1537

CONTENTS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, : Civil Action 96-1285 et al. :

Plaintiffs

Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, October 23, 2007

DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

:, Secretary :

Defendants : MORNING SESSION

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING

DAY 8
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQUIRE LAW OFFICES OF DENNIS GINGOLD 607 14th Street, NW Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20005 (202) 824-1448

ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, ESQUIRE WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 1100 Peachtree Street Suite 2800 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 (404) 815-6450

KEITH HARPER, ESQUIRE JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 607 14th Street, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 585-0053

DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE
DANIEL R. TAYLOR, JR., ESQUIRE
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101
(336) 607-7392

Rebecca Stonestreet

(202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net

WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS

PAUL HOMAN

By Mr. Dorris 1537 -- -- --By Mr. Quinn -- 1581 -- --

RICHARD FASOLD

By Mr. Guilder 1603 -- -- -

EXHIBITS

NUMBER

ADMITTED

(No Exhibits Moved into Evidence.)

1535

For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE

JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE U.S. Department of Justice 1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010

JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104

Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET

Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. Good morning,

3 Mr. Dorris. Whenever you're ready, Mr. Dorris.

4 MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

00:00:47 5 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION OF PAUL HOMAN

6 BY MR. DORRIS:

 ${\bf 7} \quad {\bf Q}. \quad {\sf Good\ morning}, \, {\sf Mr}. \, \, {\sf Homan}. \, \, \, {\sf Yesterday\ when\ we\ broke}, \, {\sf we\ were}$

8 looking at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 575, and page 10 of that exhibit,

9 page number eight of the Arthur Andersen audit that was

 $_{\tt 00:01:05}$ $\,$ $\,$ $\,$ $\,$ furnished in 1990 for the years that we've identified in the

11 late '80s. And we were looking at the language toward the

12 bottom of the page - we'll bring that up - dealing with matters

13 there.

14 Let me direct your attention to a statement, and this

00:01:25 **15** is under item number three, "Accounting systems and material

16 internal control weaknesses." And if you'll look down about

17 five or six lines, do you see a sentence that starts, "Certain

18 of these internal control weaknesses"?

19 A. Yes.

00:01:46 **20 Q.** It says, "Certain of these internal control weaknesses are

21 so pervasive and fundamental as to render the accounting systems

22 unreliable."

Now, we're not going to look at the 16 specific items

24 that they reference there, but what did you find when you came

00:02:11 **25** in as special trustee in terms of this statement, not just of

	1538		1540
1	Arthur Andersen, but what you found there at the department?	1	Fund Management was required to keep its books in accordance
2	A. In terms of internal control	2	with GAAP, and it was required to have an independent outside
3	Q. Yes, sir.	3	audit in accordance with GAS.
4	A weaknesses?	4	And so I received the first audit in my capacity as the
00:02:25 5	Internal controls in this instance, and in the instance	00:05:41 5	manager of the Office of Trust Fund Management.
6	that I found when I was special trustee, in my due diligence for	6	Q. Good. Let's look at that. It's in the administrative
7	the strategic plan really involved control over the Trust	7	record as Bates document 66-5. And we'll start looking at page
8	accounting and asset management systems, which I was chartered $% \left(\mathbf{r}\right) =\left(\mathbf{r}\right) $	8	two.
9	by the Reform Act to reform. And that includes accounting	9	So we're looking at administrative record, Bates page
00:02:49 10	policy, accounting practices, and the recordkeeping aspects of	00:05:57 10	number 66-5-2, and is this the audit that you were just
11	any Trust account.	11	referring to from Griffin in December of 1996 for the Statement
12	Q . Now, if we'll look and I think we looked at the next page	12	of Assets and Trust Fund Balances at September 30, 1995 for the
13	here in this report yesterday. It's a continued list of	13	Office of Trust Funds Management?
14	specific items. And if we'll go to the end of that list on the	14	A. Yes, it is.
00:03:13 15	next page, so that we're now at page 10 of this report, it's	00:06:21 15	Q. Now, let's look over, it would be Bates page four, we'll
16	page 12 of the exhibit. And would you focus on the paragraph	16	skip the table of contents. And if you would bring the top of
17	just below paragraph P, toward the top of the page?	17	this document up so we're at 66-5-4. And this is a December 13,
18	And it states, "As a result of the material weaknesses	18	1996 document from the Office of the Inspector General, and it's
19	and internal controls referred to above, it is not possible to	19	to the special trustee. At this time, was that you?
00:03:36 20	determine whether certain financial elements reflected in the	00:06:48 20	A. Yes.
21	accompanying financial statements are fairly stated and	21	Q. So you were the one that received this report. Why is it
22	presented."	22	coming from the Office of the Inspector General?
23	You indicated yesterday that this was a qualified	23	A. The Office of the Inspector General conducts separate
24	audit.	24	investigations and et cetera for any audit deficiencies
00:03:49 25	A. Yes.	00:07:08 25	identified that may involve fraud or some other defect in the
	1539		1541
1	Q. Is this a confirmation or an indication that it is?	1	account reconciliation and verification process.
2	A. Yes, it is, in accounting terms.		
_		2	Q. Okay. And so the audit actually comes to the Office of
3	Q. Now, Arthur Andersen audited, you said, I think for	3	Inspector General, and then they forward it on to you?
4	Q. Now, Arthur Andersen audited, you said, I think for four years. And this is the first, as we saw yesterday, as you	_	Inspector General, and then they forward it on to you? A. Yes.
4 00:04:08 5	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	3 4 00:07:24 5	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
4	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 that correct?	3 4	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
00:04:08 5 6 7	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7	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?
00:04:08 5 6 7 8	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8	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.
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9	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
4 00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10	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
4 00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? A. Yes, an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management. 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11	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?
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11	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.
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 Management. The audits we just looked at of Arthur Andersen 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13	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
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 Management. The audits we just looked at of Arthur Andersen were audits of what? 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14	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
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:35 15	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15	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?
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16	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.
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17	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
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:35 15 16 17 18	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18	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
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18	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
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:35 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:58 20	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits,	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:16 20	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?
4 00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:35 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:58 20 21	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits, we're actually looking at an audit of the Office of Trust Fund	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:16 20 21	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.
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits, we're actually looking at an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management as opposed to BIA? 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:16 20 21 22	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
00:04:08	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits, we're actually looking at an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management as opposed to BIA? A. Yes. And the Griffin audit, which was the first audit	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:16 20 21 22 23	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
00:04:08 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:35 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:58 20 21 22	 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 that correct? A. Yes, that's correct. Q. And then when you came in as special trustee, there was an audit done, I think you said by Griffin & Company. Do you recall that? 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 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 Indian Affairs, which at that time included the functions of the Office of Trust Fund Management. Subsequent to 1991, it was separated out from the bureau. Q. Okay. So now when we go and look at the Griffin audits, we're actually looking at an audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management as opposed to BIA? 	3 4 00:07:24 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:08:16 20 21 22	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

	1542		1544
1	address four material weaknesses, six reportable conditions, and	1	Q. Then is this then the Office of Inspector General's summary
2	six advisory comments as follows." And then they go on to	2	of the audit report that is attached to it?
3	summarize those.	3	A. Yes.
4	Let's look at those briefly, at the first one. But you	4	Q. Now, at this point in time, then, did Griffin continue to do
00:08:52 5	notice they're talking about 16 recommendations, and various	00:12:28 5	audits such as this each year while you were still special
6	weaknesses and conditions and comments. And I think we saw from	6	trustee?
7	the Arthur Andersen audit that there were 16 individual items	7	A. Yes, they did.
8	that they addressed.	8	Q. And were the results of that audit how did that compare
9	We're now looking at the paragraph that starts, "The	9	to what we see here?
00:09:10 10	four material internal control weaknesses." Would you take a	00:12:40 10	A. As I recall, they were qualified during those years, which
11	moment and review that to yourself, please, sir?	11	would have been '96, '97, and '98, for the same reasons that are
12	A. (Witness complies.) Yes.	12	set forth in this report.
13	Q. And you were the one that was receiving this document. What	13	Q. And then at some point after you left, KPMG became the
14	did you as special trustee at this time understand you were	14	auditor for the Office of Trust Fund Management. And have you
00:09:46 15	being told by the independent auditor, Griffin, with respect to	00:12:59 15	reviewed the most recent audit from KPMG?
16	the Office of Trust Fund Management and the ability to manage	16	A. I reviewed all of the audits that were publicly available,
17	those Trust funds?	17	but paid particular attention to the most recent one, 2006.
18	A. I found the conditions there, by my own due diligence, to be	18	Q. Let's look at that. It is in the administrative record as
19	equivalent to the general opinions of Griffin. And they	19	document 60-2. And if we'll look at the first page of it. So
00:10:10 20	discussed with me and my staff prior to the issuance of the	00:13:24 20	it's administrative record Bates page 60-2-1.
21	audit, to give us an opportunity to respond to the audit	21	And this is then the audit for fiscal year 2006/2005.
22	deficiencies, and essentially I agreed that the staffing was	22	Do you see that?
23	inadequate, the financial resources attributed to the Office of	23	A. Yes.
24	Trust Fund Management was inadequate, and essentially the Trust	24	Q. And if we will look at Bates page two of this document. And
00:10:36 25	accounting system had defects dating over decades that made the	00:13:47 25	at the top, this then is a similar cover memo from the Office of
	1543		1545
1	accounting systems unreliable.	1	Inspector General to the special trustee for American Indians,
1 2	accounting systems unreliable. Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just	1 2	Inspector General to the special trustee for American Indians, dated December 14, 2006. Of course, you weren't you were not
			·
2 3 4	Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just	2 3 4	dated December 14, 2006. Of course, you weren't you were not
2 3 4 00:10:57 5	Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades?	2 3 4 00:14:07 5	dated December 14, 2006. Of course, you weren't you were not the one that received this memo, but you have reviewed it?
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that were identified in prior audits and the like. 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18	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."
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that were identified in prior audits and the like. Q. Okay. Now, if we'll look at the next paragraph of the IG 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:43 20	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 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 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19 00:15:18 20	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:43 20 21	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 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, 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19 00:15:18 20 21	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:43 20 21 22	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 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. 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19 00:15:18 20 21 22	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?
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:43 20 21 22 23	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 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 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19 00:15:18 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 00:10:57 5 6 7 8 9 00:11:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:11:20 15 16 17 18 19 00:11:43 20 21 22	 Q. I think there's a difference in pronunciation. Did you just say I would call it decades, and you said it was decades? A. Well, decades. Q. But we're talking about the same thing? A. I guess. Q. Okay. Now, you notice at the bottom of that paragraph, it talks about the accountant's report not containing recommendations because there was going to be a strategic plan for the Office of the Special Trustee. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. Q. And was that something that you were preparing and putting together? A. Yes, I was required by the Reform Act to put together a strategic plan to reform the Trust accounting systems and the Trust asset management systems, and the other deficiencies that 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. 	2 3 4 00:14:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:14:29 10 11 12 13 14 00:14:53 15 16 17 18 19 00:15:18 20 21 22	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?

	1546		1548
1	THE COURT: Let's see if the witness can answer the	1	they've observed. And the heading is "Reliance on Processing of
2	question.	2	Trust Transactions At the Bureau of Indian Affairs and
3	A. What I believe that means is the same that it meant in 1996,	3	Unresolved Financial Reporting Matters From the Prior Periods."
4	7, 8, and 9; and that is that up until 1999, at least, to my	4	Do you see that?
00:16:01 5	knowledge and as stated in the audit reports that I reviewed,	00:19:39 5	A. Yes.
6	the bureau had no accounts receivable system.	6	Q. And let me ask this question as we get ready to go through
7	THE WITNESS: The bureau, Your Honor, manages the	7	some of the items here: Are most of the items that we saw from
8	assets. It lists the assets; it contracts for the lease of	8	Arthur Andersen's report in the late 1980's, and Griffin's
9	those assets, or invests those assets; it collects payments from	9	reports starting in the mid 1990's, is that much the same
00:16:30 10	those lease revenues and oil and gas revenues or timber	00:20:01 10	problems that are being addressed here by KPMG?
11	contracts and land contracts; and then it passes that through to	11	A. Substantially the same.
12	the Office of Trust Fund Management.	12	Q. All right. Now, let's look at the second paragraph under
13	A. I installed a new system there called TFAS, Trust Fund Asset	13	the condition here. And it's talking about the "financial
14	Management or Accounting System, that was a commercial grade	14	information systems and internal control procedures," and
00:16:54 15	while I was there. So while I was there, we were able to	00:20:25 15	talking about "suffered historically from a variety of system
16	account for every nickel that came in from the bureau; some	16	and procedural internal control weaknesses."
17	most of it passes through to account holders, but in connection	17	Is that what you were talking about from your own due
18	with minor accounts or per capita accounts, in some instances it	18	diligence of having looked at these problems going back decades?
19	is invested by that TFAS system, which is operated by an outside	19	A. Yes.
00:17:20 20	servicer, and has passed all of the audits when I was there and	00:20:39 20	Q. Let's look at some of the specific items starting at the
21	up to the present, to my knowledge.	21	next paragraph. Let me give you a moment to look at that. It's
22	What isn't audited and what can't be audited is the	22	the paragraph, for the record, that begins, "The regional and
23	bureau's part of this. Up until 1999, at least - and according	23	agency offices."
24	to these reports, it still does not have an adequate accounts	24	A. (Witness complies.)
00:17:42 25	receivable system which is able to trace a payment back to a	00:21:05 25	Q. And this is then where the auditor is getting ready to start
	1547		1549
1	lease - in some cases, it does not have copies of past leases.	1	listing problems. Do you see that?
2	And without that kind of a system, you are unable to	2	A. Yes.
3	tell whether the lessee is paying the correct contract amount.	3	Q. Now, before we look at that, it talks about the regional and
4	He may be making a partial payment, he may be past due on	4	agency offices of BIA. From when you were special trustee, did
00:18:00 5	payments, and there's no way to verify that from an audit	00:21:22 5	you gain some familiarity with differences as to how the various
6	standpoint. Therefore, you can't certify the beginning balance	6	regions and offices would handle the accounting or the
7	in any of these accounts.	7	management of the Trust funds?
8	When these accounts were passed from the bureau to the	8	A. Yes. Originally, when I joined the office as special
9	Office of Trust Fund Management in the 1999, like any private	9	trustee, I did not have management responsibility over the
00:18:21 10	trustee, the Office of Trust Fund Management or the trustee	00:21:45 10	Office of Trust Fund Management. The Secretary asked me to
	trustee, the office of frust runa runagement. Of the trustee		office of Trade Faria Management. The decretary asked me to
11	is compelled to certify the ownership information, the asset	11	undertake that because of certain managerial difficulties in the
11 12	•	11 12	•
	is compelled to certify the ownership information, the asset		undertake that because of certain managerial difficulties in the
12	is compelled to certify the ownership information, the asset information, the valuations of those assets, and a cash balance,	12	undertake that because of certain managerial difficulties in the BIA.
12 13	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	12 13	undertake that because of certain managerial difficulties in the BIA. So about one year after I joined, and I believe it was
12 13 14	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.	12 13 14	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15	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	12 13 14 00:22:04 15	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16	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	12 13 14 00:22:04 15	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.
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17	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.	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17 18	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:	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17 18	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17 18 19	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,	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17 18 19	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:54 20	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	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17 18 19 00:22:26 20	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:54 20 21	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	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17 18 19 00:22:26 20 21	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
12 13 14 00:18:40 15 16 17 18 19 00:18:54 20 21 22	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.	12 13 14 00:22:04 15 16 17 18 19 00:22:26 20 21 22	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.

	1550		1552
1	A. Yes, there was no consolidated accounting for the Trust	1	A. It certainly doesn't look like it.
2	assets. According to the GAO audits, they did not know the	2	Q. Now let's look at the next paragraph, B. And we're still on
3	total population of the assets under management. There were	3	Bates page 60-2-34, talking about accounts receivable. And
4	breaks in the chain of title, for certain of their assets, which	4	would you take a moment and review that?
00:23:23 5	were never audited.	00:26:36 5	A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
6	And they were relying on a defective system, in my	6	Q. You've already talked a little bit about accounts receivable
7	view, in what is called the Integrated Resource Management	7	and having accounts receivable programmed. Was there an
8	System, IRMS	8	accounts receivable program in place when you became special
9	THE WITNESS: Which I'm sure you're familiar with by	9	trustee at BIA?
00:23:40 10	now, Your Honor.	00:26:57 10	A. No. No, there was not. And that is one of the audit
11	BY MR. DORRIS:	11	exceptions that was mentioned in the Griffin audit report: No
12	Q. All too familiar with, I'm sure.	12	accounts receivable system.
13	A. In my due diligence, I looked back. IRMS was out of balance	13	THE WITNESS: Also in connection with my due diligence,
14	with the trust fund accounting system for every year after it	14	Your Honor, in connection with my strategic plan, I was given
00:23:53 15	was organized in 1972 through 1997.	00:27:16 15	the opportunity to have to employ an outside contractor to
16	When the Office of Trust Fund Management received its	16	look at the integrated or IRMS system, as well as the
17	first audit, the bureau or excuse me, the Department of	17	accounts receivable system. I personally made 22 over 20
18	Interior started taking the trust fund asset or excuse me,	18	trips to the reservations and the various regional offices, and
19	accounting system's numbers rather than IRMS because they were	19	personally inspected their recordkeeping processes and their
00:24:19 20	audited and the others were not.	00:27:40 20	accounts receivable systems.
21	To my knowledge, those adjustment differences during	21	Almost to a person one of the outside contractors
22	that period were a cumulative net \$105 million that have never	22	described their information systems of the 12 area offices as
23	been reconciled; at least, they weren't up until the time I	23	12 islands of information without a ferry in between. He was an
24	left, nor could they be, because a good many of the records had	24	Englishman.
00:24:38 25	been destroyed prior to 1985, as previous people have testified	00:28:03 25	The Englishman also came back when I came into the
	1551		1553
1	here, the electronic records.	1	Office of Total Food Management, there are a second to 110
		•	Office of Trust Fund Management, there was one computer in 110
2	Q. Mr. Homan, let's look at some of the items that the auditor	2	offices. We established, and the bureau gave out, some
2		_	
_	Q. Mr. Homan, let's look at some of the items that the auditor	2	offices. We established, and the bureau gave out, some
3	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	3	offices. We established, and the bureau gave out, some state-of-the-art computers at the time. And the outside
3 4	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	2 3 4	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
3 4 00:25:03 5	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.	2 3 4 00:28:25 5	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.
3 4 00:25:03 5 6	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."	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10	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.	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8	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.
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10	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:	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9	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:
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13	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."
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14	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.
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17	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."	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18	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.
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18	 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 	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19	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.
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18 19 00:25:59 20	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."	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19 00:29:32 20	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18 19 00:25:59 20 21	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19 00:29:32 20 21	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?
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18 19 00:25:59 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19 00:29:32 20 21 22	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18 19 00:25:59 20 21 22 23	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?	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19 00:29:32 20 21 22 23	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
3 4 00:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:25:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:25:36 15 16 17 18 19 00:25:59 20 21 22	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.	2 3 4 00:28:25 5 6 7 8 9 00:28:42 10 11 12 13 14 00:29:18 15 16 17 18 19 00:29:32 20 21 22	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

	1554		1556
1	THE COURT: No, but I'll hear your answer to the	1	look at that for a moment.
2	question.	2	A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
3	BY MR. DORRIS:	3	Q. And this is addressing BIA not consistently performing
4	Q. I think that's an indication for you to go ahead and answer	4	reviews over active supervised accounts, or maintaining
00:29:54 5	the question.	00:33:44 5	documentation regarding them. Was that a problem when you were
6	A. All right.	6	special trustee?
7	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, my due diligence and the	7	A. That was essentially the issue I just identified, where the
8	actual probate backlog is contained in my strategic plan, which	8	superintendents often made disbursement and receipt decisions
9	was an exhibit in my last testimony. So in that testimony is a	9	for the trustee, particularly minors, that were not sufficiently
00:30:10 10	list of the so-called audit and other exceptions we found in	00:34:01 10	documented.
11	connection with my due diligence look at the Office of Trust	11	Q. Let's look at the next paragraph, where the accountant
12	Fund Management.	12	concludes that "The presence of these internal control
13	A. As I recall, at that time there were over 6,000 cases	13	weaknesses directly impacts OST's ability to process Trust
14	backlogged in the probate system, and in some cases those cases	14	transactions on behalf of Trust beneficiaries, and to provide
00:30:33 15	were over four years old.	00:34:19 15	accurate information to account holders, due to the
16	In my subsequent look at the information that was	16	interrelationship between BIA and OST.
17	provided in 2003	17	And as of this report of December 1996 excuse me,
18	THE COURT: You think four years is old for a case?	18	2006, is this the same state that you found when you were
19	THE WITNESS: Yes. On average, in some cases.	19	special trustee in the late 1990's?
00:30:50 20	A. Now, that was to be resolved in the I-level implementation	00:34:39 20	A. Yes. And for all the reasons I have suggested, I was
21	plan under the Secretary's watch. He made that comment. His	21	confident when I left the Office of the Special Trustee that the
22	watch ended at the end of the year 2000 when the administration	22	Office of Trust Fund Management could account for every nickel
23	changes.	23	coming in. But I didn't know whether those nickels should have
24	Now I see that they still have a backlog, and they're	24	been dollars or dimes or zero.
00:31:09 25	going to be resolving these issues by September 2009. So	00:35:00 25	And I was confident that we were investing those at
	1555		1557
1	nine years have passed.	1	1557 interest up to a commercial grade, but we weren't to disburse it
1 2		1 2	
1	nine years have passed.	_	interest up to a commercial grade, but we weren't to disburse it
2	nine years have passed. BY MR. DORRIS:	2	interest up to a commercial grade, but we weren't to disburse it because of the condition of the ownership records and the
2 3 4 00:31:26 5	nine years have passed. BY MR. DORRIS: Q. But tie, very briefly if you can, how a probate backlog	2	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
3 4	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.	3 4	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10	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.	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I left, of the regional offices, who act as surrogate guidelines	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I left, of the regional offices, who act as surrogate guidelines for minors in particularly (sic), to distribute funds based on	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15	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?
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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.	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19	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.
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:32:54 20	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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 20th century.	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19 00:36:28 20	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:32:54 20 21	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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 20th century. Q. Let's look over	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19 00:36:28 20 21	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:32:54 20 21 22	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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 20th century. Q. Let's look over A. I'm not prepared to say what's happening in the 21st	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19 00:36:28 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:32:54 20 21 22 23	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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 20th century. Q. Let's look over A. I'm not prepared to say what's happening in the 21st century.	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19 00:36:28 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 00:31:26 5 6 7 8 9 00:32:02 10 11 12 13 14 00:32:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:32:54 20 21 22	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. It has been the practice, at least up until the time I 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 20th century. Q. Let's look over A. I'm not prepared to say what's happening in the 21st	2 3 4 00:35:22 5 6 7 8 9 00:35:39 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:01 15 16 17 18 19 00:36:28 20 21 22	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

	1558		1560
1	ledger differences, as I recall, over 70 million net, between	1	it didn't bother to go back and reconcile all of the general
2	the accounts in 1971, cash balances, essentially of the	2	ledger differences. And so, you know, as a government, these
3	U.S. Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.	3	are pretty much debits to the general account, but they would be
4	So they've never been reconciled. That money belongs	4	an insolvent situation if it were a private sector trust
00:37:18 5	to somebody, and it was having to do with either the Tribal or	00:40:49 5	company.
6	the individual Indian accounts.	6	But those monies again belong to somebody; nobody knows
7	So they've been out of balance. And as I said,	7	who. And chances are, you know, an American Indian got benefit;
8	subsequent to that, according to a document I've seen in	8	but whether the right beneficiary got benefit is unknown.
9	connection with this and the throughput study, the IRMS has been	9	Q. Let's look at the top of the next page, so it's Bates page
00:37:42 10	out of balance with the TFAS account to the tune of 105 million	00:41:07 10	60-2-36. And this is one of the differences from the prior year
11	net from 1997, every year or excuse me, from 1972 to 1997.	11	that's noted by KPMG in this audit, dealing with Special Deposit
12	None of those differences, as I recall the footnotes, said it	12	Accounts, Tribal and IIM.
13	was due to missing records and undocumented receipts and	13	My questions to you will only be asking about the IIM
14	disbursements.	14	Special Deposit Accounts. Okay?
00:38:06 15	THE COURT: Now, is that 70 million and that	00:41:27 15	A. Right.
16	105 million, is that the same money, or do those two differences	16	Q. Now, let me give you a moment to review that.
17	total 175 million?	17	A. (Witness complies.) Yes.
18	THE WITNESS: No, the 70 million has to do with the net	18	Q. Mr. Homan, you see there the last sentence in that
19	differences between the ending balance. So they took one	19	paragraph, it says, "At September 30, 2006, a significant number
00:38:23 20	balance or the other. And then subsequent to that, it's another	00:42:26 20	of Special Deposit Accounts continued to require resolution."
21	105 million, at least.	21	Was this also a problem during the time that you were
22	BY MR. DORRIS:	22	special trustee?
23	Q. And you've talked about those differences. And would you	23	A. Yes. Historically, and contrary to modern trust accounting,
24	look at this paragraph dealing with lack of reliable IIM	24	some of the Tribal funds and Special Deposit Accounts that had
00:38:36 25	balance? And take a moment to review that to answer this	00:42:50 25	nothing to do with the individual Indian accounts were mixed
	1559		1561
1	question. This is actually talking about where the TFAS system	1	1561 into the same general fund, and have never been able to sort
1 2		1 2	
	question. This is actually talking about where the TFAS system	_	into the same general fund, and have never been able to sort
2	question. This is actually talking about where the TFAS system itself, between the control ledger balance and the subsidiary	2	into the same general fund, and have never been able to sort out.
2	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.	2	into the same general fund, and have never been able to sort out. I noted it in some of the throughput studies. The
2 3 4	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	3 4	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11	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.
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12	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.	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15	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.
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16	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?	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17	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,	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18	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?
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19	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.	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:03 20	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19 00:44:18 20	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:03 20 21	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19 00:44:18 20 21	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:03 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19 00:44:18 20 21 22	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.
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:03 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19 00:44:18 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 00:39:03 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:40:03 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 00:43:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:43:37 10 11 12 13 14 00:43:59 15 16 17 18 19 00:44:18 20 21 22	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.

	1562		1564
1	when you were special trustee, you also received a report from	1	timber contracts, and oil and gas leases dating back to 1972,
2	Arthur Andersen dealing with the Tribal Reconciliation Project.	2	most of which had been destroyed. Not were missing, but were
3	Do you recall that?	3	destroyed, and the like.
4	A. Yes.	4	So general results, as I remember, is that they came up
00:44:58 5	Q. Now, before I ask you about that, that is one that dealt	00:48:50 5	with \$7.1 billion of general ledger entries that were not
6	with the Tribal Trust funds and not the IIM funds. Is that	6	supported with sufficient documentation. \$2.4 billion had no
7	right?	7	documentation supporting the check or deposit receipt,
8	A. It didn't start out that way, but that's the way it ended,	8	supporting the general ledger entries. That's astounding.
9	yes.	9	Q. The amounts that you just stated
00:45:15 10	Q. Okay. This report and this process had started before you	00:49:25 10	THE COURT: Mr. Dorris, I'm going to ask you to stop
11	became special trustee?	11	for a minute. My computer has crashed here. I need to reboot
12	A. Yes. In the early 1990's, the Department of Interior took	12	it. We're all living in a new age.
13	the selfsame Arthur Andersen that had done the audits from 1988	13	(OFF THE RECORD.)
14	to 1991, and asked them to do a GAAP audit of excuse me, a	14	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Dorris. Thank you.
00:45:40 15	GAS audit of the receipts and disbursements dating from 1971 on	00:50:11 15	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	to 1992, which was the end date. So essentially, that '70-'92	16	BY MR. DORRIS:
17	period was covered.	17	Q . Mr. Homan, the amounts that you just mentioned of the
18	Immediately again, I received the report in 1995 of	18	7.1 billion and I think it was 2.4 billion, those were dealing
19	the completed I was the receiving official at that time. I	19	with the Tribal Trust funds. Correct?
00:46:10 20	had to present that to the American Indians. It showed the	00:50:22 20	A. Yes, they were, with one exception. Some of the Osage per
21	significant departures from GAAP, and inconclusive results,	21	capita accounts were included. And the Osage, as I recall,
22	presumably because Arthur Andersen had to depart from GAAP,	22	because I had to present it to their Tribal Council, had over
23	according to agreed-upon procedures, over 100 times, mostly	23	400 million of that 2.4 million (sic) unsupported.
24	because of missing records, destroyed records, lack of	24	Q . But you were using that as an example as to when I asked
00:46:37 25	predecessor accounting systems that were accurate, and lack of	00:50:47 25	you what it meant that there would be inconclusive results, that
	1563		1565
1	audits.	1	was an example of how the Tribal Trust
2	Q. Now, with respect to the Arthur Andersen report on the	2	A. That's right. What can you say? I had to say to that
3	Tribal Trust, what did that tell you or what did you learn	3	Tribal Council, "We can't account for 400 million of the
4	regarding the IIM Trust as a result of that process with Arthur	4	disbursements out of your account for your per capita people,
00:47:04 5	Andersen?	00:51:05 5	because we have no check or no other proof of disbursement. So
6	A. I looked into the history. And originally, the department	6	we don't know whether it went to the right beneficiary or not.
8	had intended that the IIM accounts be audited under the same	8	And that can never be reconciled. There's been no look
9	by the same Arthur Andersen, according to GAAP, for the same	9	back, in any of these plans, to account for those types of
00:47:20 10	period of time. Arthur Andersen, early in that process, advised the	00:51:29 10	historical discrepancies. The department wishes to just go
11	department that it would cost at least 10 times the	11	forward from the time in 1994, but how can you not go back and verify and reconcile these astounding accounting deficiencies?
12	20 million-odd in funds spent for the audit to do the IIM	12	Q. Now, you also talked yesterday about a file check. And you
13	accounts, and would yield inconclusive results for the reasons I	13	said it wasn't an audit, but it was a process that you had
14	just mentioned. So the department decided not to do that	14	ordered to be undertaken.
00:47:50 15	Q. Okay.	00:51:53 15	A. Yeah.
16	A for the IIM accounts.	16	Q. First of all, would you briefly describe what the process
17	Q. When you talk about, "would yield inconclusive results,"	17	was that you implemented, and then we'll talk about the results.
18	what do you mean?	18	What was the process for the file check?
19	A. Well, let me give you just one example of the results of	19	A. Yes. As part of my due diligence for the strategic plan,
00:48:05 20	this audit that was done by Arthur Andersen, that had	00:52:08 20	and in parallel with the Griffin audit, I did my own examination
21	disclaimers 110 times in the first few pages. Even with the	21	of the audit of the Office of Trust Fund Management. I secured
22	limited audit they were able to do, they were not able to look	22	funds, and ordered a file check of the six-odd legal
23	at any lease contract because of the lack of an accounts	23	requirements for each OTFM fund.
24	receivable system.	24	The process was that we pulled in each file from the
00:48:28 25	They had originally started to look at some regional	00:52:36 25	regions by Fed Ex. We ran them through an assembly line

