

Arthur Andersen, but what you found there at the department?

> A. In terms of internal control --
> Q. Yes, sir.
> A. -- weaknesses?
Q. Now, if we'll look -- and I think we looked at the next page
here in this report yesterday. It's a continued list of specific items. And if we'll go to the end of that list on the next page, so that we're now at page 10 of this report, it's page 12 of the exhibit. And would you focus on the paragraph just below paragraph $P$, toward the top of the page?

And it states, "As a result of the material weaknesses
and internal controls referred to above, it is not possible to
determine whether certain financial elements reflected in the
accompanying financial statements are fairly stated and presented."

You indicated yesterday that this was a qualified
audit.
A. Yes. that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

8 Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an recall that?

11 A. Yes, an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management.
Q. So now you just said an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the
Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits,

21 we're actually looking at an audit of the Office of Trust Fund
22 Management as opposed to BIA?
23 A. Yes. And the Griffin audit, which was the first audit
24 performed, was done because it was required by the 1994 Reform
25 Act. As a result of the 1994 Reform Act, the Office of Trust
Q. Is this a confirmation or an indication that it is?
A. Yes, it is, in accounting terms.
Q. Now, Arthur Andersen audited, you said, I think for
four years. And this is the first, as we saw yesterday, as you
came in -- and then there was a break in terms of audits. Is audit done, I think you said by Griffin \& Company. Do you Management. The audits we just looked at of Arthur Andersen were audits of what?
A. They were audits, as I testified yesterday, of the Bureau of Office of Trust Fund Management.

Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau.

Fund Management was required to keep its books in accordance with GAAP, and it was required to have an independent outside audit in accordance with GAS.

And so I received the first audit in my capacity as the manager of the Office of Trust Fund Management.
Q. Good. Let's look at that. It's in the administrative
record as Bates document 66-5. And we'll start looking at page two.

So we're looking at administrative record, Bates page number 66-5-2, and is this the audit that you were just referring to from Griffin in December of 1996 for the Statement of Assets and Trust Fund Balances at September 30, 1995 for the Office of Trust Funds Management?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, let's look over, it would be Bates page four, we'll
skip the table of contents. And if you would bring the top of
this document up so we're at 66-5-4. And this is a December 13, 1996 document from the Office of the Inspector General, and it's to the special trustee. At this time, was that you?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were the one that received this report. Why is it coming from the Office of the Inspector General?
A. The Office of the Inspector General conducts separate investigations and et cetera for any audit deficiencies identified that may involve fraud or some other defect in the

## account reconciliation and verification process.

Q. Okay. And so the audit actually comes to the Office of Inspector General, and then they forward it on to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So this is then the cover memo where the Office of Inspector General gives you an overview of what the report says that's attached?
A. That is correct.
Q. Let's look at that, then. The first paragraph, just to confirm that they are forwarding to you the Griffin \& Associates audit. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at the last paragraph on this page, and that confirms again what you indicated earlier about this is the first audit since 1990. Is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So this now is where Arthur Andersen left off in 1990, and Griffin picks up in '95, though we're really talking about BIA was being audited by Andersen, and OTFM is being audited by Griffin?
A. Right.
Q. Now let's look at the next page. So we're at 66-5-5. And
look at the small paragraph in the middle of the page that
begins, "The independent public accountant's report on the
internal control structure contained 16 recommendations to
address four material weaknesses, six reportable conditions, and six advisory comments as follows." And then they go on to summarize those.

Let's look at those briefly, at the first one. But you notice they're talking about 16 recommendations, and various weaknesses and conditions and comments. And I think we saw from the Arthur Andersen audit that there were 16 individual items that they addressed.

We're now looking at the paragraph that starts, "The
four material internal control weaknesses." Would you take a moment and review that to yourself, please, sir?

## A. (Witness complies.) Yes.

Q. And you were the one that was receiving this document. What did you as special trustee at this time understand you were being told by the independent auditor, Griffin, with respect to the Office of Trust Fund Management and the ability to manage those Trust funds?
A. I found the conditions there, by my own due diligence, to be equivalent to the general opinions of Griffin. And they
20 discussed with me and my staff prior to the issuance of the audit, to give us an opportunity to respond to the audit deficiencies, and essentially I agreed that the staffing was inadequate, the financial resources attributed to the Office of Trust Fund Management was inadequate, and essentially the Trust accounting system had defects dating over decades that made the

1 accounting systems unreliable.
2 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just
3 say -- I would call it decades, and you said it was decades?
4 A. Well, decades.
Q. But we're talking about the same thing?

6 A. I guess.
7 Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan
A. Yes.

13 Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting
A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a

16 strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the
17 Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? together? were identified in prior audits and the like.
Q. Okay. Now, if we'll look at the next paragraph of the IG summary of the Griffin report, it talks about the six nonmaterial reportable conditions. And then on the next page, the paragraph dealing with the internal control comments.

MR. DORRIS: The top part of that, please. And then
the next.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Then is this then the Office of Inspector General's summary of the audit report that is attached to it?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, at this point in time, then, did Griffin continue to do audits such as this each year while you were still special trustee?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And were the results of that audit -- how did that compare to what we see here?
A. As I recall, they were qualified during those years, which would have been '96, '97, and '98, for the same reasons that are set forth in this report.
Q. And then at some point after you left, KPMG became the auditor for the Office of Trust Fund Management. And have you reviewed the most recent audit from KPMG?
A. I reviewed all of the audits that were publicly available, but paid particular attention to the most recent one, 2006.
Q. Let's look at that. It is in the administrative record as document 60-2. And if we'll look at the first page of it. So it's administrative record Bates page 60-2-1.

And this is then the audit for fiscal year 2006/2005.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we will look at Bates page two of this document. And at the top, this then is a similar cover memo from the Office of

Inspector General to the special trustee for American Indians, dated December 14, 2006. Of course, you weren't -- you were not the one that received this memo, but you have reviewed it?
A. Yes.
Q. Now let's look down toward the bottom of that page at the results of the independent audit. And let me let you look at that for a second.
A. Yes.
Q. Looking, after the first paragraph, at the next paragraph at the bottom of the page, it indicates, "In addition, inadequacies in certain Department of Interior Trust-related systems and processes made it impracticable to extend auditing procedures sufficiently to satisfy auditors as," and then we go over to the next, "the fairness of Trust fund balances. KPMG identified one reportable condition related to internal controls over financial reporting: Reliance on processing of Trust transactions at the Bureau of Indian Affairs and unresolved financial reporting matters from prior periods."

Can you explain for us, where it's talking about the processing of Trust transactions at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, how that happens inside the Department of Interior with respect to the Office of Trust Fund Management and then the BIA?

MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. Foundation. I don't believe this witness established knowledge of current operations.

THE COURT: Let's see if the witness can answer the question.
A. What I believe that means is the same that it meant in 1996, 7, 8, and 9; and that is that up until 1999, at least, to my knowledge and as stated in the audit reports that I reviewed, the bureau had no accounts receivable system.

THE WITNESS: The bureau, Your Honor, manages the assets. It lists the assets; it contracts for the lease of those assets, or invests those assets; it collects payments from those lease revenues and oil and gas revenues or timber contracts and land contracts; and then it passes that through to the Office of Trust Fund Management.
A. I installed a new system there called TFAS, Trust Fund Asset Management -- or Accounting System, that was a commercial grade while I was there. So while I was there, we were able to account for every nickel that came in from the bureau; some -most of it passes through to account holders, but in connection with minor accounts or per capita accounts, in some instances it is invested by that TFAS system, which is operated by an outside servicer, and has passed all of the audits when I was there and up to the present, to my knowledge.

What isn't audited and what can't be audited is the bureau's part of this. Up until 1999, at least - and according to these reports, it still does not have an adequate accounts receivable system which is able to trace a payment back to a
lease - in some cases, it does not have copies of past leases.
And without that kind of a system, you are unable to tell whether the lessee is paying the correct contract amount. He may be making a partial payment, he may be past due on payments, and there's no way to verify that from an audit standpoint. Therefore, you can't certify the beginning balance in any of these accounts.

When these accounts were passed from the bureau to the Office of Trust Fund Management in the 1999, like any private trustee, the Office of Trust Fund Management -- or the trustee is compelled to certify the ownership information, the asset information, the valuations of those assets, and a cash balance, if any, and then account for the receipts and disbursements coming through.

They can do that now in the Office of Trust Fund Management. But to my knowledge, they were not doing that in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, at least through 1999. BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Now let's look over at the part of the audit report itself, and I'm going to direct us to a page, Bates page 60-2-34. That is a portion of the audit report that was attached to the memo we were just looking at that is in the AR.

And if we'll focus up at the top there at that first heading, where it talks about -- this is then where the auditors in their own words describe this reportable condition that
they've observed. And the heading is "Reliance on Processing of Trust Transactions At the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Unresolved Financial Reporting Matters From the Prior Periods." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And let me ask this question as we get ready to go through some of the items here: Are most of the items that we saw from Arthur Andersen's report in the late 1980's, and Griffin's reports starting in the mid 1990's, is that much the same problems that are being addressed here by KPMG?
A. Substantially the same.
Q. All right. Now, let's look at the second paragraph under the condition here. And it's talking about the "financial information systems and internal control procedures," and talking about "suffered historically from a variety of system and procedural internal control weaknesses.'

Is that what you were talking about from your own due
diligence of having looked at these problems going back decades?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look at some of the specific items starting at the next paragraph. Let me give you a moment to look at that. It's the paragraph, for the record, that begins, "The regional and agency offices."
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. And this is then where the auditor is getting ready to start
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listing problems. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, before we look at that, it talks about the regional and
agency offices of BIA. From when you were special trustee, did you gain some familiarity with differences as to how the various regions and offices would handle the accounting or the management of the Trust funds?
A. Yes. Originally, when $I$ joined the office as special trustee, I did not have management responsibility over the Office of Trust Fund Management. The Secretary asked me to undertake that because of certain managerial difficulties in the BIA.

