1940:15, 1960:25
1912:11, 1912:25,	1864:10, 1864:13,	Defendants [3] -	Departmental [1] -	<b>died</b> [4] - 1901:17,
1913:4, 1914:8,	1879:25, 1931:6		1942:8	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
1913:4, 1914:8, 1921:11, 1921:18,	1879:25, 1931:6	1864:7, 1864:1,	=	1923:5, 1923:12,
		1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21	1942:8	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17
1921:11, 1921:18,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 <b>defendants</b> [1] -	1942:8 <b>departments</b> [4] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 <b>difference</b> [3] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2 <b>DANIEL</b> [1] - 1864:23	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 <b>defendants</b> [1] - 1942:19	1942:8 <b>departments</b> [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 <b>difference</b> [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 <b>defendants</b> [1] - 1942:19 <b>Defendants'</b> [2] -	1942:8 <b>departments</b> [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2 <b>DANIEL</b> [1] - 1864:23 <b>data</b> [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 <b>defendants</b> [1] - 1942:19 <b>Defendants'</b> [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10	1942:8  departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 <b>difference</b> [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 <b>differences</b> [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2 <b>DANIEL</b> [1] - 1864:23 <b>data</b> [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] -	1942:8 <b>departments</b> [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 <b>dependent</b> [1] - 1908:22	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 <b>difference</b> [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 <b>differences</b> [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2 <b>DANIEL</b> [1] - 1864:23 <b>data</b> [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18	1942:8  departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22,	1879:25, 1931:6 <b>Dalehite</b> [1] - 1928:2 <b>DANIEL</b> [1] - 1864:23 <b>data</b> [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14 <b>date</b> [9] - 1891:23,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 <b>defendants</b> [1] - 1942:19 <b>Defendants'</b> [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 <b>defense</b> [1] - 1929:18 <b>Deja</b> [1] - 1913:9	1942:8  departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 <b>difference</b> [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 <b>differences</b> [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] -	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] -	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] -	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21     defendants [1] - 1942:19     Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10     defense [1] - 1929:18     Deja [1] - 1913:9     Delaware [1] - 1880:3     delegates [1] - 1925:19     deliver [1] - 1911:23	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] -	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18  coverage [2] -	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] -	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] -
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] -	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1 create [1] - 1899:13	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10,	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1 create [1] - 1899:13 creation [1] -	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1 create [1] - 1899:13 creation [1] -	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,  1949:8	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21, 1885:10, 1885:18,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1900:17	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1 create [1] - 1899:13 creation [1] - 1934:16 criteria [1] - 1952:24	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,  1949:8  dealing [2] -	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21, 1885:10, 1885:18, 1886:10, 1888:15,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1900:17 describe [1] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5, 1879:14, 1934:3
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18  coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13  coverd [1] - 1880:3  covers [1] - 1921:1  create [1] - 1899:13  creation [1] - 1934:16  criteria [1] - 1952:24  CROSS [2] - 1867:1,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,  1949:8  dealing [2] -  1949:13, 1953:21	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21, 1885:10, 1885:18, 1886:10, 1888:15, 1895:11, 1895:16,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1963:23	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5, 1879:14, 1934:3 direct [10] - 1871:23,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18  coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13  coverd [1] - 1880:3  covers [1] - 1921:1  create [1] - 1899:13  creation [1] - 1934:16  criteria [1] - 1952:24  CROSS [2] - 1867:1, 1913:5	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,  1949:8  dealing [2] -  1949:13, 1953:21  deals [2] - 1904:6,	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21, 1885:10, 1885:18, 1886:10, 1888:15, 1895:11, 1895:16, 1895:17, 1895:25,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1963:23 described [2] -	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5, 1879:14, 1934:3 direct [10] - 1871:23, 1873:2, 1873:5,
1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2  Courthouse [1] - 1864:12  courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25  cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18  coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13  coverd [1] - 1880:3  covers [1] - 1921:1  create [1] - 1899:13  creation [1] - 1934:16  criteria [1] - 1952:24  CROSS [2] - 1867:1,	1879:25, 1931:6  Dalehite [1] - 1928:2  DANIEL [1] - 1864:23  data [7] - 1890:4,  1892:13, 1949:8,  1949:9, 1949:13,  1949:18, 1955:14  date [9] - 1891:23,  1893:3, 1904:25,  1905:4, 1907:9,  1942:20, 1948:15,  1955:21, 1956:15  DAVID [1] - 1864:23  DAY [1] - 1864:9  day-to-day [1] -  1937:19  days [2] - 1876:15,  1876:17  DC [1] - 1864:14  deal [10] - 1907:16,  1927:11, 1936:20,  1936:24, 1937:6,  1937:7, 1937:8,  1937:9, 1937:21,  1949:8  dealing [2] -  1949:13, 1953:21	1864:7, 1864:1, 1932:21 defendants [1] - 1942:19 Defendants' [2] - 1865:7, 1932:10 defense [1] - 1929:18 Deja [1] - 1913:9 Delaware [1] - 1880:3 delegates [1] - 1925:19 deliver [1] - 1911:23 demand [1] - 1919:25 demonstrate [2] - 1946:6, 1946:16 DENNIS [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Department [55] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1866:21, 1884:6, 1884:16, 1884:21, 1885:10, 1885:18, 1886:10, 1888:15, 1895:11, 1895:16,	1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1963:23	1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5, 1879:14, 1934:3 direct [10] - 1871:23,

1936:10, 1936:11, 1967:18 directing [1] -1938:18 direction [2] -1920:22, 1930:9 directives [1] -1942:8 directly [6] - 1897:2, 1900:9, 1901:11, 1901:24, 1936:8, 1937:9 director [8] - 1885:3, 1885:11, 1887:24, 1888:25, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1940:1 **DIRK** [1] - 1864:6 disagree [1] -1922:10 disagreed [1] -1897:16 disbursement [2] -1954:12, 1963:4 disbursements [1] -1963:8 discharge [1] -1898:18 discover [2] -1928:13, 1928:14 discovered [1] -1881:11 discussed [9] -1877:12, 1890:22, 1932:16, 1944:11, 1949:23, 1950:8, 1953:19, 1959:13, 1960:8 discussion [6] -1898:5, 1926:22, 1949:12, 1950:10, 1953:22, 1955:4 discussions [4] -1942:12, 1947:24, 1952:3, 1967:20 dismissed [1] -1894:23 dispute [1] - 1921:8 disputes [1] - 1898:1 dissenting [1] -1927:6 distinct [1] - 1949:15 distinction [2] -1903:25, 1966:13 distinctly [1] -1880:18 DISTRICT [3] -1864:1, 1864:1, 1864:10 divided [2] -

1965:15, 1967:10 dividend [2] -1966:23, 1968:7 division [2] -1936:10, 1967:12 **Division** [1] - 1864:8 document [42] -1880:21, 1882:5. 1882:9, 1887:22, 1889:5, 1889:12, 1889:15, 1894:3, 1911:19, 1941:18, 1942:24, 1946:20, 1946:22, 1947:2, 1947:8, 1947:12, 1948:2, 1948:8, 1948:10, 1950:11, 1952:25, 1953:1, 1953:17, 1954:23, 1954:25, 1955:6, 1955:21, 1956:4, 1959:8, 1960:13, 1960:16, 1960:23, 1961:4, 1961:16, 1962:3, 1962:11, 1962:23, 1963:1, 1963:13, 1963:18 documentation [10] - 1893:9, 1893:10, 1893:11, 1893:12, 1918:19, 1926:16, 1926:17, 1926:19, 1963:9 documents [53] -1870:4, 1873:1, 1874:23, 1875:2, 1880:25, 1888:19, 1918:17. 1918:25. 1919:3, 1919:5, 1926:6, 1926:8, 1927:14, 1933:22, 1938:16, 1939:11, 1939:15, 1939:19, 1939:24, 1940:25, 1941:4, 1941:9, 1941:17, 1943:4, 1943:12. 1943:13. 1943:15, 1943:17, 1943:22, 1944:1, 1944:2, 1944:7, 1944:8, 1944:13, 1944:20, 1944:22, 1945:9, 1945:14, 1945:19, 1946:2, 1946:6, 1946:10, 1946:14, 1946:23, 1947:5, 1947:11, 1947:13, 1948:10, 1960:14, 1963:6, 1968:10

dollars [13] - 1915:3, 1915:7, 1915:9, 1915:10, 1952:21, 1955:1, 1965:15, 1966:5, 1967:1, 1967:10, 1967:12, 1970:7. 1970:10 **Dollars** [1] - 1955:1 Donald [1] - 1972:3 done [16] - 1868:15, 1868:19. 1887:12. 1904:17, 1916:12, 1917:4, 1923:12, 1952:21, 1958:21, 1964:5, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1969:9, 1969:11, 1969:13 Donna [3] - 1897:16, 1897:18, 1936:24 **DORRIS** [26] -1864:16, 1865:3, 1865:6, 1866:5, 1866:9, 1871:22, 1876:1, 1876:4, 1876:20, 1876:25, 1877:4, 1930:23, 1931:15, 1933:8, 1933:11, 1933:15, 1933:17, 1934:4, 1945:3, 1945:4, 1945:16, 1945:25, 1950:5, 1970:3, 1970:19, 1970:21 **Dorris** [2] - 1865:2, 1934:5 doubts [4] - 1893:19, 1893:20, 1926:18, 1926:20 down [26] - 1875:24, 1875:25, 1880:3, 1884:5, 1884:12, 1888:10, 1890:9, 1899:14, 1902:7, 1905:6. 1907:13. 1913:14, 1922:19, 1922:22, 1942:20, 1950:16, 1953:9, 1955:25, 1960:17, 1962:5, 1962:17, 1963:18, 1966:19, 1971:3, 1971:4 **Dr** [5] - 1875:10, 1931:12, 1932:2, 1937:23, 1947:25 draft [7] - 1941:1, 1941:6, 1941:13, 1956:13, 1956:24,

**DOI** [1] - 1918:13

draw [2] - 1959:23, 1966:13 driving [1] - 1951:12 due [2] - 1926:16, 1965:4 **Dunne** [6] - 1865:8, 1865:17. 1866:23. 1866:25, 1931:11, 1932:2 during [6] - 1866:15, 1886:15, 1903:12, 1940:24, 1967:7, 1968:8 During [1] - 1908:9 duties [3] - 1894:25, 1905:24, 1935:19 duty [3] - 1885:15, 1898:19, 1902:5

## Ε

e-mail [5] - 1896:10, 1896:12, 1896:14, 1938:15, 1938:19 e-mails [1] - 1940:3 early [2] - 1916:4, 1916:15 earn [1] - 1967:11 earned [11] -1965:14, 1966:2, 1966:15, 1967:2, 1967:7, 1968:16, 1968:19, 1969:21, 1970:7, 1970:11, 1970:15 earning [1] - 1968:8 earnings [2] -1964:15, 1968:7 easy [1] - 1910:10 Edwards [6] -1935:13, 1940:1, 1940:17, 1940:19, 1940:21, 1953:4 effect [2] - 1937:19, 1965:8 effort [5] - 1867:8, 1936:15, 1945:18, 1950:21, 1966:1 either [2] - 1900:9, 1964:2 electronic [1] -1954:12 eligible [1] - 1965:18 eliminated [1] -1888:24 ELLIOTT [1] -1864:15 Elliott [1] - 1877:9 ELOUISE [1] -1864:3

employed [1] -1868:13 employee [1] -1953:7 employees [8] -1917:13, 1917:16, 1918:2, 1935:15, 1936:4, 1936:6, 1936:8, 1938:18 enable [1] - 1922:17 end [3] - 1878:1, 1958:20, 1970:5 ended [5] - 1952:13, 1953:24, 1954:12, 1958:15, 1958:16 ends [1] - 1960:2 engaged [6] -1879:22, 1882:20, 1882:24, 1882:25, 1891:20 engagement [4] -1869:23, 1870:1, 1873:15, 1873:17 engagements [1] -1868:8 engaging [1] -1935:17 enlighten [1] -1926:23 ensure [2] - 1885:17, 1939:15 ensuring [2] -1939:3, 1952:7 entering [1] -1905:24 entire [4] - 1929:19, 1929:22, 1962:18, 1962:20 entirety [1] - 1939:21 entitled [6] -1894:12, 1900:6, 1907:25, 1911:3, 1967:11, 1973:5 entry [1] - 1879:22 equitable [1] -1892:4 era [5] - 1916:19, 1957:22, 1959:9. 1959:12, 1959:18 **error** [4] - 1949:19, 1958:17, 1963:4, 1963:10 errors [4] - 1949:9, 1949:13, 1969:16, 1969:17 Erwin [3] - 1897:16, 1897:18, 1936:25 escape [1] - 1905:20 escheat [1] -

1909:11

drafts [1] - 1969:6

1957:11, 1958:9

especially [1] -1933:21 ESQUIRE [13] -1864:12, 1864:15, 1864:16, 1864:19, 1864:19, 1864:23, 1864:23, 1864:1, 1864:2. 1864:2. 1864:3, 1864:3, 1864:6 essence [1] -1898:22 essentially [4] -1882:10, 1897:5, 1905:21, 1914:13 estate [4] - 1902:17, 1902:18, 1923:20, 1923:25 estates [1] - 1923:23 estimate [1] - 1875:7 et [2] - 1864:3, 1864:6 evaluates [1] -1898:23 eventually [1] -1916:5 evidence [8] -1866:11, 1867:11, 1867:24, 1873:2, 1873:5, 1877:8, 1930:21, 1964:23 EVIDENTIARY [1] -1864:8 evolved [1] - 1949:16 exactly [7] - 1914:24, 1926:14, 1927:9, 1927:10, 1930:8, 1963:14, 1969:11 Examination [1] -1972:3 **EXAMINATION** [6] -1865:5, 1867:1, 1879:14, 1913:5, 1928:22, 1934:3 examination [5] -1879:23, 1881:14, 1883:10, 1883:18, 1913:22 Examination..... .... [1] - 1972:5 Examination..... ..... [2] - 1972:4, 1972:6 Examination..... ...... [2] - 1972:4, 1972:5 examinations [1] -

