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## THE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS' RESPONSE TO THE DEBTOR'S MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE ADMISSIBILITY OF TESTIMONY REGARDING FINANCIAL FORECASTS AND OTHER LAY WITNESS TESTIMONY

The Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit ("PFRS") and the General Retirement System of the City of Detroit ("GRS") (collectively, the "Retirement Systems"), through their counsel, Clark Hill PLC, respond to the Debtor's Memorandum Regarding Admissibility of Testimony Regarding the City's Financial Projections, [Dkt. No. 1352], as follows:

1. On October 23, 2013, the Court sustained objections by counsel for the Objecting Parties based on Fed. R. Evid. 701(c) and excluded from evidence as improper lay opinion the testimony City of Detroit (the "City") witness Gaurav Malhotra regarding forecasts of future expected cash flows of the City. (See Exhibit A, Rough Hr'g Tr. 10/23/2013 at 203:19 to 208:9, 213:13 to 214:22, $228: 3-15,241: 15$ to $242: 6,244: 5-12,257: 10$ to $258: 25,263: 4-20,269: 19$ to 272:15).
2. On October 24, 2013, Kenneth Buckfire testified on several subjects for which he has not been qualified as an expert, including: a 10-year financial forecast (over objection, see Exhibit B, Rough Hr'g Tr. 10/24/2013 at 121:10-25); estimated unfunded pension liability (over objection, 122:24 to 124:7); a draft actuarial valuation report ( $127: 14$ to $131: 25$ ); the aviation industry ( $218: 12$ to 219:1); lease agreements regarding international border crossings (Windsor Tunnel, 219:4-16); real property values, municipal zoning, and land use planning (Belle Isle Park, p. 219:19 to 220:2); real property values, blight, and liens (222:222); the bond market (224:4-25), municipal parking operations (222:24 to 223:9), municipal entertainment and sports arenas (Joe Louis Area, 223:11-13).
3. Neither Mr. Malhotra nor Mr. Buckfire has been identified by the City as an expert witness in these proceedings pursuant to the Court's August 2, 2013 Order [Dkt. No. 280] or qualified as an expert on any subject area pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 702.
4. Before proceedings continued on October 24, the City filed a memorandum which asserts that Mr. Malhotra should be allowed to provide certain testimony (the "Memorandum") [Dkt. No. 1352] related to cash flow forecasts and financial projections. In its Memorandum, the City asserts that Mr. Malhotra should be allowed to testify regarding future cash flow projections on the basis of "particularized knowledge" of the City's finances based on two engagements by
his firm, Ernst \& Young, over a two-year period to "help sort through" the City's finances. [Dkt. No. 1352 at 5].
5. At the conclusion of the hearing on October 23, the Court indicated that it would consider authority that indicates that an analysis and development of a forecast does not involve expertise. (Ex. A, Rough Hr'g Tr. 10/23/2013 at 272:1215).
6. The authority offered by the City in the Memorandum fails to support the City's position, or supports the Court's decision to exclude Mr. Malhotra's testimony on future financial projections.
7. Fed. R. Evid. 701 was amended in the year 2000 to add subsection 701(c), which provides that a lay witness may only testify as to "opinions or inferences which are . . . (c) not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of Rule 702." JGR, Inc. v. Thomasville Furniture Indus., 370 F.3d 519, 525 (6th Cir. 2004) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 701).
8. According to the Advisory Committee Notes for the 2000 Amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence,
[m]ost courts have permitted the owner or officer of a business to testify to the value or projected profits of the business, without the necessity of qualifying the witness as an accountant, appraiser, or similar expert. Such opinion testimony is admitted not because of experience, training or specialized knowledge within the realm of an expert, but because of the particularized knowledge that the witness has by
virtue of his or her position in the business. The amendment does not purport to change this analysis.
$J G R$, Inc., 370 F.3d at 525 (quoting Advisory Committee Notes to 2000 Amendments) (emphasis added by reviewing court). However, "generic industry experience does not pass Rule 702 scrutiny." DIJO, Inc. v. Hilton Hotels Corp., 351 F.3d 679, 686 (5th Cir. 2003). "[A] lay witness who was never employed by or directly involved in a business is unlikely to have the type of first-hand knowledge necessary to provide reliable forecasts of future lost profits. The further removed a lay man is from a company's day-to-day operations, the less likely it is that his opinion testimony will be admissible under Rule 701." Id at 686.
9. The year 2000 Amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence served "to eliminate the risk that the reliability requirements set forth in Rule 702 will be evaded through the simple expedient of proffering an expert in lay witness clothing." Id. (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 701, Advisory Committee Notes for 2000 Amendments).
10. This final foundational requirement "prevents a party from conflating expert and lay opinion testimony thereby conferring an aura of expertise on a witness without satisfying the reliability standard for expert testimony set forth in

Rule 702 and the pre-trial disclosure requirements set forth in . . . Fed. R. Civ. P.
26." ${ }^{1}$ United States v. Garcia, 413 F.3d 201, 215 (2d Cir. 2005).
11. Authority offered by the City is unhelpful, distinguishable, or inapplicable to the City's position.
12. For example, in United States v. Madison, 226 Fed. Appx. 535, 544
(6th Cir. 2006), Memorandum at 7, a lay witness used "simple arithmetic" that was "within the capacity of any reasonable lay person" to make his conclusion, and did not provide forecasts/predictive testimony. Mr. Malhotra's cash flow projections no doubt exceed "the capacity of any reasonable lay person." See also LifeWise Master Funding v. Telebank, 374 F.3d 917, 929 ("person may testify as a lay
${ }^{1}$ Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2), "a party must disclose to the other parties the identity of any witness it may use at trial to present evidence under Federal Rule of Evidence 702, 703, or 705." In addition, "this disclosure must be accompanied by a written report..." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B). This written report must contain the witnesses' opinions, the data used to form those opinions, exhibits that will be used to summarize those opinions, the witness' qualifications, a list of cases where the witness testified in the past four years, and disclosure of any compensation paid to the expert. Fed. R. Civ. P. 265(a)(2)(B)(i)-(vi). Importantly, a "party must make these disclosures at the times and in the sequence that the court orders." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(C) (emphasis added).

Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 37(c) mandates sanctions for failing to timely disclose or supplement an earlier disclosure. Once a violation of Rule 26 is found, sanctions under Rule 37(c) are mandatory. "Rule 37 authorizes -- indeed, directs -exclusion of the witness as a sanction for a Rule 26 violation." Smith v. Botsford Gen. Hosp., 419 F.3d 513, 517 (6th Cir. 2005); see also Matilla v. S. Ky. Rural Elec. Coop. Corp., 240 Fed. Appx. 35, 43 (6th Cir. 2007) (noting the mandatory nature of sanctions under Rule 37 for violations of Rule 26 with respect to expert disclosures); Pride v. BIC Corp., 218 F.3d 566, 578-79 (6th Cir. 2000) (upholding the exclusion of untimely expert-witness reports and affidavits).
witness only if his opinions or inferences do not require any specialized knowledge and could be reached by any ordinary person"). Indeed, given the complexity of the City's financial situation, it is likely that not many experts, much less an ordinary person, could comprehend, analyze and explain the City's cash flow forecasts.
13. Another case offered by the City included a future projection, but it was by a witness with personal knowledge of her own lost future earnings. Donlin v. Phillips Lighting N. Am. Corp., 581 F.3d 73, 80-81 (3rd Cir. 2009) (testimony plaintiff-former employee in employment discrimination suit had personal knowledge of the damages she suffered in lost future earnings and pension benefits).
14. In two cases offered by the City, the lay witness testimony was improper or excluded. See JGR, Inc. at 526 (6th Cir. 2004) (held that the district court abused its discretion by allowing lay witness testimony on lost profits where the witness was not an owner, director, officer of the company and did not independently verify information on which he based his opinion); DIJO, Inc. v., 351 F.3d at 686 (financial consultant's opinion was excluded from record because he did not have the "requisite first-hand, personal knowledge about DIJO," was never qualified as an expert witness, and "a lay witness who was never employed
by or directly involved in a business is unlikely to have the type of first-hand knowledge necessary to provide reliable forecasts of future lost profits").
15. In the cases offered by the City where lay witness opinion was admitted, the witness either did not offer testimony about future projections and/or held an internal position with the entity in question and was thereby intimately familiar with the entity. Latifiver Liquidating Trust v. Clear Channel Comm., Inc., 345 F. Appx. 46, 50 (6th Cir. 2009) (lay testimony admitted under 701(c) because damages testimony on diminished value of a company was given by a company board member and major investor); Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Group, Ltd., 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58331 at *6 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 24, 2013) (lay witness testimony on economic prejudice admitted because testimony given by CEO); In re LTV Steel Co., 285 B.R. 259, 263-64 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio 2012) (lay witness testimony on environmental liabilities given by officer of the company); United States v. Hamaker, 455 F.3d 1316, 1331-32 (11th Cir. 2006) (lay witness testimony regarding a summary of past business records was admitted because the witness "simply added and subtracted numbers").
16. Finally, two of the cases relied upon by the City were decided before the 2000 Amendment to Rule 701, rendering them simply unhelpful. ${ }^{2}$

[^0]17. The City offers Tampa Bay Shipbuilding \& Repair Co. v. Cedar Shipping Co., 320 F.3d 1213, 1223 (11th Cir. 2002), a case where lay opinion testimony was provided regarding the prices for repairing a ship by a consultant who had worked for the company in question on cost estimates, bid price review, and contract administration. The Court in that case made no distinction regarding 'consultant' vs. employee/officer, referring to all of the witnesses as the "employees and/or officers." Id. at 1223.
18. The objection regarding Mr. Malhotra's improper lay testimony should be sustained because that testimony was properly excluded and prevents Mr. Malhotra from serving as an expert witness in lay clothing. It may be that Mr. Malhotra has specialized knowledge based on his experience, training, and education to qualify as an expert regarding any number of topics, but the City has not offered him as one in this matter. ${ }^{3}$ However, to allow Mr. Malhotra to testify as a lay witness about projections of the City's future cash flows that he prepared with his years of training and experience, rather than just historical data he has collected about City finances, would be inconsistent with the language and policy behind Fed. R. Evid. 701(c). Mr. Malhotra's cash flow projections could not be
2002) (District Court was interpreting Rule 701 before 2000 Amendment went into effect and testimony was given by company officer ).
${ }^{3}$ Mr. Malhotra testified as to his status as a Certified Financial Analyst, in addition to his M.B.A. in finance [sic] in business policy from Case Western University, and 13 years of experience in the restructuring field. (Ex. A, Rough Hr'g Tr. at 194:9-24).
reproduced by a reasonable lay person lacking his training and experience, and he lacks "particularized knowledge" regarding the City from an internal and experienced perspective sufficient to liken his experience with that of an owner or an officer of a business.
19. The same logic applies to testimony by Kenneth Buckfire, whose testimony on October 24, 2013, varyingly delved into areas of improper lay testimony. Mr. Buckfire's opinions on topics ranging from the aviation industry to a 10-year financial forecast exceed the bounds of lay opinion testimony set forth in Rule 701.
20. "Lay opinion testimony is admissible only to help the jury or the court to understand the facts about which the witness is testifying and not to provide specialized explanations or interpretations that an untrained layman could not make if perceiving the same acts or events." United States v. Peoples, 250 F.3d 630, 641 (8th Cir. 2001) (emphasis added).
21. The purpose behind lay opinion testimony as explained by the Peoples court directly contradicts the counsel for the City's explanation that Mr. Buckfire is "a man of rare experience . . . telling his story . . . [as] . . . a witness of rare gifts." (Ex. B, Rough Hr'g Tr. 234:14 to 235:9). For example, Mr. Buckfire explained that his partner told him about the aviation industry (218:23-25), plainly relying on hearsay on subjects about which he lacks personal knowledge to provide
an expert opinion. This, and the examples noted above, are improper lay testimony by Mr. Buckfire, and all instances of it should be stricken from the record.
22. For the foregoing reasons, the Retirement Systems respectfully request that the Court sustain the objections lodged as to improper lay opinion proffered in violation of Rule 701.

Respectfully submitted,
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COURT CLERK: Case number 1353846, City of Detroit, Michigan.

THE COURT: Good morning. We have an attorney to admit to the bar of the court, Miguel Eaton.

IHE COURI: And we should go ahead and have appearances entered, please

MR. IRWIN: Good morning, Your Honor, Geoff Erwin, Jones Day, on behalf of the City.

MR. STEWART: Geoffrey Stewart, Jones Day, also on behalf of the City, Your Honor

MS. LEVINE: Good morning, Your Honor Sharon Levine. And if I can introduce to the Court, my partner, Jack Sherwood, Lowenstein Sandler, for AFSCME. Thank you.

THE COURT: Welcome, sir.
MR. MONTGOMERY: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Claude Montgomery, Dentons West, for he retireement committee. And with me in th courtroom today with possible speaking roles are Anthony Ullman, a partner at Dentons and Arthur

Ruegger back there. Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Good morning, Your Honor Matthew Schneider, chief legal counsel, Michigan Department of the Attorney General on behalf of the State of Michigan. And with me is Steven Howell, special assistant, Attorney General.

MS. CECCOTTI: Good morning, Your Honor. Babette Ceccotti, Cohen, Weiss \& Simon, LLP, for the UAW. I would also like to introduce my partners, Tom Ciantra, sitting here at counsel table, Peter Dechiara over in the corner, both of whom will be speaking retiree predominantly at the trial.

THE COURT: Thank you
MR. WERTHEIMER: William Wertheimer, Your
Honor, on behalf of the Flowers plaintiffs
MS. GREEN: Good morning. Jennifer Green, on behalf of the General Police and Fire Retirement Systems. And I have with my colleagues Ron King and Bob Gordon.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MS. GREEN: Ronald King and Bob Gordon
THE COURT: Mr. King. Okay.
MR. MORRIS: Good morning, Your Honor
Thomas Morris of Morris \& Silverman on behalf of
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the Retiree Association Parties. Also her
representing those parties is Ryan Plecha of Lippitt O'Keefe.

MS. PADDOCK: Good morning, Your Honor
Barbara Patek of Erman, Teicher, Miller \& Friedman,
on behalf of the Detroit Public Safety Unions. And
with me this morning are Julie Tisher and David Eisenberg.

MS. BRIMER: Good morning, Your Honor
Lynn M. Brimer, appearing on behalf of the Retired Police Officers Association. Also with me this morning is trial counsel, Meredith Taunt, and Mallory Field, from the firm of Stroebel \& Sharp, PC.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BENNETT: Bruce Bennett of Jones Day on behalf of the City, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay then. In terms of our order of proceeding this morning, I would first ike to deal with the motion in limine and then the three remaining discovery motions, then the joint final pre-trial order and then we will begin the rial. Is that order of proceeding okay with everyone? Okay. Actually, first, dealing with the motion in limine, I'm going to waive further oral
argument on that and rely on your papers and conclude as I suggested I might the other day the court must conclude that it is challenging if not difficult if not impossible to resolve this motion before trial and before Mr. Moore is actually testifying. Before the Court can determine the add admissibility of his proffered testimony, the Court must have before it the question that the proponent of the witness asks of him.

So under the circumstances, I will deny the motion, but without prejudice, of course, to the right of any party to object to any of Mr. Moore's testimony on any a appropriate ground. So let's turn our attention then to the three discovery motions. Who will argue those. MR. CIANTRA: I will start off, Your Honor. Thomas Ciantra, Cohen, Weiss \& Simon for the UAW.

THE COURT: All right, sir
MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, first I want to thank the Court for its indulgence. Obviously we have been under a lot of strain and effort to complete discovery in this matter so that the trial can take place on an expedited basis and we appreciate the Court's hearing these issues on an
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expedited basis. I'm not going to go over the papers extensively. The Court has seen the issues and I'm sure has read the papers, but I will make a presentation and its going to be divided basically chronologically. First part I want to discuss are documents and testimony concerning matters which ant he date the retention of Jones Day or the emergency manager's retention, and then the second part of the argument deals with matters that come after that point in time, and that are really taken up with with our request that the Court revisit the issues that it ruled upon back in September.

So let me begin then with the first part, the matters that antedate Jones Day retention. And the issue has been crystalized by the position that counsel for the City took in the October 15 th email that is attached as Exhibit 6D to the UAW's motion papers with respect to the City. And what it involves are a series of memoranda that Jones Day prepared in 2012, approximately at least a year before the firm was retained to represent the City in this matter, and these emails -- these memoranda are referenced in an email that discusses a meeting between partner Jones Day that had been scheduled with governor Snyder for June 5th, I believe, of
2012. And they're very specific emails, Your Honor. They're identified there and they go to obviously issues that are at the heart of UAW and other objectors issues that they would raise here, the constitutional protection of the retirees pensions being the most salient.

And obviously we are seeking production of those documents as well as anything else that may be being withheld that antedates the retention of Jones Day.

Now the City has sort of taken a selective approach with respect to these types of materials. Obviously Jones Day spent a lot of time and a lot of effort to get itself in a position to impress the state and get hired to represent the City in connection with this case. There's a very detailed pitch book that we have marked as an exhibit that will be discussed throughout this proceeding. They have pro dude that, they have withheld these emails. These memoranda that are attached to the email. And the principal basis for that decision at this point is the work product doctrine. They have withdrawn attorney-client privilege, they weren't retained by the state at any point, and now they are focusing on work
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## product.

And of course going back to first principles, the work product doctrine as it developed is intended to preserve a party's lawyers work on developing the theories and facts of a case. I mean, this is Hickman v Taylor, the classic example of an attorney who was interviewing witnesses to an accident to assist his clients defense of that case. That's not what's involved here. Of course, Jones Day wasn't retained at this date at any point and they weren't retained by the City --

THE COURT: What do you contend was the relevance or would be the relevance of these memoranda in this eligibility trial?

MR. CIANTRA: I think, Your Honor, it gets to the central question of what were the motivations and intent of the decision makers here. We know from discovery and it's going to be crystal clear that the governor and the state were well aware of the constitutional protections that apply to retiree pensions. They knew that, they were well aware of what the position was with respect to the creditor proposal that the emergency manager made in June. The following was authorized without
any conditions. We all know that. These memos, we believe, will get beyond that, get into the question of the specifics of knowledge, the specifics of the intent of the parties to do that. And that's why we're looking --

THE COURT: Doesn't that statement of relevance prove more conclusively perhaps than the City could even on its own that these memoranda are prepared in anticipation of litigation.

MR. CIANTRA: They weren't, Your Honor They were prepared more than a year in advance of any litigation. And by a firm that was not representing anyone. These were like the pitch book. They were prepared to market. To develop theories and to market services. There's no case law that they cite that would support the assertion of work product privilege for documents that are prepared in this context. They have selectively produced the pitch book. It's the same type of material.

So for them at this point to demand work product protection with respect to this, we think is just base less. I mean, this is not a case where maybe the memo is prepared, the client comes in to meet with the attorney and reveals

MR. CIANTRA: To prove what these people knew and what they were intend together do? THE COURT: Regarding what though. MR. CIANTRA: We think it would be relevant to assess the conduct that we know occurred in 2013.

THE COURT: Which was to file this Chapter 9 case.

MR. CIANTRA: Which was to authorize the filing in the face of the constitutional protections for the pension benefits.

THE COURT: Okay. But doesn't that establish that these memoranda were in anticipation of litigation.

MR. CIANTRA: It can't, Your Honor, because of the simple distance in time. They have not provided any indication that the memoranda were demanded by the state, that there was any retention at that point in time. It's an effort like the pitch book, which is a very detailed document, to get work. They spent a thousand hours to get work That's what law firms do and that's what's involved here. Since we don't have the memos, we have the titles of the memos that are revealed in the email. We don't have them. I can't argue the specific
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relevance of the content. I would.
THE COURT: Do you have any case law that specifically says that pre-retention work by a lawyer cannot be the subject of the work product privilege.

MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, to be honest with you, we have done the research. I haven't been able to find a case that is recognized work product in this instance. The text of the rule talks.

THE COURT: But you haven't found any that specifically key nice it either, huh?

MR. CIANTRA: But the purpose of work product and the wording of Rule 26 contemplates a representation. It contemplates that the lawyer is working for a client, developing facts, developing theories. It does not contemplate a relationship between parties who never consummated a attorney-client relationship. Of course, Jones Day is not working for the State of Michigan here. That's who these discussions were with. It wasn't with the City of Detroit. It was with the State of Michigan. But as I said, Your Honor, we haven't had access to the memos, I.

THE COURT: We know, don't we, that as a
here. This is something that happened a year before between parties that never had an attorney-client relationship. As I said, Your Honor, we haven't looked at the memos. I don't know what's in them. I would suggest and we would request that the court consider in camera review of the documents.

THE COURT: I think you said six memoranda that are the subject of this dispute.

MR. CIANTRA: At this point, that's what it's boiled down to, Your Honor, but we feel that we're entitled to a decision with respect to this that would -- if there's anything else out there that we're not aware of and frankly, Your Honor, there's been a lot of documents that have been produced in a very exigent period of time, we would like --

THE COURT: All right. We'll inquire about that.

MR. CIANTRA: Okay. Let me turn to the second point. And this concerns the issue that was litigated back in September, September 19th, on the joint --

THE COURT: On that one, you need you to begin a response to the City's assertion that this
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motion is late, untimely. MR. CIANTRA: It is late, Your Honor. It is late.
THE COURT: So why should it be
considered?
MR. CIANTRA: I think it should be considered because of the particular facts and circumstances that are involved here. We -- back in September as this issue was framed, and as the Court ruled, it was rather narrowly focused with respect to the question of authorization. It was the hypothetical that the Court developed to support its reasoning.

THE COURT: Right. I recall that.
MR. CIANTRA: What has happened since
then, and this I think is most clearly brought out in the excerpts from Governor Snyder's deposition, that are attached to both of the motions that UAW filed, is that that common interest has moved and morphed well beyond the issue of authorization that was presented in September to basically every element of every material element with respect to the case. The development of the creditors proposal, the discussion of article nine, section 24, and its protections here, consideration to be
provided to creditors under the proposed plan, consideration to be provided to the pensioners under the proposed plan. It has just morphed into essentially a cloak with respect to -- excuse me, very dry -- with respect to all of the deliberations involving the emergency manager and the state.

And while we concede the City is correct
there is an attorney-client privilege that they have, it should be construed narrowly in light of the public interest that's involved here. The emergency manager by law is the governing body of the City of Detroit. He has executive and legislative authority rolled into one. His actions obviously affect the 700,000 residents of the City, and people have a right, we submit, to know what his deliberations are, how policy is being formulated, and it shouldn't be cloaked under a very broad and we would submit legally unsupported construction of the attorney-client privilege. Discovery has been -- has been curtailed and it has put us in a position where now we are facing trial and we have not been able to, because of the extensive theory of privilege, that the state and the City have adhered to, to develop facts fully in

deposition and otherwise.
We would submit that the assertion of the privilege that the governor has made and as revealed in the deposition transcripts that that has been taken throughout the discovery is extensive beyond what was considered in the Court's September 19 th ruling and we would ask the court to respectfully to reconsider it.

Because otherwise, we have secrecy. We have public actors here, Your Honor. The public has to be able to hold political representatives accountable for their actions. They have to know what policy decisions are being made and right now, this privilege ruling has cloaked -- has cloaked that in secrecy.

I don't have anything else, Your Honor,
to state.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. CIANTRA: I don't know if
Mr. Wertheimer has anything he would like to add.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. CIANTRA: Thank you for your
consideration.
MR. WERTHEIMER: William Wertheimer, Your Honor. First, I would like to join in the UAW's
motion vis-a-vis the City. I did formally join on the papers the motion vis-a-vis the state.

I just have two points in addition to what Mr. Ciantra just argued. One relates to the Snyder deposition, which I participated in, and kind of what it revealed about the scope of the privilege arguments now being made and how far we are from the day in Court where you made it a point of indicating to the state that transparency was necessary here.

At the governor's deposition, essentially privilege was invoked as to the entire content of weekly meetings that the governor had with the emergency manager for months as to the entire scope of those meetings. Making it virtually impossible to examine the governor as to any of that. That's point number one. And just one other point, and that is that in the normal case -- let me back up.

Per the agreement the parties made and given the position of the governor, we agreed to limit our discovery deposition to three hours. In the normal case, where privileges are alleged on privilege logs like what we have here, you have an opportunity to go beyond the privilege log and the cursory explanation for why the privilege is being
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invoked by -- at deposition, asking witnesses questions, detailed yes, sir about the particular meeting at which they're claiming a privilege, what the other subjects were, how long the meeting took, did the lawyer do anything at the meeting, et cetera. As to key documents.

We have not had that opportunity here, just given the time -- and no one is at fault for that, it's going too fast, we had three hours with the governor, we did appropriate examinations, but I think in this circumstance that it would make sense for this Court to examine certain of the documents in camera in order to assure that the Court's desire and everybody's desire for transparency is met. I think this is a special case. I don't think.

THE COURT: Are you referring to
documents other than these six memoranda attached to the email?

MR. WERTHEIMER: I am, Your Honor. I'm referring specifically to documents that are in dispute that are in the state's possession.

THE COURT: Can you identify them anymore particularly for me?

MR. WERTHEIMER: We've attempted to
identify them to the state by indicating in logs, documents that covered what we believed to be a key time period was, we've also attempted to limit the request in terms of those in which Mr. Orr and Mr. Snyder were directly involved, but I must admit to the Court, it still involves at least at this point in terms of our back and forth a fairly large number of documents that I would respectfully suggest that the best way to proceed given the fact that the governor is going to be testifying on Monday at trial, the best way to proceed maybe for the Court to get involved in terms of in camera review.

THE COURT: And these are documents which you claim were improperly withheld pursuant to the common interest exception?

MR. WERTHEIMER: Not just common interest, Your Honor, also just documents where they claimed attorney-client. And we're not claiming -- we don't know whether they're improperly withheld, I guess is what I'm trying to say. We're claiming.

THE COURT: You're concerned. Okay.
MR. WERTHEIMER: That we should not have to rely upon the cursory description of counsel
that we should use, and as I recall, there were at least two attempts to limit the documents, one related to time, that is, we said we think that the judge should be able to take an in camera look at documents between key players from date A to date B. and I don't have in front of me exactly what those dates were.

And second, we indicated that the
documents directly between the governor and the emergency manager over a broader period of time should be the subject of in camera review. If there's no time to do anything else, our position would be that the Court should examine those documents in camera.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
MR. WERTHEIMER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: While you're sitting down, I would suggest you try to figure out what those dates are. That would be helpful.

MR. WERTHEIMER: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor, Matthew
Snyder on behalf of the state. Mr. Werthheimer has raised some issues that relate to this and also to the other motion, so in expediency, I can kind of respond to both.
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The first issue here that Mr. Wertheimer or the UAW and Flowers objectors raised relates to a March 12 email and the objection was that it should have opinion produced without redactions.

Now the state disagrees, but we want to
resolve this dispute. And we have produced that any way. So we're not waiving the attorney-client privilege or altering the common interest agreement or anything by doing that, but $I$ wanted to let know at least one issue has been resolved.

Secondly --
THE COURT: When you say has been
resolved, you say you have or are willing to turn over the memos.

MR. SCHNEIDER: We have. Is. This is related to the March 12 email.

THE COURT: March 12.
MR. SCHNEIDER: An email from from
Richard bare to.
THE COURT: 2012.
MR. SCHNEIDER: 2013.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Secondly, there's another
argument that the state hasn't been specific on its
privilege $\log$ and $I$ think that's why this is kind
of bleeding together. Again, the state disagrees, we think the logs are sufficient, but we've advised these anyway and we're giving them to

Mr. Wertheimer. Again, we're not waiving anything but we want to let the Court know that we are working with them and are happy to do so.

But finally, third --
THE COURT: It is a little frustrating
that your log didn't provide any identifying information involving the people involved other than their names.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, we've corrected
that.
THE COURT: Where? How.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, Mr. Wertheimer
asked for additional information, more specific on the privilege log, and I believe we've done that. THE COURT: In the log itself, because we looked at the revised log, at least I did, and all I saw were names. Now it's possible I missed a page where the names were identified, whether attorneys or officers of the state or associated with the emergency manager, $I$ couldn't tell who was who.


MR. SCHNEIDER: My understanding is
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there's more description about what actually is in there, but I will continue to work with Mr. Wertheimer on this so as to not delay.

The third issue here is relating to the common interest agreement and I think that's where the Flowers and UAW objectors are really going here. The state's position ultimately at the end of the day, the state's position is that your order, Your Honor, that you entered on September 19 was corrects and we believe that it was correct then and it's correct today. And the new position that the objectors are raising is essentially that there's no common interest privilege before the filing. This is, as the Court is aware, this has been brought to your attention literally, literally on the eve of trial. There was a deposition in which the Court invited the parties to contact the Court in case there were concerns. They never did that. They never raised a written objection after the deposition. It's beyond the 14 day rule and there's no defect or no error shown, so I think there's a waiver here. And therefore, it should be denied on that ground.

In addition, the common interest
agreement here, as to the argument that the
objectors are trying to find information that antedate the appointment of the emergency manager, if you look at the common interest agreement itself, it states that this isn't just about the appointment of the emergency manager, it states that the parties have a common interest in relation to the City's financial emergency and the bankruptcy case and the emergency manager, so this goes to a lot more than just the chapter nine filing. It goes to the financial emergency and things in connection with the policy issues and the legal discussions related to that. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. IRWIN: Thank you, your. I will
address the motion to compel Jones Day and then the motion for reconsideration.

The request that has been made as it relates to core Jones Day internal research memoranda, it seems to us, is antithetical to the work product privilege and we think the Court's analogy is exactly right. If a client prepares a legal -- if a lawyer prepares a legal memoranda to assist him or her or a team of lawyers in order to deliver legal advice to a potential client, a client or potential client, even before there is an
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attorney-client relationship, that is wholly protected by work product. If it reflects the attorney's mental impressions and it puts him or her in a position where they can deliver appropriate legal advice, and it shouldn't matter if that attorney-client relationship is ultimately consummated or not. It is an inviolable attorney work product that is belongs to the lawyer who prepared it and puts them in a position where they can effectively do their jobs and deliver legal advice.

Now what happened in this particular case, just to put a finer point on it, is I think not the subject of any real debate. Everyone knew that Detroit was in trouble in late 2011 and that there were people working this problem and that included people from the state, it included people from the City, it included numerous advisors and consultants, it involved numerous law firms, and
there were lots of people who wanted to get involved and Jones Day had the opportunity to do just that, and we.

THE COURT: So why doesn't it matter that
the work product was for the state, for the
governor -- state officials, and the ultimate
client wound up being none of those, but the City?
MR. IRWIN: Well, I think it was all part of the same problem. I think the entity that had the problem here was the City and I think the law firms like Jones Day and I think the papers that we submit support that, were hoping and expecting to be retained and engaged by the City, and it's not -- it shouldn't surprise anyone that Jones Day would have been doing legal research in order to put itself in a position to assist the City in that regard, and so it really didn't matter which of the entities was -- not engaging in the sense of an attorney-client representation, but was discussing these matters with Jones Day. Jones Day had to put itself in a position where it was able to represent the City effectively and in order to do that, it had to investigate this entire situation. There was a legal analysis that you would expect to have been done on a number of levels and we have memoranda that came about as a result and if? THE COURT: But what's the foundational basis for the work product privilege that shields otherwise relevant facts from discovery and suggests that that basis should apply to memoranda such as you claim privilege for here.
circumstances in terms of the number of privileges and the nature of privileges that we could assert. What we have done here is we have in fact already released many of the emails that reflect conversations between Jones Day lawyers and the folks in 2012 who were working this problem. This again is before there was any attorney-client relationship with anyone. We've released those and we're not claiming those back. What we're seeking to an order from the Court is to protect our wholly

THE COURT: Well, when you say wholly

MR. IRWIN: Yes?
THE COURT: Do you mean that these
memoranda were not shared even with with the state officials.

MR. IRWIN: We will make that
determination but we believe there are memoranda at issue here that were not shared with anyone from the state. So we are asking to be able to hold our internal research memoranda, even though work product would protect that, the work product, because there's no waiver of work product unlike attorney-client, as long as you share it with
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MR. IRWIN: Well, if they're prepared in anticipation of litigation, and as we've indicated in the papers, that's a broad standard. You don't have to anticipate a specific piece of litigation. You can anticipate litigation broadly. You can anticipate that this is a City and financial crisis and that they are going to need assistance moving forward. It might take the path of a Chapter 9, it might not, it might take the form of numerous previous lawsuits against individual stakeholders in all of this, and a law firm has to be able to explore those various options to put itself in a position where it can ably represent the ultimate client here, which turned out to be the City. But we also -- Your Honor, the -- we're having a hard time understanding the relevance here of the memoranda as well. We are happy to provide them to the court in camera. If the Court would like to see the memoranda, we have the memoranda, we can easily provide them and the Court could determine for itself if in fact it finds these memoranda either surprising or relevant in some way.

And what we have done here, Your Honor, is we've proposed a structure or a framework that I would submit is reasonably conservative under the
someone who is in a non adversarial -- you share it in a non adversarial way. It's not like attorney-client in that regard. We believe that we would still have work product protection over those materials and so we're asking for the Jones Day research materials and the Jones Day internal conversations about how to proceed here and how to deliver advice should be protected. Now there comes a point in time later in 2012 when a specific client opportunity presents itself in terms of being hired by the City in the form of this RFP process and the public documents that the pitch material that is in the record already and that we are not seeking to disclose, but insofar as

## documents relating.

THE COURT: You mean not seeking not to disclose.

MR. IRWIN: I'm sorry, Your Honor, yes. It's in the record right now. We are not seeking to claw back or anything like that. That's not an issue here. But we are -- we do believe that as the Court referenced, because preengagement conversations between a lawyer and a potential client are still protected by the attorney-client privilege, we are seeking -- we are seeking
protection for those communications, communications out bound communications from Jones Day in the retention period where we are receiving confidential information and acting upon it, we do think at that period of time, attorney-client protection would attach as well as attorney work product, but in the 2012 time period, which is what the UAW motion is directed towards, we are simply asserting work product for the Jones Day legal research that was conducted to put our self in a position to ultimately be hired and to assist the City.

THE COURT: Are you telling the Court you don't have any objection to disclosing and don't claim work product privilege as to any memoranda that was shared with one or more state officials? MR. IRWIN: That's right.
THE COURT: And have you already turned over all such memoranda and communications that were given to state officials?

MR. IRWIN: The communication -- no, the answer is no, but we are prepared to do that. We are not standing on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
MR. IRWIN: Yeah. Does the Court wish to
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hear on the motion for reconsideration? We THE COURT: Yes, yes, I do. If you would like to address that, I would like to hear from you of course.

MR. IRWIN: I would, Your Honor. As we indicated, we think this is late. There is no -there's nothing in the papers that have been submitted that indicate a good reason for reopening this. There is no palpable dealing in the ruling and there's no new evidence. Despite the fact they occur in the same motion, there is no linking of these two issues and so there's therefore no good reason and I haven't heard one offered as to why this matter should be reopened. And the parties have in fact been relying on this ruling in connection with all of the discovery proceedings that have taken place since then. We think the ruling was sound, the objectors have not indicated why there is any reason to disturb the Court's a analogy of a board of directors and corporation counsel and the fact that they should be permitted and need to talk to each other in order to reach a sound conclusion as to whether to do something like file for bankruptcy. We think that's an analogous here, that the governor and his legal team and the
emergency manager and his legal team need to be able to talk, they need to be able to talk in confidence with regard to the common interest, which again, is counsel to what -- contrary to what we heard, broader than simply a Chapter 9 filing. The common interest related to the stays financial -- the City's financial crisis more broadly and the right legal path forward, and insofar as the communications related to a legal path forward, that privilege was properly invoked. And I do recall at court -- I read, I was not here, but I understand that the Court made itself available to the parties if in fact there were specific questions. Because it's very difficult to know exactly what form these questions will take in making a ruling. Answered believe the court offered its services to the parties if in fact there was any impasse at the depositions, and why believe any objectors took advantage of that. And so we believe that under the circumstances, given that the ruling was fundamentally correct, that there was no attempt at the time to seek further Court intervention and that we have been relying on these rulings going forward, that there is no reason to overturn them at this time.

on the record. Do we doubt it?
MR. CIANTRA: I did not hear that. I did not hear him say definitively that those memos were not shared with anyone at the state.

THE COURT: Let's ask to be sure. Mr. Irwin?

MR. IRWIN: I will investigate -- that's part of what we're saying. We will investigate that and we will have a clear answer

THE COURT: There you go.
MR. CIANTRA: So we don't have a clear answer. But I would suggest if the Court reviews the email that they are claiming privilege with respect to, the conclusion can be drawn that the substance of those memos was surely shared in that meeting. And it would seem at a minimum that would arguably constitute a waiver along with the production of the pitch materials which go into considerable detail with respect to the legal theories that were involved here.

THE COURT: All right
MR. CIANTRA: The second issue, just
brief clarification with respect to the privilege logs. We filed -- we requested that the state supplement the privilege logs and that is in the

correspondence that is attached to the motion that we filed with respect to the state because there was no specification in certain cases of who was involved in the communications, who authored them, who received them, or the subject matter of many -of all of the communications, so we had no way to assess the assertion of privilege based on the logs.

In response to that correspondence, they revised the logs, so this is what the Court referred to, but we only received those within the past day or two.

THE COURT: Right, I know.
MR. CIANTRA: So we haven't had the opportunity to, you know, line that up.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. CIANTRA: But I just wanted the
record to be clear with respect to that.
THE COURT: I appreciate that very much.
MR. CIANTRA: Obviously with respect to having not filed this within 14 days, Your Honor, obviously the discovery here was enfolding well past the deadline for the production and we have not -- we've done the best we could. This was not an intentional delay on our part. As these issues
developed, it became clear to us that the scope of what was being withheld, we felt was inconsistent with what the Court had permitted.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take
this under advisement until 10:00 $0^{\prime}$ clock and I
will give you a decision then.
COURT CLERK: All rise.
(Whereupon a break was taken
from 9:49 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.)
COURT CLERK: Court is in session
Please be seated. Recalling case number 1353846.
MS. GREEN: Good morning, Your Honor. I apologize, $I$ think there was some shuffle --

THE COURT: I was actually going to hear it after, but if you would like to be heard now that's fine.

MS. GREEN: You know, it dovetailed with what they were arguing, so $I$ had a few points.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MS. GREEN: The first thing I wanted to add is that at the time we drafted our motion, we thought that the June 5, 2012, email was being reasserted as privileged.

Mr. Irwin in his argument this morning that they are not -- they are now waiving privilege
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to that. It is back in the record. So to clarify, the email does say that the memos were shared with the Treasurer. It says they were memos we did for Andy. I presume that means they were shared with him. I don't know if that's actually true or not, but the memo does seem to indicate they were shared with a third party.

As far as the work product analysis, in our brief we went through the relevant standard, Sixth Circuit, Your Honor. I don't believe we talked about that today.

There is a two-part of the test. The first part is whether prepared quote because of the parties subjective anticipation of litigation as contrasted with ordinary business purpose, and two, whether that subjective anticipation was
objectively reasonable, and furthermore, the drawing force of preparation of the document is what is key, and we assert that the "because of" part fails. They did it because of the fact they were trying to prepare themselves for the prospect of being hired, not because of the fact that there was actually anticipated litigation.