So about one year after I joined, and I believe it was sometime in 1996, he asked me to take over as the manager of OTFM. So I then had direct responsibility for that aspect of the accounting system.

What this is referring to are the regional agency offices, which are separated out from the Office of Trust Fund Management. The Office of Trust Fund Management is essentially like a branch office of a bank, and it collects the monies coming from the bureau, and then distributes it or invests it according to the Trust corpus, or the Trust instructions.
Q. Now, did you find that there were differences between
various agencies and regional offices as to how they handled their books from agency to agency?

## here, the electronic records.

Q. Mr. Homan, let's look at some of the items that the auditor talks about here. Because we want to see if this audit, as of December of 2006, reflects some of the same problems that you saw when you were there as special trustee.

Let's look at item A, "Trust systems."
MR. DORRIS: And can we just pull that whole paragraph
up? Oh, thank you.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. And it says -- the first sentence in this paragraph is, "BIA
had not consistently implemented automated systems for tracking and processing activities of the Indian Trust assets." It goes on down, indicating "BIA has developed an automated system for certain activities, and completed the first phase of the roll-out in September of 2006."

And then it's talking about something coming up in
September 2007, and it concludes, "This situation increases the risk that transactions are recorded inaccurately and untimely."

At the time that you left in 1999, had BIA implemented a system-wide automated system for all of the agency offices that was being uniformly run by them?
A. No.
Q. And at least from what you can tell from this description, had they accomplished it, at least as of the time of this report in December 2006?

## A. It certainly doesn't look like it.

Q. Now let's look at the next paragraph, B. And we're still on Bates page 60-2-34, talking about accounts receivable. And would you take a moment and review that?
A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
Q. You've already talked a little bit about accounts receivable and having accounts receivable programmed. Was there an accounts receivable program in place when you became special trustee at BIA?
A. No. No, there was not. And that is one of the audit exceptions that was mentioned in the Griffin audit report: No accounts receivable system.

THE WITNESS: Also in connection with my due diligence, Your Honor, in connection with my strategic plan, I was given the opportunity to have -- to employ an outside contractor to look at the integrated -- or IRMS system, as well as the accounts receivable system. I personally made 22 -- over 20 trips to the reservations and the various regional offices, and personally inspected their recordkeeping processes and their accounts receivable systems.

Almost to a person -- one of the outside contractors described their information systems of the 12 area offices as 12 islands of information without a ferry in between. He was an Englishman.

The Englishman also came back -- when I came into the
THE WITNESS: May I respond to that?

Office of Trust Fund Management, there was one computer in 110 offices. We established, and the bureau gave out, some state-of-the-art computers at the time. And the outside contractor said they can't account for them, that a lot of them have taken a walk.
A. At any rate, that tells you the state of the accounts
receivable system as $I$ found it in 1997. This -- apparently it's been improved, but it's still having difficulties. BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Thank you. Let's look at the next that deals with probate backlog. We've not talked about that before here, either yesterday or today as you've talked. And I would ask you to read that to yourself, paragraph C, "probate backlog."
A. (Witness complies.) I understand it, yes.
Q. Okay. Now let me -- I'm not asking about this audit report now. I'm asking about while you were special trustee.
A. I understand that.
Q. What did you find to be the situation with probate and probate backlog when you were special trustee?

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I'm going to object to this question and line of questions regarding probate. There's no disclosure in this expert's expert report, a remark about opinion concerning probate, or any indication of testimony concerning probate in their disclosure.

THE COURT: No, but I'll hear your answer to the
question.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. I think that's an indication for you to go ahead and answer the question.
A. All right.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, my due diligence and the actual probate backlog is contained in my strategic plan, which was an exhibit in my last testimony. So in that testimony is a list of the so-called audit and other exceptions we found in connection with my due diligence look at the Office of Trust Fund Management.
A. As I recall, at that time there were over 6,000 cases backlogged in the probate system, and in some cases those cases were over four years old.

In my subsequent look at the information that was provided in 2003 --

THE COURT: You think four years is old for a case?
THE WITNESS: Yes. On average, in some cases.
A. Now, that was to be resolved in the I-level implementation plan under the Secretary's watch. He made that comment. His watch ended at the end of the year 2000 when the administration changes.

Now I see that they still have a backlog, and they're going to be resolving these issues by September 2009. So
nine years have passed.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. But tie, very briefly if you can, how a probate backlog
affects the distribution of Trust income.
A. Normally in a bank or private sector, trustee circumstances when somebody dies and the account balances and assets go into probate, the trustee is not allowed to disburse funds except under a court order, and usually on the request of a guardian. If it's four years old, they will usually hold it in suspense until the court orders a distribution. left, of the regional offices, who act as surrogate guidelines for minors in particularly (sic), to distribute funds based on need, without sufficient documentation. And when the probate is finally finished, there's no reconciliation going back to see that those disbursements essentially were to the right heir.

So the balances that are set forth from the closing of
one bank to the heir of those assets cannot be certified by the trustee, and that's one of the continuing problems that the bureau has had in the 20 th century.
Q. Let's look over --
A. I'm not prepared to say what's happening in the 21st century.
Q. Let's look over at Bates page 35. At the top of the page it talks about "Supervised and restricted accounts." And let you
look at that for a moment.
A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
Q. And this is addressing BIA not consistently performing reviews over active supervised accounts, or maintaining documentation regarding them. Was that a problem when you were special trustee?
A. That was essentially the issue $I$ just identified, where the superintendents often made disbursement and receipt decisions for the trustee, particularly minors, that were not sufficiently documented.
Q. Let's look at the next paragraph, where the accountant
concludes that "The presence of these internal control
weaknesses directly impacts OST's ability to process Trust
transactions on behalf of Trust beneficiaries, and to provide accurate information to account holders, due to the interrelationship between BIA and OST.

And as of this report of December 1996 -- excuse me, 2006, is this the same state that you found when you were special trustee in the late 1990's?
A. Yes. And for all the reasons I have suggested, I was confident when I left the Office of the Special Trustee that the Office of Trust Fund Management could account for every nickel coming in. But I didn't know whether those nickels should have been dollars or dimes or zero.

And I was confident that we were investing those at
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interest up to a commercial grade, but we weren't to disburse it because of the condition of the ownership records and the probate backlog. We were never sure we were disbursing it to the right trustee beneficiary.
Q. Let's look at the next paragraph here in the audit report. And it talks about, that there's "several significant financial reporting differences from prior periods not being resolved." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it begins to list some of these prior differences.

Let's look at the next one under this that deals with lack of reliable IIM balance.

And this is something that you referred to previously in your testimony, where there were items that were out of balance?
A. Yes. In my due diligence, as also listed in my special -or the strategic plan of 1997, we had general ledger differences dating to the time when the U.S. Treasury passed all of the accounting on to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Before 1971, they kept duplicate accounts, so you could have a check and balance between the U.S. Treasury account and the bureau's accounting systems. In 1971, the government made the decision to vest all of that into the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

When those transfers were made, there were general
question. This is actually talking about where the TFAS system itself, between the control ledger balance and the subsidiary ledgers, TFAS itself does not balance.
A. That's correct. And a good part of that, as I recall, is due to the fact that certain interest payments of the old system, the Omni system as it were, were out of balance when it was transferred to the modern system that I installed, trust fund management.

So none of those -- there have been general ledger
differences each year that have not been reconciled. I'm not
familiar with these particular numbers, but I know that that was generally the case when we made that transfer to the new system.
Q. I'm not sure that we've heard during this trial about the

Omni system that you just referred to. Let me just ask this question: Was that another computerized system that was a predecessor to the TFAS system?
A. It was. And there were differences, as I just outlined, between the new system and the old system that could not be reconciled.

When I looked at -- the Omni system wasn't all that old. It was deficient in several material respects, which were identified by the auditors at the time, and it too had differences with the system it replaced. So -- none of which were ever reconciled.

So each time the bureau changed its accounting system,
it didn't bother to go back and reconcile all of the general
ledger differences. And so, you know, as a government, these
are pretty much debits to the general account, but they would be an insolvent situation if it were a private sector trust company.

But those monies again belong to somebody; nobody knows
who. And chances are, you know, an American Indian got benefit; but whether the right beneficiary got benefit is unknown.
Q. Let's look at the top of the next page, so it's Bates page

60-2-36. And this is one of the differences from the prior year that's noted by KPMG in this audit, dealing with Special Deposit Accounts, Tribal and IIM.

My questions to you will only be asking about the IIM
Special Deposit Accounts. Okay?
A. Right.
Q. Now, let me give you a moment to review that.
A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
Q. Mr. Homan, you see there the last sentence in that paragraph, it says, "At September 30, 2006, a significant number of Special Deposit Accounts continued to require resolution."

Was this also a problem during the time that you were special trustee?
A. Yes. Historically, and contrary to modern trust accounting, some of the Tribal funds and Special Deposit Accounts that had nothing to do with the individual Indian accounts were mixed
into the same general fund, and have never been able to sort out.

I noted it in some of the throughput studies. The
department had to make certain assumptions, like special
deposits were 15 percent because of some -- maybe one year's look at that. But that has never been reconciled, either.

So some of the interest on those type of funds that might have belonged to an IIM account, you know, can't be reconciled. Somebody got benefit - again, maybe the tribe, maybe an Indian - but not necessarily the right trust beneficiary.