1879:22, 1883:24, 1883:25 examiners [3] -1880:10, 1883:15, 1913:23 example [4] -1941:5, 1947:16, 1956:7. 1956:17 examples [2] -1940:4, 1940:7 exams [4] - 1880:4, 1880:5, 1880:7, 1881:22 except [3] - 1897:2, 1908:20, 1947:2 exclude [2] - 1899:8, 1906:18 exclusions [1] -1910:25 Exclusions [2] -1899:1, 1906:23 Excuse [3] -1909:20, 1928:9, 1949:24 excuse [2] - 1900:19, 1953:1 execute [1] -1906:12 executed [1] -1946:24 executive [2] -1935:12, 1940:1 exhibit [7] - 1877:22, 1882:10, 1887:20, 1942:22, 1957:3, 1957:10, 1957:15 Exhibit [18] - 1865:7, 1866:7, 1866:10, 1876:8, 1877:6, 1879:7, 1882:4, 1882:10, 1887:18, 1889:4, 1896:9, 1911:16, 1930:13, 1930:20, 1942:16, 1972:9, 1972:10, 1972:10 exhibits [4] - 1876:5, 1925:15, 1943:23, 1961:25 EXHIBITS [1] -1972:8 exist [4] - 1910:20, 1910:21, 1928:14, 1956:18 existed [2] -1884:22, 1885:14 exists [1] - 1961:14 expect [4] - 1873:16, 1887:8, 1930:23,

expected [4] -1886:24, 1893:22, 1929:6, 1957:21 experience [16] -1884:1, 1891:4, 1891:6, 1891:9, 1892:17, 1893:4, 1893:8. 1893:14. 1901:10, 1902:11, 1905:13, 1908:2, 1909:24, 1911:4, 1913:24, 1925:17 experienced [3] -1881:16, 1883:15, 1913:23 expert [16] - 1872:15, 1879:6, 1879:7, 1885:24, 1885:25, 1886:8, 1887:17, 1890:19, 1896:9, 1898:21, 1906:22, 1911:17, 1912:14, 1933:3, 1935:16 experts [1] - 1935:18 explain [6] -1865:13, 1894:4, 1900:21, 1926:8, 1926:12, 1966:11 explanatory [1] -1946:7 explicitly [1] -1865:24 exploring [1] -1932:9 extent [11] - 1895:22, 1911:9, 1911:11, 1915:1, 1927:5, 1935:1, 1938:23, 1938:24, 1940:20, 1952:13, 1958:18 external [2] -1867:10, 1867:23 extinguish [1] -1905:25 extra [1] - 1971:5 Extract [1] - 1921:11

## F

F-I-T-Z-G-E-R-A-L-D[1] - 1879:4
face [1] - 1924:15
fact [12] - 1873:17,
1889:17, 1901:15,
1904:6, 1905:23,
1911:11, 1921:10,
1921:14, 1951:19,
1951:21, 1964:7
factor [10] - 1964:2,
1965:17, 1966:4.

1967:5, 1967:12, 1968:5 factors [5] - 1965:8, 1965:10, 1966:12, 1966:14 failed [1] - 1876:4 failure [5] - 1885:6, 1886:5, 1900:13, 1914:16, 1963:9 fair [9] - 1874:10, 1889:10, 1936:3, 1938:25, 1939:5, 1940:22, 1952:10, 1960:6, 1964:22 Fair [2] - 1876:19, 1884:3 fairly [2] - 1865:21, 1966:19 faith [1] - 1898:5 falls [1] - 1925:1 familiar [4] -1873:25, 1886:19, 1889:16, 1917:15 familiarity [1] -1917:17 family [4] - 1901:17, 1901:24, 1901:25, 1925:25 far [7] - 1869:16, 1882:25, 1891:14, 1893:17, 1902:24, 1955:18, 1958:2 Far [1] - 1869:17 farming [1] - 1867:17 fashion [1] - 1929:17 favor [2] - 1893:20, 1926:20 **FDIC** [3] - 1882:22, 1914:25, 1915:1 February [1] -1897:12 federal [4] - 1880:10, 1905:24, 1905:25, 1935:15 Federal [1] - 1916:5 fellow [2] - 1901:16, 1937:3 felt [3] - 1882:1, 1900:23, 1916:10 few [4] - 1884:25, 1907:9, 1940:4, 1948:5 fiduciarily [2] -1888:8, 1916:10 fiduciary [24] -1881:8, 1886:23, 1886:24, 1887:20, 1888:3, 1890:21,

1890:23, 1891:8,

1966:14. 1966:16.

1893:8, 1893:25, 1894:16, 1899:9, 1905:14, 1907:7, 1909:24, 1911:1, 1911:7, 1912:16, 1912:20, 1916:12, 1923:18, 1924:7, 1927:8, 1930:10 field [2] - 1883:15, 1917:12 fifth [1] - 1879:25 figured [1] - 1952:22 file [1] - 1877:18 filed [4] - 1877:15, 1879:6, 1881:14, 1935:2 files [2] - 1919:7, 1938:10 filing [1] - 1942:18 fill [1] - 1894:25 final [5] - 1865:7, 1878:8, 1887:18, 1958:25, 1969:7 financial [4] -1865:20, 1865:25, 1872:17, 1873:3 fine [2] - 1878:8, 1878:14 finish [1] - 1914:7 firms [2] - 1873:20, 1873:22 First [2] - 1881:5, 1910:24 first [18] - 1879:19, 1882:10, 1882:13, 1884:10, 1884:19, 1890:21, 1897:4, 1900:12, 1907:11, 1914:15, 1931:3, 1931:7, 1935:14, 1943:3, 1955:7, 1960:6, 1961:21, 1962:20 Fitzgerald [21] -1878:23, 1878:25, 1879:3, 1879:16, 1882:5, 1883:7, 1884:6, 1886:8, 1886:15, 1891:6, 1898:15, 1900:5, 1903:6, 1913:2, 1913:7, 1928:24, 1931:21, 1932:10, 1932:13, 1932:16, 1972:4 FITZGERALD [1] -1879:13 Fitzgerald's [1] -

1930:13

five [1] - 1873:22

1882:19

examine [1] - 1913:4

examiner [3] -

1930:25

fix [1] - 1890:12 fixed [1] - 1890:14 Floor [1] - 1864:13 flow [1] - 1884:15 focus [4] - 1865:14, 1872:10, 1884:14, 1963:6 focusing [1] -1962:20 follow [5] - 1895:25, 1942:7, 1942:13, 1944:12, 1957:25 followed [1] -1916:20 following [2] -1900:11, 1906:21 follows [2] -1894:18, 1895:7 **FOR** [3] - 1864:1, 1879:13, 1934:2 foregoing [1] -1973:4 foreign [1] - 1925:24 form [6] - 1882:14, 1920:20, 1927:14, 1933:3, 1948:14, 1969:7 formative [1] -1961:22 former [1] - 1877:14 forming [1] -1917:11 formulate [1] -1939:21 formulated [1] -1950:23 formulating [3] -1875:7, 1946:4, 1946:11 Forrest [1] - 1937:5 forth [2] - 1898:3, 1919:2 forward [3] - 1888:8, 1911:12, 1955:14 forwarded [2] -1881:12, 1881:15 foundation [2] -1903:4, 1921:8 Four [1] - 1912:15 fourth [2] - 1871:6, 1942:21 Fourth [1] - 1864:24 fraction [1] - 1965:16 fractionization [1] -1929:14 frame [1] - 1962:15 Franklin [1] - 1864:9 fraud [1] - 1901:23

fraudulent 121 -

1872:17, 1873:2

Friday [1] - 1880:8 front [4] - 1881:7, 1912:14, 1946:22, 1961:25 full [4] - 1879:1, 1882:17, 1929:21, 1938:23 fully [3] - 1898:18, 1910:25, 1913:20 function [2] - 1889:1, 1902:24 Fund [1] - 1885:23 fund [2] - 1887:16, 1929:15 fundamentally [1] -1914:2 Funds [2] - 1964:3, 1966:19 funds [47] - 1887:4, 1887:12, 1887:14, 1891:24, 1891:25, 1892:1, 1892:12, 1893:5, 1897:6, 1897:11, 1897:13, 1900:13, 1900:15, 1900:16, 1900:24, 1900:25, 1901:1, 1901:2, 1901:4, 1901:6, 1901:7, 1901:15, 1901:24, 1905:8. 1905:12. 1905:15, 1906:13. 1907:19, 1907:24, 1909:18, 1909:21, 1911:13, 1923:24, 1929:20, 1929:24, 1954:12, 1965:14, 1966:21, 1967:2, 1967:15, 1968:7, 1968:11, 1970:11 furnished [1] -1941:14

## G

GAAP [3] - 1869:11, 1869:18 GAAS [2] - 1869:7 gained [1] - 1952:9 Gallery [1] - 1910:8 game [1] - 1971:5 gas [1] - 1867:15 general [13] - 1881:2, 1886:22, 1887:21, 1886:22, 1887:21, 1888:17, 1890:6, 1896:23, 1903:8, 1906:2, 1906:17, 1908:18, 1920:10, 1926:18, 1944:7

generally [7] -

1869:8, 1869:12, 1869:15, 1870:6, 1886:9, 1892:16, 1935:18 Generally [2] -1869:14, 1908:2 generated [2] -1909:18, 1920:8 generates [1] -1965:16 generations [2] -1910:15, 1927:11 Georgia [3] -1864:17, 1880:4, 1901:17 GINGOLD [2] -1864:12, 1864:12 Gingold [1] -1915:21 given [8] - 1886:25, 1887:9, 1891:12, 1894:15, 1911:4, 1926:6, 1950:9, 1963:14 glasses [1] - 1962:25 good-faith [1] -1898:5 govern [3] - 1881:2, 1888:3, 1888:4 governance [1] -1925:12 governing [2] -1880:21, 1880:25 government [23] -1867:4, 1867:7, 1868:8, 1868:12, 1868:13, 1868:15, 1868:18, 1879:8, 1901:7, 1901:8, 1902:8, 1912:17, 1912:20, 1926:9, 1927:2, 1927:4, 1927:9, 1931:10, 1933:20, 1933:24, 1935:2, 1970:23 Government [3] -1876:16, 1877:15, 1877:16

Griles [1] - 1948:24 ground [1] - 1917:16 group [2] - 1884:20, 1940:13 guess [10] - 1882:7, 1885:9, 1900:1, 1909:5. 1909:15. 1920:2, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1939:5, 1960:19 guesses [1] -1960:21 guessing [1] -1903:1 guidance [6] -1872:20, 1887:21, 1889:3, 1895:13, 1915:23, 1927:4 guide [4] - 1895:23, 1942:12, 1942:13, 1942:14 guided [1] - 1895:22 guidelines [1] -1888:18 GUILDER [1] -1864:19 н half [1] - 1879:23

halfway [1] - 1953:9 hallowed [1] -1898:7 halls [1] - 1898:7 hallway [1] - 1898:11 handled [2] -1963:21, 1963:24 hands [2] - 1900:24, 1909:16 handwritten [2] -1948:13, 1948:15 hanging [1] - 1910:7 hard [1] - 1941:4 Harper [4] - 1878:19, 1883:20, 1899:16, 1932:5 HARPER [32] -1864:19, 1878:20, 1878:22, 1878:25, 1879:5, 1879:15, 1883:6, 1884:3, 1884:4, 1886:7, 1886:14, 1891:5, 1892:5, 1894:24, 1895:5. 1898:14. 1899:21, 1899:23, 1900:4, 1903:5, 1912:9, 1912:13, 1913:1, 1914:6, 1921:7, 1922:24,

1928:20, 1928:23, 1929:11, 1930:12, 1932:6, 1932:20 Haspel [4] - 1937:23, 1947:25, 1950:13, 1953:3 hate [1] - 1949:24 head [2] - 1885:15, 1897:16 heading [3] -1898:25, 1905:6, 1962:16 headquartered [1] -1880:2 hear [5] - 1878:4, 1878:5, 1895:3, 1921:3, 1921:4 heard [4] - 1878:13, 1900:23, 1908:25, 1931:21 hearing [4] -1871:25, 1877:13, 1938:3, 1940:25 HEARING [1] -1864:8 hearsay [3] -1897:22, 1897:25, 1912:11 heirs [1] - 1902:21 held [11] - 1887:1. 1887:5, 1889:23, 1891:15, 1892:3, 1894:7, 1899:10, 1902:1, 1905:8, 1927:21, 1961:21 help [1] - 1884:16 helped [1] - 1939:21 hierarchy [1] -1936:9 highlight [1] - 1881:9 highlighted [5] -1900:12, 1900:16, 1900:22, 1962:18, 1963:3 Hinkins [2] -1931:12, 1932:2 hire [1] - 1906:11 hired [2] - 1868:11, 1937:13 Historical [7] -1934:10, 1935:11, 1936:2, 1936:4, 1938:8. 1938:20. 1944:19 historical [24] -1867:7, 1897:1, 1897:4, 1914:1, 1916:1, 1918:19,