	1566		1568
1	consisting of outside lawyers, paralegals, accountants, to check	1	THE WITNESS: These, Your Honor, can't be reconciled,
2	each file to determine that it had the right information in it.	2	because they are an accumulated burden that took place over
3	And there were astounding results, again.	3	almost every year in the 20th century.
4	Q. Okay. Now, can you give us a highlight of the what you	4	BY MR. DORRIS:
00:53:02 5	said were astounding results, some insights into what you	00:56:42 5	Q. Now, you've talked about much of what you did as special
6	found	6	trustee, your due diligence and documents that you've also
7	THE COURT: When did you do this?	7	reviewed, that brings some of that information current.
8	THE WITNESS: I did this in 1997, as part of my	8	Would you tell the Court what your opinion is as to
9	strategic plan. Actually, it started in 1996, Your Honor.	9	whether these IIM accounts, an accounting that is conclusive
00:53:18 10	BY MR. DORRIS:	00:57:07 10	with respect to IIM accounts, can be rendered?
11	Q. Can you give us an overview of some of the results that you	11	MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. I don't see that in
12	found?	12	his disclosure, expert disclosure. And there's no foundation
13	A. Yes. I don't want to get into a lot of the details.	13	established of this witness' current knowledge.
14	They're again laid out in a chart in my strategic plan that was	14	THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be
00:53:38 15	introduced in Court.	00:57:23 15	asked and answered. He just said that: They can't be
16	But the highlights are following: It's the 70 million	16	reconciled, they're an accumulated burden that took place over
17	in general ledger deficiencies that I outlined earlier; we found	17	almost every year in the 20th century.
18	over 70,000 Whereabouts Unknown accounts, with balances of	18	MR. QUINN: I understood his testimony to be related to
19	\$49 million, as I recall; we found 183,000 of the 790,000 open	19	the time he was in office, 1996, 1997.
00:53:59 20	and closed accounts that had no tax ID or Social Security	00:57:41 20	THE COURT: Well, it's the impossibility question.
21	number, as required by the tax codes and the Bank Secrecy Act at	21	Everybody in this case has an opinion on that subject. I'll
22	the time.	22	allow this witness to give his.
23	THE WITNESS: The bureau, Your Honor, is required, like	23	THE WITNESS: I think I just summed it up, Your Honor.
24	every other trustee, to file a 1099 of income information on its	24	THE COURT: They were your words, Mr. Homan.
00:54:20 25	beneficiaries. These are all American citizens, they pay taxes	00:57:54 25	THE WITNESS: And I can back them up.
	1567		1569
1	1567 like everybody else. And there was 183,000 that had no identity	1	A. But generally, I don't believe that a what is required
1 2		1 2	
_	like everybody else. And there was 183,000 that had no identity		A. But generally, I don't believe that a what is required
2	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	2	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
2 3	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.	2	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
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5	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.
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6	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.	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9	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.	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10	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:	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11	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.
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16	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,	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18	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?	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19	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,	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19	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.
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19 00:55:53 20	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19 00:59:23 20	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19 00:55:53 20 21	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'	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19 00:59:23 20 21	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19 00:55:53 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19 00:59:23 20 21 22	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.
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19 00:55:53 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19 00:59:23 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 00:54:44 5 6 7 8 9 00:55:05 10 11 12 13 14 00:55:31 15 16 17 18 19 00:55:53 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 00:58:17 5 6 7 8 9 00:58:44 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:07 15 16 17 18 19 00:59:23 20 21 22	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 -

	1570		1572
1	account. It can't be done, should not be done.	1	Mr. Dorris, I think government counsel are itching to
2	Q. Why do you say it shouldn't be done?	2	stand up and say you're talking about remedy here and not the
3	A. It's too expensive, and it would again prove inconclusive	3	trial issues. I don't know why they're not doing that. I'm
4	results. What could you tell the current account holders, that	4	going to do it for them.
01:00:09 5	we think the balance is this much; we can't tie any disbursement	01:04:11 5	It's an interesting what you're suggesting here is
6	going back before X in the 20th century to a particular asset or	6	very interesting. It is not what we're about in this trial.
7	lease?	7	Okay?
8	And so you give erroneous and suspect information to	8	MR. DORRIS: Okay. Your Honor, where I was going with
9	the beneficiary that he can't use. How can he challenge that?	9	this with respect to this trial was that there is a different
01:00:37 10	Q. Mr. Homan, let's look back, now shifting subjects, to	01:04:27 10	approach than the approach that is being used.
11	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210, page four. And if you would look down	11	THE COURT: I understand that.
12	at the paragraph that begins B at the bottom. And we're back,	12	MR. DORRIS: But I won't go any further.
13	Mr. Homan, in your report.	13	THE WITNESS: I understand that. But the question that
14	A. Yeah.	14	this witness is now being asked to address is: What do we do
01:01:00 15	Q . Now, I would ask you you're talking here about Bank of	01:04:41 15	about this?
16	America. And this is based on a document from the	16	MR. DORRIS: Okay.
17	administrative record. The Bates number in the administrative	17	THE COURT: And that's not the issue we're talking
18	record is 22-3, pages two through three. So 22-3-2 through 3,	18	about in this trial, the way I see it and the way I've set it
19	is a quote from an e-mail from Bank of America to the Department	19	up.
01:01:34 20	of Interior, that talks about what Bank of America would do if	01:04:47 20	MR. DORRIS: I'll move on, Your Honor.
21	they took over a bank and then that trust department of that	21	THE COURT: Thank you.
22	bank had missing documents regarding an account.	22	BY MR. DORRIS:
23	Would you read to yourself the quote from that e-mail	23	Q. Would you look at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210, page five, in
24	that begins on this page, and then goes over to the next page?	24	the middle of the page? It begins with paragraph C.
01:01:52 25	A. (Witness complies.)	01:05:04 25	MR. DORRIS: If you would show the last half of that
	1571		1573
1	Q. And if you would look at the top of the next page, please,	1	page, please.
2	sir.	2	BY MR. DORRIS:
3	A. (Witness complies.)	3	Q. Mr. Homan, let me ask this: You talk about here that the
4	MR. DORRIS: Could you keep that up and pull up the	4	2000 plan is flawed in other respects. And the question is,
01:02:26 5	paragraph just underneath it, also?	01:05:25 5	what are you talking about in the the other flaws in the 2007
6	BY MR. DORRIS:	6	plan here?
7	Q. At the end there, where you've quoted the Bank of America	7	A. Well, first of all, as part of my opinion I stated that the
8	e-mail and advice, you state, "This is the practice followed by	8	only way to do this in strict conformance with GAAP and GAS is
9	all reasonable and prudent trustees. However, without	9	to verify the balances back to the original opening of the
01:02:50 10	explanation, the 2007 plan disregards the guidance provided by	01:05:51 10	trust.
11	Bank of America."	11	So any sampling technique is inappropriate, which in my
12	Can you explain that?	12	view not only the one suggested in 2003, but the current one.
13	A. Yes.	13	So I don't believe any sampling technique is going to satisfy
14	THE WITNESS: First of all, Your Honor, this procedure	14	anyone, and will yield inconclusive results. So I wouldn't
01:03:03 15	is not unique to the Bank of America. It is a procedure	01:06:12 15	spend a nickel on this.
16	consistent with GAAP that can be done at a reasonable cost and	16	But assuming that it's going to be done or approved,
17	has been used by the government in resolving failed bank	17	then you look at the plan. And when you get to the second half
18	situations since 1970. It was developed, is my recollection, by	18	of it, it qualifies it by saying that we're sacrificing
19	the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC, and	19	completeness, accuracy, and timeliness because we don't have
01:03:30 20	has been used in over 2000 cases since the 1970s to deal with	01:06:32 20	we suspect we aren't going to get the appropriations from
21	missing records, or records that cannot be reconciled back to	21	Congress to carry this plan out.
22	the beginning balance.	22	And that's certainly been the history. They recite
23	It is also used in the private sector in bank	23	that they wanted 400 million, as I recall, in appropriations for
24	mergers	24	the last three fiscal years, and got something close to 170.
01:03:49 25	THE COURT: Mr. Dorris excuse me, sir.	01:06:55 25	Now, what they estimated a few years ago to cost 400 million is

	1574		1576
1	apparently going to be completed for a total of 271 million.	1	A. (Witness complies.) Yes, I read it.
2	127 million they've already spent. So again, they're going to	2	Q . Looking at the second paragraph of this quote, it says, "The
3	get less conclusive results in any procedure along this line.	3	only viable option from a legal and legislative standpoint is
4	I agree with Congress. I wouldn't appropriate a nickel	4	that the historical accounting commence with the date of the
01:07:23 5	for this exercise.	01:11:10 5	initial allotment. Unfortunately, from a feasibility
6	Q. Well, let me ask you this. And I'm changing subjects	6	perspective, this could date back to the 1950s (sic)." Do you
7	slightly, but on this same topic.	7	see that?
8	A. All right.	8	THE COURT: 1850s.
9	Q. And I want to ask you about cost, and the cost of doing an	9	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. I misspoke.
01:07:36 10	accounting in a trust situation, based on your experience.	01:11:25 10	BY MR. DORRIS:
11	Where a trustee is doing an accounting, and the cost of	11	Q. Do you see that?
12	that is because of things the trustee has not done properly,	12	A. Yes, I do.
13	such as not maintaining records and the like, who, from your	13	Q. And was this something do you see anywhere in the 2007
14	experience in the private sector, bears the cost of that?	14	plan where this advice is taken into account?
01:08:01 15	MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. This is asking for	01:11:33 15	A. No.
16	a legal conclusion.	16	Q. Now, with respect to have you been involved with where
17	THE COURT: Sustained.	17	trustees furnish an accounting to beneficiaries?
18	BY MR. DORRIS:	18	THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Dorris. When you say, "this
19	Q. Mr. Homan, let me ask you to look on the next page of your	19	advice taken into account," you're talking about what's on the
01:08:23 20	report. That would be Plaintiffs' 4210, item D. This is on page	01:11:56 20	screen here?
21	six, and it talks about "Key definitional issues not being	21	THE WITNESS: Yes. The advice that "the only viable
22	adequately addressed in the plan." And you talk about a	22	option from a legal and legislative standpoint," et cetera, that
23	specific Deloitte & Touche document that was included in the	23	it corresponds and I agree with that advice, that the only
24	administrative record. Do you see that?	24	way to do this is to go back to the beginning of each of these
01:08:46 25	A. Yes.	01:12:13 25	accounts.
	1575		1577
1	${\bf Q}. \;\;$ Now, this is a document in the administrative record that's	1	THE COURT: And my question is, what am I looking at on
2	document 4-2-1. And we're going to just stay here on your	2	the screen?
3	report, but for the record I want to indicate where it is in the	3	THE WITNESS: I'm looking at the last paragraph there,
4	record. And it's at pages, Bates pages 321 through 336 of the	4	Your Honor.
01:09:22 5	administrative record.	01:12:20 5	THE COURT: Of what?
6	And you have quoted from that document in a couple of	6	MR. DORRIS: It's from the Deloitte & Touche document
7	spots here in your report. Do you see that?	7	that's in the administrative record.
8	A. Yes.	8	(Simultaneous conversation.)
9	Q. Let's look at the first one coming from this report dealing	9	THE COURT: I just got confused about whether I was
01:09:37 10	with key definitional issues, and doing the historical	01:12:34 10	looking at Deloitte, or whether I was looking at this witness'
11	accounting.	11	report.
12	At the bottom it begins, "The Court and/or Congress may	12	Go ahead.
13	expect that all beneficiaries at any point in time are owed	13	MR. DORRIS: It's the Deloitte quote that is quoted in
14	accountings. As a result, closed accounts other than	14	his report. And I'm sorry for the lack of clarity, Your Honor.
01:09:53 15	predecessor accounts may have to be included in the accounting."	01:12:45 15	THE COURT: All right.
16	Now, Mr. Homan, with respect to trying to establish the	16	BY MR. DORRIS:
17	accuracy of a beginning balance in an account for someone that's	17	Q. Looking down further toward the bottom of this page of your
18	not an original allottee, how can you determine the accuracy of	18	report, page seven, in item E you begin quoting from a number of
19	that balance without looking at the account prior to it?	19	documents that are identified as being from the administrative
01:10:17 20	A. You can't. If you can't certify the beginning balance, how	01:13:08 20	record of Hughes & Bentzen. Do you see that?
21	can you certify the ending balance that is going to be passed on	21	A. Yes.
22	to someone else?	22	Q. And then it carries over to the next page.
23	Q. And then look at the next down a little bit, the next quote	23	And Hughes & Bentzen were attorneys that were hired by
24	from the Deloitte & Touche document. And let you review that	24	the Department of Interior to give them advice during the
01:10:42 25	for a moment. eets Page 1574 to	01:13:28 25 1577 of 163	course at some point in the administrative record. And 10/23/2007 07:20:56 Pt

	1578		1580
1	there's some seven different letters, opinions in the	1	deficiency is caused, it's been what I call the 100 percent
2	administrative record, that you reviewed. Is that right?	2	rule, since at least my memory when I joined the Office of the
3	A. Yes.	3	Comptroller in 1996, all the way through my banking career.
4	Q. I want to just ask you about one of them. Well, about maybe	4	Generally
01:13:57 5	two of them. On this page, it is the third one down. So we're	01:18:06 5	MR. QUINN: Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm going to object
6	on page eight of your report where you're quoting from a	6	for the record. First, the answer is nonresponsive; the answer
7	document, and it's talking about the duty of a trustee.	7	is narrative, expressing an opinion outside the scope and the
8	And this is from the administrative record. It's Bates	8	expert opinion disclosed in the report, and goes into irrelevant
9	page 64-6-1. Do you see that?	9	matter.
01:14:20 10	A. Yes. Yes, I do.	01:18:22 10	THE COURT: That's the old immaterial, irrelevant, and
11	Q. And have you been involved let me ask it this way: This	11	inconsequential objection.
12	is talking about a trustee's duty to keep full, accurate, and	12	MR. QUINN: I'm covering all my bases.
13	orderly records.	13	THE COURT: Every bit of it is true, and I'm going to
14	A. Yes.	14	overrule it. I want to hear the answer.
01:14:32 15	Q. And from your time as special trustee, was this being done?	01:18:36 15	THE WITNESS: The answer simply is this, Your Honor:
16	A. No.	16	If there is a discrepancy in your checking account, and the bank
17	Q . Now, let me ask this. And we can maybe save looking at some	17	cannot provide you with a copy of your check on a daily basis
18	of these. From your time in both the Office of the Comptroller	18	this is the same requirement as in the 1994 Reform Act. On a
19	of the Currency, and when you were actually out involved in	19	daily basis, they can't provide you with that balance, the
01:15:02 20	running financial institutions, were you when a trustee is	01:18:58 20	accounting rule and the regulatory rule is that they have one
21	providing an accounting to a beneficiary, what is included in	21	accounting period, which is normally 90 days, to these items
22	that accounting?	22	that are unproven go into a suspense account. They can be a
23	A. What is included in that accounting?	23	liability or an asset suspense account.
24	${\bf Q}. What is the custom and practice that you're familiar with in$	24	If they can't resolve that issue, they take the loss.
01:15:21 25	terms of what information is included in the accounting?	01:19:20 25	They have to, as a presumption, restore the amount that they
	1579		1581
	1010		1301
1	A. Well, as required by common law and Reg 9 of the OCC,	1	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for
2		2	
3	A. Well, as required by common law and Reg 9 of the OCC,	3	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for
2 3 4	A. Well, as required by common law and Reg 9 of the OCC, Officer of the Comptroller of the Currency, when an account is	2 3 4	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 50 years.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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:
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8	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.	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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?
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12	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.	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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?
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16	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,	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18	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.	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:17:17 20	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19 01:20:42 20	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:17:17 20 21	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,	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19 01:20:42 20 21	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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.
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:17:17 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19 01:20:42 20 21 22	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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?
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:17:17 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19 01:20:42 20 21 22 23	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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
2 3 4 01:15:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:16:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:16:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:17:17 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 01:19:48 5 6 7 8 9 01:20:06 10 11 12 13 14 01:20:17 15 16 17 18 19 01:20:42 20 21 22	can't prove into the account. That's been commercial law for 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?

	1582		1584
1	A. Good morning.	1	And those documents are in my appendix as documents I relied
2	MR. QUINN: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Quinn	2	upon.
3	for the United States.	3	Q. Okay. Let me ask you about that before we put it up on the
4	BY MR. QUINN:	4	screen. I want to ask you a little bit about the document list
01:21:16 5	Q. It's nice to see you again, Mr. Homan. We've spoken before,	01:23:51 5	that you appended with your expert report.
6	haven't we?	6	And before I even get to that, I would like to ask you,
7	A. For seven days, as I remember the last time.	7	have you gone back through your report and looked at it since
8	Q. That was back in 2003?	8	you authored it, since you prepared it?
9	A. Yeah.	9	A. Yes.
01:21:26 10	Q. In front of Judge Lamberth, in the Phase 1.5 trial?	01:24:05 10	${\bf Q}. \mbox{Do you have any amendments to make or corrections that you}$
11	A. That's correct.	11	noted that you would like to put on the record this morning?
12	${\bf Q}. \mbox{And I think before that trial, I may have taken your }$	12	A. No.
13	deposition. Do you remember that?	13	$\mathbf{Q}. \mbox{With respect to the list of documents that you reviewed and}$
14	A. Yes, generally.	14	relied upon, could you describe how you prepared that? I'm
01:21:39 15	${\bf Q}. \mbox{Why don't we begin this morning, I would like to look at }$	01:24:23 15	trying to make certain that I understand that what you have in
16	your go back a moment to your expert report that you	16	that list is a list of everything you looked at and considered,
17	delivered for purposes of this hearing.	17	or just the things that you relied on for purposes of forming
18	A. Yes.	18	your opinion.
19	MR. QUINN: If we could put it up on the screen. This	19	A. Well, the list is as stated in my appendix. But it also
01:21:59 20	is plaintiffs' for the record, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210.	01:24:44 20	incorporates by reference my testimony before the Court last
21	BY MR. QUINN:	21	time, which had an extensive list of documents which are
22	Q. Do you recognize that as your expert report, sir?	22	included as part of this testimony.
23	A. Yes. The cover page, at least.	23	Q. But you would agree with me
24	${\bf Q.}\;\;$ Okay. And I wanted to ask you some questions more	24	A. I think there are some like 300 pages of testimony there, as $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left($
01:22:09 25	specifically about that in a moment.	01:25:00 25	I recall, that I filed in connection with this report.
	1583		1585
1	But in answering the questions that Mr. Dorris was	1	Q. Right, because you had an extensive amount of testimony from
2	putting to you this morning and yesterday, and to put things a	2	the Phase 1.5 trial. Right? And you appended the entire record
3	little bit into a little better time perspective, if you will,	3	transcript to your report. Right?
4	when did you become the special trustee for American Indians?	4	A. That's correct.
01:22:32 5	A. In September of 1995.	01:25:13 5	Q. What I want to ask you is what for purposes of the report
6	Q. And when did you resign that position?	6	that you authored and rendered, for purposes of this hearing in
7	A. On January 7th of 1999.	7	August of 2007, did you look at the entire administrative record
8	Q. Have you had any continuing role in advice to the Department	8	that was produced by the government, or only selected materials
9	of Interior, or as a contractor or otherwise, since you departed	9	out of that administrative record?
01:22:50 10	that position in 1999?	01:25:32 10	A. Only selected materials.
11	A. No.	11	Q. And those are the ones that are listed on your appendix?
12	Q. You did give some testimony to Congress, though. Right? In	12	A. Yes. Or referred to in the body of my report and quoted.
13	2002?	13	MR. QUINN: Can we go to that, I think it's Exhibit 4
14	A. At their request, yes.	14	or attachment four? Show the cover, and zoom in so the witness
01:22:58 15	Q. At the time you left in 1999, there was no such thing as the	01:25:53 15	can identify it, if you could.
16	Office of Historical Trust Accounting. Right?	16	BY MR. QUINN:
17	A. No.	17	Q. Now, this is a copy of your Exhibit 4 to your report.
18	Q. That came later. Correct?	18	Right?
19	A. Yes.	19	A. The cover page, looks like it.
01:23:14 20	Q. So sitting here today, you don't have knowledge, personal	01:26:03 20	Q. The cover page. We're going to take this
21	knowledge, sir, with respect to the operations, the decision	21	A. All right. I will trust you
22	making, the investigations, the research that's been undertaken	22	Q. We're working with the screens here. We have to go piece by
23	by that office, do you?	23	piece. But for reference, in terms of the file numbers, this
24			
01:23:32 25	A. No, with the exception that I did review documents produced by that office in connection with the 2003 and this hearing.	24 01:26:17 25	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.
	1587		1589
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.
l			
23	of experience in commercial trust operations?	23	Q. If we could
23 24 01:28:33 25	of experience in commercial trust operations? A. I would say yes. Q. As much as anybody else, probably?	23 24 01:31:01 25	Q. If we could THE COURT: If we could take a mid-morning break. 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 10	you had left as the special trustee for American Indians in	01:48:10 10	A. Yes.
11	1999.	11	${\bf Q}. \mbox{And I}$ 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	A. Yes, that's correct.	01:48:32 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 20	Q. Okay. So then I can take that	01:48:56 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 01:46:00 25	completeness validation?	01:49:19 25	Q. And the funding for the management of the Trust comes from
01:46:00	A. It would have had to have been probably the throughput.	01:49:19	Congressional appropriations. Correct?
	1501		
1	1591 O So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at	1	1593
1 2	Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at	1 2	1593 A. Yes.
1 2 3	Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its	1 2 3	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some
2	Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at		1593 A. Yes.
3	Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its		A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM
3 4	Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right?	3 4	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts?
2 3 4 01:46:19 5	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan 	3 4 01:49:35 5	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it.
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting.
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily.
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. 	01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. 	01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please.
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN:
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. 	01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:13 20	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:45 20	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution?
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:13 20 21	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, or thereabouts, to Congress? 	01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:45 20 21	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution? A. No, I'm not aware of the current situation at all.
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:13 20 21 22	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, or thereabouts, to Congress? A. Yes. 	01:49:35	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution? A. No, I'm not aware of the current situation at all. Q. Do you have any understanding of the accounts, to the extent
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:13 20 21 22 23	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, or thereabouts, to Congress? A. Yes. Q. In the course of your proposals, did you propose that the 	3 4 01:49:35 5 6 7 8 9 01:49:57 10 11 12 13 14 01:50:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:45 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution? A. No, I'm not aware of the current situation at all. Q. Do you have any understanding of the accounts, to the extent that they've been reconciled, per capita and judgment accounts?
2 3 4 01:46:19 5 6 7 8 9 01:46:35 10 11 12 13 14 01:46:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:13 20 21 22	 Q. So in terms of forming your opinion, you have not looked at the current efforts by the Department of Interior and its contractors to analyze the IRMS data and the TFAS data for its reliability. You haven't taken that into account. Right? A. Only to the extent that it was provided either in the plan or in those documents. Q. Okay. And your own personal knowledge with respect to the state of Interior's systems is at least seven years old at this point? A. Yes. But the I did review the audit reports, as I Q. But your own personal A didn't bring it up to date until 1996. Q. Excuse me, Mr. Homan. I'm just asking about your personal knowledge, not what you've read from other sources. Your personal knowledge ended about seven years ago. Correct? A. My personal knowledge includes what I reviewed. Q. When you were in the Office of Special Trustee, you made a proposal to Congress, correct, in terms of the strategic plan? A. Yes. Q. And you made a similar proposal in your testimony in 2002, or thereabouts, to Congress? A. Yes. 	01:49:35	A. Yes. Q. And this Trust also has another unique aspect to some extent, doesn't it, in terms of the longevity of the IIM accounts? A. Would you rephrase that question? I don't quite understand it. Q. I was asking you whether in terms of the Trust, this Trust is different or distinct from most commercial trusts, that the longevity of the accounts are longer than what you would ordinarily find in a commercial trust setting. A. Not necessarily. Q. Let's go MR. QUINN: Do we have that up now? Okay. Could we go to his resumé? Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. This is one from his earlier testimony. It was appended to his earlier report. It's not the current one, so let's take that down, please. BY MR. QUINN: Q. In terms of the work that's been done to date, are you aware that there are a number of per capita and judgment account accounting statements complete and awaiting distribution? A. No, I'm not aware of the current situation at all. Q. Do you have any understanding of the accounts, to the extent

	1594		1596
1	reconciliation on the land-based accounts, the high dollar value	1	believes that the department was not abiding by advice given by
2	accounts; that is, \$100,000 account transactions and above?	2	the Bank of America in terms of what it would do in a trust
3	A. Currently?	3	situation. And I'd like to have the witness answer one question
4	Q. Yes.	4	about a statement just above this quotation, if I may.
01:51:25 5	A. No.	01:54:00 5	THE COURT: The only way I'm going to un-fact that is
6	Q. Let's go to a couple of the documents that Mr. Dorris showed	6	to hear the question. So let's hear what the question is.
7	you that were referenced in your report.	7	MR. QUINN: All right, Your Honor.
8	MR. QUINN: Could we bring up AR-445, please? For the	8	Could you scroll up the page? Let's see. We should be
9	record, this is Bates number 22-3-1. It starts on that Bates	9	on page two of the document. Scroll up a little bit more.
01:52:03 10	number and runs three pages over to 22-3-3.	01:54:18 10	Yeah, that introductory bit. Okay.
11	BY MR. QUINN:	11	BY MR. QUINN:
12	Q. And I'll put this up on the screen.	12	Q. In fact, Mr. Homan, I want to ask you about the last
13	MR. QUINN: If we could zoom in a little bit on the	13	sentence of the message to which the quoted material is
14	introductory part.	14	appended. Where it says, "If there are gaps in the
01:52:19 15	BY MR. QUINN:	01:54:35 15	documentation, I would agree with the method the OHTA presented
16	Q. Can you see that, Mr. Homan? Can you see that on your	16	in their plan." Do you see that?
17	screen okay?	17	A. Yes, I do see that.
18	A. Yes.	18	Q. And so in effect, Bank of America's representative was
19	Q. Do you recognize this as the document that you were	19	agreeing with what OHTA was putting into its plan. Correct?
01:52:26 20	describing and conversing with Mr. Dorris about a few minutes	01:54:55 20	A. I can't represent that. That's not what it says.
21	ago?	21	Q. Okay. You disagree with what that sentence says?
22	A. Generally, yes. Although I can't see all of the document on	22	A. I disagree, because what they quoted from the Bank of
23	my screen.	23	America is not done. It has to do with their beginning
24	Q. Well, we'll go down. I think the part you were referring to	24	sentence, which says, "You have to validate the account."
01:52:40 25	was at the bottom of page two and three. So if we go down to	01:55:15 25	I saw nothing if we're going to talk about that Bank
	1595		1597
1	1595 the bottom of page two, we'll come back to the context here in a	1	\$1597\$ of America memorandum, then I saw nothing in that Bank of
2		1 2	
	the bottom of page two, we'll come back to the context here in a		of America memorandum, then I saw nothing in that Bank of
2	the bottom of page two, we'll come back to the context here in a moment.	2	of America memorandum, then I saw nothing in that Bank of America or the plan that came even close to the first
2 3 4 01:52:54 5	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5	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
2 3 4	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7	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?	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8	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?
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9	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?	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10	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
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02	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:
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15	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
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15	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?
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16 17 18	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.	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19	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:
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:25 20	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,	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:18 20	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
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:25 20 21	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:18 20 21	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?
01:52:54	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:18 20 21 22	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.
2 3 4 01:52:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:02 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:16 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:25 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:18 20 21 22 23	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.
01:52:54	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	2 3 4 01:55:36 5 6 7 8 9 01:55:51 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:02 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:18 20 21 22	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.

there.	1	that document, Bates number six.
I have the cover page up on the screen, Mr. Homan, from	2	MR. QUINN: Can we zoom in on the middle paragraph,
page 322. Do you recognize that as the document you testified	3	please?
about?	4	BY MR. QUINN:
A. Generally, yes.	02:01:02 5	Q. And Mr. Homan, there are other ways, correct, besides
Q. With respect to the sentence you quoted in your opinion	6	looking at a document over the passage of time that you can
report at page 13 of the document, Bates 335?	7	determine that a transaction occurred. Correct?
MR. QUINN: Can we move to that page? And can we zoom	8	A. Generally, yes, you can, if the records are available.
in on that first heading, first full paragraph? Thank you.	9	Q. Okay. And, in fact, the Bank of America document that we
BY MR. QUINN:	02:01:24 10	were talking about goes back and talks about doesn't even
Q. Do you see that all right, Mr. Homan?	11	talk about the original balance, does it?
A. If you're which sentence are you referring to?	12	A. Are we allowed to talk about the Bank of America's
Q. Under the title, it says, "What is the proper temporal scope	13	methodology? I'd be glad to.
for the reconciliation?"	14	Q. They don't go back to the original balance, though, in that?
A. Yes.	02:01:41 15	A. As I recall, they go back as far as they can reasonably, and
Q. You see that? And that's the excerpt you were quoting from,	16	then they settle for the difference. That's the remedy. It's a
right, in your expert opinion?	17	practical remedy used, as I said earlier, by the FDIC and in
A. I think I quoted the first sentence, maybe the second.	18	bank mergers.
Q. And in terms of this Deloitte statement here, you recognize,	19	Q. And there are situations also where accountants would use
do you not, that the statement here is concerning the legal and	02:02:01 20	alternative procedures. Right?
legislative standpoint in terms of where to start the historical	21	A. That is one that's consistent with GAAP. That's the only
accounting. That's what it says. Right?	22	one available or that I recognize is consistent with GAAP,
A. Yes. But yes.	23	and it's not the Bank of America's sole policy, it's the policy
Q. So this is not a statement from an accounting perspective.	24	of the federal government.
Correct?	02:02:16 25	Q. Well, you mentioned GAAP. That brings to mind another
1599		1601
A. That would include the legal part, I would assume. And also	1	question I wanted to ask you in terms of GAAP.
the legislative account, which is required by the Reform Act.	2	GAAP, even if all the documents you take the
Q. I understand that's your interpretation. The document here,	3	hypothetical all the documents existed, you had documentation to
though, is not you agree it's referring to the legislative	4	verify everything, all the data systems were there, there was
and historical legal issues in the case. Correct?	02:02:35 5	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 GAA
		opinion. But if the current auditors depend on prior audits
		as one of their criteria, and there's never been a GAAP audit o
		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. Yo
		can accrue or not accrue. Certain small businesses have that
	22	option under the tax code and under the accounting regulation
describe antation that a turnet		
documentation that a trustee comes forward with? A. Yes.	24	Or guidance, I should say. MR. QUINN: I'm trying to take your instructions to
	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? 1599 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,	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? 1599 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.