And moreover, it's very attenuated that
in 2011, they had some kind of crystal ball that
they knew two years from now they knew they were going to be arguing about eligibility under Chapter 9. And we did cite case law in our brief. You asked counsel this morning if there was any case law regarding some type of temporal factor and we cited two cases. One, states the mere fact that litigation does eventy ensue does not buy itself cloak materials with work product immunity. So between that and the next case that we cited, the abstract possibility that an event might be the subject of future litigation will not support the claim of privilege. I think those are dispositive This was two years before any of this even arose.

Furthermore, I think that goes to whether or not the anticipation of litigation could be objectively reasonable. I don't know how two years prior to the litigation it could be objectively reasonable that number one, PA4 still had to get past the Referendum $N 2$, it was ten months before the EM was hired even if you assume these were prepared in June of 2012 when the memos were shared with the governor, with Andy Dillon. They may have been prepared prior to that, we don't know. More over, the EM had to be a pointed, PA436 had to become affected testify. All of these things had
not saying the City official that has ever CC'd, BCC'd, sent the memos, it's purely between Jones Day attorneys, Miller Buckfire, here on consulting, all of these advisors that, again, when I think it comes to waiver, clearly these are third parties and not the potential client.

The last point I will make because I want to be brief, I know you were ready to rule, I think, is that I think the wrong standard was stated earlier by the City. He said that there's a different standard for waiver of the attorney-client privilege versus work product. And that is not true in the Sixth Circuit. We cited two cases in our brief. First one is New Phoenix Sunrise and it says both the attorney-client privilege and work product protection are waived by voluntary disclosure of private communications to third parties. We also cite the In Re: Columbia case --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, are waived by? MS. GREEN: Disclosure of private
communications to third parties. And he had said that some sort of different standard applied when it was work product versus attorney-client and we also cited the In Re: Columbia case that says the
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same thing. There's no compelling reason for differentiating waiver work product from waiver of the attorney-client work privilege, so to me, it's a distinction without a difference to say well, we gave it to -- and I think the quote he said a minute ago was numerous consultants and advisors as well as the state. And to me, that is disclosing to to third parties. Therefore, it was waived when it was created a year or two ago, not to mention the fact that it's part of this litigation, they have selectively waived certain emails that somewhat have to do with this subject matter in that they relate to for instance, reviewing the consent agreement or reviewing and commenting on PA4, and the analysis related to PA4. And we cited case law in our brief stating that if you waive the privilege on selected pieces, you therefore waive it as to the entire subject matter and therefore you can't select actively say you can have the email but you can't have the attachments or you can have this email, but you can't have this email. So we would say that the entire privilege has been waived by selectively waiving it as to a few emails here and there.

Those are my comments. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. IRWIN: I'll simply respond to those few points that counsel made. The first, in connection with whether the timing of all of this should make a difference, I would submit that that is arbitrary. There are lots of things that could have happened in the middle of 2012 that would have been litigation events, maybe they didn't, but that doesn't mean that at the time that all of this was being considered, when legal advice or when Jones Day was considering some of these issues they weren't anticipating litigation.

It is fortuitous that this happened two years later, actually, a year and a half later or one year later, but that doesn't mean that either potential clients or Jones Day were not working in anticipation of litigation which as we indicate in addition our brief does not need to be a specific litigation event. You can anticipate litigation broadly, you never know what form it will take, you know there are going to be fights, you know there will be disputes, you don't know if it will be a private lawsuits, you don't know if it will be a Chapter nine filing, but you can anticipate the need for legal advice in an adversarial proceeding
in some form and meet the standard.
In terms of whether there's been
selective waiver or subject matter waiver as counsel suggests, this is, I think, fundamentally incorrect. The standard for subject matter waiver is whether documents have been disclosed -- it's the shield and sword problem. If documents have been disclosed and counsel intends to rely on them affirmatively, yet withholds the balance of the documents that in fairness should be considered, and I think this is codified pretty clearly in the advisory committee notes to federal rule 502, where they say thus subject matter waiver is limited to situations in which a party intentionally puts protected information into the litigation in a selective misleading and unfair manner. Under both rules a party that makes a selective misleading presentation that is unfair to the adversarial opens itself to a more complete and accurate presentation. We the City are not using any of these materials affirmatively. They are not on our exhibit lists, we are not introducing them through witnesses, we are not using them to our advantage that should open us to some sort of claim of subject matter waiver or selective disclosure under
the rules. And then lastly, I think fundamentally there is and I believe this is black letter law, there are different standards for whether there is waiver by disclosure under attorney work product as opposed to attorney-client.

If you would disclose attorney-client communications to a third party, you are much more likely to be deemed to have waived that privilege, but with attorney work product, you can make
disclosures, and as long as they are disclosures to parties who are non-adversarial, then you can still enjoy that protection. And that is a fundamental difference between the two privileges, it is not something where they are -- where disclosures to folks who are within the potential group of clients or advisors who are working these problems operates to waive the privilege and I think we've demonstrated that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to be sure the record accurately reflects your position regarding what's to be disclosed and what isn't.

Is it correct that to the extent any of these memoranda that were attached to this

June 2012 email from Ms. Lennox were disclosed to state officials, you are willing to make them
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available to counsel here.
MR. IRWIN: Yes, Your Honor. But the email itself suggests that -- if memoranda was prepared to prepare a Jones Day lawyer for a meeting with counsel, that would not be -- that's not my understanding of what we're talking about.

THE COURT: Okay. But you don't know which of the several memoranda were shared and which weren't?

MR. IRWIN: And we'll do that.
THE COURT: How will you determine that?
MR. IRWIN: Because the Jones Day lawyers
are accessible and we can figure that out.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MS. GREEN: Brief rebuttal?
THE COURT: Yes, of course.
MS. GREEN: I think the hypo that you
stated earlier compared to what he just said, you know, these were memos preparing a Jones Day lawyer to go seek work is different than the hypo that you stated earlier which was you meet with a client who wants to meet with you for the purpose of retaining you and you may make notes. That's different to me than I did memos to prepare myself to go pitch a client. To me, those are two different scenarios.

And there's a distinction, I think, between did the state ask for this work or was Jones Day just doing it internally again to prepare. I think it's two distinct scenarios.

One other thing that occurred yesterday, you made a note on the record about PA4 and that perhaps the intent behind the appropriation, the inclusion of the appropriation was a factual issue for this trial and I think that some of the email correspondence may go to that issue, quite frankly, because the PA4 appropriation was extensively discussed in some of these emails and for that reason, I think there is a possibility that it would become relevant to a separate issue than what Mr. Ciantra stated this morning, which was the good faith and the bad faith issues and things like that.

The last thing I would offer is our exhibits 31 through 65 have a lot of the email correspondence that has been produced by the City and there is a lot of, I guess, internal what they would consider their internal work product in those emails. I don't concede it's work product, but according to what they are defining as work product, it's in those emails and it's already been

produced and it's been waived. So if would you like to look at those emails to sort of familiarize yourself with what we're talking about, I have produced a copy of our binder for your clerk this morning if would you like to look at those.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. BRIMER: Your Honor, I'll be very
brief.
THE COURT: Why should I hear you?
You're not a party to these motions.
MS. BRIMER: I understand, Your Honor. I
want to clarify one matter on the record that Ms. Green made.

THE COURT: I will let you clarify a statement on the record, but I can't let you argue on one side or the other of these motions. MS. BRIMER: That's fine, Your Honor. And Ms. Green raised the issue of your ruling on Monday with respect to the intent of the appropriation in PA4 and I want to be sure the record is very clear that it's the appropriation in PA436 that Your Honor ruled may be a factual issue that prior to that was not considered a factual issue. I want to be sure the record is very clear
on that, which law we are addressing, Your Honor. It may have an impact on the memos.

THE COURT: Thank you, I guess
All right. On the first issue, the motion for consideration of the Court's previous ruling on the common interest doctrine, the court concludes that the record does not establish cause to consider that motion out of time and accordingly for that reason alone, the motion is denied.

But having said that, I want the record to be clear and the parties to understand that to the, tent a question is asked of a witness and either witness or counsel on behalf of witness's behalf claims attorney-client privilege and asserts the common interest doctrine or any other privilege for that matter, the Court will take a fresh look at that and consider counsel's arguments relating to that.

On the motions to compel, the Court appreciates the City's willingness to disclose to counsel for the objecting parties whatever memoranda it shared the City's counsel, Jones Day, shared with state officials and would request that that disclosure be accomplished as promptly as possible.
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To the extent, however, that the moving parties seek a ruling from the court that the mere fact that memoranda or other documents that would otherwise be protected by the work product doctrine were prepared pre-retention means that they are not protected by that doctrine, the Court must reject and overrule that position.

Accordingly, to the extent that the City
is maintaining this privilege as to any of these memoranda that were attached to Ms. Lennox email or any other memoranda for that matter, the court will look at them in camera and ask the City to produce them for that purpose again as promptly as possible.

As to the documents that Mr. Wertheimer suggests were improperly withheld in discovery, this parents a more challenging request if only because the documents that are the subject of Mr. Wertheimer's request are not identified. And so Mr. Wertheimer, all can I do in that regard is ask you to identify, again, as promptly as possible, what documents or range of documents you seek the City to be compelled to disclose, review that with the City and to the extent you can't work it out, we will take a break from our trial
whenever you are ready and work our way through it.
MR. WERTHEIMER: Yes, Your Honor. I
believe you meant the state.
THE COURT: The state. I did. Thank
you.
MR. WERTHEIMER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So are there any other issues still open before we begin our opening statements?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor, there is one and that is because there has been discussion about the trial subpoenas that were issued to the governor, the Treasurer, Mr. Baird and Mr. Ryan. Last time I appeared before you, I argued -- I opposed that. I want the Court to know I am not going to file a motion to quash. The Governor, in the spirit of cooperation and because he wants to move this proceeding along, is willing to testify and we have -- we will make all of those state witnesses available and we believe that Monday between one p.m. and three p.m., the Governor would be available and we think the other witnesses -- well, the other witnesses will be available on Monday or

( $\rightarrow$ ? the



Tuesday.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. DeCHIARA: Good morning, Your Honor. Peter DeChiara, from the law firm of Cohen, Weiss \& Simon for the UAW.

The UAW and the Flowers plaintiffs appreciates the State's decision to change its position and to produce the state witnesses. We just want to be careful to note for the record that there's been no agreement that there should be any set time for the testimony of the state witnesses, including the Governor.

While we realize the Governor has a busy schedule, it is also our view that the Governor perhaps with the exception of Mr. Orr's may be the most important witness in this case, and given the significance of his testimony and given the significance of the fact that there may be documents, we may have to examine him on, which we have not yet seen, we would just want to note for the record that there's been no agreement that his testimony would be limited to two hours. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: As of this point, Your

Honor, I fail to see the reason for the objectors argument that the government would require to testify for a lengthy period of time. This Court is well aware of the Governor's situation and who he is in the state. He is willing to do this, but I think we will have to work with the objectors as to timing.

THE COURT: Well, I would certainly encourage that, but it's not for a witness who appears in any Court to condition his appearance on a specific time limit.

MR. SCHNEIDER: He's certainly not doing that.

THE COURT: The UAW certainly interpreted it that way, and frankly, I did, too.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, I'm sorry about that, Your Honor, but I can tell you, as I indicated before, the Governor wants to be as cooperative as possible.

THE COURT: All right. Good. Thank you.
All right. We do have to get to the
issue of the amended joint final pre-trial order. If.

I read it correctly, one or more of the objecting parties decided after our final pre-trial

## ROUGH - DAY 1 - 10/23/13

conference to object to a certain small number of exhibits and the state was -- excuse me, the City was not willing to allow for a statement of such a late asserted objection, is that what this is about?

MR. ULLMAN: Not really, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Not really?
MR. ULLMAN: Not really. Not in our
view.
THE COURT: So you're withdrawing our
objections.
MR. ULLMAN: May I speak?
THE COURT: Please.
MR. ULLMAN: Your Honor, the issue is not that we're trying to add new objections, the --

THE COURT: You're not trying to add new
objections? So to the extent there are new
objections, we can strike them that?
MR. ULLMAN: Let me try to explain. We had always told the State -- the City that for this subset of documents, I believe there's six of them, that we were not opposing admissibility in general, but we believe that they are admissible for limited purposes only, to show that these documents were said, that they were in a created, that they were
given to people. We weren't contesting that they're authentic documents, but we spoke with Mr. Irwin and told him but at the same time, that's not why we're not contesting admissibility in general. We do not agree they're admissible for the truth of what they say.

Some of these documents have
forward-looking objections that we don't think there's been adequate foundation for, and in our discussions with Mr. Irwin, he said we understand that, we're not asking you to concede to the truth of what's in there. We said fine. On that basis

THE COURT: Well, but hang on. The admission of a document into evidence or the agreement of the admission of a document into evidence is not a stipulation to the truth or credibility of the document, it just means that it meets the criteria for admissibility under the rules.

MR. ULLMAN: And that may be all that's going on here. The reason this came up is because I had heard -- I was not here at the legal argument yesterday, but I had been told that Your Honor had indicated that if a document did not have a note on
it saying there was some sort of objection would be admitted for any and all purpose, at which point I said to Mr. Irwin, wait a minute, there's a couple documents here we know from our discussions, you know, they're limited -- we agree they're admissible for limited purposes only and we have the right --

> THE COURT: But for what purpose do you asswert these six documents are not admissible for?

MR. ULLMAN: Just for truth of what's in
them, expert opinion and lack of foundation. Some of these have forward looking numbers or values into them as to the amount of the unfunded pension liability and for those we say we don't disagree you gave these documents up, but we're not agreeing that the numbers that are in there are necessarily true numbers. That's all we're saying. That was understood from day one with discussions with Mr. Irwin.

We just wanted to make sure that Your Honor -- that if the document came in, that Your Honor would not assume that everything that was in it in these six documents was true. That's all that we cared about. We don't deny that they were created, that they were given to people, and for
that purpose we have no problem with admission. And it may have been that we misinterpretted what

THE COURT: I'm having a hard time
comprehending what you're saying, frankly.
If a piece of evidence has hearsay within hearsay, which think is what you're talking about here, right, the document itself is hearsay, and it contains hearsay statements.

MR. ULLMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. If the documents is admitted opposing parties waive -- if they agree to the admission, they waive both hearsay objections. That does not mean that that party is stipulating to the truth of any of that hearsay. It just doesn't mean that. All it means is it's evidence.

MR. ULLMAN: And if I had been given a misinterpretation or misapplication of what Your Honor indicated the other day, then you're right, this is a moot issue and there is no problem based on what Your Honor said. I think that's true.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then in that event, the Court will enter the amended final pre-trial order, and based on the list of documents that are shown as having no objections, the Court

## Your Honor said.

## ROUGH - DAY 1 - 10/23/13

will prepare an order admitting all of those

## documents into evidence.

Okay. Opening statements?
MR. BENNETT: Good morning, Your Honor I'm assuming that you want to hear from us first, notwithstanding the order was different in the other -- in the legal issues proceedings, but in any event --

THE COURT: Well, you have the burden of proof, right?

MR. BENNETT: Correct.
First of all I want to make crystal clear many people having different environments that I'm not going to speak about any arguments that came up in the context of the legal argument part of the proceedings.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BENNETT: I appreciate that part,
too.
And I want to confine myself to the
issues or the parts of the eligibility standard and the part of 521C that have some factual disputes
that have been identified in connection with them.
And toward the end, I do want to spend a minute on
the materiality of facts relating to legislators or
governors intent relating to statutes because I think it was not something we did cover when we were here before.

So first of all, I'm going to start with the issue of insolvency. And what I'm going to say about that because I could stand here for hours describing the evidence that is going to come in on that subject, but I'm not going to do that, I'm going to say simply that the witnesses that we will present on the subject are going to present a mountain of evidence showing insolvency of the City.

Sadly, that evidence will show that the City is insolvent on every relevant standard and Your Honor, there's been at least intimated in a lot of the papers about the significance that no expert report has been submitted quite frankly that is because no expert report is required. This is one of those cases where the data speaks very clearly and persuasively on its own, it needs no gloss, and that observely AFSCME is objecting on the insolvency point at least as I read the papers itself speaks volumes.

I want to say from the near term perspective, the City did not run out of cash only - $\square$
because actions were taken to prevent that from happening. The evidence will show that if the City just kept on paying debts as and when they were becoming due, cash would have run out. The fact that the City stopped doing that is the only reason why there are positive cash balances. As I said before, there's no question that if the actions were not taken, cash would have run out.

I will also say that the steps that the City took during past years to pay many of the steps as they became due they didn't turn out particularly well. One of the consequences and you'll see in the evidence and in fact a good document to keep around at all times is the proposal for creditors dated June 14th. There's a section in there that deals with this. It shows that there were numerous secured borrowings made to create liquidity in the City in past years when there were similar cash flow problems. Each and every one of those borrowings were done on a secured basis and so the consequence that we face today is that those borrowings consume a very significant amount of cash otherwise available for creditors generally. So avoiding a liquidity problem in the prior periods didn't exactly work
out well from the perspective of many other

Also, as will come into evidence, pension contributions were deferred during at least the past two fiscal years with the effect that the under funding under anyone's measure don't have to worry about the fight between the different measures of pension under underring, it's greater than it otherwise might have been.

Finally on the insolvency point, you're going to hear from several witnesses but most importantly perhaps Chief Craig about the fact that the City is failing to provide basic services to its residents. We don't think that as another which one of the creditor claims or obligations, but the reality is it's important as anything else. As we've indicated before and as the witness also indicate without solving that problem, there may not be a City to reorganize.

Now AFSCME makes a few points that are worth discussing how the evidence will deal with

First, much is made over the dispute about the under funding amount and it is asserted that because there's a dispute of the underfunding
them.

## creditors.

amount, the City can't demonstrate it's insolvent. Well, as Your Honor knows, the insolvency test focuses on cash flow, focuses on near term and longer term cash flow type measures.

And in that connection, there are cash
flows that will be put into evidence. There's also convenient place to find them in the proposals for creditors, there's different versions with different levels of updates that are baked into them, but the line items that talk about pension contributions, Your Honor, is going to learn don't change very much whether you use the City's assumptions as to underfunding amount for the City's calculation of underfunding amount for the Gabriel Rotors calculuation underfunded account, Gabriel Rotors, of course, being the actuaries retained by the pension fund management themself to give them advice.

And so Your Honor, we take into the numbers and you will find that the contribution amounts which are the relevant numbers in the insolvency calculation don't move around very much notwithstanding the very different calculations of underfunding amounts and the reason for that will be remained.

Mr. Moore of Conway MacKenzie will be the witness that will cover that area. There's also a little bit of numerical confusion concerning the percentage of the City's contribution to the GRS pension fund that is attributable to DWSD employees. You will see in the papers a number band read around 62 percent. Well, actually the number is the reverse of that. It's 38 to 39 percent. Mr. Orr got that wrong in his deposition. He corrected it at the end, but of course the correction wasn't cited in the papers. There will be evidence on the point so there won't be confusion on the point as we no forward with the numbers.

Then AFSCME says the City deferred sales of assets and they talk about two examples. We will demonstrate of course that that is not true. First of all, the Belle Isle deal, Belle Isle leased to the state in exchange for the state taking over the maintenance and cap back requirements with respect to Belle Isle. Never involved the generation of incremental expendable cash. It did and always has involved a reduction of the cost on the City to maintain Belle Isle. And what the evidence will show is that those

anticipated savings were included in the projections that were the basis for insolvency calculations and they are in the projections, the basis for the proposal for creditors or at least the lead up to the proposal for creditors in the June 14 th presentation. It's also very hard for us to understand how anyone can say that art sales were deferred. It is common knowledge and I suspect we'll figure out a way to get this into evidence as well, that there's an attorney general opinion out there that basically says that the art can't be sold for creditors.

We unfortunately in the absence of some form of agreement, there are no sales possible without a significant change in current management of the museum or litigation and maybe and/or litigation relating to some of the points made in the attorney general's opinion. There were no pre-filing opportunities to liquidate art.

Next, AFSCME talks about the swap deal,
which of course Your Honor is familiar with because it's before you in still another adversary set inning this case. The swap deal itself, you will hear, does not provide adequate cash relief, but the transaction hasn't been approved yet, and there
is unfortunately no assurance as we stand here today and certainly as we stood here several months ago that it will be done. It turns out that some of the objectors in this proceeding are also objectors in that one. And so I'm not sure how we're supposed to even count the anticipated cash flow relief that attributable to the swap transaction as something that could have even affected the City's insolvency calculations.

And lastly, there is the assertion and I'm anxious to hear what the evidence will be to support this one, that the appointment of the emergency manager prevented the City from taking actions designed to raise revenue and avoid insolvency. Of course in the briefs that have been filed, there is no suggestion about exactly what steps those are, that the City counsel council or the mayor or whoever has been displaced in the view of AFSCME have been planning and anxious to implement that would solve the City's financial problem. No such actions have ever been specified, we have idea where that evidence is coming from, it will be quite a surprise if there is any.

It was for these reasons the insolvency and the fact that there really weren't anything
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left that the City or the state could think of to do to address the problems that the June 14th -June 14 th presentation was put together and it proposes a plan that includes significant reductions in the City's obligations, including bonds, including other post employment benefits, including other unsecured claims and including pension underfunding claims.
Whatever the law turns out to be concerning protections to be afforded to various claims, there is no law prohibiting the City from trying to commence negotiations to resolve its financial problems and that's what we were trying to do.

Now while we're near this subject, there is an issue that ripples through actually several of the standards, which is whether or not the proposal that's included in the proposal to creditors -- and I'm referring to the materials that are I think between pages 101 and 109 or thereabouts of that document -- whether that proposal was close enough to a confirmable plan of adjustment to qualify for the purposes of open paren one, demonstrating that the City desires to implement a plan, open paren two, that the City was
in good faith as part of the good faith
negotiations because they had to be talking about a certain kind of plan that is asserted, and three, whether the City was acting in good faith generally.

And I think the proposal for creditors that June 14th document has been admitted into evidence, again for all purposes, but very clearly for purpose of showing this is what the proposal was that the City presented as its initial presentation to creditors.

And so it speaks for itself. We can look at it, we don't need testimony, it's reasonably detailed in fact, I would argue Your Honor cease disclosure statements, summaries of plans all the time and you will see this measures up quite nicely to the standard that's applicable even in disclosure statements to what a plan should look like. It is he has a classification scheme, it defines treatment for all classes, it includes a very extensive term sheet for notes that are to be distributed to creditors, and it is a plan, Your Honor, that for that reason is a plan that could be confirmable.

Now there is clearly disputes over what
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law should be applied by this Court in determining whether or not it would confirm that plan if it was fleshed out, put into plan form and presented to Your Honor. I told Your Honor in prior hearings I doubt that's the way this case is going to come out, but that's the relevant standard for today. And the reality is that on the City's very reasonable view of the law, there is no question that it could be confirmed. I understand that with respect to the retiree constituents use of the law, they say it can't be, but that doesn't render the proposal inappropriate for purposes of a Chapter nine case. We are dealing with issues that Your Honor has heard argument about, is going to ultimately decide, but the plan hangs together as an appropriate expression of the kind of debt relief the City should be able to get based upon one very reasonable view of the law. We think it's absolutely the right view.

The other assertion as to why the plan isn't an appropriate plan is that it doesn't adequately liquidate claims and here again, they're talking about the pension underfunding amount. But I think we know, both from the structure of the bankruptcy code itself and for many many many other
cases that the liquidation of claims is not a prerequisite to confirmation of a plan. Plans are confirmed all the time with a treatment specified as the treatment is specified in the plan in the proposal for creditors that is not claim size dependent. It's plan. It makes distributions based on pro rata interests in the overall claims pool. It was designed that way because there are -- is in fact uncertainty concerning the aggregate amount of certain claims. Frankly, the City believes it's more questions relating to the size of the OPEB or other post employment benefit claim pool than there is with respect to the pension claim pool but there's uncertainty on these issues it is acknowledged there is uncertainty of issues, those are not confirmation problems, at least least there's not confirmation problems with some plan structures and they're certainly not confirmation problems with the plan that was offered by the City.

So for these reasons, that is a plan that is sufficiently detailed, more detailed than it has been in many other of the reported Chapter nine cases and it is appropriate for all purpose as a starting point for good faith negotiations,
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demonstration of the City's intent to implement a plan in Chapter nine and demonstration of the City's overall good faith in commencing its Chapter nine case. And so I think we've dispensed of that component of the different standards.

We now to impracticability. Moving to impracticability. The record shows in numerous places that the City has many many issues of bonds outstanding and another reason to keep the proposal for creditors nearby is that toward the back of it, and I think it's between pages like 115 and 130, thereabouts, there is an extensive list and a type size, not so good for people who wear bifocals.

I think you will hear in the evidence if it's not already clear from the record that most of the individual bond issues do not have indentured trustees as we think of them in the commercial context or any other equivalent holder representative. In fact, holders reserve more rights in most muni structures or assign them to their insurers, to bond insurers if insurers are involved.

So what you have here is that in order to comp mischaracterize prince amended pal or interest as well as many other terms of debt that have to be
addressed in connection with radio resolving the City's financial problems either under the proposed plan that was in the proposal for creditors or in any other plan, there is going to have to be extensive solicitation, efforts to find relevant bondholders to get the right consents. The bankruptcy process can make it a little bit easier because of course it will be majorities of those who vote and the solicitation rules are clearer. Outside of a proceeding you might have to get everybody in order to implement changes.

In fact, you do have to get everybody with respect to most of the issues. There are a couple where there might be an exception if the insurer exercises certain extensive levels of control.

The bottom line is it is an awful mess. There is many many many issues, many many many holders. And this of course is the definition of impracticability in a lot of ways in the bankruptcy code and the whole reason we have impracticability is because of New York's case back in the 70s. New York back then, numbers are different, times have changed, but didn't have materially more -- may have had less -- bond issues and bondholders than
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Detroit has today.
And the purpose of the impracticability standard was to recognize with that kind of debt structure, having good faith negotiations withs creditors in advance of a proceeding in an effort to have an out of Court work out were frankly pointless or would have been pointless.

And frankly, for the most part, the objectors don't disagree with anything I've just said. It's hard to. What they say instead is that whether -- however negotiations might have been practicable with bondholders, negotiations were practicable with them, with the in some senses self appointed or appointed representatives of particular labor groups or retirees. And we're going to talk about that in detail in a second.

But we have a point first, which is if you have a situation where it's admitted or almost admitted and the Court may have to decide that negotiations are impracticable with a huge universe of creditors but they might be practicable with respect to a another universe of creditors, what do you do? And the retiree committee is actually good about admitting there's law in this in one of their footnotes and the law is that if you've got an
impracticability problem, you have an
impracticability problem in negotiating the the groups are kind of pointless. I think if we think about it, that has to be right. Because of course its let's take a hype that you've got a group over here, not organized, and then you have one bang debt piece which is clearly organized, and you can clearly negotiate it. Well, you try to do everything with a bank but at some point the bang is going to say what's going to happen with them, all those people you can negotiate with. Because no one ever makes a deal in a vacuum. And even if you could get all the way to the conclusion with the bank and you still have to file a Chapter 9 case doesn't that make you start effectively start all over again with the one that was easy to negotiate with. And even if it doesn't, even if it's possible to negotiate a deal but both the bank and City decides this is it, we're going to make this deal no matter what happens in the Chapter 9 case that you need for everybody else, you still have to go through the Chapter 9 case and waiting to file a Chapter 9 case while you work with the bank and finally reach the deal you're going to have with the bank that's going to be permanent,
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you've wasted a lot of time because you have to start Chapter 9 process and go that process any way.

So I submit the couple cases that are focused on this and we cite in our papers and the retirees cite in the footnote. Have got it exactly right. If you have an impracticability with respect to a material part of your capital structure, you have an impracticability problem period.

So I think that by looking at this -- by the way, before we go off, I want to say there's one paragraph of the AFSCME brief that I think is just terribly important on this. They argue this point a lot. But then they have paragraph 102 at page 46. And it's only two sentences -- three sentences, so I'm going to read the whole thing.
"AFSCME is not suggesting that pre-petition negotiations could have bound everyone" -- hold that thought -- "or must have involved all of the City's thousands of creditors."

I don't -- I think that sentence means
we're done because if pre-petition negotiations couldn't have bound everyone, how would you get a plan done? And if it didn't involve all the City's
thousands of creditors, how would you get a plan done? So I think they're conceding that our situation has to be regarded as impracticable, but they go on.

They say some level of negotiation with principal creditors could have led the City to a non-bankruptcy solution. I think that's a nonsequitor. If you're not talking to everyone, you can't possibly have a solution.

But then they go on further. By way of analogy, Section 109 C 5 B of the Bankruptcy Code contemplates prebankruptcy negotiations with creditors that the municipality intends to impair not all creditors.

Well, one of the complaints of AFSCME is that the City intends to impair substantially all of its material creditors. It has no other choice. So I suppose there's a circumstance if the City was arguing that we have the huge group of creditors as to which negotiations are impracticable but we're not going to impair them and we have another group of creditors that we really can talk to and we're going to impair them, if the City said no discussions, that would be a rather extreme and silly position, it's just not our case. We need
this yesterday and even suggested some changes. I think it's also in the binders.

Now there's a lot of information on this chart and I'm not going to try to take a us all the way through it, but I want to zero in on the fourth line of data, which is -- first of all the third line of data which says was a letter sent to a creditor. What that is is basically a letter that asked are you in a position to represent retirees and which ones. You'll see it. It will be in evidence.

And then the next line is respondent is able to represent retirees. And I'll give you the key. $X$ means they said no, the Green check means they said yes, and the question mark is there was no response or it's not clear and Your Honor is going to hear some evidence on that.

So look across the line. I have a number of your most vigorous objectors who said no, we can't represent retirees. So I'm going to come back to this in the context of good faith, but we can start thinking about it now. What is -- what do you expect of the City having made a proposal heavily supported, certainly again as the standards go in similar circumstances, had lots of meetings
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to explain, answered every question, every question that was asked at the meetings, there will be evidence on that too, and you're negotiating partner says to you, many instances in writing, we actually can't represent the people who are impaired by your proposal. To say that anything that happened afterwards is not in good faith, you've got to have a good answer as to what do you do. What's the next sentence of the dialogue? You're getting fade back from someone who doesn't have authority to give feedback, if they give you any feedback, by the way the bottom line is feedback, X means no, there's no other term we need to define, if they said responded otherwise constructively which weighs either no but I might do this, or yes, if, you make the following changes, that's -- okay, but that just came from somebody who said they don't represent the person who's going to be affected. What is the next step in a negotiation where the person who said they're here to negotiate says to you we really don't represent the person who is affected by the plan we're discussing? None of the objectors say how that question is supposed to be answered.

The reality is the City said tell us your
suggestions any way. And if we got suggestions, feedback, we would have had to then figure out what to do with it in that very unusual circumstance that I frankly haven't confronted very often in my career. But we weren't even put to that hard question because what the other part says is that -- and this is more towards the good faith negotiation part than this one but as long as I've got the chart up, as the bottom line indicates, the evidence will show that from this creditor constituency, not from others, I'll get to that in a second, we received no concrete proposal or comprehensive feedback, we got a lot of no, but I'll come to that later.

With respect to this part, again,
impracticable. AFSCME sites results of past collective bargaining as a result of negotiations with unions that have succeeded. That doesn't surprise me in the slightest, but there's also no evidence and I don't think there will be any that those past discussions began with unions disclaiming power to bargain on behalf of the relevant constituency. As the evidence will demonstrate, that's how these discussions did. So the bottom line, again, with respect
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to this part is even if and it's not, the standard for impracticability of negotiations is impracticability with every major constituency, I think the fourth line of this chart demonstrates that negotiations were impracticable with the tire side and impracticable with the bond holder side. Good faith negotiations. Again, this is a question I don't think we have to reach because I think we've demonstrated that those kinds of negotiations were impracticable. But we tried really hard any way. The evidence will show that we presented the June 14th plan. Mr. Buckfire of Miller Buckfire who was integral to all the negotiations but others Mr. Moore, Mr. Malthotra, people you will hear from, they also extensively participated and will testify about what happened in the rooms.

The City told the creditors essentially the following. The City would have discussions with all parties willing to speak for the City for about a month after the June 14 th presentation. So the City could listen to people and figure out if there was an out of Court solution possible for this enormously complex and dire circumstance. The City representative asked for feedback including proposals that the creditors would accept if they
weren't going to accept the City's proposal. And the City said in writing and verbally that it would evaluate what it heard during the following month during the week beginning July 15, 2013, and decide what came next. It's conceivable, I think people would say they doubted it would happen, that one of the thins that would have come next were consensual negotiations on the effort to build some kind of plan.

THE COURT: You said July. Did you mean
June?
MR. BENNETT: No, July was the evaluation wheat. The June 14 proposal and July 15th evaluation week. Meetings in the middle. I'll have a timeline at some point and you'll see how this fits together.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BENNETT: So one of the things that might have happened next would have been negotiations on a consensual plan but after the month of discussions and after the evaluation week, the City could not see a path to an out of court reinstruct link that could be implemented outside of Court, a Chapter 9 case would absolutely a possibility. No one was shy about that. And
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frankly, it should not be surprising to anyone that the evidence shows that work on both contingencies was proceeding throughout this entire period. Much is made of the fact that there's contingency planning going on for a Chapter 9 case. Absolutely there was. It would have been irresponsible not to.

> By the way, nothing in the Jones Day
pitch is inconsistent with this way of organizing a case. And there's a lot of complaints about well, people thought they had to keep a record, make a record. Well, absolutely they that have to keep a record and make a record. Making a record of out of Court steps taken in a Chapter 9 negotiating process is just sensible when everybody knows based upon the play book executed in the last six or seven major cases have involved vigorous objections to eligibility by bondholders and labor unions, depending upon the case which, sometimes both, and in every single one of those cases, the judge has to go through pages and pages and pages about what happened during the out of Court phase to determine whether people were in good faith.

So courts do their opinions have sent a message to people who are serious about Chapter 9
restructurings. Keep records. And we did.
There is a lot of criticism in the papers that there were instances where the City said these are not negotiations, particular meetings were not negotiations. I confess that this implicates an area of law that I'm not tremendously familiar with, it has to do with collective bargaining. As the evidence will show the collective bargaining was suspended as a result of statutes passed and there was a clear concern by the City that they were not going to waive the or reverse the suspension of collective bargaining and all of the baggage that came with that, however, we don't really have to deter ourselves much over that incident because it's admitted by the objectors that the City sought feedback. The evidence will show that. It's admitted that there were quote discussion, closed quote. And by the way, the leading case that people cite as -- I think it's end cot schools case that cited for the proposition of what is a non-negotiated process or absence of negotiations -- that case talks about absence of discussions. That's the actual quote if you go back to the case itself.

So in any event, there is no dispute that
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dialogue was something that was encouraged and not discouraged. Nobody said we don't care what you think. Never happened. Evidence will show never happened. Now, again, assuming for a second that what the City did in negotiations has any relevance at all given the clear impracticability in this case, what is required of the City in good faith negotiations -- and I intimated that when we started talking about the chart -- is informed what creditors -- by what creditors said and did okay?

Mr. Buckfire will testify about some of that being especially careful not to talk about proposals that other people made because they were made with an intent that they be kept confidential, but we got permission at least in one instance to talk about the fact that a proposal was made and what Mr. Buckfire is going to tell the Court is that the proposals that the City got back were proposals that basically said our position is better than everybody else, we should do better than everybody else and they were frankly completely in sensitive to the overall problems that the City faced. Again, the fact that we did get proposals from people other than the labor negotiators is going to be Mr. Buckfire will
testify to it but there's a letter in evidence and I don't have the number, I forgot to put it on this morning is a letter in evidence, cover letter to a proposal that came from three major insurers in the pre-filing period, and Your Honor, that demonstrates that a party that's represented by qualified professionals as a number of the labor/retiree constituents were you knew exactly what you are supposed to do when you receive a proposal and you don't like it. The way you respond to a proposal and you don't like it is you send back something you do like and that's how a negotiation gets started. Whether it would have worked that's a different question. The point is it wasn't a mystery to anybody how to start a negotiation if somebody really wanted to start one.

What did labor do besides respond maybe
we're not right person to talk to, which is a problem in and of itself? Well, here, the UAW's papers are particularly instructive. And in many places, in their papers, particularly their supplemental objection, $I$ think it's also in the pre-trial brief, just not remembering that as clearly today, the UAW says well, of course we weren't going to say yes to any modifications of
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retiree benefits of pension benefits in the pre-filing scenario because we had a constitutional guarantee. Any proposal that doesn't pay these in fall and does not impair retiree benefits is a proposal we cannot accept, or we will not accept, I think it says both of those things in different places.

So again, I think we have to ask the most crucial question in evaluating the City's good faith. When you get back a response that says we're never going to agree to anything but non-impairment, what exactly is the City supposed to do next? What's the next step in that negotiations? Gee, we were just kidding, we found the money in a mattress, we'll do that? I don't think that's the right response. I don't think there is a right response. I think at that point you can determine that negotiations have failed and they're not going to succeed.

The retiree committee goes even further in their papers, their pre-trial brief. They say that negotiations were not in goods faith because they included an impairment, meaning the City was in good faith because we didn't agree with them from day one. Okay? Again, I ask the question,
what exactly -- if anyone is going to contend the City was a bad faith negotiations and got that response, what exactly were they supposed to do next in the negotiations that would have helped matters?

And as I said before, many retiree groups said we'd love to help you but we don't represent the relevant people.

Clearly, Your Honor, we received many requests for additional information. You will see some interesting charts that show what was in the data room, at least in terms of volumes, how the data room is populated. The evidence will show that the City did its best to comply with information requests. I'm absolutely certain that no one was completely satisfied with what this City gave them. In some instances that's because the City doesn't always have everything that people want and some instances I suspect it's -- we will find that to the end of this case, we will not find -- we will find certain people who will never agree that they've gotten everything they want or they're satisfied with the information they received. It's a hard problem. But the evidence will show that the City created a database, worked
$\rightarrow \rightarrow$ ?
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really hard to populate it, populated with enormous amounts of information and did not withhold information as a basis to obtain negotiating advantage.

Final point with respect to this section. In almost all the papers -- it could be all -there is a statement quoted by Kevyn Orr concerning the financial and operating plan at a meeting to discuss the financial and operating plan, which is not the proposal for creditors. The financial operating plan is a document required by statute to be filed 45 days after his appointment. It's about facts and he's reporting facts, and someone asked him about negotiating the financial and operating plan and he said this is not something to negotiate, this isn't a public site, this is a report I'm supposed to file. So that quote, which I think the objectors would have you think applied to the restructuring plan and does not, did not and it applies to something completely different and I think the evidence will show that.

For the foregoing reasons, I think the City did act in good faith in all of the negotiations that it conducted those negotiations were unsuccessful and thus that prerequisite for
filing a Chapter 9 case and being eligible for relief has been met.