1921:2, 1923:10,

1935:23, 1943:5,

Government's [1] -

government's [2] -

GPRA[1] - 1934:21

grafted [1] - 1885:13

grazing [1] - 1867:20

grant [1] - 1878:10

great [1] - 1907:15

Griffin [1] - 1865:19

1873:13, 1873:18

graduating [1] -

1898:15

1879:20

1954:4. 1956:13. hours [1] - 1880:18 1865:18, 1870:5 inform [2] - 1910:17, Inappropriate [1] -1956:16, 1956:21, HSA [4] - 1872:7, 1922:6 INDEX [1] - 1972:1 1924:24 1956:24, 1957:11, 1872:10, 1872:11, inappropriate [2] index [4] - 1939:8, information [37] -1959:17, 1964:9, 1872:12 1902:12, 1922:5 1939:18, 1943:3, 1867:14, 1867:17, 1964:20, 1965:5, **HSAs** [1] - 1869:19 1946:2 1867:24, 1868:2, inartfully [1] -1965:23, 1968:25, hundred [3] -1904:17 India [1] - 1912:10 1871:10, 1890:4, 1969:2, 1970:6 1915:3. 1915:7. inarticulately [1] -Indian [26] - 1885:19. 1890:16, 1891:12, history [2] - 1870:5, 1915:9 1899:3 1885:22, 1889:10, 1892:13. 1894:13. 1882:11 1903:13, 1903:15, 1895:8, 1895:12, hundreds [3] inasmuch [1] -1904:21, 1910:13, **hmm** [1] - 1959:11 1919:17, 1919:18, 1949:3 1895:21, 1896:20, hold [3] - 1887:7, 1919:20 inception [2] -1900:21, 1903:2, 1911:2, 1916:1, 1918:21, 1924:8, 1910:18, 1923:19 1934:13, 1948:16 1903:7, 1915:25, 1924:11, 1926:1, holder [4] - 1919:15, include [13] -1916:6, 1917:7, 1926:3, 1926:5, 1920:9, 1923:24 1870:11, 1872:17, 1919:11, 1919:13, idea [2] - 1911:12, holders [6] -1872:23, 1876:22, 1919:21, 1920:1, 1926:6, 1937:11, 1926:9 1917:18. 1918:8. 1920:3, 1928:17, 1938:18, 1952:3, 1887:2, 1923:5, 1918:12, 1918:13, identical [2] -1934:25, 1936:16, 1952:9, 1952:23, 1923:12, 1923:14, 1869:22, 1869:25 1958:12, 1958:17, 1936:18, 1937:1, 1957:12, 1965:5 1943:13, 1945:20, identification [1] -1958:19, 1959:25, 1943:6, 1964:2, holding [1] - 1910:7 1951:4, 1961:16, 1909:25 1965:21 1961:22, 1969:2, holds [2] - 1894:7 1961:18 identified [3] -Indians [2] - 1909:6, 1969:3 Homan [4] - 1876:6, Included [1] -1865:15, 1893:6, 1929:12 Information [1] -1915:13 1943:15 1946:4 1867:21 indicate [4] -Homan's [3] included [27] identifies [1] -Informed [1] -1868:17, 1943:2, 1876:5, 1876:14, 1870:17, 1880:17, 1943:12, 1960:15 1887:1 1889:14 1915:12 1891:10, 1923:20, identify [4] - 1892:2, informed [5] indicated [4] -Honor [54] - 1865:3, 1939:12, 1939:16, 1896:6, 1910:6, 1915:23, 1924:8, 1889:20, 1889:21, 1866:5, 1866:9, 1940:9, 1940:18, 1922:17 1920:11, 1920:12, 1928:4, 1940:8 1866:13, 1866:20, 1941:9, 1941:15, identifying [1] -1925:2 indicates [6] -1871:14, 1871:16, 1943:18, 1944:1, 1891:15 1868:11, 1923:3, inherently [6] -1871:22, 1875:22, 1944:5, 1944:15, **IIM** [17] - 1867:4, 1944:21, 1944:22, 1941:5, 1946:2, 1867:11, 1867:15, 1876:1. 1876:11. 1912:17, 1916:21, 1867:20, 1867:22, 1944:24, 1945:1. 1948:21, 1959:8 1876:20, 1877:4, 1867:25, 1868:3 1918:8, 1918:11, 1945:6, 1945:10, indicating [1] -1877:5, 1877:9, 1918:13, 1918:18, Inherently [1] -1946:12, 1946:16, 1881:7 1877:24, 1878:14, 1919:2, 1919:24, 1867:17 1947:6, 1947:22, 1878:18, 1878:20, indication [1] -1922:13, 1923:24, inherited [1] -1879:5, 1883:5, 1957:2. 1958:23. 1958:18 1923:25, 1928:5, 1888:11 1969:4 1884:3, 1886:7, indications [2] -1929:20, 1935:23, 1894:21, 1894:24, including [6] -1968:11, 1969:12 innings [1] - 1971:5 1966:21, 1967:16 1897:23, 1899:21, 1876:17, 1891:15, indirectly [2] innumerable [1] immediate [1] -1912:2, 1912:9, 1933:21, 1944:10, 1918:4, 1918:5 1906:10 1896:15 1912:23, 1913:1, 1950:24, 1952:13 insolvent [3] individual [27] impacts [1] -1914:6, 1921:7, 1882:21, 1882:23, income [4] - 1887:5, 1880:11, 1880:16, 1914:17 1922:24, 1930:12, 1897:15, 1910:5, 1914:23 1880:20, 1881:10, 1930:23, 1931:11, impeach [1] - 1944:4 1910:17 instance [9] -1895:8, 1907:2, 1931:16, 1932:6, implementation [2] income-producing 1880:19, 1887:6, 1908:20, 1908:24, 1932:14, 1932:20, 1946:7, 1946:16 [1] - 1910:5 1909:7, 1909:8, 1887:8, 1890:8, 1933:8, 1933:11, implemented [3] -1901:4, 1901:14, incomplete [5] -1917:7, 1919:9, 1933:15, 1933:17, 1898:18, 1911:1, 1910:11, 1910:12, 1919:11, 1919:13, 1902:4, 1925:24, 1945:2, 1945:11, 1939:15 1942:14 1910:13, 1911:8, 1919:21, 1920:1, 1945:21, 1949:24, implication [1] -1911:11 1920:2, 1920:3, instances [2] -1955:12, 1969:24, 1895:24 1934:25, 1936:15, 1906:10, 1954:16 inconsistent [4] -1970:19, 1970:21, implications [1] -1896:4, 1896:19, 1943:5, 1967:11, institute [1] -1971:1 1896:25 1967:16, 1967:24, 1922:16 1900:13, 1912:16 honor [1] - 1908:22 important [4] -1968:13, 1969:8, incorporated [1] instituted [1] -HONORABLE [1] -1910:16, 1914:16, 1969:22 1876:25 1916:23 1864:9 1939:19, 1939:25 indeed [2] - 1895:19, individual's [2] instituting [2] hope [2] - 1885:23, 1970:8, 1970:15 impossible [2] -1920:11 1916:14, 1917:11 1923:22 1928:8, 1928:10 Indeed [3] - 1896:1, individuals [3] institution [2] -Horton [3] - 1952:19, inability [1] -1866:20, 1919:16, 1925:13, 1930:8 1880:23, 1913:21 1952:22, 1952:24 1929:12 1926:14 independent [2] institutional [1] -

1910:10 institutions [3] -1880:14, 1886:6, 1892:24 instrument [1] -1920:21 instruments [1] -1968:3 insufficient [1] -1870:17 insurance [1] -1915:1 insure [1] - 1914:25 integrated [2] -1885:2, 1885:20 intend [2] - 1902:10, 1968:24 intended [3] -1869:20, 1889:9, 1952:2 intending [2] -1904:12, 1923:5 interaction [1] -1918:6 interest [47] -1892:4, 1902:22, 1909:2, 1919:25, 1920:13, 1933:25, 1963:21, 1963:23, 1963:25, 1964:2, 1964:7, 1964:10, 1964:15, 1964:19, 1964:24, 1965:1, 1965:7, 1965:10, 1965:12, 1965:13, 1965:14, 1965:16, 1965:17, 1965:18, 1966:1, 1966:4, 1966:6, 1966:11, 1966:13, 1966:15, 1966:16, 1966:23, 1967:4, 1967:5, 1967:7, 1967:8, 1967:11, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:16, 1969:8, 1969:19, 1969:21, 1970:5, 1970:7, 1970:14 interested [2] -1884:23, 1898:2 interesting [4] -1883:25, 1903:16, 1907:21, 1927:7 interests [2] -1889:22, 1909:18 interface [1] -1936:14 interim [1] - 1958:23 Interior [34] - 1864:6, 1873:21, 1873:23,

1874:15, 1874:17, 1875:4, 1884:7, 1894:18, 1895:7, 1895:11, 1898:2, 1898:4, 1898:8, 1908:10, 1909:3, 1911:5, 1911:7, 1915:24, 1918:11, 1922:16, 1928:5, 1934:18, 1941:11, 1942:19, 1943:18, 1944:3, 1944:18, 1945:8, 1945:19, 1946:3. 1946:11. 1960:24, 1961:5, 1964:24 Interior's [4] -1867:7. 1872:16. 1872:22, 1886:10 intern [1] - 1935:13 internal [9] -1865:23, 1866:1, 1870:4, 1887:21, 1888:17, 1889:3, 1892:24, 1898:1, 1915:23 internally [1] -1892:14 interrupt [1] -1949:25 interrupted [1] -1914:9 interstices [1] -1894:25 intervals [2] -1929:5, 1929:7 interview [3] -1918:2, 1918:5, 1918:8 interviewed [4] -1874:6, 1874:14, 1874:17, 1874:20 introduce [3] -1866:20, 1877:12, 1880:9 invested [5] -1929:17, 1966:22, 1967:15, 1968:2, 1968:3 investment [2] -1968:12, 1970:11 investments [4] -1966:2, 1967:3, 1967:23, 1967:25 involved [6] -1880:4, 1936:5, 1938:12, 1938:24, 1954:8, 1963:20

involvement [2] -

1933:20. 1934:24

involves [1] -1927:12 Island [1] - 1886:5 issue [8] - 1866:3, 1913:16, 1913:17, 1925:3, 1926:22, 1933:5, 1949:22, 1963:21 issues [5] - 1932:21, 1934:25, 1935:1, 1937:7, 1947:3 It'd [1] - 1907:21 it'll [2] - 1942:20, 1959:5 item [1] - 1908:25 items [4] - 1870:16, 1936:23, 1948:3 itself [5] - 1882:24, 1882:25, 1903:19, 1920:21, 1966:14

#### J

**JAMES** [1] - 1864:9 James [1] - 1933:13 January [1] - 1943:7 Jeff [2] - 1930:24, 1933:9 Jeffrey [2] - 1933:16, 1972:6 JEFFREY [1] -1934:2 Jemison [1] - 1896:8 Jensen [1] - 1948:24 **Jim** [1] - 1937:23 job [1] - 1920:17 **Joe** [1] - 1931:2 **JOHN** [3] - 1864:2, 1864:3, 1864:6 John [2] - 1896:16, 1925:14 join [1] - 1884:12 joined [2] - 1879:20, 1884:6 Jones [1] - 1937:7 JR [2] - 1864:23, 1864:1 Judge [1] - 1945:17 **JUDGE** [1] - 1864:10 judge [3] - 1897:10, 1931:1, 1952:1 judges [1] - 1927:6 judgment [2] -1873:23, 1964:18 July [5] - 1911:22, 1958:4, 1958:9, 1959:7, 1960:11 June [2] - 1955:22, 1958:1 Justice [4] - 1864:4,

1864:7, 1866:21, 1938:6 justified [2] -1912:15, 1932:17 JUSTIN [1] - 1864:19

### K

keep [6] - 1889:20,

1889:21, 1893:23,

1906:12, 1920:10, 1927:17 Keep [1] - 1889:13 keeping [1] - 1925:1 Keeping [1] -1867:23 keeps [2] - 1892:14, 1950:1 **KEITH** [1] - 1864:19 KEMPTHORNE [1] -1864:6 Ken [1] - 1905:23 Kennedy [1] -1881:23 kept [3] - 1890:18, 1893:2, 1907:8 key [1] - 1865:15 KILPATRICK [3] -1864:16, 1864:20, 1864:24 kind [8] - 1872:2, 1883:3. 1884:2. 1890:12, 1892:6, 1908:16, 1917:15, 1917:17 kinds [3] - 1914:19, 1939:24, 1964:12 KIRSCHMAN [11] -1864:1, 1876:11, 1876:14, 1877:5, 1877:24, 1878:7, 1878:18, 1931:11, 1931:16, 1932:14, 1932:25 Klinger [2] -1877:14, 1878:3 knowing [1] -1944:17 knowledge [6] -1913:24, 1917:15, 1922:12, 1927:12, 1946:13, 1967:18 known [1] - 1879:25 **knows** [1] - 1921:25 **KOHN** [1] - 1864:3 **KPMG** [1] - 1865:19

**KRESSE** [1] - 1864:3

Krulitz [1] - 1895:18

### L

L.L.P [3] - 1864:16, 1864:20, 1864:24 lack [9] - 1893:9, 1893:10, 1893:11, 1893:12, 1893:19, 1918:9, 1926:16, 1926:17, 1926:19 Lack [1] - 1903:4 land [10] - 1909:9, 1909:11, 1909:13, 1909:16, 1952:21, 1956:22, 1956:23, 1956:24, 1957:12, 1957:21 land-based [5] -1956:22, 1956:23, 1956:24, 1957:12, 1957:21 land-to-dollars [1] -1952:21 Langbein [1] -1931:18 Langbein's [3] -1932:3, 1932:7, 1932:14 language [1] -1962:18 large [7] - 1907:12, 1907:14, 1909:9, 1914:17, 1935:15, 1951:5. 1968:12 largely [2] - 1908:22, 1964:12 larger [3] - 1880:14, 1881:4, 1881:21 last [12] - 1879:1, 1891:23, 1904:25, 1928:16, 1933:12, 1942:3, 1946:1, 1947:5, 1947:13, 1949:8, 1959:5, 1966:8 Laughter [2] -1883:2, 1933:14 LAW [1] - 1864:12 law [22] - 1879:20, 1881:1, 1881:8, 1882:2, 1894:22, 1894:25, 1895:2, 1895:7, 1896:20, 1909:5, 1913:25, 1915:19, 1915:20, 1920:6, 1920:15, 1920:20, 1920:23, 1924:17, 1931:1 **lawsuits** [1] - 1886:2 lawyers [3] -1881:24, 1881:25,