I'm sure that the Special Deposit Accounts I saw out there, we made an attempt to purge them from the new trust fund accounting system, but they still exist in other aspects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' accounting systems, apparently.
Q. Do the -- the money in the Special Deposit Accounts reflect
collections into the system that have not been yet posted to
individuals' accounts. Is that correct?
A. In some respects. Sometimes they're just placed in there and used as what I call, and what our strategic due diligence call, cookie jars for inappropriate expenses by the various superintendents. I think that was well documented last time.
Q. Now, one of the -- we've looked at the audits from the
independent auditors that you talked about yesterday: Arthur
Andersen, Griffin, and KPMG. Yesterday you also indicated that

17 Q. When you talk about, "would yield inconclusive results,"
when you were special trustee, you also received a report from
Arthur Andersen dealing with the Tribal Reconciliation Project.
Do you recall that?
audits.
Q. Now, with respect to the Arthur Andersen report on the

Tribal Trust, what did that tell you or what did you learn
regarding the IIM Trust as a result of that process with Arthur
Andersen?
A. I looked into the history. And originally, the department had intended that the IIM accounts be audited under the same -by the same Arthur Andersen, according to GAAP, for the same period of time.

Arthur Andersen, early in that process, advised the department that it would cost at least 10 times the 20 million-odd in funds spent for the audit to do the IIM accounts, and would yield inconclusive results for the reasons I just mentioned. So the department decided not to do that -Q. Okay.
A. -- for the IIM accounts.
what do you mean?
A. Well, let me give you just one example of the results of this audit that was done by Arthur Andersen, that had disclaimers 110 times in the first few pages. Even with the limited audit they were able to do, they were not able to look at any lease contract because of the lack of an accounts receivable system.

They had originally started to look at some regional
timber contracts, and oil and gas leases dating back to 1972, most of which had been destroyed. Not were missing, but were destroyed, and the like.

So general results, as I remember, is that they came up with $\mathbf{\$ 7 . 1}$ billion of general ledger entries that were not supported with sufficient documentation. \$2.4 billion had no documentation supporting the check or deposit receipt, supporting the general ledger entries. That's astounding. Q. The amounts that you just stated --

THE COURT: Mr. Dorris, I'm going to ask you to stop
for a minute. My computer has crashed here. I need to reboot
it. We're all living in a new age.
(OFF THE RECORD.)
THE COURT: All right, Mr. Dorris. Thank you.
MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Mr. Homan, the amounts that you just mentioned of the 7.1 billion and I think it was 2.4 billion, those were dealing with the Tribal Trust funds. Correct?
A. Yes, they were, with one exception. Some of the Osage per capita accounts were included. And the Osage, as I recall, because I had to present it to their Tribal Council, had over $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ million of that $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ million (sic) unsupported.
Q. But you were using that as an example as to -- when I asked you what it meant that there would be inconclusive results, that
was an example of how the Tribal Trust --
A. That's right. What can you say? I had to say to that

Tribal Council, "We can't account for $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ million of the
disbursements out of your account for your per capita people, because we have no check or no other proof of disbursement. So we don't know whether it went to the right beneficiary or not.

And that can never be reconciled. There's been no look back, in any of these plans, to account for those types of historical discrepancies. The department wishes to just go forward from the time in 1994, but how can you not go back and verify and reconcile these astounding accounting deficiencies? Q. Now, you also talked yesterday about a file check. And you said it wasn't an audit, but it was a process that you had ordered to be undertaken
A. Yeah.
Q. First of all, would you briefly describe what the process was that you implemented, and then we'll talk about the results.

What was the process for the file check?
A. Yes. As part of my due diligence for the strategic plan, and in parallel with the Griffin audit, I did my own examination of the audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management. I secured funds, and ordered a file check of the six-odd legal requirements for each OTFM fund.

The process was that we pulled in each file from the regions by Fed Ex. We ran them through an assembly line
consisting of outside lawyers, paralegals, accountants, to check each file to determine that it had the right information in it.

And there were astounding results, again.
Q. Okay. Now, can you give us a highlight of the -- what you said were astounding results, some insights into what you found --

THE COURT: When did you do this?
THE WITNESS: I did this in 1997, as part of my strategic plan. Actually, it started in 1996, Your Honor. BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Can you give us an overview of some of the results that you found?
A. Yes. I don't want to get into a lot of the details.

They're again laid out in a chart in my strategic plan that was introduced in Court.

But the highlights are following: It's the $\mathbf{7 0}$ million in general ledger deficiencies that I outlined earlier; we found over 70,000 Whereabouts Unknown accounts, with balances of $\$ 49$ million, as $I$ recall; we found 183,000 of the 790,000 open and closed accounts that had no tax ID or Social Security number, as required by the tax codes and the Bank Secrecy Act at the time.

THE WITNESS: The bureau, Your Honor, is required, like every other trustee, to file a 1099 of income information on its beneficiaries. These are all American citizens, they pay taxes
like everybody else. And there was 183,000 that had no identity to it, attached to it. That's roughly 20 percent of the 790,000 we looked at.

There's no going back on a Whereabouts Unknown. We tried to reconcile that as best we could, but most of them predated 199 -- excuse me, predated 1994.

MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would just note for the Court that a summary of the file check is on page 28 of

Plaintiffs' Exhibit 575 that is Mr. Homan's report. BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. And we won't go further but to ask you this question on that: As a person with your experience at the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and then as you were actually running financial institutions, including trust departments, what did this file check tell you about the Department of Interior as a trustee for the IIM funds?
A. That, coupled with the audits that we just went through, told me as a bank regulator, I can look you in the eye and tell you it was the worst case I've ever seen in my 40 years' experience in the banking industry. And as a bank regulator, in terms of lax accounting controls, lax internal controls, lax accounting and asset management controls and systems, and insufficient management and financial resources that occurred over decades -- I don't know how you pronounce it; you say, "tomàto," I say, "tomãto" -- over decades.

THE WITNESS: These, Your Honor, can't be reconciled,
because they are an accumulated burden that took place over
almost every year in the 20th century
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Now, you've talked about much of what you did as special
trustee, your due diligence and documents that you've also reviewed, that brings some of that information current.

Would you tell the Court what your opinion is as to whether these IIM accounts, an accounting that is conclusive with respect to IIM accounts, can be rendered?

MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. I don't see that in his disclosure, expert disclosure. And there's no foundation established of this witness' current knowledge.

THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be asked and answered. He just said that: They can't be reconciled, they're an accumulated burden that took place over almost every year in the 20th century.

MR. QUINN: I understood his testimony to be related to the time he was in office, 1996, 1997.

THE COURT: Well, it's the impossibility question.
Everybody in this case has an opinion on that subject. I'll
allow this witness to give his.
THE WITNESS: I think I just summed it up, Your Honor
THE COURT: They were your words, Mr. Homan.
THE WITNESS: And I can back them up.

## A. But generally, I don't believe that a -- what is required

 here is that a trustee must be able to certify to the ownership information, the assets, and the balances and valuation information from the beginning of any trust. That has never been done.So theoretically, if you take the strict interpretation of GAAP or GAS, in my view, at least, you would have to go back to the origin of each of these accounts, in some case 1887, or otherwise, depending on when they were originated. Per capita payments or judgment accounts have come later over several years.

When the Office of Trust Fund Management was separated out, the bureau couldn't certify to those accounts. So the only legitimate historical accounting - and I suggest that it not be done - would be a full GAS or GAAP audit dating back to the origin of these accounts. That's the only way you can certify the beginning balances.

After you certify the beginning balances, then you must be able to prove as a trustee that every receipt and every disbursement, as long as those accounts were open, were correct. That's not possible either, because of the lack of electronic and checks that have been destroyed, which is the only modern modern being after World War II - way that the private sector in the person of the Federal Reserve accepts as proof of disbursement: Front and back of a check. Just like your local
account. It can't be done, should not be done.
Q. Why do you say it shouldn't be done?
A. It's too expensive, and it would again prove inconclusive results. What could you tell the current account holders, that we think the balance is this much; we can't tie any disbursement going back before $X$ in the 20th century to a particular asset or lease?

And so you give erroneous and suspect information to the beneficiary that he can't use. How can he challenge that?
Q. Mr. Homan, let's look back, now shifting subjects, to

Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210, page four. And if you would look down at the paragraph that begins $B$ at the bottom. And we're back, Mr. Homan, in your report.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, I would ask you -- you're talking here about Bank of

America. And this is based on a document from the
administrative record. The Bates number in the administrative record is 22-3, pages two through three. So 22-3-2 through 3, is a quote from an e-mail from Bank of America to the Department of Interior, that talks about what Bank of America would do if they took over a bank and then that trust department of that bank had missing documents regarding an account.

Would you read to yourself the quote from that e-mail that begins on this page, and then goes over to the next page? A. (Witness complies.)
Q. And if you would look at the top of the next page, please, sir.
A. (Witness complies.)

MR. DORRIS: Could you keep that up and pull up the
paragraph just underneath it, also?
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. At the end there, where you've quoted the Bank of America e-mail and advice, you state, "This is the practice followed by all reasonable and prudent trustees. However, without explanation, the 2007 plan disregards the guidance provided by Bank of America."

Can you explain that?
A. Yes.

THE WITNESS: First of all, Your Honor, this procedure is not unique to the Bank of America. It is a procedure
consistent with GAAP that can be done at a reasonable cost and has been used by the government in resolving failed bank situations since 1970. It was developed, is my recollection, by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC, and has been used in over 2000 cases since the 1970s to deal with missing records, or records that cannot be reconciled back to the beginning balance.

It is also used in the private sector in bank
mergers --
THE COURT: Mr. Dorris -- excuse me, sir.

Mr. Dorris, I think government counsel are itching to
stand up and say you're talking about remedy here and not the
trial issues. I don't know why they're not doing that. I'm going to do it for them.