I'm now going to turn to good faith generally, spend a little time on it, 921c. Here again, I want to borrow AFSCME's papers because they're just very instructive and really help us with this. Paragraph 109 on page 48, the relevant considerations regarding good faith under Chapter 9 include -- and they point to five points out of the Stockton case. I'll accept them. Number one, whether the City's financial problems are of a nature contemplated by Chapter 9. The evidence will show that if Detroit's financial problems are not the financial problems of a nature contemplated by Chapter 9, I don't know what City's is. So we think we will satisfied that one very easily.

Number two, whether the reasons for filing are consistent with Chapter 9. I think the form and substance of the plan that was proposed and frankly everything that the City has been saying about it are indicative that the City's trying very hard to use the powers subject to the limitations included in Chapter 9 to effectuate a financial restructuring for the City. I don't think we'll have any difficulty demonstrating that
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with the evidence.
Number three, the extent of the City's pre-petition efforts to address the issues. Here I want to pause and put on a timeline. And there's -- it's really long so there's two pieces, but for this purpose, it's the first piece that's the most relevant.

THE COURT: Let me ask you to pause for just a second. We should have the record reflect what exhibit number that chart is.

MS. HALE: It's Exhibit No. 36 .
MR. BENNETT: I have better. They'll try
to put it up, but I also have some copies of it.
Here's what I'm going to do. Aisle a going to
distribute the first piece now with the court's permission and the second piece in a minute after I get through this.

So here's the first piece. Again, I think everyone has seen this already.

MS. HALE: I exhibit I just put up is
Exhibit No. 104, the timeline. Ben the other page, the one that looks like this. The two pieces. If you don't have it, that's okay. Everyone else is going to have it.

MR. BENNETT: Obviously in a bunch of
ways this chart summarizes lots and lots of evidence that is going to go into the record, but what is going to be seen in the record was that it wasn't a bunch of people up at night on June 13th working on a presentation of a plan for June 14 th. The efforts to address the pre-petition efforts to address the issues stretch probably before December 21-11, but I think at least as I understand the history and as the evidence will certainly show, no later -- excuse any. Yeah, no later than December 21, 2011, December 2011, a number of people within state government and City government started focusing on the fact that the Detroit financial situation was very serious and had to be addressed. And there were a number of efforts that were attempted all through 2012 to try to grapple this problem with this problem short of requiring concessions from creditors, short of Chapter 9, kind of everything else you might think of doing was done by a large number of really devoted and qualified people. Regrettably, it all failed. And -- but the part about this first chart, which covers almost a year and a half on one page, it was a lot of time and a lot of effort in a search for alternative solutions.
restructuring could work. And what the evidence will show is that on this page, which shows all kinds of meetings and all kinds of different interactions with creditors, a concerted decision was made to exclude meetings with individual creditors or individual creditor representatives because it wouldn't be readable anymore, so this is just organize the meetings with different groups for different specific purposes. The other key to interpretation is when it says non union, it means the bonds, so the union --

THE COURT: It means what sir.
MR. BENNETT: The bonds. The non union means bonds and other borrowed money because there is a collection of notes involved in that side of the case as well. Where it says union, it's really the retiree representatives which at the time were predominately union.

So what this demonstrates again, maybe part of the good faith piece too, but for purposes of the fourth prong of the Stockton test, I would say both of these are relevant, both the long term assessment of alternatives that were short of that structuring and then the close in effort to figure out whether there was any conceivable way to get
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something accomplished out of court. It is perfectly clear that there was an extensive effort to evaluate every conceivable alternative that anyone could think of.

And then last factor, factor five.
Whether the City residents would be prejudiced by denying Chapter 9 relief. As we said in argument last week, and the Court will hear to extensive evidence, and it's really important part of the case, both for purposes of eligibility and for everything that will follow, the residents are dramatically prejudiced by denying Chapter 9 relief. Many of the problems the City confronts in providing services to its residents is because so many of its tax dollars are devoted to dealing with bonds and other legacy liabilities. That's the problem. The taxpayer in Detroit puts up a dollar and gets back right now the number is something -right now the number is something like 58 cents and the projection show it could be some day 35 cents. That's an unstable situation. It's not working now, it's not going to work in the future and it has to be changed.

The other side of the coin. Very often the first reaction in cases like this is raise
taxes. The evidence will show it summarized by the way in the June 14 th -- June 14 th proposal that the taxes in Detroit are already the highest in any municipality in Michigan that we're already having enforcement problems. The City is already having enforcement problems with respect to property taxes, the that property tax assessments may be too high, not too low, indicating that that revenue source is stressed as well. There's nothing left to do here. There is no revenue solution. So we have come to a case -- which is not necessarily like other Chapter 9 cases -- where we have a very finite revenue pool and it just isn't enough to provide services and to pay debt and thus Chapter 9 is more needed here than in any other scenario you can possibly think of. The evidence will show that.

Last topic. And this gets a lot more technical, but this is responsive to Your Honor's suggestion that we had to deal with a disputed issue of fact, and that was the motivation for the inclusion of appropriations provisions in PA436. Your Honor, I think the following is intended to really indicate that that question isn't material, but I think it's also when we did the research, we
opinions, there's one judge who writes a dissenting opinion, I think it's just one but not a hundred percent positive about that, and so the lead -- the first concurring opinion has this to say. This Court has repeatedly held the courts must not be concerned with the alleged motives of a legislative body in enacting a law but only with the end result. The actual language of the legislation and a whole series of case that is are cited to support that proposition that I won't read the citations in the record unless Your Honor wants them.

The next concurring opinion, Judge
Corrigan's, quotes from Justice Cooley's constitutional law thesis or textbook, looks like maybe a textbook, and the quote $I$ think is also instructive. It's a little bit longer. It says the following. To make legislation depend upon motives render all statute law uncertain and the rule which should allow it could not logically stop short of permitting a similar inquiry into the motives of those who passed judgment, therefore, the courts do no permit a question of improper legislative motives to be raised, but they will in every instance assume that the motives will public
found that it's also not a legitimate question for judicial review so I'm going to give you some citations and I'm going to read a very few quotes and Your Honor is clearly going to find more when you look at this question.

In the State of Michigan, frankly I think in other places at all -- other places as well, the judiciary is not supposed to engage in guessing with the length slate you are's intent. The leading case about this turns out to be a referendum case in Michigan. It's called Michigan United Conservation Clubs versus Secretary of State. It's found at 630 Northwest, 2nd, 297. Michigan United involved a review of a Court of Appeals decision, I think it's called the Court of Appeals here, Court of Appeals decision that held in fact that an appropriations provision in gun control legislation was not going to prevent that legislation from being subject to a referendum and the Supreme Court reverses and says that the inclusion of that provision is going to insulate that statute from the referendum process, and along the way, the court was not fractured in result, but was fractured a little bit in reasoning. There's a collection of $I$ think it's three concurring
and benefiting the station. They will also assume

that the ledge sure had before it any evidence necessity to enable it to take the action it did take.

Then Your Honor, the next case you would
find if you look to this is Houston versus
Governor, which is a 2012 case. 491, Michigan,
876, 810, northwest second, 255. And right near
the front of the opinion, there's a paragraph, I'm only going to read two parts of the paragraph to save time. There is nothing that is relevant in this regard in -- in terms of interpreting a statute -- that can be drawn from the political or partisan motivations of the parties. Skip a sentence. Moreover, this Court possesses no special capacity and there are no legal standards by which to assess the political propriety of actions undertaken by the legislative branch.

Now of course, much of this makes sense because one of the problems we scratched our heads about when we got back to think about how we would address Your Honor's question is there are a whole bunch of legislators in two houses that conceivably had all kinds of different reasons for supporting the appropriations, it could well be that most of them put the appropriations there because they
really thought they needed the money even if some thought they were putting it there because it was a problem relating to the referendum process. I will tell you a very persuasive example of the hazards of trying to figure out the intent of statutes was impressed upon by an example I learned in law school which was about the age 55 -- or the $55-$ mile per hour speed limit and research turns out to show that the purpose of that speed limit was to save fuel, and the reason that it wasn't increased for a long time is because it saved lives. And so also the purpose of legislation actually can change over time or the reason why it stays there. So I think it's a hazardous inquiry. I don't think we know where to start. I don't think we can drag all the legislators in here and ask them all and I think the only other evidence you're going to see about this is frankly inadmissible hearsay.

Maybe more importantly than this, I think I indicated to Your Honor in argument last week that I didn't think there was any consequence to a determination by this Court that the -- that the ledge -- that the appropriation provisions might prevent a referendum. I said statute wouldn't be unconstitutional, just would be subject to

referendum. Well, it turns out in the Michigan united case, one of the concurrences goes back and gives everybody the history of what happened in that case and so how did that case wind up in Court to begin with, and it wound up in Court because the persons, the group that wanted to have referendum went out and got the required number of signatures, went to the appropriate office where the election is going to be held and the first response was no referendum because of the provisions and then they went to Court to testify it, so I think we're in a situation where frankly the only circumstance where this issue of whether or not the appropriate -whether or not the appropriation provisions are in there for an appropriate purpose would conceivably come up is when a person or organization desiring a referendum within the time specified by the statute -- and it could conceivably have run, I couldn't figure that out -- actually collects the signatures, goes down to the appropriate place and tries. That never happened.

It also appears that even if a group or person doesn't do that, there is an initiative process which is different from a referendum process which they could have triggered, and that
process is not dependent in any way on whether or not there's an appropriation provision in the relevant statute.

And finally I think it was pointed out when we were together last that the PA436 contains the sever ability clause, and so what's left to have happen at this point is that if that provision is somehow inappropriate and has to be stricken for some legally cognizable reason, the rest of the statute is still there. So I would say again, summarizing from where I started, there's two points here. One is that I think Your Honor is asking for an inquiry that is not only impracticable, it is not one for courts, but in any event, it is not material to anything because it doesn't lead us anywhere that would change the result that we have PA436 or at least every single one of its provisions with or without the appropriation provision to apply and it's not upset by reason of the possibility that a referendum could have been attempted in some circumstances where one never apparently has been attempted.

And with that, I'll -- if you have no more questions, $I$ think $I$ 'm done.

THE COURT: Thank you.

As with the oral arguments, we have
agreed to work together to try and not duplicate efforts and to make a cohesive presentation. So just to give Your Honor a little bit of an

```
we may wish to make a closing statement.
we may wish to make a closing statement.
```

    THE COURT: Fine.
    MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
    THE COURT: You may proceed.
    MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor.
    Sharon Levine, Lowenstein Sandler, for AFSCME. I'm
actually here in the role of MC. asked to offer 104 for demonstrable purposes only because it may not be on the relevant list.

THE COURT: Any objection to 104 for demonstrative purposes only?

All right. The Court will admit it for that purpose.

MS. LEVINE: Good morning, Your Honor.
Sharon Levine.
THE COURT: Let's just have the record clearly state this. Does the State of Michigan wish to make an opening statement on the issue of the City's eligibility?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No, Your Honor, however,

THE COURT: Fine.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
THE COURT: You may proceed.
MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor.
Sharon Levine, Lowenstein Sandler, for AFSCME. I'm actually here in the role of MC.
understanding, the retirement system is going to in
Just days later, within actually win essence go first, spend about 20 minutes going through the timeline as we see it, following that, the retired Detroit police members association will react to the City's final portion of their statement and also to their particular issues as reflected in the timeline and apply it to the facts. The UAW, the public safety unions, the retired association parties and AFSCME will each spend just a few minutes indicate how long we see any additional facts or how the facts applied to our particular situations and then the retiree committee probably for 20 or 30 minutes will give a global overview of applying the facts that came out in the timeline to the law. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, do you think it's okay with your group if at a convenient break around noon we take our lunch break?
MS. LEVINE: That would be great.

MS. GREEN: Your Honor, Jennifer Green on behalf of the Retirement Systems.

THE COURT: Be sure you speak right into the microphone even though you've angled the lectern there.

put together a slide show presentation of the timeline. We believe that these facts will later be used to support certain legal arguments that we will be raising throughout trial regarding the fact that Chapter 9 was a foregone conclusion well before any creditor negotiations occurred. The Chapter 9 was filed in bad faith to circumstance vent the pension clause and we submit respectfully we disagree with the City's assertion a moment ago that Chapter 9 was a mere contingency and our assertion is that it really was a foregone conclusion before any of the creditor negotiations ever occurred. And with that, I will begin.

You may ask why we're going back this far to 2011, but at his deposition, Your Honor, Governor Snyder testified that this has been a high ly structured process foreclose to three years. So we again in January 2011 when Richard Snyder takes office of the Governor of the State of Michigan.
Shortly thereafter, just three months
later, the Governor signs into law what we now refer to as PA4. The legislation makes it is its a awe both awes within just 34 days. February, 2012, stand up for democracy files with the Secretary of State a petition to invoke a referendum on PA4.
three days of stand up for Democracy's position, discussions begin regarding ways to insulate PA436 or what will become PA436 eventually from referendum. There are notations that discussions were had with Andy Dillon, the treasurer of the State of Michigan's office, and there are notes about Miller Buckfire going to follow up with Andy directly with the process for getting this to the Governor and a notation that the cleanest way to do all of this is new legislation that establishes aboard and includes an appropriation for state institution if an appropriation is attached, it concludes then the statute is not subject to repeal by the referendum process.

In April of 2012, the City enters into the consent agreement with the State of Michigan. Shortly thereafter, Heather Lennox of Jones Day and Ken Buckfire of Miller Buckfire purportedly meet with Governor Snyder on June 6 of 2012 to discuss the City of Detroit's financial crisis and issues related to potential Chapter 9 bankruptcy.

Prior to the meeting in the email that we discussed earlier, and that I quoted for you earlier during oral arguments, there is a notation
that Mr. Buckfire suggested that all the memos be put together, the ones that were done for Andy. A list of those memos were compiled and three of those we think are pertinent to some of the issues at trial in this case. One of the memos would regarding a summary and comparison of PA4 in Chapter 9, one was a memoranda on constitutional protections for pension and OPEB liabilities and a third memo was analysis of filing requirements of section 109 C5 of the Bankruptcy Code in particular negotiation being impracticable and negotiate inning good faith.

Two weeks after meeting with Governor Snyder, Miller Buckfire is engaged by the State of Michigan to perform an analysis of the City's financial condition. Shortly thereafter, Ken Buckfire testified that after he got this engagement, he started receiving phone calls from law firms seeing if we would be interested in helping them get inserted.

THE COURT: I need to interrupt you for a second.

MS. GREEN: Going too fast? I was trying to get done.

THE COURT: I really want to follow what
you say, so I need you to slow down.
MS. GReEN: I knew I only had 30 minutes. THE COURT: We don't have to stop right at noon.

MS. GREEN: I will slow down.
THE COURT: Slow down for me by about 50 percent.

MS. GREEN: Wonderful. I get this a lot.
I know I'm a fast talker.
The discussion continues, Mr. Buckfire testified that core in ball had wanted him to meet one of her partners who was successful in a Chapter 9 case. This is in 2012. In October of 2012, PA -- before PA4 is even rejected by the voters, the treasury department and the Governor's office begin discussing creation of a new emergency manager statute just in case the referendum is passed. Howard Ryan who is $30(b)(6)$ witness for the State of Michigan will testify to that.

Shortly thereafter, November 6, 2012, the
Michigan electorate rejected PA4. In December, a Senate bill 865, which would eventually become PA436 is introduced in the Michigan legislature The final version is adopted by both houses just 14 days later on December 15th.
your understanding that one or more of the reasons to put the appropriation language in there was to make sure it could not -- the new act could not be defended by a referendum? He answered yes. Where did you get that knowledge from? Well, having watched the entire process unfold over the past two years. The Governor's office new that was the point of it? Yes. That your department, his is the treasury, knew that was the point of it? Yes.

In January of 2013, Miller Buckfire was regauged this time by the City of Detroit to continue its evaluation of the City's financial condition.

Mr. Buckfire was then asked by treasurer Dillon to make arrangements for the City and state officials to meet and interview Jones Day and seven other law firms that were interested in serving as restructuring counsel.

The day before the pitch presentation, with the City of Detroit, Kevyn Orr, who attends the pitch, receives an email recounting conversation withs Mr. Buckfire. Mr. Buckfire will be testifying live during this trial and listed are the questions that will be asked the following day at the pitch. They all relate to Chapter 9. Given
the issues that Detroit faces, how can they address them outside of Chapter 9 is the first, but all the rest are under what circumstances should Chapter 9 be used, how would one execute a low cost fast Chapter 9. Given Chapter 9 experience, what went wrong with Jeff co and Orange County? And at the bottom, if Miller Buckfire finds away to monetize assets and create liquidity, how would that impact eligibility?

The next day on January 29, Joans day parents its restructuring strategy to the City and state officials and it explains, while out of Court solutions are referred, they conclude they are extremely difficult to achieve in practice.

They note the Chapter 9 can create negotiating leverage, negotiating with the back drop of bankruptcy which we submit is not good faith.

They further conclude in their strategy that an out of Court plan should contemplate the possibility of Chapter 9 because it creates leverage, you can negotiate in the shadow of Chapter 9, and it helps bolster your eligibility and your success in a Chapter 9 by establishing a record of seeking creditor consensus.

There are notes on the slide that state a good faith effort to pursue and out of Court restructuring plan will establish that clear record and will deflect any eligibility complaints based on alleged failure to negotiate or bad faith. If needed though, Chapter 9 could be used as a means to further cut back or compromise quota crude financial benefits otherwise protected under the Michigan constitution.

The next day, Richard Baird, who is Governor Snyder's consultant reaches out to Jones Day to inquire about hiring Kevyn Orr as the emergency manager. The following day, Mr. Orr calls PA436 a clear end around the prior initiative that was rejects by the voters in November. And also comments so although the new law, PA436, provides the thin veneer of a revision, it is essentially a redo of the prior rejected law and appears to merely adopt the conditions necessary for a Chapter 9 filing?

THE COURT: What do those statements appear in?

MS. GREEN: It's Orr Exhibit 4,
JDRDOOO0295. An email.
THE COURT: Right. But what is that?
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MS. GREEN: It's an email. An email. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. GREEN: In February of 2013, Mayor Bing was approached by Mr. Baird regarding Kevyn Orr as the candidate for the emergency manager position and Mayor Bing recalls that the only salient qualifications about Mr. Orr was his bankruptcy experience.

Mr. Baird told him about Kevyn Orr's experience in part of the Chrysler bankruptcy team. And Mr. Orr -- Mayor Bing was asked, did you ask Mr. Baird anything else about Mr. Orr's qualifications to serve as emergency financial manager.

And then he answers, yes, I did, and he felt that not only was he a lawyer that dealt with bankruptcy for over 30 years, but he also had some qualifications as it related to restructuring. And did Mr. Baird indicate that Orr had qualifications concerning restructuring outside the context of bankruptcy? That would be no was his response.

In March, the Governor declared that a local government financial emergency existed in the City of Detroit. At the end of March, Kevyn or was
appointed emergency manager of the City of Detroit and March 28, PA436 becomes effective and in April 2013, Jones Day is engaged as legal counsel for the City of Detroit.

After being appointed emergency manager, Kevyn Orr is quoted on May 12, 2013, and we've all heard this quote, I'll say it again, the public can comment on the City's financial and operating plan, but we are not like negotiating the terms of the plan.

The day before presenting its proposal to the creditors, Mr. Orr gives an interview with the Detroit Free Press and expresses his intent to invade the pensions clause through a Chapter 9 bankruptcy proceeding. And we have quoted for you the portion of that interview and highlighted it in yellow.

He states if you think your state vested pension rights, either as an employee or retiree -that's not going to protect you. If we don't reach an agreement one way or the other, we feel fairly confident that the state federal law, federalism will trump state law.

On June 14, the emergency manager held a meeting at the Detroit Metropolitan airport and
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presented the City's proposal for the creditors. The evidence will show that the City proposed to fully intended to impair and diminish accrued financial benefits. This is an excerpt from the proposal for creditors and it clearly states that with respect to unfunded pension liabilities, quote such contributions will not be made under the plan. And it further states there must be quote significant cuts and accrued vested pension amounts for both active and currently retired persons.

On June 20, the emergency manager
undertook a presentation regarding the City's finances and planned restructuring to both uniform and non uniformed retirees. Numerous witnesses who attended this meeting, several of which will be testifying at trial, will testify that they did not observe or participate in any negotiations regarding the City's financials and that these meetings were purely informational.

On June 27, following this presentation
that I just spoke of, the city sends a letter to the UAW thanking them for their time and participating in the meeting and in that letter even the City acknowledged that unions would need more information moving forward. The letter here
is quoted. The City recognizes that representatives of active and retired employees will need access to additional information to analyze the restructuring proposals outlined in the June 20 meetings. Information relevant to these proposals will be made available in the online data room, but at this time on June 27th, that information, as they were saying, was not yet available.

Five days later on July 23, gracey
Websters and Veronica Thomas commenced lawsuits against the State of Michigan, the Governor and the Treasurer, seek ago declaratory judgment that PA436 violated the pensions clause and they also sought an injunction.

In July, when several of the creditor meetings took place, the evidence will show that the City had no intention of actually negotiating with its creditors. By July 8, you will see an email with an attachment of a timeline and a communications roll out demonstrating that the City had already determined that its Chapter 9 petition was going to be filed on July 19th. There's a timeline crafted by the State of Michigan that identifies July 19th as a filing date despite the

In an email from Kevyn Orr's press secretary, Bill Nowling to certain state officials, he lays out the communications plan and if you go down to the yellow portion, starts with we negotiated in good faith with all of Detroit's creditors. Mind you, several of the meetings had not yet even occurred. We presented a comprehensive restructuring plan to creditors in June. At this point, it would be impractical to continue discussions out of Court because it is clear that we will be able to reach agreement with some creditors only through a court supervised process. And the State of Michigan has authorized the emergency manager to take this step This is on July 8th.

The timeline attached to that
communications roll out, on Thursday, July 18th, states that last minute revisions will be made to all the key documents and on Friday, July 19th,
which is in bold and capital letters called the filing day, at 9:00 the Governor's office is supposed to transmit the authorization letter to the emergency manager and at 10:00 on the 19th, the necessary paperwork is supposed to be filed with the Court system and then a series of press conferences are to be held.

The following day, on July 9th, an email from treasurer Dillon to the Governor of the State of Michigan states we are still in the informational mode. This email is interesting for several reasons. First, it states that Kevyn will meet with the Detroit pensions the following day on July 10th. It says there will be no exchange of documents. And that he will not translate the information that he gives into an impact on retiree or employees vested rights. Treasurer Dillon continues and says that are a lot of creative options that we can explore to address how they will be treated and restructuring with respect to the pensions but at his deposition when he was asked whether these creative options were ever explored directly with the Retirement Systems, Dillon said no and it's not up there but he also was asked if they were ever -- three creative
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options were put into written reports or formal proposals and he also said no, they were not.

If you are in the email I says to the Governor, tops rows meetings could be lead to directions to you about your view on this topic. In my view, it's too early in the process to respond to hypothetical questions. We remain in many ways at the informational stage. This was just one week before the filing and Mr. Dillon admitted at his deposition that nothing changed between July 9 and the filing date of July 18th that would take them out of this informational stage as he called it.

On July 10 and 11, there were a series of creditor negotiations, alleged creditor negotiations that took place. The emergency manager himself did not even attend. But witnesses who did attend the meeting will testify that they did not observe or participate in any negotiations regarding the City's finances and that again these meetings were purely informational. And this is consistent with the state treasurer's report to the Governor that as of July 8, we are still in the informational mode. It's also consistent with

Mr. Orr's admission at his deposition when he was
questioned, there were no actual negotiations at the June 14th meeting, were they? And he answers no, not as is generally understood.

Lastly, the fact that there were no negotiations on July 10 th and 11 is consistent with the City's and the state's communications roll out which had already adopted the excuse that negotiations were going to be impractical.

On July 12, following those meetings, the Detroit firefighters association sends a letter to the emergency manager asking for more information and stating it would be productive if the City could provide us with its specific proposals on pension benefit restructuring as soon as possible. We have two meetings with the City where pension benefits were addressed and City have only the City's general observation that pension benefits must be reduced.

At trial, Mark Diaz, the president of the Detroit Police Officers Association and Dan McNamara, the president of the Detroit Fire fighters association, will testify that no specific proposal were ever given by the City after this letter and instead the City filed bankruptcy just six days later.
unions received correspondence from the City thing them on behalf of the emergency manager for their quote strong cooperation regarding the City of Detroit pension restructuring. Later that same day, the Retirement Systems filed their lawsuit against the Governor and the emergency manager inning am county circuit Court seeking declaratory relief.

That same night at 6:23 p.m., the Governor's press secretary Sara Warfal, circulates an updated timeline that still shows the bankruptcy filing date of Friday, July 19th.

This is July 17 th at 6:23 p.m. The following day, the Retirement Systems filed a motion for a TRO seeking an injunction. At 3:05 p.m. that afternoon, Margaret Nelson of the Attorney General's office received a phone call informing her the retirement systems were in Court seeking a TRO.

At 3:47, the governor emailed his
authorization to Orr and to Treasurer Dillon. At 4:06, Orr changes the date on the filing papers from July 18th, crosses us out the 19 because it was supposed to be filed on the 19th, handwrites in 18 and files the petition, one hour and one minute
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after finding out that the retirement systems were in Court seeking a TRO, which is inconsistent with the timeline sent at 6:30 the night before saying it was going to be on Friday. And at 4:10 p.m. the attorney general appears for the TRO hearing inning am county. And this is reflected in the papers filed by the state, the docket history and the hearing transcripts.

Orr later admitted he was being counseled that it would be quote irresponsible not to file the petition sooner rather than later given all the lawsuits that were popping up.

On July 19, following day, the
declaratory judgment was entered against the Governor, Treasurer and State of Michigan and that declaratory judgment states PA436 is unconstitutional and in violation of Article IX, Section 24 of the Michigan constitution. It further states the Governor is prohibited from authorizing an emergency manager to proceed under Chapter 9 .

Yet the City filed its Chapter 9 petition
despite the fact that each of its advisors
uniformly testified at the depositions that the
City's financial information was still incomplete
as of the filing and in fact to date is still incomplete.

Charles Moore, senior managing director at Conway McKenzie testified that quote when he was asked how has there been a specification of those level of cuts that the City contends must occur? He says I mean, have you put a dollar amount on it? He answers no, our analysis of this continues. Right now we still don't know what assets could be available to put towards the pensions. We still have not had the type of dialogue that we would like to have related to the calculation of the unfunded amount so because of those two uncertainties among others we don't know what cuts, if any, there may need to be.

State Treasurer also agreed that as of July 8, just a week before the filing, I thought that situation was not understood enough for the Governor to go on record yet because I don't even tell him with any degree of confidence what level of funding the pension funds had, so why should he get in the middle of a debate about this?

In addition, as of the petition date, and I believe the City's witnesses will testify consistent with their depositions, that to date,
on the discovery matters with respect to which law had a spending provision added onto it.

## THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BRIMER: So rather than address my opening issue, to begin with, would the Court like me to address the legal issues raised by

Mr. Bennett or would you like -- I'm prepared to briefly discuss those. I don't have a written preparation but document into evidence think it's important for Court to understand, I did look at the case that Mr. Bennett cited. I didn't disregard in a case law when come together this Court and believing there was a factual issue.

With respect to the Michigan united case, I think it's factually distinguishable again. That case did not involve an original law that did not have a spending provision that was overturned on referendum and then a new law presented. In that case, Your Honor, the issue is whether or not the spending provision itself, added in the original law, such that it was not subject to referendum, was in fact an appropriate provision taking it out of the referendum provision. You know, Your Honor, that is not the facts that we have before us today In addition, Your Honor, I have reviewed justice
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core began's opinion, which by the way was a concurring opinion, not the Court's majority opinion, but she addressed the issue of intent and that generally speaking we do not look to the motive or intent of the legislature -- legislative body when passing a law, but she said this is because and she notes this in a footnote, this is because generally speaking we do not have any testimonial record regarding motive or intent.

That would be, Your Honor, in her concurring opinion, there is no testimonial record in the -- in this original action regarding the motive or intent. Well, Your Honor, that is simply not the case in this matter.

As Ms. Green read to you and as I quoted from the state's own $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness, we have evidence regarding the motive of the inclusion of the spending provisions on an act that had previously been rejected on referendum. We believe that factual issue is important to this Court in determining that whether or not some or all of PA436 should have been subject to the second provision that everyone seems to gloss over in article two, section nine of the constitution, which states specifically that no law that has
properly been submitted to referendum can then -and rejected can then be passed without a referral back to the general electorate.

Your Honor, the cases cited by the state, Ms. Nelson, of Reynolds v Martin, and the case cited this morning just simply are not factually -similar enough to PA436 to be controlling and we do and -- my opening can be as simple as Your Honor, the evidence will show that the motive of including the spending provisions was to in fact take an act that had previously been overturned on referendum and disregard the will of the people and it's very clear that the state's attorney argued yesterday that we knew what the people's will was because we have the media. Well, we know what the people's will was. The people's will was we not have an emergency manager who would supplant the democratically elected officials in the City of Detroit and that was very clear and yet we now have PA436, which disregarded that, which added spending provision to it and the facts will demonstrate that we can establish what the motive was in adding those spending provisions, and moreover, we can establish that the emergency manager, Mr. Orr, was fully aware of that at the time he accepted his
our lunch break now. Before we do, I want to remind everyone that we are guests here in this building and we need to maintain decor up and silence while we are in the hallways. Please don't linger in the halls. You can have your conversations here in the courtroom over lunch if you would like to do that or in the elevator or the first floor but please maintain silence in the hall.

Is it -- let's see. It's noon. We'll
reconvene at $1: 30$ please. And that's it.
COURT CLERK: All rise.
(Whereupon a lunch break was taken from 11:59 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.)

THE COURT: Counsel are present. We have
a couple of housekeeping matters that we need to address before we continue with our opening statements please.

The first is that in the amended final pre-trial order that was submitted through our order processing program, on Attachment $G$, which is attachment from the Retirement Systems, the exhibit numbers were omitted. I'm sure that was inadvertent. So please fix that and resubmit it as soon as possible so we can get it entered, okay.
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MR. IRWIN: Of course, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And then a second brief housekeeping matter is Ms. Green still here? Mr. Gordon?

Just to keep the record a hundred percent clean, we need to put an exhibit number on a paper version of the slide presentation. So that for the record, that is identified, whatever exhibit number you want to put on it.

MR. GORDON: All right. Very well, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, will counsel be provided a copy of that when it's done?

THE COURT: Can you do that?
MR. GORDON: Yes. Absolutely.
THE COURT: All right. We are ready to
proceed.
MR. WERTHEIMER: William Wertheimer on behalf of the plaintiffs. I'll be very brief and I just want to add a couple points relative to the timeline Ms. Green was showing you. I do not have
a clicker, but I'll just state them.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WERTHEIMER: That is, first on

July 3rd, the Flowers lawsuit was actually filed before the Webster lawsuit. They were both filed on July 3rd, so they were both filed that day. Second, on the same day, both Flowers and Webster cases, the Judge Aquilina signed orders to show cause setting a hearing for the preliminary injunction that we were seeking for July 22 nd. So that -- and those were served on the Governor and the Treasurer on July 3rd. So that at the point in time on the timeline a few days later, when they're sitting the punitive bankruptcy for July 19th, fray, they know that the state Court preliminary injunction hearing is being scheduled for July 22nd, the following Monday. That's it. Thank you.

## THE COURT: Okay.

 MS. CECCOTTI: Good afternoon, YourHonor. Babette Ceccotti, Cohen, Weiss \& Simon LLP for the UAW. Ms. Green's timeline was very complete and detailed. I do want to just -because I don't think this particular slide was up there, so I would like to mention the pitch book again. Ms. Green had a slide from the Jones Day pitch book from January 20, 2013, and 1 thing that when Your Honor goes through the pitch book, you'll
notice that there are a few -- quite a few, I would say, or certainly more than one or two references to the use of Chapter 9, either itself or the shadow of Chinas leverage. Vis-a-vis creditors, vis-a-vis specific proposals and claims related to -- related to labor costs, and I think Ms. Green showed the slide with the quote on there about using Chapter 9 to reduce accrued financial benefits.

The other thing that I would like to mention about the pitch book which really does become something of a blueprint, I think, for what follows, is at page 57, there's a slide that reads any Chapter 9 process should be comprehensive, and it starts with the bullet plans of adjustment address narrow range of economic compromises. And then it talks about -- then there are other bullets that follow. Other fundamental changes must occur outside the plan context. Any Chapter 9 process should pursue as many revitalization initiatives as possible. Negotiating in Chapter 9 or its shadow is a powerful tool for revitalization and finally, the City should take advantage of its opportunity for long-term comprehensive solutions.

So that's actually a good segue to the

June 14 th proposal because as we've talked about before, in the other arguments that we've had, this is really a massive comprehensive revitalization proposal. It really has elements of more or less what that slide that $I$ just read you is talking about. It's got the plans include a $\$ 1.25$ billion spending program going out over ten years. There are many detailed wide ranging initiatives that have to do with improvement of services, upgrades, reinvestment, and the like, and there is also a restructuring proposal. There is a section called restructuring proposal. I don't have to take you through that because we've been through it a number of times. You know what the pension proposal, what the pension proposal is, but the point being that just the four corners of the proposal itself, what that reflects in terms of what it is that the City is trying to pursue through Chapter 9 .

In terms of the events following the launch of that proposal on June 14th, I think that we see a number of things, and the evidence will show this.

As we saw actually from Mr. Bennett's slide, the number of meetings that actually occur on this proposal -- regarding this proposal are

ROUGH - DAY 1 - $10 / 23 / 13$
relatively few. It's a limited number of sessions regardless of how we're characterizing them. There's at least one document that refers to one of the meetings as informational, in fact.

We have the data room issue. Ms. Green
read the letter or showed the letter to the UAW regarding the fact that the data room wasn't quite up and running yet, but what is also true about the data room is as Your Honor knows from the early days of this case, is that in order to access the data room, one had to sign a confidentiality agreement and an additional release to get the Milliman pension materials and my client at least took issue with that prior to the bankruptcy. And others -- other groups may have as well, so you had this quite massive proposal, a series of really a handful of meetings being held, with the data that the City was loading into the data room about the proposal not readily available.

In addition, as I mentioned, these were not -- they were just a few of these meetings, and I think the evidence will show that they wouldn't really constitute labor negotiations, the unions various ways that they talk about that in the evidence. They are fairly well, I guess I'll just
use the word highly organized or the phrase highly organized by the City, including one meeting where -- at least one meeting where if there are were questions about the proposal, those in attendance were required to submit them on cards anded cards would be read as opposed to any sort of free flowing give and take that one might associate with a meeting with stakeholders that we might think about in terms of going over a restructuring proposal or even a labor proposal.

So now I would like to get to
Mr. Bennett's comments about the UAW because I think this really does -- this is really a very important point. Yes, it is true that we as we know, the proposal included the cessation of funding to the retirement system and the statement about -- the statement that significant cuts to accrued vested pension benefits would be necessary So yes, on its -- the UAW's position is yes, on its face, looking at page 109, if that's the right page, that is a proposal that violates the Michigan State constitution and the immediate question that a rises on its face just looking at it like that is how could it be accepted, how could it be a accepted by a labor union, how could it be accepted

by anyone purporting to speak for or represent actives or retirees.

So yes, on its face, the proposal was not acceptable and we believe that that has legal consequences as distinct from fact consequences, so I do want to make that point about the -- about our objection our amended objection in that regard.
We very much believe that has legal
consequences. As a factual matter, however, and notwithstanding the fact that the proposal on its face could not be accepted, you couldn't simply hand it to the union with a signature line and say here, sign. The UAW, through its general counsel, contacted Jones Day on July 9 th and we'll have a witness to this effect and we have an exhibit on it as well, to raise a couple of points. One regarding the data room and the confidentiality issue that I mentioned already, and in response to the letter that Mr. Bennett's chart showed trying to ask the labor organizations and the retiree groups if they would be representing their retirees, the email to Jones Day reads as follows. Further, to -- it's reservation of rights, the UAW continues to seek an answer from Mr. Orr and your firm as to the following. Please cite the basis
for any claim that the UAW has the authority to compromise the vested benefits of active and/or retired UAW or former UAW members employed or formerly employed by the City of Detroit and its affiliates, as I presume you know, article nine, section 24 of the Michigan constitution provides in pertinent part that quote the accrued financial benefits of each pension plan and retirement system of the state and its political subdivisions shall be a contractual obligation thereof, which shall not be diminished or impaired thereby, unquote.

Please tell me what authority your firm and/or Mr. Orr believe gives the UAW the right to compromise vested pension benefits despite the contrary preventions of article nine, section 24. Please also tell us whether Mr. Orr and/or your firm take the position that Article IX, Section 24 of the Michigan constitution is not or may not be binding on the City of Detroit, the State of Michigan, Governor Snyder, Mr. Orr, or the UAW and the state, if that is the case, under what circumstances you believe that, Article IX, Section 24 would not bind some all of these persons or entities.
We also seek answer to the same question

I should note that -- and we'll have testimony to this effect -- that no answer was forthcoming from the City and as far as I know has not been forthcoming regarding the questions posed other than obviously when we got into bankruptcy Your Honor solved the problem of the debtor. Timeframe. Putting aside the lawsuits and all of the activity surrounding all of that, it does appear that the City set out a timeline for itself that only had about a 30 day period for this launch, notwithstanding everything that's in that proposal, and everything that was expected apparently to be accomplished by it. I think I heard Mr. Bennett refer to something like a valuation week, which was supposed to occur on or probably did occur, I gather did occur on July 15 th, that's really a month later.

So one -- now Mr. Bennett's timeline of course goes way back, I think it was to 2011 and the various initiatives to deal with Detroit's problems and we are certainly not denying any of those and I'm sure everyone is fully cognizant of particularly those who live here are fully cognizant of all of those efforts, but we think as a legal matter that those efforts really don't

legally count. They obviously count to the citizens of Detroit, but for purposes of eligibility, the relevant timeframe from our perspective is the proposal is launched on June 14 th, and then apparently evaluated -- the sponsor reaction apparently evaluated merely a mere four weeks later.

So during this time, again, the evidence
we believe will show that during the same sort of compressed time period, we know that the Governor and the Emergency Manager are meeting on a fairly regular basis, we know that the Governor had seen the June 14th proposed, had a draft of it before it was launched, he knew about the pension proposal, he knew that there was an issue a legal issue with respect to Article IX, section 24 , of the Michigan constitution and the effect, if any, of the Bankruptcy Code in federal law on the continued enforcement of that section. He knew it was a serious issue.

We know again since we have discussed it most recently last week at the argument that we then Marched through the timeline to get to Mr. Orr's July 16 th request and the Governor's July 18 th response. We know that the Governor
obviously from the dates signed it only two days later. Apparently with a review of all of the material that was contained in Mr. Orr's letter, I think could probably best be characterized as limited. It does not appear that there was an independent evaluation that the Governor conducted regarding many of the sort of predicate items that Mr. Orr laid out in his letter. The Governor was also aware as we know from the slides that Ms. Green showed that the pension numbers were very much still up in the air and in question.

Nevertheless, both the July 16 th and the July -- the July 16 th letter from Mr. Orr and the July 18 th approval letter from the Governor lay out the what I will characterize as the shift in spending priorities. This is the part of the proposal that relates to revitalization. And we know that the Governor in his letter approves of the manner in which Mr. Orr has proposed to proceed in that regard. And so he signs the letter and of course the bankruptcy petition is filed on the 18th.