	1602		1604
1	THE COURT: Well done, Mr. Quinn.	1	some of the documents that defendants have put forward as their
2	(OFF THE RECORD.)	2	throughput analysis.
3	MR. QUINN: Well, Your Honor, no more questions for	3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	this witness.	4	MR. GUILDER: If we could first look at document number
02:04:34 5	THE COURT: Very well done, Mr. Quinn.	02:07:17 5	PPX-4208, please. And if we could go to page three, please.
6	MR. DORRIS: We have nothing further, Your Honor.	6	I'm sorry, the fourth page of the document.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Homan, thank you very much, sir.	7	BY MR. GUILDER:
8	You're excused.	8	Q. And Mr. Fasold, is that your resumé?
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	9	A. Yes, it is.
02:04:59 10	MR. GUILDER: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is	02:07:39 10	MR. GUILDER: And if you want to scroll down through
11	Justin Guilder. For the record, this is the first time I'm	11	that slowly, and it continues on the next page.
12	appearing before you, but at a pretrial conference you've	12	BY MR. GUILDER:
13	already admitted me pro hac vice, so I guess I don't need the	13	Q. While we look at that, could you briefly describe the scope
14	appointment of the water.	14	of your experience with financial modeling?
02:05:23 15	My witness will be Mr. Rick Fasold.	02:07:50 15	A. Yes. It began when I was
16	THE COURT: All right.	16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Excuse me, Your Honor. I would like
17	(Oath administered by Courtroom Deputy.)	17	to note two objections. First of all, the Court has indicated
18	MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, before the testimony	18	to the extent you want an expert offered, that we would do it
19	starts, I would just like to note for the record that I received	19	through review of a CV, and, if necessary, a voir dire. It's
02:05:55 20	a phone call last night informing us that Mr. McCarthy would be	02:08:06 20	not necessary to have Mr. Fasold to go through his background.
21	the next witness.	21	But more importantly, Mr. Fasold's testimony is going
22	So we are again at counsel table you might excuse us	22	to be entirely cumulative of evidence that's already been
23	as we reshuffle a little.	23	received in this case. The plaintiffs have designated his
24	THE COURT: What's up with this?	24	entire transcript from the 2003 hearing for inclusion in the
02:06:12 25	MR. GUILDER: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I wasn't aware of	02:08:23 25	record here, and Mr. Fasold's expert report in the 2007 matter
	1603		1605
1	that. I thought it was Mr. Fasold and then Mr. McCarthy. If I $$	1	simply incorporates by reference his 2003 report. He says he
2	could have a moment, please?	2	has done no additional work since 2003; at the direction of
3	THE COURT: Is this a problem?	3	plaintiffs, nothing's been done since 2003.
4	MR. KIRSCHMAN: It's not a problem, but we will be	4	So this is going to be entirely cumulative of what
02:06:21 5	reshuffling our laptops and the like.	02:08:41 5	happened in 2003. It's a waste of the Court's resources.
6	THE COURT: Shuffle away.	6	THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure I agree with that,
7	Go ahead, Mr. Guilder.	7	Counsel. On the subject of qualifications, you can skip right
8	MR. GUILDER: Thank you, Your Honor.	8	to the bottom line on that.
9	THE COURT: Has the witness been sworn? That escaped	9	As far as what his opinions are, I'd like to hear them.
02:06:32 10	me.	02:09:00 10	I mean, I haven't read his 2003 testimony, so it's not
11	(RICHARD FASOLD, PLAINTIFF witness, having been duly sworn,	11	cumulative to me. It's all new to me. Let's go.
12	testified as follows:)	12	MR. GUILDER: Okay.
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION	13	If there's no objection, then I would like to right now
14	BY MR. GUILDER:	14	move for Mr. Fasold's admission as an expert in financial
02:06:33 15	Q. Mr. Fasold, could you please state your full name for the	02:09:21 15	modeling, if that's what defendants have indicated.
16	record?	16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: No objection, Your Honor.
17	A. Yes. My name is Richard E. Fasold, and that's spelled	17	THE COURT: All right.
18	F-A-S-O-L-D.	18	MR. GUILDER: Okay. Thank you.
19	MR. GUILDER: Your Honor, if you would like, I can	19	BY MR. GUILDER:
02:06:44 20	briefly summarize an outline format as you mentioned before?	02:09:30 20	Q. Well, I guess we'll jump ahead from where we thought we were
21	THE COURT: That would be useful.	21	going to be.
22	MR. GUILDER: I'll briefly go through Mr. Fasold's	22	MR. GUILDER: Could we put up on the screen the first
23	background as a financial modeler and as it relates to this	23	page of 4208, please?
1	buckground as a mandar modeler and as it relates to this		
24 02:07:01 25	case, and then we'll go through his expert opinion and financial	24	BY MR. GUILDER:

1 A. Yes. That is my expert report of August 2007. 2 Q. Okay. And this incorporates your prior expert report. Is 3 that correct? 4 A. Yes, it does. 1 accounts; it was just the money that was generated from 2 Trust assets. 3 Q. So in a sense, this was an attempt to demonstrate input 4 A. Right. Yeah, we attempted in all cases to get hope	
3 that correct? 3 Q. So in a sense, this was an attempt to demonstrate input	om the
4 A. Yes, it does. 4 A. Right. Yeah, we attempted in all cases to get hope	s?
	fully the
02:09:56 5 Q. And plaintiffs came to you and asked you to do perform a 02:13:23 5 universe of reliable data, and then subdivide that universe of reliable data, and the subdivide data data data.	erse into
6 task that ultimately resulted in this report. Could you explain 6 the income that resulted in trust to allottees.	
7 what that task was? 7 Q. And if we could start analyzing your methodology by sta	rting
8 A. Yes. They asked me in the spring of 2000 to calculate the 8 with the GIS image overlays process. Could you briefly desc	ribe
9 revenues generated on the Individual Indian Monies Trust from 9 what GIS is?	
02:10:25 10 1887 through the current time, where I would rely upon documents 02:13:49 10 THE COURT: Just before you get into the GIS, let	me
11 other than generated by the Department of Interior, to the 11 make sure that I've got the bounds of this inquiry. You're	
12 extent possible. 12 trying to find out how much money hit the door, and not how	much
13 And that was the mission given to me. 13 money should have hit the door?	
14 Q. And it was just mentioned that you did not update this, 14 THE WITNESS: No. We wanted the actual dollar	rs that
02:10:47 15 according to your expert report. If you could briefly explain 02:14:05 15 were received by the Department of Interior on behalf of the	
16 what that meant what you meant by saying you did not update 16 beneficiaries was the way we viewed our objective.	
17 this. 17 THE COURT: Okay. And you were interested in re	ceipts,
18 A. Yes. My report encompasses data from 1887 to 2002. And 18 not necessarily what was posted or accounted for?	
19 presumably data is available for the years 2003 through 2006, 19 THE WITNESS: No, we didn't have that kind of	
02:11:08 20 and we did not garner the source data to perform the analysis to 02:14:22 20 information available, nor did we draw any conclusions to that	it.
21 update the report from 2002 to I would presume 2006 would be 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.	
22 appropriate. 22 BY MR. GUILDER:	
23 Q. So in part	ur
24 THE COURT: Did anybody tell you why they were asking 24 methodology.	
02:11:25 25 you to rely on documents other than those generated by the	sound
1607	1609
1 Department of the Interior, to the extent possible? 1 perhaps a little daunting, but it really is once again a	
THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. They directed me to the computer application of something you could accompli	sh yourself,
3 extent possible to do that because, and they explained it 4 counsel explained it to me, due to the unreliability of the data 4 And GIS software, generally speaking, is the later to the unreliability of the data	
6 THE COURT: Okay. 6 that they had from the Department of Interior. 6 be brought up in electronic form. And then, as the GIS	
7 BY MR. GUILDER: 7 call it, they superimpose, and if you look at what you w 8 Q. Did you rely solely on plaintiffs' representation that it 8 think of perhaps like a clear plastic overlay of this map	
9 was unreliable data? 9 GIS people are prone to call the boundaries of the area	
02:11:57 10 A. No, we also conducted our own due diligence of what we	uiac
11 thought would happen amongst the public record at the time, and 11 irregularly shaped objects. So in this case, a polygon r	niaht he
12 that's when we encountered unavailable - a large number, as I 12 an Indian reservation.	g.ic bc
13 recall - of the GAO reports that occurred over a period of time 13 And then there are sources of data that have	also been
14 where they had looked at the BIA, and specific, the IIM 14 reduced to electronic data	
02:12:23 15 accounts. 02:15:43 15 Q. Excuse me for a second, Mr. Fasold. Did you perform th	is
16 Q. Could you move the microphone a little closer? 16 GIS overlay or did you contract with somebody?	a GIS firm
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it.	
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it. 18 Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially 17 A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is 18 that specializes only in GIS applications.	hing.
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it. 18 Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially 19 impartial data. Is that what you were saying? 10 A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is that specializes only in GIS applications. 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field?	•
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it. 18 Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially 19 impartial data. Is that what you were saying? 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field? 102:12:38 20 A. Yeah. We were what we arrived at is we were trying to 17 A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is 18 that specializes only in GIS applications. 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field? 102:18:04 20 THE COURT: GIS has to be an acronym for sometime.	•
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it. 18 Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially 19 impartial data. Is that what you were saying? 102:12:38 20 A. Yeah. We were what we arrived at is we were trying to 21 determine then what data in theory, what income hit the door, if 17 A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is 18 that specializes only in GIS applications. 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field? 102:16:04 20 THE COURT: GIS has to be an acronym for sometical statement of the with Farragut Systems, which is 21 THE WITNESS: Geographical Information Systems	s, Your
17 A. Okay. Or I'll move closer to it. 18 Q. Okay. And so you were tasked with finding essentially 19 impartial data. Is that what you were saying? 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field? 20 A. Yeah. We were what we arrived at is we were trying to 21 determine then what data in theory, what income hit the door, if 22 you want to put it that way, of the Department of Interior. In 23 A. No, we contracted with Farragut Systems, which is 18 that specializes only in GIS applications. 19 Q. And so they're very experienced in this field? 20 THE COURT: GIS has to be an acronym for sometical systems. 21 THE WITNESS: Geographical Information Systems. 22 Honor.	s, Your

	1610		1612
1	Q. So you used Farragut Systems to create this GIS map,	1	can interact with online, and it has various overlays, including
2	essentially?	2	the location of gas and oil wells.
3	A. Yes. In essence, they manipulate the data. The physical	3	Q. You said that BLM has a GIS software that has graphic
4	map comes with a software program that enables these overlays of	4	overlays of oil and gas?
_	, , ,	1 _	,
02:16:30 5	data, and ARC review system is the basic system that they	02:19:48 5	A. Yes. If you pull up that site, it comes up with a basic map
	started with.	1 _	with state boundaries, for example. You can overlay roads, you
7	Q. So you spoke a moment ago about polygons. By those	7	can overlay rivers. Another option that you can click overlays
8	polygons, are you referring to the reservation boundaries?	8	gas and oil wells.
9	A. Yes. In this particular application, it is their	9	Q. Okay. And so let's move on to how you identified these
02:16:50 10	terminology, polygon, which is the irregularly bounded borders	02:20:11 10	polygons you were talking about earlier that are the reservation
11	of, again, Indian reservations.	11	boundaries. Did that come with the GIS software you got from
12	Q. Okay. And before we move on to that identification of those	12	Farragut Systems, or did you do that research?
13	lands, are you aware of any other users of GIS and the reliance	13	A. No, the boundaries, the polygons that we received digitized
14	they place on this software?	14	was available at the Department of Interior website when we
02:17:10 15	A. Yes. I mean, and I use this example: My home in Colorado	02:20:35 15	first started this case, at least for a long period after we
16	has a GIS application, actually. We are in the boundary of a	16	started the case, it was brought down. I don't believe it's
17	national forest. And a few years ago, the forest, there was a	17	publicly accessible anymore.
18	huge fire called the Hayman Fire, 130,000 acres that we could	18	Q. And so did you rely solely on that information from Interior
19	observe from our house.	19	Department to create these polygons?
02:17:34 20	When that fire started and started blowing up to us, I	02:20:49 20	A. No, no. We purchased a number of maps that we also had
21	at the time had about four telephone lines. They all rang. You	21	digitized. And that means we sent it out to people who
22	picked them up, there was a recorded message saying "prepare for	22	literally take a map and mark the boundaries of the reservation;
23	evacuation."	23	in essence, connect the dots between where they mark. Extremely
24	That was the use of a GIS system. And what they did is	24	tedious kind of work.
02:17:50 25	called reverse 911 - and they're able to do that in many areas	02:21:14 25	Q. So after you put these polygons from collecting from the
	1611		1613
1	of the country - and that is the fire department drew a line, a	1	maps that you purchased, the next step was to place as the
2	polygon, and said, everybody that has a phone number that	2	terminology is, point intersects on top of that of other
3	terminates in this area, call them and give them the	3	information.
4	notification for evacuation.	4	And if we could talk about the oil and gas information
02:18:10 5	And that's an excellent example of how they're used in	02:21:30 5	you overlaid on top of that. Who did you contract to provide
6	real life, and that is, you know, they could draw any boundary	6	the oil and gas information?
7	and instantly the computer could overlay that and make calls	7	A. Ultimately we selected a petroleum engineering firm that was
8	out. So that's one of the examples in practical life.	8	then called Questa, Q-U-E-S-T-A.
9	The other one that we're aware of is utility companies.	9	Q . And was it Questa's own information that you used, or was it
02:18:30 10	If they start getting calls from different customers, they can	02:21:52 10	other information?
11	identify where that call is coming from, and that superimposes	11	A. No, we had already identified and purchased a software
12	on to their utility branching network. And they frequently can	12	package that through the years the old timers call it
13	identify where the break occurred because these following people	13	PI/Dwight's. It has since been acquired by a firm called IHS,
14	were affected. So it's in more and more common use for a number	14	so it's now referred to as the IHS software. And they provide,
02:18:52 15	of applications.	02:22:13 15	for a fee, of course, in essence the latitude and the longitude
16	Another one comes to mind is when they build a highway,	16	of every oil and gas well drilled in the United States, and they
17	they use GIS to estimate how much earth has to be moved, and	17	provide certain associated data with each individual well.
18	they decide where it can be moved and disposed of by volume.	18	$\mathbf{Q}. \text{And is there another company that also provides that type of }$
19	They know exactly what the volume of earth is to be moved.	19	information?
02:19:12 20	Before they just had to start digging and order up enough dump	02:22:31 20	A. Yes. A company now is in competition with them, and that is
21	trucks to haul it away.	21	called PDS. And I believe it stands for Petroleum Data
22	${\bf Q}. \mbox{Have you seen any use of this GIS software by the Department}$	22	Services.
23	of Interior in your experience?	23	${\bf Q}. \mbox{And do those companies, do they create this information or }$
24	A. Yeah. As a matter of fact, it's available online today, and	24	do they rely on other parties to gather information about wells?
02:19:28 25	that is the the BLM has a GIS software application that you	02:22:53 25	A. That data is generally garnered from local records, and that
10/23/2007	7 07:20:56 PM Page 1610 to	1613 of 163	38 20 of 42 shee

	1614		1616
1	would be county and/or state, where they captured in the first	1	A. We had, yeah, in theory, totally unbiased, universal data,
2	instance the location of the well. And they measured, which we	2	and they were given from Farragut Systems the subset of those
3	were most interested in, the production of a particular well,	3	who were contained within the boundaries of an Indian
4	they'd measure that typically by calculating how much tax was	4	reservation.
02:23:17 5	paid on, for example, a barrel of oil.	02:26:27 5	Q. And did Questa Engineering do anything else to further
6	Q. So the information in IHS or PDS is tax information, in	6	inform how much revenue is produced on those wells that are then
7	part?	7	contained within the polygon?
8	A. In part. In part it's derived from taxing the tax that	8	A. Right. Once they had the identified wells, the IHS data and
9	was paid on a particular barrel of oil produced.	9	PDS data as a general statement show the well production,
02:23:34 10	Q. So the information in there is only information that tax has	02:26:50 10	meaning the units, being barrels of oil or thousands of cubic
11	been paid on?	11	feet of gas, that have come out on a monthly basis, or as you
12	A. That is one source of their information. They do outline	12	can add them up, for a yearly basis.
13	some other sources when they don't have tax information. So I	13	That data in general from IHS only has cumulative data
14	•	14	•
02:24:00 15	wouldn't say 100 percent of either IHS or PDS is 100 percent related to tax sources.	02:27:20 15	prior to about the early 1970's; '70, '71, '72 is where they
16		16	start providing monthly data. PDS's entree into the market has
17	Q. What type of industry reliance is placed on these companies'	17	been they're going to provide monthly data preceding the 1970 time frame.
18	information, IHS and PDS's information?	18	
19	A. Yeah, the one that's used, one of the more the highest	19	But what the petroleum engineers do is they know
02:24:22 20	reliance placed on it is to calculate underground reserves,	02:27:41 20	exactly how much that well has produced, for example, from date
02:24:22 20	underground reserves. And they use that data in the first	02:27:41 20	of drilling through 1970; what they need to do is then spread
22	instance, and that, of course, post Sarbanes-Oxley becomes very	22	that over that time frame from a lump sum number.
23	important in public statements of oil and gas firms.		And what they use is a technique that is unique or a
23	So they use the PI/Dwight's, give it to their petroleum	23	specialty of petroleum engineers, is the decline curves. And
02:24:42 25	engineers who calculate reserves, for example.	24	they can fit, retrofit that cumulative data into years from
02:24:42	They also, this data is used by prospectors to try to	02:28:06 25	inception through when the data is available monthly.
	1615	1	1617
1	calculate. There's core data involved with that, so the	1	1617 So they plot this down and enable us to find which year
1 2	calculate. There's core data involved with that, so the prospector can see what wells may have been drilled in the area	2	So they plot this down and enable us to find which year these barrels of oil were produced.
1 2 3	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.	2	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
1 2 3 4	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	3 4	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5	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?	2	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6	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.	3 4	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.
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7	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?
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9	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.	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9	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?
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11	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.	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13	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?	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13	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.
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15	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.
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15	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?
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17	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.	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18	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?	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18	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,
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18	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
1 2 3 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:51 20	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18 19 02:29:26 20	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.
1 2 3 4 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:51 20 21	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18 19 02:29:26 20 21	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
02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:51 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18 19 02:29:26 20 21 22	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.
1 2 3 4 4 02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:51 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18 19 02:29:26 20 21 22 23	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
02:25:03 5 6 7 8 9 02:25:19 10 11 12 13 14 02:25:34 15 16 17 18 19 02:25:51 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 02:28:27 5 6 7 8 9 02:28:34 10 11 12 13 14 02:28:59 15 16 17 18 19 02:29:26 20 21 22	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.

	1618		1620
1		1	A. No. The MAC/MILS database is you might say overly detailed.
2	Q. So Questa provides all the information back to you in terms	2	, , ,
3	of the price and the revenue of each well's oil?	3	It includes just about any mine, whether it was commercially viable or not.
4	A. Yeah. They provide the units, the dollars, and the next thing they provide is the royalty percentage that would be	4	
_		_	So Pincock Allen & Holt did their research, and from
02:30:11 5	applicable for that time frame.	02:33:32 5	their knowledge, very rapidly winnowed out the vast majority of
	Q. Okay. And there's going to be one more step before you		the mines as being never commercially viable.
7	determine what is allocable to individual Indians, but we'll	7	Q. And of those that were commercially viable, they then
8 9	come back to that. I want to move through the all revenue	8	provided the information back to you of how did you break
_	sources that you used.	9	that down? Was it a you know, it's not going to be the
02:30:26 10	And the next revenue source is hard rock minerals. And	02:33:53 10	gallons or the barrels, like oil. What type of information did
11 12	you used a different company to provide this information. Could	11	they provide to you?
	you say what that company's name is?	12	A. Well, they appropriately identified the units, like coal, it
13	A. Yes. The hard rock experts were Pincock Allen & Holt.	13	would be tons; precious metal, ounces. So each one of the
14	Q. And this is something that they exclusively perform, is	14	precious metal categories they would identify the unit, they
02:30:47 15	specialize in hard rock minerals?	02:34:13 15	would identify again the cost and the typical royalty paid if
16	A. Yes, they are hard rock mineral engineers that provide	16	the land was leased by a commercial enterprise and exploited for
17	various services to commercial interests.	17	the mineral values.
18	Q. What type of minerals have been exploited from allotted	18	Q. So they were able to provide all commercially exploited mine
19	land?	19	information in terms of revenue?
02:31:01 20	A. There's quite a few. I think probably the largest would be	02:34:31 20	A. That's correct.
21	coal that goes down to phosphates were also a major source of	21	Q. Okay. And then you next turned to a resource to find out
22	revenues. You have the precious metals, gold, silver, platinum.	22	timber production?
23	In a certain period of time they had lead and zinc, and also	23	A. Right. Timber production, we also had hoped that we would
24	there was a significant amount of uranium mined off of Indian	24	have some kind of universal database and do a GIS overlay. And
02:31:35 25	lands.	02:34:49 25	after extensive research, we found no reliable commercial
	1619		1621
1	Q. And Pincock Allen & Holt, are they experts in all of these	1	
2		_	database that talked about timber.
_	areas?	2	So we retained Professor Allen McQuillan, University of
3	areas? A. Yes. The engineers for natural resources sort of divide	2	
3 4		3 4	So we retained Professor Allen McQuillan, University of
3 4 02:31:52 5	A. Yes. The engineers for natural resources sort of divide	3	So we retained Professor Allen McQuillan, University of Montana, and his background included working on a couple of
3 4 02:31:52 5 6	A. Yes. The engineers for natural resources sort of divide themselves into the oil and gas, and then the firms that	3 4	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8	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.	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8	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.
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9	 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 	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10	 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 	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10	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?
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11	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?	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12	 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 	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11	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.
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11	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?
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13	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.
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13	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?
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15	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.	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15	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,
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15	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,	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17 18	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17 18	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.	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18	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.
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:57 20	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	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18 19 02:36:08 20	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:57 20 21	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?	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18 19 02:36:08 20 21	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
3 4 02:31:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:32:08 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:33 15 16 17 18 19 02:32:57 20 21 22	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? A. As I recollect, there were about 2,000 identified sources of	3 4 02:35:12 5 6 7 8 9 02:35:29 10 11 12 13 14 02:35:45 15 16 17 18 19 02:36:08 20 21 22	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

	1622		1624
1	Q. And then now you know or Professor McQuillan knew whether	1	Q. The vast number, you mean, of leases?
2	a piece of wood and how much came from individual land. What	2	A. Of the data points.
3	did he do next with that data?	3	Q. For leases?
4	A. Yeah, the data they call in that industry, the way to	4	A. Yeah, for leases.
02:36:50 5	measure it, they call it V and V, volume and value. And so a	02:39:52 5	Q. Okay. And so you were describing the four types of leases
6	scale ticket would tell the volume estimated in a particular	6	that are broken up, I guess, by Interior. And it's agricultural
7	tree, how many board feet, and then he would apply the	7	and three other?
8	commercially available rate for that specific kind of species of	8	A. Yeah, agriculture and grazing. And those were basically the
9	tree in that particular area, that particular year.	9	two types of land leases that were categorized as such up until
02:37:13 10	Q. So each one of these experts has been an oil and gas, a	02:40:12 10	about 1996, when they added two other categories and started
11	minerals and a timber expert, and they provide information to	11	reporting on it, and that was business and then the old "other"
12	you as to how much revenue was derived from those resources?	12	category.
13	A. That's correct.	13	Q. And did you recognize when you took these data points any
14	Q . And then after that, there are other areas that generated	14	type of patterns that developed?
02:37:29 15	revenue for individual Indians, some of those that you	02:40:26 15	A. Yes. What we did is, in essence, plot these datas literally
16	researched yourself. Land leases, that was one area. Could you	16	on a chart. And for example, with agriculture, you could
17	briefly describe the types of land leases?	17	quickly say, if you plotted them and connected the dots, you
18	A. Well, we looked again for any kind of universal database,	18	would form a very logical and predictable curve. They plotted
19	and were unable to find any universal database. We looked also	19	out onto a geometric curve.
02:37:48 20	then to see if there were any land lease experts that have	02:40:50 20	That was true for agriculture, it was true for
21	testified before or have done the research before, and we found	21	business, and it was true for the other category. It was fairly
22	none.	22	logical and reasonable to assume those were geometric curves.
23	So then we went to again, trying to abide by our	23	Q. And now briefly before we get down this, these data points,
24	non-DOI sourcing, we purchased a number of books, 50 or 100	24	are these aggregate data points?
02:38:09 25	books, periodicals, anything we could find, many times off of a	02:41:13 25	A. Yes. There are a lot of data points by reservation, but in
	1623		1625
1	1623 website called aBOOKS, which has used bookstores from around the	1	each year if I only got one or two reservations, that said
1 2		1 2	
1	website called aBOOKS, which has used bookstores from around the		each year if I only got one or two reservations, that said
2	website called aBOOKS, which has used bookstores from around the United States, and we were able to garner copies of valuable	2	each year if I only got one or two reservations, that said nothing about the total. $ \\$
2 3	website called aBOOKS, which has used bookstores from around the United States, and we were able to garner copies of valuable source data.	2	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
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5	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.	2 3 4 02:41:32 5	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.
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9	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?
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11	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,	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11	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.	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13	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?	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13	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.
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14	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.	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16	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?	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:39:31 20	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.	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19 02:42:42 20	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:39:31 20 21	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:	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19 02:42:42 20 21	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.
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:39:31 20 21 22	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.	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19 02:42:42 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:39:31 20 21 22 23	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: Q. So essentially in that realm, although you attempted to find independent numbers, you did not?	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19 02:42:42 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 02:38:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:38:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:39:08 15 16 17 18 19 02:39:31 20 21 22	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: Q. So essentially in that realm, although you attempted to find	2 3 4 02:41:32 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:51 10 11 12 13 14 02:42:13 15 16 17 18 19 02:42:42 20 21 22	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

	1626		1628
1	as we know, over the period of time from 1887 until now,	1	A. Yeah, that was another challenge for us. And we identified
2	literally tens of thousands and millions of acres were alienated	2	databases that told us once again where every pipeline in the
3	from the system.	3	United States was, when it occurred, when it was laid, where the
4	So that's certainly a large amount of land that left	4	utility lines were in the United States, where roads were in the
02:43:20 5	the system, and trying to determine what happened is difficult.	02:46:43 5	United States, when they were made.
6	But the big leg up for all the data from 1887 to I believe 1934	6	One of the interesting things is we did an overlay of
7	was from the National Resources Board, which I believe was an	7	railroads, and I had a preconception that was totally wrong, and
8	FDR appointed board. And they provided a bunch of data, a lot	8	that is I thought we would start measuring rail lines that were
9	of data, and a lot of it related to Indians and individual	9	laid post 1887 and be able to measure the rights of ways
02:43:49 10	Indian land sales.	02:47:06 10	procured then.
11	So we started with that and determined of the existing	11	And we found out just about all significant rail lines
12	pool of allocated lands still in trust, what percentage was sold	12	were already laid by 1887, which I found interesting, since we
13	in any given year. And over that period of time, that	13	only did the transcontinental, railroad, what, in 1854.
14	percentage was reasonably constant.	14	So those railway rights of way were all secured prior
02:44:07 15	Q. I'm sorry to interrupt. You said that there was land	02:47:28 15	to 1887, But we did have this database, actually several
16	alienated. How many acres were alienated , in your experience	16	databases, that gave us once the universal scope of rights of
17	researching this issue?	17	way.
18	A. Yeah, I'm not sure anybody has the exact number. But	18	Our problem, which was extraordinarily disappointing to
19	clearly in 1887, beginning in 1887, there were tens of millions	19	us, is we never found any experts that could tell us what the
02:44:32 20	of acres already in allocation status before the Dawes Act was	02:47:49 20	value of those rights of way that actually produced income for
21	passed in 1887. And the total, I have seen various estimates,	21	Indians. We interviewed several firms, and nobody was able to
22	but somewhere between 40 and 57 million acres were at one time	22	do it at any reasonable cost.
23	individually Indian allocated.	23	Q. And were you concerned that you were unable to put that
24	Q. And does your approach, does that assume that all those	24	revenue source into your methodology? I mean, did it account
02:44:56 25	lands that are alienated sold?	02:48:07 25	for any money, in your opinion, with your research?
	1627		1629
1	A. No. There were again, that is a story that is not	1	A. Yeah, it's I guess the old Navy term is oink-oink or
1 2		2	
	A. No. There were again, that is a story that is not	3	A. Yeah, it's I guess the old Navy term is oink-oink or
2 3 4	A. No. There were again, that is a story that is not heartening to look at. But a number of Indian lands were	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5	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.
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6	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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8	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.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8	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 \$1 billion of revenues that were negotiated and deposited ultimately at the Department of Interior. I don't
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9	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 \$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.
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11	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.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11	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 \$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?
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12	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?	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13	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.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13	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 \$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?
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14	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.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16	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.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17	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 \$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.
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18	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?	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19	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 \$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.
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18 19 02:46:08 20	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 over the time span covered.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:40 20	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 \$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.
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18 19 02:46:08 20 21	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 over the time span covered. Q. And we'll get back to how you treated those gaps in a few	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:40 20 21	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18 19 02:46:08 20 21 22	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 over the time span covered.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:40 20 21 22	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18 19 02:46:08 20 21 22 23	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 over the time span covered. Q. And we'll get back to how you treated those gaps in a few moments. I just want to finish up with the other revenue sources	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:40 20 21 22 23	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 \$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
2 3 4 02:45:21 5 6 7 8 9 02:45:44 10 11 12 13 14 02:45:52 15 16 17 18 19 02:46:08 20 21 22	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 over the time span covered. Q. And we'll get back to how you treated those gaps in a few moments.	2 3 4 02:48:33 5 6 7 8 9 02:48:56 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:18 15 16 17 18 19 02:49:40 20 21 22	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 \$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

	1630		1632
1	final calculation?	1	never were able to produce reliable data is contained in our
2	A. Yes. A number, one of which is in the hard rock mineral	2	other category.
3	category that is known as aggregates. And you and I would call	3	Q. And we'll discuss that other category in a little bit.
4	them sand and gravel pits. And sand and gravel is a little bit	4	I wanted to talk about some of the gaps in data. You
02:50:22 5	unique in the sense that it is a very heavy commodity that uses	02:53:39 5	said there were gaps in land leases and land sales. And were
6	large volumes for you know, the application generally is	6	there gaps in other data that you collected, or was given to you
7	concrete.	7	by some of these experts?
8	And so the transportation costs frequently usurp the	8	A. When we receive data from other experts, we do not
9	cost of the material. So sand and gravel pits tend to be very	9	presuppose any information that they don't give us.
02:50:45 10	local, so you can't say here's a sand and gravel pit that you	02:54:00 10	So yes, I did note very limitedly there were certain
11	can easily identify with individual Indian income. It turns out	11	gaps in like the Questa data. I've observed them, but I
12	it's very difficult. They come and go in a matter of years, and	12	wouldn't call them in any way significant.
13	we didn't have any reliable method of calculating that data.	13	In other words, if they were able to identify the
14	Q. But you did identify there was some revenue generated from	14	production value in a particular year but they couldn't identify
02:51:07 15	that?	02:54:22 15	the price reliable, they might leave price blank, which would
16	A. Yes. And we attempted we when I say "we" at this	16	come down in my model as zero, which I would take the production
17	point in time, Pincock Allen & Holt actually did a study and	17	value times zero would equal zero.
18	tried to estimate it, and determined post calculation that their	18	But those were very limited in nature.
19	methodology was not reliable.	19	Q. So the gaps you had to deal with were essentially with the
02:51:22 20	Q. And did you also look at water rights or judgment per capita	02:54:40 20	land sales and land leases, for the most part?
21	accounts?	21	A. Yes. We had two sets of what I would call gaps, and gaps
22	A. Yes. Yeah, water rights are a big issue, as everyone knows	22	means years where I didn't have any data in my model. And so we
23	in the west; they are a big issue for American Indians. We did	23	dealt with those gaps by virtue of what is, I think, called
24	a lot of research, and it turns out that it is determined by a	24	linear interpolation, or interpolation, and that means filling
02:51:45 25	court case, and I'm searching my memory. I believe it's 1911,	02:55:05 25	the gaps between two known points with and the vernacular
	1631		1633
1	and the judge in that case was named Winters, and it became	1	would be straight line data reconstruction.
1 2	and the judge in that case was named Winters, and it became known as the Winters Doctrine.	1 2	would be straight line data reconstruction. MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1,
	,		
2	known as the Winters Doctrine.	2	MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1,
2	known as the Winters Doctrine. This is still my understanding of that is Indians	2	MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1, please?
3 4	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	2 3 4	MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1, please? BY MR. GUILDER:
2 3 4 02:52:04 5	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	2 3 4 02:55:18 5	MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1, please? BY MR. GUILDER: Q. Have you seen this document, Mr. Fasold?
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6	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.	2 3 4 02:55:18 5	MR. GUILDER: Could we see Bates document 60-27-1, please? BY MR. GUILDER: Q. Have you seen this document, Mr. Fasold? A. Yes.
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7	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'
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8	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?
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10	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:
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that.	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita?	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13	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,
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14	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?
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16	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.
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16 17 18	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and not individual interests.	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17 18	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?
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16 17 18 19	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and not individual interests. So I didn't know what amount of those revenues were	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17 18 19	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:
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16 17 18 19 02:53:12 20	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and not individual interests. So I didn't know what amount of those revenues were allocable, again, to individual Indians in the Trust.	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17 18 19 02:56:03 20	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16 17 18 19 02:53:12 20 21	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and not individual interests. So I didn't know what amount of those revenues were allocable, again, to individual Indians in the Trust. Q. And so essentially, that is all the revenue sources you used	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17 18 19 02:56:03 20 21	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
2 3 4 02:52:04 5 6 7 8 9 02:52:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:52:47 15 16 17 18 19 02:53:12 20 21 22	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 could have been water rights that an Indian was able to sell to a third party independent of a land lease, and if so, we don't capture that. Q. And then also judgment and per capita? A. Yes. We clearly knew again, judgment and per capita data is available historically. It appears to us that there was sort of waves of litigation. Of the litigation we identified, most of it appeared to be filed on behalf of Tribal interests, and not individual interests. So I didn't know what amount of those revenues were allocable, again, to individual Indians in the Trust. Q. And so essentially, that is all the revenue sources you used to develop this model?	2 3 4 02:55:18 5 6 7 8 9 02:55:31 10 11 12 13 14 02:55:40 15 16 17 18 19 02:56:03 20 21 22	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.