It's an interesting -- what you're suggesting here is very interesting. It is not what we're about in this trial.

Okay?
MR. DORRIS: Okay. Your Honor, where I was going with this with respect to this trial was that there is a different approach than the approach that is being used.

THE COURT: I understand that.
MR. DORRIS: But I won't go any further.
THE WITNESS: I understand that. But the question that
this witness is now being asked to address is: What do we do about this?

MR. DORRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: And that's not the issue we're talking about in this trial, the way I see it and the way I've set it up.

MR. DORRIS: I'll move on, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Would you look at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210, page five, in the middle of the page? It begins with paragraph C.

MR. DORRIS: If you would show the last half of that
page, please.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Mr. Homan, let me ask this: You talk about here that the

2000 plan is flawed in other respects. And the question is,
what are you talking about in the -- the other flaws in the 2007
plan here?
A. Well, first of all, as part of my opinion I stated that the only way to do this in strict conformance with GAAP and GAS is to verify the balances back to the original opening of the trust.

So any sampling technique is inappropriate, which in my view -- not only the one suggested in 2003, but the current one. So I don't believe any sampling technique is going to satisfy anyone, and will yield inconclusive results. So I wouldn't spend a nickel on this.

But assuming that it's going to be done or approved, then you look at the plan. And when you get to the second half of it, it qualifies it by saying that we're sacrificing completeness, accuracy, and timeliness because we don't have -we suspect we aren't going to get the appropriations from Congress to carry this plan out.

And that's certainly been the history. They recite that they wanted 400 million, as I recall, in appropriations for the last three fiscal years, and got something close to 170. Now, what they estimated a few years ago to cost $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ million is
apparently going to be completed for a total of $\mathbf{2 7 1}$ million.
$\mathbf{1 2 7}$ million they've already spent. So again, they're going to
get less conclusive results in any procedure along this line.
I agree with Congress. I wouldn't appropriate a nickel

## for this exercise.

Q. Well, let me ask you this. And I'm changing subjects slightly, but on this same topic.

## A. All right.

Q. And I want to ask you about cost, and the cost of doing an accounting in a trust situation, based on your experience.

Where a trustee is doing an accounting, and the cost of that is because of things the trustee has not done properly, such as not maintaining records and the like, who, from your experience in the private sector, bears the cost of that?

MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. This is asking for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Mr. Homan, let me ask you to look on the next page of your report. That would be Plaintiffs' 4210, item D. This is on page six, and it talks about "Key definitional issues not being adequately addressed in the plan." And you talk about a specific Deloitte \& Touche document that was included in the administrative record. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is a document in the administrative record that's document 4-2-1. And we're going to just stay here on your report, but for the record I want to indicate where it is in the record. And it's at pages, Bates pages 321 through 336 of the administrative record.

And you have quoted from that document in a couple of spots here in your report. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look at the first one coming from this report dealing with key definitional issues, and doing the historical accounting.

At the bottom it begins, "The Court and/or Congress may expect that all beneficiaries at any point in time are owed accountings. As a result, closed accounts other than predecessor accounts may have to be included in the accounting."

Now, Mr. Homan, with respect to trying to establish the accuracy of a beginning balance in an account for someone that's not an original allottee, how can you determine the accuracy of that balance without looking at the account prior to it?
A. You can't. If you can't certify the beginning balance, how can you certify the ending balance that is going to be passed on to someone else?
Q. And then look at the next down a little bit, the next quote from the Deloitte \& Touche document. And let you review that for a moment.
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A. (Witness complies.) Yes, I read it.
Q. Looking at the second paragraph of this quote, it says, "The
only viable option from a legal and legislative standpoint is that the historical accounting commence with the date of the initial allotment. Unfortunately, from a feasibility
perspective, this could date back to the 1950s (sic)." Do you see that?

THE COURT: 1850s.
MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. I misspoke.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And was this something -- do you see anywhere in the 2007 plan where this advice is taken into account?
A. No.
Q. Now, with respect to -- have you been involved with where trustees furnish an accounting to beneficiaries?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Dorris. When you say, "this advice taken into account," you're talking about what's on the screen here?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The advice that "the only viable option from a legal and legislative standpoint," et cetera, that it corresponds -- and I agree with that advice, that the only way to do this is to go back to the beginning of each of these
accounts.

THE COURT: And my question is, what am I looking at on the screen?

THE WITNESS: I'm looking at the last paragraph there, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Of what?
MR. DORRIS: It's from the Deloitte \& Touche document that's in the administrative record.
(Simultaneous conversation.)
THE COURT: I just got confused about whether I was looking at Deloitte, or whether I was looking at this witness' report.

Go ahead.
MR. DORRIS: It's the Deloitte quote that is quoted in his report. And I'm sorry for the lack of clarity, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Looking down further toward the bottom of this page of your report, page seven, in item $E$ you begin quoting from a number of documents that are identified as being from the administrative record of Hughes \& Bentzen. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it carries over to the next page.

And Hughes \& Bentzen were attorneys that were hired by the Department of Interior to give them advice during the
course -- at some point in the administrative record. And
there's some seven different letters, opinions in the administrative record, that you reviewed. Is that right?
A. Well, as required by common law and Reg 9 of the OCC, Officer of the Comptroller of the Currency, when an account is opened, the trustee is compelled to validate and verify the ownership information, validate and verify the assets to be administered in the trust account, and validate and verify the opening balances, if they're cash, or some other evaluation for nonmarketable assets, such as an appraisal valuation and et cetera. Those are the general requirements.

Since -- at least in my recollection, when it comes to reconciling disbursements and receipts, through the Federal Reserve payment system there are specific requirements for the checks that pass through that system that the bureau has never followed, although the U.S. Treasury must follow those.

One of those is that you -- in a trust account, you have to maintain the checks that passed through the system. The Treasury, by design, through inappropriate retention records, has destroyed most of those checks. There's still a copy of them somewhere in the Federal Reserve system, but they're on microfiche, and it takes literally days to find one.

The other issue is that the checks are returned not to the Bureau of Indian Affairs or to the account beneficiaries, but are mixed in with all of the other Treasury accounts -Treasury checks issued: Social Security checks, et cetera. Can't be found or retrieved.

But in terms of who takes a loss when an accounting
deficiency is caused, it's been what I call the $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ percent rule, since at least my memory when $I$ joined the Office of the Comptroller in 1996, all the way through my banking career. Generally --

MR. QUINN: Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm going to object
for the record. First, the answer is nonresponsive; the answer is narrative, expressing an opinion outside the scope and the expert opinion disclosed in the report, and goes into irrelevant matter.

THE COURT: That's the old immaterial, irrelevant, and inconsequential objection.

MR. QUINN: I'm covering all my bases.
THE COURT: Every bit of it is true, and I'm going to overrule it. I want to hear the answer.

THE WITNESS: The answer simply is this, Your Honor: If there is a discrepancy in your checking account, and the bank cannot provide you with a copy of your check on a daily basis -this is the same requirement as in the 1994 Reform Act. On a daily basis, they can't provide you with that balance, the accounting rule and the regulatory rule is that they have one accounting period, which is normally 90 days, to -- these items that are unproven go into a suspense account. They can be a liability or an asset suspense account.

If they can't resolve that issue, they take the loss.
They have to, as a presumption, restore the amount that they 50 years.

And if the government cannot follow that kind of a procedure, which it never has, it's got a lower standard. BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Mr. Homan, let me ask this: Is the information that the government is talking about putting on the historical statement of accounts that it's proposing to furnish as part of the 2007 plan to land-based beneficiaries, is the information they're talking about putting there sufficient for a beneficiary to make any meaningful judgments about his or her account, and whether the trustee has fulfilled its fiduciary duties?
A. No.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Well, as I said, they can't provide the beneficiary with a certified statement that the ownership is correct, the asset values are correct, and the balances are correct.

So anything less than that is of no use, in my view, to a beneficiary or anyone else.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Homan.

MR. DORRIS: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examine?

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Homan.

13 2002?

19

22
23
A. In September of 1995.

6 Q. And when did you resign that position?
7 A. On January 7th of 1999.
8 Q. Have you had any continuing role in advice to the Department of Interior, or as a contractor or otherwise, since you departed that position in 1999?
11 A. No.
12 Q. You did give some testimony to Congress, though. Right? In

14 A. At their request, yes. Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Right?
17 A. No.
18 Q. That came later. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So sitting here today, you don't have knowledge, personal

21 knowledge, sir, with respect to the operations, the decision

24 A. No, with the exception that I did review documents produced
But in answering the questions that Mr. Dorris was
putting to you this morning and yesterday, and to put things a
little bit into a little better time perspective, if you will,
when did you become the special trustee for American Indians?

And those documents are in my appendix as documents I relied
upon.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you about that before we put it up on the
screen. I want to ask you a little bit about the document list
that you appended with your expert report.
And before I even get to that, I would like to ask you,
have you gone back through your report and looked at it since
you authored it, since you prepared it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any amendments to make or corrections that you noted that you would like to put on the record this morning?
A. No.
Q. With respect to the list of documents that you reviewed and relied upon, could you describe how you prepared that? I'm trying to make certain that I understand that what you have in that list is a list of everything you looked at and considered, or just the things that you relied on for purposes of forming your opinion.
A. Well, the list is as stated in my appendix. But it also incorporates by reference my testimony before the Court last time, which had an extensive list of documents which are included as part of this testimony.
Q. But you would agree with me --
A. I think there are some like $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ pages of testimony there, as I recall, that I filed in connection with this report.
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A. Only selected materials.
Q. And those are the ones that are listed on your appendix?
A. Yes. Or referred to in the body of my report and quoted.

MR. QUINN: Can we go to that, I think it's Exhibit 4 or attachment four? Show the cover, and zoom in so the witness can identify it, if you could.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Now, this is a copy of your Exhibit 4 to your report.