1893:1 leading [1] - 1946:24 learn [1] - 1963:17 learned [1] - 1909:3 lease [4] - 1867:15, 1867:17, 1867:20, 1901:4 least [4] - 1897:9, 1951:8, 1955:18, 1962:6 leave [1] - 1899:16 led [1] - 1898:12 legal [2] - 1890:25, 1894:6 Legal [1] - 1891:3 legislative [2] -1886:4 legislature [1] -1886:5 Lenexa [3] -1875:17, 1928:16, 1930:19 **Leshy** [2] - 1905:22, 1905:23 less [3] - 1904:21, 1950:17, 1968:18 lessee [2] - 1900:7, 1908:22 letter [4] - 1895:17, 1925:13, 1925:15, 1930:11 level [4] - 1879:22, 1917:9, 1950:18, 1969:9 levels [2] - 1883:11, 1938:22 LEVITAS [3] -1864:15, 1877:9, 1877:19 Levitas [1] - 1877:9 liabilities [2] -1870:10, 1870:11 liability [7] - 1870:8. 1927:15, 1927:20. 1927:23, 1927:24, 1927:25, 1928:2 liable [3] - 1906:16, 1926:11, 1927:21 life [1] - 1890:7 light [6] - 1909:22, 1910:25, 1911:5, 1952:5, 1958:15, 1961:9 likely [1] - 1959:23 likewise [2] -1869:13, 1961:9 Likewise [5] -1867:14, 1867:20, 1869:25, 1873:5, 1875:13

limbo [1] - 1951:25 limine [2] - 1877:15, 1878:10 limit [1] - 1958:1 limitations [3] -1866:1, 1944:11, 1969:4 limits [1] - 1906:25 line [2] - 1887:18, 1949:7 lines [1] - 1949:8 liquidity [1] - 1968:1 liquor [2] - 1901:18, 1901:20 list [3] - 1868:16, 1881:8, 1912:9 listed [2] - 1887:9, 1910:17 listing [2] - 1887:14, 1891:14 lists [1] - 1886:25 Litigation [1] -1864:8 litigation [5] -1870:12, 1885:25, 1896:18, 1951:22, 1952:1 live [1] - 1931:5 local [2] - 1885:1, 1908:24 locate [1] - 1945:18 located [1] - 1888:10 locating [1] - 1963:5 longer-term [1] -1968:3 look [38] - 1880:15, 1887:11, 1902:23, 1914:21, 1916:8, 1920:23, 1929:23, 1937:24, 1941:22, 1942:16, 1942:21, 1942:23, 1943:1, 1945:7, 1947:7, 1947:16, 1947:18, 1948:2, 1948:3, 1948:8, 1948:9, 1949:5, 1950:11, 1950:16, 1952:25, 1954:14, 1954:22, 1955:20, 1955:21, 1956:1, 1956:8, 1958:3, 1958:8, 1959:5, 1959:6, 1960:13, 1962:5, 1962:17 Look [3] - 1953:9, 1960:6, 1962:16 looked [6] - 1895:13, 1921:22, 1928:1, 1939:10, 1939:24,

1940:24 Looking [3] -1910:22, 1939:18, 1946:1 looking [6] - 1899:4, 1914:19, 1951:4, 1955:1, 1959:22, 1961:13 lose [5] - 1914:14, 1914:15, 1914:20, 1914:24, 1927:18 losses [1] - 1891:21 lost [3] - 1870:22, 1927:13, 1966:8 LSA [13] - 1952:9, 1952:11, 1954:4, 1954:7, 1954:16, 1958:5, 1958:19, 1958:22, 1958:25, 1959:2

1906:6

manual [2] -

1868:19, 1893:20, M 1894:4, 1899:19, 1915:9, 1916:23, machine [1] -1919:13 1864:25 meaning [1] mail [5] - 1896:10, 1897:14 1896:12, 1896:14, 1938:15, 1938:19 1891:25, 1910:12, mails [1] - 1940:3 1955.9 maintain [2] -1944:19, 1945:9 1899:17 maintained [4] mechanic [1] -1941:10, 1943:17, 1890:9 1947:22, 1960:24 meeting [23] maintaining [1] -1948:11, 1948:19, 1938:9 1949:2, 1949:6, maintains [2] -1949:16, 1949:22, 1944:14. 1944:15 1949:23, 1950:1, maintenance [2] -1950:7, 1950:13, 1894:9, 1894:10 1953:2, 1954:23, major [5] - 1865:15, 1955:22, 1956:1, 1865:17, 1881:18, 1956:5, 1957:18, 1901:17, 1969:18 1958:4, 1958:6, manage [2] - 1879:9, 1959:10, 1960:10 1918:1 meetings [5] managed [4] -1898:11, 1916:7, 1905:9, 1905:17, 1938:5, 1950:7, 1917:25, 1968:3 1961:20 management [7] -1872:1, 1889:22, 1896:15, 1905:22, 1889:24, 1892:14, 1905:23, 1938:14, 1900:20, 1906:7, 1938:19, 1939:13 1906:8 memory [1] -Management [2] -1910:12 1885:23, 1964:3 manager [2] -1938:14 1934:21, 1938:9 manages [1] mentioned [4] -1906:4 1873:20, 1913:12,

1872:19, 1954:2 manuals [1] - 1942:8 marked [1] - 1877:22 Maryland [1] -1881:5 material [4] - 1940:2, 1946:8, 1946:17, 1961:19 materials [1] -1940:3 mathematical [1] -1969:17 matter [5] - 1901:15, 1913:19, 1944:10, 1964:18, 1973:5 matters [1] - 1876:1 max [1] - 1930:16 mean [8] - 1868:13, means [4] - 1868:20, meant [2] - 1889:17, memo [7] - 1885:6, memos [2] - 1919:1, mention [1] - 1921:3 1915:17, 1939:13

mentions [1] -1883:7 met [4] - 1915:13, 1915:15, 1933:19, 1934:6 meta [1] - 1866:16 meta-analysis [1] -1866:16 method [2] -1969:19, 1970:4 MICHAEL [1] -1864:2 Michael [1] - 1970:23 middle [2] - 1916:16, 1942:18 might [8] - 1876:2, 1907:22, 1913:20, 1922:21, 1932:16, 1941:20, 1956:18, 1960:4 Mike [1] - 1937:6 Miller [3] - 1896:16, 1915:17, 1925:14 Miller's [1] - 1930:11 millions [1] -1907:12 minimis [2] - 1960:7, 1960:8 minute [1] - 1937:25 minutes [1] -1930:16 misappropriation [1] - 1873:6 misappropriations [1] - 1872:24 mismanaged [4] -1870:20, 1870:23, 1871:5, 1871:20 mismanagement [7] - 1870:21, 1870:25, 1871:21, 1871:24, 1872:1, 1872:7, 1927:22 misread [1] -1900:19 missing [8] - 1926:8, 1949:8, 1949:9, 1949:13, 1958:12, 1958:17, 1958:19, 1963:8 mission [1] -1935:19 misstated [2] -1872:12, 1872:13 Mitchell [2] - 1927:5, 1927:6 mixed [1] - 1904:8 moment [3] -1911:16, 1953:10, 1970:19

managing [1] -

Monday [1] - 1880:8 money [20] - 1887:2, 1891:15, 1907:14, 1907:15, 1908:21, 1908:23, 1909:10, 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15, 1914:20, 1914:25, 1922:12, 1929:16, 1943:6, 1955:9, 1955:12, 1955:18, 1966:17, 1968:16 monies [8] - 1897:6, 1907:1, 1907:9, 1908:3, 1908:5, 1917:7 Morgan [3] - 1941:6, 1941:13, 1941:14 morning [4] -1880:8, 1931:3, 1931:7, 1971:6 most [7] - 1882:22, 1883:14, 1883:15, 1914:16, 1936:11, 1936:14, 1969:9 mostly [1] - 1961:21 motion [3] - 1876:22, 1877:14, 1878:10 move [8] - 1866:6, 1872:15, 1876:4, 1876:8, 1886:8, 1930:12, 1952:6, 1969:6 moved [3] - 1935:7, 1936:9, 1965:13 **MR** [96] - 1865:3, 1865:6, 1866:5, 1866:9, 1866:13, 1867:2, 1871:14, 1871:16, 1871:18, 1871:22, 1872:5, 1875:22, 1876:1, 1876:4, 1876:11, 1876:14, 1876:20, 1876:25, 1877:4, 1877:5, 1877:9, 1877:19, 1877:24, 1878:7, 1878:18, 1878:20, 1878:22, 1878:25, 1879:5, 1879:15, 1883:6, 1884:3, 1884:4, 1886:7, 1886:12, 1886:14, 1890:25, 1891:3, 1891:5, 1892:5, 1894:21, 1894:24, 1895:5, 1897:22, 1898:14, 1899:21, 1899:23, 1900:4, 1903:4,

1903:5, 1912:2, 1912:9, 1912:13, 1912:23, 1913:1, 1913:6, 1914:6, 1914:12, 1921:7, 1921:10, 1921:13, 1922:3, 1922:24, 1923:2, 1928:19, 1928:20, 1928:23, 1929:11, 1930:12, 1930:23, 1931:11, 1931:15, 1931:16, 1932:6, 1932:14, 1932:20, 1932:25, 1933:8, 1933:11, 1933:15, 1933:17, 1934:4, 1945:3, 1945:4, 1945:11, 1945:16, 1945:21, 1945:25, 1949:24, 1950:5, 1969:23, 1970:3, 1970:19, 1970:21, 1970:23, 1970:25 must [4] - 1873:8, 1873:13, 1889:20, 1928:25 muster[1] - 1888:6

### Ν

N.W [2] - 1864:20, 1864:4 name [8] - 1874:10, 1877:9, 1879:1, 1933:11, 1933:12, 1933:16, 1942:3 Nancy [1] - 1896:8 narrative [1] - 1883:3 nation [3] - 1925:19, 1925:25, 1926:7 national [5] -1879:24, 1880:1, 1882:18, 1925:19, 1950:17 National [3] - 1881:5, 1882:17, 1910:8 nationals [1] -1925:24 **nations** [3] - 1925:6, 1925:7, 1925:9 nature [4] - 1873:9, 1885:1, 1891:24, 1944:23 Near [1] - 1887:18 nearly [1] - 1883:25 necessarily [4] -1919:24, 1922:22,

1926:24, 1969:20

necessary [4] -

need [14] - 1878:15, 1883:20, 1885:7, 1892:8, 1892:9, 1917:1. 1926:12. 1928:13, 1937:6, 1937:8, 1937:10, 1963:7, 1966:18, 1967:25 needed [3] -1892:16, 1938:7, 1959:12 needs [2] - 1907:15, 1929.6 negligence [1] -1927:14 negotiations [1] -1954:10 never [5] - 1893:14, 1900:24, 1905:2, 1933:19, 1934:6 new [4] - 1885:13, 1887:13, 1931:22, 1959:21 next [17] - 1874:14, 1876:2, 1878:22, 1879:22, 1898:25, 1899:14, 1902:7, 1904:3, 1905:6, 1908:25, 1922:1, 1929:10, 1942:23, 1949:5, 1956:1, 1958:3 Nice [2] - 1913:8, 1913:9 nice [1] - 1914:1 night [1] - 1880:8 Ninth [1] - 1864:13 non [2] - 1897:15, 1910:17 non-incomeproducing [2] -1897:15, 1910:17 None [1] - 1947:18 none [3] - 1919:9, 1947:19, 1957:7 nonfund [2] -1910:1, 1910:2 nonmonetary [1] -1910:3

1879:9. 1931:12.

1938:12, 1965:1

1951:20

necessitate [1] -

Normally [1] -1904:23 North [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3 Nos [2] - 1877:6, 1972:10 note [7] - 1940:19. 1947:4, 1947:8, 1957:18, 1959:6, 1959:8, 1960:10 note-taker [1] -1940:19 notebooks [1] -1948:15 noted [2] - 1953:21, 1964:19 notes [21] - 1939:25, 1940:2, 1940:8, 1940:9, 1940:11, 1940:13, 1940:14, 1940:17, 1940:21, 1940:22, 1948:3, 1948:5, 1948:11, 1948:13, 1948:15, 1948:18, 1949:3, 1949:9 Notes [1] - 1959:12 nothing [2] - 1969:7, 1970:21 notice [2] - 1916:6, 1942:18 notion [1] - 1893:25 November [2] -1949:6, 1953:2 number [17] -1886:1, 1906:23, 1907:13, 1907:24, 1918:6, 1934:6, 1935:15, 1936:21, 1937:4, 1939:19, 1947:17, 1950:25, 1952:7, 1959:16, 1961:25, 1962:5 numbered [3] -1947:12, 1962:7, numbers [1] - 1962:9 NW [2] - 1864:13, 1864:13

### 0

object [4] - 1871:22, 1876:17, 1894:21, 1912:23 objected [1] -1932:10 objection [8] -1876:16, 1886:12, 1897:24, 1912:12,

1914:10, 1932:11, 1932:20, 1933:4 Objection [10] -1890:25, 1897:22, 1903:4, 1912:2, 1914:6, 1921:7, 1922:24, 1945:11, 1945:21, 1969:23 objections [1] -1866:15 obligation [3] -1901:3. 1920:10. 1927:8 obligations [2] -1899:13, 1900:14 obtained [1] -1954:18 obtaining [1] -1953:24 obvious [1] -1893:16 obviously [7] -1904:16, 1916:14, 1916:19, 1931:22, 1933:19, 1936:6, 1963:15 OCC [5] - 1882:15, 1882:16, 1886:15, 1913:10, 1915:11 occasion [2] -1886:16, 1897:9 occurred [1] -1968:15 October [7] - 1864:5, 1899:11, 1899:18, 1923:5, 1923:13, 1923:21, 1924:1 **OF** [3] - 1864:1, 1864:8, 1864:12 of.. [1] - 1962:4 offered [1] - 1931:20 Office [24] - 1879:18, 1879:21, 1882:14, 1882:16, 1883:22, 1884:9, 1885:3, 1885:12, 1888:22, 1888:25, 1903:9, 1934:10, 1934:15, 1935:10, 1936:2, 1936:4, 1936:17, 1936:19, 1938:8, 1938:20, 1944:19, 1964:3, 1965:20 office [37] - 1881:12, 1881:15. 1882:20. 1882:24, 1882:25, 1884:11, 1884:12, 1885:11, 1885:13, 1885:14, 1885:16, 1887:23, 1888:11,

nonresponsive [1] -

NORC [3] - 1931:13,

normal [1] - 1902:19

1939:20, 1958:24

normally [2] -

1886:23, 1886:24

1914:8

1888:24, 1913:20,
1915:14, 1934:13,
1935:4, 1935:7,
1935:12, 1935:14,
1935:20, 1936:23,
1937:17, 1937:21,
1938:5, 1938:15,
1939:14, 1940:12,
1942:10, 1944:14,
1948:16, 1953:7,
1954:2, 1968:4
officer [2] - 1884:10,
1888:24
officer's [1] -
1937:14 <b>offices</b> [11] -
1885:18, 1917:20,
1917:23, 1936:13,
1937:9, 1937:10,
1944:17, 1945:5,
1945:8, 1945:15,
1945:19
OFFICES [1] -
1864:12
official [6] - 1896:6,
1896:7, 1902:18,
1902:20, 1924:9
Official [2] - 1864:12,
1973:3
officials [2] -
1903:14, 1903:15
often [1] - 1887:7
<b>OHTA</b> [6] - 1875:20,
1934:12, 1934:16,
1935:7, 1937:13,
1947:25
oil [1] - 1867:14
on-request [3] -
1920:15, 1924:17,
1924:20
on-site [2] - 1880:4,
1882:19
on-the-ground [1] -
1917:16
<b>one</b> [48] - 1866:15,
1870:7, 1871:7,
1873:8, 1873:13, 1877:10, 1880:17,
1884:19, 1885:7,
1889:13, 1889:15,
1897:9, 1901:16,
1901:19, 1903:8,
1903:18. 1904:9.
1903:18, 1904:9, 1905:24, 1907:6,
1919:14, 1919:20,
1931:23, 1934:5,
1937:4, 1939:3,
1939:13, 1940:11,
1945:7, 1945:23,
1946:20, 1948:10,