	1634		1636
1	BY MR. GUILDER:	1	MR. GUILDER: If we could look at page 21, please? And
2	Q. And could you read that to yourself for a moment?	2	if you could highlight in on that or zoom in on the
3	A. (Witness complies.) Yes, I've read it.	3	highlighted portion?
4	Q. So essentially what NORC is saying here is the minor in	4	BY MR. GUILDER:
02:56:37 5	effects assumption is interpolation. Is that correct?	02:59:30 5	Q. Could you read that to yourself for a moment?
6	A. Yeah, they typify they did similar things with their data	6	A. (Witness complies.) Yes, I've read it.
7	and did exactly what I tried to describe, and that is	7	Q. And this is essentially saying explaining the problems
8	interpolate between two known data points. And they typify	8	with not aligning the title realty to the actual tract
9	minor in effects, is what this interpolation does.	9	information. Is that correct?
02:56:58 10	Q. And so now after you've done that interpolation, you	02:59:55 10	A. Yes. It's a problem that they've recognized in this report.
11	essentially have the revenue data for the polygons. Is that	11	Q. And without something like that, you couldn't have the
12	correct?	12	individual polygons of an individual allottee's land. Is that
13	A. That's correct.	13	correct?
14	Q. And what was the next process you had to take to establish	14	A. No. I mean, I just look at it as data available to me to do
02:57:13 15	what portion of that was allocable to individual Indians?	03:00:12 15	my job the best way possible. It doesn't exist, and they're
16	·	16	
17	A. Right. What we would have loved to have in each instance	17	saying why this might not exist or be reliable.
17	was not a polygon for each reservation, we would have loved to	17	Q. Have you seen any other studies by BLM regarding some of
19	have had a polygon for each allottee's interest. But we don't	19	these issues when you were preparing to decide how you were
02:57:40 20	have that. That data I'm not sure exists in any volume at all.	03:00:26 20	going to address this issue?
	So what we were forced to do is to say, we will take		A. And I couldn't quote the source, but I have read that there
21	this revenue in a pro rata method, which is based upon the	21	have been error rates up to the 20 percent range. And the other
22	percentage of allottee interest to the total reservation	22	firsthand knowledge I have of this is one of the gentlemen from
23	interest	23	Farragut Systems, his name was Matt Gabriel, actually worked for
24	Q. Before you move fully to that, I wanted to talk about one	24	the BIA, and he worked on GIS issues and he was describing to me
02:58:03 25	thing you just mentioned. You said that if you could, you would	03:00:56 25	the difficulties they had
	1635		1637
1	have polygons of individual Indian land. You mean each	1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object as
2	individual allottee's land?	2	hearsay.
3	A. Yeah. I mean, it is certainly conceivable, and I believe	3	THE COURT: Yeah, it is. It's even beyond the expert
4	the department has addressed it, where you could perform surveys	4	witness hearsay rule.
02:58:22 5	of individual Indian lands, and that could be digitized. And	03:01:05 5	But it's also lunchtime, and that's not hearsay. I'm
6	then I would know, for example, exactly which wells were	6	taking judicial notice that it's 12:32, so it's lunchtime.
7	contained within the boundaries of an allottee's interest.	7	MR. GUILDER: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	MR. GUILDER: Could we look at Bates number 48-2-1,	8	(Recess taken at 12:32 p.m.)
9	please?	9	
02:58:40 10	BY MR. GUILDER:	10	
11	Q. And have you looked at this document and can you identify	11	
12	it?	12	
13	A. Yes, I've looked at portions of this document. I have not	13	
14	read the entire document.	14	
02:58:50 15	Q . And you were just mentioning that if BLM had created	15	
16	essentially the GIS software but for individuals, and outlined	16	
17	their allotted lands, you could have done more essentially?	17	
18	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond	18	
19	the scope of the witness' expert opinion. He's now offering	19	
02:59:09 20	opinions about what he could have done if different things had	20	
21	happened.	21	
22	MR. GUILDER: He's actually not going to offer that	22	
23	opinion. He's going to explain why he chose a certain	23	
24			
24	methodology.	24	
02:59:18 25	methodology. THE COURT: Overruled.	24 25	

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER I, Rebecca Stonestreet, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE

	1972 - 1550:15,	21 - 1636:1	66-5-5 - 1541:22	1579:2, 1579:5,
\$	1558:11, 1564:1	21st - 1555:22		1579:14, 1579:21,
\$100,000 - 1594:2	1980's - 1548:8 1985 - 1550:25,	22 - 1552:17 22-3 - 1570:18	7	1580:16, 1580:22, 1580:23, 1581:1,
\$105,000 - 1594.2 \$105 - 1550:22	1588:6	22-3 - 1570.18 22-3-1 - 1594:9	7 - 1546:4	1581:11, 1591:4,
\$49 - 1566:19	1988 - 1562:13	22-3-2 - 1570:18	7.1 - 1564:5.	1593:19, 1594:2,
410 1000110	199 - 1567:6	22-3-3 - 1594:10	1564:18	1596:24, 1597:4,
•	1990 - 1537:10,	23 - 1534:4	70 - 1558:1,	1597:5, 1599:2,
	1541:15, 1541:17	271 - 1574:1	1558:15, 1558:18,	1628:24
'70 - 1616:14	1990's - 1548:9,	27101 - 1534:25	1566:16	accountant -
'70-'92 - 1562:16 '71 - 1616:14	1556:19, 1562:12	28 - 1567:8	70,000 - 1566:18 790,000 - 1566:19,	1556:11, 1601:15 accountant's -
'72 - 1616:14	1991 - 1539:18, 1562:14	2800 - 1534:17	1567:2	1541:24, 1543:8
' 80s - 1537:11	1992 - 1562:16	3	7th - 1583:7	accountants -
'95 - 1541:18	1994 - 1539:24,	3	7411 1000.7	1566:1, 1600:19
'96 - 1544:11	1539:25, 1565:10,	3 - 1570:18	8	accounted -
'97 - 1544:11	1567:6, 1580:18	30 - 1540:12,		1608:18
'98 - 1544:11	1995 - 1540:12,	1560:19	8 - 1534:8, 1546:4	Accounting -
	1562:18, 1583:5	300 - 1584:24	815-6450 - 1534:18 824-1448 - 1534:14	1537:15, 1546:14,
1	1996 - 1540:11, 1540:18, 1546:3,	30309-4530 - 1534:17	024-1440 - 1554.14	1583:16 accounting -
1 - 1621:4, 1629:7	1549:14, 1556:17,	307-0010 - 1535:4	0	1537:21, 1538:8,
1.5 - 1582:10,	1566:9, 1568:19,	307-1104 - 1535:9	9	1538:9, 1538:10,
1585:2	1580:3, 1591:12,	321 - 1575:4	9 - 1546:4, 1579:1	1539:2, 1542:25,
10 - 1537:8,	1624:10	322 - 1597:23,	90 - 1580:21	1543:1, 1543:16,
1538:15, 1563:11	1997 - 1550:15,	1597:25, 1598:3	900 - 1534:21	1549:6, 1549:16,
100 - 1562:23,	1553:7, 1557:17,	333 - 1535:12	911 - 1610:25	1550:1, 1550:14,
1580:1, 1614:14, 1622:24	1558:11, 1566:8, 1568:19	335 - 1598:7 336 - 1534:25.	96-1285 - 1534:2 975 - 1535:8	1550:19, 1557:19, 1557:22, 1559:25,
1001 - 1534:24	1998 - 1601:11	1575:4	979 - 1000.0	1560:23, 1561:14.
105 - 1558:10,	1999 - 1546:4,	35 - 1555:24	Λ	1561:15, 1562:25,
1558:16, 1558:21	1546:23, 1547:9,	354-3249 - 1535:13	Α	1565:11, 1567:21,
1099 - 1566:24	1547:17, 1551:19,	397 - 1585:25	abide - 1622:23	1567:22, 1568:9,
110 - 1553:1,	1583:7, 1583:10,	399 - 1585:25	abiding - 1596:1	1569:14, 1574:10,
1563:21	1583:15, 1590:11		ability - 1542:16,	1574:11, 1575:11,
1100 - 1534:16,		4	1556:13	1575:15, 1576:4,
1535:3 11:04 - 1590:4	2	4 - 1585:13, 1585:17	able - 1546:15, 1546:25, 1561:1,	1576:17, 1578:21, 1578:22, 1578:23,
12 - 1538:16,	2 - 1621:4	4-2-1 - 1575:2	1563:22, 1569:2,	1578:25, 1579:25,
1552:22, 1552:23	2,000 - 1619:22	40 - 1567:19,	1569:19, 1609:5,	1580:20, 1580:21,
127 - 1574:2	2.4 - 1564:6,	1626:22	1610:25, 1619:7,	1588:15, 1588:17,
12:32 - 1637:6,	1564:18, 1564:23	400 - 1564:23,	1620:18, 1621:13,	1593:20, 1598:22,
1637:8	20 - 1552:17,	1565:3, 1573:23,	1623:2, 1625:20,	1598:24, 1601:17,
13 - 1540:17, 1598:7	1563:12, 1567:2,	1573:25, 1586:1	1627:24, 1628:9,	1601:20, 1601:22
130,000 - 1610:18	1636:21	404 - 1534:18	1628:21, 1631:8,	accountings -
14 - 1545:2 14th - 1534:12,	2000 - 1554:22, 1571:20, 1573:4,	42 - 1597:25 4208 - 1605:23	1631:10, 1632:1, 1632:13	1575:14 Accounts - 1560:12,
1534:20	1606:8	4210 - 1570:11,	abooks - 1623:1	1560:14, 1560:20,
15 - 1561:5	20001 - 1535:13	1572:23, 1574:20,	above-entitled -	1560:24, 1561:12,
1537 - 1536:3	20005 - 1534:13,	1582:20	1638:5	1561:16
1581 - 1536:4	1534:21, 1535:4	48-2-1 - 1635:8	accepted - 1601:20	accounts - 1546:6,
16 - 1537:23,	2002 - 1583:13,		accepts - 1569:24	1546:18, 1546:24,
1541:25, 1542:5,	1591:20, 1592:1,	5	accessible -	1547:7, 1547:8,
1542:7 1603 - 1536:5	1606:18, 1606:21 2003 - 1554:17,	50 - 1581:2, 1622:24	1612:17	1552:3, 1552:6, 1552:7, 1552:8
170 - 1573:24	1573:12, 1582:8,	516 - 1581:2, 1622:24 516 - 1599:10	accompanying - 1538:21	1552:7, 1552:8, 1552:12, 1552:17,
176 - 1373.24 175 - 1558:17	1583:25, 1589:12,	57 - 1626:22	accomplish -	1552:20, 1553:6,
183,000 - 1566:19,	1604:24, 1605:1,	575 - 1537:8, 1567:9	1609:2	1555:25, 1556:4,
1567:1	1605:2, 1605:3,	585-0053 - 1534:22	accomplished -	1557:20, 1558:2,
1850s - 1576:8	1605:5, 1605:10,	_	1551:24	1558:6, 1560:25,
1854 - 1628:13	1606:19	6	accordance -	1561:18, 1563:7,
1887 - 1569:8, 1606:10, 1606:18,	20044 - 1535:9 2006 - 1544:17.		1540:1, 1540:3, 1601:20	1563:13, 1563:16, 1563:23, 1564:21,
1626:1, 1626:6,	1545:2, 1551:4,	6,000 - 1554:13 60-2 - 1544:19	According - 1550:2	1565:23, 1564:21, 1566:18, 1566:20,
1626:19, 1626:21,	1551:15, 1551:25,	60-2-1 - 1544:20	according -	1568:9, 1568:10,
1628:9, 1628:12,	1556:18, 1560:19,	60-2-34 - 1547:20,	1546:23, 1549:22,	1569:8, 1569:10,
1628:15, 1629:13	1606:19, 1606:21	1552:3	1558:8, 1562:23,	1569:13, 1569:16,
1900 - 1623:10,	2006/2005 - 1544:21	60-2-36 - 1560:10	1563:8, 1606:15	1569:20, 1575:14,
1623:11	2007 - 1534:4,	60-27-1 - 1633:2	account - 1538:11,	1575:15, 1576:25,
1911 - 1630:25	1551:17, 1571:10,	607 - 1534:12,	1541:1, 1546:16,	1579:22, 1581:8,
1934 - 1625:16, 1626:6	1573:5, 1576:13, 1581:8, 1585:7,	1534:20 607-7392 - 1534:25	1546:17, 1547:13, 1553:4, 1555:6,	1591:24, 1593:4, 1593:9, 1593:22,
1950s - 1576:6	1604:25, 1606:1	616 - 1599:11,	1553:4, 1555:6, 1556:15, 1556:22,	1593:23, 1593:22,
1970 - 1571:18,	2009 - 1554:25	1599:13	1557:21, 1558:10,	1594:2, 1607:15,
1616:16, 1616:20	202 - 1534:14,	64-6-1 - 1578:9,	1560:3, 1561:8,	1608:1, 1630:21
1970's - 1616:14		1599:14	1565:3, 1565:4,	accrue - 1601:21
	1534:22, 1535:4,	.000		
1970s - 1571:20	1535:9, 1535:13	6511 - 1535:12	1565:8, 1570:1,	accumulated -
1970s - 1571:20 1971 - 1557:20,	1535:9, 1535:13 20th - 1555:20,	6511 - 1535:12 66-5 - 1540:7	1565:8, 1570:1, 1570:4, 1570:22,	1568:2, 1568:16
1970s - 1571:20	1535:9, 1535:13	6511 - 1535:12	1565:8, 1570:1,	

(202) 354-3249

accurate - 1556:15,	agency - 1548:23,	1560:7, 1562:20,	1609:9, 1611:3,	1547:19, 1547:21,
1562:25, 1578:12	1549:4, 1549:17,	1566:25, 1583:4,	1615:2, 1621:17,	1550:17, 1551:3,
acquired - 1613:13	1549:25, 1551:20,	1590:10, 1630:23	1622:9, 1622:16	1552:10, 1552:11,
acres - 1610:18,	1592:21	amount - 1547:3,	areas - 1610:25,	1553:15, 1554:10,
1626:2, 1626:16, 1626:20, 1626:22,	aggregate - 1624:24, 1625:3	1580:25, 1585:1, 1587:22, 1618:24,	1619:2, 1622:14 arrived - 1607:20	1557:5, 1560:11, 1562:14, 1562:15,
1627:7	aggregates -	1626:4, 1629:13,	art - 1553:3	1563:12, 1563:20,
acronym - 1609:20	1630:3	1631:19	Arthur - 1537:9,	1563:22, 1565:13,
acronyms - 1608:25	ago - 1573:25,	amounts - 1564:9,	1538:1, 1539:3,	1565:20, 1565:21,
act - 1555:12,	1591:15, 1594:21,	1564:17	1539:13, 1541:17,	1569:15, 1591:10,
1625:16	1595:7, 1610:7,	analysis - 1603:25,	1542:7, 1548:8,	1601:10
Act - 1538:9, 1539:25, 1543:15,	1610:17 agree - 1574:4,	1604:2, 1606:20 analyze - 1591:3	1561:24, 1562:2, 1562:13, 1562:22,	audited - 1539:3, 1541:19, 1546:22,
1566:21, 1580:18,	1576:23, 1584:23,	analyzing - 1608:7,	1563:2, 1563:4,	1550:5, 1550:20,
1599:2, 1625:17,	1589:18, 1596:15,	1633:7	1563:8, 1563:10,	1563:7
1626:20	1597:7, 1599:4,	Andersen - 1537:9,	1563:20, 1601:11	auditing - 1545:12
acting - 1592:22	1605:6	1538:1, 1539:3,	aspect - 1549:15,	auditor - 1542:15,
Action - 1534:2	agreed - 1542:22, 1562:23	1539:13, 1541:17, 1541:19, 1542:7,	1593:2	1544:14, 1548:25, 1551:2
active - 1556:4 activities - 1551:12,	agreed-upon -	1561:25, 1562:2,	aspects - 1538:10, 1561:14	auditors - 1545:13,
1551:14	1562:23	1562:13, 1562:22,	assembly - 1565:25	1547:24, 1559:22,
actual - 1554:8,	agreeing - 1596:19	1563:2, 1563:5,	assess - 1591:24	1561:24, 1601:9
1608:14, 1636:8	agricultural -	1563:8, 1563:10,	asset - 1538:8,	audits - 1539:5,
add - 1616:12	1623:11, 1624:6	1563:20, 1601:11	1543:17, 1547:11,	1539:13, 1539:14,
added - 1624:10 addition - 1545:10	agriculture - 1623:9, 1624:8,	Andersen's - 1548:8 anecdotal - 1629:6	1550:18, 1567:22, 1570:6, 1580:23,	1539:15, 1539:20, 1543:18, 1544:5,
additional - 1605:2	1623.9, 1624.6,	anecdotal - 1629:6 annual - 1623:4,	1581:16	1543.16, 1544.5, 1544:16, 1546:20,
address - 1542:1,	ahead - 1554:4,	1623:5	Asset - 1546:13	1550:2, 1561:23,
1572:14, 1595:23,	1577:12, 1603:7, [°]	annuities - 1629:14,	Assets - 1540:12	1562:13, 1563:1,
1601:14, 1636:19	1605:20	1629:19	assets - 1546:8,	1567:17, 1601:9
addressed - 1542:8,	aided - 1535:15	annuity - 1629:15,	1546:9, 1547:12,	August - 1585:7,
1548:10, 1574:22, 1621:5, 1635:4	al - 1534:3, 1534:6	1629:16, 1629:18, 1629:23	1550:2, 1550:3, 1550:4, 1551:12,	1606:1
addresses -	alienated - 1626:2, 1626:16, 1626:25,	answer - 1546:1,	1555:6, 1555:18,	authored - 1584:8, 1585:6, 1589:3
1595:23	1627:3, 1627:9	1554:1, 1554:4,	1569:3, 1579:4,	authoring - 1586:8
addressing -	aligning - 1636:8	1558:25, 1580:6,	1579:7, 1608:2	authorities -
1556:3, 1599:22	Allen - 1618:13,	1580:14, 1580:15,	associated -	1615:5, 1615:6
adequate - 1546:24	1619:1, 1620:4,	1596:3, 1627:10	1613:17	automated -
adequately - 1574:22	1621:2, 1630:17 allocable - 1618:7,	answered - 1568:15 answering - 1583:1	Associates - 1541:10	1551:11, 1551:13, 1551:20
adjustment -	1629:24, 1631:20,	Appearances -	assume - 1599:1,	available - 1544:16,
1550:21	1634:15	1534:10	1624:22, 1626:24	1600:8, 1600:22,
administered -	allocated - 1621:22,	appeared - 1631:17	assuming - 1573:16	1606:19, 1608:20,
1579:5, 1602:17	1625:4, 1626:12,	appearing -	assumption -	1611:24, 1612:14,
administration - 1554:22	1626:23 allocation - 1626:20	1602:12 appended - 1584:5,	1634:5 assumptions -	1616:25, 1617:18, 1621:15, 1622:8,
administrative -	allotment - 1576:5	1585:2, 1593:15,	1561:4, 1633:21	1623:12, 1631:15,
1540:6, 1540:9,	allotted - 1618:18,	1596:14	astounding -	1636:14
1544:18, 1544:20,	1629:24, 1635:17	appendix - 1584:1,	1564:8, 1565:11,	Avenue - 1535:12
1570:17, 1574:24,	allottee - 1575:18,	1584:19, 1585:11	1566:3, 1566:5	average - 1554:19
1575:1, 1575:5, 1577:7, 1577:19,	1634:22	applicable - 1618:5	Atlanta - 1534:17	awaiting - 1593:20
1577:25, 1578:2,	allottee's - 1634:18, 1635:2, 1635:7,	application - 1609:2, 1610:9,	attached - 1541:7, 1544:2, 1547:21,	aware - 1593:18, 1593:21, 1602:25,
1578:8, 1585:7,	1636:12	1610:16, 1611:25,	1567:2, 1592:7	1610:13, 1611:9
1585:9, 1590:14,	allottees - 1608:6	1630:6	attachment -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1599:13	allow - 1568:22,	applications -	1585:14	В
admission - 1605:14	1601:19 allowed - 1555:7.	1609:18, 1611:15	attempt - 1561:13,	
Admitted - 1536:8	1600:12	applied - 1607:25 apply - 1617:23,	1608:3 attempted - 1608:4,	background - 1603:23, 1604:20,
admitted - 1602:13	Almost - 1552:21	1622:7	1623:22, 1630:16	1621:3
advice - 1571:8,	almost - 1568:3,	appointed - 1626:8	attention - 1537:14,	backlog - 1553:11,
1576:14, 1576:19,	1568:17	appointment -	1544:17, 1599:25	1553:13, 1553:19,
1576:21, 1576:23,	alternative -	1602:14	Attorney - 1535:6	1554:8, 1554:24,
1577:24, 1583:8, 1595:24, 1596:1	1600:20 amendments -	appraisal - 1579:7	attorneys - 1577:23 attributed - 1542:23	1555:3, 1557:3 backlogged -
advise - 1587:6	1584:10	approach - 1572:10, 1626:24	attributes - 1592:15	1554:14
advised - 1563:10	America - 1570:16,	appropriate -	attribution -	balance - 1547:6,
advisory - 1542:2	1570:19, 1570:20,	1574:4, 1606:22,	1623:20	1547:12, 1550:13,
Affairs - 1539:16,	1571:7, 1571:11,	1617:13	audit - 1537:9,	1557:12, 1557:15,
1545:17, 1545:21,	1571:15, 1587:13, 1587:14, 1587:15,	appropriately -	1538:24, 1539:9, 1530:11, 1530:12	1557:21, 1558:7,
		1620:12	1539:11, 1539:12,	1558:10, 1558:19, 1558:20, 1558:25,
1547:17, 1548:2,		appropriations -		
	1587:14, 1587:15, 1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2,	appropriations - 1573:20, 1573:23,	1539:21, 1539:23, 1540:3, 1540:4,	1559:2, 1559:3,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1,	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11 Affairs' - 1561:15	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1, 1597:2, 1597:7,	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25 approved - 1573:16	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24, 1541:2, 1541:11,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5, 1571:22, 1575:17,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11 Affairs' - 1561:15 affected - 1611:14	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1, 1597:2, 1597:7, 1600:9	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25 approved - 1573:16 Ar - 1547:22	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24, 1541:2, 1541:11, 1541:15, 1542:7,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5, 1571:22, 1575:17, 1575:19, 1575:20,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11 Affairs' - 1561:15 affected - 1611:14 affects - 1555:4	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1, 1597:2, 1597:7, 1600:9 America's -	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25 approved - 1573:16 Ar - 1547:22 Ar-445 - 1594:8	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24, 1541:2, 1541:11, 1541:15, 1542:7, 1542:21, 1544:2,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5, 1571:22, 1575:17, 1575:19, 1575:20, 1575:21, 1580:19,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11 Affairs' - 1561:15 affected - 1611:14 affects - 1555:4 age - 1564:12	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1, 1597:2, 1597:7, 1600:9 America's - 1596:18, 1597:3,	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25 approved - 1573:16 Ar - 1547:22 Ar-445 - 1594:8 Ar-56 - 1597:18	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24, 1541:2, 1541:11, 1541:15, 1542:7, 1542:21, 1544:2, 1544:8, 1544:15,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5, 1571:22, 1575:17, 1575:19, 1575:20, 1575:21, 1580:19, 1597:4, 1600:11,
1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:24, 1558:3, 1579:21, 1601:11 Affairs' - 1561:15 affected - 1611:14 affects - 1555:4	1587:19, 1588:5, 1595:9, 1596:2, 1596:23, 1597:1, 1597:2, 1597:7, 1600:9 America's -	1573:20, 1573:23, 1592:25 approved - 1573:16 Ar - 1547:22 Ar-445 - 1594:8	1540:3, 1540:4, 1540:10, 1540:24, 1541:2, 1541:11, 1541:15, 1542:7, 1542:21, 1544:2,	1559:2, 1559:3, 1559:6, 1570:5, 1571:22, 1575:17, 1575:19, 1575:20, 1575:21, 1580:19,