So what all of this adds up to, we think at the end of the day, in terms of the legal cases, in terms of our legal objections, is a fairly
deliberate plan to use Chapter 9. We think that really knitting, connecting all of the dots here, that the plan was to use Chapter 9, we've said for another day all of the legal issues associated with that. The state's authorization, there's really -well, we won't get knee those because we'll have closing and we'll have other briefs on all of that, but the sort of deliberate plan which starts whenever you would like to start it on the timeline, but certainly from the Governor's appointment of Mr. Orr leaving the Jones Day firm, the Jones Day retention by the City, this really several month timeline leading from the end of March to the middle of July, we believe the evidence establishes this as a deliberate plan to use Chapter 9 to, in effect, find a way to under mine the Michigan State constitution through the use of bankruptcy. We believe that that is evidence of a lack of bad faith under 921c, a lack of bad faith in connection with --

> THE COURT: You mean a lack of good
faith.
MS. CECCOTTI: I'm sorry. I'm sorry
sorry, Your Honor. Not enough sleep. Now I'm afraid to open my mouth.

THE COURT: I'll help you
MS. CECCOTTI: A lack of good faith negotiations under 109 C5 and not a valid plan of adjustment for Chapter 9 purposes.

Thank you
MS. PATEK: Good afternoon, Barbara Patek again, on behalf of the Detroit firefighters association, the Detroit Police Officers Association, the Detroit police lieutenants and sergeants association and the Detroit police command officers association who have been collectively referred to in these proceedings as the Detroit public safety unions or the public safety unions.

As the evidence in this case will show, the public safety unions are the recognized collective bargaining representatives of the nearly 3200 men and woman employed by the Detroit fire department and the Detroit Police Department. I'm sure we'll here from Chief Craig, either today, tomorrow or sometime this week about the very daunting and difficult conditions in which they work to provide police and fire services to that are so essential to the survival and the revival of the City of Detroit.
may help in form those decisions by providing the Court with a practical and very real platform in which those questions can be applied.

Because the public safety unions will rely on and adopt certain proofs submitted by the other objectors, I'm going to try to avoid repeating what was said this morning, but I do want to briefly address where our proofs will fit in the chronology, the retirement system's put up this morning. And for ease of the Court's reference, and I apologize in advance, this will also have to be marked and we'll get a paper copy and I believe it will be Exhibit 720 ?

THE COURT: Okay. And I'll have to ask you to understand that I'm going to be looking at what's there on this little screen here just because it's easier for me, not that I'm not paying attention to you. I'm looking at it here.

MS. PATEK: That's okay. That's okay. The public safety union's piece of it are in red and the portions in black are portions from Ms. Green's timeline. And we did that so the Court could see where they fit in.

And we start in December of 2011 and January of 2012, but before we start talking about
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that time period, I do want to take a moment because I think it's important to this negotiations issue, and I think it's also important to some of the state labor law issues that inform how we ended up in Chapter 9 to take the Court back about 44 years ago. In the fall of 1969, again, not long after the City had been through some very, very trying times, then Governor Millikin, a Republican Governor, signed into law an act found beginning at MCL 423.231, that has come to be known as act 312 . Act 312 is as the Court may be aware the platform on which public safety unions negotiate their labor agreements under the auspices of the Michigan employment relations commission.

Before the Emergency Manager, terms and conditions of employment were negotiated pursuant to this process. That process which will be described by one of our witnesses, the Detroit police command officers labor attorney, Mary Ellen Gurwitz, is designed to provide for a period of mediation, followed by if the mediation fails, compulsory arbitration, including the opportunity to send the parties back to mediation, and it's designed to be expeditious and to keep labor piece, and if $I$ might say, might be a tool that if it
jurisdiction to address those disputes. And that becomes important because if you consider there's a plan on June 30, 2013, the collective bargaining agreements between the City, the DFFA, and the DPLSA all expired. Just two and a half weeks before the Chapter 9 petition was filed.

> The presidents of the firefighters association, Dan McNamara, the president of the lieutenants and sergeants, mark young, and the president of the DPOA, Mr. Diaz, as previously referred to, will each tell the Court that very quickly after the Emergency Manager's appointment on March 28 th, they were each informed by the City that it was exercising its right under public act 436 not to bargain. I know we've heard through some of the testimony that that was done to somehow not waive their rights not to bargain, but the Court will have to consider whether it accepts that as a credible explanation for what happened next. Following the June 14 th presentation, again, as Ms. Ceccotti referred to, things moved very quickly. There was a presentation by the City the week of July 10 th, and on July 12 th, and it was up on the screen earlier today in Ms. Green's presentation, and I believe it is in the record as


Exhibit -- give you the right number here. I'm not seeing it, but it's a letter from each of the presidents of each of the Detroit public safety unions addressed to Jones Day indicating in response that they were in fact interested in making a counter proposal, they were seeking more information and a concrete proposal from the City in that regard.

Four days later, on June -- July 16, the Governor -- I'm sorry, Mr. Orr sent his letter to the Governor seeking authorization. The following day, Jones Day sent correspondence back to the four public safety unions thanking them on behalf of the Emergency Manager for their strong cooperation in the City of Detroit's pension restructuring efforts. The next day, the petition was filed. Your Honor, we believe that when the court has heard all the evidence that it will be difficult for the Court not to conclude that in this case that there was in fact a calculated effort by the City going back over an extended period of time to use Chapter 9 to both in Mr. Orr's words trump that constitutional provision, but also as suggested in some of the arguments last week, to obtain the political cover that would be provided by this

Court to do so. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. MORRIS: Good afternoon. Thomas
Morris of Silverman \& Morris on behalf of the Retiree Association parties.

The Court heard a comprehensive opening statement from the Retirement Systems and opening statements from other opponents of the City's eligibility. Those statements chronicle the voluminous evidence weighing against eligibility. In our pre-trial brief, we focused on the evidence which we will offer through Shirley Lightsey, president of the DRCEA, that's the Detroit Retired City Employees Association, and Donald Taylor, the president of the RDPFFA. That's the Retired Detroit Police \& Firefighters Association. My opening statement will likewise address that evidence.

Mr. Taylor and Ms. Lightsey will testify that their associations have a long and active history they're not organizations which came into being just to respond to the present situation. But they are and were prepared to deal with it. The police and firefighters have had a
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Retiree Association since 1946. The DRCEA was formed in 1960. The elected leadership of these associations includes persons who had they been working for the City would be the ones responsible for helping to resolve the City's problems.
Members and management of the associations include a past can chief of police, deputy chief, City budget director, personnel managers, a Retirement Systems trustee, and City financial and legal staff. These are people who are leaders during their active service for the City and they continue to be leaders for the retirees.

More than 12,000 retired non uniform City employees are members of the DRCEA, and more than 8,000 retired Detroit police officers and firefighters and members of their organization. Both of these organizations serve City retirees in a number of ways but they have particular expertise in the pension and benefits areas. Although the associations do not have the power for governmental body to enter into agreements that bind their members, the elected leadership is responsible to the membership in responsive to the membership. They communicate with the retirees. The associations go beyond service through members.

Together they represent the class of retired Detroit employees. All Detroit retirees, not just the members who send in their dues.
The associations have appeared before City council, they have lobbied the state legislature, they have been party to lawsuits involving pension and benefit issues. The evidence will show that the associations of the natural representatives of the retirees capable of negotiating on their behalf. Upon the Emergency Manager's appointment, each of the associations contacted the Emergency Manager in writing, sent him a letter. Mr. Orr did not respond to the letters but he did invite the association -associations to informational sessions which they conducted. The City conducted in April, June and July.

Both Ms. Lightsey and Mr. Taylor attended those meetings. The evidence will show that the City in its meetings never got beyond the first step of presenting information. The City never offered to meet with the retirees to discuss the City's proposal or to negotiate. The retiree representatives were relegated to being members of a large audience. The associations had their

## ROUGH - DAY 1 - 10/23/13

attorney contact the City's attorneys, Jones Day, to request the opportunity to specifically address retiree issues but nothing came of that. Instead, on July 18, in a tactical rush, the City filed its petition.

The evidence will show that negotiations with the retirees was possible. The membership of the associations is more than a majority of the retirees. Overall, it's considerably more than two thirds. By working with the membership, the City had the opportunity to make an agreement with a majority of the retirees and thereby satisfy section 109 C5 A either by not impairing the class or by reaching an agreement.

The evidence will show that negotiation
was not impracticable. Certainly not with the retirees who prior to the appointment of the Emergency Manager had already elected their leaders. The retirees had built and maintained through the work of generations of dedicated volunteers organizations which were prepared to work on behalf of the retirees for the best outcome of Detroit for Detroit. The evidence will show that the Emergency Manager in his advisors rejected the opportunity to attempt to resolve matters as to
the retirees. The City therefore does not satisfy the eligibility requirements of section 109 C5. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. LEVINE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
Sharon Levine, Lowenstein Sandler for AFSCME.
Very briefly and not to be repetitive, with regard to solvency, the City addressed AFSCME's brief with regard to our request that there should actually be expert testimony in order to meet the burden of proof with regard to this issue.

And the City's response is basically what we've seen in some smaller debtor cases which is the debtor can testify to its own numbers. We're not necessarily disputing that line of cases. What we're saying here, Judge, is that this is not the debtor that's testifying to its own numbers. We don't have anybody from the budget department, we don't have any of the elected officials. What we have are hired experts who are being offered as fact witnesses, so we're bringing in experts like Ernst \& Young, Conway MacKenzie, Miller Buckfire being paid millions of dollars who routinely appear as expert witnesses and for reasons that we submit

ve,




an entire City said that there wasn't enough -there wasn't an ability to get it done out of Court and they had run out of time.

The other issue there is too many bold holders means that you've met the impracticality standard means that what you're doing is you're writing the need to respond to labor out of the code. If you have too many bondholders it's impractical and therefore you don't even have to go further. With we would respectfully submit that that would be a sad day for Detroit if we're actually writing the need to negotiate with labor out of the code.

The June 14 meeting is the meeting where the proposal was presented. We've heard the City say that at that meeting, they invited questions. Okay. So we have a meeting that lasts a couple of hours, we have a proposal that's in excess of 110 pages, the amount of time it fakes to read the slides takes up the line's share of that meeting and in addition to that, the questions this which were can permitted were in a very controlled environment and under the guise that the City was quote unquote begging for feedback. All right? The City announced at that meeting that these are
are not appropriate here are just simply being offered without having to give their expert testimony with regard to solvency.

With regard to impracticality and the issue of good faith. We would respectfully submit that the argument that there is simply too many classes of bondholders doesn't make a lot of since. The June 14 date that the proposal was presented and the filing date of July 18 th was only one month and three days. Even if we went by the City's own originally projected timeline, the filing date was projected to be July 19th. That's only one month and four days. It takes more months than that to negotiate out of court work outs in simple, small, single level of debt Chapter 11 cases. We respectfully submit that the timeline the City set for itself was a team line not to allow an out of Court negotiation to fully take place.

The City also looks to the fact that there are too many bondholders. And therefore, it was impractical to negotiate with bondholders and they cited to a New York case. The only New York case we were able to find that addressed the issue was the off track betting case which dealt with a six-month period before that case which wasn't even
not negotiations. Now whether that announcement was made to preserve a technical reservation of rights under PA436, they invited a roomful of labor negotiations and they held a meeting that was basically a classroom type instruction meeting and then they announced after a brief Q\&A period these are not negotiations. And somehow or other, this roomful of labor negotiations was supposed to understand that, well, they're not technically legal negotiations for PA436, we really are asking for negotiations to meet the good faith requirement under the Bankruptcy Code. That's not a realistic or fair interpretation of the facts here, coupled with the fact we have sophisticated bankruptcy counsel and all these sophisticated outside consultants who apparently when receiving a letter from these same labor negotiations that a certificate and response to the June 14 proposal what we have factual and legal reasons why we think we can't negotiate with you, that causes them to immediately think negotiations are impossible. That's not an -- that's not a fair reaction either. I've never walked into a labor negotiation where the company said to the union here's your 1113 proposal, what do you think. And the union has
said oh, good idea. It takes a little bit more than that, Your Honor.

In addition to that,
THE COURT: Well, you raise an
interesting point there that has been on my mind and that is the extent to which the standard of good faith negotiation in 1113 is related to or overlaps with the standard of good faith negotiation in Section 109 or even for that matter
the extent to which it overlaps with whatever the law of good faith negotiation is in labor law outside of bankruptcy.

I think it would help me if anyone would be interested in briefing that subject. I'm not surprised. And two distinct questions there. The one is is there this overlap, should there be this overlap; and second, how might the law in those other circumstances, 1113 and labor law more generally, help to resolve the issue here of whether there was good faith negotiation?

MS. CECCOTTI: Your Honor, may we join with that?

THE COURT: Yes, the invitation is an open invitation.

MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor. We
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accept the invitation and if you if Your Honor sets a deadline.

THE COURT: What's convenient for you
all?
MS. LEVINE: Two weeks? Is that --
THE COURT: Two weeks is fine with me. MS. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Two weeks from today then. I'll enter an order just so the record has it there.

MS. LEVINE: Your Honor, but moving past
that, okay, so we have the City saying that these are not negotiations and labor negotiators are supposed to glean that they are negotiations, and then we have labor negotiations taking a hard line at the initial proposal and the City accepting that then there can't be any negotiation somehow or other this proves that the City acted in good faith or that the negotiations were impractical, we respectfully submit that's false, and not only is it false, but for the reasons that you've heard from some of the other folks already, we too sent requests to the City for additional information to understand what the ask was, what the savings, what the proposed savings were and for better
information to understand while it was a long slide show, a little bit more about what the assumptions behind the proposal or the alleged proposal were so that we could in fact liken an 1113 context truly engage in a meaning fulling negotiation. And AFSCME itself, Your Honor, just a mere 18 months prior to the bankruptcy filing, on behalf of itself and with a coalition of 30 unions, did agree to a tentative agreement which resulted in substantial savings for active and retirees benefits and those were ratified by all of those respective unions but not implemented by the City.

So I would respectfully submit that not only was there an ability to negotiate in good faith over a period of just a couple of months, but there's a proven track record that on this side of the table, we have been able to actually do those negotiations and accomplish results.

THE COURT: Why not implemented?
MS. LEVINE: You would have to ask the City and the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LEVINE: It does remain a mystery to us because it also included for example changes to the pension benefits on a go forward basis and to
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the extent that there are other different issues that they needed to address now, those too should have been addressed through negotiations.

What we seem to be hearing and what is also a very important point for the City of Detroit and for Chapter 9 on a go forward basis is that if you have legacy liabilities and you have to deal with retiree benefits, then you automatically get to say it's impractical and I don't have to show good faith at all and we would respectfully submit that that would be a very sad place for the City of Detroit to take Chapter 9 in all cases on a go forward basis. We would respectfully submit, Your Honor, that the City can't meet its burden of proof and that it's not eligible in this case at this time to be a Chapter 9 debtor.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. ULLMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
Anthony Ullman from Dentons. I'll be speaking for the Retiree Committee.

But first, Ms. Patek asked me to tell you
that Exhibit 704 was the number of the joint public safety unions letter that she couldn't find previously.

## THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ULLMAN: So I've done that.
Your Honor, of course we're here today on what the Court has identified as a factual issues which rise in the context of eligibility which the City has the burden of proof on and you've heard an overview of a lot of the evidence that the objectors expect to bring to the hearing, much of it in chronological order. And what I'm going to try to do is put that in a framework of the legal issues that relate to eligibility and try to explain how the evidence that we expect to come out at the hearing fits in with those legal issues. I'm going to be focusing of course on the issues that the Retiree Committee is advancing which I think are common to most if not all of the objectors.

Now it's the committee -- it's the committee's contention and the contention of the objectors in general that the City's failed to meet its burden of proof on a number of specific elements that it has to meet to be eligible for Chapter 9 and that it also has failed to meet its burden that showing that it's filing has been made in good faith, so I what I would like to do is kind
first of all what section 109 C 2 requires. And it requires specifically that the City be specifically authorized or the person acting for the City be specifically authorized to be a debtor under state law. And we don't think the City can show this as a factual matter because in filing the Chapter 9 petition, the Emergency Manager did so with the specific intent of taking actions and achieving results that are prohibited by the Michigan State constitution, namely the pension clause, Article IX, section 24 . And we believe that that renders the filing ultra vires ineffective and void. And this point also obviously ties in with the view that in filing the Chapter 9 petition, the Emergency Manager didn't act in good faith under section 921C. So what I'm going to do is review the evidence on the intent in filing particularly relative to the pension clause for both purposes of specific authorization and good faith under 921C together.

Now as the Court may recall, there's also another aspect we've raised with respect too section 921C, and good faith, and that is what we contend are the misleading statements and omission that is were made in connection with the Chapter 9
of go through those elements serially and put into context our view of how the evidence falls into that and how the evidence should shape your view of the law and application of the law.

And basically, our points are as follows.
The committee itself of course doesn't contest the Detroit's municipality and the committee is not contesting insolvency, although AFSCME of course is, but we do contest that other necessary elements have been met. Specifically it's our contention that the City can't show that the Emergency Manager first of all was specifically authorized to make this Chapter 9 filing.

We also contend that the City that is failed to meet the eligibility criteria that are set out in 109 C5 and there are of course two prongs of that. We say the City has not shown that it negotiated in good faith which was fired under sub prong C5 B, and we say the City can't show that the good faith negotiations were impracticable, which is a prong under sub C5C and finally the committee says that the City cannot show that it filed its petition in good faith which is required under 921C.

So taking that from the top, this is

doesn't prove anything, but the evidence will show that before becoming the emergency manager, he was a bankruptcy lawyer at Jones Day ands as I believe the Court has heard, he participated in the pitch that Jones Day made to the City and to the state to get its current assignment as restructuring counsel.

Now we've already seen from Ms. Green's presentation that prior to the pitch that Jones Day made, which was in late January, 2013, Mr. Orr was specifically asked about the availability and use of Chapter 9 specifically relative to the City of Detroit. And the evidence will show that in connection with that pitch, the Jones Day team was not only focused on Chapter 9, but was also specifically aware of the Michigan State pension clause and had already thought of using Chapter 9 as a means to try to get around it.

Now this is the cover of the Jones Day pitch book. And here's a slide from it. Which we're blowing up and what it says specifically is that if needed, Chapter 9 could be used as a means to further cut back or compromise quota crude financial benefits closed quote otherwise protected under the Michigan constitution. And that
appeared in the Jones Day pitch book are right there in the constitution.

Now the evidence will show that Mr. Orr was personally aware of the pension clause and the evidence will also show that when he became the emergency manager, Mr. Orr took an oath requiring him to uphold the pension -- the state constitution of which the pension clause is part.

And this is Mr. from Mr. Orr's testimony,
where he acknowledged that yes, he took the oath of office and he solvency Emily swore to support the constitution of the United States and the constitution of this state, that is, of the State of Michigan. But the evidence will show that instead of adhering to the strictures of the pension clause, Mr. Orr decided contrary to his sworn oath, to engage on a course of action that was deliberately designed to thwart it through the vehicle of a Chapter 9 filing. And I'm going to go through now some highlights of what I think the evidence will show, some of which your seen before, some of which you may not have.

The evidence will show that as early as May 2013, which is less than two months after he became the Emergency Manager, Mr. Orr made the
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quotation accrued financial benefits, I believe are words that are lifted right out of the pension clause itself.

So this is from the pitch book that Jones Day prepared and as we've said, Mr. Orr himself was a major player and part of the pitch book -- the Jones Day pitch team.

And the evidence further is that from his own review of the circumstances of PA 436 and PA 4, Mr . Orr concluded that the new law PA 436, in reality, was nothing more than a thin veneer. Those are Mr. Orr's words -- a thin veneer of a revision that's essentially a redo of the prior PA 4, the voters rejected and an end run around the voter rejection. This is from an email that Mr. Orr wrote and I believe it's a little hard to read because we didn't blow that top part up but I believe it's January 31 of 2013.

And this is from one of the exhibits that
was gone over with Mr. Orr in his deposition.
Now central to the issue of bad faith and authorization is a Michigan constitutions pension clause. I'll just put a copy of that up on the screen. And as we see the same word, the financial accrued financial benefits, the same words that
decision to cut pension benefits that were owed to retirees. And it will show that he therefore -- he understood that he was unable to identify any viable way to achieve that end just under state law and the evidence will show that the emergency manager therefore decided to accomplish that end through the means of a Chapter 9 filing.

And even more specifically, the evidence will show that the emergency manager decided to try to use Chapter 9, the Chapter 9 filing as a vehicle specifically to quote trump the pension clause of the Michigan constitution.

Now this all came together in the proposal to creditors that the Emergency Manager made on June 14 of 2013. And in his proposal, the Emergency Manager made no pretense that he was intending to protect accrued financial benefits as is required and provided for in the Michigan constitution. For example, here's an excerpt from page 109, where he specifically says that under this proposal, there must be significant cuts in accrued, vested pension amounts for both active and currently retired persons.

And under this June 14 proposal, the emergency manager in fact said that the City would
not make any further pension contributions on account of retirees.

For retirees, the defined pension benefits were to be cut entirely from the forecast of the City's expenses going forward as were the retiree healthcare benefits. And for active employees, they were being shown as switched from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan with the level of the City's funding of the contributions slashed dramatically from the present levels. Now for the actives, that is a new plan and the contributions are being made only on a going forward basis, so for the active employees, vested pensions, under this proposal, no further contributions would be made for those either.

Now the June 14 proposal, although it was very lengthy, well over a hundred pages, didn't mention anywhere in it the prospect or even the potentiality of a Chapter 9 filing, but the evidence will show very clearly that the Emergency Manager understood that his proposal could not be implemented outside of the context of Chapter 9 specifically because of the pension clause and that he therein tended to use Chinas a vehicle to, again in his words, trump that very clause, the
applies directly to what the City is trying to do through this Chapter 9 proceeding and that the pension clause is indirect conflict with what the emergency manager is trying to do here as regards pensions. There's no question about it, they are trying to do something that they acknowledge is in conflict with the pension clause. If that weren't the case, there would be no context in which the federal law could trump anything. There would be nothing to trump.

THE COURT: I don't mean to cut you off, but haven't we been through this? THE COURT: Any extent to which we haven't?

MR. ULLMAN: Yes, I believe there is, Your Honor. I'm trying to bring in additional evidence to make the largely the same points but in a more summary fashion and then move on to the eligibility issues.

And the Emergency Manager did all this in circumstances where he himself has admitted that he was not aware of any Court decision that allowed the use of a federal bankruptcy proceeding to trump

```
MR. ULLMAN: To some extent, Your Honor, I'm trying not to repeat.
            MR. ULLMAN: To some extent, Your Honor,
```

I'm trying not to repeat.
THE COURT: Any extent to which we
constitution's pension clause, and he's freely admitted that it's the state constitution, the pension clause and no other provision of the Michigan constitution that the Emergency Manager was trying to trump. This is an excerpt from his deposition. I think you may have seen parts of this before, but he says -- he goes on to say that he answers we don't believe there's an obligation under the state constitution to pay pensions. He says yes, that's right. He says no, I've made that statement many times.

And then we go on to ask him and the state law that you were referring to is being trumped was Article IX, section 24, isn't that right? He says yes, that's right. We asked is there any other state law that you viewed as relevant to the pension issue that you were trying to trump. He says no, there's no other state law that he's trying to trump. It's specific, the pension clause. Chapter 9 filing was done specifically to try to get around the pension clause of the constitution and there's no other way to read the evidence on that.

And these admissions also confirm the City's recognition that the pension clause in fact

a provision of the state law constitution. And the emergency manager did this in circumstances where the Jones Day law firm itself had previously advised that the Emergency Manager's ability to cut pensions through Chapter 9 was at best uncertain. That comes from the Jones Day pitch book itself. They said it was uncertain. And he did this in circumstances where the emergency manager had been advised by the state attorney general that the pensions were protected under Michigan State law and that what the emergency manager was doing in terms of trying to cut them was contrary to the Michigan constitution.

And finally on this point, we think that the timing of the filing itself is very
significant. You've seen already that there
were -- there was state Court litigation that was pending and you've heard that there was a TRO hearing that was scheduled and that the hearing on the TRO was scheduled to take place on the 18 th. And what the evidence shows -- I'm sorry, yeah, it was on the 18 th and the evidence shows as your seen already that the bankruptcy filing had been originally scheduled for the 19 th and then had been moved up to go and Cohen side on the 18 th
immediately prior to when the TRO hearing was supposed to take place.

And the evidence on that is as follows. I'll just skip to this particular slide. Mr. Orr was asked specifically about the timing of the filing of the bankruptcy petition and in particular about the timing relative to the TRO proceeding, he was asked is there a particular reason why the filing was made when it was at the time it was other than to try to get a jump on the state Court decision. And the Emergency Manager answered that to the best of his knowledge, there was no such reason.

So to sum up on all this, we think that it boils down to the simple proposition that a state actor who takes actions that are intentionally designed to achieve results that are in plain violation and indirect odds with the state constitution is not acting within the scope of his authority and is not acting in good faith and we believe the evidence will show that that's the situation here.

And I'm going to turn now to the issues of eligibility. And as we've said there are two prongs here. The City can prove by the good faith

negotiation or the impracticality issue either by showing it engaged in good faith negotiations or by showing that those were impracticable. Now on the good faith negotiation prong, we believe the evidence is going to show two things. First of all, the Emergency Manager has argued that the presentations and discussions that followed his June 14 th proposal to creditors constituted attempts add good faith negotiation, however, the evidence will show that at the time of the presentations and meetings, the Emergency Manager did not have what he believed was a plan of adjustment and specifically the Emergency Manager himself viewed the June 14th proposal only as a proposal and not as a plan of adjustment. Now we've heard this morning from Mr. Bennett that the City is apparently trying to backtrack on this now, but when Mr. Orr was questioned at his deposition, he not only acknowledged but was adamant that what he presented on June 14th, which was the subject of the following discussions and meetings, was not a plan, but merely a proposal that he had put out to seek the general creditor feedback. He said this very specifically. We never called this a plan. We
never called it a deal, we always called it a proposal. So it was never considered whatever the City is saying now, at the time that the proposal was made, which of course was well before we filed our pre-trial brief, which is the same period Mr. Orr testified prior to the filing of our pre-trial brief, Mr. Orr was quite clear that what they put on the table on June 14 th was not a plan of adjustment, was not intended as a plan of adjustment, was just intended as a proposal, something to be discussed.

And we believe this is important because under the clear what we believe is the clear weight of the law, in order for the negotiations that are referred to in subpart C5 B.

THE COURT: One second. I have been asked to ask you to move back from the mike just a bit.

MR. ULLMAN: Is that better? THE COURT: Maybe a little bit more. MR. ULLMAN: Little bit more. THE COURT: There you go. MR. ULLMAN: The reason this is important is because under subpart 109 C5 B, the negotiation that is are referred to in that subpart have to be
negotiations over what is a plan of adjustment as that plan is used in the Bankruptcy Code. The legal analysis on that, the authority as we site in our brief, and I'm in the going to repeat that here, but the point is that for the good faith negotiation prong to be met, the negotiations that have to be at issue have to take place over a plan of adjustment and the evidence shows that per the Emergency Manager's own testimony in this case no plan of adjustment was ever presented to the creditors and so a fortiori, the negotiations required under subprong C5 B never took place.

And so there's no confusion on this, I want to be clear that the question of whether the City presented the creditors with a plan of adjustment is a very different question from whether the City intended to impair or diminish protected pension payments.

On the one hand, as I've gone through,
the evidence will show that the City never presented creditors with anything that they considered a plan of adjustment and on the other hand, as I've gone through and Ms. Green has summarized, the evidence will show that the Emergency Manager did intend to impair the
protected pension benefits.
In fact, this latter point is not even subject to question. The City has actually admitted in an RFA in this proceeding that's binding on it that it in fact intends to impair the pension rights as part of this proceeding and that's from the City's answer to the RFA that was served on it, number 12, where they admit that the City intends to seek to diminish or impair accrued financial benefits, and that again is a term that's used in the pension clause of the constitution. So that's what the evidence will show on the existence of a plan of adjustment.

Now we also believe and you've heard before that even if there were a plan of adjustment, even if there had been one presented, there were no good faith negotiations. For example, there was into way to know from the evidence or rather from the information that was provided at the June 14 meeting how an actual monetary terms the individuals that the City sought to effect under the June 14 proposal would be impacted. And specifically, in terms of both the proposed pension cuts and the OPEB where the City was saying that the retirees would instead get some
proposed in the June 14 th document. And here's another letter from Jones Day. This is dated I believe July 17th, and what it says is we think it first makes sense to try to reach common ground with the unions and associations on actuarial assumptions and methods and the amount of the underfunding. First we got to figure out what the amount of the underfunding is, and then tackle the contributions and attendant benefit changes. We have to know what the size of the underfunding is before discussions can even take place. So again, there wasn't even anything concrete to negotiate over.

And finally, on this point, we believe
the evidence will show the City never really intended to engage in good faith negotiations. I'm going to put this document up briefly. We've gone through this before. This is a document from Bill Nowling of the Emergency Manager's office and basically what he's saying, this is as of July 8th, that they've already concluded what their key filing messages would be, July 8th, they're saying it's impracticable. This is before the meetings that were scheduled for July 10 th and 11, even too took place. So what we can see is even as the City
share of notes, there was no way for the retirees to know what the cash value was of what the City was proposing. And in fact, the evidence will show that for at least for retirees, at the time of the discussions over the June 14 proposal, the time those discussions were proceeding, the City itself did not even know what the real size of the unfunded pension liability was. In other words, there was no way to know what the parties were even negotiating over. And here's some of the evidence, quickly, on the negotiations.

First of all, the Emergency Manager has admitted, this is a question asked in regards to the June 14 meeting. We asked him were there negotiations there. His answer, no, there are not negotiations. I'm going to be careful how I use the word, but no, as we generally use the word, there were none. There are other meetings that then took place. The next meetings as I recall took place on June 20. And this is from a letter that Jones Day wrote. And it called them informational meetings. And acknowledged that actives and retired employees will need access to additional information to analyze the proposals that are being -- that are
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was telling the world that it wanted to have more meetings, it had already internally and secretly decided it would claim impracticability. So the meetings that were followed were really nothings more than an effort to create a record that would allow the City to claim good faith negotiations when in there were no real negotiations and the City wasn't negotiating with we believe in good faith.

With respect to the impracticability
prong, we believe the situation is similar. At the outset as we explained in our pre-trial brief, the committee believes that the requirement that there be a plan of adjustment applies equally to the impracticability test. And this makes sense because without an actual plan identifying who the City intends to impair and how, there is no way to a sirs whether negotiations would be practicable. And specifically what as we've said, the only document that was on the table was the June 14 proposal and that was a proposal not a plan. And further, as we've set out, we believe in the law is that to show impracticability, the City has to show impracticability with respect to each class of creditors, it has to try to negotiate
with those with whom negotiations are possible, and as you've heard, the evidence will show that we believe there was certainly a number of classes of creditors with whom that was possible. And as we saw from the last slide, the evidence indicates the City really never intended to try to negotiate but really just tried to use impracticability as a tool to get out of it. So from a factual viewpoint, we believe the impracticability prong will not be met either.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about section 921C, which is a good faith requirement. I've already addressed one aspect of the good faith, the emergency manager's pursuit of a course of action that's contrary to the pension clause of the constitution but there's also another aspect to it. And that is this. That we believe that in connection with his filing of the petition, the Emergency Manager made a number of misrepresentation -- or of representations that we believe the evidence will show were at minimum misleading and incomplete. And I'll give you some examples.

First of all, in his declaration, this is the deck rakes that the Emergency Manager filed
unfunded pension liability, that the unfunded pension liability is $\$ 3.5$ billion. And this is stated here as a fact, not subject to qualification, and as we all know, the unfunded pension liability, how big it is and what if anything will be done about it, those are central action proceeds, but for present purposes, the evidence will show that this $\$ 3.5$ billion number that Mr. Orr stated in his declaration is not a fact. I think we think the evidence will show that the fact is that at the time the petition was filed, the City did not know the actual size of the unfunded pension liability as its analysis on that was ongoing and hadn't been completed and indeed still hasn't been completed today. And this, for example, is from the deposition testimony of Charles more, who is -- who is the City's from Conway McKenzie, which is the City's operational restructuring advisor. Mr. Moore also put in a declaration addressing unfunded pension
liabilities. And at his deposition, Mr. Moore candidly admitted that in fact the City didn't know what the actual amount of the unfunded liability was and that work was going on to try to make that filed, the city did not know the actual slze or the
with the petition. He stated that the City has over 18 billion in accrued liabilities and including specifically over 6.4 billion in bonds that are backed by enterprise revenues or otherwise secured. Now that of course sounds like a huge liability for the struggling City of Detroit to bear, but the evidence will show that what's not stated in this is that the vast majority of these bonds that we see referred to here, the 6.4 billion, are bonds that are issued by the Detroit water and sewer and department which is operated as a separate authority and is fully responsible for the payment of those bonds, and the evidence will show that the department of water and sewers itself has the financial wherewithal to make those payments. We put this question to the Emergency Manager in his deposition. Said yes, the department of water and sewers, it generates its own revenues and it pays its debts as they come do. So right off the bat, the total liabilities that according to the Emergency Manager he has to struggle to meet are effectively reduced by at least a third.

Now also in his declaration, the
Emergency Manager stated that in terms of the

determination. He says specifically, the most importantly the City's actuary has not completed its analysis on the unfunded position and until that work is done, no one really knows what the unfunded liability is.

And indeed, we believe the evidence will show that the last full actuarial valuation of the unfunded liability was done around June of 2011 and the unfunded amount that was shown in that evaluation was about 643,644 million.

And the evidence is also going to show that of that total amount, the 644 or so only about 250 million is allocable to the general fund, which is the fund that the city's most concerned about, which it pays most of its bills, and that is not a charge on the general fund. What the evidence will show that a very large chunk that have is in fact allocable to other departments such as the department of water and sewer and, which again is responsible for that and pays its own bills.

Now during Mr. Bennett's arguments, he suggested that we had somehow misstated what
Mr. Orr said at his deposition, failed to cite all the appropriate parts, that's not accurate. At his deposition, Mr. Orr was put through the numbers and
there was initial error, he then corrected that arithmetic error at the end of the deposition, Mr. Orr said that it appeared -- to his knowledge at the time, the portion of the unfund funded pension liability that was allocable to the department of water and sewerage was about 68 percent. Mr. Bennett suggesting that maybe 68 percent isn't the right number, and the right number should be 38 percent. Be that as it may, 38 percent is still in this context a huge chunk of the unfunded pension liability which is something that's born by department of water and sewerage and payable from those funds without any strain on the general fund. And the evidence will show that the Emergency Manager has acknowledged that even if the unfunded pension liability were ultimately found to be greater than the $\$ 644$ million number, even if it were found to be as high as $\$ 3.5$ billion number that you've heard, that same principal would hold true that there's is a significant portion of it that is not allocable to the general fund, but is born entirely and payable by and fully funded by the department of water and sewers. And as I said, the evidence will show that that department is solvent and capable of meeting its obligations and
indeed the water and sewerage pension payments even have priority over secured claims in that they're included in net operating expenses.

So we believe the evidence will show that the amount of the underfunding on the pension liability is not nearly as severe as -- still substantial, not denying that, but not nearly as severe as was portrayed in the Emergency Manager's declaration.

And finally, related to all of this, the evidence will show that the City does we believe have substantial assets that can be monetized. Chiefly, but not alone among them is the art that's owned by the City that's maintained at the Detroiit Institute of Arts, and we're talking about art that's owned out ride by the City, not art that's subject to any charitable trust. And the evidence will show that there is that asset and also the department of waters and sewers is a valuable asset that can be monetized. The City may be well be in a position to obtain the substantial attached influx from these assets and we understand is actively pursuing these opportunities, those assets, those cash flows could obviously be used to fund other obligations as well, yet none of that
was factored in any way into the Orr declaration even though that could dramatically change the nix in terms of what happens in terms of not only paying pension obligations but other obligations as well.

So that, Your Honor, is what we believe the evidence will show. Based on that, we believe the City cannot meet its burdens of proving eligibility or good faith and we look forward to proceeding. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. ULLMAN: And we will have a bound copy of the slides that I used for you and marked. THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. LEVINE: Your Honor, I apologize, but
I got a flurry of emails after I got away from the emails saying two weeks, what are you crazy? THE COURT: What was your answer to that question? I'm crazy or not.

THE COURT: I take it you're asking for more time?

MS. LEVINE: If we could have another week, Your Honor.

```
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            THE COURT: Sure. Three weeks.
Absolutely.
            So does that conclude your openings
statements?
    All right. We'll take a recess now until
ten after three and we'll begin with the evidence
at that time.
            COURT CLERK: All rise.
            (Whereupon a break was taken
            from 2:51 p.m. to 3:10 p.m.)
            COURT CLERK: Court is in session.
            THE COURT: Please be seated. It appears
everyone is here. You may proceed
            MR. STEWART: Thank you, Your Honor,
Geoffrey Stewart, Jones Day for the City.
            Our first witness will be Gurav Malhotra,
but before we call him, I wanted to put on the
record a stipulation that the parties have reached
with regard to the sequestration. We believe the
witnesses should be sequestered with the exception
of those who by definition representatives of a
party.
    THE COURT: That's fine. I ask counsel
```

please to supervise this sequestration because you
know who your opinions witnesses are.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Your Honor, we will.