1950:7. 1951:9. 1952:19, 1952:21, 1952:24, 1953:20, 1954:11, 1954:18, 1959:5, 1960:14, 1960:19, 1961:3, 1962:13, 1963:15, 1968:23, 1970:19 One [4] - 1887:19, 1906:24, 1928:16, 1954:8 one-on-one [1] -1919:14 ones [5] - 1893:23, 1910:17, 1937:4, 1954:20, 1957:14 ongoing [1] -1958:24 open [2] - 1923:20, 1924:1 **Opened** [1] - 1904:4 opened [1] - 1880:9 opening [3] -1956:11, 1957:16, 1957:23 operating [1] -1901:5 operation [4] -1889:9, 1889:19, 1893:22, 1895:22 operations [1] -1879:8 opinion [10] -1870:19, 1871:19, 1875:7, 1894:2, 1895:19, 1921:1, 1922:5, 1923:13, 1924:12, 1928:11 opinions [5] -1865:18, 1870:3, 1870:8, 1874:9, 1917:11 opportunity [3] -1865:11, 1895:12, 1924:17 oppose [1] - 1876:22 opposed [2] -1911:14, 1950:10

opposite [1] - 1930:9

options [2] -

1947:17, 1947:25

1872:21, 1895:16,

1916:25, 1954:18

Ordinarily [1] -

1892:6

order [5] - 1868:2,

ordered [1] - 1952:1

ordinary [1] - 1933:2

organization [1] -

orders [1] - 1880:8

1888:25 origin [1] - 1963:12 originally [1] -1883:13 OST [2] - 1930:24, 1964:3 **OST's** [2] - 1935:4, 1935:7 **OTFM** [5] - 1884:23, 1888:12, 1897:16, 1929:16. 1930:24 OTFM-centered [1] -1888:12 **OTP** [2] - 1887:23, 1888:2 ourselves [1] -1880:9 outcome [1] - 1898:3 outside [4] -1906:12, 1918:13, 1936:1, 1938:20 overnighter [1] -1968:2 overrule [1] -1914:10 Overruled [2] -1872:4, 1969:25 oversaw [1] -1883:18 oversee [4] -1935:20, 1935:21, 1935:25, 1937:15 owed [5] - 1908:3, 1908:5, 1908:8, 1908:19, 1908:21 owes [1] - 1912:21 own [5] - 1939:25, 1950:19, 1950:22, 1951:20, 1952:7 owner [1] - 1894:6 Р

**p.m** [3] - 1930:22, 1971:7 **P.O**[1] - 1864:9 **PAGE** [1] - 1972:2 page [43] - 1881:7, 1882:7, 1882:9, 1884:5, 1887:18, 1889:12, 1890:20, 1898:22, 1898:25, 1900:2, 1900:11, 1904:3, 1906:21, 1912:15. 1942:22. 1942:23, 1943:1, 1946:22, 1947:16,

1947:19, 1948:9,

1949:5. 1950:12.

1950:16, 1953:9,

1956:4, 1958:3, 1958:9, 1959:6, 1962:2, 1962:4, 1962:10, 1962:16, 1962:17, 1962:20 pages [4] - 1881:4, 1947:12, 1973:4 paid [1] - 1966:16 painting [2] - 1887:7, 1910:7 **Pallais** [16] - 1865:7, 1866:17, 1867:3, 1868:21, 1870:3, 1870:15, 1871:9, 1871:19, 1872:6, 1873:2, 1873:8, 1873:22, 1873:25, 1874:14, 1875:23, 1972:3 Pallais's [1] -1866:23 paper [7] - 1956:10, 1957:16, 1957:22, 1959:17, 1959:18, 1959:19, 1960:2 Paper [2] - 1959:9, 1959:12 paragraph [5] -1894:1, 1894:2, 1910:22, 1962:16, 1962:18 parlance [1] - 1955:9 part [33] - 1873:15, 1873:17, 1877:22, 1883:24, 1883:25, 1892:20, 1892:23, 1898:22, 1900:22, 1902:18, 1903:18, 1916:9, 1916:15, 1925:11, 1925:25, 1926:15, 1933:4, 1934:24, 1935:2, 1935:3. 1935:17. 1947:11, 1947:12, 1951:12, 1958:22, 1961:22, 1963:3, 1964:1, 1964:9, 1965:4, 1966:8, 1968:24 partially [1] -1958:22 participants [1] -1887:15 particular [26] -1872:7, 1887:2,

1897:10. 1913:21. 1954:23. 1955:21. 1955:25, 1956:2, 1918:24, 1920:13, 1923:8, 1939:24, 1949:15, 1949:22, 1962:2, 1962:10, 1962:13, 1964:4, 1968:6, 1968:19, 1969:22, 1970:7, 1970:14 particularly [7] -1880:14, 1896:17, 1910:10, 1914:17, 1927:6. 1928:11. 1936:22 parts [3] - 1884:21, 1890:12, 1906:24 party [9] - 1953:10, 1953:15, 1953:22, 1953:25, 1954:3, 1954:5, 1954:6, 1954:17 pass [2] - 1877:16, 1877:19 passed [2] - 1888:6, 1909:4 past [1] - 1916:21 pay [11] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1900:8, 1900:13, 1906:13, 1908:23, 1922:12, 1922:15, 1927:13 paying [1] - 1890:14 payment [5] -1922:19, 1954:8, 1954:9, 1954:14, 1966:6 payments [1] -1922:17 pays [1] - 1966:23 Peachtree [1] -1864:17 pending [1] -1870:11 **people** [36] - 1872:2, 1881:16, 1881:17, 1881:25, 1884:20, 1885:7, 1888:1, 1888:13, 1888:15, 1898:6, 1900:23, 1902:25, 1903:17, 1906:12, 1916:12, 1917:23, 1918:6, 1918:11, 1918:13, 1924:15, 1935:12, 1936:12, 1936:21, 1937:4, 1937:6, 1937:8, 1937:18, 1887:3, 1888:4, 1937:23, 1938:7, 1888:23, 1893:12, 1938:16, 1938:20, 1895:19, 1896:5, 1939:11, 1940:11,

1954:24, 1964:9	1905:7, 1906:24,	1967:15, 1967:23,	1931:25, 1934:9,	1926:10, 1926:15,
<b>PEPION</b> [1] - 1864:3	1909:17, 1910:25,	1968:11, 1970:11	1935:9, 1944:9	1926:23, 1927:3
per [2] - 1915:3,	1921:2, 1923:20,	population [5] -	presented [8] -	proactive [1] -
1964:18	1933:21, 1933:25,	1923:11, 1923:19,	1865:21, 1897:4,	1920:18
percent [2] - 1950:18	1946:21, 1947:3,	1959:17, 1959:24,	1931:23, 1947:25,	probate [13] -
Perfect [1] - 1971:2	1947:14, 1948:1,	1964:1	1957:3, 1957:10,	1902:14, 1902:17,
perform [3] - 1897:1,	1950:23, 1951:6,	portion [1] - 1872:15	1957:15, 1961:20	1902:14, 1902:17,
1903:3, 1911:7	1951:17, 1951:23,	posed [1] - 1872:14	presenting [5] -	1903:7, 1903:14,
performed [1] -	1952:8, 1956:20,	position [11] -	1896:5, 1931:14,	1903:15, 1903:17,
1936:1	1963:21, 1963:24,	1879:19, 1882:13,	1932:2, 1963:16,	1924:2, 1924:9,
Perhaps [1] -	1970:4	1883:19, 1884:10,	1965:5	1924:14, 1931:1
1924:19	<b>plan</b> [13] - 1873:9,	1896:5, 1896:19,	presidents [1] -	probates [1] -
perhaps [1] - 1871:6	1873:12, 1897:4,	1896:25, 1897:3,	1901:19	1903:25
period [5] - 1904:23,	1898:16, 1906:25,	1903:23, 1934:9,	pretrial [2] - 1877:13,	probative [1] -
1913:10, 1965:13,	1931:8, 1931:15,	1934:14	1878:9	1898:12
1967:8	1933:18, 1943:5,	possibility [1] -	pretty [2] - 1884:23,	problem [6] -
<b>periods</b> [1] - 1969:10	1943:7, 1943:13,	1951:11	1893:16	1908:16, 1914:2,
permit [1] - 1878:11	1946:24, 1961:21	possible [1] -	prevent [1] - 1890:3	1914:13, 1963:8,
person [6] - 1881:13,	planner [1] - 1934:22	1877:14	previous [2] -	1968:22, 1968:23
1888:22, 1896:2,	<b>Plans</b> [2] - 1939:16,	possibly [1] -	1876:15, 1954:13	problems [6] -
1937:7, 1937:12,	1940:15	1932:12	previously [5] -	1865:23, 1866:1,
1937:24	<b>plans</b> [17] - 1943:9,	posted [4] - 1897:7,	1874:9, 1879:10,	1881:10, 1881:11,
personal [1] - 1919:7	1943:13, 1943:14,	1964:11, 1964:15,	1920:14, 1931:17,	1917:18, 1963:5
personally [2] -	1943:16, 1943:21,	1964:25	1932:3	Procedures [3] -
1917:14, 1918:20	1944:2, 1944:3,	postings [2] -	Primarily [2] -	1885:4, 1885:12,
perspective [1] -	1944:4, 1944:16,	1963:25, 1969:9	1869:10, 1936:17	1889:1
1914:1	1944:21, 1945:9,	potential [1] -	primarily [4] -	procedures [12] -
pertain [1] - 1916:20	1946:4, 1946:7,	1913:14	1882:19, 1936:1,	1866:2, 1873:9,
pictures [1] -	1946:11, 1946:16,	practicable [1] -	1936:20, 1938:1	1884:17, 1884:24,
1928:18	1960:25, 1961:23	1965:6	primary [4] -	1885:20, 1886:9,
place [7] - 1887:11,	play [1] - 1874:10	practice [2] - 1886:2,	1884:14, 1936:14,	1886:10, 1887:25,
1899:5, 1901:22,	pleased [1] - 1906:1	1923:18	1937:2, 1937:12	1888:22, 1911:6,
1906:11, 1908:17,	point [12] - 1877:20,	practices [3] -	principal [4] -	1916:14, 1916:19
1939:22, 1969:17	1879:18, 1889:15,	1882:3, 1906:2,	1883:17, 1885:15,	<b>Proceed</b> [1] - 1900:3
places [1] - 1881:6	1925:14, 1928:16,	1916:20	1888:21, 1937:4	proceed [1] - 1933:7
plaintiff [3] - 1909:6,	1931:13, 1932:7,	preceded [1] -	principally [3] -	proceeding [2] -
1909:7, 1909:8	1932:23, 1949:12,	1915:14	1932:8, 1936:24,	1877:11, 1879:11
Plaintiff [7] -	1951:18, 1952:23, 1959:2	precedents [1] -	1939:3	Proceedings [2] -
1866:10, 1877:6,	policies [13] -	1894:24	Principally [1] -	1864:25, 1971:7
1930:20, 1970:20,	1884:17, 1884:21,	Precisely [1] -	1937:23	proceedings [2] -
1972:9, 1972:10,	1884:24, 1885:20,	1891:11	principle [4] -	1885:25, 1973:5
1972:10	1886:9, 1886:10,	predate [1] - 1904:12	1889:19, 1890:6,	<b>proceeds</b> [8] - 1891:21, 1900:18,
Plaintiff's [1] -	1887:25, 1888:21,	predates [1] -	1910:4, 1926:18	1900:20, 1901:2,
1887:17	1911:6, 1916:14,	1899:11	<b>principles</b> [23] - 1869:12, 1869:14,	1900:20, 1901:2,
PLAINTIFFS [2] -	1916:18, 1916:20,	preferred [4] -	1869:16, 1869:18,	process [16] -
1879:13, 1934:2	1917:12	1955:2, 1955:4, 1955:13, 1955:17	1881:1, 1881:9,	1872:17, 1872:23,
plaintiffs [2] -	Policies [3] - 1885:4,	prepared [16] -	1884:22, 1886:9,	1883:11, 1883:18,
1866:18, 1909:13	1885:12, 1889:1	1876:22, 1887:22,	1886:11, 1888:3,	1892:16, 1892:18,
Plaintiffs [8] -	<b>policy</b> [8] - 1884:10,	1889:5, 1941:5,	1894:19, 1894:22,	1892:21, 1892:23,
1864:4, 1864:12,	1884:14, 1888:24,	1941:17, 1956:14,	1895:8, 1895:23,	1893:2, 1902:14,
1877:10, 1878:5, 1886:7, 1931:14,	1896:16, 1898:12,	1957:4, 1957:7,	1895:25, 1896:23,	1903:2, 1903:7,
1933:8, 1934:6	1913:19, 1925:11,	1960:15, 1961:2,	1906:17, 1912:16,	1903:12, 1936:5,
Plaintiffs' [8] -	1925:20	1961:4, 1961:10,	1913:25, 1917:22,	1938:4, 1959:1
1866:6, 1874:24,	<b>pool</b> [3] - 1967:2,	1961:12, 1963:13,	1924:7, 1926:21,	produce [7] - 1887:4,
1876:5, 1876:8,	1967:3, 1970:11	1963:14, 1963:18	1927:3	1887:5, 1892:11,
1879:7, 1882:4,	pooled [10] -	preparer [1] -	private [11] - 1886:2,	1901:1, 1901:15,
1930:13, 1942:16	1965:14, 1966:2,	1941:18	1895:23, 1902:15,	1902:19, 1928:5
<b>Plan</b> [24] - 1873:8,	1966:19, 1966:21,	present [7] - 1877:1,	1904:1, 1906:3,	produced [5] -
1902:9, 1904:11,	1966:22, 1966:25,	1924:8, 1931:15,	1925:17, 1925:18,	1864:25, 1890:23,
.,,				