Right?
A. The cover page, looks like it.
Q. The cover page. We're going to take this --
A. All right. I will trust you --
Q. We're working with the screens here. We have to go piece by piece. But for reference, in terms of the file numbers, this was filed with the Court by the plaintiffs. And at the top of the page there's a reference number, page 397 of 399 . And your

|  | 1586 |  | 1588 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | report was about 400 pages. Right? | 1 | A. Not as much as everybody else, but yes. |
| 2 | A. Thereabouts. | 2 | Q. Quite a bit? |
| 3 | MR. QUINN: So if you go to the next page, please. | 3 | A. Right. There are bigger ones. |
| 4 | BY MR. QUINN: | 4 | Q. Okay. Do you have any reason to doubt the competency of |
| 01:26:28 5 | Q. And this is the first part of your list, is that right, of | 01:28:45 5 | Bank of America and its commercial trust operations? |
| 6 | what you reviewed? | 6 | A. Not -- but it's been since 1985 since I've looked at them. |
| 7 | A. That's correct. | 7 | Q. But sitting here today, you have no to reason to -- |
| 8 | Q. Now, in authoring your opinion and rendering your opinions | 8 | A. No. |
| 9 | today, would you say you took an independent view, an unbiased | 9 | Q. I think you referred to a report by Deloitte \& Touche. |
| 01:26:45 10 | view? | 01:28:59 10 | Right? Among the papers that you looked at in terms of giving |
| 11 | A. Yes. | 11 | your opinion? |
| 12 | Q. And among the materials you relied upon, I see at number | 12 | A. That's correct. |
| 13 | four and number five you referred to a couple of briefs filed by | 13 | Q. And describe for the record your knowledge of the firm of |
| 14 | the plaintiffs. Is that right? | 14 | Deloitte \& Touche. Who are they? |
| 01:27:00 15 | A. Yes. | 01:29:11 15 | A. It's a major accounting firm in the United States, one of |
| 16 | Q. And you read those briefs, and apparently relied on them to | 16 | the, used to be Big Six, I think it's now Big Four. |
| 17 | one extent or another in rendering your opinion. Correct? | 17 | Q. So they're one of the larger accounting firms in this |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | country? |
| 19 | Q. I don't see on your list, however, the government's response | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 01:27:18 20 | to those briefs. So you didn't rely on the government's -- or | 01:29:23 20 | Q. Would you have any reason to distrust or doubt statements by |
| 21 | look at or consider the government's opinion in response? | 21 | Deloitte \& Touche? |
| 22 | A. I read the plan, which is what I was commissioned to report | 22 | A. No. |
| 23 | on. | 23 | Q. And in fact, you point to some of Deloitte \& Touche's |
| 24 | Q. But in terms of the briefs that were filed by the plaintiffs | 24 | statements in your opinion. Correct? |
| 01:27:29 25 | that you refer to in your list, you do not identify that you at | 01:29:39 25 | A. That's correct. |
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| 1 | all considered the response of the government to those briefs, | 1 | Q. And you also refer to -- and on this list of your |
| 2 | did you? | 2 | relied-upon documents, you also refer to a series of legal |
| 3 | A. That is correct. | 3 | memoranda authored and prepared by a firm of Hughes \& Bentzen. |
| 4 | Q. Now, in your report and on your list here, you also | 4 | Right? |
| 01:27:48 5 | reference a number of experts that the government has hired as | 01:29:55 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | contractors to advise you. Right? | 6 | Q. And you read all those documents? |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | A. I did. |
| 8 | Q. And you testified about some of those today. Correct? | 8 | Q. Okay. Did you have any familiarity with Hughes \& Bentzen |
| 9 | A. I quoted some of those today. | 9 | before you read these opinions? |
| 01:28:02 10 | Q. All right. And some of those are quoted in your report. | 01:30:06 10 | A. No, but I had familiarity with the case law that they |
| 11 | Right? | 11 | referenced from my days at the Comptroller of the Currency. And |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | there's a report I wrote on it in connection with my 2003 |
| 13 | Q. Bank of America? | 13 | testimony. |
| 14 | A. Bank of America. | 14 | Q. Okay. So in your review, you didn't see anything in their |
| 01:28:07 15 | Q. Okay. Bank of America, fairly big trust operation, to your | 01:30:25 15 | legal memoranda that stood out as being at a great difference of |
| 16 | knowledge? | 16 | opinion with what your experience had been in terms of trust? |
| 17 | A. One of the biggest in the United States. | 17 | A. I think they were equivocal in some of their opinions. So I |
| 18 | Q. Do you know people there from your banking experience? | 18 | agree with the quotations that $I$ referenced, but $I$ don't agree |
| 19 | A. Not anymore. But I examined the Bank of America when I was | 19 | with all of their opinions. |
| 01:28:20 20 | an examiner in San Francisco. I supervised it for a number of | 01:30:47 20 | Q. Okay. But you didn't cite anything you disagreed with in |
| 21 | years. | 21 | your report, did you? |
| 22 | Q. But you would say, as an institution they have a fair amount | 22 | A. No. |
| 23 | of experience in commercial trust operations? | 23 | Q. If we could -- |
| 24 | A. I would say yes. | 24 | THE COURT: If we could take a mid-morning break. |
| 01:28:33 25 | Q. As much as anybody else, probably? | 01:31:01 25 | MR. QUINN: I would be happy to do that, Your Honor. |


|  |  | 1590 |  |  | 1592 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | THE COURT: And Mr. Quinn, could I see you and |  | 1 | Q. Okay. You included your testimony from 2002, right, in your |
|  | 2 | Mr. Dorris at side-bar, please? |  | 2 | expert report? |
|  | 3 | MR. QUINN: Sure. |  | 3 | A. Yes. |
|  | 4 | (Recess taken at 11:04 a.m.) |  | 4 | MR. QUINN: Can we have that? Okay. All right. We'll |
| 01:44:59 | 5 | THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Quinn. You may proceed. | 01:47:57 | 5 | come back to that. |
|  | 6 | MR. QUINN: Thank you, Your Honor. |  | 6 | BY MR. QUINN: |
|  | 7 | BY MR. QUINN: |  | 7 | Q. I believe in your CV that you attached with your expert |
|  | 8 | Q. Mr. Homan, just before we took our recess, we were talking a |  | 8 | report, you identify your experience in the Office of Special |
|  | 9 | little bit about your expert report and your experience since |  | 9 | Trustee under a separate category of experience. Right? |
| 01:45:11 1 | 10 | you had left as the special trustee for American Indians in | 01:48:10 1 | 10 | A. Yes. |
|  | 11 | 1999. |  | 11 | Q. And I take it that your role as special trustee was a unique |
|  | 12 | And tell me if I'm wrong, but your review of the |  | 12 | one in your career history? |
|  | 13 | current plan did not include a review of the entire |  | 13 | A. Well, by definition it was unique. |
|  | 14 | administrative record. Is that right? |  | 14 | Q. And, in fact, there aren't commercial trusts that have all |
| 01:45:30 15 | 15 | A. Yes, that's correct. | 01:48:32 15 | 15 | the attributes of the IIM Trusts. Is that fair to say? |
|  | 16 | Q. So you have not considered the data completeness validation |  | 16 | A. If you -- all? No. Substantially all, yes. |
|  | 17 | studies done by FTI Consulting and Michelle Herman? |  | 17 | Q. In this case, the Trust is established by statute. Right? |
|  | 18 | A. I was provided some part of the throughput. I'm not sure |  | 18 | A. Yes. |
|  | 19 | who Michelle Herman is. |  | 19 | Q. The terms of the Trust are established by statute, too? |
| 01:45:46 2 | 20 | Q. Okay. So then I can take that -- | 01:48:56 2 | 20 | A. Yes. |
|  | 21 | A. I mean, I remember her name, so I did review something that |  | 21 | Q. And here the government agency, a government agency within |
|  | 22 | was sent to me by Michelle Herman. |  | 22 | the Department of Interior, is acting as the trustee delegate? |
|  | 23 | Q. Perhaps it was on the throughput, but not probably on data |  | 23 | A. That's correct. |
|  | 24 | completeness validation? |  | 24 | Q. And the funding for the management of the Trust comes from |
| 01:46:00 25 | 25 | A. It would have had to have been probably the throughput. | 01:49:19 2 | 25 | Congressional appropriations. Correct? |
|  |  | 1591 |  |  | 1593 |
|  | 1 | Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at |  | 1 | A. Yes. |
|  | 2 | the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its |  | 2 | Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some |
|  | 3 | contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its |  | 3 | extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM |
|  | 4 | reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? |  | 4 | accounts? |
| 01:46:19 | 5 | A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan | 01:49:35 | 5 | A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand |
|  | 6 | or in those documents. |  | 6 |  |
|  | 7 | Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the |  | 7 | Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust |
|  | 8 | state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this |  | 8 | is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the |
|  | 9 | point? |  | 9 | longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would |
| 01:46:35 10 | 10 | A. Yes. But the -- I did review the audit reports, as I -- | 01:49:57 1 | 10 | ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. |
|  | 11 | Q. But your own personal -- |  | 11 | A. Not necessarily. |
|  | 12 | A. -- didn't bring it up to date until 1996. |  | 12 | Q. Let's go -- |
|  | 13 | Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal |  | 13 | MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go |
|  | 14 | knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your |  | 14 | to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his |
| 01:46:53 15 | 15 | personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? | 01:50:25 15 | 15 | earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's |
|  | 16 | A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. |  | 16 | not the current one, so let's take that down, please. |
|  | 17 | Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a |  | 17 | BY MR. QUINN: |
|  | 18 | proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? |  | 18 | Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware |
|  | 19 | A. Yes. |  | 19 | that there are a number of per capita and judgment account |
| 01:47:13 20 | 20 | Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, | 01:50:45 20 | 20 | accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution? |
|  | 21 | or thereabouts, to Congress? |  | 21 | A. No, I'm not aware of the current situation at all. |
|  | 22 | A. Yes. |  | 22 | Q. Do you have any understanding of the accounts, to the extent |
|  | 23 | Q. In the course of your proposals, did you propose that the |  | 23 | that they've been reconciled, per capita and judgment accounts? |
|  | 24 | department assess fees against accounts? |  | 24 | A. No. |
| 01:47:33 2 | 25 | A. I don't recall doing that. I may have. | 01:51:04 25 | 25 | Q. Do you have an understanding with respect to the |

reconciliation on the land-based accounts, the high dollar value accounts; that is, $\$ 100,000$ account transactions and above?
the bottom of page two, we'll come back to the context here in a moment.