MR. Stewart: May we call Mr. Malhotra to the stand.
(Witness sworn.)
THE COURT: Please sit down.
You may proceed, sir. EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Good afternoon. Mr. Malhotra, could you please, for the record, give us your full name and your home address?
A. Gurav Malhotra, and I live in Chicago, Illinois.
Q. And are you presently employed?
A. Yes.
Q. who are you employed by?
A. Ernst \& Young.
Q. And what is Ernst \& Young?
A. Ernst \& Young is a big four accounting firm.
Q. And how long have you worked for Ernst \& Young?
A. For close to four years since I recently joined.
Q. And what part of Ernst \& Young's practice do you work?
A. Restructuring specifically.
Q. And just for the record, tell us what that means
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when you say restructuring?
A. I'm a practice predominantly represents
corporations and public sector clients in order to assist with business plan assessments, liquidity analyses, as well as developing restructuring proposals.
Q. Tell us, if you could, about your college education and any post-graduate education that you have.
A. I went to college in New Delhi, India, and I did my MBA in finance in business policy from Case Western, and I'm also a CFA.
Q. Certified Financial Analyst?
A. That is correct.
Q. After you left Case Western, what was the first job that you had?
A. I joined Ernst \& Young.
Q. And how long were you at EY at that point?
A. At Ey, I joined in May of 2000 and EY's
restructuring practice was, I believe about 2004, sold to Julian Capital Advisors. I transitioned with that team. That team was subsequently sold to MaQuarry, an Australian investment bank, and I transitioned with that team, and came full circle back to EY about four years ago.
Q. And what is your title at EY now?
A. I am a principal.
Q. And what does that mean?
A. It's a non-CPA partner of the firm.
Q. So you're an equity partner of EY?
A. I am an equity partner of EY.
Q. Tell us some of the clients you have worked for as part of your work in restructuring.
A. I worked for Delta Airlines, I did work for Detroit Public Schools, doing work for liberty medical
right now, worked at Collins \& Aikman, and those are some of the clients that I have worked with in addition to others.
Q. Did there come a time when EY was retained by the City of debt at the time to perform work for the City?
A. Yes. We started our work in about the May, June of 2011 timeframe.
Q. so over two years ago?
A. That's right.
Q. At the time the City approached you or any time since, was EY retained to serve as an expert for the City in any litigation including Chapter nine litigation?
A. No, in fact, it's very clear in our letter that we will not serve as an expert.
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Q. What were you hired to do in May of 2011?
A. Generally it was to get a handle on the City's
liquidity position and try and get our arms around in terms of the City's short term liquidity forecast over the next 12 months or so.
Q. And this was back in 2011, that was what you were asked to do?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did there come a time earlier this year when the scope of work the City asked of EY was expanded?
A. Yes, in the timeframe of this calendar year, our role was expanded to look at a ten-year forecast for the City, predominantly on the general fund, and to ascertain what the deficit as well as cash projections would be over a longer timeframe versus a shorter timeframe.
Q. Now you just used the term general fund.
A. Yes.
Q. What is the general fund?
A. The general fund is basically where the day-to-day activities for a municipality are recorded, IE collection of taxes, payment of operating expenses and administrative expenses, as well as debt service that is not related to an enterprise fund.
Q. Why is the general fund a logical place to look
A. Because that's where the tax revenues of the fees are recorded, so the enterprise funds specifically charge their own fees for their specific service, but the general fund is where the core operating deficit office cities is recorded in municipal accounting across the country.
Q. 11
when you're analyzing the City's financial position?
Q. You used the term a couple times enterprise funds. For the record, what are the enterprise funds or what are examples of the enterprise funds?
A. Enterprise funds generally are have a specific fees that is charged for the services that are provided by that fund. It's generally break even. For example, the water and sewer department is an enterprise fund of the City, the Detroit department of transportation is enterprise fund of the City, all the department of transportation requires a subsidy from the general fund so it's not break even.
Q. Now in your analysis of the City's financial position and of the general fund, did you take into account the enterprise funds?
A. We looked at some of the cash activity of the enterprise funds back in 2011, but focused majority
enterprise funds back in 2011, but focused majority
$\square$
of our efforts on the general fund and those enterprise funds that require a subsidy from the general fund like DDOT, which is the department of transportation.
Q. Now in the course of your work, what materials or information from the City did you rely upon?
A. We looked at a CAFR --
Q. I'm going to stop you right there. Can we put up Exhibit 6? And I believe Your Honor, the CAFR, which is Exhibit 6 has been stipulated into evidence.
Is this the CAFR?
A. Yes, that's the CAFR for 2012. Its eight comprehensive annual financial report, which is the City's audited financial statements.
Q. Those are audited?
A. Yes.
Q. By Ernst \& Young?
A. No.
Q. And what does the CAFR tell you?
A. It gives you a detailed snapshot of revenues and expenses as well as the deficit position of the general fund as well as some activity of the enterprise funds.
Q. Is this a public document?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What else did you look at in the course of your work to learn about the details of the finances of the City?
A. We looked at the City's budgets, we looked at internal financial reports that we had access to from the City.

## Q. What kind of financial reports?

A. They were generally department specific revenues and expenses as we had available. We also looked at receipts and disbursements activity for different bank accounts to try and get our arms around the financial position of the City.
Q. Now were these materials you looked at records that financial records that the City had kept in the ordinary course of its business?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your experience, is it in the ordinary course of an enterprise or City's business to keep records such as the ones you were looking at?
A. Yes.
Q. And did the records appear to you to be accurate?
A. Generally, yes. I mean, they were always questions about assumptions, like specifically on budgets,
but we did not find any material discrepancies at
but we did not find any material discrepancies at
least in the information that we were trying to get our arms around specifically like the CAFR.
Q. What did you do to check the reliability of the information the City gave you?
A. What we did is we looked at the information that was made available, we spoke to various members of the City's management team, the finance department at the City, various department heads, we looked at the receipts and disbursements activity as generally cash was a telling barometer in terms of the quality of information we were receiving.

So we went through and tried to scrub the data to the best of our ability.
Q. You just used the term we. I should have asked you earlier, how many people from EY worked with you on this project?
A. On the front end of this engagement, we had a team of about four or five and that team is larger now.
Q. What deliverables were expected of $E \& Y$ as a result of its work?
A. It was generally a cash flow updates, whether they be short term or medium term. Generally going out on a monthly basis. Variance reports in terms of how the City was performing in context of those cash flows. As time progressed, our work expanded
to helping develop the long-term projections in conjunction with other members of the City. So we also helped in terms of updating the financial advisory board on a monthly basis in terms of where some of the cash position of the City was.
Q. And in terms of organizing and presenting your data, what methods did you use?
A. It was just lien Excel spreadsheets or PowerPoint presentations.
Q. And an Excel spreadsheet is what?
A. It's a software that allows you to compile,
organize or make calculations in terms of the data we have available.
Q. And the calculations are a arithmetical
calculations?
A. yes
Q. Let me ask you this. Did there come a time when you learned an Emergency Manager had been appointed for the City of Detroit?
A. Yes
Q. And do you remember when you learned of it?
A. Right around March.
Q. And when did you meet Kevyn orr for the first time?
A. The first time I met Kevyn Orr was during the
interview process of various law firms where Jones Day was one of the firms that was presenting its credentials to represent the City.
Q. And after Mr. Orr was appointed as Emergency Manager, how often did you meet with him?
A. Generally weekly
Q. And is that continued to this day?
A. Yes, either meetings or phone conversations
Q. Are you aware of something called a 45 day report?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the 45 day report?
A. It's a report that an Emergency Manager has to present 45 days after his or her appointment to provide a snapshot of the financial and operating condition of the City.
Q. Now we've put up on the monitor before you exhibit, I think it's 75 for identification. Is that the 45 day report?
A. Yes, it is
Q. And you've seen this before?
A. I have.
Q. And do you understand why it was Mr. Orr was
required to submit a 45 day report?
A. I believe it's per statute, under P 436.
Q. Did you yourself contribute any part of the content
of the 45 day report?
A. We did. We helped work on the financial section of the document as well as some short term liquidity projections that were available as of that point in time.
Q. Let me ask if we could go to page 40 of the -- and if we could blow it up for the monitor please, Lauren, so we can see it better. Mr. Malhotra, do you have that before you, page 40 of the report?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what is that?
A. That is a snapshot of the monthly receipts and disbursements activity of the general fund and the cash balance available for the general fund along with any deferrals that we were able to identify as of that time.
Q. And is this a spreadsheet that you or someone at EY working at your direction prepared?

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I would just like to interpose an objection at this time.

THE COURT: Would you identify yourself,
sir.
MR. SHERWOOD: I'm, Your Honor, I was
introduced this morning. I'm Jack Sherwood, Lowenstein Sandler, counsel for AFSME. I'm Ms.
Q. Let me ask if we could go to page 40 of the -- and
projections that were available as of that point in
time.
if we could blow it up for the monitor please,
Lauren, so we can see it better. Mr. Malhotra, do
you have that before you, page 40 of the report?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what is that?
A. That is a snapshot of the monthly receipts and
disbursements activity of the general fund and the
cash balance available for the general fund along
with any deferrals that we were able to identify as
of that time.
And is this a spreadsheet that you or someone at EY
working at your direction prepared?
MR. SHERWooD: Your Honor, I would just
like to interpose an objection at this time.
THE court: Would you identify yourself,
sir.
introduced this morning. I'm Jack Sherwood,
Lowenstein Sandler, counsel for AFSME. I'm Ms.

Levine's partner.
THE COURT: Go ahead, sir.
MR. SHERWOOD: I believe this testimony in terms of forecasts of future performance by the City is improper lay opinion testimony and should be disallowed. We submit that this testimony is in the nature of financial projections requires special expertise training and so forth and under federal rule of evidence 701C, should be excluded. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Well, Your Honor, two
responses.
THE COURT: Excuse me. One second. Is it the exhibit you object to or the testimony about it.

MR. SHERWOOD: Both, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The exhibit is already in
evidence, right?
MR. SHERWOOD: Then the testimony about $T$
I think it has been stipulated into evidence. I
think this document is in evidence, but I do believe that any testimony about these projections is expert testimony and should be disregarded.

THE COURT: Sir.
MR. STEWART: Well, first of all, I don't
believe the witness is going to be asked any opinion about this and he's testified earlier he has not been hired as an expert, but more fundamentally, I think the rule is clear that to the extent a witness even one who has expertise is simply performing arithmetic or similar calculations on voluminous data, it is not expert testimony and I think the leading Sixth Circuit case on that, Your Honor, is I think it's the Madison case, 226 federal appendix 535, which is the 2007 case, and it cites at length at 11th circuit case that says that in greater detail and on different facts.

And so that is why I ask the questions I ask a few minutes ago about the source of the data, were they business records, what did he do with them, they went into a spreadsheet, what is a spreadsheet do, and this stage I'm still trying to explain how he went about compiling his spreadsheets, but counsel is correct, I'm going to ask him at some point what were the results of the calculations. I'm not going to ask him his opinion on what anything ought to be, it is simply going to be after you compiled the information as you testified, what did the number turn out to be.

$$
\cdots
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MR. SHERWOOD: Just briefly, Your Honor. Anything that projects future revenues or forecasts is opinion, it's not fact. It's not adding numbers that exist. I understand that a fact witness can testify what are expenses and payments were on a given month or even that are due this month, but this is forecasting into the future in terms of not only -- not only expenses, but also receipts, things like property taxes, utility taxes, various types of revenues going out through the end of this year. And I think that by definition that requires some type of expertise specialized training, certainly not something that anyone can do as properly the subject of expert testimony and shouldn't be allowed.

MR. STEWART: I think what the Sixth
Circuit wrote, Your Honor, was that there are many things that require expertise, for example, requires expertise to read the records and know what part of the City's records are important, but where the calculations themselves do not require expertise beyond simple mathematics, it's not expert testimony. They distinguish between an expert and expert testimony.

THE COURT: What was the specific last
question that you asked?
MR. STEWART: I believe it was, if I -how went about preparing or his staff went about preparing the spreadsheet we see before us on the screen.

> THE COURT: I'll permit that question.

MR. STEWART: You may answer.
THE WITNESS: The way we helped pull this spreadsheet together or any of the spreadsheets on the cash flows were we looked at the information that was available in the different budgets, we were able to look at the different receipts and disbursements on an actual basis in terms of what was actually coming in to the City and break that down into the different categories and then based on the assumptions that we had collectively in conjunction with the City, forecast what the monthly receipts and disbursements could be over this forecast period.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. And you populated the spreadsheet with those numbers?
A. That is correct
Q. And you performed addition and subtraction on them to reach the conclusions that are shown here; is
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that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And now may I ask you, just as to this, what did you conclude the short term cash flow forecast would yield to in terms of the City's available cash as of the end of calendar year 2013. MR. SHERWOOD: We're going to have the same objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: That objection is sustained. BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Mr. Malhotra, let me also ask you to look at -I'll come back to that in just one minute. Did there come a time, Mr. Malhotra, that you learned that the Emergency Manager had scheduled a meeting with creditors of the City for June 14 of this year?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you learn of the meeting?
A. It was right around I think in that June timeframe.
Q. And did you attend the meeting?
A. I did.
Q. Where was it held?
A. At the west in at the airport.
Q. And how many people attended?
A. I would say about a couple hundred.
Q. How long did it last?
A. Four, five hours.
Q. Did you speak or present anything at the meeting?
A. I did.
Q. And were were materials passed out at the June 14 meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me first put up on the screen Exhibit 43. Do you see Exhibit 43?
A. I do.
Q. Is that a document entitled proposal for creditors that was distributed on June 14?
A. It was.
Q. And let's put up Exhibit 44. Is that an executive summary of the proposal that was also distributed that day?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now at that meeting, this is entitled proposal for creditors?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the title of it. What's being proposed?
A. What the City was proposing was a framework for a restructuring of its long-term liabilities showing that the City was going to be unable to meet its obligations as they came due.
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Q. Now I think you testified that you prepared certain parts of this document?
A. That is correct.
Q. And let me direct your attention, if I could, to page eight of the document.

Is this a spreadsheet that you or others
at E\&Y prepared?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And what does it per port to show?
A. The first column in that spreadsheet
Q. First of all, what's the title of the spreadsheet?
A. It says fiscal year 2013 forecasted cash flow to year end.
Q. Now it uses the term fiscal year 13. What is the fiscal year of the City of Detroit?
A. July 1 to June 30th.
Q. So at the time of this meeting, the fiscal year 13 had about 16 days to go?
A. Yes, June -- the month of June 2013 was still a forecast.
Q. So before we go further, let's look at our spreadsheet here. How many months of this spreadsheet are actual numbers?
A. on the first column is 12 months, fiscal year 2012, and subsequent to that, 11 of the 12 months are
actuals and a month of forecast.
Q. And that information you obtained from where?
A. It was compiled from the information that was given to us by the City.
Q. Okay. And what I would like to do, because we're going to be dealing with some of these issues later, is to go over some of the elements of operating receipts and operating disbursements that we see here on the spreadsheet. And I don't know if they can be blown up to be even larger or not, Lauren. I don't know if everyone can see them. Let's just blow up operating receipts if we could. I have asked the technical assistant here to blow these up so we can all see them better. And let me ask you about some of the operating receipts.

Property taxes and income and utility
taxes are just what they say they are?
A. That's right. That's what they contain.
Q. And gaming taxes, what are gaming taxes?
A. Those are the taxes the City receives from the three casinos.
Q. Next is municipal service fee to casinos?
A. Those are generally additional fees that the City collects from the casinos for additional services
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that are provided.
Q. And then our next line is state revenue sharing?
A. That's state aide that the City receives every other month.
Q. And below that, we have other receipts. Could you tell us what the other receipts are?
A. Sure. Those are combination of fees from the different departments, it has grant revenue in there as well as any other one time items that are also captured in there.
Q. And the final item is called refinancing proceeds.
A. Yes, those generally reflect the monies that the

City was borrowing from the escrow account that was set up with the state, so it was essentially additional debt borrowings.
Q. Let's go back if we could, Lauren, to the -- if you could just then expand for us the part of our chart that says operating receipts. Still be the top part, I think.
Q. Now your spreadsheet purported to tabulate what the operating receipts were and I think the first column is actual for fiscal year 12. What did you determine the City's operating receipts had been for that fiscal year?
A. For the general fund, predominantly the

## A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. And can you tell me what your forecast was with those 11 actual and one forecasted month?

MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. Sorry.
MR. STEWART: For the operating receipts for fiscal queer 13.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I object to testimony based on forecasts.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, what we have, he spoke not only about the City's actual receipts, he also spoke about the City's budgets. Not as a forecast he made, but as a budget the City had. Which was itself a factual document. To the extent he's talking about what the City has budgeted, especially when he test it against actual experience for reliability, I believe he can talk about what the forecast result is to look at. I would add that this is one where $11 / 12$ th of the date as is actuals that had already in fact come to
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pass.
THE COURT: Sir, is the number for the column forecast June 13 of 125 your number or the City's number?

THE WITNESS: It was generally a
collaborative effort in which we used the numbers that were, Your Honor, developed by the City originally, we scrubbed them along with the City. THE COURT: What does scrub mean?
THE WITNESS: So we looked at, Your
Honor, the historical actuals in terms of how the amount of collections that were received in that particular month in conjunction and comparison with the overall tax row, so it was, you know, actually or looking through the historical information that we had available as well as the best forecast information we had available to demonstrate what the one month of forecast would have looked like. THE COURT: All right. I'll permit the testimony as to the full year for actual and forecast, but subject to credible admissible evidence regarding June 13.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, we will provide that.

By MR. Stewart:
Q. And then Mr. Malhotra, as to the full year operating receipts for 2012, what did you
calculate?
A. For the full year of fiscal year 2013, the total operating receipts were 11 months of actual and one month of forecast were 1.582 billion, which included roughly $\$ 30$ million of borrowings from the escrow account as shown in the line item up above.
Q. And sorry, the line you are referring to is the line that says refinancing proceeds?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you better tell us what the escrow account is?
A. It's an account escrow account that's set up with that's subject to an escrow agreement between the City and the state where they are roughly about \$70 million of cash that is sit inning that escrow account today. It was projected that $\$ 20$ million of that 70 would have been collected, Your Honor, in June of 2013, but that has not happened. We are anticipating to collect that $\$ 20$ million from the escrow account in the subsequent months going forward, but it is subject to the -- the amount in there is subject to an escrow agreement between the City and the state.

## Q. (By Mr. Stewart): Let's if we could now?

## by mr. stewart:

Q. At the time you wrote it, you expected that it would happen?
A. That is correct.
Q. Could we now expand the segment of the chart that talks about operating disbursements. Just the title so we can see them all.
Q. Now we've now expanded on the screen Mr. Malhotra the segment of the spreadsheet that speaks of operating disbursements. Let me ask you, if we could go through this. The first line is payroll taxes and deductions. And I assume that's self explanatory, that's what it says?
A. yes.
Q. Next is benefits. What are benefits?
A. Those are generally health benefits.
Q. okay. Below that is something called pension contributions?
A. That is correct.
Q. And those are pension contributions to who?
A. To either the police retirement system or the general retirement system.
Q. And those are both defined benefit plans?
A. Those are defined benefit plans, yes.
Q. Now I understand that some portion of the benefits from the general retirement system goes to City employees who work for the department of water and sewer?
A. That is correct.
Q. And how do you account for that in this spreadsheet?
A. Those are not accounted for here because this shows the activity predominantly of the general fund. The contributions that the water and sewer department makes for pension go directly to the retirement system.

THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. You need to lien back away from the make phone a little bit because when you get too close, it cuts out.

```
        THE WITNESS: Great.
        THE COURT: And while we have a break
```

here, I think your tech person needs to redo that chart because her effort to line up the headings isn't working very well separately.
MR. STEWART: Okay.

THE COURT: That's better.
MR. STEWART: That's better.
THE COURT: Thank you.
By MR. Stewart:
Q. We were talking I guess about pension contributions. Next we have -- for actual of the year 2012, those had amounted to how much?
A. For actual orifice calendar year 12, there were pension contributions of 103.9 million made by the general fund.
Q. And for fiscal year 2013, what is the number?
A. That reflects 11 months of actuals and one month of forecast, but about $\$ 30.8$ million of pension contributions that were made.
Q. Why is that so much lower than the pension contributions that have been made in 2012?
A. Because the City was trying its best to preserve liquidity during this timeframe where liquidity was extremely tight and was deferring pension contributions.
Q. Now let's -- let me ask you about this. When you
say deferring pension contributions, what do you

> mean?
A. It's essentially not making the scheduled payments
as they came due and as were laid out by the City's systems actuaries, so I would say it was more or less borrowing money from the pension system to fund ongoing operations.
Q. Just so just to be clear, the money was owed to the pension systems, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. But the City did not pay the pension systems the money it owed them?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that is called deferral?
A. Yes, that's what we are calling deferral.
Q. And do you know, looking at this, what the amount
of deferrals were for fiscal year 2013?
A. For fiscal year 2013, I would say compared to the beginning of fiscal year 2012, there was problem another 70 odd million dollars that was deferred compared to the beginning of fiscal year 2012, an additional 70 million.

THE COURT: May I interrupt for one moment? Just so the record is clear, and everyone understands, would you describe in more plain


English what you mean by the concept of liquidity was tight.

```
THE WITNESS: Sure, Your Honor. The City
```

was during this timeframe paying very close
attention to its cash position and in order to
ensure that the City did not have a pay less pay
day or run out of complete cash in its bank
account, the amount of cash available for the
City's general fund to continue to operate was
dwindling, and in order to make sure that the cash
position did not get to an unsustainable level
where the core operations of the City were put at
peril, that's what Your Honor I meant by liquidity
being extremely tight. It's the cash that was
available to run the operations of the general
fund.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. If we can go back to the full chart for just a
minute, please. And before we go further, just on
the same point, this chart is a projection of cash
flow for the City for the past year and for fiscal
year 2013?
A. It's actuals --
MR. STEWART: Actuals and -- okay.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Now you just talked about deferrals as something the City did to preserve cash. Is there something called pooled funds?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, something called
MR. STEWART: Pooled funds. And I'm going to ask him what they are.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Can you tell us what pooled funds are?
A. The the pooled funds are cash that has been available in other accounts for specific purposes such as the solid waste fund or the street fund or the risk management fund that has been pooled with the general fund cash so that the general fund cash is higher because of the result of the pooling of cash from these other accounts.
Q. Now these other accounts, are not -- first of all, you better tell us what these other accounts are.
A. As highlighted in the City's CAFR, the City had roughly $\$ 92$ million of pooled cash from the solid waste fund, the street fund, and the risk management fund, cash that was combined with the general fund that is currently reflected in the cash balances reported for the general fund.

## what?

 $v$- 

$\square$

Q. And so that I understand, so that because of the liquidity problems the City faced, that took the $\$ 90$ million out of the street fund, the solid waste fund and the public safety or emergency fund and commingled it with money in the general fund?
A. I don't know when it was done, but that would generally be yes. The comming1ing has probably happened some time ago, but the answer would be yes, it would be to further supplement the cash available for the general fund.
Q. And if the city had not done that, what would have been the effect on its liquidity position?
A. wel1, at the end of fiscal year 12, where the cash net of distributions would shown as 1.9 million, if the City had to go ahead and segregate or unpool almost $\$ 92$ million, that cash net of distributions or cash available to the general fund would have been significantly lower of dollar for dollar.
Q. It would have been $\$ 92$ million lower?
A. Yes, that is my understanding.
Q. Let's go back now to our operating disbursements that we were talking about.

All right. The next item there is something called subsidy payments. What are subsidy payments?
A. Subsidy payments are the cash payments that the general fund makes to DDOT, which is department of transportation, because the department of transportation requires an annual subsidy every year from the general fund.
And below that, we have distributions in there three different lines, distributions, tax authorities, then distributions, UTGO, and then distributions DDA. Please tell us what those items
are.
A. Those are distributions to other taxing authorities. In the first line when we saw property tax collections, the City collects property taxes not only for itself but also on behalf of other taxing authorities, like Detroit Public Schools, Wayne County, and what the City does then is once the gross property taxes are collected, it distributes to these other entities on behalf of whom the cash has come in.
Q. so in other worese, stes casen the city hase but then it has to turn over to someone else?
A. yes, that is correct.
Q. And below that, we have income tax efefunss, account payables and other disbursements and professional fees.


## ROUGH - DAY 1 - $10 / 23 / 13$

Q. And that's just the sum of all the operating
disbursements?
A. That is correct.
Q. And below that, there's something called net cash
flow. What is net cash flow?
A. That's the total operating receipts less the total
disbursements.
Q. And what was it for fiscal year 2012?
A. It was negative $\$ 65.5$ million after including
$\$ 50$ million of proceeds from the escrow fund.
Q. okay. And why were those excluded?
A. Those were already a part of a negative 65.5. Had
they been excluded, the net cash flow would have
been negative 115.5.
Q. And then the next line is beginning cash balance.
And what is that?
A. That would be reflective of the cash balance the

City's general fund had in its account including the pooled cash.
Q. And you subtract that the net cash flow we just talked about, correct?
A. res.
Q. And we end up with cash before required distributions of $\$ 29.8$ million?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then there's something subtracted from that. And what is subtracted?
A. Those are the accumulated property tax distributions. So when the City collects its property taxes, makes the distributions to the different taxing authorities, there still is a hold back in terms of amounts that are being reconciled where the City and the different taxing authorities are going back and forth in terms of what the final amount is that is due to those authorities, that is the estimate that the City has available at that point in time in terms of additional monies that were due to these other taxing authorities but had not been paid yet. So we reserve for that the cash that it will eventually be paid out
Q. Okay. And what's an example of one of these other authorities that is owed the to which the money has
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to be paid out by the City?
A. It would include Detroit Public Schools, it would include Wayne County, it would include the library Those would be some of those examples.
Q. And so our last line hearsays cash net of distributions and that's $\$ 1.9$ million?
A. That is correct.
Q. And what does that represent?
A. That would be the net cash available for the general fund, including pooled cash, that was available for the general fund's operations at that point in time.
Q. At the end of fiscal year 2012?
A. 2012 .
Q. Which would be June 30,2012 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And below you have something that says memo and the first line is accumulated deferrals.
A. Yes.
Q. And is that what you told us about earlier, which were pension contributions that the City owed but had not paid?
A. That is correct, about 64.4 million.
Q. And below that, refunding bond proceeds in escrow. What are those?
A. Those are the escrow amounts that were still in escrow and had not been drawn upon. There was still subject to this escrow agreement with the state
Q. From the refunding financing that you told us about earlier?
A. yes.
Q. And finally, reimbursements owed to other funds, what is that?
A. That is where we've highlighted the amounts or we haven't put an amount in off the funds that would subject -- be subject to the unpooling of the cash that is shown in the general fund, but the City did not have a specific view in terms of when and how the unpooling of some of that cash would take place.
Q. Now if we could, now highlight the far right column which is the fiscal year 2013. It says 11A plus $1 F$. And let's look at that. And then Lauren if you could put the categories next to it.
Q. So I'm going to ask you the same questions but I'm going to be quicker when it comes to the fiscal year 2013. You already told us I think that the operating receipts were thought to be 1.52 -- 582.2 billion. What were the total disbursements
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## expected to be?

A.
1.5 -

MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. This is the
same point I think we argued earlier.
THE COURT: What is the objection,
please? Excuse me one second? And I have been asked to ask you to pull that microphone closer to you and you speak.

MR. SHERWOOD: I object based on the fact that the disbursements include projections for June of 2013 and that requires expert testimony. That's improper lay opinion testimony.

THE COURT: All right. Subject to the same condition I indicated earlier, the Court will permit this. Go ahead.

## BY MR. STEWART

Q. I'll repeat the question. The total disbursements for fiscal year 2013 are shown to be what?
A. 1.578 .2 billion.
Q. And the net cash flow for the City in fiscal 2013 was how much?
A. $\$ 4$ million positive.
Q. And then we had cash before required distributions of how much?
A. Before required distributions, $\$ 33.8$ million.
Q. And then cash net of those distributions for fiscal year 2013 came to what?
A. $\$ 14.1$ million.
Q. And by then, what was the accumulated -- what was the amount of accumulated deferrals and what was owed to the pension funds?
A. By then, the amount of accumulated deferrals predominantly due to the pension funds had increased from roughly $\$ 65$ million at the end of fiscal year 2012, all the way to $\$ 118.7$ million at the end of fiscal year 2013.
Q. And where did the number come from in terms of what was owed to the pension funds?
A. The amount of funding that would have been scheduled for the general retirement system and the police and fire retirement system would have come from the payments that the actuaries of the systems had suggested to be made but had not been made over the course of this timeframe. That was predominantly the way those numbers came from.

## Q. So the numbers came from the pension plans

themselves or their actuaries?
A. The schedule.
MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. Hearsay. Move
to strike.
to strike.
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Q. So who is it who tells the City how much the pension payments ought to be?
A. It's the system's actuaries.
Q. The system being the general retirement system and the police and fire retirement system, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did there come a time when you spoke with Mr. Orr about what you had found in the course of this analysis?
A. We showed kevyn orr in terms of what the actual
activity was and the magnitude of the deferrals that were taking place to sustain the City's cash
Q. position on a monthly basis.
Q. Do you remember what you said to him and what he said to you?
A. Not specifically, but it was generally showing us to what the magnitude of the -- what the magnitude of the dire liquidity position of the City. THE COURT: I'm sorry, the magnitude what? THE WITNESS: The dire. THE COURT: I didn't hear what you said. What did you say? THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I said the dire liquidity situation of the City. THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Let's go now to page nine of the same exhibit and the control number on this if it makes it easier is ends with 7289.

And could you just tell us what this is?
A. This is the fiscal year 2014 forecasted cash flow to year end on a monthly basis.
Q. And is this a document you or others at Ernst \& Young prepared?

A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you show it to Mr. Orr?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Did you discuss it with Mr. Orr?
A. Yes, we discussed their receipts and disbursements.
Q. As shown in this document?
A. That is correct.
Q. And do you remember what you said to him and what he said to you?

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, object to the extent the question calls for testimony about these forecast, this document, this particular page relates to 2014 which is all projections?

MR. STEWART: And that's why I'm asking the questions I'm asking. Only was this shown to Mr. Orr and did he discuss it with him and I won't go my deeper into it right now.

MR. SHERWOOD: I didn't object to those questions.

THE COURT: No, I believe the witness can testify as to what he said to Mr. Orr about these documents. It goes to what Mr. Orr new or at leastly knew what he was advised of at the time. So just tell us what you said to him about these documents or this document.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, my recollection what I would have said on this particular document would have been the that the fiscal year 2014? THE COURT: Well, hold on. Are you reconstructing what you said would have said or are you remembering what you did say?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, it's -- I am trying to recall what I would have said. I do not remember specifically what I would have said.

THE COURT: But don't know the answer to a question, just say that. Don't guess or try to reconstruct.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Did you provide this document to Mr. Orr?
A. I did.
Q. Did there come a time that he raised it with you? THE COURT: I'm sorry, was there would inter.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Did there come a time when Mr. Orr raised this document with you? Did he call you up and ask to have a conversation with you about it that you can remember?
A. We had several discussions about this particular document and the overall contents of the numbers, yes.
Q. And my only question to you is going to be if you remember what did you say to him and what did he say to you, just that?
A. What I would have said on this.
Q. Not would have said. What you did say if you done remember?

THE COURT: If you don't remember, just
say that.
THE WITNESS: I don't remember
specifically what I would have said to Mr. Orr on this particular page in a specific conversation around that but.

MR. STEWART: Let me ask the question a different way.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. In the timeframe around June 14, did you have discussions with Kevyn Orr about the liquidity situation of the City?
A. I did.
Q. And do you remember what you said to him about the liquidity situation of the City?
A. I do.
Q. And would you tell us what you told him?
A. The point -- what I said is that the fiscal year '14 cash receipts could fall short of the cash disbursements.
Q. And what did he say to you?
A. I do not remember specifically about what he said
to me directly.
Q. Let's go if we could now to another page of this, page 47 , which has control number 227327. And what's the title of this document?
A. The ten-year projections for the general fund only on the steady state.
Q. What is a steady state?
A. The steady state would have reflected no restructuring of the City's long-term obligations or legacy liabilities.
Q. And I'm not going to ask you about the content of this, but I'm going to ask you to tell us how you prepared it.
A. The way we prepared this is through different line items in terms of the revenue assumptions, we looked into specifically the overall State of Michigan forecast, we looked at the historical information with respect to the City of Detroit, we also went ahead and looked at analyses in terms of
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what the property taxes recently were for the City, and what the -- where the City of Detroit was faring in conjunction with the State of Michigan to come up with a forecast in terms of what the assumptions were for the revenue and property tax and income tax assumptions over the next ten years We did it in conjunction with the management team of the City, we went through income taxes in a great level of detail between residents and non residents, corporations, to build up assumptions from the standpoint of what the revenues would look like over the next ten years. We looked at the casino taxes with respect to all three casinos, read what their growth had been historically, where they were projected to be in the future, state aide, we got those numbers directly from the budget department of the State of Michigan in terms of where they saw the overall sales taxes that were due to the City, were projected to be over the next ten years. That's generally how we came up with the revenue forecast and I can highlight how we went through the expenses as well.
Q. Well, yes, if you could. The expense and finally the legacy cost without getting into what the numbers actually are. Just what your methodology
A. With respect to the salaries, wages and over time, we started with what the current wage levels and the head count was, it was built up by department to try and ascertain what the exact head count was by department. From there on, we had fairly simplistic assumptions with respect to wage level increases of two percent on a year over year basis over the forecast period. From the health benefits
for the active employees, we used assumptions that the City's health actuaries have developed on a pull-ahead basis which is what we used the based on a pull-ahead count basis to extrapolate over the next ten years. On the other operating expenses, it was developed by individual department to look at every single department, their budgets, to help ascertain what were the ongoing operating expenses of each one of those departments on a ongoing basis.

MR. DeCHIARA: Objection, Your Honor. Peter DeCharia, Cohen, Weiss \& Simon, for UAW. Objection based on relevance. The only relevance it would have to how this witness performed these numbers would be if the numbers
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were coming in for the truth of the matter. Others wise it, has no relevance.

THE COURT: I'm concerned about that, Mr. Stewart. First of all, just so the record is clear, what exhibit number is this page 47 of?

MR. STEWART: It is Exhibit 44.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. STEWART: Forty-four is in evidence?
THE COURT: So the question is what
weight is page 47 of this exhibit entitled to.
MR. STEWART: Correct. It goes to
weight.
THE COURT: If the witness has not been qualified as an expert.

MR. STEWART: Well, Judge, what I was going to do was lay a greater foundation for how it was put together and then I was going to simply ask the witness this question, which I'll ask him now, wherein here, Mr. Malhotra, did you insert your own personal assumptions?

THE WITNESS: All of the assumptions were
done in collaboration with the City?
by mr. stewart:
Q. wel1, where do the numbers come from?
A. The numbers came from either the actuaries that we
were working with with the City or the City's debt documents with respect to the long-term liabilities of the City, or in terms of the revenues, it was assumptions that we worked on in conjunction with the City.

MR. DeCHIARA: Your Honor --
MR. STEWART: So Your Honor, my point on that is the following. The fact something is a future projection does not make it an opinion. In the sense of being an expert opinion. If one is relying on numbers from another source in this case, all the sources Mr. Malhotra told us about, it is their numbers, not his numbers, but their numbers, and what he is doing is tabulating them and calculating them?

THE COURT: I heard him say that at least some portion of this, which he didn't specify, was done in collaboration.

MR. STEWART: Well, let me -- but I asked him this other question about which of these -collaboration, and I will ask him this,

MR. DeCHIARA: Your Honor, may I be

## heard?

THE COURT: One second.
MR. STEWART: Sounded from his testimony
he met with them and worked with them to get the numbers when I asked him which assumptions were his assumption, not the assumptions of the people who gave him the numbers. The answers were they were not his assumptions.

THE COURT: His answer was we
collaborated.
MR. STEWART: Well, I thought maybe I
heard him -- I must have heard him differently than Your Honor. Should we ask him again?
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Mr. Malhaltra, of these numbers, which ones are your assumptions?
A. The EY has made no assumptions that these are EY's numbers. I want to make that -- that's what I'm making clear.
Q. So these numbers came to you from who?
A. The numbers with respect to -- they are a lot of numbers on this page. The numbers with respect to all of the debt service would have been picked up from the City's CAFR. The numbers on the health benefits for pension and retiree contributions would have come from the City's actuaries. The numbers for the actual head count for all of the departments and associated costs would have come
from the City and its departments. The numbers with respect to the health costs for the active employees on a per head basis would have come from the City's actuaries. The numbers with respect to state revenue sharing would have come from the state directly. The numbers for property taxes, income taxes and wage range taxes, those numbers in terms of the assumptions were validated -collaborated between our team and the City in terms of the assumptions behind the revenue assumptions.
When you say assumptions do you mean the number here?

THE COURT: I need to hear from counsel at this point.

MR. DeCHIARA: Your Honor, to the extent the information in this exhibit comes from actuaries who are not on the witness stand, those numbers are hearsay and should not come in.

THE COURT: But the document is already in evidence.

MR. DechiARA: Your Honor, and also I
would say to the witness is testifying about a process that took high degree of expertise. I don't think $I$ or most of the people in this room let alone the man on the street would be able to

take these raw data and convert them into ten-year projections. It took the sophisticated work of an Ernst \& Young team to put it together. This is in the nature. This is the very essence of expert testimony.

THE COURT: I agree. I do.
MR. STEWART: All right. Your Honor, we may ask leave to do submit perhaps a memorandum raising this with Your Honor later on.

THE COURT: You may, of course.
MR. STEWART: So we can move on now.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. STEWART: Your Honor, one other
thing. Since it's in evidence, I assume I am allowed to at least ask the witness what it says and objections go to weight.

THE COURT: Well, it's duplicative to do
that, but I suppose to make a point you could ask briefly for the witness to review what it says.

## MR. STEWART: I'm going to ask him to

 look at the far right column and then I'm going to -- I'll move on to my next question.MR. RUEGGER: Arthur Ruegger from
Dentons, Your Honor. We submit the document speaks for itself. Any further narrative from this
witness is in the nature of asking for his expertise on that.

THE COURT: Well, it doesn't take an expert to read it, so I'll permit it.

MR. RUEGGER: Very well, Your Honor.
MR. STEWART: Could we simply blow up the far right column?
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. As a result of your calculations, Mr. Malhotra, what did your spreadsheet conclude was the ten-year adjusted deficit the City was facing?
A. That the spreadsheet would have said that revenues would be 10.4 billion, operating expenditures would be 7.4 billion legacy expenditures would be 7 billion over this ten-year timeframe for a surplus/deficit of almost $\$ 4$ billion, so negative $\$ 3.93$ billion.
Q. A11 right. so did there come a time when you sat down with the Emergency Manager to talk about these projections?
A. ves.
Q. Now in preparing the projections, what did you do to make them as accurate as you knew how to make them accurate?
A.
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MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. Calls for analysis of projections that have.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir, I can't hear you.

MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. Calls for
improper opinion testimony. He is he a being asked to testify about projections that are properly the subject of expert testimony.

```
                                    MR. STEWART: I think I asked him what he
```

did to be accurate.
THE COURT: No, the objection is
sustained.
MR. STEWART: Okay.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. In your conversations with Mr. Orr, what did you say to him about your ten-year projections?

MR. SHERWOOD: Same objection?
THE COURT: That objection is overruled. Please answer.

THE WITNESS: What we said is that if you lack at simply the operating --

THE COURT: You said, we said.
THE WITNESS: What I said is if you look
at the total operating revenues and the total
operating expenditures, the City still has a
surplus of roughly $\$ 3$ billion, however, when you Lear in the legacy costs of roughly $\$ 7$ billion over next ten years, the City has a deficit of almost \$4 billion over that ten-year timeframe.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. And what did he say to you?
A. I don't remember specifically about what he said back to me.
Q. Now June 14 was the date of the meeting I have been asking you about, I believe. This document was a document passed out that day, correct?
A. yes.
Q. Before moving on from the meeting, let me ask you this. Were questions asked by anyone at that meeting on June 14?
A. Yes, there were questions asked.
Q. Do you remember any of the questions that were asked or who asked them?
A. I don't know who asked them, but there were questions about the assumptions and the liquidity position of the City.
Q. And am I correct in understanding that when you addressed the people attending that meeting that day, you were speaking about the spreadsheets I've asked you about this afternoon?
Q. The City defaulted on it?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. What effect did that default have upon the City's cash position?
A. It improved the cash position by $\$ 40$ million at the end of June 30, 2012.
Q. What conversations if any did you have with the Emergency Manager or his advisors on the subject of the decision to default on the swaps?
A. I do not recall a specific discussion with Kevyn Orr on defaulting on the swaps.
Q. Let's move on to another set of meetings. Did you attend meetings held on June 20th, 2013, with representatives of the pension plans?
A. I do.
Q. And am I correct in remembering there were two meetings that day?
A. That is correct.
Q. The morning meeting was with a non uniformed pension plan, the GRS?
A. yes.
Q. And the afternoon meeting was with who?
A. With police and fire.
Q. And we have put up the first exhibit, I believe this is in evidence, Exhibit 48. Can you tell me
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A. That is correct.
Q. And were questions asked of you then about those spreadsheets?
A. They were -- yes, they were questions about it.
Q. okay. Let me move to another subject.