1952:2 1970:24 1895:17, 1919:7, 1964:1, 1969:18, 1956:15 1969:20 provided [15] -QUINN [7] - 1864:2, producing [7] -1865:20, 1866:18, 1945:11, 1945:21, recalculating [2] -1897:15, 1901:4, 1866:22, 1871:21, 1949:24, 1969:23, 1967:20, 1970:5 1909:10, 1910:5, 1874:23, 1877:16, 1970:23, 1970:25 recalculation [1] -1910:17, 1920:18, 1902:15, 1903:12, quite [3] - 1896:1, 1965:1 1958:15 1903:21, 1904:1, 1907:12, 1917:24 receipt [2] - 1922:19, 1904:24, 1904:25, professional [1] -Quite [1] - 1936:21 1922:20 1905:2, 1915:23. 1873:23 quote [2] - 1921:14, receivable [3] -Professor [4] -1939:20 1970:5 1908:10, 1908:13, 1931:18, 1932:3, provides [2] -1908:20 1932:7, 1932:14 1872:20, 1930:4 R receive [5] - 1901:11, proffer [12] providing [2] -1923:4, 1929:21, raise [4] - 1876:2, 1877:12, 1877:18, 1916:1, 1952:23 1933:3, 1965:18 1890:1, 1903:23, 1877:19, 1877:21, provisions [3] -RECEIVED [1] -1924:25 1877:25, 1878:1, 1867:21, 1872:17, 1972:8 raised [2] - 1926:18, 1878:2, 1878:4, 1872:23 received [6] -1964:13 pulled [1] - 1956:17 1878:13, 1879:5, 1866:8, 1866:11, rate [3] - 1963:4, 1930:18 purchaser [1] -1876:10, 1877:7, 1968:7 program [4] -1900:8 1930:15, 1930:21 rather [4] - 1882:2, 1888:1, 1934:21, purposes [1] receives [1] - 1910:5 1915:16, 1927:17, 1935:19, 1950:17 1941:23 recent [1] - 1884:1 1937:17 project [6] - 1873:21, pursuant [2] recently [1] - 1937:5 rather.. [1] - 1877:25 1874:15, 1874:18, 1902:8, 1925:19 recess [1] - 1930:15 1874:21, 1909:15. reaching [1] - 1878:9 pursuing [1] -Recess [1] - 1930:22 reaction [1] -1954:17 1951:25 recipient [2] -1896:14 promote [1] pushing [1] - 1885:8 1871:5, 1896:12 read [16] - 1865:24, 1925:11 put [13] - 1884:19, recite [1] - 1905:22 1874:3, 1874:9, proper [8] - 1889:24, 1888:1, 1888:17, recites [1] - 1925:15 1874:10, 1875:13, 1889:25, 1890:1, 1895:16, 1897:19, recognize [3] -1875:15, 1875:16, 1890:3, 1902:3, 1899:3, 1903:23, 1882:5, 1911:19, 1889:14, 1894:1, 1907:17, 1909:16 1911:12, 1916:5, 1948:9 1895:12, 1910:23, properly [5] -1918:5, 1957:7, recognized [1] -1922:7, 1953:14, 1871:11, 1901:5, 1969:7 1925:8 1962:6, 1962:18 1901:22, 1902:2, putting [2] - 1896:3, recollect [1] readily [1] - 1954:20 1964:8 1938:2 1941:20 real [1] - 1882:3 property [10] puzzled [1] - 1945:7 recollection [9] realize [1] - 1896:1 1887:4, 1889:22, 1949:11, 1949:15, 1891:16, 1892:3, really [18] - 1872:13, Q 1950:9, 1950:24, 1878:4, 1885:6, 1894:6, 1894:9, 1953:19, 1953:20, qualified [4] -1894:10, 1894:11, 1888:12. 1893:14. 1959:15, 1961:2, 1865:19. 1870:7. 1893:15, 1893:16, 1902:22, 1905:5 1963:12 1885:24, 1886:8 1894:5, 1894:15, propose [1] recommendations qualify [1] - 1870:9 1907:15, 1910:18, 1931:17 [1] - 1943:19 quarterly [2] -1913:24, 1917:21, proposed [3] recomputation [1] -1887:16, 1892:12 1919:17, 1921:22, 1873:13, 1931:19, 1964:8 1923:7, 1960:21, 1943:20 question's [1] reconcile [3] -1944:12 1968:9 proposing [1] -1954:5, 1954:6, questions [16] realty [1] - 1937:7 1928:12 1958:16 1866:5, 1875:22, reason [6] - 1881:23, prove [2] - 1926:10, reconciliation [7] -1903:23, 1910:24, 1881:25, 1889:21, 1926:15 1872:16, 1872:23, 1913:1, 1913:10, 1893:21, 1931:21, provide [18] -1949:17, 1949:18, 1924:13, 1924:25, 1931:23 1892:7, 1892:9, 1954:17, 1958:21, 1928:19, 1928:20, reasonable [2] -1902:9, 1903:13, 1963:17 1929:3, 1930:14, 1893:16, 1902:3 1904:12, 1905:8, reconciliations [2] -1933:24, 1934:7, reasons [2] - 1889:7, 1905:13, 1920:22, 1868:5, 1954:19 1970:18, 1970:25 1929:4, 1929:7, 1952:21 record [68] quickly [2] -1936:15, 1938:16, rebut [1] - 1932:12 1866:14, 1866:17, 1885:15, 1966:18 1938:18, 1946:7, rebuttal [1] - 1931:10 1866:19, 1877:22, 1946:17, 1951:2, Quinn [2] - 1970:23,

recalculated [3] -

1878:4, 1879:2,

1938:1. 1953:24 1916:3. 1925:15. 1884:11. 1884:18. 1955:2. 1955:13. recounting [1] -1898:1 1926:3, 1960:8 1955:17 1899:9, 1935:6, region [5] - 1880:1, recourse [1] -1880:2, 1950:19, remind [1] - 1910:18 reports [6] -1935:9 1914:21 1950:22, 1951:9 rendered [1] -1865:24, 1866:16, responsibility [12] -1935:2, 1936:11, 1874:21, 1884:14, Redirect [1] - 1972:5 regional [3] -1865:18 redirect [1] - 1928:20 1881:12, 1917:23, rent [1] - 1900:9 1939:20, 1941:6 1894:9, 1905:5, REDIRECT [1] -1937:9 reorganization [1] -Repository [1] -1905:20, 1906:1, regions [1] - 1969:13 1906:8, 1906:15, 1885:10 1928:17 1928:22 1911:12, 1930:7, **Register** [1] - 1916:6 representative [6] refer [5] - 1888:18, repaired [1] - 1890:8 1930:10, 1935:25 1915:25, 1935:24, regular [2] - 1929:4, reparations [1] -1881:13, 1883:8, 1943:6. 1955:6 1929:7 1881:20 1883:9, 1883:10, responsible [5] -1901:8, 1906:16, regulate [1] repeat [1] - 1950:3 1883:14. 1883:16 reference [4] -1938:2, 1938:9, 1881:10, 1896:3, 1882:18 Repeat [1] - 1891:7 Representative [1] -1939:3 1896:22, 1896:23 regulation [1] report [67] - 1865:8, 1878:3 1887:14 1865:11, 1865:16, representatives [3] responsive [2] referencing [1] -1883:14, 1937:15, 1865:8, 1931:24 1955:7 regulations [3] -1866:6, 1866:23, 1938:6 rest [2] - 1881:9, referred [9] - 1876:7, 1884:17, 1887:25, 1868:25, 1869:17, 1877:1, 1889:4, 1888:4 1871:4, 1872:16, represented [2] -1931:8 1954:10, 1967:10 restate [3] - 1895:4, 1909:1, 1938:3, Regulations [3] -1872:20, 1872:22, request [8] - 1920:9, 1945:7, 1970:1 1955:8, 1955:11, 1885:4, 1885:12, 1872:25, 1875:10, 1920:15, 1920:16, 1959:18, 1967:9 1889:1 1876:5, 1876:14, restated [1] referring [9] rejected [1] -1876:15, 1876:17, 1924:17, 1924:20, 1897:12 1928:25, 1929:3, 1885:21, 1885:22, 1951:24 1876:18, 1876:21, restatement [3] -1895:14, 1896:4, 1896:10, 1920:19, relate [2] - 1894:10, 1876:25, 1877:1, 1932:4 1896:22 1921:23, 1947:9, 1932:19 1879:7, 1881:3, requested [1] -1950:1, 1957:19, related [2] - 1872:15, 1881:6, 1881:9, 1926:2 result [2] - 1893:10, 1958:14 1881:12, 1881:14, requesting [1] -1952:9 1932:17 1882:8, 1882:10, 1938:15 resulted [1] **refers** [1] - 1957:17 relates [2] - 1899:12 Reflect [1] - 1871:15 1887:14, 1887:17, requests [1] - 1875:4 1891:21 relationship [2] reflect [8] - 1871:16, 1890:19, 1890:21, require [2] - 1906:2, results [4] - 1958:5, 1895:21, 1937:18 1896:9, 1897:5, 1871:17, 1871:21, 1909:25 1958:19, 1964:17, relationships [1] -1897:13, 1898:21, 1872:7, 1938:17, 1937:20 required [9] -1969:15 1898:23, 1906:22, 1947:24, 1969:20, relative [1] - 1877:13 1886:19, 1886:23, resume [7] - 1868:8, 1911:17, 1912:14, 1970:14 1886:24, 1887:14, 1868:11, 1868:16, relatively [3] -1921:4, 1921:15, reflected [4] -1888:9, 1890:23, 1868:17, 1868:20, 1887:13, 1896:2, 1921:20, 1922:1, 1872:10, 1946:2, 1891:8, 1892:11, 1883:21, 1886:3 1916:4 1923:3, 1930:13, 1947:2, 1967:23 release [1] - 1954:2 1893:23 resumes [1] - 1865:4 1931:18, 1932:18, reflecting [2] requirements [3] retired [1] - 1937:5 relevance [1] -1936:8, 1936:10, 1873:25, 1874:4, retroactively [2] -1947:23, 1970:5 1912:24 1936:12, 1937:13, 1942:11 reflects [6] - 1868:8, 1916:15, 1916:23 relevant [3] -1941:13, 1941:14, 1943:3, 1949:25, requires [1] review [19] -1931:20, 1940:2, 1942:5, 1955:5, 1967:15, 1968:6, 1885:19 1865:11, 1878:15, 1940:3 1955:6, 1958:23, 1880:21, 1880:23, 1970:10 research [1] relied [2] - 1918:20, 1958:25, 1964:9, **Reform** [5] - 1874:1, 1907:16 1884:21, 1885:5, 1951:21 1966:4, 1968:24, 1886:17, 1888:2, 1884:15, 1885:23, resolved [2] relies [1] - 1917:3 1969 1 1888:16, 1897:18, 1899:11, 1899:12 1893:20, 1926:20 rely [1] - 1927:5 **Report** [1] - 1871:15 1902:20, 1902:25, refresh [1] - 1963:12 resolves [1] - 1963:7 relying [1] - 1908:23 Report's [1] - 1877:3 1905:8, 1908:9, refreshes [1] respect [8] remain [1] - 1920:11 reported [6] -1918:18, 1932:22, 1962:14 1891:24, 1896:20, remained [1] -1864:25, 1869:19, 1939:6, 1939:18, regard [5] - 1870:16, 1899:7, 1899:10, 1882:21 1869:20, 1871:2, 1953:10 1901:10, 1933:25, 1922:4, 1926:8, remaining [1] -1884:13, 1935:1 reviewed [18] -1926:14, 1944:18 1936:15, 1936:23 1960:7 Reporter [3] -1866:16, 1867:3, regarded [1] respond [2] remains [2] - 1906:8, 1864:11, 1864:12, 1867:7, 1873:1, 1866:16 1877:24, 1878:16 1906:9 1973:3 1874:23. 1875:1. regarding [12] responding [1] remember [16] reporting [11] -1875:4, 1875:10, 1867:10, 1870:14, 1866:22 1868:22, 1872:22, 1870:15, 1870:20, 1876:6, 1881:16, 1897:1, 1915:24, response [2] -1880:18, 1883:12, 1870:24, 1872:18, 1883:21, 1898:15, 1921:4, 1928:24, 1865:14 1895:20, 1897:17, 1873:3, 1903:18, 1918:20, 1930:3, 1930:6, 1931:22, responsibilities [7] -1901:16, 1907:11, 1903:19, 1937:19, 1939:8. 1940:12.