Do you see that quoted section in the last paragraph,
Mr. Homan?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the part that you were testifying about a few minutes ago?
A. Yes.
Q. About what Bank of America would do?
A. That's correct. That's where I got the quote.
Q. Okay. That's where the quote came from. All right.

Let's see if we can --
MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I think this was where we were where you were indicating that it was remedies and we needed to move along.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I'd just like to put this --
THE COURT: I sustained the objection that you didn't make.

MR. QUINN: That's because in terms of the context,
Your Honor, there's one question I'd like to ask this witness about in terms of the overall document, just to put it in context. It doesn't address the remedy issue, it addresses the advice.

He opines in his expert report, and confirmed today, he
believes that the department was not abiding by advice given by
the Bank of America in terms of what it would do in a trust
situation. And I'd like to have the witness answer one question about a statement just above this quotation, if I may.

THE COURT: The only way I'm going to un-fact that is to hear the question. So let's hear what the question is.

MR. QUINN: All right, Your Honor.
Could you scroll up the page? Let's see. We should be on page two of the document. Scroll up a little bit more. Yeah, that introductory bit. Okay.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. In fact, Mr. Homan, I want to ask you about the last sentence of the message to which the quoted material is appended. Where it says, "If there are gaps in the documentation, I would agree with the method the OHTA presented in their plan." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do see that.
Q. And so in effect, Bank of America's representative was agreeing with what OHTA was putting into its plan. Correct?
A. I can't represent that. That's not what it says.
Q. Okay. You disagree with what that sentence says?
A. I disagree, because what they quoted from the Bank of

America is not done. It has to do with their beginning
sentence, which says, "You have to validate the account."
I saw nothing -- if we're going to talk about that Bank
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## of America memorandum, then I saw nothing in that Bank of

## America -- or the plan that came even close to the first

sentence there in the Bank of America's suggestion, which was that you have to validate the balance in the account. The only way you can validate the balances in the account is the way $I$ suggested in previous testimony.
Q. Do you agree with Bank of America that you would also ask the beneficiary to come forward with documentation?
A. I'm not sure that's what they said.
Q. Okay. Let's see if we can refresh your recollection.
A. They have no documentation because none has ever been provided them.

THE COURT: All right. Let's move on.
MR. QUINN: It's in the record, Your Honor. Thank you.
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. With respect to another document Mr. Dorris asked you about --

MR. QUINN: Can you put up AR-56?
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Okay. Do you recognize this front page, Mr. Homan, as something you've seen before?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go inside that document to at least the PDF pages 322 .

The Bates range I think you testified about concerns a document
that begins at 42 -- 322, and then runs on a few pages from

22 Q. Do you recognize this one as addressing the issue concerning
23 documentation that a trustee comes forward with?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And I would like to direct your attention to page five of
I have the cover page up on the screen, Mr. Homan, from page 322. Do you recognize that as the document you testified about?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. With respect to the sentence you quoted in your opinion report at page 13 of the document, Bates 335?

MR. QUINN: Can we move to that page? And can we zoom in on that first heading, first full paragraph? Thank you.
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Do you see that all right, Mr. Homan?
A. If you're -- which sentence are you referring to?
Q. Under the title, it says, "What is the proper temporal scope for the reconciliation?"
A. Yes.
Q. You see that? And that's the excerpt you were quoting from, right, in your expert opinion?
A. I think I quoted the first sentence, maybe the second.
Q. And in terms of this Deloitte statement here, you recognize, do you not, that the statement here is concerning the legal and legislative standpoint in terms of where to start the historical accounting. That's what it says. Right?
A. Yes. But -- yes.
Q. So this is not a statement from an accounting perspective. Correct?
A. That would include the legal part, I would assume. And also the legislative account, which is required by the Reform Act.
Q. I understand that's your interpretation. The document here,
though, is not -- you agree it's referring to the legislative
and historical legal issues in the case. Correct?
A. They cover the gamut, as far as I'm concerned.
Q. All right. Mr. Homan, I'd like to ask you about a couple of the documents that you looked at and considered and quoted toward the end of your report from Hughes \& Bentzen.

Take, for example, I think it's 516 -- or I'm sorry, 616.

MR. QUINN: Now, can you zoom in on that so the
witness -- this is indexed administrative record 616, Bates range begins at 64-6-1.
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Do you recognize that, Mr. Homan? It's one of the memoranda that you reviewed.
A. Yes. Yes, I do.
Q. And I think you quoted from that. Correct?
A. I may have. I really -- I don't have it in front of me.

I've quoted from several of those documents.
that document, Bates number six.
MR. QUINN: Can we zoom in on the middle paragraph,

## please?

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. And Mr. Homan, there are other ways, correct, besides
looking at a document over the passage of time that you can determine that a transaction occurred. Correct?
A. Generally, yes, you can, if the records are available.
Q. Okay. And, in fact, the Bank of America document that we were talking about goes back and talks about -- doesn't even talk about the original balance, does it?
A. Are we allowed to talk about the Bank of America's methodology? I'd be glad to.
Q. They don't go back to the original balance, though, in that? A. As I recall, they go back as far as they can reasonably, and then they settle for the difference. That's the remedy. It's a practical remedy used, as I said earlier, by the FDIC and in bank mergers.
Q. And there are situations also where accountants would use alternative procedures. Right?
A. That is one that's consistent with GAAP. That's the only one available -- or that I recognize is consistent with GAAP, and it's not the Bank of America's sole policy, it's the policy of the federal government.
Q. Well, you mentioned GAAP. That brings to mind another
question I wanted to ask you in terms of GAAP.
GAAP, even if all the documents -- you take the
hypothetical all the documents existed, you had documentation to
verify everything, all the data systems were there, there was
never a report of any lack of controls on the systems, in terms of the way the system is structured, though, you could still not get a GAAP opinion. Right?
A. The GAAP -- in that circumstance, you wouldn't get a GAAP opinion. But if -- the current auditors depend on prior audits as one of their criteria, and there's never been a GAAP audit of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as Arthur Andersen said in 1998.
Q. My question's a little different.
A. It's a distinction without a difference for me. Could you rephrase it and I'll try to address it?
Q. Perhaps that's because you're not an accountant, you don't recognize this.

But if you have a cash basis system for accounting, you could not have a GAAP opinion. Isn't that correct?
A. GAAP and/or RAP, you know, do allow for a cash basis, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. You can accrue or not accrue. Certain small businesses have that option under the tax code and under the accounting regulations. Or guidance, I should say.

MR. QUINN: I'm trying to take your instructions to
heart, Your Honor. May I have one moment?

A. Yes. That is my expert report of August 2007.
Q. Okay. And this incorporates your prior expert report. Is that correct?

Department of the Interior, to the extent possible?
THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. They directed me to the extent possible to do that because, and they explained it --
counsel explained it to me, due to the unreliability of the data
that they had from the Department of Interior.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Did you rely solely on plaintiffs' representation that it was unreliable data?
A. No, we also conducted our own due diligence of what we thought would happen amongst the public record at the time, and that's when we encountered unavailable - a large number, as I recall - of the GAO reports that occurred over a period of time where they had looked at the BIA, and specific, the IIM accounts.
Q. Could you move the microphone a little closer?
A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it.
Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially impartial data. Is that what you were saying?
A. Yeah. We were -- what we arrived at is we were trying to determine then what data in theory, what income hit the door, if you want to put it that way, of the Department of Interior. In other words, what monies did they receive. From like my banking experience, that would be captured in the first instance, and not necessarily measuring what were applied to specific
accounts; it was just the money that was generated from the Trust assets.
Q. So in a sense, this was an attempt to demonstrate inputs?
A. Right. Yeah, we attempted in all cases to get hopefully the universe of reliable data, and then subdivide that universe into the income that resulted in trust to allottees.
Q. And if we could start analyzing your methodology by starting with the GIS image overlays process. Could you briefly describe what GIS is?

THE COURT: Just before you get into the GIS, let me make sure that I've got the bounds of this inquiry. You're trying to find out how much money hit the door, and not how much money should have hit the door?

THE WITNESS: No. We wanted -- the actual dollars that were received by the Department of Interior on behalf of the beneficiaries was the way we viewed our objective.

THE COURT: Okay. And you were interested in receipts, not necessarily what was posted or accounted for?

THE WITNESS: No, we didn't have that kind of
information available, nor did we draw any conclusions to that.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. If you could briefly explain the use of GIS software in your methodology.
A. GIS software -- I mean, all these acronyms always sound

## perhaps a little daunting, but it really is once again a

 computer application of something you could accomplish yourself, given enough time.And GIS software, generally speaking, is the use of a map that has been digitized, and digitized meaning it is able to be brought up in electronic form. And then, as the GIS people call it, they superimpose, and if you look at what you would think of perhaps like a clear plastic overlay of this map. And GIS people are prone to call the boundaries of the area that they're trying to identify as polygons. And those are irregularly shaped objects. So in this case, a polygon might be an Indian reservation.