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net

1555:6, 1555:17,	belong - 1560:6	1594:25, 1595:1,	1571:21, 1580:17,	1624:16, 1625:9
1558:2, 1566:18,	belonged - 1561:8	1605:8	1581:3	chartered - 1538:8
1569:3, 1569:17,	belongs - 1558:4	boundaries -	capacity - 1540:4	check - 1557:21,
1569:18, 1573:9,	below - 1538:17	1609:9, 1610:8,	capita - 1546:18,	1564:7, 1565:5,
1579:6, 1581:17, 1597:5	Ben - 1535:8	1612:6, 1612:11,	1564:21, 1565:4,	1565:12, 1565:18,
Balances - 1540:12	beneficiaries - 1556:14, 1566:25,	1612:13, 1612:22, 1615:23, 1616:3,	1569:9, 1593:19, 1593:23, 1630:20,	1565:22, 1566:1, 1567:8, 1567:15,
bank - 1549:20,	1575:13, 1576:17,	1619:21, 1635:7	1631:13, 1631:14	1569:25, 1580:17
1555:5, 1555:18,	1579:21, 1581:9,	boundary -	capture - 1631:12	checking - 1580:16
1567:18, 1567:20,	1608:16	1610:16, 1611:6	captured - 1607:24,	checks - 1569:22,
1570:21, 1570:22,	beneficiary -	bounded - 1610:10 bounds - 1608:11	1614:1, 1629:22 career - 1580:3,	1579:12, 1579:15,
1571:17, 1571:23, 1580:16, 1600:18	1557:4, 1560:8, 1561:11, 1565:6,	Box - 1535:8	1592:12	1579:17, 1579:20, 1579:23
Bank - 1566:21,	1570:9, 1578:21,	branch - 1549:20	Carolina - 1534:25	chose - 1635:23
1570:15, 1570:19,	1581:10, 1581:15,	Branch - 1535:7	carries - 1577:22	Christopher-
1570:20, 1571:7,	1581:19, 1597:8	branching -	carry - 1573:21	1535:2
1571:11, 1571:15, 1587:13, 1587:14,	benefit - 1560:7, 1560:8, 1561:9,	1611:12 break - 1539:5,	case - 1554:18, 1559:12, 1567:19,	circumstance - 1601:8
1587:15, 1587:19,	1631:5, 1631:8	1589:24, 1611:13,	1568:21, 1569:8,	circumstances -
1588:5, 1595:9,	Bentzen - 1577:20,	1620:8	1589:10, 1592:17,	1555:5
1596:2, 1596:18,	1577:23, 1589:3,	breaks - 1550:4	1599:5, 1603:24,	cite - 1589:20
1596:22, 1596:25, 1597:1, 1597:3,	1589:8, 1599:9 best - 1567:5,	briefly - 1542:4, 1555:3, 1565:16,	1604:23, 1609:11, 1612:15, 1612:16,	citizens - 1566:25 Civil - 1534:2,
1597:7, 1600:9,	1636:15	1603:20, 1603:22,	1630:25, 1631:1	1535:7
1600:12, 1600:23	better - 1583:3	1604:13, 1606:15,	cases - 1547:1,	clarity - 1577:14
banking - 1567:20,	between - 1549:23,	1608:8, 1608:23,	1554:13, 1554:14,	clear - 1609:8,
1580:3, 1587:18,	1552:23, 1556:16,	1622:17, 1624:23,	1554:19, 1571:20,	1615:19
1607:23 bar - 1590:2	1557:21, 1558:1, 1558:19, 1559:2,	1625:23 briefs - 1586:13,	1608:4, 1621:4, 1621:5	clearly - 1626:19, 1629:6, 1631:14
barrel - 1614:5,	1559:18, 1612:23,	1586:16, 1586:20,	cash - 1547:12,	Clearly - 1627:19
1614:9, 1617:25	1626:22, 1632:25,	1586:24, 1587:1	1558:2, 1579:6,	click - 1612:7
barrels - 1616:10,	1634:8	bring - 1537:12,	1601:17, 1601:19	close - 1573:24,
1617:2, 1617:15, 1620:10	beyond - 1635:18, 1637:3	1540:16, 1591:12, 1594:8	categories - 1620:14, 1621:24,	1597:2 closed - 1566:20,
based - 1555:13,	Bia - 1539:22,	brings - 1568:7,	1623:9, 1623:14,	1575:14
1570:16, 1574:10,	1541:18, 1545:22,	1600:25	1624:10	closer - 1607:16,
1581:9, 1594:1, 1634:21	1549:4, 1549:12, 1551:10, 1551:13,	broke - 1537:7 broken - 1624:6	categorized - 1623:8, 1623:13,	1607:17
bases - 1580:12	1551:19, 1552:9,	brought - 1624.0	1624:9	closing - 1555:17 coal - 1618:21,
basic - 1610:5,	1556:3, 1556:16,	1612:16	category - 1592:9,	1620:12
1612:5	1607:14, 1636:24	build - 1611:16	1624:12, 1624:21,	Cobell - 1534:2
basis - 1580:17, 1580:19, 1601:17,	Big - 1588:16 big - 1587:15,	bunch - 1626:8 burden - 1568:2,	1625:22, 1630:3, 1632:2, 1632:3	code - 1601:22 codes - 1566:21
1601:19, 1616:11,	1626:6, 1629:21,	1568:16	caused - 1580:1	collected - 1632:6
1616:12	1630:22, 1630:23	Bureau - 1539:15,	century - 1555:20,	collecting - 1612:25
Bates - 1540:7,	bigger - 1588:3	1545:17, 1545:20,	1555:23, 1568:3,	collections -
1540:9, 1540:15, 1544:20, 1544:24,	biggest - 1587:17 billion - 1564:5,	1547:17, 1548:2, 1557:19, 1557:23,	1568:17, 1570:6 certain - 1538:20,	1561:17 collects - 1546:9,
1547:20, 1552:3,	1564:6, 1564:18,	1558:3, 1561:15,	1545:11, 1549:11,	1549:20
1555:24, 1560:9,	1629:7	1579:21, 1601:11,	1550:4, 1551:14,	Colorado - 1610:15
1570:17, 1575:4,	bit - 1552:6,	1619:12	1559:5, 1561:4,	Columbia - 1534:1
1578:8, 1594:9, 1597:24, 1598:7,	1575:23, 1580:13, 1583:3, 1584:4,	bureau - 1539:19, 1546:6, 1546:7,	1584:15, 1613:17, 1618:23, 1632:10,	combined - 1619:16 coming - 1540:22,
1599:13, 1600:1,	1588:2, 1590:9,	1546:16, 1547:8,	1635:23	1547:14, 1549:21,
1633:2, 1635:8	1594:13, 1596:9,	1549:21, 1550:17,	Certain - 1537:17,	1551:16, 1556:23,
bears - 1574:14 became - 1544:13,	1596:10, 1630:4, 1632:3	1553:2, 1555:20, 1559:25, 1566:23,	1537:20, 1601:21 certainly - 1552:1,	1575:9, 1611:11, 1615:8
1552:8, 1562:11,	blade - 1625:10	1569:13, 1579:12	1573:22, 1626:4,	commence - 1576:4
1631:1	blank - 1632:15	bureau's - 1546:23,	1635:3	comment - 1554:21,
become - 1583:4,	Blm - 1611:25,	1557:22	Certificate - 1638:1	1629:6
1627:9 becomes - 1614:21	1612:3, 1621:23, 1625:16, 1625:17,	business - 1624:11, 1624:21	certified - 1555:18, 1581:16	comments - 1542:2, 1542:6, 1543:22
began - 1604:15,	1635:15, 1636:17	businesses -	certify - 1547:6,	commercial -
1623:10	blowing - 1610:20	1601:21	1547:11, 1569:2,	1546:14, 1557:1,
begin - 1577:18,	Board - 1626:7		1569:13, 1569:16,	1581:1, 1587:23,
1582:15 beginning - 1547:6,	board - 1622:7, 1626:8	С	1569:18, 1575:20, 1575:21, 1638:3	1588:5, 1592:14, 1593:8, 1593:10,
1569:4, 1569:17,	body - 1585:12	calculate - 1606:8,	cetera - 1540:24,	1618:17, 1620:16,
1569:18, 1571:22,	book - 1623:19	1614:19, 1614:24,	1576:22, 1579:8,	1620:25
1575:17, 1575:20, 1576:24, 1596:23,	books - 1540:1, 1549:25, 1622:24,	1615:1 calculated -	1579:23 chain - 1550:4	Commercial - 1535:7
1626:19	1622:25, 1623:16	1623:25	challenge - 1570:9,	commercially -
begins - 1541:24,	bookstores -	calculating -	1628:1	1620:2, 1620:6,
1548:22, 1557:10,	1623:1	1614:4, 1630:13	chances - 1560:7	1620:7, 1620:18,
1570:12, 1570:24, 1572:24, 1575:12,	borders - 1610:10 bother - 1560:1	calculation - 1629:11, 1630:1,	changed - 1559:25 changes - 1554:23	1622:8 commissioned -
1597:25, 1599:14	bottom - 1537:12.	1630:18	changing - 1574:6	1586:22
behalf - 1556:14,	1543:7, 1545:5,	calculations -	characterizes -	commissioner's -
1608:15, 1631:17 believes - 1596:1	1545:10, 1570:12, 1575:12, 1577:17,	1617:16 cannot - 1555:18,	1633:23 chart - 1566:14,	1623:5 commodity -
NOTIC 4 CO - 1000.1	.0.0.12, 10//.1/,	Juniot - 1000.10,	Jilait - 1000.14,	Commounty -

(202) 354-3249

1630:5	1602:12	1537:18, 1537:20,	1568:14, 1568:20,	Cv- 1592:7, 1604:19
common - 1579:1,	confident -	1538:2, 1538:7,	1568:24, 1571:25,	
1611:14 Commonly	1556:21, 1556:25, 1617:12	1541:25, 1542:10, 1543:22, 1548:14,	1572:11, 1572:17, 1572:21, 1574:17,	D
Commonly - 1625:16	confirm - 1541:10	1548:16. 1556:12.	1575:12, 1576:8,	daily - 1580:17,
commutation -	confirmation -	1559:2	1576:18, 1577:1,	1580:19
1629:19	1539:1	controls - 1538:5,	1577:5, 1577:9,	Daniel - 1534:23
companies - 1611:9, 1613:23,	confirmed - 1595:25	1538:19, 1545:15, 1567:21, 1567:22,	1577:15, 1580:10, 1580:13, 1581:22,	data - 1590:16, 1590:23, 1591:3,
1615:4, 1615:10,	confirms - 1541:14	1601:5	1584:20, 1585:24,	1601:4, 1606:18,
1615:13	conformance -	conversation -	1589:24, 1590:1,	1606:19, 1606:20,
companies' - 1614:16	1573:8 confused - 1577:9	1577:8 conversing -	1590:5, 1595:16, 1595:18, 1596:5,	1607:4, 1607:9, 1607:19, 1607:21,
company - 1560:5,	Congress - 1573:21,	1594:20	1597:13, 1602:1,	1608:5, 1609:13,
1613:18, 1613:20,	1574:4, 1575:12,	cookie - 1561:21	1602:5, 1602:7,	1609:14, 1610:3,
1618:11 Company - 1539:9	1583:12, 1591:18, 1591:21	copies - 1547:1, 1623:2	1602:16, 1602:24, 1603:3, 1603:6,	1610:5, 1613:17, 1613:25, 1614:20,
company's -	Congressional -	copy - 1579:17,	1603:9, 1603:21,	1614:25, 1615:1,
1618:12	1592:25	1580:17, 1585:17	1604:3, 1604:17,	1615:4, 1616:1,
compare - 1544:8	connect - 1612:23	core - 1615:1	1605:6, 1605:17,	1616:8, 1616:9,
compelled - 1547:11, 1579:3	connected - 1624:17, 1625:14	corpus - 1549:22 correct - 1539:6,	1606:24, 1607:6, 1608:10, 1608:17,	1616:13, 1616:15, 1616:16, 1616:24,
competency -	connection -	1539:7, 1541:8,	1608:21, 1609:20,	1616:25, 1617:18,
1588:4	1546:17, 1552:13,	1541:15, 1541:16,	1623:13, 1629:5,	1621:15, 1622:3,
competition - 1613:20	1552:14, 1554:11, 1558:9, 1583:25,	1547:3, 1559:4, 1561:18, 1569:20,	1635:25, 1637:3, 1638:1, 1638:10	1622:4, 1623:3, 1623:5, 1623:7,
complete - 1593:20	1584:25, 1589:12	1581:16, 1581:17,	court - 1555:8,	1623:12, 1623:17,
completed -	consider - 1586:21	1582:11, 1585:4,	1555:10, 1630:25	1624:2, 1624:13,
1551:14, 1562:19, 1574:1	considered - 1584:16, 1587:1,	1586:7, 1587:3, 1588:12, 1588:25,	Court's - 1605:5 Courthouse -	1624:23, 1624:24, 1624:25, 1625:4,
completeness -	1590:16, 1599:8	1590:15, 1591:18,	1535:12	1625:8, 1625:13,
1573:19, 1590:16,	consistent -	1592:23, 1595:10,	Courtroom-	1626:6, 1626:8,
1590:24 complies - 1542:12,	1571:16, 1600:21, 1600:22	1600:5, 1601:18, 1606:3, 1620:20,	1602:17 cover - 1541:5,	1626:9, 1627:6, 1627:12, 1627:17,
1548:24, 1552:5,	consistently -	1622:13, 1627:18,	1544:25, 1582:23,	1627:12, 1627:17,
1553:14, 1556:2,	1551:11, 1556:3	1633:14, 1634:5,	1585:14, 1585:19,	1630:13, 1631:14,
1560:17, 1570:25, 1571:3, 1576:1,	consisting - 1566:1 consolidated -	1634:12, 1634:13, 1636:9, 1636:13,	1585:20, 1598:2, 1599:6	1632:1, 1632:4, 1632:6, 1632:8,
1634:3, 1636:6	1550:1	1638:4	covered - 1562:17,	1632:11, 1632:22,
Comptroller-	constant - 1626:14	Correct - 1564:19,	1627:20	1633:1, 1634:6,
1567:13, 1571:19, 1578:18, 1579:2,	Constitution - 1535:12	1583:18, 1586:17, 1587:8, 1588:24,	covering - 1580:12 crashed - 1564:11	1634:8, 1634:11, 1634:19, 1636:14
1580:3, 1589:11	Consulting-	1591:15, 1592:25,	create - 1610:1,	Data - 1613:21
computer -	1590:17	1596:19, 1598:25,	1612:19, 1613:23	database - 1619:9,
1535:15, 1553:1,	contained -	1599:5, 1599:19, 1600:7	created - 1635:15 criteria - 1601:10	1619:13, 1619:16,
1564:11, 1609:2, 1611:7	1541:25, 1554:8, 1616:3, 1616:7,	corrections -	cross - 1633:15	1619:18, 1620:1, 1620:24, 1621:1,
computer-aided -	1619:13, 1623:5,	1584:10	Cross - 1536:2,	1622:18, 1622:19,
1535:15 computerized -	1632:1, 1635:7	corresponds - 1576:23	1581:22, 1581:23 cross-examination	1628:15 databases -
1559:15	containing - 1543:8 contemporaneous	cost - 1563:11,	- 1633:15	1619:10, 1628:2,
computers - 1553:3	- 1623:16	1571:16, 1573:25,	Cross-examine -	1628:16
conceivable - 1635:3	contemporary - 1623:18	1574:9, 1574:11,	1581:22 crude - 1617:22,	datas - 1624:15
concerned -	content - 1617:24	1574:14, 1620:15, 1628:22, 1630:9	1617:25	date - 1562:16, 1576:4, 1576:6,
1599:6, 1628:23	contents - 1540:16	costs - 1630:8	cubic - 1616:10,	1591:12, 1593:18,
concerning - 1553:23, 1553:24,	context - 1595:1, 1595:20, 1595:23	Council - 1564:22, 1565:3	1617:15 cumulative -	1616:19 Date - 1638:10
1553:23, 1553:24, 1598:20, 1599:22	continue - 1544:4	counsel - 1572:1,	1550:22, 1604:22,	dated - 1545:2
concerns - 1597:24	continued -	1602:22, 1607:4	1605:4, 1605:11,	dating - 1542:25,
conclude - 1603:25	1538:13, 1560:20	Counsel - 1605:7	1616:13, 1616:24, 1617:4	1557:18, 1562:15,
concludes - 1551:17, 1556:12	Continued - 1537:5 continues - 1604:11	country - 1588:18, 1611:1	Currency - 1567:13,	1564:1, 1569:15 daunting - 1609:1
conclusion -	continuing -	county - 1614:1,	1571:19, 1578:19,	David - 1534:23
1574:16, 1615:3	1555:19, 1583:8	1615:16	1579:2, 1589:11	Dawes - 1626:20
conclusions - 1608:20	contract - 1547:3, 1563:23, 1609:16,	couple - 1575:6, 1586:13, 1594:6,	current - 1545:24, 1568:7, 1568:13,	days - 1579:19, 1580:21, 1582:7,
conclusive -	1613:5	1599:7, 1619:10,	1570:4, 1573:12,	1589:11
1568:9, 1574:3	contracted -	1621:3	1590:13, 1591:2,	Dc - 1534:4,
concrete - 1630:7 condition -	1609:17 contractor -	coupled - 1567:17 course - 1545:2,	1593:16, 1593:21, 1601:9, 1606:10	1534:13, 1534:21, 1535:4, 1535:9,
1545:15, 1547:25,	1552:15, 1553:4,	1577:25, 1591:23,	curvature - 1625:7	1535:13
1548:13, 1557:2	1583:9	1613:15, 1614:21	curve - 1617:5,	deal - 1571:20,
conditions - 1542:1, 1542:6,	contractors - 1552:21, 1587:6,	Court - 1534:1, 1535:11, 1537:2,	1617:7, 1624:18, 1624:19	1625:25, 1632:19 dealing - 1537:12,
1542:18, 1543:21	1591:3	1546:1, 1554:1,	curves - 1616:23,	1543:22, 1558:24,
conducted -	contracts - 1546:8,	1554:18, 1558:15,	1617:12, 1624:22	1560:11, 1562:2,
1607:10 conducts - 1540:23	1546:11, 1564:1 contrary - 1560:23	1564:10, 1564:14, 1566:7, 1566:15,	custom - 1578:24 customers -	1564:18, 1575:9 deals - 1553:10,
conference -	control - 1537:16,	1567:8, 1568:8,	1611:10	1557:11
		,		

(202) 354-3249

dealt - 1562:5,	deposited - 1629:8	1537:5, 1603:13	1564:6, 1564:7,	downstream -
1632:23	deposition -	direct - 1537:14,	1596:15, 1597:8,	1631:6
debits - 1560:3	1582:13	1547:20, 1549:15,	1597:11, 1599:23,	draw - 1608:20,
decades - 1542:25, 1543:3, 1543:4,	deposits - 1561:5 Deputy - 1602:17	1599:25 directed - 1607:2	1601:3, 1627:4 documented -	1611:6, 1615:3 drew - 1611:1
1548:18, 1567:24,	derived - 1614:8,	direction - 1605:2	1556:10, 1561:22,	drilled - 1613:16,
1567:25	1622:12	directly - 1556:13,	1629:18, 1629:19	1615:2
December -	derives - 1621:16	1621:5	documents -	drilling - 1616:20
1540:11, 1540:17,	describe - 1547:25,	Dirk - 1534:5	1568:6, 1570:22,	due - 1538:6,
1545:2, 1551:4, 1551:25, 1556:17	1565:16, 1584:14, 1588:13, 1604:13,	disagree - 1596:21, 1596:22	1577:19, 1583:24, 1584:1, 1584:13,	1542:18, 1547:4, 1548:17, 1550:13,
decide - 1611:18,	1608:8, 1622:17,	disagreed - 1589:20	1584:21, 1589:2,	1552:13, 1554:7,
1636:18	1625:23, 1634:7	disappointing -	1589:6, 1591:6,	1554:11, 1556:15,
decided - 1563:14	described -	1628:18	1594:6, 1599:8,	1557:16, 1558:13,
decision - 1557:23, 1583:21	1552:22, 1625:7 describing -	disburse - 1555:7, 1557:1	1599:21, 1601:2, 1601:3, 1604:1,	1559:5, 1561:20, 1565:19, 1568:6,
decisions - 1556:8	1594:20, 1624:5,	disbursement -	1606:10, 1606:25,	1607:4, 1607:10
decline - 1616:23,	1636:24	1556:8, 1565:5,	1633:8	duly - 1603:11
1617:7, 1617:11	description -	1569:20, 1569:25,	doi - 1622:24	dump - 1611:20
defect - 1540:25 defective - 1550:6	1551:23 design - 1579:16	1570:5 disbursements -	Doi - 1623:17, 1623:19	duplicate - 1557:20 during - 1544:10,
defects - 1542:25	designated -	1547:13, 1555:16,	dollar - 1594:1	1550:21, 1559:13,
Defendants -	1604:23	1558:14, 1562:15,	dollars - 1556:24,	1560:21, 1577:24
1534:7, 1535:1	destroyed -	1565:4, 1579:10	1608:14, 1618:3	duties - 1581:12
defendants -	1550:25, 1562:24,	disbursing - 1557:3	done - 1539:9,	duty - 1578:7, 1578:12
1604:1, 1605:15 defendants' -	1564:2, 1564:3, 1569:22. 1579:17	disclaimers - 1563:21	1539:24, 1562:13, 1563:20, 1569:5,	1370.12
1633:7	detailed - 1620:1	disclosed - 1580:8	1569:15, 1570:1,	E
deficiencies -	details - 1566:13	disclosure -	1570:2, 1571:16,	
1540:24, 1542:22,	determine -	1553:22, 1553:24,	1573:16, 1574:12,	e-mail - 1570:19,
1543:17, 1565:11, 1566:17	1538:20, 1566:2, 1575:18, 1600:7,	1568:12 discrepancies -	1578:15, 1590:17, 1593:18, 1596:23,	1570:23, 1571:8 earliest - 1623:10
deficiency - 1580:1	1607:21, 1617:19,	1565:9	1602:1, 1602:5,	early - 1562:12,
deficient - 1559:21	1618:7, 1626:5	discrepancy -	1605:2, 1605:3,	1563:10, 1616:14
definition - 1592:13	determined -	1580:16	1622:21, 1623:18,	earth - 1611:17,
definitional - 1574:21, 1575:10	1617:17, 1617:21, 1626:11, 1630:18,	discuss - 1632:3 discussed -	1627:7, 1634:10,	1611:19
delegate - 1592:22	1630:24	1542:20	1635:17, 1635:20 door - 1607:21,	easily - 1630:11 effect - 1596:18
delivered - 1582:17	develop - 1631:22	dispense - 1615:16	1608:12, 1608:13	effects - 1633:23,
Deloitte - 1574:23,	developed -	disposed - 1611:18	Dorris - 1534:15,	1634:5, 1634:9
1575:24, 1577:6,	1551:13, 1571:18,	disregards -	1536:3, 1537:3,	efforts - 1591:2
1577:10, 1577:13, 1588:9, 1588:14,	1624:14, 1625:15 dies - 1555:6	1571:10 distinct - 1593:8	1537:4, 1537:6, 1543:23, 1543:25,	eight - 1537:9, 1578:6
1588:21, 1588:23,	difference - 1543:2,	distinction -	1547:18, 1550:11,	either - 1553:11,
1598:19	1589:15, 1600:16,	1601:13	1551:7, 1551:9,	1558:5, 1561:6,
demonstrate -	1601:13	distribute - 1555:13	1553:9, 1554:3,	1569:21, 1591:5,
1608:3 Dennis - 1534:11,	differences - 1549:5, 1549:23,	distributes - 1549:21	1555:2, 1558:22, 1564:10, 1564:14,	1614:14 electronic - 1551:1,
1534:12	1550:21, 1557:7,	distribution -	1564:15, 1564:16,	1569:21, 1609:6,
depart - 1562:22	1557:10, 1557:17,	1555:4, 1555:10,	1566:10, 1567:7,	1609:14
departed - 1583:9	1558:1, 1558:12,	1593:20	1567:10, 1568:4,	elements - 1538:20
department -	1558:16, 1558:19,	District - 1534:1, 1534:9	1571:4, 1571:6,	Elliott - 1534:15
1538:1, 1561:4, 1563:6, 1563:11,	1558:23, 1559:10, 1559:17, 1559:23,	distrust - 1588:20	1571:25, 1572:1, 1572:8, 1572:12,	Elouise - 1534:2 employ - 1552:15
1563:14, 1565:9,	1560:2, 1560:10	divide - 1619:3	1572:16, 1572:20,	enable - 1617:1
1570:21, 1591:24,	different - 1572:9,	Division - 1535:7	1572:22, 1572:25,	enables - 1610:4
1596:1, 1611:1,	1578:1, 1593:8, 1601:12, 1611:10	Doctrine - 1631:2	1573:2, 1574:18,	encompasses - 1606:18
1635:4 Department -	1601:12, 1611:10, 1618:11, 1623:9,	document - 1540:7, 1540:17, 1540:18,	1576:9, 1576:10, 1576:18, 1577:6,	encountered -
1535:3, 1535:6,	1623:14, 1635:20	1542:13, 1544:19,	1577:13, 1577:16,	1607:12
1545:11, 1545:21,	difficult - 1625:25,	1544:24, 1558:8,	1581:5, 1581:21,	end - 1538:14,
1550:17, 1558:3,	1626:5, 1630:12	1570:16, 1574:23,	1583:1, 1590:2,	1554:22, 1562:16,
1562:12, 1567:15, 1570:19, 1577:24,	difficulties - 1549:11, 1553:8,	1575:1, 1575:2, 1575:6, 1575:24,	1594:6, 1594:20, 1595:13, 1597:16,	1571:7, 1599:9 ended - 1554:22,
1583:8, 1591:2,	1636:25	1575.6, 1575.24, 1577:6, 1578:7,	1602:6	1562:8, 1591:15
1592:22, 1606:11,	difficulty - 1625:12	1584:4, 1594:19,	dots - 1612:23,	ending - 1558:19,
1607:1, 1607:5,	digging - 1611:20	1594:22, 1595:22,	1615:20, 1624:17,	1575:21
1607:22, 1608:15, 1611:22, 1612:14,	digitized - 1609:5,	1596:9, 1597:16, 1597:23, 1597:24,	1625:14	engineering -
1612:19, 1619:14,	1612:13, 1612:21, 1635:5	1597.23, 1597.24, 1598:3, 1598:7,	doubt - 1588:4, 1588:20	1613:7 Engineering -
1627:16, 1629:8	diligence - 1538:6,	1599:3, 1600:1,	down - 1537:16,	1616:5
departments -	1542:18, 1548:18,	1600:6, 1600:9,	1545:5, 1551:13,	engineers -
1567:14	1550:13, 1552:13,	1604:4, 1604:6,	1570:11, 1575:23,	1614:24, 1616:18,
departures - 1562:21	1554:7, 1554:11, 1557:16, 1561:20,	1605:25, 1627:5, 1633:2, 1633:5,	1577:17, 1578:5, 1593:16, 1594:24,	1616:23, 1618:16, 1619:3
deposit - 1564:7	1565:19, 1568:6,	1633:18, 1633:20,	1594:25, 1604:10,	Englishman -
Deposit - 1560:11,	1607:10	1635:11, 1635:13,	1612:16, 1615:14,	1552:24, 1552:25
1560:14, 1560:20,	dimes - 1556:24	1635:14	1617:1, 1618:21,	enterprise -
1560:24, 1561:12, 1561:16	dire - 1604:19 Direct - 1536:2,	documentation - 1555:14, 1556:5,	1619:21, 1620:9, 1624:23, 1632:16	1620:16 entire - 1585:2,
1001.10	DIIGUL IJJU.Z,	1000.17, 1000.0,	1027.20, 1002.10	GITTIE - TOUD.Z,

(202) 354-3249

entirely - 1604:22, 1605:4 entitled - 1638:5 entree - 1616:15 entries - 1564:5, entries - 1564:5, entries - 1564:5, entries - 1564:5, entries - 1609:7 except - 1598:16 except - 1598:16 except - 1598:16 except - 1629:7 exclusively - 1628:18	1604:18, 1607:1, ed - 1619:25 rdinarily - 1612:23 567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
1604:24, 1635:14 entirely - 1604:22, 1605:4 entitled - 1638:5 entree - 1616:15 entries - 1564:5, 1564:8 1564:20, 1583:24 exceptions - 1552:11, 1554:10 excerpt - 1598:16 excess - 1629:7 exclusively - 1628:18 Extrem	1604:18, 1607:1, ed - 1619:25 rdinarily - 1612:23 567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
entirely - 1604:22, 1605:4	1607:1, ed - 1619:25 dinarily - 1619:- 1612:23 567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
entitled - 1638:5 excerpt - 1598:16 extract entree - 1616:15 excess - 1629:7 extraor entries - 1564:5, exclusively - 1628:18 1564:8 1618:14 Extrem	rdinarily - nely - 1612:23 567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
entree - 1616:15 excess - 1629:7 extraor entries - 1564:5, exclusively - 1628:18 1618:14 Extrem	rdinarily - nely - 1612:23 567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
entries - 1564:5, exclusively - 1628:18 1564:8 Extrem	F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
	567:18 F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
enumerated - excuse - 1550:17. eve - 15	F 559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
1631:25 1550:18, 1556:17,	559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
equal - 1632:17 1558:11, 1562:14,	559:5, 1592:14, 1596:12,
equivalent - 1567:6, 1571:25,	1592:14, 1596:12,
1542:19, 1615:19 1602:22 fact - 1589:17 Excuse - 1580:5, 1588:23,	1596:12,
error - 1617:10, 1609:15 1600:9, 1	
	- 1617:23 1571:17
escaped - 1603:9	
1534:15, 1534:19, 1567:9, 1570:11, 1592:15	
	1538:21,
1535:2, 1535:5	s - 1545:14
1612:23, 1613:15, 1538:16, 1554:9 familia	r - 1543:10,
1619:5, 1621:16, Exhibits - 1536:9 1550:9, 1	
1624:15, 1631:5 exist - 1561:14, 1559:11, essentially - 1636:15, 1636:16 familia	1578:24 rity - 1549:5,
1542:22, 1542:24, existed - 1601:3 1589:8, 1	
1549:19, 1555:16, existing - 1626:11 far - 159	
1556:7, 1558:2, exists - 1634:19 1600:15, 1562:16, 1607:18, expect - 1575:13, 1631:24	1605:9,
1610:2, 1615:24, 1627:16 Farrage	ut- 1609:17,
1623:22, 1631:21, expenses - 1561:21 1610:1, 1	612:12,
1632:19, 1633:14, expensive - 1570:3 1616:2, 1 1633:20, 1634:4, experience - fashion	1636:23 1 - 1629:9
	- 1536:5,
1635:17, 1636:7 1574:10, 1574:14, 1602:15,	1603:1,
establish - 1575:16, 1587:18, 1587:23, 1603:11, 1634:14 1589:16, 1590:9, 1603:17,	1603:15, 1603:18
established - 1592:8, 1592:9, 1604:8, 1	1603:18, 1604:20,
1545:24, 1553:2, 1604:14, 1607:24, 1609:15,	1633:5
	's - 1603:22, 1604:25,
estimate - 1611:17, experienced - 1605:14	1004.20,
1630:18 1609:19 Fdic - 19	571:19,
estimated - expert - 1553:22, 1600:17 1573:25, 1622:6 1568:12, 1580:8, Fdr- 16	26.8
	lity - 1576:5
et - 1534:3, 1534:6, 1584:5, 1590:9, Fed - 15	65:25
1540:24, 1576:22, 1592:2, 1592:7, Federal 1579:7, 1579:23 1595:25, 1598:17, 1579:10,	I- 1569:24, 1579:18
	- 1600:24
1610:23, 1611:4 1604:25, 1605:14, fee - 16	
evaluation - 1579:6 1606:1, 1606:2, fees - 1 evidence - 1604:22 1606:15, 1622:11, feet - 16	
Evidence - 1536:9 1635:19, 1637:3 1617:15,	
Evidentiary - 1534:8 expert's - 1553:22 fell - 16	
Ex - 1565:25 exact - 1626:18 experts - 1587:5, 1619:20 ferry - 1	1552:23
exactly - 1611:19, 1621:10, 1622:10, few - 15	
1616:19, 1634:7, 1622:20, 1628:19, 1573:25,	1594:20,
1635:6 1632:7, 1632:8 1595:6, 1 Examination - explain - 1545:19, 1610:17,	1618:20,
1537:5, 1581:23, 1571:12, 1606:6, 1627:21	1010.20,
	ry - 1581:12
examination - 1635:23 field - 1 1565:20, 1633:15 explained - 1607:3, 1621:4, 1	1609:19, 1621:10
examine - 1581:22 1607:4, 1631:24 fields -	1617:12
examined - 1587:19 explaining - 1636:7 file - 15	
examiner - 1587:20 explanation - 1565:18, example - 1563:19, 1571:10 1565:24,	1565:22, 1566:2.
1564:24, 1565:1, exploited - 1618:18, 1566:24,	1567:8,
1599:10, 1610:15, 1620:16, 1620:18 1567:15,	1585:23
	1584:25, 1586:13,
1616:19, 1624:16, extended - 1621:11 1586:24,	1631:17
1631:6, 1635:6 extensive - filling -	1632:24
examples - 1611:8	- 1555:15,
except - 1555:7 extent - 1586:17, 1603:25	

```
financial - 1538:20
1538:21, 1542:23, 1545:15, 1545:17,
1548:13, 1557:6,
1567:14, 1567:23,
1578:20, 1603:23,
1603:24, 1604:14,
1605:14
  Financial- 1548:3
  finish - 1627:23
finished - 1555:15
fire - 1610:18,
1610:20, 1611:1
  Fire- 1610:18
  firm - 1588:13,
1588:15, 1589:3, 1609:17, 1613:7,
1613:13
firms - 1588:17, 1614:22, 1619:4,
 1628:21
  first - 1539:4,
1539:23, 1540:4,
1541:9, 1541:15,
1542:4, 1544:19,
1545:9, 1547:23,
1550:17, 1551:10,
1551:14, 1563:21,
1573:7, 1575:9,
1586:5, 1597:2,
1598:9, 1598:18,
1602:11, 1604:4,
1602:11, 1604:4,
1605:22, 1607:24,
1612:15, 1614:1,
1614:20, 1623:12,
1633:18, 1633:23
First- 1565:16,
1571:14, 1580:6,
 1604:17
  firsthand - 1636:22
fiscal - 1544:21,
1573:24
  fit - 1616:24
 fitting - 1625:6
five - 1537:17,
1572:23, 1586:13,
 1599:25
  flawed - 1573:4
flaws - 1573:5
  Floor- 1534:13
  flow - 1615:8
  focus - 1538:16,
 1547:23
  follow - 1579:13,
  followed - 1571:8,
  following - 1566:16,
 1611:13
  follows - 1542:2,
 1603:12
  footnotes - 1558:12
  forced - 1634:20
  foregoing - 1638:3
forest - 1610:17
form - 1609:6,
1624:18, 1629:14
  format - 1603:20
  forming - 1584:17,
forth - 1544:12, 1555:17
forward - 1541:3, 1565:10, 1597:8, 1599:23, 1604:1
forwarding -
1541:10
  foundation -
```

1545:23 Four- 1588:16 four - 1539:4, 1540:15, 1542:1, 1542:10, 1554:15, 1554:18, 1555:9, 1570:11, 1585:14, 1586:13, 1610:21, 1623:9, 1623:14, 1624.5 Fourth- 1534:24 fourth - 1604:6 frame - 1616:17, 1616:21, 1618:5 Francisco - 1587:20 Franklin- 1535:8 fraud - 1540:25 frequently -1611:12, 1630:8 front - 1582:10, 1597:20, 1599:20 Front- 1569:25 Fti- 1590:17 fulfilled - 1581:12 **full** - 1569:15, 1578:12, 1598:9, 1603:15 fully - 1634:24 functions - 1539:16 fund - 1545:14, 1550:14, 1550:18, 1559:8, 1561:1, 1539:1, 1501:1, 1561:13, 1565:23 Fund- 1539:11, 1539:12, 1539:17, 1539:21, 1540:1, 1540:5, 1540:12, 1542:16, 1542:24, 1544:14, 1545:22, 1546:12, 1546:13, 1547:9, 1547:10, 1547:15, 1549:10, 1549:18, 1549:19, 1550:16, 1553:1, 1554:12, 1556:22, 1565:21, 1569:12 fundamental funding - 1592:24 funds - 1542:17, 1549:7, 1555:7, 1555:13, 1560:24, 1561:7, 1562:6, 1563:12, 1564:19, 1565:22, 1567:16, 1629:13 Funds- 1540:13 furnish - 1576:17, 1581.8 furnished - 1537:10 future - 1625:15, 1625:21, 1629:20 G

Gaap - 1540:2, 1562:214, 1562:21, 1562:22, 1563:8, 1569:7, 1569:15, 1571:16, 1573:8, 1600:21, 1600:22, 1600:25, 1601:1, 1601:2, 1601:17, 1601:8, 1601:19 Gabriel - 1636:23 gain - 1549:5 gallons - 1620:10 gamut - 1599:6 Gao - 1550:2.