1882:15, 1883:19,

1932:8, 1933:24,

1909:8, 1915:2,

simple [1] - 1966:19

simultaneously [1] -

single [2] - 1919:24,

**sitting** [1] - 1948:19

1880:14

1929:18

1882:19

1925:22

1953:14

1912:7

1922:22

1963:4

Sinclair [2] -

1925:14, 1930:11

site [2] - 1880:4,

situation [6] -

1900:7, 1904:20,

1910:11, 1918:7,

1925:18, 1925:24

situations [1] -

sixth [1] - 1889:12

size [4] - 1950:17,

1950:24, 1951:6,

Slonaker [3] -

1911:21, 1911:23,

slow [2] - 1922:19,

**small** [4] - 1884:20,

smart [1] - 1890:11

**SMITH** [1] - 1864:23

Smith [1] - 1877:13

sneak [1] - 1884:2

solely [1] - 1932:19

Solicitor [1] -

solicitor's [5] -

1895:19, 1938:5,

solvency [2] -

someone [1] -

someplace [1] -

sometimes [2] -

1903:25, 1964:19

somewhat [1] -

1933:15, 1970:24

1870:22, 1870:23,

sort [12] - 1885:8,

1890:6, 1894:19,

1928:10, 1950:3,

1962:4, 1970:2,

1970:16

**Sorry** [3] - 1874:13,

**sorry** [8] - 1868:10,

1881:21, 1913:21

1938:15, 1939:14,

**solve** [1] - 1968:22

solvent [1] - 1882:21

1895:18

1942:10

1963:16

1880:8

1889:2

1946:20, 1947:19

significant [1] -

similar [2] - 1925:22,

1935:3

1932:15

1886:6, 1935:15,

1942:11, 1947:13 1906:22, 1910:22 send [2] - 1888:2, sample [5] reviewing [8] -1950:17, 1950:24, **sector** [8] - 1902:15, 1901:19 1886:16, 1887:25, 1951:6, 1956:10, 1904:1, 1906:3, sending [1] -1888:19, 1894:3, 1959:23 1925:17, 1925:18, 1964:21 1926:10, 1926:15, 1896:2, 1953:17, samples [5] senior [5] - 1881:16, 1962:23, 1963:1 1950:25, 1951:13, 1926:24 1883:14, 1896:2, rhetorical [1] -1952:7, 1952:11, **secure** [1] - 1890:18 1896:6 1921:25 1952:17 securities [5] -Senior [1] - 1864:7 Rhode [1] - 1886:5 sampling [5] -1880:17, 1880:19, **sense** [3] - 1886:22, Richard [3] -1873:13, 1873:18, 1887:3, 1891:15, 1890:16, 1898:4 1878:23, 1879:3, 1922:4, 1922:5, 1906:12 sent [4] - 1910:13, security [1] -1972:4 1952:15 1938:14, 1938:20, RICHARD [1] -**SAS** [5] - 1868:25, 1966:22 1956:21 1879:13 1869:3, 1869:5, see [63] - 1865:9, sentence [2] -1880:16, 1880:24, Richmond [2] -1870:10 1906:25, 1963:6 satisfaction [2] -1883:21, 1884:16, 1880:2, 1881:15 separate [1] -1887:8, 1889:25, Riggs [6] - 1881:5, 1918:9 1951:23 1901:16, 1901:18, **Savings** [1] - 1915:5 1890:2, 1890:10, September [1] -1890:14, 1896:17, 1901:25, 1902:1, saw [3] - 1887:7, 1942:21 1901:3, 1901:21, 1902:4 1893:14, 1955:18 series [1] - 1948:15 1902:2, 1905:23, right-of-way [1] -Saxon [2] - 1882:1, service [1] - 1868:6 1954:8 1906:1, 1906:10, 1913:21 SESSION [1] -1907:2, 1907:9, risks [1] - 1913:20 schedule [1] -1864:7 1907:16, 1907:21, **road** [1] - 1890:9 1930:17 set [2] - 1927:10, 1910:24, 1913:8, **ROB**[1] - 1933:13 Schiess [2] - 1953:7 1930:17 1913:9, 1919:22, Robert [1] - 1931:14 scholarship [3] settlement [1] -1921:2, 1921:3, 1893:18, 1920:24, **ROBERT** [1] - 1864:1 1952:3 1922:22, 1932:12, 1929:8 Robertson [3] seven [2] - 1876:15, 1940:21, 1943:7, school [1] - 1879:20 1933:13, 1945:17 1876:17 1945:22, 1946:4, science [1] - 1893:15 ROBERTSON [1] several [2] - 1881:3, 1946:8, 1946:19, 1864:9 scope [5] - 1871:23, 1885:5 1946:23, 1947:8, 1871:24, 1921:1, rocket [1] - 1893:15 sheet [1] - 1881:6 1947:17, 1949:6, 1923:10, 1938:7 role [1] - 1935:6 **ship** [1] - 1888:1 1950:14, 1950:19, Scott [3] - 1895:15, Room [1] - 1864:12 **Short** [1] - 1961:13 1952:8, 1954:24, 1896:4, 1920:24 Ross [1] - 1936:21 shorthand [2] -1955:1, 1955:2, screen [4] - 1865:8, Rossman [1] -1864:25, 1920:14 1955:23, 1956:5, 1910:23, 1942:17, 1905:23 **show** [5] - 1910:8, 1956:7, 1956:11, 1946:1 1941:17, 1942:20, rounding [1] -1958:5, 1958:8, scroll [2] - 1942:20, 1969:16 1943:19, 1962:13 1958:11, 1958:13, 1955:25 royal [1] - 1925:25 showing [2] -1959:10, 1962:2, seal [1] - 1880:10 **RPR**[1] - 1864:11 1927:23, 1927:25 1962:10, 1962:14, second [13] - 1871:8, rubric [1] - 1925:1 **SID** [1] - 1949:7 1962:20, 1962:24, 1881:7, 1887:18, side [5] - 1881:17, rule [1] - 1898:13 1963:10, 1969:16, 1887:20, 1890:20, 1913:23, 1915:16, rules [1] - 1966:7 1971:6 1895:6, 1900:16, ruling [1] - 1953:21 1963:4 See [1] - 1900:12 1900:21, 1900:22, Siemietkowski [1] run [5] - 1901:14, seeing [2] - 1882:20, 1903:1, 1906:25, 1866:12 1901:19, 1901:20, 1961:14 1911:4, 1954:11 1901:22, 1902:2 SIEMIETKOWSKI [7] seek [1] - 1929:19 second-guessing - 1866:13, 1867:2, Running [1] seem [2] - 1924:23, [1] - 1903:1 1871:14, 1871:16, 1893:15 1927:16 Secretary [6] -1871:18, 1872:5, running [1] selecting [1] -1864:6, 1894:18, 1875:22 1894:14 1952:24 1895:7, 1895:16, sign [1] - 1897:20 self [2] - 1925:12, 1937:21, 1948:22 signed [5] - 1881:13, S 1930:3 Section [2] - 1921:4, 1937:25, 1942:24, self-determination

self-governance [1]

sell [1] - 1882:23

[1] - 1930:3

1925:12

S-C-H-I-E-S-S [1] -

sake [1] - 1877:1

**Salem** [1] - 1864:25

Sally [1] - 1930:25

1953:8

1921:14

section [8] -

1887:19, 1899:14,

1900:6, 1900:12,

1902:7, 1904:3,

1960:6 1901:23. 1906:14. 1868:25, 1878:24, 1891:25. 1926:2 sustain [2] -1917:18, 1917:22, 1933:10, 1950:19, statute [6] - 1888:9, subsequent [1] -1897:24, 1912:11 1920:6, 1922:16, 1950:22, 1951:20, 1897:14, 1909:9, 1931:18 sustained [1] -1922:18, 1934:22, 1952:7 1921:22, 1930:3, subsequently [1] -1932:11 1937:18 standard [3] -1930:6 1932:18 Sustained [3] statutes [2] - 1888:3, **sorts** [3] - 1881:5, 1868:6, 1889:19, substantive [1] -1912:25, 1923:1 1890:7, 1925:22 1926:21 1930:8 1866:2 Swimmer [2] sound [1] - 1873:23 standards 191 -Stemplewicz [3] -1897:8, 1936:21 succeeded [1] -1869:2, 1869:3, sounds [2] -1914:11, 1922:2, 1954:13 **SWORN** [2] -1892:22, 1938:24 1869:8, 1872:19, 1970:22 sufficient [1] -1879:13, 1934:2 **source** [2] - 1893:5, 1879:8, 1886:9, STEMPLEWICZ [16] 1964:23 synopsis [2] -1901:11 1894:25, 1932:15, - 1864:6, 1886:12, 1882:11, 1895:9 suggest [1] sources [2] -1932:17 1890:25, 1891:3, 1876:20 synopsize [1] -1918:21, 1964:13 standing [1] - 1926:2 1894:21, 1897:22, suggested [1] -1894:19 sovereign [7] start [3] - 1920:8, 1903:4, 1912:2, 1931:23 system [3] - 1908:11, 1920:9, 1955:20 1912:23, 1913:6, 1925:5, 1925:7, 1908:17, 1914:17 suggestions [1] -1914:12, 1921:10, 1925:9, 1925:19, started [1] - 1879:17 systems [2] - 1879:9, 1943:20 1921:13, 1922:3, 1925:25, 1926:2, starting [2] - 1917:1, 1908:9 suggests [1] -1926:6 1934:15 1923:2, 1928:19 1911:13 Starting [1] step [3] - 1875:24, speaking [1] -Т Suite [2] - 1864:17, 1953:15 1935:14, 1971:2 1908:2 1864:21 table [2] - 1866:21, Special [9] state [11] - 1879:1, steps [3] - 1875:25, sum [3] - 1967:9, 1955:7 1880:25, 1886:6, 1939:14, 1971:4 1883:22, 1884:9, 1967:23, 1968:12 1888:22, 1903:9. 1911:5, 1918:19. tail [2] - 1959:19, Steve [1] - 1942:2 summarization [1] -1960:3 1934:15, 1936:17, 1932:21, 1933:11, still [6] - 1890:20, 1869:18 taker [1] - 1940:19 1936:19, 1936:20, 1935:19, 1945:17, 1902:4, 1906:15, summer [1] -1965:20 talks [6] - 1865:16, 1954:11, 1968:5 1907:13, 1911:10, 1935:13 1884:6, 1894:17, special [14] state-chartered [1] -1924:1 supervisor [1] -1928:2, 1953:9, 1884:13, 1885:11, 1886:6 stock [1] - 1892:10 1896:15 1956:20 1888:7, 1896:16, statement [22] stocked [1] supervisory [1] task [1] - 1935:17 1897:9, 1897:20, 1871:9. 1871:20. 1901:23 1874:20 tasked [2] - 1938:7, 1900:18, 1911:22, 1873:16. 1886:25. STOCKTON [3] support [11] -1938:10 1915:18, 1916:9, 1892:9, 1892:21, 1864:16, 1864:20, 1893:12, 1943:14, 1935:23, 1936:21, TAYLOR [1] -1907:23, 1907:24, 1864:24 1944:3, 1944:16, 1936:22, 1965:13 1912:22, 1936:3, 1864:23 **stop** [1] - 1896:22 1945:9, 1949:18, specific [4] -1939:5. 1952:10. telephone [1] store [2] - 1901:18, 1951:22, 1952:1, 1900:19, 1921:9, 1956:10, 1956:13, 1949:25 1901:20 1952:3, 1954:18, 1937:2, 1961:1 1957:15, 1962:13, tenure [2] - 1886:15, straighten [1] -1963:5 specifically [3] -1965:6, 1968:25, 1888:14 1899:17 supported [2] -1869:5, 1896:2, 1969:3, 1970:6 term [3] - 1872:2, strategic [1] -1872:11, 1944:1 Statement [1] -1944:6, 1968:3 1954:1 1934:22 supporting [3] -1869:2 specificity [1] terminology [1] strategy [1] - 1963:7 1943:4, 1943:13, 1941:7 statements [9] -1868:25 Street [5] - 1864:13, 1963:9 1865:21, 1865:25, terms [3] - 1886:22, speculation [2] -1864:17, 1864:20, supportive [2] -1956:8, 1956:15, 1912:3, 1922:25 1919:12, 1936:13 1864:24, 1864:4 1944:6, 1944:20 **spell** [3] - 1879:1, 1956:17, 1956:20, terribly [1] - 1935:8 string [1] - 1885:8 suppose [5] -1956:24, 1957:11, 1933:12, 1942:3 test [1] - 1952:21 struck [1] - 1917:20 1872:11, 1891:24, 1964:20 spend [1] - 1880:18 study [3] - 1951:18, 1923:7, 1927:25, testified [12] -**States** [3] - 1905:9, spent [1] - 1872:9 1951:21, 1964:14 1928:14 1867:3, 1867:6, 1927:20, 1927:21 spread [1] - 1968:17 1868:5, 1870:3, stuff [2] - 1896:3, supposed [6] states [3] - 1880:3, staff [13] - 1888:10, 1886:1, 1886:3, 1901:24 1884:15, 1885:17, 1952:2, 1965:10 1888:13, 1888:14, 1887:24, 1888:16, 1919:5, 1921:1, subject [4] -**STATES** [2] - 1864:1, 1936:11, 1936:22, 1918:25, 1922:8, 1907:17, 1918:1 1923:3, 1928:24, 1864:10 1929:20, 1940:5 1936:24, 1936:25, 1952:15, 1959:9 Supreme [2] -1937:14, 1937:19, stating [1] - 1872:22 testify [2] - 1885:24, submit [1] - 1932:25 1909:14, 1928:1 **Station** [1] - 1864:9 1938:10, 1939:9, submitted [1] surfaced [1] - 1955:7 1931:12 1942:2 statistical [4] surprise [1] - 1880:7 testifying [2] -1947:2 1922:4, 1922:5, stamped [2] -1868:21, 1940:7 suboffices [1] survey [1] - 1954:3 1949:19. 1951:2 testimony [30] -1941:1, 1941:6 suspect [1] -1868:17, 1870:14, stand [8] - 1865:4, status [3] - 1878:8, subparagraph [1] -1901:13