You are aware of a security called the
certificates of participation?
A. yes,
Q. Sometimes called pension obligation certificates?
A. Yes, I am aware.
Q. For the record, can you tell us what those are?
A. Those are certificates of participation of the fund that the City borrowed back in about 2005 that helped fund the underfunding on the two pension systems.
Q. And did the City have obligations to service the interest or principal of those securities?
A. yes.
Q. And do you know what the city's obli gation was?
A. As of June of 2013, the City had a $\$ 40$ million payment that was due to those on behalf of those POCs.
Q. And what did the City do with respect to that payment?
A. The city did not make that payment.
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A. That were some questions asked.
Q. Do you remember the questions?
A. They were questions about the cash position of the City, they were questions about the City's ability to make any changes to specific legacy liabilities.
Q. Do you remember any questions being directed to you?
A. They were -- yes, I remember questions that came up with respect to the cash flows of the City.
Q. And do you recall who in particular asked you those questions?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Or what you said in response to them?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Was Mr. Orr there that day?
A. He was not.
Q. Let's go to the next exhibit if we could, which is Exhibit 49. Is this the hand out that was given in the afternoon meeting?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And tell me about the afternoon meeting. First of all, I should have asked where these meetings were held.
A. These meetings were held at City hall.
Q. And how long did the after than meeting last?
A. About two or three hours.
Q. who attended?
A. It was the City's advisors along with some
representatives from the Retirement Systems as well as I thought some active employees.
Q. And once again, if you look towards the back, are there portions of this document that was prepared by you or someone else at E\&Y?
A. Yes, we helped pull together pages four and five for this particular presentation.
Q. Okay. Now page four which we have has legacy liabilities, some for fiscal years that have already ended?
A. That is correct.
Q. And theories are projected?
A. Yes.
Q. And where did your numbers come from for these?
A. The debt service numbers are the scheduled debt service as the amortization tables exist today, the POC principal and interest payments were again based on the current amortization schedules, the POC swaps payments were based on the existing swap schedule, the pension contributions and the health benefits for retirees would have come based on the assumptions that were provided to us by the City's
actuaries.
Q. Now let me ask you about the substance of the meeting. Did you make any part of the presentation
that afternoon?
A. I did.
Q. And what parts of the presentation did you make?
A. I would have focused on pages four and five in terms of laying out what the financial position of the City was.
Q. Were questions asked of you that day, that afternoon?
A. I don't remember specific questions that afternoon.
Q. Where were matters left at the end of the morning meeting?
A. They were generally left to have an open dialogue and communication flow between the City's advisors and participants in the meeting.
Q. And at the end of the afternoon meeting?
A. It was the same.
Q. Let's look at the next exhibit, Exhibit 51. Could you tell us what Exhibit 51 is?
A. Exhibit 51 is the ten-year plan in terms of the forecast that was available at that point in time as of June 21st.
Q. Did you attend a meeting on June 25 th with
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representatives of the bondholders?
A. I did.
Q. And where was that meeting held?
A. That meeting was held in New York.
Q. Who attended?
A. It was bondholders and bond insurers and theirs financial advisors.
Q. Was Exhibit 51 a document given to them that day?
A. That -- yes, that was the document that we went through on that particular day.
Q. Do you remember which bond insurers you met with or bondholders you met with on the 25 th?
A. Yes, Ann Beck was there I think assured was there, national advisors from Frigic, advisors from Sincora. Those are at least some of the ones I remember of specifically. It was a pretty big meeting.
Q. And I apologize if I asked you this. How long did you meet with them?
A. We met with them for at least four to five hours.
Q. What was the purpose of that meeting?
A. The purpose of the meeting was to have a subsequent discussion and Q\&A on the assumptions behind the information that was shared as of June 20 th.
Q. Do you remember any questions you were asked?
A. They were a lot of questions with respect to the assumptions underlying the ten-year projections and the details in terms of how those numbers were built up.
Q. And once again, where were matters left at the end of the June 25 th meeting?
A. They were left to have follow up meetings on an individual basis with certain bondholders or their insurers to have more specific discussions around the business plan
Q. Let me direct your attention to July 9. Were there meetings that day with bondholders or insurers for bondholders?
A. yes.
Q. where where those meetings?
A. Those meetings were held in Detroit.
Q. And did you attend them?
A. yes.
Q. How long did they last?
A. I think the morning meeting lasted about four or five hours.
Q. And then I assume there was an afternoon meeting as well?
A. Yeah, there was an afternoon meeting my recollection is with the pension systems. I


ROUGH - DAY 1 - $10 / 23 / 13$
believe there were a lot of meetings during this timeframe.
Q. How long was your meeting with the pension systems?
A. I think we had a meeting for about two or three hours.
Q. What was the purpose of the morning meeting?
A. The morning meeting was generally to have additional dialogue and discussions around the assumptions of the business plan.
Q. Do you remember who you met with in particular that morning?
A. I remember it was the financial advisors for national, it was the financial advisors for Fugic, assured was some of the names that at least come to mind.
Q. In this period, did the City, to your knowledge, make any proposals to the bondholders to resolve their claims?
A. The City made a proposal or framework for a proposal in its June 14 th presentation.
Q. Did the bondholders at any point or any sub group of bondholders make a proposal to the City at some point?
A. My understanding is yes. I have not reviewed a proposal from the bondholders in detail.
Q. Do you recall when that proposal was made?
A. My recollection is it was prior to the City filing.
Q. Okay. Now in the afternoon meeting, what was the reason for meeting with the two pensions on the afternoon of July 9?
A. It was to have additional discussions around the assumptions that the City's actuaries were using with respect to not only the size of the claim but also to ascertain the contribution levels required over the next ten years for the pension systems.
Q. And I apologize if I have asked you this before, at the end of that afternoon meeting with the pensions, what was supposed to happen next if anything?
A. There was supposed to be a process to try and understand the assumptions, the actuarial assumptions, and thereby drive -- have an understanding of the amount of the claim and then have subsequent discussions around the amount of funding that the City may or may not be able to afford over the long term.
Q. Now let's now go to July 18th?

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Stewart. I'm sorry to be such a nuisance about this, but please try not to wander so far from the microphone.
Q. How many days before July 18 did you start working on your declaration?
A. I don't recall the specific number of days. It was sometime in June, late June is I think when we started.
Q. And do you -- how much of your declaration did you write and how much of it was written by others for you?
A. Majority of it of the declaration was written by me in conjunction with counsel.
Q. Now your declaration has a number of attachments to
A. yes.
Q. And what is it?

MR. RUEGGER: Your Honor, objection. We objected to this document. It is forecast which we think would require expert testimony. We believe any testimony related to it should be excluded on that grounds.

THE COURT: The document is in evidence.
MR. RUEGGER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's not.
MR. STEWART: Judge I'm going to ask him now about his dealings with Mr. Orr about the document however we also designated this document and the next two as summaries under federal rule of evidence 1006, since they accumulate voluminous evidence which we made available to the objectors.

THE COURT: What does this document purport to do or to be without telling me what its
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contents are?
THE WITNESS: It was meant to be to show the two years of actual cash activity for the general fund and what the City's cash position was at the end of fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2012. The magnitude of the deferrals over that timeframe, Your Honor, and then the two-year forecast beyond that timeframe.

## Q. (By The Court): And who?

THE COURT: And so how was the document
come pied?
THE WITNESS: Your Honor, the actuals for the first two years were compiled based on the receipts and disbursements activity that we were able to ascertain for the bank accounts. Your Honor, for the next two years, with respect to the different line items, I can walk through the assumptions, but by.

THE COURT: By the next two years you mean fiscal year 14 and 15 .

THE WITNESS: That is right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: No need. I'll admit the
document as to actual and preliminary for 2012 and 2013, but the objection is sustained as to the forecasts.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Is this a document you discussed with the Emergency Manager or his advisors, Mr. Malhotra, on or before the date you executed your declaration?
A. Yes.
Q. And why did you discuss it with them?
A. Because it showed the status of the City's liquidity position right from that timeframe and in the subsequent few months.
Q. And what did you say to the Emergency Manager or his advisors about the City's liquidity position at that time or in the coming periods?
A. What $I$ said is the City'sing liquidity position at the end of fiscal year 2013 had improved by roughly $\$ 40$ million because the City did not make the BOC payment that was due on June 15, 2013, and what I said is that over the next two years, the City was requesting to have a significant cash burn for each particular year based on the disbursements significantly exceeding receipts.

THE COURT: Excuse me one second. Again, we have to clarify your language. You used the phrase POC. What does that mean?
THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I was referring

ROUGH - DAY 1 - 10/23/13
to the pension obligation certificate and the
payment that was due on June 15 th .
THE COURT: And then you used the phrase cash burn. What does that refer to?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, that refers to the City's operating disbursements exceeding its receipts or its City's total disbursements exceeding its receipts thereby reducing the cash over specified timeframe.

## BY MR. STEWART:

Q. And so you told us what you said to Mr. Orr. Did you tell him what the cash position was going to be at this rate in the coming years?
A. Yes, I did
Q. And what did you tell him?
A. I would have -- what I said is that the City's cash position net of deferrals could be approximately \$143 million negative at the end of fiscal year 2014, not making -- by not repaying any of the deferrals that had already been made as of that point in time or without unpooling any of the cash that the City has currently pooled.
Q. And if the City had unpooled the cash or paid up with the deferrals, what did you tell them the cash position was going to be?
A. what I said is that the city's cash position for would have been almost $\$ 150$ million worse off if the pension contributions that had been deferred until that timeframe were made, as well as if the deferred POC payment had been made. If the pooled cash had to be unpooled, that amount would be roughly an additional $\$ 90$ million based on what was in the CAFR.
Q. For a total cash shortfall of how much?
A. Before the unpooling of cash --

MR. DeCHIARA: Objection. Your Honor, I just am objecting to the extent that this -- what the witness is recounting he's saying to Mr. Orr, I just want to make clear that's not coming into the record as the truth of the matter of the statements he's make together Mr. Orr. If that's clear, I have no objection, but the line is getting pretty blurred and I think it's getting close to the line. THE COURT: I'm concerned about that. I share your concern. You used a phrase again that needs clarification. Unpooled -MR. STEWART: I'm talking about THE COURT: I'm asking the witness. What does unpooled cash mean?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, what I meant to
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say is if the pooled cash had to be restricted or segregated out of the general fund, that's what I was referring to the unpooling of cash

## STEWART

Q. What did Mr. Orr say to you?
A. On this particular document, the discussions with Mr. Orr or specifically also the other advisors was the magnitude.

MR. RUEGGER: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt the witness, but I thought the question was what was the conversation with Mr. Orr.

MR. STEWART: Or his advisors.
MR. RUEGGER: And I thought the witness was describing a conversation that might not have been with Mr. Orr but might have been with the advisors.

MR. STEWART: I thought I said Mr. Orr or his advisors but if not I'll reask the question. MR. RUEGGER: Thank you.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. What did Mr. Orr or his advisors say to you?
A. The specific discussions on this particular page were around the magnitude of the City's cash disbursements exceeding its cash receipts in terms of how dire the situation was with respect to the
general funds cash position.
Page two of our exhibit is -- let's put it up there. Let me ask you, just what this is.

MR. RUEGGER: Your Honor, objection
It's a forecast. I would rather not have any testimony on this. THE COURT: I'm sorry, did you say you would rather not have any testimony about it? MR. RUEGGER: I will rephrase my
objection without -- with respect, Your Honor. Objection. It's a forecast, Your Honor.

MR. STEWART: My question is what is this document.

THE COURT: I think we can get at least
that much in.
MR. STEWART: Yeah.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. What is this document?
A. It's the monthly cash flow forecast for fiscal year 2014 under base case.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, what?
THE WITNESS: Base case.
THE COURT: I base case which means. THE WITNESS: Your Honor on this it means the City continuing to make its payments for both
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all unsecured claims, per schedule, and no restructuring initiatives such as any benefits from the bankruptcy protection may avail. It was the City paying its payments as they came due based on the information that we had including the information from the actuaries.

THE COURT: Like steady state before. THE WITNESS: That is correct, Your

Honor.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. And did you discuss your conclusions with Mr. Orr or his advisors?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's put up the next exhibit. Ten for identification. Mr. Malhotra, I think we have Exhibit 10 for identification, which is Exhibit B to your declaration. Is this a ten-year financial projection?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you discuss this with Mr. Orr or his advisors?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what did you say to him and what did he say to
you or his advisors say to you about the ten-year projections?

MR. RUEGGER: Objection, Your Honor.
operating -- a potential deficit to the tune of $\$ 4$ billion over the next ten years.
Q.

And let's put up Exhibit 11, if we could.
A.

This is the same issue that Mr. DeCharia raised, a discussion of forecasts is essentially I think a back door around your ruling, so we would object to the question and the answer.

THE COURT: Well, I'll permit the witness to answer this question with the understanding that the document is not in evidence and the witness's testimony about what the document says is only for the purpose of the truth of what he told Mr. Orr and not for the truth of the statements themselves MR. RUEGGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. And what did you say to Mr. Orr about the conclusions you had reached in the document?
A. What I said is that the City's revenues over the ten years, approximately ten and a half billion dollars, and the City's operating expenditures over these next ten years, approximately seven and a half billion dollars for roughly a $\$ 3$ billion operating surplus. What I said specifically around the legacy liabilities was based on the current amortization schedule and the information that we have received from the actuaries, the legacy cost could be in excess of $\$ 7$ billion over the ten years, which would result in a potential

THE COURT: Any objections? The Court will admit this document. What was the exhibit number again so we're clear?

MR. STEWART: Eleven, believe, judge.
THE COURT: Admitted Exhibit 11, 2008, 20022012 only.

MR. STEWART: And then go back to the full document if you could.

## BY MR. STEWART:

Q. As to the overall document, Mr. Malhotra, did you have discussions with the Emergency Manager or his advisors about it?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And why did you discuss it with him?
A. We discussed it in the context of the legacy expenditures continuing to have an increasing percentage of the overall general fund revenues compared to where the City was five years ago compared to where the City was headed by 2017, that the weight of the legacy expenditures was almost going to close to double based on the projections that we had been given.
Q. And what did Mr. Orr or his advisors say to you in response to the points that you made?
A. Specifically, there was -- they were surprised in

terms of the magnitude of the increase in pension and retiree healthcare costs over the next five
Q. (By Mr. DeChiara):
objection. Lack of foundation. Testifying to the state of mind of the?

THE COURT: It actually wasn't the
question. The question was what did they say.
THE WITNESS: They basically said that
the costs going up from where they were five years ago to where they were ten years ago, I specifically remember that it was almost going to double was the response that I got back on this

## Q. (By Mr. DeChiara):

THE COURT: Okay. Can you try to specify for us when these conversations were that Mr . Stewart has been asking you about?

THE WITNESS: Sure. On this particular document, we would have had -- which was also as a part of the June 14th proposal, Your Honor, so we would have had meetings with Mr. Orr and the other advisors all through the June timeframe and even in some of the May timeframe, so they were a series of meetings that we had.

THE COURT: At which these documents were

## discussed?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The June 14th proposal, Your Honor, was pulled together over a period of time so there was specific documents that were discussed in those meetings.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, I have a demonstrative Exhibit I would like to use but before putting it up on the screen, since there have been objections, it's Exhibit 38. Why don't we put it up on the screen.

Judge, this is a graphic representation of what the witness has already testified to that he told Mr. Orr was the City's cash position as the witness had seen it. And what I would like to ask the witness is does this represent what you told Mr. Orr or his advisors about what you believe the City's cash position was going to look like in the coming year.

MR. RUEGGER: Objection. Leading. And it's also a forecast.

MR. STEWART: I can ask it in a
non-leading way, Judge.
MR. RUEGGER: Then just forecast.
THE COURT: No, the objection is sustained.
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BY MR. STEWART:
. Your Honor, as to these last three exhibits and actually also this chart, I would like to move them into evidence on another ground. And as I mentioned, we identified these to the objectors as documents that qualified as summaries over federal -- under federal rule of evidence 1006, in other words, they compiled and pulled together voluminous records that could not conveniently or easily otherwise be made into proofs. That was done with proper notice as the rule requires. We notified the objectors of this, we told them we have the underlying records available for your examination, if you wish to see them, please come and do so. One person did call to say they would like to see them but never in fact came. I would submit that we have actually satisfied the requirements of rule 1006 by doing this and that as simple summaries of voluminous information they qualify for admission.

MR. RUEGGER: Your Honor, I think
Mr. Stewart misunderstands our objection. It's not that there's a lot of data underlying any of these documents that might very well be, but they are forecasts which require in our view expert
testimony which is not in the courtroom. So we're not objecting due to the volume of the underlying data, it's because they are forecasts.

THE COURT: I do agree with that. The motion is denied.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, could I be
heard one more moment on this?
THE COURT: All right.
MR. STEWART: The fact they're forecast doesn't per se change anything. They would have to be opinions before they're excludable. And it's been testified --

THE COURT: But why isn't the forecast an opinion about what's being forecast?

MR. STEWART: Well, it's possible to have forecast that is are factual, that are extrapolations, that are not really opinions, and there are forecasts rendered many times that don't involve experts. In fact, the two decisions I cited earlier involved financial analysts, much like Mr. Malhotra, who pulled together documents from which conclusions could be reached about the probability of something happening or not happening?

THE COURT: They involve forecasts,
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financial forecasts.
MR. STEWART: These involved complicated personal financial records, but they did involve an ultimate issue such as could this person have possibly afforded this item based on his or her income.

THE COURT: The past.
MR. STEWART: Well, it's past, but if a
forecast is based on information that is either historical or is made available as information about a forecast,

THE COURT: I have to say I'm not
persuaded, but if you can find me a case which says that a forecast does not involve expertise, I'll certainly consider it.

MR. STEWART: Okay, Your Honor. We'll do
that.
THE COURT: We'll leave it open to that extent.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. That's all I
have of this witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Well, we won't
press on with cross examination now. We will break for the day and reconvene at 9:00 tomorrow morning.

Before we go, Ms. Patek has something and
then I have something.
MS. PATEK: Your Honor, this is just a brief housekeeping matter about a matter of a summary exhibit that came in at the beginning of the day and in this is something Mr. Irwin and I had talked about and there was an error on it and it was to be corrected and it didn't get corrected but it's going to be corrected on the --

THE COURT: Let me ask the two of you to consult about that and get back to me first thing in the morning.

I have been asked to remind you that although this courtroom will be locked overnight there may and probably will be people in here doing what they regularly do, the IT staff, court staff, cleaning staff, so you are free to leave your equipment and property here, with that
understanding or of course you can take it with you. And I remind you once again, please be quiet, perfectly quiet in the hall was. And we will reconvene at 9:00 tomorrow morning.

COURT CLERK: All rise.


| 4 | \|ability [6] 103/6 159/2 163/14 176/4 200/13 249/4 | 137/18 139/7 170/1 170/25 172/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 [3] 148/5 209/14 238/6 | able [19] 12/8 17/23 18/11 23/4 29/15 | accumulate [1] 257/22 |
| 45 [7] 90/12 202/9 202/11 202/13 202/17 | 30/11 31/21 35/2 35/2 70/17 79/13 | accumulated [6] 225/11 226/18 229/4 |
| 202/23 203/1 | 118/17 158/23 163/17 203/15 207/12 | 229/5 229/7 230/7 |
| 46 [1] 76/16 | 241/25 255/20 258/15 | accurate [6] 46/19 188/24 199/22 243/23 |
| 47 [3] 235/9 238/5 238/10 | ably [1] 30/13 | 243/24 244/10 |
| 48 [3] 91/7 247/25 248/1 | aboard [1] 107/12 | accurately [1] 47/20 |
| 49 [1] 249/18 | about [192] 13/19 13/21 14/3 14/13 14/14 | achieve [3] 112/14 172/4 177/17 |
| 491 [1] 100/6 | 15/19 19/6 20/2 26/1 27/4 29/20 32/7 | achieving [1] 167/8 |
| 4:06 [1] 123/22 | 40/11 41/2 48/6 49/6 50/3 53/12 55/16 | acknowledge [2] 146/22 175/6 |
| 4:10 [1] 124/4 | 56/5 58/24 59/7 60/14 61/6 61/16 63/7 | acknowledged [7] 71/15 116/24 122/16 |
| 4:53 [1] 273/24 | 63/12 63/24 64/10 65/16 66/20 67/16 | 171/10 178/20 182/23 189/15 |
| 5 | 69/2 70/14 70/23 74/16 74/24 75/4 79/22 | acknowledging [1] 22/10 |
| 50 million [1] 213/2 | 85/22 86/9 86/11 86/12 86/16 90/12 | act [16] 90/23 111/3 128/18 129/10 |
| 50 percent [1] 109/7 | 90/14 91/21 93/22 98/10 99/3 100/20 | 130/12 130/19 148/9 148/10 148/11 |
| 502 [1] 46/12 | 100/20 101/7 101/17 105/2 107/8 109/6 | 149/5 150/3 150/14 150/24 150/25 |
| 51 [4] 251/20 251/21 251/22 252/8 | 113/12 114/8 114/10 114/13 120/5 122/3 | 151/14 167/15 |
| 521C [1] 60/22 | 125/22 134/7 134/11 134/17 135/1 135/6 | acted [1] 162/18 |
| 535 [1] 205/10 | 136/8 136/18 136/24 137/4 137/9 137/12 | acting [5] 33/4 69/4 167/3 177/19 177/20 |
| 55 [1] 101/7 | 137/17 138/6 138/6 140/16 140/23 | action [5] 100/2 128/12 171/17 185/15 |
| 55-mile [1] 101/7 | 141/10 142/14 145/21 147/25 148/5 | 187/8 |
| 57 [1] 134/13 | 150/6 163/2 169/11 175/5 177/5 177/7 | actions [9] 17/14 18/12 62/1 62/7 67/14 |
| 58 [1] 96/19 | 185/11 187/6 188/10 188/12 188/14 | 67/21 100/17 167/8 177/16 |
| 582.2 [1] 227/24 | 189/6 190/15 194/7 194/19 194/24 | active [12] 116/10 117/2 139/2 153/21 |
| 5th [1] 6/25 | 195/16 199/3 199/24 200/18 204/14 | 154/11 163/10 172/22 173/6 173/13 |
| 6 | 204/19 204/22 205/2 205/15 205/19 | 237/10 241/2 250/5 |
| 6.4 billion [2] 186/3 186/10 | 213/16 213/17 213/20 213/23 215/16 |  |
| 62 percent [1] 65/7 | 216/4 216/15 218/9 218/17 218/25 221/2 | activities [1] 19 |
| 630 [1] 98/13 | 222/22 225/4 226/20 226/23 227/5 | activity [10] 141/8 197/24 198/23 199/11 |
| 64.4 million [1] 226/23 | 230/23 232/11 232/21 232/24 233/24 | 200/9 203/13 217/17 231/1 258/3 258/14 |
| 643 [1] 188/10 | 234/1 234/20 234/23 235/6 235/17 238/3 | actor [1] 177/16 |
| 644 [1] 188/12 | 239/12 239/20 241/22 243/19 244/7 | actors [1] 18/10 |
| 644 million [1] 188/10 | 244/16 245/7 245/10 245/20 245/24 | acts [2] 149/24 150/9 |
| 65 [1] 49/19 | 245/25 246/2 246/4 246/13 248/20 249/3 | actual [26] 42/4 85/23 99/8 121/1 181/20 |
| 65.5 [1] 224/20 | 249/4 249/21 250/1 251/2 253/20 254/4 | 184/16 187/13 187/24 207/13 210/23 |
| 68 percent [2] 189/7 189/8 | 255/24 256/11 257/2 257/19 257/19 | 212/22 213/6 213/9 213/16 213/21 |
| 6:23 [2] 123/9 123/13 | 259/12 261/19 261/22 263/8 264/23 | 214/20 215/6 218/10 218/12 224/3 |
| 6:30 [1] 124/3 | 265/8 265/13 267/12 268/17 269/16 | 230/25 240/24 248/10 258/3 258/23 |
| 6D [1] 6/17 | 271/14 271/22 272/11 273/3 273/6 | 266/5 |
| 7 | 273/10 | actually [30] 4/24 5/5 26/1 39/14 40/5 |
| 7 billion [1] 243/15 | absence [3] 66/13 85/21 85/22 | 101/12 102/19 104/21 107/1 117/18 |
| 7.4 billion [1] 243/14 | absolutely [7] 70/19 83/24 84/5 84/12 | 133/1 134/25 135/23 135/24 157/10 |
| 70 [2] 215/19 219/20 | 89/15 132/16 192/2 | 159/12 163/17 181/3 207/14 214/14 |
| 70 million [1] 219/22 | abstract [1] 41/10 | 236/25 268/6 270/3 270/17 |
| 700,000 [1] 17/15 | accept [6] 82/25 83/1 88/5 88/5 91/10 | actuals [7] 211/1 213/25 214/11 218/16 |
| 701C [1] 204/9 | 162/1 | 220/23 220/24 258/12 |
| 704 [1] 164/23 | acceptable [1] 138/4 | actuarial [3] 183/5 188/7 255/16 |
| 70s [1] 73/22 | accepted [5] 129/25 137/24 137/25 | actuaries [18] 64/16 219/5 229/17 229/22 |
| 720 [1] 147/13 | 137/25 138/11 | 230/12 230/18 237/11 238/25 240/23 |
| 7289 [1] 231/20 | accepting [1] 162/16 | 241/4 241/17 248/12 251/1 255/7 264/6 |
| 75 [1] 202/17 | accepts [1] 151/18 | 265/23 266/9 266/21 |
| 8 | access [5] 12/24 117/3 136/10 182/24 | actuary [1] 188/2 |
| 8,000 [1] 154/15 | accessible [1] 48/13 | adamant [1] 178/20 <br> add [8] 5/6 18/20 39/21 56/15 56/16 |
| 810 [1] 100/7 | accident [2] 8/8 150/17 | 132/21 178/9 213/24 |
| 865 [1] 109/22 | accomplish [2] 163/18 172/6 | added [4] 110/21 127/2 127/20 129/20 |
| 876 [1] 100/7 | accomplished [3] 51/24 96/1 141/13 | adding [2] 129/22 206/3 |
| 8th [3] 118/21 183/20 183/22 | accordance [1] 1/15 | addition [11] 19/3 26/24 42/21 45/18 |
| 9 | according [2] 49/24 186/21 | 125/23 127/25 136/20 159/21 161/3 |
| 921C [8] 91/4 144/19 146/21 166/24 | accordingly [2] 51/8 52/8 | (95/12 207/24 |
| 167/16 167/19 167/23 185/12 | account [14] 64/15 173/2 197/23 212/13 | additional [16] 25/16 89/10 105/11 117/3 |
| 9:00 [1] 273/21 | 215/22 217/14 220/8 223/23 225/1 | 211/25 212/15 219/22 225/20 254/8 |
| 9:00 the [1] 119/2 | accountable [1] 18/12 | 255/6 261/7 |
| 9:00 tomorrow [1] 272/24 | accounted [1] 217/16 | address [19] 27/15 34/3 68/2 92/3 93/6 |
| 9:49 [1] 39/9 | accounting [2] 193/19 197/8 | $93 / 7 \quad 100 / 21 \quad 112 / 1 \quad 119 / 19127 / 4127 / 6$ |
| 9th [2] 119/8 138/14 | accounts [6] 199/12 221/12 221/17 | 131/17 134/16 147/8 151/1 153/19 156/2 |
| A | 221/18 221/19 258/15 | 164/2 193/12 |
| a.m [3] 39/9 39/9 131/14 | accrued [12] 116/3 116/9 122/23 134/8 | addressed [11] 73/1 93/15 121/16 128/3 |

## A

addressed... [7] 152/4 157/8 158/23
164/3 185/13 187/7 245/23
addressing [3] 36/18 51/1 187/21
adds [1] 143/23
adequate [2] 57/9 66/24
adequately [1] 70/22
adhered [1] 17/25
adhering [1] 171/15
adjusted [1] 243/11
adjustment [15] 68/23 134/15 145/4
178/13 178/15 179/9 179/10 180/1 180/8 180/10 180/16 180/22 181/13 181/16 184/14
administrative [1] 196/23
admissibility [4] 5/7 56/22 57/4 57/19 admissible [5] 56/23 57/5 58/6 58/9 214/21
admission [6] 57/15 57/16 59/1 59/13 120/25 270/20
admissions [1] 174/24
admit [6] 2/7 21/5 104/6 181/8 258/22 267/2
admitted [16] 10/20 58/2 59/12 69/7
74/18 74/19 85/15 85/17 120/10 124/9
174/2 175/23 181/4 182/13 187/23 267/5
admitting [2] 60/1 74/24
adopt [2] 113/19 147/5
adopted [3] 109/24 121/7 149/15
advance [3] 9/11 74/5 147/11
advancing [1] 165/15
advantage [4] 35/19 46/23 90/4 134/23
adversarial [5] 32/1 32/2 45/25 46/18 47/11
adversary [1] 66/22
advice [7] 27/24 28/5 28/11 32/8 45/10 45/25 64/18
advised [4] 25/2 176/4 176/9 232/23
advisement [1] 39/5
advisor [1] 187/20
advisors [30] 28/18 43/4 44/6 47/16 124/23 156/24 194/20 247/8 248/22 250/3 251/16 252/7 252/14 252/14 254/12 254/13 259/4 259/12 262/7
262/12 262/16 262/18 262/21 264/12
264/20 264/23 267/12 267/23 268/22 269/16
advisory [2] 46/12 201/4
affect [1] 17/15
affected [4] 41/25 67/9 80/19 80/22
affiliates [1] 139/5
affirmatively [2] 46/9 46/21
afford [1] 255/21
afforded [2] 68/10 272/5
afraid [1] 144/25
AFSCME [16] 2/19 61/21 63/20 65/15 66/20 67/19 76/13 76/18 77/15 81/16 94/5 104/20 105/9 157/6 163/6 166/8 AFSCME's [2] 91/5 157/9
AFSME [1] 203/25
after [28] 6/10 26/19 39/15 55/25 82/20 83/20 83/21 90/12 92/16 108/13 108/17 115/5 121/23 124/1 148/7 149/25 150/7 151/12 160/6 171/24 191/16 192/6 194/14 202/4 202/13 205/24 224/17 249/25
afternoon [20] 123/16 133/17 145/6 153/4 157/5 164/19 193/10 245/25 247/22 249/19 249/21 251/4 251/11 251/12 251/18 253/22 253/24 255/3 255/5 255/12
afterwards [1] 80/7
again [49] $25 / 1$ 25/4 31/7 35/4 42/17 43/4 49/3 52/13 52/21 69/8 70/22 75/16 79/24 81/15 81/25 82/7 86/4 86/23 88/8 88/25 91/5 92/18 95/19 103/10 106/18 115/7 120/20 127/15 130/24 133/23 140/5 142/8 142/21 145/7 148/6 151/21 173/24 181/10 183/11 188/19 230/5 240/10 250/6 250/20 253/5 259/22 261/20 267/3 273/19
against [8] 14/1 30/10 117/12 123/6 124/14 153/11 168/22 213/21
age [1] 101/7
aggregate [1] 71/10
ago [13] 44/6 44/9 67/3 106/9 117/13
148/6 194/24 195/18 205/15 222/8 267/18 268/10 268/10
agree [12] 1/18 22/7 22/13 57/5 58/5 59/12 88/11 88/24 89/22 163/8 242/6 271/4
agreed [3] 19/20 104/23 125/16 agreeing [1] 58/15
agreement [20] 19/19 24/8 26/5 26/25
27/3 44/14 54/10 54/21 57/16 66/14
107/17 115/21 118/18 136/12 156/11
156/14 163/9 215/15 215/24 227/3
agreements [6] 148/13 149/14 149/15 149/15 151/4 154/21
ahead [8] 2/10 39/19 204/2 222/15
228/15 235/25 237/12 237/13
aide [2] 212/3 236/16
Aikman [1] 195/10
air [1] 143/11
Airlines [1] 195/8
airport [2] 115/25 208/23
Aisle [1] 92/14
all [149] 1/14 5/19 9/1 10/1 10/16 15/18
17/5 22/20 23/15 25/19 29/2 30/11 33/19
34/16 37/21 38/6 39/4 39/7 41/25 43/4
45/4 45/9 48/14 50/7 51/4 52/20 53/8
53/21 55/20 55/21 57/21 58/2 58/17
58/23 59/16 59/22 60/1 60/12 61/4 62/14
65/18 69/8 69/15 69/20 71/3 71/24 75/11
75/13 75/16 76/21 76/25 77/14 77/16
79/4 79/6 82/13 82/19 85/12 86/6 90/6
90/6 90/23 93/16 93/21 94/8 94/9 95/2
95/3 98/7 99/18 100/23 101/15 101/16
104/6 107/11 108/1 111/25 112/2 115/6 118/12 118/25 124/11 128/21 130/25 131/12 132/10 132/17 139/23 141/8 141/8 141/24 143/2 143/23 144/2 144/4 144/7 151/5 152/18 153/1 155/2 159/24 160/15 162/4 163/11 164/10 164/12 165/16 166/12 167/1 168/7 172/13 175/22 177/14 178/6 182/12 185/24 187/4 188/23 190/10 192/5 192/8 197/18 204/25 210/11 211/14 214/19 216/16 221/18 222/23 224/9 228/13 229/10 232/13 236/13 238/4 238/7 238/21 239/12 240/20 240/24 242/7 243/18 249/22 264/1 268/22 271/8 272/20 272/22 273/22
alleged [5] 19/22 99/6 113/5 120/15 163/3
allocable [4] 188/13 188/18 189/5 189/21 allocation [1] 266/21
allow [4] 56/3 99/19 158/17 184/6
allowed [3] 175/24 206/15 242/15
allows [1] 201/12
almost [9] 74/18 90/6 93/23 222/16
243/16 245/3 261/2 267/20 268/11
alone [3] 51/9 190/13 241/25
along [9] 37/17 53/20 98/22 150/7 203/14
214/8 224/3 248/22 250/3
already [33] 31/3 32/13 33/18 49/25 72/15 92/19 97/3 97/4 97/5 117/22 118/3 121/7 122/9 138/18 156/18 162/22 169/8 169/17 176/16 176/23 183/21 184/2
185/13 204/17 213/25 224/20 227/23 241/19 250/13 260/20 266/13 266/13 269/12
also [87] 1/22 2/15 3/9 4/1 4/11 21/3 21/18 23/23 30/15 36/8 43/18 43/25 54/14 62/9 63/3 63/17 64/6 65/2 66/6 67/4 79/2 81/19 82/15 87/22 92/13 97/25 98/1 99/15 99/25 101/11 102/22 105/6 113/16 114/18 117/14 119/24 120/2 120/24 122/21 125/16 135/10 136/8 139/16 139/25 143/9 146/4 146/18 146/24 147/11 148/3 149/5 149/9 152/23 158/19 163/24 164/5 165/23 166/14 167/13 167/21 169/15 171/5 174/24 181/14 185/16 186/24 187/20 188/11 190/18 194/11 199/10 201/3 206/8 208/11 209/15 212/10 213/17 223/14 235/25 241/21 255/9 257/20 262/7 266/19 268/19 269/20 270/3
altering [1] 24/8
alternative [2] 93/25 96/3
alternatives [4] 94/7 94/8 94/25 95/23 although [6] 113/16 150/13 154/19 166/8 173/16 273/13
always [5] 56/20 65/23 89/18 179/1 199/23
am [13] 20/20 36/14 53/16 123/7 124/6 195/1 195/5 233/7 242/14 245/22 246/10 247/16 261/12
amended [5] 55/22 59/23 72/24 131/19 138/7
among [2] 125/14 190/13
amortization [3] 250/19 250/21 265/22 amount [32] 58/13 62/23 63/24 64/1 64/13 64/14 70/23 71/10 94/4 110/14 125/7 125/13 159/19 183/6 183/8 187/24 188/9 188/12 190/5 214/12 215/23 219/16 220/8 225/18 227/11 229/5 229/7 229/14 230/11 255/18 255/19 261/6 amounted [1] 218/11
amounts [9] 64/21 64/24 90/2 116/9 172/22 225/15 227/1 227/10 248/16 analogous [1] 34/24
analogy [3] 27/21 34/20 77/11
analyses [2] 194/5 235/25
analysis [12] 29/18 40/8 44/15 108/9
108/15 125/8 180/3 187/14 188/3 197/21
230/24 244/2
Analyst [1] 194/12
analysts [1] 271/20
analyze [2] 117/4 182/25
analyzing [1] 197/1
and/or [5] 1/13 66/16 139/2 139/13 139/16
anded [1] 137/6
ands [1] 169/3
Andy [5] 40/4 41/22 107/6 107/8 108/2
angled [1] 105/23
Ann [1] 252/13
announced [2] 159/25 160/6
announcement [1] 160/1
annual [2] 198/14 223/4
another [17] 24/23 63/14 66/22 72/9
74/22 77/21 144/4 167/22 183/2 185/16
191/24 219/20 235/8 239/11 246/5 247/12 270/4
answer [18] 33/22 37/9 37/12 78/12 80/8 138/24 139/25 141/2 181/7 182/15 191/18 207/7 222/8 233/10 240/6 244/19