Rebecca Stonestreet

(202) 354-3249

1568:12

Foundation-

kingreporter2@verizon.net

1607:13	1571:17, 1572:1,	Hearing - 1534:8	1602:6, 1602:9,	improved - 1553:8
gaps - 1596:14,	1581:3, 1581:7,	hearing - 1582:17,	1602:10, 1602:18,	inaccurately -
1627:17, 1627:21,	1585:8, 1587:1,	1583:25, 1585:6,	1602:25, 1603:8,	1551:18
1632:4, 1632:5,	1587:5, 1592:21,	1604:24	1603:19, 1604:16,	inadequacies -
1632:6, 1632:11, 1632:19, 1632:21,	1600:24 government's -	hearsay - 1637:2, 1637:4, 1637:5	1605:16, 1607:2, 1609:22, 1623:15,	1545:10 inadequate -
1632:23, 1632:25	1586:19, 1586:20,	heart - 1601:25	1635:18, 1637:1,	1542:23, 1542:24
garner - 1606:20,	1586:21	heartening - 1627:2	1637:7	inappropriate -
1623:2	grade - 1546:14,	heavy - 1630:5	Honorable - 1534:9	1561:21, 1573:11,
garnered - 1613:25	1557:1	heir - 1555:16,	hoped - 1620:23	1579:16
gas - 1546:10, 1564:1, 1612:2,	graphic - 1612:3 gravel - 1630:4,	1555:18 Herman - 1590:17,	hopefully - 1608:4 house - 1610:19	inception - 1616:25 include - 1590:13,
1612:4, 1612:8,	1630:9, 1630:10	1590:19, 1590:22	huge - 1610:18	1599:1
1613:4, 1613:6,	gravity - 1617:23	high - 1594:1	Hughes - 1577:20,	included - 1539:16,
1613:16, 1614:22,	grazing - 1624:8,	highest - 1614:18	1577:23, 1589:3,	1564:21, 1574:23,
1616:11, 1617:15,	1625:6, 1625:8,	highlight - 1566:4,	1589:8, 1599:9	1575:15, 1578:21,
1619:4, 1622:10 Gas - 1540:3,	1625:12 Grazing - 1625:17	1636:2 highlighted -	hypothetical - 1601:3	1578:23, 1578:25, 1584:22, 1592:1,
1562:15, 1569:7,	great - 1589:15	1633:18, 1633:24,	1001.0	1621:3
1569:15, 1573:8	Griffin - 1539:9,	1636:3		includes - 1538:9,
gather - 1613:24	1539:20, 1539:23,	highlights -	_	1591:16, 1620:2
General - 1540:18,	1540:11, 1541:10,	1566:16	I-level - 1554:20	including -
1540:22, 1540:23, 1541:3, 1541:6,	1541:18, 1541:20, 1542:15, 1542:19,	highway - 1611:16 hired - 1577:23,	ld - 1566:20 identification -	1567:14, 1612:1 inclusion - 1604:24
1545:1	1543:20, 1544:4,	1587:5	1610:12	income - 1555:4,
general - 1542:19,	1552:11, 1561:25,	historical - 1565:9,	identified -	1566:24, 1607:21,
1557:17, 1557:25,	1565:20	1569:14, 1575:10,	1537:10, 1540:25,	1608:6, 1623:8,
1559:9, 1560:1, 1560:3, 1561:1,	Griffin's - 1548:8 guardian - 1555:8	1576:4, 1581:7, 1598:21, 1599:5,	1543:18, 1545:14, 1556:7, 1559:22,	1628:20, 1630:11 inconclusive -
1564:4, 1564:5,	guess - 1543:6,	1617:18	1577:19, 1612:9,	1562:21, 1563:13,
1564:8, 1566:17,	1602:13, 1605:20,	Historical - 1583:16	1613:11, 1615:22,	1563:17, 1564:25,
1579:8, 1615:7,	1624:6, 1629:1	Historically -	1615:24, 1616:8,	1570:3, 1573:14
1616:9, 1616:13	guidance - 1571:10,	1560:23	1619:22, 1620:12,	inconsequential -
General's - 1544:1	1601:23	historically -	1621:18, 1628:1, 1631:16	1580:11
generally - 1559:12, 1569:1, 1582:14,	guidelines - 1555:12	1548:15, 1631:15 history - 1563:6,	identify - 1585:15,	incorporates - 1584:20, 1605:1,
1601:20, 1609:4,	Guilder- 1534:19,	1573:22, 1592:12,	1586:25, 1592:8,	1606:2
1613:25, 1630:6	1536:5, 1602:10,	1629:12	1609:10, 1611:11,	increases - 1551:17
Generally - 1580:4,	1602:11, 1602:25,	hit - 1607:21,	1611:13, 1620:14,	independent -
1594:22, 1598:5, 1600:8	1603:7, 1603:8, 1603:14, 1603:19,	1608:12, 1608:13 hold - 1555:9	1620:15, 1621:20, 1625:11, 1627:12,	1540:2, 1541:24, 1542:15, 1545:6,
generated - 1606:9,	1603:22, 1604:4,	holders - 1546:17,	1629:21, 1630:11,	1561:24, 1586:9,
1606:11, 1606:25,	1604:7, 1604:10,	1556:15, 1570:4	1630:14, 1632:13,	1623:23, 1631:11
1608:1, 1622:14,	1604:12, 1605:12,	Holt - 1618:13,	1632:14, 1635:11	independently -
1630:14	1605:18, 1605:19,	1619:1, 1620:4,	identity - 1567:1	1623:25
generators - 1627:9 gentlemen -	1605:22, 1605:24, 1607:7, 1608:22,	1630:17 Homan - 1536:3,	lg - 1543:19 lhs - 1613:13,	indexed - 1599:13 indian - 1621:23
1636:22	1609:23, 1609:25,	1537:5, 1537:7,	1613:14, 1614:6,	Indian - 1539:16,
Geographical-	1623:21, 1633:2,	1551:2, 1560:18,	1614:14, 1614:17,	1545:17, 1545:20,
1609:21	1633:4, 1633:10,	1564:17, 1568:24,	1615:11, 1615:14,	1547:17, 1548:2,
geological - 1615:3 geometric -	1633:11, 1633:17, 1633:19, 1633:24,	1570:10, 1570:13, 1573:3, 1574:19,	1616:8, 1616:13 li - 1569:23	1551:12, 1557:19, 1557:23, 1558:3,
1624:19, 1624:22	1634:1, 1635:8,	1575:16. 1580:5.	lim - 1557:12,	1558:6, 1560:7,
Georgia - 1534:17	1635:10, 1635:22,	1581:6, 1581:20,	1558:24, 1560:12,	1560:25, 1561:10,
Gingold - 1534:11,	1636:1, 1636:4,	1581:25, 1582:5,	1560:13, 1561:8,	1561:15, 1579:21,
1534:12 Gis - 1608:8,	1637:7	1590:8, 1591:13,	1562:6, 1563:4,	1601:11, 1606:9, 1609:12, 1610:11,
1608:9, 1608:10,	ш	1594:16, 1595:4, 1596:12, 1597:20,	1563:7, 1563:12, 1563:16, 1567:16,	1615:23, 1616:3,
1608:23, 1608:25,	Н	1598:2, 1598:11,	1568:9, 1568:10,	1618:24, 1621:6,
1609:4, 1609:6,	hac - 1602:13	1599:7, 1599:16,	1592:15, 1593:3,	1621:8, 1621:11,
1609:9, 1609:16,	half - 1572:25,	1600:5, 1602:7	1607:14	1621:25, 1625:4,
1609:17, 1609:18, 1609:20, 1610:1,	1573:17 handle - 1549:6	Homan's - 1567:9 home - 1610:15	image - 1608:8 immaterial -	1625:19, 1626:10, 1626:23, 1627:2,
1610:13, 1610:16,	handled - 1549:24	Honor - 1537:4,	1580:10	1630:11, 1631:9,
1610:24, 1611:17,	happy - 1589:25	1545:23, 1546:7,	Immediately -	1631:10, 1635:1,
1611:22, 1611:25,	hard - 1618:10,	1550:10, 1552:14,	1562:18	1635:5
1612:3, 1612:11, 1615:21, 1619:8,	1618:13, 1618:15, 1618:16, 1619:5,	1553:20, 1554:7, 1564:15, 1566:9,	impacts - 1556:13 impartial - 1607:19	Indians - 1545:1, 1562:20, 1583:4,
1620:24, 1635:16,	1630:2	1566:23, 1567:7,	implementation -	1590:10, 1618:7,
1636:24	Harper - 1534:19	1568:1, 1568:11,	1554:20	1622:15, 1626:9,
given - 1552:14,	harvested -	1568:23, 1571:14,	implemented -	1627:10, 1627:11,
1596:1, 1606:13,	1621:17, 1621:25	1572:8, 1572:20, 1574:15, 1576:9,	1551:11, 1551:19, 1565:17	1628:21, 1629:14, 1630:23, 1631:3,
1609:3, 1616:2, 1617:20, 1625:5,	haul - 1611:21 Hayman - 1610:18	1574:15, 1576:9, 1577:4, 1577:14,	important - 1614:22	1631:20, 1634:15
1626:13, 1632:6	heading - 1547:24,	1580:15, 1582:2,	importantly -	indicate - 1575:3
glad - 1600:13	1548:1, 1598:9	1589:25, 1590:6,	1604:21	indicated - 1538:23,
glossary - 1609:24	hear - 1554:1,	1593:14, 1595:13,	impossibility -	1541:14, 1561:25,
gold - 1618:22	1580:14, 1596:6,	1595:17, 1595:21,	1568:20	1604:17, 1605:15
	1605·9	1596:7 1597:14	impracticable -	indicates - 1545:10
government - 1557:22, 1560:2,	1605:9 heard - 1559:13	1596:7, 1597:14, 1601:25, 1602:3,	impracticable - 1545:12	indicates - 1545:10 indicating -

(202) 354-3249

1551:13, 1595:14	instructions -	1609:11, 1610:10	1550:21, 1568:13,	laying - 1633:20
indication - 1539:1,	1549:22, 1601:24	irrelevant - 1580:8,	1583:20, 1583:21,	lead - 1618:23,
1553:23, 1554:4 individual - 1542:7,	insufficient - 1567:23	1580:10	1587:16, 1588:13,	1621:10 learn - 1563:3
1558:6, 1560:25,	integrated -	irrigated - 1631:9 islands - 1552:23	1591:7, 1591:14, 1591:15, 1591:16,	learned - 1623:6
1613:17, 1618:7,	1552:16	issuance - 1542:20	1615:6, 1620:5,	lease - 1546:8,
1621:11, 1621:14,	Integrated - 1550:7	issue - 1556:7,	1621:7, 1621:11,	1546:10, 1547:1,
1622:2, 1622:15,	intended - 1563:7	1572:17, 1579:20,	1636:22	1563:23, 1570:7,
1626:9, 1627:10, 1627:19, 1630:11,	interact - 1612:1 interest - 1557:1,	1580:24, 1595:23, 1599:22, 1626:17,	known - 1617:11, 1630:3, 1631:2,	1622:20, 1631:11 leased - 1620:16
1631:18, 1631:20,	1559:5, 1561:7,	1630:22, 1630:23,	1632:25, 1634:8	leases - 1547:1,
1634:15, 1635:1,	1634:18, 1634:22,	1636:19	knows - 1560:6,	1564:1, 1622:16,
1635:2, 1635:5,	1634:23, 1635:7	issued - 1579:23,	1630:22	1622:17, 1623:8,
1636:12 Individual - 1606:9	interested - 1608:17, 1614:3	1629:15 issues - 1554:25,	Kohn - 1535:2 Kpmg - 1544:13,	1623:11, 1623:13, 1624:1, 1624:3,
individually -	interesting -	1572:3, 1574:21,	1544:15, 1545:14,	1624:4, 1624:5,
1621:22, 1626:23	1572:5, 1572:6,	1575:10, 1599:5,	1548:10, 1560:11,	1624:9, 1625:4,
individuals -	1628:6, 1628:12	1633:13, 1636:18,	1561:25	1625:6, 1627:18,
1635:16 individuals' -	interests - 1618:17, 1631:17, 1631:18	1636:24 itching - 1572:1		1632:5, 1632:20 least - 1546:4,
1561:18	Interior - 1534:6,	item - 1537:15,	L	1546:23, 1547:17,
industry - 1567:20,	1545:11, 1545:21, [°]	1551:6, 1574:20,	lack - 1557:11,	1550:23, 1551:23,
1614:16, 1622:4	1550:18, 1562:12,	1577:18	1558:24, 1562:24,	1551:24, 1555:11,
inform - 1616:6 information -	1567:16, 1570:20, 1577:24, 1583:9,	items - 1537:23, 1538:14, 1542:7,	1562:25, 1563:23, 1569:21, 1577:14,	1558:21, 1563:11, 1569:7, 1579:9,
1547:11, 1547:12,	1591:2, 1592:22,	1548:7, 1548:20,	1601:5	1580:2, 1582:23,
1548:14, 1552:22,	1606:11, 1607:1,	1551:2, 1557:14,	laid - 1566:14,	1591:8, 1597:23,
1552:23, 1554:16,	1607:5, 1607:22,	1580:21	1628:3, 1628:9,	1612:15
1556:15, 1566:2,	1608:15, 1611:23,	itself - 1547:19,	1628:12	leave - 1632:15
1566:24, 1568:7, 1569:3, 1569:4,	1612:14, 1612:18, 1619:14, 1624:6,	1559:2, 1559:3	Lamberth- 1582:10 land - 1546:11,	ledger - 1557:17, 1558:1, 1559:2,
1570:8, 1578:25,	1627:16, 1629:8	J	1581:9, 1594:1,	1559:9, 1560:2,
1579:4, 1581:6,	Interior's - 1591:8		1618:19, 1620:16,	1564:5, 1564:8,
1581:9, 1608:20,	internal - 1537:16,	James- 1534:9	1621:8, 1621:14,	1566:17
1612:18, 1613:3, 1613:4, 1613:6,	1537:18, 1537:20, 1538:2, 1538:19,	January- 1583:7 jars - 1561:21	1621:19, 1621:22, 1622:2, 1622:17,	ledgers - 1559:3 left - 1541:17,
1613:9, 1613:10,	1541:25, 1542:10,	job - 1636:15	1622:20, 1623:8,	1544:13, 1550:24,
1613:19, 1613:23,	1543:22, 1545:15,	John- 1535:1,	1623:13, 1624:9,	1551:19, 1555:12,
1613:24, 1614:6,	1548:14, 1548:16,	1535:5	1625:23, 1625:24,	1556:21, 1583:15,
1614:10, 1614:12, 1614:13, 1614:17,	1556:12, 1567:21, 1617:19	joined - 1549:8, 1549:13, 1580:2	1626:4, 1626:10, 1626:15, 1627:17,	1590:10, 1626:4, 1627:4
1615:11, 1615:15,	Internal - 1538:5	Jr - 1534:23, 1535:1	1627:18, 1631:4,	leg - 1626:6
1615:16, 1615:18,	interpolate - 1634:8	judge - 1631:1	1631:5, 1631:8,	legal - 1565:22,
1615:25, 1617:3,	interpolation -	Judge - 1534:9,	1631:11, 1632:5,	1574:16, 1576:3,
1617:4, 1618:1,	1632:24, 1633:13,	1582:10	1632:20, 1635:1,	1576:22, 1589:2,
1618:11, 1619:9, 1620:8, 1620:10,	1634:5, 1634:9, 1634:10	judgment - 1569:10, 1593:19,	1635:2, 1636:12 Land - 1622:16,	1589:15, 1598:20, 1599:1, 1599:5,
1620:19, 1622:11,	interpretation -	1593:23, 1630:20,	1625:25	1621:5
1625:23, 1632:9,	1569:6, 1599:3,	1631:13, 1631:14	land-based -	legislative - 1576:3,
1636:9	1617:10	judgments -	1581:9, 1594:1	1576:22, 1598:21,
Information - 1609:21	interrelationship - 1556:16	1581:11 judicial - 1637:6	lands - 1610:13, 1618:25, 1621:6,	1599:2, 1599:4 legitimate - 1569:14
information's -	interrupt - 1626:15	jump - 1605:20	1621:11, 1626:12,	less - 1574:3,
1617:8	intersections -	Justice- 1535:3,	1626:25, 1627:2,	1581:18, 1617:25
informing - 1602:20	1615:20	1535:6	1627:9, 1629:15,	lessee - 1547:3,
initial - 1576:5 inputs - 1608:3	intersects - 1613:2 interviewed -	Justin - 1534:19, 1602:11	1629:16, 1629:24, 1635:5, 1635:17	1631:8 letters - 1578:1
inquiry - 1608:11	1628:21	1002.11	language - 1537:11	level - 1554:20
inside - 1545:21,	introduced -	K	laptops - 1603:5	Levitas- 1534:15
1597:23	1566:15		large - 1607:12,	liability - 1580:23
insights - 1566:5 insolvent - 1560:4	introductory - 1594:14, 1596:10	k/m - 1619:17	1625:13, 1626:4, 1629:13, 1630:6	lieu - 1629:20 life - 1611:6, 1611:8
inspected - 1552:19	inured - 1631:5,	keep - 1540:1, 1571:4, 1578:12	larger - 1588:17	limited - 1563:22,
Inspector -	1631:7	Keith - 1534:19	largest - 1618:20	1632:18
1540:18, 1540:22,	invested - 1546:19	Kempthorne-	last - 1541:13,	limitedly - 1632:10
1540:23, 1541:3, 1541:6, 1544:1,	investigations -	1534:5	1554:9, 1560:18, 1561:22, 1572:25	line - 1553:21,
1541:0, 1544:1, 1545:1	1540:24, 1583:22 investing - 1556:25	kept - 1557:20 Key- 1574:21	1561:22, 1572:25, 1573:24, 1577:3,	1565:25, 1574:3, 1605:8, 1611:1,
installed - 1546:13,	invests - 1546:9,	key - 1575:10	1582:7, 1584:20,	1633:1
1559:7	1549:21	Kilpatrick - 1534:16,	1595:3, 1596:12,	linear - 1632:24
instance - 1538:5,	involve - 1540:25	1534:20, 1534:24	1602:20, 1633:12	lines - 1537:17,
1607:24, 1614:2, 1614:21, 1623:12,	involved - 1538:7, 1576:16, 1578:11,	kind - 1547:2, 1581:3, 1608:19,	late - 1537:11, 1548:8, 1556:19	1610:21, 1628:4, 1628:8, 1628:11
1634:16	1578:19, 1615:1	1612:24, 1620:24,	latitude - 1613:15,	list - 1538:13,
instances - 1546:18	Irms - 1550:8,	1622:8, 1622:18	1619:11	1538:14, 1554:10,
instantly - 1611:7	1550:13, 1550:19,	Kirschman - 1535:1,	Law- 1534:12	1557:10, 1584:4,
institution - 1587:22	1552:16, 1558:9, 1591:3	1602:18, 1603:4 knowledge -	law - 1579:1, 1581:1, 1589:10	1584:13, 1584:16, 1584:19, 1584:21,
institutions -	irregular - 1625:10	1545:24, 1546:5,	lawyers - 1566:1	1586:5, 1586:19,
1567:14, 1578:20	irregularly -	1546:21, 1547:16,	lax - 1567:21	1586:25, 1587:4,
	·			

(202) 354-3249

1589:1 listed - 1557:16, 1585:11 listing - 1549:1 lists - 1546:8 literally - 1579:19, 1612:22, 1615:14, 1624:15, 1626:2 Litigation- 1535:7 litigation - 1631:16 living - 1564:12 Llp- 1534:16, 1534:20, 1534:24 **local** - 1569:25, 1613:25, 1615:14 1630:10 located - 1615:22 location - 1612:2, 1614:2, 1619:11 logical - 1624:18, logically - 1627:16 logs - 1621:18 longevity - 1593:3, 1593.9 longitude -1613:15, 1619:11 look - 1537:16, 1537:23, 1538:12, 1539:20, 1540:6, 1540:15, 1541:9, 1541:22, 1541:23, 1542:4, 1543:19, 1544:18, 1544:19, 1544:24, 1545:5, 1545:6, 1547:19, 1548:12, 1548:20, 1548:21, 1549:3, 1551:2, 1551:6, 1552:1, 1552:2, 1552:16, 1553:10, 1554:11, 1554:16, 1555:21, 1555:24, 1556:1, 1556:11, 1557:5, 1557:11, 1558:24, 1560:9, 1561:6, 1563:22 1563:25, 1565:7 1567:18, 1570:10, 1570:11, 1571:1, 1572:23, 1573:17, 1574:19, 1575:9, 1575:23, 1582:15, 1585:7, 1586:21, 1604:4, 1604:13, 1609:7, 1617:18, 1627:2, 1630:20, 1633:24, 1635:8, 1636:1, 1636:14 looked - 1538:12, 1539:13, 1548:18, 1550:13, 1559:20, 1561:23, 1563:6, 1567:3, 1584:7, 1584:16, 1588:6, 1588:10, 1591:1, 1599:8, 1607:14, 1622:18, 1622:19 1635:11, 1635:13 **Looking**- 1545:9, 1576:2, 1577:17 looking - 1537:8, 1537:11, 1539:21, 1540:7, 1540:9, 1542:9. 1547:22 1575:19, 1577:1. 1577:3. 1577:10. 1578:17, 1600:6 looks - 1585:19

1580:24 loved - 1634:16, 1634:17 lower - 1581:4 lump - 1616:21, 1629:20 lunchtime - 1637:5, 1637:6

М

M-a-k/m-i-l-s -1619:17 Mac - 1619:17 Mac/mils - 1619:16, 1619:18, 1620:1 machine - 1535:15 mail - 1570:19, 1570:23, 1571:8 maintain - 1579:15 maintaining -1556:4, 1574: major - 1588:15, 1617:24, 1618:21, 1621.4 majority - 1620:5, 1623:24 manage - 1542:16 management -1538:8, 1543:17, 1549:7, 1550:3, 1559:8, 1567:22, 1567:23, 1592:24 Management -1539:11, 1539:13, 1539:17, 1539:22, 1540:1, 1540:5, 1540:13, 1542:16, 1542:24, 1544:14, 1545:22, 1546:12, 1546:14, 1547:9, 1547:10, 1547:16 1547:10, 1547:10, 1549:10, 1549:19, 1550:7, 1550:16, 1553:1, 1554:12, 1556:22, 1565:21, 1569:12 manager - 1540:5, 1549:14 managerial -1549:11 manages - 1546:7 manipulate - 1610:3 **map** - 1609:5, 1609:8, 1610:1, 1610:4, 1612:5, 1612:22 maps - 1612:20, 1613:1, 1619:21 mark - 1612:22, 1612:23 market - 1616:15 matched - 1625:20 material - 1537:15, 1538:18, 1542:1, 1542:10, 1559:21, 1596:13, 1630:9 materials - 1585:8. 1585:10, 1586:12 Matt - 1636:23 matter - 1580:9 1604:25, 1611:24, 1630:12, 1638:5 matters - 1537:12, 1545:18

Matters - 1548:3

1603:1

Mccarthy - 1602:20,

Mcquillan - 1621:2

1622.1 mean - 1563:18, 1590:21, 1605:10, 1608:25, 1610:15, 1624:1, 1628:24, 1631:25, 1635:1, 1635:3, 1636:14 meaning - 1609:5, 1616:10, 1627:3 meaningful -1581:11 means - 1546:3, 1612:21, 1629:20, 1632:22, 1632:24 meant - 1546:3, 1564:25, 1606:16 measure - 1614:4 1615:8, 1622:5. 1628:9 measured - 1614:2 measuring - 1607:25, 1628:8 memo - 1541:5, 1544:25, 1545:3, 1547.21 memoranda -1589:3, 1589:15, 1599:16 memorandum -1597.1 memory - 1580:2, 1630:25 mention - 1625:6 mentioned -1552:11, 1563:14, 1564:17, 1600:25, 1603:20, 1606:14, 1634:25 mentioning -1635:15 merged - 1619:13 mergers - 1571:24, 1600:18 message - 1596:13. 1610:22 metal - 1620:13, 1620:14 metals - 1618:22 meters - 1615:7, 1615.8 method - 1596:15, 1629:23, 1630:13, 1634:21 methodology -1600:13, 1608:7, 1608:24, 1628:24, 1630:19, 1635:24 Michael - 1535:2, Michelle - 1590:17 1590:19. 1590:22 microfiche microphone -1607:16 mid - 1548:9, 1589:24 mid-morning -1589:24 middle - 1541:23, 1572:24, 1600:2 might - 1561:8, 1602:22, 1609:11, 1609:23, 1620:1, 1632:15, 1636:16 million - 1550:22, 1558:1, 1558:10, 1558:15, 1558:16, 1558:17, 1558:18,

1564:23, 1565:3, 1566:16, 1566:19, 1573:23, 1573:25, 1574:1, 1574:2, 1626:22 million-odd -1563:12 millions - 1626:2, 1626:19 Mils - 1619:17 mind - 1600:25, 1611:16 mine - 1620:2, 1620:18 mined - 1618:24, 1619:6, 1619:19 mineral - 1618:16, 1620:17, 1630:2 minerals - 1618:10. 1618:15, 1618:18, 1619:6, 1622:11 **mines** - 1619:8, 1619:12, 1619:19, 1619:20, 1619:23, 1619:24, 1619:25, 1620.6 Mines - 1619:13 minor - 1546:18, 1633:23, 1634:4, 1634.9 minors - 1555:13 1556:9 minute - 1564:11 minutes - 1594:20, 1595:7 **missing** - 1558:13, 1562:24, 1564:2, 1570:22, 1571:21 mission - 1606:13 misspoke - 1576:9 Mitchell - 1621:4 mixed - 1560:25, 1579:22 model - 1603:25 1627:24, 1631:22, 1632:16, 1632:22, 1633:22 modeler - 1603:23 modeling -1604:14, 1605:15, 1633:21 modern - 1559:7, 1560:23, 1569:22. 1569:23 moment - 1542:11, 1548:21, 1552:4, 1556:1, 1558:25, 1560:16, 1575:25, 1582:16, 1582:25, 1595:2, 1601:25, 1603:2, 1610:7. 1634:2, 1636:5 moments - 1627:22 money - 1558:4, 1558:16, 1561:16,

1608:1, 1608:12,

1608:13, 1628:25

1560:6, 1607:23

1616:15, 1616:16,

Morning - 1534:7

morning - 1537:2, 1537:7, 1581:25,

1582:1, 1582:2, 1582:15, 1583:2

1584:11, 1589:24

1616:25

Monies - 1606:9 monies - 1549:20.