And then there are sources of data that have also been reduced to electronic data --
Q. Excuse me for a second, Mr. Fasold. Did you perform this GIS overlay or did you contract with somebody?
A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is a GIS firm that specializes only in GIS applications.
Q. And so they're very experienced in this field?

THE COURT: GIS has to be an acronym for something.
THE WITNESS: Geographical Information Systems, Your
Honor.
MR. GUILDER: I thought it might have been on the
glossary.
BY MR. GUILDER:

22 Q. Have you seen any use of this GIS software by the Department
23 of Interior in your experience?
24 A. Yeah. As a matter of fact, it's available online today, and
02:19:28 $\mathbf{2 5}$ that is the -- the BLM has a GIS software application that you
of the country - and that is the fire department drew a line, a polygon, and said, everybody that has a phone number that terminates in this area, call them and give them the notification for evacuation.

And that's an excellent example of how they're used in real life, and that is, you know, they could draw any boundary and instantly the computer could overlay that and make calls out. So that's one of the examples in practical life.

The other one that we're aware of is utility companies. If they start getting calls from different customers, they can identify where that call is coming from, and that superimposes on to their utility branching network. And they frequently can identify where the break occurred because these following people were affected. So it's in more and more common use for a number of applications.

Another one comes to mind is when they build a highway, they use GIS to estimate how much earth has to be moved, and they decide where it can be moved and disposed of by volume. They know exactly what the volume of earth is to be moved. Before they just had to start digging and order up enough dump trucks to haul it away.
can interact with online, and it has various overlays, including
the location of gas and oil wells.
Q. You said that BLM has a GIS software that has graphic overlays of oil and gas?
A. Yes. If you pull up that site, it comes up with a basic map with state boundaries, for example. You can overlay roads, you can overlay rivers. Another option that you can click overlays gas and oil wells.
Q. Okay. And so let's move on to how you identified these polygons you were talking about earlier that are the reservation boundaries. Did that come with the GIS software you got from Farragut Systems, or did you do that research?
A. No, the boundaries, the polygons that we received digitized was available at the Department of Interior website when we first started this case, at least for a long period after we started the case, it was brought down. I don't believe it's publicly accessible anymore.
Q. And so did you rely solely on that information from Interior Department to create these polygons?
A. No, no. We purchased a number of maps that we also had digitized. And that means we sent it out to people who literally take a map and mark the boundaries of the reservation; in essence, connect the dots between where they mark. Extremely tedious kind of work.
Q. So after you put these polygons from collecting from the

## 1613

maps that you purchased, the next step was to place -- as the terminology is, point intersects on top of that of other information.

And if we could talk about the oil and gas information you overlaid on top of that. Who did you contract to provide the oil and gas information?
A. Ultimately we selected a petroleum engineering firm that was then called Questa, Q-U-E-S-T-A.
Q. And was it Questa's own information that you used, or was it other information?
A. No, we had already identified and purchased a software package that through the years the old timers call it PI/Dwight's. It has since been acquired by a firm called IHS, so it's now referred to as the IHS software. And they provide, for a fee, of course, in essence the latitude and the longitude of every oil and gas well drilled in the United States, and they provide certain associated data with each individual well.
Q. And is there another company that also provides that type of information?
A. Yes. A company now is in competition with them, and that is
called PDS. And I believe it stands for Petroleum Data
Services.
Q. And do those companies, do they create this information or do they rely on other parties to gather information about wells?
A. That data is generally garnered from local records, and that
would be county and/or state, where they captured in the first instance the location of the well. And they measured, which we were most interested in, the production of a particular well, they'd measure that typically by calculating how much tax was paid on, for example, a barrel of oil.
Q. So the information in IHS or PDS is tax information, in part?
A. In part. In part it's derived from taxing -- the tax that was paid on a particular barrel of oil produced.
Q. So the information in there is only information that tax has been paid on?
A. That is one source of their information. They do outline some other sources when they don't have tax information. So I wouldn't say $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ percent of either IHS or PDS is $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ percent related to tax sources.
Q. What type of industry reliance is placed on these companies' information, IHS and PDS's information? A. Yeah, the one that's used, one of the more -- the highest reliance placed on it is to calculate underground reserves, underground reserves. And they use that data in the first instance, and that, of course, post Sarbanes-Oxley becomes very important in public statements of oil and gas firms.

So they use the PI/Dwight's, give it to their petroleum engineers who calculate reserves, for example.

They also, this data is used by prospectors to try to
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calculate. There's core data involved with that, so the
prospector can see what wells may have been drilled in the area and draw some geological conclusion from that.
Q. So companies are relying on this data, and surveyors. How about taxing authorities?
A. The taxing authorities to my knowledge don't rely on that.

They rely in general -- my understanding is they rely on meters
that -- meters that measure the flow of oil coming out of a particular well.
Q. But then what's reported back to those companies is the tax information, in part, to IHS and PDS --
A. Well, yeah.
Q. -- from the companies?
A. Actually, IHS and PDS literally have to go down to the local source of information and pull that back. I don't believe any state or county agencies voluntarily dispense that information to them.
Q. And what did Questa do with that information?
A. Well, what we got was the equivalent of another clear plastic overlay with dots or intersections of every well in the western United States. And what the GIS people did is identified for Questa those wells that were located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation.
Q. So essentially, it identified a subset of the original information?
A. We had, yeah, in theory, totally unbiased, universal data, and they were given from Farragut Systems the subset of those who were contained within the boundaries of an Indian reservation.
Q. And did Questa Engineering do anything else to further
inform how much revenue is produced on those wells that are then contained within the polygon?
A. Right. Once they had the identified wells, the IHS data and PDS data as a general statement show the well production, meaning the units, being barrels of oil or thousands of cubic feet of gas, that have come out on a monthly basis, or as you can add them up, for a yearly basis.

That data in general from IHS only has cumulative data prior to about the early 1970's; '70, '71, '72 is where they start providing monthly data. PDS's entree into the market has been they're going to provide monthly data preceding the 1970 time frame.

But what the petroleum engineers do is they know exactly how much that well has produced, for example, from date of drilling through 1970; what they need to do is then spread that over that time frame from a lump sum number.

And what they use is a technique that is unique or a specialty of petroleum engineers, is the decline curves. And they can fit, retrofit that cumulative data into years from inception through when the data is available monthly.
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So they plot this down and enable us to find which year
these barrels of oil were produced.
Q. So the information, let's say pre-'72, let's call it that
year, is cumulative information that is then plotted to some
type of curve --
A. Right.
Q. -- decline curve?

And so all the information's already there, it's just plotting it per year?
A. Right. Yeah. The only error or the only interpretation is which years it had come in. And obviously, their known decline curves for each of these fields, they're very confident that they have put it into the appropriate years.
Q. And then after you had that -- so you have a total revenue production in terms of barrels of oil or cubic feet of gas. What happens next with those calculations?
A. Yeah, then, again, this is a Questa determined number. They look through their historical data and publicly available data, their own internal records, and they determine the price of oil that was paid in each of those given periods.

And that is determined by research. It is also -- the West Texas crude is sort of the standard in terms of quality. And they also apply factors for specific gravity and sulfur content, which are two of the major variables that would render a barrel of oil at a price less than West Texas crude.

22 A. As I recollect, there were about 2,000 identified sources of

24 Q. And are all of those mines valuable resources? Were oil
25 extracted from those mines?

## Q. And Pincock Allen \& Holt, are they experts in all of these

 areas?A. Yes. The engineers for natural resources sort of divide themselves into the oil and gas, and then the firms that specialize in hard rock, in essence, specialize in all the other minerals that can be mined.
Q. Okay. And were they able to provide where those points of mines fell on the GIS software, or did you go to another database to find that information?
A. Right. There are a couple of databases that plot the location - again, usually by latitude and longitude - of each of the mines. And that -- the original -- there was a Bureau of Mines database that contained that. They were merged back into the Department of Interior, so they don't -- I think they went into the USGS.

So they combined a database that is called MAC/MILS, M-A-K/M-I-L-S -- M-A-C, I'm sorry, M-I-L-S. So we call it MAC/MILS, and that database, again, a universe of database of mines that were at one time mined in the United States.
Q. And how many of those mines fell within the polygons of the boundaries that you put down on the maps? mines.
A. No. The MAC/MILS database is you might say overly detailed. It includes just about any mine, whether it was commercially viable or not.

So Pincock Allen \& Holt did their research, and from their knowledge, very rapidly winnowed out the vast majority of the mines as being never commercially viable.
Q. And of those that were commercially viable, they then provided the information back to you of -- how did you break that down? Was it a -- you know, it's not going to be the gallons or the barrels, like oil. What type of information did they provide to you?
A. Well, they appropriately identified the units, like coal, it would be tons; precious metal, ounces. So each one of the precious metal categories they would identify the unit, they would identify again the cost and the typical royalty paid if the land was leased by a commercial enterprise and exploited for the mineral values.
Q. So they were able to provide all commercially exploited mine information in terms of revenue?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And then you next turned to a resource to find out timber production?
A. Right. Timber production, we also had hoped that we would have some kind of universal database and do a GIS overlay. And after extensive research, we found no reliable commercial

## database that talked about timber.

So we retained Professor Allen McQuillan, University of Montana, and his background included working on a couple of major cases in the field called Mitchell 1 and Mitchell 2, which were legal cases directly addressed at timber recovery off of Indian lands.
Q. So he already had a working knowledge of timber production on Indian land?
A. Right. He had obviously extensive experience, being one of the lead experts in the field.
Q. And that knowledge extended to individual Indian lands?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was he able to use to understand whether a piece of wood came from individual land or Tribal land?
A. Yeah, the source data, whenever he could see it available, was what is called a scale ticket. And, in essence, it derives from when these trucks pull out of the harvested area and have a number of logs on them. Those logs are identified as to the owner of the land from which it came.