## A

answer... [2] 265/4 265/6
answered [5] 35/16 80/1 80/24 111/4 177/11
answers [6] 114/16 121/2 125/8 140/12
174/8 240/4
ant[1] 6/7
antedate [2] 6/14 27/2
antedates [1] 7/9
Anthony [2] 2/25 164/20
anticipate [5] 30/4 30/5 30/6 45/19 45/24
anticipated [3] 40/23 66/1 67/6
anticipating [2] 45/12 215/21
anticipation [8] 9/9 11/13 13/12 30/2
40/14 40/16 41/15 45/17
antithetical [1] 27/19
anxious [2] 67/11 67/19
any [120] 1/19 1/20 5/12 5/12 5/13 7/25
8/11 9/1 9/12 11/17 11/18 12/2 12/11 19/16 24/7 25/9 28/14 31/7 33/14 33/15 34/19 35/18 35/19 36/21 36/23 41/4 41/13 42/24 46/20 47/22 51/15 52/9 52/11 53/8 54/10 55/10 58/2 59/15 60/8 60/14 67/23 72/18 73/4 76/2 80/12 81/1 81/20 82/10 85/25 86/5 87/25 88/3 91/25 93/10 94/25 95/25 97/3 97/15 100/1 101/21 103/1 103/14 104/4 105/11 106/6 106/12 113/4 116/17 120/19 122/19 125/15 125/20 128/8 130/11 130/14 134/14 134/19 137/6 139/1 140/15 141/21 142/17 157/20 162/17 172/3 173/1 174/16 175/15 175/24 189/13 190/17 191/1 194/8 195/20 195/22 199/25 202/25 203/15 204/22 205/1 207/9 212/9 242/25 245/17 247/7 249/5 249/6 251/3 252/25 254/17 254/21 254/21 257/13 260/19 260/21 263/5 263/8 264/2 267/1 270/23
anybody [2] 87/15 157/19
anymore [2] 20/23 95/7
anyone [13] 9/13 29/8 31/8 31/20 37/4 66/7 84/1 89/1 96/4 138/1 161/13 206/13 245/14
anyone's [1] 63/6
anything [26] 7/8 15/13 18/16 18/20 20/5
23/12 24/9 25/4 32/20 63/16 67/25 74/9
80/6 88/11 103/15 114/13 169/1 175/9
180/21 183/12 187/6 205/23 206/2 209/3 255/14 271/10
anyway [1] 25/3
anywhere [3] 103/16 173/18 230/6
apologize [6] 39/13 126/13 147/11
191/15 252/18 255/11
apparently [8] 10/7 103/22 141/13 142/5
142/6 143/2 160/16 178/17
Appeals [3] 98/15 98/16 98/16
appear [5] 113/22 141/9 143/5 157/24
199/22
appearance [1] 55/10
appearances [1] 2/11
appeared [4] 53/15 155/4 171/1 189/3
appearing [1] 4/10
appears [5] 55/10 102/22 113/19 124/5 192/12
appendix [1] 205/10
applicable [1] 69/17
application [1] 166/4
applied [6] 43/23 70/1 90/18 105/11 147/3 149/1
applies [3] 90/20 175/1 184/14 apply [4] 8/21 29/24 103/19 105/7 applying [1] 105/14
appointed [6] 74/14 74/14 115/1 115/5
201/19 202/4
appointment [11] 27/2 27/5 67/12 90/12 130/1 144/11 150/8 151/12 155/11 156/17 202/13
appreciate [3] 5/25 38/19 60/18
appreciates [2] 51/20 54/7
approach [1] 7/12
approached [2] 114/5 195/20
appropriate [15] 5/13 20/10 28/5 70/16
70/21 71/24 102/8 102/13 102/15 102/20 127/22 130/5 130/6 158/1 188/24
appropriation [16] 49/7 49/8 49/11 50/21
50/22 101/23 102/14 103/2 103/19
107/12 107/13 110/11 110/16 110/18 111/2 168/14
appropriations [4] 97/22 98/17 100/24
100/25
approval [1] 143/14
approved [1] 66/25
approves [1] 143/18
approximately [4] 6/20 260/17 265/16 265/18
April [4] 107/16 115/3 150/19 155/16
April 18th [1] 150/19
April 2013 [1] 115/3
Aquilina [1] 133/5
arbitrary [1] 45/6
arbitration [2] 148/22 150/24
are [300]
are's [1] 98/9
area [2] 65/2 85/6
areas [1] 154/19
arguably [1] 37/17
argue [5] 5/15 11/25 50/16 69/14 76/14
argued [5] 19/4 53/15 129/13 178/6
228/4
arguing [3] 39/18 41/2 77/19
argument [14] 5/1 6/9 24/24 26/25 39/24
55/2 57/23 60/15 70/14 96/7 101/20
130/4 142/22 158/6
arguments [9] 19/7 51/17 60/14 104/22
106/3 107/25 135/2 152/24 188/21
arithmetic [2] 189/2 205/6
arithmetical [1] 201/15
arms [3] 196/3 199/12 200/2
arose [1] 41/13
around [24] 62/14 64/22 65/7 105/18
110/1 113/14 169/18 170/14 174/21
188/8 196/3 199/13 200/2 201/23 208/19
234/15 234/19 253/9 254/8 255/6 255/19
262/23 265/3 265/20
arrangements [1] 111/15
art [7] 66/7 66/11 66/19 126/3 190/13
190/15 190/16
Arthur [2] 2/25 242/23
article [10] 16/24 124/17 128/24 139/5 139/15 139/17 139/22 142/16 167/10 174/14
Arts [2] 126/4 190/15
as [328]
ascertain [5] 196/14 237/5 237/17 255/9 258/15
ASCII [1] 1/9
ASCII/PDF [1] 1/9
aside [1] 141/7
ask [55] 18/7 37/5 49/2 52/12 52/21 88/8 88/25 92/8 101/16 106/14 114/12 126/17 138/20 147/14 162/24 163/20 174/12 179/17 191/20 192/23 201/18 203/6 205/14 205/15 205/21 205/22 208/3 208/11 211/15 216/19 218/25 221/8 227/21 228/7 230/5 233/23 234/16

235/17 235/18 238/17 238/18 239/21
240/10 242/8 242/15 242/18 242/20
245/13 248/4 251/2 257/18 263/3 269/14 269/21 273/9
asked [53] 25/16 41/4 51/12 78/16 79/9
80/2 82/24 90/13 104/2 110/19 110/24
111/14 111/24 114/12 119/22 119/25
125/5 164/22 169/11 174/15 177/5 177/8
179/17 182/13 182/14 196/7 196/10
200/14 205/1 207/1 211/13 228/7 239/19
240/2 244/6 244/9 245/14 245/16 245/18
245/18 245/19 245/25 246/2 248/25
249/1 249/10 249/22 251/10 252/18
252/25 255/11 256/11 273/12
asking [14] 20/1 31/21 32/5 57/11 103/13
121/11 160/10 191/22 232/14 232/15
243/1 245/10 261/23 268/17
asks [1] 5/9
aspect [3] 167/22 185/13 185/16
assert [3] 10/16 31/2 40/19
asserted [4] 56/4 63/24 69/3 122/4
asserting [1] 33/9
assertion [8] 9/16 15/25 18/2 38/7 67/10
70/20 106/9 106/11
asserts [1] 51/14
assess [3] 11/5 38/7 100/16
assessment [1] 95/23
assessments [2] 97/7 194/4
asset [2] 190/18 190/19
assets [8] 65/16 112/8 125/9 126/2 126/5
190/12 190/22 190/24
assign [1] 72/20
assignment [1] 169/6
assist [5] 8/8 27/23 29/10 33/11 194/4
assistance [1] 30/7
assistant [2] $3 / 6$ 211/13
associate [1] 137/7
associated [3] 25/22 144/4 240/25
association [21] 4/1 4/11 105/4 105/9
121/10 121/20 121/22 145/8 145/9
145/10 145/11 150/2 150/5 150/22
150/23 151/8 153/6 153/15 153/18 154/1
155/14
associations [12] 153/21 154/3 154/6
154/20 154/25 155/4 155/8 155/11 155/15 155/25 156/8 183/5
assume [7] 41/20 58/22 99/24 99/25
216/21 242/14 253/22
assuming [2] 60/5 86/4
assumption [1] 240/3
assumptions [32] 64/13 163/2 183/6
199/24 207/16 235/21 236/5 236/6
236/10 237/7 237/10 238/20 238/21
239/4 240/2 240/3 240/5 240/13 240/14
241/8 241/10 241/10 241/11 245/20
250/25 252/23 253/2 254/9 255/7 255/16 255/17 258/18
assurance [2] 36/23 67/1
assure [1] 20/13
assured [2] 252/13 254/14
asswert [1] 58/9
attach [1] 33/6
attached [10] 6/17 7/21 16/18 20/18 38/1
47/23 52/10 107/13 118/22 190/21
attachment [4] 117/20 131/21 131/22 257/3
attachments [3] 42/10 44/20 256/25
attempt [2] 35/22 156/25
attempted [5] 20/25 21/3 93/16 103/21 103/22
attempts [2] 23/2 178/9
attend [7] 120/17 120/18 140/10 208/20
247/13 251/25 253/17

## A

attendance [1] 137/5
attendant [1] 183/9
attended [5] 116/15 155/18 208/24 250/2
252/5
attending [1] 245/23
attends [1] 111/20
attention [8] 5/14 26/15 36/4 147/18
210/4 220/5 253/11 256/10
attenuated [1] 40/24
attorney [48] 2/7 3/4 3/6 7/23 8/7 9/25
10/2 12/19 13/1 $13 / 10$ 13/24 14/4 14/6
14/12 14/17 14/20 15/3 17/9 17/20 21/19
24/7 28/1 28/6 28/7 29/13 31/7 31/25
32/3 32/24 33/5 33/6 43/12 43/15 43/24
44/3 47/4 47/5 47/6 47/9 51/14 66/10
66/18 123/17 124/5 129/13 148/19 156/1 176/9
attorney's [1] 28/3
attorney-client [26] 7/23 10/2 12/19 13/1
13/10 14/12 15/3 17/9 17/20 21/19 24/7
28/1 28/6 29/13 31/7 31/25 32/3 32/24
33/5 43/12 43/15 43/24 44/3 47/5 47/6
51/14
attorneys [4] 25/22 42/13 43/3 156/1
attributable [2] 65/5 67/7
audience [1] 155/25
audited [2] 198/15 198/16
augmenting [1] 1/19
auspices [1] 148/13
Australian [1] 194/22
authentic [1] 57/2
authored [1] 38/4
authorities [8] 223/8 223/12 223/15
225/14 225/16 225/18 225/21 225/25 authority [7] 17/14 80/11 139/1 139/12
177/20 180/3 186/12
authorization [9] 16/11 16/20 119/3
122/18 123/21 144/5 152/11 167/19
170/22
authorize [1] 11/9
authorized [6] 8/25 118/20 150/13 166/12 167/3 167/4
authorizing [2] 122/17 124/20
automated [1] 1/7
automatically [1] 164/8
avail [1] 264/3
availability [1] 169/11
available [34] 1/9 35/13 48/1 53/22 53/24
53/25 62/23 117/6 117/9 125/10 126/5
136/19 199/10 200/6 201/14 203/4
203/14 207/11 208/5 214/16 214/17
220/8 220/15 221/12 222/10 222/17
225/19 226/9 226/11 248/17 251/23
257/23 270/13 272/10
avoid [2] 67/14 147/6
avoiding [1] 62/24
award [1] 150/4
aware [16] 8/21 8/23 15/14 26/14 55/4
110/17 129/25 130/14 143/9 148/11
169/16 171/4 175/24 202/9 246/6 246/10
away [3] 112/7 191/16 217/22
awe [1] 106/23
awes [1] 106/23
awful [1] 73/17

## B

Babette [2] 3/8 133/18
back [59] 3/1 6/12 8/2 15/22 16/8 19/18 21/7 31/9 32/20 40/1 65/20 72/10 73/22 73/23 78/19 79/21 80/10 85/24 86/18 87/12 88/10 96/18 100/20 102/2 106/14

112/16 113/7 126/16 129/3 130/20
141/19 148/5 148/23 150/17 152/12 152/21 169/23 179/17 194/24 196/6 197/25 208/12 212/16 217/22 220/18 222/21 224/1 225/15 225/17 245/8 246/13 248/4 248/5 248/18 250/6 265/3 267/7 268/12 273/10
backed [1] 186/4
background [1] 168/22
backtrack [1] 178/18
bad [7] 49/16 89/2 106/7 113/5 144/19
144/20 170/21
baggage [1] 85/13
Baird [6] 53/14 113/10 114/5 114/10 114/13 114/20
baked [1] 64/9
balance [4] 46/9 203/14 224/23 224/25
balances [2] 62/6 221/25
ball [2] 40/25 109/11
band [1] 65/7
bang [2] 75/6 75/9
bank [9] 75/9 75/14 75/18 75/24 75/25
194/22 199/12 220/7 258/15
bankruptcy [37] 27/8 34/24 70/25 73/7
73/20 77/7 77/11 107/22 108/10 112/17
114/9 114/11 114/18 114/22 115/15 121/24 122/4 122/13 123/11 133/11
136/14 141/5 142/18 143/21 144/18
160/12 160/14 161/12 163/7 168/24
169/3 175/25 176/23 177/6 180/2 256/13 264/3
bar [1] 2/7
Barbara [2] 4/5 145/6
bare [1] 24/19
bargain [3] 81/22 151/15 151/17
bargaining [6] 81/17 85/7 85/8 85/12
145/17 151/3
barometer [1] 200/10
base [4] 9/23 263/20 263/22 263/23
based [28] 38/7 59/20 59/24 70/17 71/7
84/15 110/24 113/4 122/6 122/22 146/19
191/7 207/15 213/14 228/9 237/12
237/23 250/21 250/22 250/24 258/13
259/20 261/7 264/4 265/21 267/21 272/5 272/9
basic [2] 10/2 63/13
basically [11] 6/4 16/21 66/11 79/8 86/19 157/13 160/5 166/5 183/20 196/20 268/8 basis [30] 1/15 5/24 6/1 7/21 22/9 29/22
29/24 57/12 62/21 66/2 66/4 90/3 138/25 142/12 163/25 164/6 164/13 173/13 200/23 201/4 207/13 230/14 231/3
231/23 237/8 237/12 237/13 237/19
241/3 253/8
bat [1] 186/20
BCC'd [1] 43/2
be [346]
bear [1] 186/7
became [5] 39/1 62/11 150/4 171/5 171/25
because [103] 11/16 16/7 17/23 18/9 25/18 31/24 32/22 35/14 36/15 38/2 40/13 40/19 40/20 40/22 42/18 43/7 48/12 49/11 52/18 53/12 53/19 57/22 61/1 61/6 61/18 62/1 63/25 66/21 69/2 71/8 73/8 73/22 75/4 75/11 76/1 76/23 81/6 82/8 85/15 86/13 88/2 88/22 88/24 89/17 91/5 94/11 94/19 95/7 95/14 96/14 100/19 100/25 101/2 101/11 102/5 102/10 103/15 104/3 110/10 112/21 118/17 123/23 125/13 125/19 126/4 126/24 128/7 128/8 129/14 130/8 130/16 130/23 133/21 135/1 135/13 137/12

144/6 146/14 147/4 147/17 148/2 150/6 151/2 163/24 167/6 170/17 173/23 179/12 179/24 184/16 192/24 197/3 211/5 217/16 217/23 218/2 218/21 221/16 222/1 223/3 259/8 259/16 271/3 Beck [1] 252/13
become [5] 41/25 49/14 107/4 109/22 134/12
becomes [2] 115/2 151/2
becoming [2] 62/4 169/2
been [126] 5/22 6/15 6/24 12/8 14/25
15/15 15/15 17/21 17/21 17/23 18/5
24/10 24/12 24/24 26/15 27/17 29/9
29/19 34/7 34/15 35/23 41/23 42/23 44/22 45/8 46/2 46/6 46/8 49/20 49/25 50/1 53/12 54/10 54/21 57/9 57/24 59/2 59/17 60/23 61/15 61/17 63/9 66/25 67/15 67/18 67/19 67/21 69/7 71/23 74/7 74/11 83/19 84/6 91/2 91/20 103/21 103/22 104/1 106/16 122/9 125/5 128/19 128/22 129/1 129/11 135/13 140/7 141/4 145/11 148/7 154/3 155/6 161/5 163/17 164/3 165/24 166/10 168/18 175/12 176/8 176/23 176/24 179/16 181/16 187/15 187/16 198/10 201/19 204/20 205/3 212/23 215/19 218/20 221/11 221/14 222/12 222/18 222/19 224/21 224/22 225/22 227/2 228/6 229/14 229/18 230/9 230/11 230/13 233/3 236/14 238/13 240/20 245/9 248/10 260/20 261/2 261/3 261/5 262/15 262/15 266/13 267/22 268/17 269/9 271/12 273/12
before [74] 5/5 5/5 5/6 5/8 6/21 10/15 15/2 26/13 27/25 31/7 41/13 41/19 42/1 42/4 53/9 53/15 55/18 61/3 62/7 63/17 66/22 76/12 89/6 93/7 100/1 106/6 106/12 109/14 111/19 115/11 118/4 120/9 122/17 124/3 125/17 127/24 131/1 131/17 133/2 135/2 142/13 147/25 148/15 151/6 155/4 158/25 169/2 171/21 174/7 179/4 181/15 183/11 183/18 183/23 192/17 202/16 202/20 203/9 207/4 210/21 220/19 225/6 228/23 228/25 245/13 255/11 256/15 257/1 259/4 261/10 264/7 269/8 271/11 272/25 began [2] 81/21 146/10
began's [1] 128/1
begging [1] 159/24
begin [10] $4 / 226 / 1315 / 25$ 53/9 102/5 106/13 107/3 109/16 127/5 192/6 beginning [7] 83/4 146/8 148/9 219/19 219/21 224/23 273/4
behalf [25] 2/13 2/15 3/4 3/16 3/18 3/25
4/6 4/10 4/17 23/22 51/13 51/14 81/22
105/21 123/2 132/20 145/7 152/13 153/5 155/10 156/22 163/7 223/15 223/19 246/21
behind [4] 49/7 163/3 241/10 252/23
being [42] $1 / 6$ 7/6 7/9 17/17 18/13 19/7
19/25 29/1 32/11 39/2 39/22 40/22 45/10 64/16 86/12 91/1 98/19 108/11 115/5 124/9 133/13 135/15 136/17 140/21 149/24 153/23 155/24 157/21 157/24 158/1 173/7 173/12 174/13 182/25
209/21 220/14 225/15 230/19 239/10 244/6 249/6 271/14
believe [82] 6/25 9/2 14/10 14/11 25/17 26/10 31/19 32/3 32/21 35/16 35/19 35/20 40/10 47/2 53/3 53/22 56/21 56/23 106/2 110/22 125/24 126/10 128/19 138/4 138/8 139/13 139/22 142/9 144/14 144/18 146/9 146/12 146/15 146/19

## B

believe... [48] 146/24 147/12 149/9 151/25 152/17 167/11 168/15 169/3 170/1 170/16 170/18 174/8 175/17 177/21 178/4 179/12 179/13 181/14 183/3 183/14 184/8 184/11 184/22 185/3 185/9 185/17 185/21 188/6 190/4 190/11 191/6 191/7 192/19 194/19 198/9 202/24 204/3 204/22 205/1 207/2 213/22 232/20 245/10 247/24 254/1 257/12 267/4 269/16
believed [2] 21/2 178/12
believes [2] 71/11 184/13
believing [1] 127/13
Belle [4] 65/18 65/18 65/21 65/24
belongs [1] 28/8
below [8] 110/13 212/5 217/1 223/6
223/23 224/12 226/17 226/24
Ben [1] 92/21
benefit [8] 71/12 121/14 122/15 155/7
173/8 183/9 217/7 217/8
benefiting [1] 99/25
benefits [39] 11/11 68/6 88/1 88/1 88/4
113/8 116/4 121/16 121/17 122/23 134/9 137/18 139/2 139/8 139/14 140/2 154/19 163/10 163/25 164/8 169/24 170/1 170/25 172/1 172/17 173/4 173/6 181/1 181/10 216/24 216/24 216/25 217/9 237/9 240/22 248/11 250/24 264/2 266/18
Bennett [9] 4/16 126/22 127/7 127/11 141/14 146/4 146/9 178/17 189/7
Bennett's [7] 130/4 135/23 137/12 138/19 141/18 149/10 188/21
besides [1] 87/17
best [11] 21/9 21/11 38/24 89/14 143/4 156/22 176/5 177/12 200/13 214/16 218/21
better [13] 86/20 86/20 92/12 149/4 162/25 179/19 203/8 211/15 215/13 218/5 218/6 221/19 256/7 betting [1] 158/24
between [26] 6/24 12/18 15/2 23/5 23/9 31/5 32/23 41/9 42/12 43/2 47/13 49/1 53/22 63/7 68/20 72/11 120/11 149/11 151/4 206/23 215/15 215/24 236/9 241/9 251/16 266/11
beyond [9] 9/2 16/20 18/6 19/24 26/20
154/25 155/20 206/22 258/8
bifocals [1] 72/13
big [4] 78/22 187/5 193/19 252/16 bill [5] 109/22 110/21 118/8 130/7 183/18
billion [25] 135/6 186/2 186/3 186/10
187/2 187/9 189/18 213/2 215/7 216/4 227/25 228/19 243/13 243/14 243/15
243/16 243/17 245/1 245/2 245/4 265/16 265/19 265/19 265/24 266/2
bills [2] 188/15 188/20
bind [2] 139/23 154/21
binder [1] 50/4
binders [1] 79/2
binding [2] 139/19 181/5
Bing [3] 114/5 114/7 114/12
bit [11] 65/3 73/7 98/24 99/16 104/25
161/1 163/2 179/18 179/20 179/21 217/22
black [2] 47/2 147/21
bleeding [1] 25/1
blocking [1] 150/21
blow [6] 170/17 203/7 211/12 211/14
243/6 266/10
blowing [1] 169/21
blown [3] 94/11 94/21 211/10
blueprint [1] 134/12
blurred [1] 261/18
board [4] 34/20 78/1 78/3 201/4
Bob [2] 3/20 3/22
BOC [1] 259/16
body [4] 17/12 99/7 128/6 154/21
boil [1] 13/23
boiled [1] 15/11
boils [1] 177/15
bold [2] 119/1 159/4
bolster [1] 112/23
bond [7] 72/16 72/21 73/25 82/6 226/24 252/6 252/11
bondholders [18] 73/6 73/25 74/12 84/18 158/7 158/20 158/21 159/8 252/1 252/6 252/12 253/8 253/12 253/13 254/17
254/21 254/22 254/25
bonds [10] 68/6 72/8 95/11 95/13 95/14
96/16 186/3 186/9 186/10 186/13
book [14] 7/17 9/14 9/19 11/20 84/16
133/22 133/24 133/25 134/11 169/20
170/4 170/6 171/1 176/6
books [1] 266/13
born [2] 189/12 189/22
borrow [1] 91/5
borrowed [2] 95/14 246/13
borrowing [2] 212/13 219/6
borrowings [6] 62/17 62/20 62/22 212/15 213/3 215/8
both [34] 3/11 16/18 23/25 43/15 46/16
59/13 70/24 75/18 84/2 84/19 88/6 94/16 94/18 95/22 95/22 96/10 106/23 109/24
116/10 116/13 133/2 133/3 133/4 143/12
146/9 152/22 154/17 155/18 167/18
172/22 181/23 204/16 217/7 263/25
bottom [5] 73/17 80/12 81/9 81/25 112/7
bound [4] 33/2 76/19 76/24 191/12
branch [1] 100/17
break [12] 39/8 52/25 105/17 105/18
131/1 131/13 192/9 197/14 197/19 207/14 217/25 272/23
brief [24] 36/1 37/23 40/9 41/3 43/8 43/14 44/16 45/18 48/15 50/9 76/13 87/23
88/21 122/2 132/2 132/20 153/12 157/9
160/6 179/5 179/7 180/4 184/12 273/3
briefing [1] 161/14
briefly [8] 36/3 127/8 147/8 157/7 183/17
185/11 206/1 242/19
briefs [2] 67/15 144/7
Brimer [2] 4/10 126/14
bring [2] 165/8 175/18
bringing [1] 157/22
broad [3] 17/19 30/3 168/11
broader [2] 23/10 35/5
broadly [4] 30/5 35/8 45/20 94/8
brought [2] 16/16 26/15
Bruce [1] 4/16
Buckfire [19] 43/3 82/12 82/12 86/11
86/17 86/25 107/8 107/19 107/19 108/1
108/14 108/17 109/10 111/10 111/14
111/22 111/22 112/7 157/23
budget [6] 110/12 110/14 154/8 157/19
213/18 236/16
budgeted [1] 213/20
budgets [5] 199/5 199/24 207/11 213/17 237/16
build [2] 83/8 236/10
building [1] 131/3
built [3] 156/19 237/4 253/4
bullet [1] 134/15
bullets [1] 134/17
bunch [3] 92/25 93/4 100/22
burden [7] 60/9 146/12 157/11 164/14
165/6 165/21 165/24
burdens [1] 191/8
burn [2] 259/19 260/4
business [8] 40/15 194/4 194/10 199/16
199/19 205/16 253/10 254/9
busy [1] 54/13
buy [1] 41/7
C
C5 [9] 108/10 145/3 156/13 157/2 166/16 166/19 179/15 179/24 180/12
C5C [1] 166/21
CAFR [9] 198/7 198/9 198/12 198/13 198/20 200/2 221/20 240/21 261/8 calculate [1] 215/4
calculated [1] 152/20
calculating [1] 239/15
calculation [3] 64/14 64/22 125/12
calculations [10] 64/23 66/3 67/9 201/13 201/15 201/16 205/7 205/22 206/21 243/9
calculuation [1] 64/15
calendar [3] 196/11 208/6 218/12
call [5] 123/17 192/17 193/3 233/23 270/15
called [21] $1 / 8$ 98/11 98/15 119/1 120/13 135/11 178/25 179/1 179/1 182/22 202/9 212/11 213/3 217/1 219/14 221/4 221/5
222/24 224/12 246/6 246/9
calling [1] 219/15
calls [7] 13/24 22/15 108/18 113/14 232/11 244/1 244/5
came [25] 29/20 57/22 58/21 60/14 80/17
83/5 85/13 87/4 105/14 153/22 156/3 172/13 194/23 209/25 219/4 229/2 229/20 229/21 236/20 238/25 240/17 249/8 264/4 270/16 273/4
camera [10] 15/6 20/13 21/12 22/15 23/4 23/11 23/14 30/18 36/7 52/12
can [94] 2/17 5/6 5/24 13/1 13/4 13/11 20/23 23/24 28/4 28/10 30/5 30/5 30/13 30/19 36/23 37/14 42/6 42/9 44/19 44/20 45/19 45/24 47/9 47/11 48/13 52/20 55/17 56/18 66/7 69/12 73/7 75/7 75/11 77/22 78/21 79/22 88/18 97/16 100/12 101/12 101/15 112/1 112/15 112/22 115/7 119/19 129/1 129/2 129/8 129/22 129/23 130/9 131/5 131/25 132/15 140/25 146/12 147/3 149/5 154/7 157/15 159/22 167/5 177/25 183/11 183/25 190/12 190/20 198/8 203/8 206/4 206/13 211/10 211/11 211/14 213/8 213/22 216/16 220/18 221/10 230/1 232/20 233/24 236/21 242/11 246/11 247/25 258/17 263/14 266/4 268/15 269/21 272/13 273/18
can't [24] 11/15 11/25 22/22 22/23 42/5 44/19 44/20 44/21 50/16 52/24 64/1 66/12 70/11 77/9 78/6 78/6 79/20 80/5 160/20 162/17 164/14 166/11 166/19 244/3
candidate [1] 114/6
candidly [1] 187/23
cannot [5] 12/4 14/19 88/5 166/22 191/8
cap [1] 65/20
capable [2] 155/9 189/25
capacity [2] 100/15 140/16
capital [3] 76/8 119/1 194/20
captured [1] 212/10
cards [2] 137/5 137/6
care [1] $86 / 2$
cared [1] 58/24

## C

career [1] 81/5
careful [3] 54/9 86/12 182/16
case [98] 2/4 7/16 8/6 8/9 9/15 9/23 10/10 $11 / 8$ 12/2 $12 / 8$ 14/16 14/25 16/23 19/18 19/22 20/16 26/18 27/8 28/13 39/11 41/3 41/5 41/9 43/19 43/25 44/16 54/16 66/23 70/5 70/13 72/4 73/22 75/15 75/21 75/22 75/23 77/25 83/24 84/5 84/10 84/19 85/19 85/20 85/22 85/24 86/7 89/20 91/1 91/10 95/16 96/10 97/11 98/10 98/11 99/9 100/4 100/6 102/2 102/4 102/4 108/5 109/13 109/17 122/24 127/11 127/12 127/14 127/16 127/19 128/14 129/5 130/11 130/14 136/10 139/21 140/4 140/18 140/19 145/15 152/19 158/22 158/23 158/24 158/25 164/15 175/8 180/9 194/10 194/14 205/9 205/10 205/11 205/12 239/12 263/20 263/22 263/23 272/13
cases [18] 38/3 41/6 43/14 61/19 71/1 71/24 76/4 84/17 84/20 96/25 97/12 129/4 133/5 143/24 157/14 157/16 158/15 164/12
cash [95] 61/25 62/4 62/6 62/8 62/19 62/23 64/3 64/4 64/5 65/23 66/24 67/6 182/2 190/24 196/14 197/24 200/10 200/21 200/25 201/5 203/14 207/10 208/4 208/6 210/12 215/17 220/5 220/7 220/8 220/10 220/14 220/20 221/3 221/11 221/15 221/15 221/17 221/21 221/23 221/25 222/9 222/13 222/16 222/17 223/1 223/19 223/20 224/12 224/13 224/21 224/23 224/25 225/2 225/3 225/6 225/22 226/5 226/9 226/10 227/12 227/15 228/20 228/23 229/1 231/2 231/22 235/3 235/3 247/4 247/5 249/3 249/9 258/3 258/4 259/19 260/4 260/8 260/12 260/16 260/21 260/23 260/24 261/1 261/6 261/9 261/10 261/24 262/1 262/3 262/23 262/24 263/1 263/19 269/13 269/17
casino [1] 236/13
casinos [4] 211/22 211/23 211/25 236/13 categories [2] 207/15 227/20
cause [2] 51/7 133/6
causes [1] 160/20
CC'd [1] 43/1
CD [1] 1/9
cease [1] 69/14
Ceccotti [4] 3/8 133/18 146/16 151/21
Ceccotti's [1] 149/20
center [1] 126/16
central [3] 8/17 170/21 187/6
cents [2] 96/19 96/20
certain [15] 20/12 36/12 38/3 44/11 56/1
69/3 71/10 73/15 89/15 89/21 106/3
118/9 147/5 210/1 253/8
certainly [15] 55/8 55/12 55/14 67/2
71/18 79/24 93/10 130/10 134/2 141/21
144/10 156/16 185/3 206/13 272/15
certificate [2] 160/18 260/1
certificates [3] 246/7 246/9 246/12 certification [1] 1/18
certified [4] $1 / 41 / 141 / 22194 / 12$
cessation [1] 137/15
cetera [1] 20/6
CFA [1] 194/11
challenging [3] $5 / 3$ 14/20 52/17
change [7] 54/7 64/12 66/15 101/12
103/16 191/2 271/10
changed [3] 73/24 96/23 120/10
changes [9] 73/11 79/1 80/17 123/22 134/18 140/9 163/24 183/9 249/5 chapter [95] 10/10 11/8 27/9 30/8 35/5 41/3 45/24 70/13 71/23 72/2 72/3 75/14 75/20 75/22 75/23 76/2 83/24 84/5 84/14 84/25 91/1 91/8 91/12 91/15 91/18 91/23 93/19 94/7 96/7 96/12 97/12 97/14 106/5 106/7 106/10 107/22 108/7 109/12 111/25 112/2 112/3 112/5 112/5 112/15 112/21 112/23 112/24 113/6 113/20 115/14 117/22 118/3 118/6 122/20 122/24 124/21 124/22 126/8 134/3 134/8 134/14 134/19 134/21 135/18 144/1 144/3 144/16 145/4 146/13 148/5 151/6 152/22 158/15 164/6 164/12 164/16 165/23 166/13 167/6 167/14 167/25 169/12 169/15 169/17 169/22 171/19 172/7 172/10 172/10 173/19 173/22 174/20 175/2 176/5 195/22 characterize [1] 143/15 characterized [1] 143/4 characterizing [1] 136/2 charge [2] 188/16 197/5 charged [1] 197/13 charitable [1] 190/17 Charles [2] 125/3 187/18 chart [16] 79/4 81/9 82/4 86/9 92/10 93/1 93/23 94/12 138/19 212/17 216/14 218/2 220/18 220/20 224/1 270/3
charts [1] 89/11
check [2] 79/14 200/3
Chicago [1] 193/13
chief [5] 3/3 63/12 145/20 154/7 154/7
Chiefly [1] 190/13
Chinas [2] 134/4 173/24
choice [1] 77/17
chronicle [1] 153/10
chronological [1] 165/9
chronologically [1] 6/5
chronology [1] 147/9
Chrysler [1] 114/11
chunk [2] 188/17 189/10
chunks [1] 78/5
Ciantra [4] 3/10 5/17 19/4 49/15
circle [1] 194/23
circuit [6] 40/10 43/13 123/7 205/8
205/12 206/17
circulated [1] 122/10
circulates [1] 123/10
circumstance [7] 20/11 77/18 78/4 81/3 82/23 102/12 106/7
circumstances [13] 5/10 16/8 31/1 35/20 79/25 103/21 112/3 139/22 161/18 170/9 175/23 176/2 176/8
citation [1] 110/13
citations [2] 98/3 99/10
cite [9] 1/19 9/16 41/3 43/18 76/5 76/6
85/19 138/25 188/23
cited [13] 41/6 41/9 43/13 43/25 44/15
65/11 85/20 99/9 127/11 129/4 129/6
158/22 271/20
cites [1] 205/11
cities [1] 197/7
citizens [1] 142/2
city [334]
City's [101] 15/25 27/7 35/7 51/20 51/22
64/12 64/14 65/4 67/9 67/20 68/5 70/7 72/1 72/3 73/2 76/21 76/25 83/1 88/9 91/11 91/15 91/21 92/2 104/13 105/5 106/9 108/15 110/2 111/12 115/8 116/1 116/12 116/18 120/20 121/6 121/17 122/18 124/25 125/24 153/9 154/5 155/23 156/1 157/13 158/10 165/20

173/5 173/9 174/25 181/7 187/18 187/19 188/2 188/14 196/2 196/4 197/1 197/21 198/15 199/5 199/19 200/7 206/20 208/5 212/23 213/16 213/17 214/4 219/4 220/9 221/20 225/1 231/2 235/15 237/11 239/1 240/21 240/23 241/4 246/19 247/3 248/12 248/22 249/4 250/3 250/25 251/16 255/7 258/4 259/8 259/12 260/6 260/7 260/16 261/1 262/23 265/15 265/17 266/20 269/13 269/17
City'sing [1] 259/14
claim [15] 10/11 14/1 21/15 29/25 33/15 41/12 46/24 71/5 71/13 71/14 139/1 184/3 184/6 255/8 255/18
claimed [2] 21/19 36/15
claiming [7] 13/7 20/3 21/20 21/22 31/9 37/13 42/23
claims [16] 51/14 63/15 68/7 68/8 68/11
70/22 71/1 71/7 71/10 122/6 134/5 190/2
248/16 248/17 254/18 264/1
clarification [2] 37/23 261/21
clarify [6] 40/1 50/13 50/15 126/25 230/5 259/23
class [3] 155/1 156/13 184/25
classes [3] 69/20 158/7 185/3
classic [1] 8/7
classification [1] 69/19
classroom [1] 160/5
Claude [1] 2/22
clause [25] 103/6 106/8 115/14 117/14 167/10 167/18 168/4 169/17 170/3
170/23 171/4 171/8 171/16 172/11
173/23 173/25 174/1 174/3 174/20
174/22 174/25 175/3 175/7 181/11
185/15
claw [1] 32/20
clean [1] 132/6
cleanest [1] 107/10
cleaning [1] 273/16
clear [38] 8/20 10/19 37/9 37/11 38/18 39/1 42/22 50/22 50/25 51/11 60/12 72/15 79/16 85/10 86/6 94/3 96/2 113/3 113/14 118/17 129/13 129/19 140/4 140/20 168/5 179/7 179/13 179/13
180/14 195/24 205/4 219/8 219/24 238/5 240/16 261/14 261/16 267/3
clearer [1] 73/9
clearly [14] 16/16 43/5 46/11 61/20 69/8
69/25 75/7 75/8 87/24 89/9 98/4 104/11
116/5 173/20
clerk [1] 50/4
clicker [1] 132/23
client [47] 7/23 9/24 10/2 12/16 12/19
$13 / 1 \quad 13 / 513 / 1013 / 1613 / 2414 / 514 / 12$
14/18 14/20 15/3 17/9 17/20 21/19 24/7 27/21 27/24 27/25 27/25 28/1 28/6 29/1 29/13 30/14 31/7 31/25 32/3 32/10 32/24 32/24 33/5 42/22 43/6 43/12 43/15 43/24 44/3 47/5 47/6 48/21 48/25 51/14 136/13 clients [6] 8/8 45/16 47/15 194/3 195/6 195/11
cloak [2] 17/4 41/8
cloaked [3] 17/18 18/14 18/14
close [7] 68/22 95/24 193/21 217/23
220/4 261/18 267/21
closed [3] 85/18 169/24 266/13
closer [1] 228/7
closing [2] 104/15 144/7
Clubs [1] 98/12
co [1] 112/6
coalition [1] 163/8
code [9] 70/25 73/21 77/11 108/10
142/18 159/8 159/13 160/12 180/2