Montana - 1621:3 monthly - 1616:11,

1602:10 Most - 1623:17 most - 1544:15 1544:17, 1546:17, 1548:7, 1564:2, 1567:5, 1579:17, 1593:8, 1614:3, 1631:7, 1631:16, 1632:20, 1633:15 mostly - 1562:23 move - 1572:20, 1595:15, 1597:13, 1598:8, 1605:14, 1607:16, 1607:17, 1610:12, 1612:9, 1618:8, 1634:24 Moved - 1536:9 moved - 1611:17, 1611:18, 1611:19 must - 1569:2, 1569:18, 1579:13

Ν

name - 1590:21, 1602:10, 1603:15, 1603:17, 1618:12, 1636:23 named - 1631:1 narrative - 1580:7 national - 1610:17 National - 1626:7 natural - 1619:3 nature - 1632:18 Navy - 1629:1 necessarily -1561:10, 1593:11, 1607:25, 1608:18 necessary -1604:19, 1604:20 **need** - 1555:14, 1564:11, 1602:13, 1616:20 needed - 1595:15 negotiated - 1629:7 net - 1550:22, 1558:1, 1558:11, 1558:18 network - 1611:12 never - 1550:5, 1550:22, 1557:3, 1558:4, 1561:1, 1561:6. 1565:7 1569:4, 1579:12, 1581:4, 1601:5, 1601:10, 1620:6, 1628:19, 1632:1 **new** - 1546:13, 1559:12, 1559:18, 1561:13, 1564:12, 1605:11 **next** - 1538:12, 1538:15, 1541:22, 1543:19, 1543:21, 1543:24, 1545:9, 1545:14, 1548:21, 1552:2, 1553:10, 1556:11, 1557:5, 1557:11, 1560:9, 1570:24, 1571:1, 1574:19, 1575:23, 1577:22, 1586:3, 1602:21, 1604:11, 1613:1, 1617:16, 1618:3, 1618:10, 1620:21, 1622:3, 1633:24, 1634:14 nice - 1582:5 nickel - 1546:16. 1573:15 556:22

Rebecca Stonestreet

loss - 1579:25

(202) 354-3249

1563:12

1558:21

kingreporter2@verizon.net

1574:4 nickels - 1556:23 night - 1602:20 nine - 1555:1 Ninth - 1534:13 nobody - 1560:6, 1628:21 non - 1621:23, 1622:24 non-indian - 1621:23 None - 1558:12 none - 1559:9, 1559:23, 1597:11, 1622:22 nonmarketable - 1579:7 nonmaterial - 1543:21 nonresponsive - 1580:6 Norc - 1633:20, 1633:21, 1634:4 normal - 1625:12 Normally - 1555:5 normally - 1555:5 note - 1567:7, 1602:19, 1604:17, 1632:10 noted - 1560:11, 1561:3, 1584:11 nothing - 1560:25, 1596:25, 1597:1, 1602:6, 1625:2 nothing's - 1605:3
notice - 1542:5, 1543:7, 1637:6 notification - 1611:4 Number - 1536:8 number - 1537:9, 1537:15, 1540:10, 1560:19, 1566:21, 1570:17, 1577:18, 1585:25, 1586:12, 1586:13, 1587:5, 1587:20, 1593:19, 1594:9, 1594:10, 1600:1, 1604:4, 1607:12, 1611:2, 1611:14, 1612:20, 1616:21, 1617:17, 1621:18, 1622:24, 1624:1, 1625:13, 1626:18, 1627:2, 1627:7, 1629:9, 1629:18, 1629:19, 1630:2, 1635:8 numbers - 1550:19, 1559:11, 1585:23, 1623:23, 1623:24 Nw - 1534:12, 1534:20, 1535:3, 1535:12

Oath - 1602:17 object - 1553:20, 580:5, 1595:13, 637. Objection - 1545:23, 1568:11, 1574:15, 1635.18 objection - 1568:14. 1580:11, 1595:18, 1605:16 objections

1604:17 objective - 1608:16 objects - 1609:11 observe - 1610:19 observed - 1548:1, 1632:11 obtained - 1631:4 **obviously** - 1617:11, 1621:9 Occ - 1579:1 occurred - 1567:23, 1600:7, 1607:13, 1611:13, 1628:3 October - 1534:4 odd - 1563:12, 1565:22 offer - 1635:22 offered - 1604:18 offering - 1635:19 Office - 1539:11, 539:12, 1539:17, 1539:21, 1539:25, 1540:5, 1540:13, 1540:18, 1540:22 1540:23, 1541:2, 1541:5, 1542:16, 1542:23, 1543:10, 1544:1, 1544:14, 1544:25, 1545:22, 1546:12, 1547:9, 1547:10, 1547:15 1549:10, 1549:18 1549:19, 1550:16, 1553:19, 1554:11, 1553:1, 1554:11, 1556:21, 1556:22, 1565:21, 1567:12, 1569:12, 1571:19, 1578:18, 1580:2, 1583:16, 1591:17, 1592:8 office - 1549:8, 1549:20, 1568:19 1583:23, 1583:25 Officer - 1579:2 offices - 1548:23, 1549:4, 1549:6, 1549:18, 1549:24 1551:20, 1552:18, 1552:22, 1553:2, 1555:12 Offices - 1534:12 Official - 1535:11, 1638:1 official - 1562:19 often - 1556:8 Ohta - 1596:15, 1596:19 oil - 1546:10, 1564:1, 1612:2, 1612:4, 1612:8, 1613:4, 1613:6, 1613:16, 1614:5 1614:9, 1614:22, 1615:8, 1616:10, 1617:2, 1617:15, 1617:19, 1617:25 1618:2, 1619:4, 1619:24, 1620:10, 1622:10 oink - 1629:1 oink-oink - 1629:1 old - 1554:15, 554:18, 1555:9, 1559:5, 1559:18, 1611:20 1559:21, 1580:10, 1591:8, 1613:12, 1624:11, 1629:1 ordered - 1565:14,

once - 1609:1, 1628:2, 1628:16 One - 1579:14, 1587:17, 1623:9, 1628:6 one - 1540:21 1542:4, 1542:13, 1544:17, 1545:3, 1545:14, 1549:13, 1552:10, 1552:21, 1553:1, 1555:18, 1555:19, 1557:11, 1558:19, 1560:10, 1561:5, 1561:23, 1562:5, 1563:19, 1564:20, 1573:12, 1575:9, 1578:4, 1578:5, 1579:19, 1576.5, 1579.19, 1580:20, 1586:17, 1588:15, 1588:17, 1592:12, 1593:14, 1593:16, 1595:21, 1596:3, 1599:16, 1599:22, 1600:21, 1600:22, 1601:10, 1600.22, 1601.10, 1601:25, 1611:8, 1611:9, 1611:16, 1614:12, 1614:18, 1618:6, 1619:19, 1620:13, 1621:9, 1621:24, 1622:10, 1622:16, 1625:1, 1626:22, 1630:2, 1634:24, 1636:22 ones - 1585:11, 1588:3, 1631:25 online - 1611:24, 1612.1 open - 1566:19, 1569:20 opened - 1579:3 opening - 1573:9, 1579:6 operated - 1546:19 operation - 1587:15 operations -1545:25, 1583:21, 1587:23, 1588:5 opines - 1595:25 **opinion** - 1553:23, 1568:8, 1568:21, 1573:7, 1580:7, 1580:8. 1584:18. 1586:8, 1586:17, 1586:21, 1588:11, 1588:24, 1589:16, 1591:1, 1598:6, 1598:17, 1601:7, 1601:9, 1601:18, 1603:24, 1628:25, 1635:19, 1635:23 opinions - 1542:19. 1578:1, 1586:8, 1589:9, 1589:17, 1589:19, 1605:9, 1635:20 opportunity 1542:21, 1552:15 opposed - 1539:22 option - 1576:3, 1576:22, 1601:22, 1612:7 order - 1555:8,

origin - 1569:8, 1569·16 original - 1573:9, 1575:18, 1600:11, 1600:14, 1615:24, 1619:12 originally - 1563:6, Originally - 1549:8 originated - 1569:9 Osage - 1564:20, 1564:21 Ost- 1556:16 Ost's - 1556:13 Otfm - 1541:19, 1549:15, 1565:23 otherwise - 1569:9. 583.9 ounces - 1620:13 outline - 1603:20, 1614:12 outlined - 1559:17, 1566:17, 1635:16 outside - 1540:2, 1546:19, 1552:15, 1552:21, 1553:3, 1566:1, 1580:7 overall - 1595:22 overlaid - 1613:5 overlapped -1625:19 overlay - 1609:8, 1609:16, 1611:7, 1612:6, 1612:7, 1615:20, 1620:24, 1628:6 overlays - 1608:8, 1610:4, 1612:1, 1612:4, 1612:7 overly - 1620:1 overrule - 1580:14 Overruled - 1635:25 overview - 1541:6. 1566:11 owed - 1575:13 own - 1542:18, 1547:25, 1548:17, 1565:20, 1591:7 1591:11, 1607:10, 1613:9, 1617:19 owned - 1621:22, 1621:23, 1621:24 owner - 1621:19 ownership -1547:11, 1557:2, 1569:2, 1579:4, 1581:16 oxley - 1614:21

package - 1613:12 page - 1537:8, 1537:9, 1537:12, 1538:12, 1538:15, 1538:16, 1538:17, 1540:7, 1540:9, 1540:15, 1541:13, 1541:22, 1541:23, 1543:21, 1544:19, 1544:20, 1544:24, 1545:5, 1545:10, 1547:20, 1552:3, 1555:24, 1560:9, 1567:8, 1570:11, 1570:24, 1571:1, 1572:23, 1572:24. 1573:1, 1574:19, 1574:20, 1577:17 1577:18, 1577:22

1578:5, 1578:6, 1578:9, 1582:23 1585:19, 1585:20, 1585:25, 1586:3, 1594:25, 1595:1, 1596:8, 1596:9, 1597:20, 1598:2, 1598:3, 1598:7, 1598:8, 1599:25, 1604:5, 1604:6, 1604:11, 1605:23, 1633:17, 1636:1 pages - 1563:21, 1570:18, 1575:4, 1584:24, 1586:1 1594:10, 1597:23, 1597:25 **paid** - 1544:17, 1614:5, 1614:9, 1614:11, 1617:20, 1620:15, 1629:20 papers - 1588:10 paradigm - 1625:15 paragraph -1538:16, 1538:17, 1541:9, 1541:13, 1541:9, 1541:13, 1541:23, 1542:9, 1543:7, 1543:19, 1543:22, 1545:9, 1548:12, 1548:21, 1548:22, 1551:7, 1551:10, 1552:2, 1553:13, 1556:11, 1557:5, 1558:24, 1560:19, 1570:12, 1571:5, 1572:24, 1576:2, 1577:3, 1595:3, 1598:9, 1600:2 paralegals - 1566:1 parallel - 1565:20 part - 1543:23, 1546:23, 1547:19, 1559:4, 1565:19, 1566:8, 1573:7, 1581:8, 1584:22, 1586:5, 1590:18, 1594:14, 1594:24, 1595:6, 1599:1, 1606:23, 1614:7, 1614:8, 1615:11, 1632:20 partial - 1547:4 particular -1544:17, 1559:11, 1570:6, 1610:9, 1614:3, 1614:9, 1615:9, 1622:6, 1622:9, 1623:7 1623:8, 1631:8, 1632:14 particularly -1555:13, 1556:9, 1627:8 parties - 1613:24 party - 1623:25, 1631:11 pass - 1579:12 passage - 1600:6 passed - 1546:20, 1547:8, 1555:1, 1557:18, 1575:21, 1579:15, 1625:17,

Rebecca Stonestreet

Omni - 1559:6,

1559:14, 1559:20

Once-1616:8

(202) 354-3249

orderly - 1578:13 orders - 1555:10

ordinarily - 1593:10 organized - 1550:15

1565:22

kingreporter2@verizon.net

1626:21

1546:17

1547:4

passes - 1546:11,

past - 1547:1,

pattern - 1625:7.

25:20, 1625:24

patterns - 1624:14	phosphates -	1612:10, 1612:13,	1555:3, 1555:7,	1613:14, 1613:17,
Paul - 1536:3,	1618:21	1612:19, 1612:25,	1555:14, 1557:3	1616:16, 1618:3,
1537:5	physical - 1610:3	1619:20, 1634:11,	problem - 1556:5,	1618:4, 1618:11,
pay - 1566:25	Pi/dwight's -	1635:1, 1636:12	1560:21, 1603:3,	1618:16, 1619:7,
paying - 1547:3 payment - 1546:25,	1613:13, 1614:23 picked - 1610:22	pool - 1626:12 population - 1550:3	1603:4, 1628:18, 1636:10	1620:11, 1620:18, 1622:11
1547:4, 1579:11	picks - 1541:18	portion - 1547:21,	problems -	provided - 1554:17,
payments - 1546:9,	piece - 1585:22,	1633:25, 1634:15,	1548:10, 1548:18,	1571:10, 1590:18,
1547:5, 1559:5,	1585:23, 1621:13,	1636:3	1549:1, 1551:4,	1591:5, 1597:12,
1569:10, 1629:16,	1622:2	portions - 1635:13	1555:19, 1636:7	1620:8, 1626:8
1629:18, 1629:20, 1629:24	Pincock - 1618:13, 1619:1, 1620:4,	position - 1583:6, 1583:10	procedural - 1548:16	provides - 1613:18, 1618:1
Pdf - 1597:23	1630:17	possible - 1538:19,	procedure -	providing -
Pds - 1613:21,	pipeline - 1628:2	1569:21, 1606:12,	1571:14, 1571:15,	1578:21, 1616:15
1614:6, 1614:14,	pit - 1630:10	1607:1, 1607:3,	1574:3, 1581:4	prudent - 1571:9
1615:11, 1615:14,	pits - 1630:4,	1636:15	procedures -	public - 1541:24,
1616:9	1630:9	post - 1614:21,	1545:12, 1548:14,	1607:11, 1614:22
Pds's - 1614:17, 1616:15	place - 1552:8, 1568:2, 1568:16,	1628:9, 1630:18 posted - 1561:17,	1562:23, 1600:20 proceed - 1590:5	publicly - 1544:16, 1612:17, 1617:18
Peachtree - 1534:16	1610:14, 1613:1	1608:18	proceedings -	published -
people - 1550:25,	placed - 1561:19,	Ppx-4208 - 1604:5	1638:4	1623:19
1565:4, 1587:18,	1614:16, 1614:19	practical - 1600:17,	Proceedings -	pull - 1551:7,
1609:6, 1609:9,	Plaintiff - 1603:11	1611:8	1535:15	1571:4, 1612:5,
1611:13, 1612:21,	Plaintiffs - 1534:3,	practice - 1555:11,	process - 1541:1,	1615:15, 1621:17
1615:21 Pepion - 1534:2	1534:11 plaintiffs - 1585:24,	1571:8, 1578:24 practices - 1538:10	1556:13, 1562:10, 1563:4, 1563:10,	pulled - 1565:24 purchased -
per - 1546:18,	1586:14, 1586:24,	pre-'72 - 1617:3	1565:13, 1565:16,	1612:20, 1613:1,
1564:20, 1565:4,	1604:23, 1605:3,	preceding -	1565:18, 1565:24,	1613:11, 1622:24,
1593:19, 1593:23,	1606:5	1616:16	1608:8, 1634:14	1623:4
1617:9, 1630:20,	Plaintiffs' - 1537:8,	precious - 1618:22,	processes -	purge - 1561:13
1631:13, 1631:14	1567:9, 1570:11,	1620:13, 1620:14	1545:12, 1552:19	purposes -
Per - 1569:9 percent - 1561:5,	1572:23, 1574:20, 1582:20	preconception - 1628:7	Processing - 1548:1	1582:17, 1584:17, 1585:5, 1585:6
1567:2, 1580:1,	plaintiffs' - 1582:20,	predated - 1567:6,	processing -	put - 1543:15,
1614:14, 1636:21	1607:8	1629:13	1545:16, 1545:20,	1582:19, 1583:2,
percentage -	plan - 1538:7,	predecessor -	1551:12	1584:3, 1584:11,
1618:4, 1626:12,	1543:9, 1543:16,	1559:16, 1562:25,	procured - 1628:10	1594:12, 1595:17,
1626:14, 1634:22 perform - 1606:5,	1552:14, 1554:8,	1575:15 predictable -	produce - 1632:1 produced -	1595:22, 1597:18, 1604:1, 1605:22,
1606:20, 1609:15,	1554:21, 1557:17, 1565:19, 1566:9,	1624:18	1535:15, 1583:24,	1607:22, 1612:25,
1618:14, 1635:4	1566:14, 1571:10,	prepare - 1610:22	1585:8, 1614:9,	1617:13, 1619:21,
performed -	1573:4, 1573:6,	prepared - 1555:22,	1616:6, 1616:19,	1628:23
1539:24	1573:17, 1573:21,	1584:8, 1584:14,	1617:2, 1625:14,	putting - 1543:13,
performing - 1556:3	1574:22, 1576:14,	1589:3	1628:20	1581:7, 1581:10,
Perhaps - 1590:23, 1601:15	1581:9, 1586:22, 1590:13, 1591:5,	preparing - 1543:13, 1636:18	production - 1614:3, 1616:9,	1583:2, 1596:19
perhaps - 1609:1,	1591:18, 1596:16,	presence - 1556:12	1617:15, 1620:22,	
1609:8	1596:19, 1597:2	present - 1546:21,	1620:23, 1621:7,	Q
period - 1550:22,	plans - 1565:8	1562:20, 1564:22,	1632:14, 1632:16	qualifications -
1562:17, 1563:9,	plastic - 1609:8,	1629:4	Professor - 1621:2,	1605:7
1580:21, 1607:13, 1612:15, 1618:23,	1615:20 platinum - 1618:22	presented - 1538:22, 1596:15	1622:1 program - 1552:8,	qualified - 1538:23, 1544:10
1626:1, 1626:13	plot - 1617:1,	presumably -	1610:4	qualifies - 1573:18
periodicals -	1619:10, 1624:15,	1562:22, 1606:19	programmed -	quality - 1617:22
1622:25	1625:8, 1625:9,	presume - 1606:21	1552:7	quantify - 1627:24
periods - 1545:18,	1625:13	presumption -	Project - 1562:2	Questa - 1613:8,
1557:7, 1617:20	plotted - 1617:4, 1624:17 1624:18	1580:25	project - 1625:14	1615:18, 1615:22, 1616:5, 1617:17
Periods - 1548:3 person - 1552:21,	1624:17, 1624:18 plotting - 1617:9	presuppose - 1632:9	prone - 1609:9 pronounce -	1616:5, 1617:17, 1618:1, 1632:11
1567:12, 1569:24	Pm - 1637:8	pretrial - 1602:12	1567:24	Questa's - 1613:9
personal - 1583:20,	Po - 1535:8	pretty - 1560:3	pronunciation -	question's -
1591:7, 1591:11,	point - 1544:4,	previous - 1550:25,	1543:2	1601:12
1591:13, 1591:15, 1591:16	1544:13, 1575:13, 1577:25, 1588:23,	1597:6 previously -	proof - 1565:5,	questions -
personally -	1577:25, 1588:23, 1591:9, 1613:2,	1557:13	1569:24 proper - 1598:13	1553:21, 1560:13, 1581:21, 1582:24,
1552:17, 1552:19	1630:17	price - 1617:19,	properly - 1574:12	1583:1, 1602:3
perspective -	points - 1619:7,	1617:25, 1618:2,	proposal - 1591:18,	quickly - 1624:17
1576:6, 1583:3,	1623:7, 1623:17,	1632:15	1591:20	Quinn - 1535:2,
1598:24	1624:2, 1624:13,	principles - 1601:20	proposals -	1536:4, 1545:23,
pervasive - 1537:21 petroleum - 1613:7,	1624:23, 1624:24, 1624:25, 1632:25,	private - 1547:9, 1555:5, 1560:4,	1591:23 propose - 1591:23	1553:20, 1568:11, 1568:18, 1574:15,
1614:23, 1616:18,	1634:8	1569:23, 1571:23,	proposing - 1581:8	1580:5, 1580:12,
1616:23	policy - 1538:10,	1574:14	prospector - 1615:2	1581:24, 1582:2,
Petroleum -	1600:23	pro - 1602:13,	prospectors -	1582:4, 1582:19,
1613:21	polygon - 1609:11,	1634:21	1614:25	1582:21, 1585:13,
Phase - 1582:10, 1585:2	1610:10, 1611:2, 1616:7, 1634:17,	probate - 1553:10,	prove - 1569:19, 1570:3, 1581:1	1585:16, 1586:3, 1586:4, 1589:25,
phase - 1551:14	1634:18	1553:13, 1553:18, 1553:19, 1553:21,	provide - 1556:14,	1580:4, 1589:25, 1590:1, 1590:3,
phone - 1602:20,	polygons - 1609:10,	1553:23, 1553:24,	1580:17, 1580:19,	1590:5, 1590:6,
1611:2	1610:7, 1610:8,	1554:8, 1554:14,	1581:15, 1613:5,	1590:7, 1592:4,

(202) 354-3249

1592:6, 1593:13, 1593:17, 1594:8, 1594:11, 1594:13, 1594:15, 1595:17, 1595:20, 1596:7, 1596:11, 1597:14, 1597:15, 1597:18, 1597:19, 1598:8, 1598:10, 1599:12, 1599:15, 1600:2, 1600:4, 1601:24, 1602:1, 1602:3, 1602:5 quite - 1593:5, 1618:20 Quite - 1588:2 quotation - 1596:4 quotations - 1589:18 quote - 1570:19, 1570:23, 1575:23, 1576:2, 1577:13, 1595:10, 1595:11, 1623:17, 1636:20 quoted - 1571:7, 1575:6, 1577:13, 1585:12, 1587:9, 1587:10, 1595:3, 1596:13, 1596:22, 1598:6, 1598:18, 1599:21 quoting - 1577:18, 1578:6, 1598:16	16 r r 155 r 155 r 16 r 15 r 155 r 16 r 15 r 15
R	16 r
rail - 1628:8, 1628:11 railroad - 1628:13 railroads - 1628:7	16 r r 15

railway - 1628:14 ran - 1565:25 rang - 1610:21 range - 1597:24, 1599:14, 1636:21 Rap- 1601:19 rapidly - 1620:5 rata - 1634:21 rate - 1553:6, 1622.8 rates - 1636:21 rather - 1550:19 read - 1553:13, 570:23, 1576:1 1586:16, 1586:22, 1589:6, ¹589:9, 1591:14, 1605:10, 1634:2, 1634:3, 1635:14, 1636:5 1636:6, 1636:20 **ready** - 1537:3, 1548:6, 1548:25 real - 1611:6 really - 1538:7 1541:18, 1599:20, 1609:1, 1623:15, 1625:11, 1629:23 realm - 1623:22 realty - 1636:8 reason - 1588:4, 1588:7, 1588:20 reasonable -1571:9, 1571:16 1624:22, 1628:22 reasonably -1600:15, 1626:14 reasons - 1544:11, 1556:20, 1563:13 Rebecca- 1535

338.3 reboot - 1564:11 receipt - 1556:8, 564:7, 1569:19 receipts - 1547:13, 558:13, 1562:15, 579:10, 1608:17 receivable - 1546:6, 546:25, 1552:3, 552:6, 1552:7, 552:8, 1552:12, 552:17, 1552:20, 553:7, 1563:24 receive - 1607:23, 332:8 received - 1540:4, 540:21, 1545:3, 550:16, 1562:1, 562:18, 1602:19, 604:23, 1608:15, 612:13, 1627:16 receiving - 1542:13, 62:19, 1629:16 recent - 1544:15, 544:17 Recess- 1590:4, 337:8 recess - 1590:8 recite - 1573:22 recognize -582:22, 1594:19 597:20, 1598:3, 598:19, 1599:16, 599:22, 1600:22, 501:16, 1605:25, 324:13 recognized -336:10 recollect - 1619:22 recollection -571:18, 1579:9, 1597:10 recommendations -1541:25, 1542:5, 1543:9 reconcile - 1560:1, 1565:11, 1567:5 reconciled -1550:23, 1558:4, 1559:10, 1559:19, 1559:24, 1561:6, 1561:9, 1565:7, 1568:1, 1568:16, 1571:21, 1593:23 Reconciliationreconciliation -1541:1, 1555:15, 1594:1, 1598:14 reconciling -1579:10 reconstruction -1633:1 record - 1540:7, 1540:9, 1544:18, 1544:20, 1548:22 1570:17, 1570:18, 1574:24, 1575:1, 1575:3, 1575:4, 1575:5, 1577:7,

1577:20, 1577:25,

1578:2, 1578:8, 1580:6, 1582:20,

1584:11, 1585:2,

1585:7, 1585:9, 1588:13, 1590:14, 1594:9, 1597:14,

1599:13, 1602:11, 1602:19, 1603:16,

1605

1604:25,

1607:11, 1638:4 Record- 1564:13, 1602:2 recorded - 1551:18, 1610:22 recordkeeping 1538:10, 1552:19 records - 1550:24, 1551:1, 1557:2, 1558:13, 1562:24, 1571:21, 1574:13, 1578:13, 1579:16, 1600:8, 1613:25, 1617:19 recovery - 1621:5 Recross- 1536:2 Redirect- 1536:2 reduced - 1609:14 refer - 1586:25, 1589:1, 1589:2 reference -1537:24, 1584:20, 1585:23, 1585:25, 1587:5, 1605:1 referenced 1589:11, 1589:18, 1594:7 referred - 1538:19, 1557:13, 1559:14, 1585:12, 1586:13, 1588:9, 1613:14 referring - 1540:11, 1549:17, 1594:24, 1598:12, 1599:4, 1610:8 reflect - 1561:16 reflected - 1538:20 reflects - 1551:4 Reform- 1538:9, 1539:24, 1539:25, 1543:15, 1580:18, 1599.2 reform - 1538:9. 1543:16 refresh - 1597:10 Reg- 1579:1 regarding -1553:21, 1556:5, 1563:4, 1570:22, 1636:17 regardless - 1623:16 regional - 1548:22. 1549:3, 1549:17, 1549:24, 1552:18, 1555:12, 1563:25 regions - 1549:6, 1565:25 regulations -1601.22 regulator - 1567:18. 1567:20 regulatory related - 1545:11, 1545:15, 1568:18, 1614:15, 1626:9 relates - 1603:23 relevant - 1627:8 reliability - 1591:4, reliable - 1557:12, 1558:24, 1608:5, 1620:25, 1629:4, 1629:9. 1630:13. 1630:19, 1632:1, 1632:15, 1636:16 reliance - 1610:13. 1614:16, 1614:19

1548.1 relied - 1584:1. 1584:14, 1584:17, 1586:12, 1586:16, 1589:2, 1627:12 relied-upon -1589:2 rely - 1586:20, 1606:10, 1606:25, 1607:8, 1612:18, 1613:24, 1615:6, 1615:7 relying - 1550:6, remark - 1553:22 remedies - 1595:15 remedy - 1572:2, 1595:23, 1600:16, 1600:17 remember - 1564:4, 1582:7, 1582:13, 1590:21 render - 1537:21, 1617:24 rendered - 1568:10, 1585.6 rendering - 1586:8, 1586:17 rephrase - 1593:5, 1601:14 replaced - 1559:23 replicate - 1625:21 report - 1538:13, 1538:15, 1540:21, 1541:6, 1541:24, 1543:8, 1543:20, 1544:2, 1544:12, 1547:19, 1547:21, 1548:8, 1551:24, 1552:11, 1553:15, 1553:22, 1556:17, 1553:22, 1550:17, 1557:5, 1562:1, 1562:10, 1562:18, 1563:2, 1567:9, 1570:13, 1574:20, 1575:3, 1575:7, 1575:9, 1577:11 1577:14, 1577:18, 1578:6, 1580:8, 1578:6, 1580:8, 1582:16, 1582:22, 1584:5, 1584:7, 1584:25, 1585:3, 1585:5, 1585:12, 1585:17, 1586:1, 1586:22, 1587:4, 1580:22, 1507:4, 1587:10, 1588:9, 1589:12, 1589:21, 1590:9, 1592:2, 1592:8, 1593:15, 1594:7, 1595:25, 1598:7, 1599:9. 1601:5, 1604:25, 1605:1, 1606:1, 1606:2, 1606:6, 1606:15, 1606:18, 1606:21, 1623:4, 1623:5, 1636:10 reportable - 1542:1, 1543:21, 1545:15, 1547:25 reported - 1535:15, Reporter- 1535:11, 1638:1, 1638:10 Reporting- 1548:3 reporting - 1545:16, 1545:17, 1557:7, 1624:11, 1625:18, 1625:19

reports - 1546:5

1546:24, 1548:9, 1591:10, 1607:13 represent - 1596:20 representation -1607:8 representative -1596:18 request - 1555:8, 1583:14 require - 1560:20 required - 1539:24, 1540:1, 1540:2, 1543:15, 1566:21, 1566:23, 1569:1, 1579:1, 1599:2, 1625:17 requirement -1580:18 requirements -1565:23, 1579:8, 1579:11 research - 1583:22, 1612:12, 1617:21, 1620:4, 1620:25, 1622:21, 1623:18, 1627:8, 1628:25, 1630:24 researched -1622:16 researching -1626:17 reservation 1609:12, 1610:8, 1612:10, 1612:22, 1615:23, 1616:4, 1621:21, 1621:25, 1624:25, 1634:17, 1634:22 reservations 1552:18, 1610:11, 1625:1 **Reserve**- 1569:24, 1579:11, 1579:18 reserves - 1614:19 1614:20, 1614:24 reshuffle - 1602:23 reshuffling - 1603:5 resign - 1583:6 resolution -1560:20 resolve - 1580:24 resolved - 1554:20, 1557:7 resolving - 1554:25, 1571:17 Resource- 1550:7 resource - 1620:21 Resources- 1626:7 resources -1542:23, 1567:23, 1605:5, 1619:3. 1619:24, 1622:12 respect - 1542:15, 1545:22, 1563:2, 1568:10, 1572:9, 1575:16, 1576:16, 1583:21, 1584:13, 1591:7, 1593:25. 1597:16, 1598:6, 1629:22 respects - 1559:21, 1561:19, 1573:4 respond - 1542:21, 1553.25 response - 1586:19, 1586:21, 1587:1 responsibility -1549:9, 1549:15