And so those scale tickets will identify whether that was -- if it came from a reservation, whether it came off of an individually owned or allocated land, whether it was a tribally owned, whether it was non-Indian owned, whether it was BLM owned, or any one of the other categories that could come off harvested timber from an Indian reservation.

22 Q. So essentially in that realm, although you attempted to find 23 independent numbers, you did not?

24 A. Yeah. I would suspect that the vast majority of our numbers
Q. And then now you know -- or Professor McQuillan knew whether a piece of wood and how much came from individual land. What did he do next with that data?
A. Yeah, the data they call in that industry, the way to measure it, they call it $V$ and $V$, volume and value. And so a scale ticket would tell the volume estimated in a particular tree, how many board feet, and then he would apply the commercially available rate for that specific kind of species of tree in that particular area, that particular year.
Q. So each one of these experts has been an oil and gas, a minerals and a timber expert, and they provide information to you as to how much revenue was derived from those resources? A. That's correct.
Q. And then after that, there are other areas that generated revenue for individual Indians, some of those that you researched yourself. Land leases, that was one area. Could you briefly describe the types of land leases?
A. Well, we looked again for any kind of universal database, and were unable to find any universal database. We looked also then to see if there were any land lease experts that have testified before or have done the research before, and we found none.

So then we went to -- again, trying to abide by our non-DOI sourcing, we purchased a number of books, $\mathbf{5 0}$ or $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ books, periodicals, anything we could find, many times off of a
website called aBOOKS, which has used bookstores from around the United States, and we were able to garner copies of valuable source data.

We also purchased every annual report, the
commissioner's annual report, which contained a lot of data.
And what we learned from all of this is what we call
data points, and that would be a particular year where there was a particular income, and they categorized land leases over the years into four different categories. One was agriculture, which was the earliest. I think it began around 1900.
Q. You said there were agricultural leases in 1900 you found?
A. Yeah, that's the first instance of data available.

THE COURT: Who categorized land leases over the years into four different categories?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, really the sourcing of all of that, regardless of the contemporaneous books that we found those, quote, "data points" in, unquote, was the DOI. Most of them were contemporary, they had done their research with the DOI, and then published in their book, sometimes giving attribution and sometimes not. BY MR. GUILDER: were not truly independently calculated by a third party.
Q. The vast number, you mean, of leases?
A. Of the data points.
Q. For leases?
A. Yeah, for leases.
Q. Okay. And so you were describing the four types of leases
that are broken up, I guess, by Interior. And it's agricultural and three other?
A. Yeah, agriculture and grazing. And those were basically the two types of land leases that were categorized as such up until about 1996, when they added two other categories and started reporting on it, and that was business and then the old "other" category.
Q. And did you recognize when you took these data points any type of patterns that developed?
A. Yes. What we did is, in essence, plot these datas literally on a chart. And for example, with agriculture, you could quickly say, if you plotted them and connected the dots, you would form a very logical and predictable curve. They plotted out onto a geometric curve.

That was true for agriculture, it was true for
business, and it was true for the other category. It was fairly logical and reasonable to assume those were geometric curves. Q. And now briefly before we get down this, these data points, are these aggregate data points?
A. Yes. There are a lot of data points by reservation, but in
each year if I only got one or two reservations, that said nothing about the total.

So we ultimately had to use, and used, the aggregate
data of saying all Indian leases, allocated Indian leases in a given year.
Q. And you didn't mention grazing leases as fitting onto that curvature you described. Was there not a pattern there?
A. Yeah, if you plot the grazing data, what $I$ have called -- if you were to plot it out on a chart, I called it a saw tooth because it was sort of irregular like a saw tooth blade. So you really couldn't say there is a trend here that $I$ could identify. So we had more difficulty with grazing than normal. We did plot -- we had a large number of data that we could plot; we connected the dots, it produced a saw tooth. And to project that into a future value, we also used the paradigm developed by BLM sources. Commonly -- I think in 1934 there was an act passed called the Taylor Grazing Act which required the BLM to start reporting.

Their reporting overlapped Indian reporting, and we saw that this saw tooth pattern matched, and so we were able to replicate that into the future.
Q. And then after -- there was another category that you used called land sales. Could you briefly describe the information used to pattern land sales?
A. Right. Land sales were very difficult to deal with, because

21 Q. And we'll get back to how you treated those gaps in a few
as we know, over the period of time from 1887 until now, literally tens of thousands and millions of acres were alienated

## A. No. There were -- again, that is a story that is not

heartening to look at. But a number of Indian lands were alienated, meaning taken out of the system without any documentation about why they left. So that's why we were left with saying, I'm only going to document those that we document were sold. And so that's where we started our data.

Because there were a number of acres, and we've done some research and it isn't relevant particularly, but how did lands become alienated that were not revenue generators for individual Indians? And the answer is a lot, and that is another sad tale of the Indians.
Q. So your data only relied on what you could identify as sold?
A. Right.
Q. Okay.
A. As again, we were back to the source of revenues that we could logically expect that the Department of Interior received.
Q. And there were some gaps in the data that you had for land
leases and land sales. Is that correct?
A. Yes. Clearly we didn't have data for each individual year

I just want to finish up with the other revenue sources that go into this model. Were you able to quantify rights of
A. Yeah, that was another challenge for us. And we identified databases that told us once again where every pipeline in the United States was, when it occurred, when it was laid, where the utility lines were in the United States, where roads were in the United States, when they were made.

One of the interesting things is we did an overlay of railroads, and I had a preconception that was totally wrong, and that is I thought we would start measuring rail lines that were laid post 1887 and be able to measure the rights of ways procured then.

And we found out just about all significant rail lines were already laid by 1887 , which $I$ found interesting, since we only did the transcontinental, railroad, what, in 1854.

So those railway rights of way were all secured prior to 1887 , But we did have this database, actually several databases, that gave us once the universal scope of rights of way.

Our problem, which was extraordinarily disappointing to us, is we never found any experts that could tell us what the value of those rights of way that actually produced income for Indians. We interviewed several firms, and nobody was able to do it at any reasonable cost.
Q. And were you concerned that you were unable to put that revenue source into your methodology? I mean, did it account for any money, in your opinion, with your research?
A. Yeah, it's -- I guess the old Navy term is oink-oink or unk-unk, which is U-N-K-U-N-K, unknown unknowns, I don't know what I don't know.

So we didn't have reliable data to present to this Court about rights of way. However, the only thing I could comment on is anecdotal, and that is clearly it was well in excess of $\mathbf{\$ 1}$ billion of revenues that were negotiated and deposited ultimately at the Department of Interior. I don't know what the number is in any reliable fashion.
Q. And now, were there any other revenue sources that went into your calculation?
A. Yes. There were -- it turns out that through the history, a large amount of funds, large for the time, predated 1887 in the form of annuities. In other words, Indians would give up their lands for an annuity, sometimes issued by the United States. So they were receiving annuity payments off of their lands in these sales.

And so we documented a number of annuity payments, and we also documented a number of commutation of annuities, which means a lump sum paid in lieu of future payments.

But we couldn't identify, A, a big enough universe to say that we captured them in any respect; and secondly, we really had no method of saying how much of those annuity payments were allocable to allotted lands.

21 Q. And so essentially, that is all the revenue sources you used
22 to develop this model?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. That you've explained so far?

## final calculation?

A. Yes. A number, one of which is in the hard rock mineral
and the judge in that case was named Winters, and it became known as the Winters Doctrine.

This is still -- my understanding of that is Indians obtained water rights with their land, but the water rights in essence inured to the benefit of the land. They couldn't sell their water rights to someone, for example, downstream.

So we believe that most water rights inured to the benefit the lessee of a particular land, because it was able to be irrigated by virtue of the Indian right to water. But there
never were able to produce reliable data is contained in our other category.
Q. And we'll discuss that other category in a little bit.

I wanted to talk about some of the gaps in data. You said there were gaps in land leases and land sales. And were there gaps in other data that you collected, or was given to you by some of these experts? A. When we receive data from other experts, we do not presuppose any information that they don't give us.

So yes, I did note very limitedly there were certain gaps in like the Questa data. I've observed them, but I wouldn't call them in any way significant.

In other words, if they were able to identify the production value in a particular year but they couldn't identify the price reliable, they might leave price blank, which would come down in my model as zero, which I would take the production value times zero would equal zero.

But those were very limited in nature.
Q. So the gaps you had to deal with were essentially with the
land sales and land leases, for the most part?
A. Yes. We had two sets of what I would call gaps, and gaps means years where I didn't have any data in my model. And so we dealt with those gaps by virtue of what is, I think, called linear interpolation, or interpolation, and that means filling the gaps between two known points with -- and the vernacular
would be straight line data reconstruction.
MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1,

## please?

BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Have you seen this document, Mr. Fasold?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you review this in analyzing the defendants'
throughput documents?
A. Yes.

MR. GUILDER: If we could turn to the --
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. Well, last time you were on the stand, you testified about interpolation; there were some issues with that term, essentially, and the use of it. Is that correct?
A. Yeah, that was most significantly on my cross-examination about how I did it and its reliability, yes.

MR. GUILDER: If we could turn to page two of this
document, and zoom in on the first highlighted section?
BY MR. GUILDER:
Q. And this is a NORC document, and it is essentially laying
out some of the modeling assumptions that NORC took in their model.

And the first, it characterizes as minor in effects.
MR. GUILDER: Could we look at the next highlighted
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