1873:21, 1875:14,	Therefore [3] -	1938:2, 1956:17,	1943:24	1910:1, 1910:2,
1875:24, 1876:16,	1890:4, 1894:2,	1957:7, 1970:12	<b>Trial</b> [1] - 1864:7	1910:3, 1910:5,
1876:18, 1876:23,	1901:8	tomorrow [3] -	tribal [3] - 1919:12,	1910:7, 1910:9,
1876:24, 1877:14,	therefore [4] -	1930:25, 1931:12,	1935:24, 1963:17	1910:14, 1910:18,
1878:3, 1878:11,	1900:25, 1901:1,	1971:6	tribe [4] - 1905:24,	1910:19, 1912:18,
1911:23, 1913:3,	1908:22, 1917:4	took [4] - 1899:5,	1909:8, 1909:11	1913:13, 1913:22,
1921:3, 1921:4,	therein [1] - 1939:12	1939:22, 1948:11,	<b>Tribes</b> [1] - 1905:7	1913:25, 1915:16,
1926:14, 1928:7,	thinking [2] - 1872:9,	1948:18	tribes [8] - 1905:10,	1915:25, 1917:21,
1931:17, 1931:19,	1964:5	top [5] - 1906:24,	1905:19, 1906:19,	1918:25, 1919:3,
1931:20, 1931:25,	thinks [1] - 1914:8	1948:9, 1953:2,	1925:3, 1925:4,	1919:4, 1919:5,
1932:4, 1932:7,	third [10] - 1890:20,	1953:11, 1960:14	1925:8, 1925:12,	1919:11, 1919:12,
1932:12, 1932:15,	1953:10, 1953:15,	topic [2] - 1950:10	1930:1	1919:13, 1919:14,
1932:19, 1932:22,	1953:22, 1953:25,	total [4] - 1966:15,	tried [1] - 1948:4	1919:15, 1919:18,
1932:25, 1933:3	1954:3, 1954:5,	1967:15, 1967:23,	trouble [1] - 1872:13	1919:21, 1920:1,
testimony's [1] -	1954:6, 1954:17	1968:12	true [9] - 1870:7,	1920:21, 1924:8,
1877:3	third-party [9] -	totally [1] - 1966:8	1870:12, 1870:13,	1925:21, 1926:5,
tests [1] - 1865:22	1953:10, 1953:15,	toward [2] - 1950:16,	1873:12, 1873:16,	1926:18, 1926:21,
<b>THE</b> [77] - 1864:1,	1953:22, 1953:25,	1958:9	1914:24, 1915:22,	1927:12, 1927:22,
1864:9, 1865:2,	1954:3, 1954:5,	towards [1] - 1969:6	1923:19, 1941:21	1928:6, 1929:12,
1866:8, 1866:12,	1954:6, 1954:17	traditional [2] -	trust [132] - 1868:23,	1929:20, 1929:22,
1866:25, 1871:12,	thirds [1] - 1962:17	1894:19, 1895:7	1879:9, 1879:21,	1929:24, 1930:7,
1871:15, 1871:17,	Thomas [2] -	training [2] - 1918:4,	1879:23, 1880:11,	1932:15, 1932:17,
1872:1, 1875:23,	1911:21, 1912:7	1918:6	1880:22, 1881:13,	1934:25, 1935:23,
1876:3, 1876:10,	thorough [1] -	TRANS [1] - 1949:10	1881:16, 1881:19,	1935:24
1876:13, 1876:19,	1945:18	transaction [8] -	1881:22, 1883:8,	<b>Trust</b> [13] - 1874:1,
1876:24, 1877:3,	thoughts [1] -	1893:13, 1926:11,	1883:9, 1883:10,	1884:15, 1885:4,
1877:17, 1877:21,	1944:10	1926:15, 1949:17,	1883:12, 1883:16,	1885:12, 1885:22,
1878:1, 1878:15,	thousand [4] -	1949:19, 1958:16,	1883:18, 1883:25,	1888:25, 1934:10,
1878:19, 1878:21,	1915:3, 1915:7,	1964:4	1884:10, 1884:18,	1935:11, 1936:2,
1879:3, 1879:12,	1915:9, 1915:10	transaction-by-	1886:9, 1886:16,	1938:8, 1938:20,
1879:13, 1883:1,	thousands [3] -	transaction [1] -	1887:1, 1887:5,	1944:19, 1964:3
1883:5, 1883:20,	1919:17, 1919:18,	1949:17	1887:7, 1887:12,	<b>Trustee</b> [9] - 1883:22, 1884:9,
1883:23, 1883:24, 1886:13, 1891:2,	1919:20	transactions [17] -	1887:13, 1887:15,	1888:22, 1903:10,
1891:4, 1891:14,	threat [2] - 1882:2,	1869:19, 1891:20,	1888:5, 1888:23,	1934:15, 1936:17,
1891:17, 1891:18,	1882:3	1891:22, 1899:5,	1889:10, 1889:17,	1934:19, 1936:17,
1891:19, 1895:2,	threaten [1] -	1899:18, 1899:24,	1889:19, 1889:23,	1965:20
1895:4, 1897:24,	1881:21	1904:6, 1904:10,	1890:3, 1891:15, 1892:2, 1892:3,	trustee [60] -
1899:16, 1900:2,	three [3] - 1883:11,	1904:12, 1904:17,	1892:12, 1892:15,	1884:14, 1888:7,
1912:4, 1912:6,	1930:23, 1931:8	1906:13, 1906:18,	1893:5, 1893:15,	1889:20, 1890:5,
1912:7, 1912:11,	Three [1] - 1898:21	1949:10, 1949:14,	1893:22, 1894:7,	1890:6, 1891:20,
1912:25, 1913:4,	throughput [1] -	1954:5, 1954:7,	1894:14, 1894:19,	1892:6, 1892:14,
1914:8, 1921:11,	1955:8	1956:18	1895:7, 1895:8,	1893:21, 1894:6,
1921:18, 1921:21,	Throughput [1] -	transcript [3] -	1895:12, 1895:14,	1894:7, 1896:16,
1921:25, 1923:1,	1955:8	1864:25, 1875:13, 1973:4	1895:20, 1895:21,	1897:9, 1897:20,
1928:21, 1929:9,	tie [1] - 1963:18	TRANSCRIPT [1] -	1895:22, 1899:10,	1900:25, 1901:3,
1930:15, 1931:9,	Tim [1] - 1866:21 timber [1] - 1867:24	1864:8	1899:13, 1900:8,	1901:12, 1902:2,
1932:5, 1932:24,	timber [1] - 1867:24 timing [2] - 1963:13,	transcription [1] -	1900:14, 1900:17,	1902:13, 1902:19,
1933:2, 1933:13,	1971:2	1864:25	1900:21, 1900:25,	1903:16, 1903:17,
1933:16, 1934:1,	tired [1] - 1952:23	transcriptions [1] -	1901:1, 1901:2,	1903:18, 1903:19,
1934:2, 1944:24,	title [3] - 1882:17,	1940:8	1901:6, 1901:7,	1905:4, 1905:19,
1945:1, 1945:13,	1887:21, 1888:24	trapped [1] - 1897:21	1901:14, 1902:1,	1905:20, 1906:4,
1945:14, 1945:22,	today [6] - 1876:7,	traveling [1] - 1931:6	1902:18, 1902:21,	1906:9, 1906:11,
1950:3, 1969:25,	1927:12, 1931:6,	treat [1] - 1963:9	1902:23, 1903:14,	1906:15, 1907:14,
1970:1, 1970:22,	1934:7, 1945:17,	treated [2] - 1931:24,	1903:24, 1904:22,	1908:2, 1910:4,
1970:24, 1971:2	1968:21	1949:19	1905:5, 1905:9,	1910:12, 1910:19,
theory [2] - 1881:18,	together [10] -	treating [1] - 1933:24	1905:25, 1906:2,	1911:22, 1912:20,
1927:24	1884:20, 1888:1,	treatises [1] -	1906:4, 1906:6,	1914:19, 1914:22,
thereafter [1] -	1888:9, 1888:17,	1895:14	1906:7, 1906:8,	1915:18, 1916:9,
1882:18	1897:19, 1918:5,	trial [2] - 1879:11,	1906:11, 1906:17,	1920:11, 1920:12,
	,,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1920:16, 1920:22,

1924:24, 1925:19, 1926:5, 1926:7, 1926:11, 1926:16, 1927:2, 1927:3, 1927:5, 1929:4, 1929:6, 1936:22 trustee's [3] -1885:11, 1900:20, 1914:23 trustees [5] -1892:25, 1893:1, 1895:23, 1900:19, 1927:3 trusts [14] - 1879:8, 1879:9, 1881:2, 1883:18, 1884:13, 1885:19, 1896:20, 1901:10, 1913:25, 1914:19, 1919:17, 1919:20, 1927:10 try [4] - 1871:14, 1954:18, 1966:18, 1970:4 trying [5] - 1903:9, 1916:18, 1943:25, 1944:2, 1950:6 turn [20] - 1882:4, 1882:9, 1884:5, 1887:17, 1889:3, 1889:12, 1890:19, 1893:24, 1893:25, 1894:17, 1896:9, 1898:21, 1898:25, 1900:5, 1900:11, 1902:7, 1904:3, 1906:21, 1911:16, 1912:14 turned [1] - 1897:10 Turning [2] -1908:25, 1925:3 twice [1] - 1890:15 **Two** [1] - 1910:24 two [13] - 1866:20, 1876:1, 1880:16, 1894:17, 1900:12, 1921:21, 1935:12, 1937:23, 1943:13, 1949:8, 1954:8, 1954:16, 1962:17 two-thirds [1] -1962:17 type [5] - 1893:16, 1903:3, 1920:19, 1948:14, 1966:22 typed [7] - 1940:7, 1940:9, 1940:11, 1940:13, 1948:10, 1948:13, 1948:16 typical [1] - 1937:17 **Typically** [1] - 1870:9

## U

**U.S** [4] - 1864:4, 1864:7, 1864:12, 1925:11 ultimate [1] -1922:19 ultimately 151 -1938:13, 1949:16, 1954:4, 1958:20, 1958:25 uncommon [2] -1887:6, 1901:13 unconstitutionally [1] - 1909:14 under [12] - 1869:20, 1895:16, 1896:13, 1914:2, 1914:13, 1920:15, 1920:19, 1921:2, 1925:1, 1952:4, 1954:4, 1959:12 underlying [4] -1867:4, 1867:7, 1892:2, 1951:7 Understood [1] -1875:17 understood [3] -1896:19, 1896:24, 1932:11 undertake [1] -1965:1 undertaken [7] -1900:8, 1943:21, 1945:18, 1950:21, 1951:22, 1952:4, 1964:14 undertook [3] -1935:17, 1938:4, 1954:3 unitary [1] - 1919:21 **UNITED** [2] - 1864:1, 1864:10 United [3] - 1905:9, 1927:20, 1927:21 unjustified [1] -1912:16 **Unless** [1] - 1971:5 unreliable [8] -1867:12, 1867:15, 1867:18, 1867:20, 1867:22, 1867:25, 1868:3, 1870:4 unsupported [2] -1949:9, 1949:14 up [30] - 1877:16, 1877:19, 1878:17, 1884:2, 1893:3, 1894:22, 1898:12,

1901:16, 1902:1,

# V Vague [1] - 1945:21

valuable [4] -1887:7, 1890:5, 1890:16, 1910:7 value [1] - 1890:17 varied [1] - 1937:20 varies [1] - 1936:6 variety [3] - 1937:8, 1956:21, 1964:13 various [8] -1865:18, 1873:20, 1879:24, 1885:17, 1897:7, 1937:12, 1938:12, 1969:13 vary [1] - 1967:25 Vaughn [4] -1931:14, 1931:15, 1931:22, 1931:25 Vaughn's [1] -1931:19 vault [1] - 1880:11 **vaults** [1] - 1880:18 vein [1] - 1878:12 verb [1] - 1871:12 verbally [1] -1897:19 verbiage [1] -1895:20 verification [4] -1892:16, 1892:20, 1892:23, 1893:1 Verification [1] -1892:18 verified [1] - 1957:16 **verify** [5] - 1922:17, 1954:9, 1954:11, 1956:11. 1957:23 versus [2] - 1949:9, 1949:13 vice [1] - 1901:19 Vicki [1] - 1937:5 view [6] - 1878:9,

1904:19, 1905:13, 1906:20, 1928:10, 1937:18 violations [3] -1881:8, 1882:2 Virginia [1] - 1880:2 vu [1] - 1913:9

### W

walks [1] - 1890:7

wants [2] - 1907:6,

1920:16 warns [1] - 1963:7 WARSHAWSKY [1] -1864:2 Washington [12] -1864:4. 1864:14. 1864:21, 1864:5, 1864:10, 1864:13, 1879:25, 1915:14, 1915:15, 1931:6, 1936:22 **WAYNE** [2] - 1973:3, 1973:6 Wayne [1] - 1864:11 ways [1] - 1937:17 Wednesday [1] -1864:5 Wells [1] - 1937:4 West [2] - 1864:24, 1931:5 Whereas [1] -1955:11 whole [7] - 1883:18, 1895:12, 1895:18, 1914:17, 1919:25, 1926:22, 1933:1 wide [1] - 1884:18 wider [1] - 1906:11 Willett [1] - 1930:25 WILLIAM [1] -1864:16 Winston [1] -1864:25 Winston-Salem [1] -1864:25 wished [1] - 1897:5 withdrawn [1] -1926:4 witness [22] -1865:4, 1866:22, 1871:12, 1872:3, 1875:25, 1876:2, 1878:22, 1878:24, 1879:6, 1879:11, 1897:25, 1898:10, 1899:17, 1912:9, 1913:2. 1914:7. 1922:25, 1931:24,

1933:7, 1933:10, 1971:4 Witness [4] - 1894:3, 1953:17, 1962:23, 1963:1 WITNESS [16] -1879:3, 1879:13, 1883:5. 1883:23. 1891:17, 1891:19, 1895:4, 1912:6, 1921:21, 1933:16, 1934:2, 1945:1, 1945:14, 1950:3, 1970:1, 1972:2 witness's [1] -1895:3 witnesses [5] -1930:24, 1931:2, 1931:4, 1931:8, 1931:10 wonder [1] - 1884:2 word [2] - 1870:22, 1905:17 words [8] - 1868:22, 1868:23, 1870:19, 1920:21, 1921:11, 1944:4, 1951:12, 1965:8 works [3] - 1903:7, 1933:19, 1937:17 world [1] - 1906:11 worry [1] - 1895:2 write [1] - 1885:6 written [7] - 1881:3, 1884:16. 1885:19. 1892:9, 1922:7, 1933:3, 1969:5 wrote [4] - 1896:15, 1904:16, 1931:18, 1962:14

### Υ

year [6] - 1879:22, 1888:15, 1909:4, 1916:4, 1917:7 yearly [1] - 1929:7 years [4] - 1885:5, 1885:14, 1917:6, 1921:21 yesterday [1] -1876:7 Yesterday [1] -1876:4 yields [2] - 1959:13, 1967:12 Youpee [5] - 1909:1, 1909:5, 1909:6, 1909:13, 1909:18 Yourself [1] - 1953:6 **yourself** [2] - 1889:14, 1894:2

**Z-I-P-P-I-N** [1] -

# Ζ

1933:16
 **Zippin** [11] 1930:24, 1933:9,
1933:16, 1933:18,
1934:5, 1943:25,
1962:24, 1963:20,
1970:18, 1971:3,
1972:6
 **ZIPPIN** [1] - 1934:2