Rebecca Stonestreet

(202) 354-3249

Reliance- 1545:1

kingreporter2@verizon.net

restore - 1580:25

restricted - 1555:25

result - 1538:18, 1539:25, 1563:4, 1575:14 resulted - 1606:6, 1608:6 results - 1544:8, 1545:6, 1562:21, 1583:19, 1564:4, 1573:18 1566:31, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:31, 1573:14, 1574:3 resum - 1593:14, 1604:8 retained - 1621:2 retrofit - 1616:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1618:2, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:8, 1618:10, 1618:15, 1626:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:21, 1596:22, 1596:8, 1596:14, 1596:3, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:16, 1596:17, 1596:3, 1596:17, 1596:3, 1596:17, 1596:3, 1596:21, 1596:21, 15	:1, '8, '8, '8, '8, '8, '19, '19, '19, '0:22, '11, '8:5, '3:4, '2:11
1539:25, 1563:4, 1578:20	:8, :8, 3:19, :19, 0:22, :1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11
resulted - 1606:6, 1608:6 results - 1544:8, 1545:6, 1562:21, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1564:4, 1573:18 sad - 1627:11 salem - 1579:16 results - 1544:8, 1593:14, 1563:17, 1566:3, 1566:5, 1566:17, 1566:3, 1566:5, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:15 resum - 1593:14, 1626:10, 1627:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1608:18, 1626:10, 16	:8, 3:19, :19, 0:22, :1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11
1608:6 results - 1544:8, 1545:6, 1562:21, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:19, 1564:4, 1566:3, 1566:5, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1574:3 resum - 1593:14, 1604:8 retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 retrofit - 1616:24 retrored - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1598:16, 1596:17, 1598:11, 1598:16, 1598:11, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:2, 1598:16, 1615:3, 1622:20, 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:18, 1600:19 1561:4, 1562 1571:15, 1622:20, 1571:15, 1622:20, 1571:15, 1622:20, 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:14, 1642:2, 1578:15, 1585:8, 1585:10, 1613:5, 1585:10, 1613:5, 1585:10, 1613:5, 1585:10, 1613:5, 1542:1, 1542:2, 1573:15, 1542:2, 1573:15, 158 1574:21, 1600:1 1571:18, 1600:19 1571:14, 1600:19 1571:14, 1600:19 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1600:19 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:15, 1622:20 1571:15, 1622:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1571:14, 1602:20 1	3:19, :19, 0:22, :1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11
results - 1544:8, 1545:6, 1562:21, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:13, 1564:4, 1564:25, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:5, 1566:14, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1604:8 retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:16 retrieved - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:18 results - 154:2, 1573:14, 1573:13 retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:10 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:4; 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1532:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1618:15, 1618:15, 1618:15, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1622:20, 1613:7, 1622:20, 1622:11, 1542:2, 1578:15, 1585:10, 1613:7, 1633:20, 1625:21, 1578:15, 1633:20, 1574:21, 1500:1, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1598:11, 1620:19, 1571:18, 1600:19 risk 1600:19 risk 1620:19, 1571:18, 1500:19 risk 1571:18, 1620:19, 1571:18, 1593:20, 1571:18, 1593:20, 1571:18, 1593:20, 1571:18, 1598:10, 1613:7, 1562:10, 1571:18, 1598:10, 1613:7, 1562:10, 1571:18, 1598:10, 1613:7, 1571:18, 1598:10, 1613:7, 1571:18, 1598:10, 1613	:19, 0:22, :1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11
1545:6, 1562:21, 1563:13, 1563:17, 1563:19, 1564:4, 1573:18 sad - 1627:11 salem - 1534:25 sales - 1625:23, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1564:4, 1626:10, 1627:18, 1626:10, 1627:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1603:22, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:19, 1571:14, 1600:1	0:22, :1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11 - 9:5
1563:13, 1563:17, sacrificing - 1621:15, 1622:20, 1571:18, 1600:19 1561:4, 1562:11, 1562:11, 1566:11, 1566:11, 1566:11, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1566:11, 1570:4, sales - 1625:23, sels - 1625:23, 1585:10, 1613:7 1542:2, 1542:2, 1578:15, 158 1573:14, 1570:4, sales - 1625:23, selfsame - 1562:13 selfsame - 1562:21 1574:21, 1600:1 specialize 1604:8 1626:10, 1627:18, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1633:10 senior - 1535:6 skip - 1540:16, specialize 1630:5 sense - 1608:3, 1605:7 specialize specialize 1673:13 sand - 1537:20 sent - 1590:22, slightly - 1574:7 specific - 1 1671:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 sentence - 1537:17, 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23	:1, 8:5, 3:4, 2:11 - 9:5
1563:19, 1564:4, 1573:18 sad - 1627:11 salem - 1534:25 sales - 1625:23, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1574:3 resum - 1593:14, 1604:8 retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:16 retrieved - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1573:18 sad - 1627:11 sad - 1631:5, 1633:2 selected - 1585:8, 1585:10, 1613:7 selected - 1585:8, 1585:10, 1613:7 selected - 1585:8, 1585:10, 1613:7 selfsame - 1562:13 self- 1631:5, 1543:20, 1565:22, 1590:10, 1593:10, 1617:14, 1618:2, 1593:10, 1593	8:5, 3:4, 2:11 - 9:5
1564:25, 1565:17, sad - 1627:11 selected - 1585:8, 1542:1, 1542:2, 1578:15, 158 1566:31, 1566:5, salem - 1534:25 selected - 1585:8, 1542:1, 1542:2, 1550:10, 159 1573:14, 1574:3 sele - 1625:23, 1563:10, 1613:7 1542:2, 1600:1 specialize 1573:14, 1574:3 1625:24, 1625:25, sell - 1631:5, six - 1588:16 specialize 1604:8 1629:17, 1632:5, 1631:10 sense - 1608:3, 1605:7 specialize retained - 1621:2 sampling - 1573:11, 1573:13 sense - 1608:3, 1605:7 specialize retrieved - 1579:24 san - 1587:20 sent - 1590:22, slightly - 1574:7 species - 1 returned - 1579:20 sand - 1630:4, sentence - 1537:17, 1601:21 small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 154 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Smith - 1534:23 so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	3:4, 2:11 - 9:5
1566:3, 1566:5, 1566:11, 1570:4, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1573:14, 1604:8 1626:10, 1627:18, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1639:16, 1630:5, 1630:5,	2:11 - 9:5
1566:11, 1570:4, sales - 1625:23, selfsame - 1562:13 1574:21, 1600:1 specialize 1618:15, 161 1573:14, 1574:3 1625:24, 1625:25, sell - 1631:5, six - 1588:16 1618:15, 161 resum - 1593:14, 1604:8 1629:17, 1632:5, Senior - 1535:6 skip - 1540:16, specializes retained - 1621:2 sampling - 1573:11, 1573:13 sense - 1608:3, 1605:7 specializes retrieved - 1579:24 sampling - 1573:11, 1573:13 sent - 1590:22, slightly - 1574:7 specializes retrofit - 1616:24 San - 1587:20 sand - 1630:4, sente - 1537:17, small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 154 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1630:10 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Smith - 1534:23 Smith - 1534:23 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	- 9:5
1573:14, 1574:3 resum - 1593:14, 1625:24, 1625:25, 1626:10, 1627:18, 1629:17, 1632:5, retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:16 retrieved - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1616:2, 1617:23, 1629:17, 1629:25, 1629:17, 1629:25, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1631:10 six-odd - 1565:22 skip - 1540:16, six-odd - 1565:22 skip - 1540:16, six-odd - 1565:22 skip - 1540:16, specializes 1609:18 s	9:5
resum - 1593:14, 1626:10, 1627:18, 1629:17, 1632:5, retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:16 retrieved - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1626:10, 1627:18, 1629:17, 1632:5, 1632:5, 1632:0 senior - 1535:6 senior - 1536:2 senior - 1540:16, 1609:18 specialty - 1605:7 slightly - 1574:7 species - 1 senior - 1590:22, 1612:21 senior - 1537:17, 1538:14, 1541:23, 1574:23, 1620:14, 1620:1	
1604:8 1629:17, 1632:5, Senior - 1535:6 skip - 1540:16, 1609:18 retanicion - 1579:16 sampling - 1573:11, 1630:5 specialty - 1574:7 specialty - 1574:7 retrofit - 1616:24 San - 1587:20 sent - 1590:22, slowly - 1604:11 specific - 1 returned - 1579:20 sand - 1630:4, sentence - 1537:17, 1601:21 1601:21 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1650:18, Smith - 1534:23 1601:21 167:14, 1601:22 1630:9, 1630:10 1596:13, 1596:21, Smith - 1534:23 1607:23, 162	•
retained - 1621:2 retention - 1579:16 retrieved - 1579:24 retrofit - 1616:24 returned - 1579:20 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 Sarbanes - 1608:3, 1630:5 sense - 1608:3, 1630:5 sent - 1590:22, 1612:21 small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 157 sentence - 1537:17, 1551:10, 1560:18, 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sarbanes - 1614:21 Sense - 1608:3, 1630:5 sentence - 1590:22, 1612:21 small - 1541:23, 1601:21 specialty - special - specia	
retention - 1579:16 sampling - 1573:11, 1630:5 slightly - 1574:7 species - 1 retrofice - 1616:24 San - 1587:20 sent - 1590:22, slightly - 1574:7 species - 1 retrofice - 1579:20 sand - 1630:4, sentence - 1537:17, 1601:21 small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 154 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23 1607:14, 160 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	1616:23
retrieved - 1579:24 1573:13 sent - 1590:22, slowly - 1604:11 specific - 1 retrofit - 1616:24 San - 1587:20 1612:21 small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 154 retrofit - 1616:6, sand - 1630:4, sentence - 1537:17, 1601:21 1574:23, 157 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23 1607:14, 160 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	
retrofit - 1616:24 San - 1587:20 1612:21 small - 1541:23, 1538:14, 154 returned - 1579:20 sand - 1630:4, sentence - 1537:17, 1601:21 1574:23, 157 revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23 5mith - 1534:23 1607:14, 160 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	
revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23 1607:14, 160 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	
revenue - 1616:6, 1630:9, 1630:10 1551:10, 1560:18, Smith - 1534:23 1607:14, 160 1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162	
1617:14, 1618:2, Sarbanes - 1614:21 1596:13, 1596:21, so-called - 1554:10 1617:23, 162 1618:8, 1618:10. Sarbanes-oxlev - 1596:24 1597:3 Social - 1566:20 specifically	
1618:8, 1618:10. Sarbanes-oxlev - 1596:24 1597:3 Social - 1566:20 specifically	2:8
,,	
1620:19, 1622:12, 1614:21 1598:6, 1598:12, 1579:23 1582:25	
1622:15, 1627:9, satisfy - 1545:13, 1598:18 software - 1608:23, spelled - 16	603:17
1627:23, 1628:24, 1573:13 separate - 1540:23, 1608:25, 1609:4, spend - 15	
1629:10, 1629:25, save - 1578:17 1592:9 1610:4, 1610:14, spent - 156	3:12,
1630:14, 1631:21, saw - 1539:4, separated - 1611:22, 1611:25, 1574:2	
1634:11, 1634:21 1542:6, 1548:7, 1539:18, 1549:18, 1612:3, 1612:11, spoken - 19	
revenues - 1546:10, 1551:5, 1561:12, 1569:12 1613:11, 1613:14, spots - 157	
1606:9, 1618:22, 1596:25, 1597:1, September - 1619:8, 1635:16 spread - 16	
1627:15, 1629:7, 1625:9, 1625:10, 1540:12, 1551:15, sold - 1626:12, spring - 16	
1631:19 1625:14, 1625:19, 1551:17, 1554:25, 1626:25, 1627:6, staff - 1542	
reverse - 1610:25	
review - 1542:11,	2:2,
1552:4, 1558:25, 1621:20, 1622:6 servicer - 1546:20 solely - 1607:8, 1633:12	4504.4
1560:16, 1575:24, scope - 1580:7, services - 1618:17 1612:18 standard -	1581:4,
1583:24, 1589:14, 1598:13, 1604:13, Services - 1613:22 someone - 1575:17, 1617:22	
1590:12, 1590:13, 1628:16, 1635:19 Session - 1534:7 1575:22, 1631:6 standpoint	
1590:21, 1591:10, screen - 1576:20, set - 1544:12, sometime - 1549:14 1547:6, 1576	
1604:19, 1610:5, 1577:2, 1582:19, 1555:17, 1572:18 Sometimes - 1576:22, 159	
1633:7 1584:4, 1594:12, sets - 1632:21 1561:19 stands - 16	
reviewed - 1544:15, 1594:17, 1594:23, setting - 1593:10 sometimes - start - 1540:154:16, 1545:3, 1598:2, 1605:22 settle - 1600:16 1623:19, 1623:20, 1548:25, 156	
1544:16, 1545:3, 1598:2, 1605:22 settle - 1600:16 1623:19, 1623:20, 1548:25, 156 1546:5, 1568:7, screens - 1585:22 seven - 1577:18, 1629:15 1598:21, 160	
1578:2, 1584:13, scroll - 1596:8, 1578:1, 1582:7, somewhere - 1611:10, 161	
1586.6, 1591:16, 1604:10 1591:8, 1591:15 1579:18, 1626:22 1616:15, 162	
1599:17 Scroll - 1596:9 several - 1557:6, Sorry - 1593:14 1628:8	0.10,
reviews - 1556:4 searching - 1630:25 1559:21, 1569:10, sorry - 1576:18, started - 15	550·18
Richard- 1536:5, second - 1545:7, 1599:21, 1628:15, 1577:14, 1599:10, 1562:10, 156	
1603:11, 1603:17 1548:12, 1573:17, 1628:21 1602:25, 1604:6, 1566:9, 1610	
Rick - 1602:15 1576:2, 1598:18, shaped - 1609:11 1619:17, 1626:15 1610:20, 161	
rights - 1627:24, 1609:15 shifting - 1570:10 sort - 1561:1, 1612:16, 162	
1628:9, 1628:14, secondly - 1629:22 shorthand - 1617:22, 1619:3, 1626:11, 162	
1628:16, 1628:20, Secrecy - 1566:21 1535:15 1625:10, 1631:15 starting - 1	
1629:5, 1630:20, Secretary - 1534:5, show - 1572:25, sound - 1608:25 1548:20, 160	8:7
1630:22, 1631:4, 1549:10 1616:9 source - 1606:20, starts - 153	37:17,
1631:6, 1631:7, Secretary's - Show - 1585:14 1614:12, 1615:15, 1542:9, 1594	:9,
1631:10	
risk - 1551:18 section - 1595:3, 1594:6 1621:15, 1623:3, state - 1550	
rivers - 1612:7 1633:18 Shuffle - 1603:6 1627:15, 1628:24, 1553:6, 1556	
roads - 1612:6, sector - 1555:5, sic - 1555:13, 1636:20 1571:8, 1591	
1628:4 1560:4, 1569:23, 1554:23, 1576:6 sources - 1591:14, 1603:15, 161	
Robert - 1535:1 1571:23, 1574:14 side - 1590:2 1509:13, 1614:13, 1614:1, 1615	
Robertson- 1534:9 secured - 1565:21, side-bar - 1590:2 1614:15, 1618:9, state-of-the	e-arτ -
rock - 1618:10, 1628:14 Signature - 1638:10 1619:22, 1625:16, 1553:3	1540:44
1618:13, 1618:15, Security - 1566:20, significant - 1627:23, 1629:10, Statement - 1570:23	
1618:16, 1619:5, 1579:23 1557:6, 1560:19, 1629:25, 1631:21 statement 1630:2 see - 1537:17, 1562:21, 1618:24, sourcing - 1622:24, 1537:14, 153	
1630:2 see - 1537:17, 1562:21, 1618:24, sourcing - 1622:24, 1537:14, 153 role - 1583:8, 1541:11, 1544:9, 1628:11, 1632:12 1623:15 1581:7, 1581	
1592:11 1544:22, 1546:1, significantly - span - 1627:20 1596:4, 1598	
roll - 1551:15 1548:4, 1549:1, 1633:15 speaking - 1609:4 1598:20, 159	
roll-out - 1551:15 1554:24, silver - 1618:22 Special - 1543:10, 1616:9	0.27,
Room- 1535:12 1555:15, 1557:8, similar - 1544:25, 1556:21, 1560:11, statements	: -
roughly - 1567:2 1560:18, 1568:11, 1591:20, 1634:6 1560:14, 1560:20, 1538:21, 158	
royalty - 1618:4, 1572:18, 1574:24, simply - 1580:15, 1560:24, 1561:12, 1588:24, 159	
1620.15 1575.7, 1576.7, 1605.1 1561.16, 1591.17, 1601.24, 1591.17	0.20,
rule - 1580:2, 1576:11, 1576:13, Simultaneous - 1592:8 states - 150	38:18
1580:20, 1637:4 1577:20, 1578:9, 1577:8 special - 1537:25, States - 1537:25	
run - 1551:21 1582:5, 1586:12, site - 1612:5 1538:6, 1539:8, 1534:9, 1582	·3
1000.0, 1000.0, 1000.0, 1000.0, 1000.0, 1000.0	

(202) 354-3249

1587:17, 1588:15,	summary - 1543:20,	task - 1606:6,	third - 1578:5,	Transcript- 1534:8
1613:16, 1615:21,	1544:1, 1567:8	1606:7	1623:25, 1631:11	transcript -
1619:19, 1623:2,	summed - 1568:23	tasked - 1607:18	thousands -	1535:15, 1585:3,
1628:3, 1628:4,	superimpose -	tax - 1566:20,	1616:10, 1626:2	1604:24, 1638:4
1628:5, 1629:15	1609:7	1566:21, 1601:22,	three - 1537:15, 1570:18, 1573:24,	transcription -
Station - 1535:8 status - 1626:20	superimposes - 1611:11	1614:4, 1614:6, 1614:8, 1614:10,	1570.16, 1573.24, 1594:10, 1594:25,	1535:15 transfer - 1559:12
statute - 1592:17,	superintendents -	1614:13, 1614:15,	1604:5, 1624:7	transferred - 1559:7
1592:19	1556:8, 1561:22	1615:10	throughput -	transfers - 1557:25
stay - 1575:2	Supervised -	taxes - 1566:25	1558:9, 1561:3,	transportation -
Stemplewicz -	1555:25	taxing - 1614:8,	1590:18, 1590:23,	1630:8
1535:5	supervised -	1615:5, 1615:6 Taylor - 1534:23,	1590:25, 1604:2, 1633:8	Treasury- 1557:18,
step - 1613:1, 1618:6	1556:4, 1587:20 supported - 1564:6	1625:17	ticket - 1621:16,	1557:21, 1558:3, 1579:13, 1579:16,
still - 1544:5,	supporting -	technique -	1622:6	1579:22, 1579:23
1546:24, 1552:2,	1564:7, 1564:8	1573:11, 1573:13,	tickets - 1621:20	treated - 1627:21
1553:8, 1554:24,	surrogate - 1555:12	1616:22	tie - 1555:3, 1570:5	tree - 1622:7,
1561:14, 1579:17,	surveyors - 1615:4	tedious - 1612:24	timber - 1546:10,	1622:9
1601:6, 1626:12, 1631:3	surveys - 1635:4 suspect - 1570:8,	telephone - 1610:21 temporal - 1598:13	1564:1, 1620:22, 1621:1, 1621:5,	trend - 1625:11 trial - 1559:13,
Stockton - 1534:16,	1573:20, 1623:24	tend - 1630:9	1621:7, 1621:3,	1572:3, 1572:6,
1534:20, 1534:24	suspense - 1555:9,	tens - 1626:2,	1622:11	1572:9, 1572:18,
Stonestreet -	1580:22, 1580:23	1626:19	Timber- 1620:23	1582:10, 1582:12,
1535:11, 1638:3	Sustained - 1574:17	term - 1629:1,	timeliness -	1585:2
stood - 1589:15	sustained - 1595:18	1633:13	1573:19	Trial- 1535:6
stop - 1564:10 story - 1627:1	sworn - 1603:9, 1603:11	terminates - 1611:3 terminology -	timers - 1613:12 title - 1550:4,	Tribal - 1558:5, 1560:12, 1560:24,
straight - 1633:1	system - 1542:25,	1610:10, 1613:2	1598:13, 1636:8	1562:2, 1562:6,
strategic - 1538:7,	1546:6, 1546:13,	terms - 1537:25,	today - 1553:12,	1563:3, 1564:19,
1543:9, 1543:16,	1546:19, 1546:25,	1538:2, 1539:2,	1583:20, 1586:9,	1564:22, 1565:1,
1552:14, 1554:8,	1547:2, 1548:15,	1539:5, 1567:21,	1587:8, 1587:9,	1565:3, 1621:14,
1557:17, 1561:20, 1565:19, 1566:9,	1549:16, 1550:6, 1550:14, 1551:13,	1578:25, 1579:25, 1585:23, 1586:24,	1588:7, 1595:25, 1611:24	1631:17 tribally - 1621:22
1566:14, 1591:18	1551:20, 1552:12,	1588:10, 1589:16,	together - 1543:14,	tribe - 1561:9
Street - 1534:12,	1552:16, 1552:17,	1591:1, 1591:18,	1543:15	tried - 1567:5,
1534:16, 1534:20,	1553:7, 1554:14,	1592:19, 1593:3,	tomàto - 1567:25	1630:18, 1634:7
1534:24, 1535:3	1559:1, 1559:6,	1593:7, 1593:18,	tomãto - 1567:25	trips - 1552:18
strict - 1569:6,	1559:7, 1559:12,	1595:20, 1595:22,	tons - 1620:13	trucks - 1611:21,
1573:8 structure - 1541:25	1559:14, 1559:15, 1559:16, 1559:18,	1596:2, 1598:19, 1598:21, 1601:1,	took - 1558:19, 1562:12, 1568:2,	1621:17 true - 1580:13,
structured - 1601:6	1559:20, 1559:23,	1601:5, 1617:15,	1568:16, 1570:21,	1624:20, 1624:21
studies - 1561:3,	1559:25, 1561:14,	1617:22, 1618:1,	1586:9, 1590:8,	truly - 1623:25
1590:17, 1636:17	1561:17, 1563:24,	1620:19	1624:13, 1633:21	Trust- 1538:7,
study - 1558:9,	1579:11, 1579:12,	testified - 1539:15,	tooth - 1625:9,	1538:11, 1539:11,
1630:17 subdivide - 1608:5	1579:15, 1579:18, 1601:6, 1601:17,	1550:25, 1587:8, 1597:24, 1598:3,	1625:10, 1625:14, 1625:20	1539:12, 1539:17, 1539:21, 1539:25,
subject - 1568:21,	1610:5, 1610:24,	1603:12, 1622:21,	top - 1538:17,	1540:5, 1540:12,
1605:7	1626:3, 1626:5,	1633:12	1540:16, 1543:23,	1540:13, 1542:16,
subjects - 1570:10,	1627:3	testifying - 1595:6	1544:25, 1547:23,	1542:17, 1542:24,
1574:6	System - 1546:14,	testimony -	1555:24, 1560:9,	1543:16, 1543:17,
subsequent - 1554:16, 1558:8,	1550:8 system's - 1550:19	1553:23, 1554:9, 1557:14, 1568:18,	1571:1, 1585:24, 1613:2, 1613:5	1544:14, 1545:11, 1545:14, 1545:16,
1558:20	system-wide -	1583:12, 1584:20,	topic - 1574:7	1545:20, 1545:22,
Subsequent -	1551:20	1584:22, 1584:24,	total - 1550:3,	1546:12, 1546:13,
1539:18	Systems - 1609:17,	1585:1, 1589:13,	1558:17, 1574:1,	1547:9, 1547:10,
subset - 1615:24,	1609:21, 1610:1,	1591:20, 1592:1,	1617:14, 1625:2,	1547:15, 1548:2, 1540:7, 1540:10
1616:2 subsidiary - 1559:2	1612:12, 1616:2, 1636:23	1593:15, 1597:6, 1602:18, 1604:21,	1626:21, 1634:22 totally - 1616:1,	1549:7, 1549:10, 1549:18, 1549:19,
Substantially -	systems - 1537:15,	1605:10	1628:7	1549:22, 1550:1,
1548:11, 1592:16	1537:21, 1538:8,	Texas- 1617:22,	Touche- 1574:23,	1550:16, 1551:6,
suffered - 1548:15	1543:1, 1543:16,	1617:25	1575:24, 1577:6,	1551:12, 1553:1,
sufficient - 1555:14,	1543:17, 1545:11,	Tfas - 1546:13,	1588:9, 1588:14,	1554:11, 1555:4,
1564:6, 1581:10 sufficiently -	1548:14, 1551:6, 1551:11, 1552:20,	1546:19, 1558:10, 1559:1, 1559:3,	1588:21 Touche's - 1588:23	1556:13, 1556:14, 1556:22, 1562:6,
1545:13, 1556:9	1552:22, 1557:22,	1559:16, 1591:3	toward - 1537:11.	1563:3, 1563:4,
suggest - 1569:14	1561:15, 1562:25,	themselves -	1538:17, 1545:5,	1564:19, 1565:1,
suggested -	1567:22, 1591:8,	1619:4	1577:17, 1599:9	1565:21, 1569:12,
1556:20, 1573:12,	1601:4, 1601:5	theoretically -	trace - 1546:25	1583:16, 1592:17,
1597:6 suggesting -	т	1569:6 theory - 1607:21,	tracking - 1551:11 tract - 1636:8	1592:19, 1592:24, 1593:2, 1593:7,
1572:5	T	1616:1	transaction -	1606:9, 1608:2,
suggestion -	table - 1540:16,	Thereabouts-	1600:7	1631:20
1597:3	1602:22	1586:2	transactions -	trust - 1550:14,
Suite - 1534:17,	tale - 1627:11	thereabouts -	1545:16, 1545:20,	1550:18, 1559:7,
1534:21 sulfur - 1617:23	talks - 1543:8, 1543:20, 1547:24,	1591:21 Therefore- 1547:6	1551:18, 1556:14, 1594:2	1560:4, 1560:23, 1561:10, 1561:13,
sum - 1616:21,	1549:3, 1551:3,	they've - 1548:1,	Transactions-	1567:14, 1569:4,
1629:20	1555:25, 1557:6,	1558:4, 1558:7,	1548:2	1570:21, 1573:10,
summarize -	1570:20, 1574:21,	1574:2, 1593:23,	transcontinental -	1574:10, 1579:5,
1542:3, 1603:20	1600:10	1636:10	1628:13	1579:14, 1585:21,

(202) 354-3249

1587:15, 1587:23, 1588:5, 1589:16. 1593:10, 1596:2, 1608:6, 1626:12 Trust-related-1545:11 **Trustee**- 1543:10, 1556:21, 1591:17, 1592.9 trustee - 1537:25. 1538:6, 1539:8, 1540:19, 1542:14, 1544:6, 1545:1, 1547:10, 1549:4, 1549:9, 1551:5, 1552:9, 1553:16, 1553:19, 1555:5, 1555:7, 1555:19, 1556:6, 1556:9, 1556:19, 1557:4, 1560:22, 1562:1, 1562:11, 1566:24 1567:16, 1568:6, 1569:2, 1569:19, 1574:11, 1574:12, 1578:7, 1578:15, 1578:20, 1579:3, 1581:12. 1583:4 1590:10, 1592:11, 1592:22, 1599:23 trustee's - 1578:12 trustees - 1571:9, 1576:17 trusts - 1592:14, 1593:8 Trusts- 1592:15 **try** - 1601:14, 1614:25 **trying** - 1575:16, 1584:15, 1601:24, 1607:20, 1608:12, 1609:10, 1622:23, 1626:5 Tuesday- 1534:4 tune - 1558:10 turn - 1633:10, 1633:17 turned - 1620:21 turns - 1629:12, 1630:11, 1630:24 **two** - 1540:8, 1544:24, 1558:16, 1570:18, 1578:5, 1594:25, 1595:1, 1596:9, 1604:17, 1617:24, 1624:9, 1624:10, 1625:1 1632:21, 1632:25, 1633:17, 1634:8 type - 1561:7 1613:18, 1614:16, 1617:5, 1618:18, 1620:10, 1624:14 types - 1565:8, 1622:17, 1624:5, 1624:9 typical - 1620:15 typically - 1614:4 typify - 1634:6, 1634:8

Ultimately - 1613:7 ultimately - 1606:6, 1625:3, 1629:8 un-fact - 1596:5 unable - 1547:2, 1622:19, 1628:23 unavailable

1607:12 unbiased - 1586:9, 1616:1 under - 1537:15, 1548:12, 1550:3, 1554:21, 1555:8, 1557:11, 1563:7, 1592:9, 1601:22 Under - 1598:13 underground -1614:19, 1614:20 underneath -1571:5 understood -1568:18 undertake -1549:11 undertaken -1565:14, 1583:22 undocumented -Unfortunately uniformly - 1551:21 unique - 1571:15, 1592:11, 1592:13, 1593:2, 1616:22, 1630:5 unit - 1620:14 United - 1534:1, 1534:9, 1582:3, 1587:17, 1588:15, 1613:16, 1615:21, 1619:19, 1623:2, 1628:3, 1628:4, 1628:5, 1629:15 units - 1616:10, 1618:3, 1620:12 universal - 1616:1, 1620:24, 1622:18, 1622:19, 1628:16 universe - 1608:5, 619:18, 1629:21 University - 1621:2 unk - 1629:2 unk-unk - 1629:2 Unknown - 1566:18, unknown - 1560:8, 1629.2 unknowns - 1629:2 Unkunk - 1629:2 unproven - 1580:22 unquote - 1623:17 unreliability -1607:4 unreliable -1537:22, 1543:1, 1607:9 unresolved -1545:17 Unresolved unsupported -1564:23 untimely - 1551:18 Up - 1546:23 up - 1537:12, 1540:17, 1541:18, 1546:4, 1546:21, 1547:23, 1550:23, 1551:8, 1551:16, 1555:11, 1557:1, 1564:4, 1568:23,

1568:25, 1571:4, 1572:2. 1572:19.

1582:19, 1584:3,

1591:12, 1593:13, 1594:8, 1594:12,

1596:8, 1596:9

1597:18, 1598:2, 1602:24, 1605:22, 1609:6, 1610:20, 1610:22, 1611:20, 1612:5, 1616:12, 1624:6, 1624:9, 1626:6, 1627:23 1629:14, 1636:21 update - 1606:14, 1606:16, 1606:21 uranium - 1618:24 useful - 1603:21 users - 1610:13 uses - 1630:5 Usgs - 1619:15 usurp - 1630:8 utility - 1611:9, 1611:12, 1628:4

validate - 1579:3. 1579:4, 1579:5, 1596:24, 1597:4, 1597.5 validation -1590:16, 1590:24 valuable - 1619:24, valuation - 1569:3, valuations -1547:12 value - 1594:1, 1622:5, 1625:15, 1628:20, 1632:14, 1632:17 values - 1581:17, variables - 1617:24 variety - 1548:15 various - 1542:5, 1549:5, 1549:24, 1552:18, 1561:21, 1612:1, 1618:17, 1626.21 vast - 1620:5 1623:24, 1624:1 verification -1541.1 verify - 1547:5, 1565:11, 1573:9, 1579:3. 1579:4. 1579:5, 1601:4 vernacular -1632:25 vest - 1557:23 viable - 1576:3, 1576:21, 1620:3, 1620:6, 1620:7 vice - 1602:13 view - 1550:7, 1569:7, 1573:12, 1581:18, 1586:9, 1586:10 viewed - 1608:16 virtue - 1631:9, 1632:23 voir - 1604:19 volume - 1611:18, 1611:19, 1622:5, 1622:6, 1634:19 volumes - 1630:6 voluntarily -1615:16

W walk - 1553:5 War - 1569:2

Warshawsky -1535:1, 1604:16, 1605:16, 1635:18, 1637:1 Washington -1534:4, 1534:13, 1534:21, 1535:4, 1535:9, 1535:13 waste - 1605:5 watch - 1554:21, 1554:22 water - 1602:14, 1630:20, 1630:22, 1631:4, 1631:6, 1631:7, 1631:9, 1631:10 waves - 1631:16 ways - 1600:5, 1627:25, 1628:9 weaknesses -1537:16, 1537:18, 1537:20, 1538:4,

1538:18, 1542:1, 1542:6, 1542:10, 1548:16. 1556:13 website - 1612:14, 1623:1 well's - 1618:2 wells - 1612:2, 1612:8, 1613:24, 1615:2, 1615:22, 1616:6, 1616:8, 1635.6 West - 1534:24

1617:22, 1617:25 west - 1630:23 western - 1615:21 Whereabouts -1566:18, 1567:4 whole - 1551:7 wide - 1551:20 William - 1534:15 winnowed - 1620:5 Winston - 1534:25

Winston-salem -Winters - 1631:1, 1631:2 wishes - 1565:9 **Witness** - 1536:2, 1542:12, 1546:7, 1548:24, 1550:9, 1552:5. 1552:13. 1553:14, 1553:25,

1554:7, 1554:19, 1556:2, 1558:18, 1560:17, 1566:8, 1566:23, 1568:1, 1568:23, 1568:25, 1570:25, 1571:3, 1571:14, 1572:13, 1576:1, 1576:21, 1577:3, 1580:15, 1602:9, 1607:2, 1608:14, 1608:19, 1609:21, 1623:15, 1634:3, 1636:6 witness - 1545:24, 1546:1, 1568:22, 1572:14, 1585:14, 1595:21, 1596:3, 1599:13, 1602:4, 1602:15, 1602:21, 1603:9, 1603:11,

1637:4 witness' - 1568:13, 1577:10, 1635:19 wood - 1621:14, words - 1547:25

1568:24, 1607:23, 1629:14, 1632:13 World - 1569:23 worst - 1567:19 wrote - 1589:12

year - 1544:5. 1544:21, 1549:13, 1550:14, 1554:22, 1558:11, 1559:10, 1560:10, 1568:3, 1568:17, 1617:1, 1617:4, 1617:9, 1622:9, 1623:7, 1625:1, 1625:5, 1626:13, 1627:19, 1632:14 year's - 1561:5 yearly - 1616:12 years - 1537:10, 539:4, 1544:10, 1554:15, 1554:18, 1555:1, 1555:9, 1569:11, 1573:24, 1573:25, 1581:2, 1587:21, 1591:8, 1591:15, 1606:19, 1610:17, 1613:12, 1616:24, 1617:11, 1617:13, 1623:9, 1623:13, 1630:12, 1632:22 years' - 1567:19 yesterday -1538:13, 1538:23, 1539:4, 1539:15, 1553:12, 1561:24, 1565:12, 1583:2 Yesterday - 1537:7, 1561:25 yield - 1563:13, 1563:17, 1573:14 yourself - 1542:11, 1553:13, 1570:23, 1609:2, 1622:16, 1634:2, 1636:5

Ζ

zero - 1556:24 1632:16, 1632:17 zinc - 1618:23 **zoom** - 1585:14, 1594:13, 1598:8, 1599:12, 1600:2, 1633:18, 1636:2

Rebecca Stonestreet

(202) 354-3249

kingreporter2@verizon.net