| C | compelled [1] 52/23 | confusion [3] 65/3 65/13 180/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| codified [1] 46/11 | compile [1] 201/12 | 236/3 236/7 239/4 256/24 266/20 |
| cognizable [1] 103/9 | compiled [5] 108/3 205/24 211/3 258/13 | connecting [1] 144/2 |
| cognizant [2] 141/22 141/24 | 270/8 | connection [13] 7/16 27/11 34/16 45/4 |
| Cohen [6] 3/8 5/17 54/4 133/18 176/25 | compiling [1] 205/19 | 60/23 64/5 73/1 110/15 144/20 167/25 |
| 237/22 | complaints [3] 77/15 84/10 113/4 | 169/14 185/18 256/12 |
| cohesive [1] 104/24 | complete [4] 5/23 46/19 133/20 220/7 | consensual [2] 83/7 83/20 |
| coin [1] 96/24 | completed [3] 187/15 187/16 188/2 | consensus [1] 112/25 |
| collaborated [2] 240/7 241/9 | completely [3] 86/22 89/16 90/20 | consent [2] 44/14 107/17 |
| collaboration [3] 238/22 239/18 239/21 | complex [1] 82/23 | consents [1] 73/6 |
| collaborative [1] 214/6 | complicated [1] 272/2 | consequence [2] 62/21 |
| colleagues [1] 3/19 | comply [1] 89/14 | consequences [4] 62/12 138/5 138/5 |
| collect [1] 215/21 | component [1] 72/5 | 138/9 |
| collected [3] 130/6 215/19 223/18 | comprehending [1] 59/5 | Conservation [1] 98/12 |
| collection [3] 95/15 98/25 196/22 | comprehensive [7] 81/13 118/14 134/14 | conservative [1] 30/25 |
| collections [2] 214/12 223/13 | 134/24 135/3 153/7 198/14 | consider [7] 15/6 49/22 51/8 51/17 151/2 |
| collective [6] 81/17 85/7 85/8 85/12 | compressed [1] 142/10 | 151/18 272/15 |
| 145/17 151/3 | compromise [4] 113/7 139/2 139/14 | considerable [1] 37/19 |
| collectively [2] 145/12 207/16 | 169/23 | considerably [1] 156/9 |
| collects [4] 102/19 211/25 223/13 225/12 | compromises [1] | consideration [4] 16/25 17/2 18/23 51/5 |
| college [2] 194/7 194/9 | compulsory [1] 148/22 | considerations [1] 91/8 |
| Collins [1] 195/10 | concede [3] 17/8 49/23 57/11 | considered [9] 16/5 16/7 18/6 45/10 |
| Columbia [2] 43/18 43/25 | conceding [1] 77/2 | 46/10 50/24 94/7 179/2 180/22 |
| column [7] 210/10 210/24 212/22 214/3 | conceivable [4] 83/5 94/25 95/25 96/3 | considering [2] 45/11 94/4 |
| 227/17 242/21 243/7 | conceivably [3] 100/22 102/15 102/18 | consistent [5] 91/18 120/22 120/24 121/5 |
| combination [1] 212/7 | concept [2] 150/16 220/1 | $125 / 25$ |
| combinations [1] 1/14 | concern [2] 85/10 261/20 | constituencies [1] 78 |
| combined [1] 221/23 | concerned [5] 21/23 99/6 188/14 238/3 | constituency [3] 81/11 81/23 82/3 |
| come [44] 6/9 61/7 63/3 70/5 78/19 79/20 | 261/19 | constituents [2] 70/10 87/8 |
| 81/14 83/7 97/11 102/16 127/12 148/10 | concerning [6] 6/6 65/3 68/10 71/9 90/7 | constitute [2] 37/17 136/23 |
| 165/12 186/19 195/13 196/9 201/18 | 114/21 | constituted [1] 178/8 |
| 208/12 208/13 213/25 223/19 229/12 | concerns [2] 15/21 26/18 | constitutes [1] 1/22 |
| 229/16 230/7 230/22 233/18 233/22 | concerted [1] 95/4 | constitution [26] 113/9 124/18 128/24 |
| 236/4 238/24 240/23 240/25 241/3 241/5 | concessionary [1] 149/14 | 137/22 139/6 139/18 142/17 144/17 |
| 241/18 243/18 250/17 250/24 254/14 | concessions [1] 93/18 | 146/23 167/10 169/25 171/2 171/7 |
| 258/11 266/15 266/16 266/17 266/20 | conclude [9] 5/2 5/3 112/13 112/19 130/2 | 171/12 171/13 172/12 172/19 174/2 |
| 270/14 | 152/19 192/3 208/4 243/10 | 174/4 174/9 174/22 176/1 176/13 177/19 |
| comes [6] 9/24 32/9 43/5 176/6 227/22 | concluded [2] 170/10 183/21 | $\text { 181/11 } 185 / 16$ |
| $241 / 16$ | concludes [2] 51/7 107/14 | constitution's [1] 174/1 |
| comfortable [1] | conclusion [6] 34/23 37/14 75/13 106/5 | constitutional [7] 7/5 8/21 11/10 88/2 |
| coming [7] 67/22 207/14 238/1 259/13 | 106/12 118/3 | 99/14 108/7 152/23 |
| 260/13 261/14 269/18 | conclusions [4] 207/25 264/11 265/14 | constitutions [1] 170/22 |
| command [3] 145/11 148/19 150/23 | 271/22 | construction [1] 17/20 |
| commence [1] 68/12 | conclusively | constructively [1] 80/15 |
| commenced [1] 117/11 | concrete [3] 81/12 152/7 183/12 | construed [2] 17/10 94/8 |
| commences [1] 110/2 | concurrences [1] 102/2 | consult [1] 273/10 |
| commencing [1] 72/3 | concurring [5] 98/25 99/4 99/12 128/2 | consultant [1] 113/11 |
| comment [1] 115/8 | $128 / 11$ | consultants [3] 28/19 44/6 160/16 |
| commenting [1] 44/14 | condition [5] 55/10 108/16 111/13 202/15 | consulting [1] $43 / 3$ |
| comments [3] 44/25 113/16 137/12 | 228/14 | consume [1] 62/22 |
| commercial [1] 72/17 | conditions [4] 9/1 113/19 145/22 148/16 | consummated [2] 12/18 28/7 |
| commingled [1] 222/5 | conduct [1] 11/5 | contact [2] 26/17 156/1 |
| commingling [1] 222/7 | conducted [5] 33/10 90/24 143/6 155/16 | contacted [2] 138/14 155/12 |
| commission [1] 148/14 | 155/16 | contain [2] 1/12 211/19 |
| committee [12] 2/23 46/12 74/23 88/20 | conference [1] | contained [1] 143/3 |
| 105/13 164/21 165/15 165/18 166/6 | conferences [1] 119/7 | contains [3] 59/9 103/5 110/10 |
| 166/7 166/22 184/13 | confess [1] 85/5 | contemplate [2] 12/17 112/20 |
| committee's [1] 165/19 | confidence [2] 35/3 125/20 | contemplated [2] 91/12 91/14 |
| common [16] 16/19 21/16 21/17 24/8 | confidences [5] 10/1 13/6 13/7 13/16 | contemplates [3] 12/14 12/15 77/12 |
| 26/5 26/13 26/24 27/3 27/6 35/3 35/6 | 14/19 | contend [4] 8/13 89/1 166/14 167/24 |
| 51/6 51/15 66/8 165/16 183/4 | confident [1] 115/22 | contends [1] 125/6 |
| communicate [2] 22/24 154/24 | confidential [2] 33/4 86/14 | content [4] 12/1 19/12 202/25 235/17 |
| communication [2] 33/21 251/16 | confidentiality [2] 136/11 138/17 | contention [3] 165/19 165/19 166/10 |
| communications [15] 33/1 33/1 33/2 | confine [1] 60/20 | contents [2] 234/2 258/1 |
| 33/19 35/9 38/4 38/6 43/17 43/22 47/7 | confirm [2] 70/2 174/24 | contest [2] 166/6 166/9 |
| 117/21 118/7 118/10 118/23 121/6 | confirmable [2] 68/22 69/24 | contesting [3] 57/1 57/4 166/8 |
| company [1] 160/24 | confirmed [2] 70/9 71/3 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Context } \\ 79 / 21 & 114 / 21 & 134 / 19 & 163 / 4 \\ 165 / 5 & 166\end{array}$ |
| compared [5] 48/18 219/18 219/21 267/18 267/19 | conflict [2] 175/3 175/7 conflicts [1] 122/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173/22 175/8 189/10 200/24 267/15 } \\ & \text { contingencies [1] 84/2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| comparison [2] 108/6 214/13 compel [2] 27/15 51/19 | confronted [1] 81/4 confronts [1] 96/13 | contingency [3] 42/3 84/4 106/10 continue [7] 22/13 26/2 111/12 118/16 |

continue... [3] 131/17 154/11 220/9
continued [2] 142/18 202/7
continues [4] 109/10 119/18 125/8
138/24
continuing [3] 150/7 263/25 267/16
contract [1] 150/4
contractual [1] 139/10
contrary [5] 35/4 139/15 171/16 176/12
185/15
contrasted [1] 40/15
contribute [1] 202/25
contribution [4] 64/20 65/4 173/8 255/9
contributions [22] 63/4 64/11 116/7 173/1
173/10 173/12 173/15 183/9 217/2 217/4 217/18 218/10 218/13 218/18 218/20 218/24 219/1 226/21 240/22 250/23 261/3 266/18
control [4] 73/16 98/18 231/19 235/9 controlled [1] 159/22
controlling [1] 129/7
convenient [3] 64/7 105/17 162/3
conveniently [1] 270/9
conversation [6] 14/3 111/22 233/24 234/14 262/11 262/14
conversations [9] 31/5 32/7 32/23 110/25
131/6 202/8 244/15 247/7 268/16
convert [1] 242/1
Conway [4] 65/1 125/4 157/23 187/19 Cooley's [1] 99/13
cooperation [3] 53/19 123/3 152/14
cooperative [2] 42/14 55/19
copies [1] 92/13
copy [8] 1/4 1/22 50/4 118/6 132/14 147/12 170/23 191/13
core [5] 27/18 109/11 128/1 197/6 220/12 corner [1] 3/11
corners [1] 135/16
corporation [1] 34/20
corporations [2] 194/3 236/10
correct [43] 1/18 17/8 26/10 26/11 35/21
47/22 60/11 194/13 196/8 205/20 207/23 208/1 209/17 210/3 213/7 215/12 216/9
216/13 217/3 217/13 219/9 219/10
219/13 223/22 224/11 225/4 225/8 226/7
226/15 226/23 230/20 230/21 232/7
238/11 245/11 245/22 246/1 247/2
247/16 247/18 250/14 264/8 266/14
corrected [7] 1/14 25/12 65/10 189/1
273/7 273/7 273/8
correction [1] 65/11
correctly [1] 55/24
corrects [1] 26/10
correspondence [7] 36/16 38/1 38/9 49/10 49/20 123/1 152/12
Corrigan's [1] 99/13
cost [4] 65/24 112/4 236/24 265/23
costs [6] 134/6 240/25 241/2 245/2 268/2 268/9
$\cot [1]$ 85/20
could [89] 9/8 10/11 14/16 22/13 30/20 31/2 38/24 41/15 41/17 42/1 45/6 61/6 67/8 68/1 69/23 70/9 75/13 76/19 77/6 78/17 78/18 78/22 82/21 83/22 83/23 90/6 95/1 96/4 96/20 99/19 100/24 102/18 102/25 103/21 111/3 111/3 113/6 120/4 121/13 125/9 137/24 137/24 137/25 138/11 143/4 147/23 149/1 149/17 163/4 169/22 173/21 175/9 190/24 191/2 191/24 193/10 194/7 203/6 203/7 207/18 210/4 211/13 212/5 212/16 212/17 216/2 216/14 216/20 224/2

227/17 227/20 231/21 235/3 235/8 236/23 242/18 243/6 249/17 251/20 256/10 260/17 265/24 266/3 266/10 267/8 270/9 271/6 271/22 272/4 couldn't [5] 25/23 76/24 102/19 138/11 164/24
council [2] 67/17 155/5
counsel [29] 3/3 3/10 4/12 6/16 21/25
34/21 35/4 41/4 45/3 46/4 46/8 48/1 48/5 51/13 51/21 51/22 67/17 111/18 115/3 131/15 132/13 138/13 160/15 169/7
192/23 203/25 205/20 241/13 256/24 counsel's [2] 1/19 51/17
counseled [1] 124/9
count [7] 67/6 142/1 142/1 237/4 237/5 237/13 240/24
counter [1] 152/6
country [1] 197/8
county [5] 112/6 123/7 124/6 223/16 226/3
couple [11] 36/5 58/3 73/14 76/4 131/16 132/21 138/16 159/17 163/15 197/9 208/25
coupled [1] 160/13
course [41] 5/12 8/2 8/10 10/24 12/19
13/4 34/4 48/16 64/16 65/11 65/17 66/21 67/15 73/8 73/19 75/4 87/24 100/18 132/1 141/19 143/21 165/3 165/14 166/6 166/8 166/16 168/9 168/25 171/17 179/4 185/14 186/5 198/5 199/2 199/16 199/19 229/19 230/10 230/23 242/10 273/18 court [119] 1/19 2/7 2/18 5/3 5/6 5/7 5/21 6/2 6/11 15/6 16/10 16/12 18/7 19/8 20/12 21/6 21/12 22/23 23/13 25/5 26/14 26/17 26/18 30/18 30/18 30/20 31/10 32/22 33/13 33/25 35/11 35/12 35/16 35/23 36/6 36/8 36/18 37/12 38/10 39/3 39/10 51/6 51/16 51/19 52/2 52/6 52/11 53/16 55/3 55/10 59/23 59/25 70/1 74/6 74/19 82/22 83/22 83/24 84/14 84/22 86/17 94/25 96/1 96/8 98/15 98/16 98/16 98/20 98/23 99/5 100/14 101/22 102/4 102/5 102/11 104/6 112/12 112/20 113/2 118/16 118/18 119/6 122/3 122/8 123/7 123/18 124/2 127/5 127/10 127/13 128/20 130/5 133/12 146/23 146/25 147/2 147/22 148/5 148/11 150/2 151/11 151/18 152/17 152/19 153/1 153/7 158/14 158/18 159/2 165/4 167/21 169/4 175/24 176/17 177/10 192/11 228/14 267/1 273/15
court's [12] 5/25 18/6 20/14 27/20 34/19 36/4 51/5 78/23 92/15 128/2 140/3 147/10
courtroom [4] 2/24 131/6 271/1 273/13 courtrooms [1] 256/3
courts [4] 84/24 99/5 99/22 103/14 cover [6] 36/8 61/2 65/2 87/3 152/25 169/19
covered [1] 21/2
covers [1] 93/23
CPA [1] 195/3
crafted [1] 117/24
Craig [2] 63/12 145/20
crazy [2] 191/17 191/21
create [5] 62/18 112/8 112/15 146/17 184/5
created [4] 44/9 56/25 58/25 89/25 creates [1] 112/21
creation [1] 109/16
creative [3] 119/18 119/22 119/25 credentials [1] 202/3
credibility [1] 57/18
credible [2] 151/19 214/21
creditor [13] 8/24 63/15 79/8 81/10 95/6
106/6 106/12 112/25 117/16 118/1 120/15 120/15 178/24
creditors [54] 16/23 17/1 62/15 62/24
63/2 64/8 66/4 66/5 66/12 68/19 69/6 69/11 69/22 71/5 72/10 73/3 74/5 74/21
74/22 76/21 77/1 77/6 77/13 77/14 77/17
77/19 77/22 82/17 82/25 86/10 86/10 90/10 93/18 95/4 95/6 115/12 116/1 116/5 117/19 118/4 118/12 118/15 118/18 134/4 172/14 178/8 180/11 180/15 180/21 184/25 185/4 208/15 209/11 209/19
crisis [3] 30/6 35/7 107/21
criteria [2] 57/19 166/15
criticism [1] 85/2
cross [1] 272/23
crosses [1] 123/23
crucial [1] 88/9
crude [2] 113/7 169/23
crystal [3] 8/19 40/25 60/12
crystalized [1] 6/15
current [5] 66/15 169/6 237/3 250/21 265/21
currently [4] 116/10 172/23 221/24
260/22
cursory [2] 19/25 21/25
curtailed [1] 17/21
cut [7] 113/7 169/23 172/1 173/4 175/11 176/4 176/12
cuts [8] 116/9 122/19 125/6 125/14 137/17 172/21 181/24 217/23

D
Dan [2] 121/20 151/8
data [22] 61/19 79/6 79/7 89/12 89/13 117/6 136/5 136/7 136/9 136/11 136/17 136/18 138/17 200/13 201/8 201/13
205/7 205/15 242/1 266/25 270/23 271/3 database [1] 89/25
date[19] 6/7 8/11 23/5 23/5 117/25 120/11 122/11 123/12 123/22 125/1 125/23 125/25 158/8 158/9 158/11
168/21 213/25 245/9 259/5
dated [2] 62/15 183/2
dates [4] 23/7 23/19 94/20 143/1
daunting [1] 145/22
David [1] $4 / 7$
day [121] 1/2 2/2 2/13 2/15 4/16 5/2 6/7 6/14 6/19 6/24 7/10 7/13 8/10 10/14 12/19 19/8 22/20 26/8 26/20 27/15 27/18 28/21 29/5 29/8 29/14 29/14 31/5 32/5
32/6 33/2 33/9 36/6 36/12 36/13 38/12 42/2 42/22 43/3 45/11 45/16 48/4 48/12 48/19 49/2 51/22 58/18 59/19 84/8 88/25 96/20 107/18 111/16 111/19 111/24 112/10 112/10 113/10 113/12 113/13 115/3 115/11 119/2 119/8 119/13 122/25 123/5 123/14 124/13 133/3 133/4 133/23 138/14 138/22 141/10 143/24 144/4 144/11 144/12 149/21 150/20 152/4 152/12 152/12 152/16 156/1 159/11 168/18 169/3 169/5 169/9 169/14 169/19 170/5 170/7 171/1 176/3 176/6 182/21 183/2 192/15 196/20 196/20 202/2 202/7 202/9 202/11 202/18 202/23 203/1 209/16 220/7 245/11 245/24 247/17 249/15 251/10 252/8 252/10 253/12 272/24 273/5
day-to-day [1] 196/20
days [20] 38/21 90/12 106/23 107/1
107/2 109/25 110/8 117/10 121/25

## D

days... [11] 122/11 133/10 136/10 143/1 152/9 158/10 158/13 202/13 210/18 256/15 256/17
DDA [1] 223/9
DDOT [3] 198/3 223/2 266/22
deadline [2] 38/23 162/2
deal [16] 4/20 63/21 65/18 66/20 66/23
75/12 75/18 75/20 75/24 97/20 130/3
141/20 153/24 164/7 168/1 179/1
dealing [5] 4/24 34/9 70/13 96/15 211/6
dealings [1] 257/19
deals [3] 6/9 62/16 266/10
dealt [2] 114/17 158/24
debate [2] 28/14 125/22
debt [16] 70/16 72/25 74/3 75/7 97/14
158/15 195/14 196/23 212/15 213/3
239/1 240/20 250/18 250/18 266/7 266/16
debtor [6] 141/6 157/14 157/15 157/18 164/16 167/4
debts [2] 62/3 186/19
December [7] 93/8 93/11 93/11 109/21
109/25 110/5 147/24
December 15th [1] 109/25
December 2011 [1] 93/11
December 21 [1] 93/11
December 21-11 [1] 93/8
Decembers [1] 149/8
DeCharia [2] 237/22 265/1
DeChiara [2] 3/11 54/4
decide [3] 70/15 74/19 83/4
decided [5] 55/25 171/16 172/6 172/9 184/3
decides [2] 14/5 75/19
decision [13] 7/22 8/18 15/12 39/6 54/7 95/4 98/15 98/16 140/3 172/1 175/24 177/11 247/9
decisions [4] 18/13 140/15 147/1 271/19 deck [1] 185/25
declaration [14] 185/24 186/24 187/10
187/21 190/9 191/1 256/12 256/16
256/20 256/23 256/25 257/4 259/5
264/17
declaratory [4] 117/13 123/7 124/14 124/16
declared [1] 114/23
decor [1] 131/3
dedicated [1] 156/20
deductions [1] 216/21
deemed [2] 47/8 130/22
deeper [1] 232/17
default [2] 247/3 247/9
defaulted [1] 247/1
defaulting [1] 247/11
defect [1] 26/21
defendant [2] 14/1 14/15
defendants [1] 122/1
defended [1] 111/4
defense [1] 8/9
deferral [3] 219/14 219/15 230/7
deferrals [12] 203/15 219/17 221/2
226/18 229/5 229/7 230/9 231/1 258/6 260/17 260/20 260/24
deferred [6] 63/4 65/15 66/8 219/20 261/3 261/5
deferring [2] 218/23 219/1
deficit [7] 196/14 197/7 198/22 243/11
243/16 245/3 266/1
define [1] 80/14
defined [5] 173/3 173/8 173/8 217/7 217/8
defines [1] 69/20
defining [1] 49/24
definition [3] 73/19 192/21 206/11
definitively [1] 37/3
deflect [1] 113/4
degree [3] 36/23 125/20 241/23
delay [2] 26/3 38/25
Delhi [1] 194/9
deliberate [4] 144/1 $144 / 8$ 144/15 $146 / 16$
deliberately [1] 171/18
deliberations [3] 17/6 17/17 31/11
deliver [5] 1/15 27/24 28/4 28/10 32/8
deliverables [1] 200/19
delivery [2] 1/15 1/16
Delta [1] 195/8
demand [1] 9/21
demanded [1] 11/18
democracy [1] 106/24
Democracy's [1] 107/2
democratically [1] 129/18
demonstrable [1] 104/2
demonstrate [5] 64/1 65/17 81/24 129/21 214/17
demonstrated [2] 47/18 82/9
demonstrates [3] 82/4 87/6 95/19
demonstrating [3] 68/24 91/25 117/21
demonstration [2] 72/1 72/2
demonstrative [3] 78/19 104/5 269/7
denied [4] 26/23 51/9 130/16 271/5
Dentons [4] 2/22 2/25 164/20 242/24
deny [2] 5/11 58/24
denying [4] 96/7 96/12 141/21 190/7
department [32] $3 / 4$ 109/15 111/8 126/3
145/19 145/19 157/19 186/11 186/14
186/18 188/19 189/6 189/12 189/23
189/24 190/19 197/15 197/16 197/18
198/3 199/9 200/7 200/8 217/11 217/19
223/2 223/3 236/17 237/4 237/6 237/15
237/16
departments [5] 188/18 212/8 237/18 240/25 241/1
depend [1] 99/17
dependent [2] 71/6 103/1
depending [1] 84/19
deposition [24] $16 / 17$ 18/1 18/4 19/5
19/11 19/21 20/1 26/16 26/20 65/10
106/15 110/17 119/21 120/10 120/25
170/20 174/6 178/19 186/17 187/17
187/22 188/23 188/25 189/2
depositions [3] 35/18 124/24 125/25
deputy [1] 154/7
describe [1] 219/25
described [1] 148/18
describing [2] 61/7 262/14
description [2] 21/25 26/1
descriptions [1] 224/4
design [1] 150/17
designated [1] 257/20
designed [6] 67/14 71/8 148/20 148/24
171/18 177/17
desire [3] 1/16 20/14 20/14
desires [1] 68/24
desiring [1] 102/16
despite [4] 34/10 117/25 124/23 139/14
detail [5] 37/19 74/16 205/12 236/9 254/25
detailed [9] 7/17 11/20 20/2 69/14 71/22
71/22 133/20 135/8 198/21
details [2] 199/3 253/3
deter [1] 85/14
determination [3] 31/19 101/22 188/1 determine [7] 5/6 30/20 48/11 84/22
88/18 140/14 212/23
determined [1] 117/22
determines [2] 36/6 110/3
determining [2] 70/1 128/21
Detroiit [1] 190/14
Detroit [65] 2/5 4/6 12/22 17/13 28/15 74/1 93/14 96/17 97/3 105/4 110/4 111/11 111/20 112/1 114/25 115/1 115/4 115/13 115/25 119/13 121/10 121/20 121/21 122/5 122/25 123/4 126/4 129/19 139/4 139/19 142/2 145/7 145/8 145/9 145/10 145/13 145/18 145/19 145/25 148/18 149/13 150/1 152/3 153/15 153/17 154/15 155/2 155/2 156/23 156/23 159/11 164/5 164/12 169/13 186/6 186/11 195/8 197/16 201/20 210/15 223/15 226/2 235/24 236/2 253/16
Detroit's [7] 91/13 107/21 118/12 141/20 152/15 166/7 256/12
develop [3] 9/14 17/25 201/1
developed [6] 8/4 16/12 39/1 214/7 237/11 237/15
developing [4] 8/5 12/16 12/16 194/5
development [1] 16/23
devised [1] 168/18
devoid [1] 10/10
devoted [3] 93/21 94/23 96/15
DFFA [1] 151/4
dialogue [5] 80/9 86/1 125/11 251/15 254/8
Diaz[3] 121/19 150/1 151/10
did [169] 19/1 20/5 20/10 22/8 22/24 25/19 26/18 37/2 37/2 40/3 40/20 41/3
48/24 49/1 53/4 55/15 57/25 61/2 61/25
65/23 81/24 83/10 85/1 86/5 86/10 86/23 87/17 89/14 90/2 90/19 90/23 97/25 100/2 102/4 111/5 114/12 114/16 114/20 116/16 120/17 120/18 120/19 127/10 127/16 127/16 140/20 141/16 141/16 147/22 155/13 155/14 163/8 167/7 175/22 176/2 176/7 178/12 180/25 182/7 187/13 194/9 195/8 195/13 196/9 197/22 198/6 199/2 199/22 199/25 200/3 200/5
201/8 201/18 201/24 202/5 202/25 203/2 205/16 205/25 208/3 208/13 208/18 208/20 208/21 209/1 209/3 209/4 212/22 215/3 216/7 216/8 219/11 220/6 220/11 221/3 227/13 229/12 230/6 230/22 231/13 232/2 232/3 232/4 232/16 233/6 233/16 233/17 233/18 233/22 233/23 234/5 234/5 234/8 234/19 234/22 235/5 236/7 238/19 243/10 243/18 243/22 244/10 244/15 245/6 246/16 246/23 246/25 247/3 247/7 247/12 248/19 249/25 250/17 251/3 251/5 251/6 251/25 252/2 252/18 253/17 253/19 254/16 254/21 256/15 256/20 259/7 259/11 259/16 260/11 260/14 260/15 260/24 262/5 262/21 263/7 264/11 264/20 264/21 264/22 264/22 265/13 266/15 267/10 267/13 267/14 267/23 268/7 270/15 272/3
didn't [18] 25/9 29/11 45/8 62/11 62/25 73/24 76/25 88/24 101/21 127/11 167/15 170/17 173/17 187/23 231/12 232/18 239/17 273/7
difference [3] 44/4 45/5 47/13
differences [1] 149/3
different [36] 43/11 43/23 47/3 48/20 48/23 48/25 60/6 60/13 63/7 64/8 64/9 64/23 72/5 73/23 87/14 88/6 90/20 95/3 95/8 95/9 100/23 102/24 164/1 180/16 199/12 205/13 207/11 207/12 207/15
different... [7] 212/8 223/7 225/14 225/16 234/17 235/20 258/17
differentiating [1] 44/2
differently [1] 240/9
difficult [5] 5/4 35/14 112/14 145/22 152/18
difficulties [1] 149/12
difficulty [1] 91/25
Dillon [9] 41/22 107/6 111/15 119/9 119/17 119/24 120/9 122/14 123/21
diminish [3] 116/3 180/17 181/9
diminished [1] 139/11
dire [5] 82/23 231/8 231/11 231/14 262/25
direct [3] 210/4 253/11 256/10
directed [2] 33/8 249/6
direction [1] 203/18
directions [1] 120/5
directly [9] 21/5 23/9 107/9 119/23 175/1
217/19 235/7 236/16 241/6
director [2] 125/3 154/8
directors [1] 34/20
disagree [3] 58/14 74/9 106/9
disagrees [2] 24/5 25/1
disallowed [1] 204/6
disbursements [23] 199/11 200/9 203/13
207/13 207/18 211/8 216/15 216/19
222/21 223/24 224/6 224/10 224/15
227/25 228/10 228/17 232/5 235/4
258/14 259/20 260/6 260/7 262/24
disclaiming [1] 81/22
disclosable [1] 14/22
disclose [5] 32/14 32/17 47/6 51/20 52/23
disclosed [4] 46/6 46/8 47/21 47/24
disclosing [2] 33/14 44/7
disclosure [7] 43/17 43/21 46/25 47/4
51/24 69/15 69/18
disclosures [3] 47/10 47/10 47/14
discouraged [1] 86/2
discoverable [1] 14/22
discovery [12] 4/21 5/15 5/23 8/19 17/21
18/5 19/21 29/23 34/16 38/22 52/16 127/1
discrepancies [1] 199/25
discuss [11] 6/5 90/9 107/20 127/8
155/22 232/4 232/16 259/7 264/11
264/20 267/14
discussed [10] 7/18 49/12 107/24 142/21
179/11 232/5 259/3 267/15 269/1 269/5
discusses [1] 6/23
discussing [4] 29/13 63/21 80/23 109/16
discussion [9] 16/24 53/12 78/8 85/18
109/10 242/12 247/10 252/23 265/2
discussions [30] 12/21 13/2 27/12 57/10 58/4 58/18 77/24 81/21 81/24 82/18 83/21 85/23 107/3 107/5 118/16 140/23 178/7 178/22 182/5 182/6 183/11 234/1 234/20 253/9 254/8 255/6 255/19 262/6 262/22 267/11
diskette [1] 1/9
diskette/CD [1] 1/9
dispensed [1] 72/4
displaced [1] 67/18
disposition [1] 122/3
dispositive [1] 41/12
dispute [7] 15/9 20/22 24/6 63/23 63/25 85/25 150/13
disputed [2] 97/20 146/7
disputes [4] 45/22 60/22 69/25 151/1 disputing [1] 157/16
disregard [2] 127/12 129/12
disregarded [2] 129/20 204/23
dissenting [1] 99/1
distance [1] 11/16
distinct [3] 49/4 138/5 161/15
distinction [2] 44/4 49/1
distinguish [1] 206/23
distinguishable [1] 127/15
distress [1] 146/8
distribute [2] 1/20 92/15
distributed [3] 69/22 209/12 209/15
distributes [1] 223/18
distributions [15] 71/6 222/14 222/16
223/6 223/7 223/8 223/9 223/11 225/7
225/12 225/13 226/6 228/23 228/25 229/1
disturb [1] 34/19
divested [1] 150/25
divided [1] 6/4
do [137] 8/13 9/4 11/2 11/22 12/2 20/5 22/19 23/12 25/6 28/10 28/21 29/16 31/15 32/21 33/4 33/22 34/2 34/23 35/11 37/1 44/12 48/10 52/20 55/5 55/21 57/5 58/8 60/24 61/8 68/2 68/14 72/16 73/12 74/22 74/23 75/8 79/23 80/8 80/9 80/16 81/3 84/24 85/7 86/20 87/9 87/12 87/17 88/13 88/15 89/3 92/14 97/10 99/22 102/23 105/16 107/10 110/20 113/21 128/4 128/8 129/7 130/3 131/1 131/7 132/15 132/22 133/20 135/9 138/6 140/5 146/11 147/7 148/1 153/1 154/20 160/25 163/17 165/10 165/25 166/9 167/16
175/1 175/4 175/6 186/19 193/22 196/1 196/7 200/3 201/22 202/22 203/8 203/10 204/21 205/16 205/18 206/13 206/21 209/8 209/10 211/5 217/14 219/1 219/16 224/7 231/4 232/8 233/8 234/23 234/25 235/6 238/16 238/24 241/11 242/6 242/8 242/17 243/22 245/17 246/19 246/23 247/10 247/15 249/2 249/6 249/10 252/11 252/25 254/10 255/1 256/7 256/20 257/25 270/15 271/4 272/16 273/15
docket [1] 124/7
doctrine [7] 7/23 8/3 13/12 51/6 51/15 52/4 52/6
document [61] 11/20 40/18 57/15 57/16
57/18 57/25 58/21 59/8 62/14 68/21 69/7 90/11 127/9 136/3 183/1 183/17 183/18 184/20 198/25 203/3 204/21 209/11 210/2 210/5 213/19 231/24 232/6 232/12 232/25 233/2 233/16 233/23 234/2 235/10 241/19 242/24 245/10 245/11 250/7 252/8 252/9 257/6 257/11 257/15 257/20 257/20 257/24 258/10 258/23 259/3 262/6 263/13 263/18 265/7 265/8 265/14 266/24 267/2 267/8 267/10 268/19
documents [58] 6/6 7/8 9/17 10/23 15/7 15/15 20/6 20/13 20/18 20/21 21/2 21/8 21/14 21/18 22/3 22/4 22/5 22/13 22/16 22/16 22/18 23/2 23/5 23/9 23/14 32/12 32/15 42/25 46/6 46/7 46/10 52/3 52/15 52/18 52/22 52/22 54/19 56/21 56/24 57/2 57/7 58/4 58/9 58/15 58/23 59/11 59/24 60/2 118/25 119/15 232/22 232/25 239/2 268/25 269/4 270/6 270/24 271/21 does [37] 12/17 33/25 40/2 40/6 41/7 41/7 45/18 51/7 59/14 66/24 88/4 90/19 104/11 126/1 126/5 126/6 134/11 137/13 141/9 143/5 157/1 163/23 190/11 192/3 195/2 198/20 210/9 214/9 223/17 226/8 239/9 257/24 259/24 260/4 261/24

269/15 272/14
doesn't [22] 9/6 10/23 11/12 28/23 45/9 45/15 59/16 70/11 70/21 75/15 75/17 80/10 81/18 88/3 89/18 102/23 103/16 158/7 166/6 169/1 243/3 271/10 doing [12] 24/9 29/9 49/2 55/12 62/5 93/20 159/6 176/11 195/9 239/14 270/18 273/14
dollar [4] 96/17 125/7 222/18 222/18 dollars [5] 96/15 157/24 219/20 265/17 265/19
don't [88] 11/23 11/25 12/25 14/10 15/4 18/16 18/19 20/16 21/20 23/6 30/3 33/14 33/14 37/11 40/5 40/10 41/16 41/23 42/6 42/8 42/19 45/22 45/23 48/7 49/23 57/8 58/14 58/24 63/6 63/14 64/11 64/22 69/13 74/9 76/22 80/18 80/21 81/20 82/8 85/13 86/2 87/2 87/10 87/11 88/15 88/16 89/7 91/15 91/24 92/23 101/14 101/15 109/3 115/20 125/9 125/14 125/19 127/8 130/10 131/4 133/21 135/12 141/25 157/19 157/20 159/9 164/9 167/5 174/8 175/11 204/25 211/9 211/11 222/6 224/2 233/10 233/11 234/10 234/12 241/24 245/7 245/19 249/12 249/14 251/12 256/17 269/9 271/18
Donald [1] 153/16
done [30] 12/7 25/17 29/19 30/23 31/3 38/24 62/20 67/3 76/23 76/25 77/2 93/20 103/24 108/2 108/24 132/14 149/17 151/16 159/2 165/2 174/20 187/6 188/4 188/8 222/6 222/11 234/8 238/22 239/18 270/11
doomed [1] 149/22
door [1] 265/3
dots [1] 144/2
double [2] 267/21 268/12
doubt [2] 37/1 70/5
doubted [1] 83/6
dovetailed [1] 39/17
down [13] 13/23 15/11 23/17 94/15
102/20 109/1 109/5 109/6 118/10 177/15
193/6 207/15 243/19
DPLSA [1] 151/5
DPOA [1] 151/10
draft [8] 1/2 1/4 1/8 1/12 1/19 2/2 110/21 142/13
drafted [1] 39/21
drag [1] 101/15
dramatic [2] 122/15 122/19
dramatically [3] 96/12 173/10 191/2
draw [1] 36/4
drawing [1] 40/18
drawn [3] 37/14 100/12 227/2
DRCEA [3] 153/14 154/1 154/14
drive [1] 255/17
drop [1] 112/17
dry [1] $17 / 5$
dude [1] 7/19
due [15] 1/18 62/4 62/11 206/6 209/25
219/4 225/18 225/21 229/8 236/19
246/21 259/17 260/2 264/4 271/2
dues [1] 155/3
dumb [1] 110/10
duplicate [1] 104/23
duplicative [1] 242/17
during [18] 62/10 63/4 83/3 83/4 84/22
107/25 111/23 126/18 142/8 142/9
149/23 154/10 188/21 201/25 218/22
220/4 230/10 254/1
dwindling [1] 220/10
DWSD [1] 65/5
earlier [14] 43/10 48/18 48/21 107/24
107/25 151/24 196/9 200/15 205/2
226/20 227/6 228/4 228/14 271/20
early [5] 110/22 110/22 120/6 136/9
171/23
ease [1] 147/10
easier [3] 73/7 147/17 231/19
easily [3] 30/20 91/16 270/10
easy [2] 75/16 149/19
Eaton [2] 2/8 2/9
economic [1] 134/16
education [2] 194/7 194/8
effect [9] 63/5 138/15 141/2 142/17
144/16 150/1 181/22 222/12 247/3 effective [2] 115/2 168/21
effectively [4] 28/10 29/16 75/15 186/22 effectuate [1] 91/23
effort [19] 5/22 7/14 10/4 11/19 22/9 22/11 22/13 74/5 83/8 93/24 94/4 95/24 96/2 113/2 146/16 152/20 184/5 214/6 218/2
efforts [10] 73/5 92/3 93/6 93/6 93/16
104/24 141/24 141/25 152/16 198/1
eight [2] 198/13 210/5
Eisenberg [1] $4 / 8$
either [18] 12/12 30/22 45/15 51/13 73/2 80/15 115/19 134/3 145/20 156/13
160/22 173/15 178/1 185/10 202/8 217/5 238/25 272/9
elected [5] 129/18 154/2 154/22 156/18 157/20
election [1] 102/8
electorate [2] 109/21 129/3
element [2] 16/22 16/22
elements [5] 135/4 165/22 166/1 166/9 211/7
elevator [1] 131/7
Eleven [1] 267/4
eligibility [21] 8/15 10/16 41/2 60/21
84/18 96/10 104/13 112/9 112/23 113/4 142/3 146/25 153/10 153/11 157/2 165/5 165/11 166/15 175/21 177/24 191/9 eligible [4] 91/1 146/13 164/15 165/22 Ellen [1] 148/19
else [15] 7/8 15/13 18/16 23/12 63/16 75/21 86/20 86/21 92/23 93/19 114/13 199/2 223/21 250/8 257/6
EM [2] 41/20 41/24
email [38] 6/16 6/23 7/21 11/24 20/19
24/3 24/16 24/18 36/8 36/10 36/11 36/15 37/13 39/22 40/2 42/12 42/15 44/20 44/21 44/21 47/24 48/3 49/9 49/19 52/10 107/23 111/21 113/24 114/1 114/1 117/20 118/8 119/8 119/11 120/3 138/22 140/22 170/15
emailed [1] 123/20
emails [13] 6/22 7/1 7/20 31/4 42/25
44/11 44/23 49/12 49/23 49/25 50/2 191/16 191/17
emergency [94] 6/8 8/24 10/9 17/6 17/12 19/14 23/10 25/23 27/2 27/5 27/7 27/8 27/10 35/1 67/13 109/16 113/13 114/6 114/14 114/24 115/1 115/5 115/24 116/11 118/20 119/4 120/16 121/11 123/2 123/6 124/20 129/17 129/24 130/1 142/11 148/15 150/8 150/18 151/12 152/14 155/10 155/12 156/18 156/24 166/11 167/7 167/15 168/3 168/8 168/10 168/11 168/22 169/2 171/6 171/25 172/5 172/9 172/14 172/16 172/25 173/20 174/4 175/4 175/22 176/2 176/4 176/8

176/11 177/11 178/6 178/11 178/13 180/9 180/25 182/12 183/19 185/14 185/19 185/25 186/17 186/21 186/25 189/15 190/8 201/19 202/4 202/12 208/14 222/4 243/19 247/8 259/3 259/11 267/11
Emily [1] 171/11
employed [5] 139/3 139/4 145/18 193/14 193/16
employee [1] 115/19
employees [13] 65/6 117/2 119/17
153/15 154/14 155/2 173/7 173/13
182/23 217/11 237/10 241/3 250/5
employment [4] 68/6 71/12 148/14
148/16
enable [1] 100/2
enacted [1] 168/20
enacting [1] 99/7
enclosed [1] 36/9
encourage [1] 55/9
encouraged [1] 86/1
end [34] 26/7 60/24 65/10 78/7 85/20 89/20 99/7 110/5 113/14 114/25 143/24
144/13 170/14 172/4 172/6 189/2 200/17
206/10 208/6 210/13 222/13 225/6
226/13 229/9 229/11 231/23 247/6
251/13 251/18 253/5 255/12 258/5
259/15 260/18
ended [3] 148/4 250/13 266/11
ends [1] 231/20
enfolding [1] 38/22
enforcement [3] 97/5 97/6 142/19 engage [4] 98/8 163/5 171/17 183/16
engaged [4] 29/7 108/14 115/3 178/2
engagement [2] 108/18 200/17
engaging [1] 29/12
English [2] 1/7 220/1
enjoy [1] 47/12
enormous [1] 90/1
enormously [1] 82/23
enough [8] 68/22 97/13 125/18 129/7
130/19 130/21 144/24 159/1
ensue [2] 41/7 42/4
ensure [1] 220/6
enter [3] 59/23 154/21 162/9
entered [4] 2/11 26/9 124/14 131/25
enterprise [14] 186/4 196/24 197/4 197/9
197/10 197/11 197/12 197/16 197/17
197/23 197/25 198/2 198/24 199/19
enters [1] 107/16
entire [9] 19/12 19/14 29/17 44/18 44/22
84/3 110/7 111/6 159/1
entirely [3] 36/24 173/4 189/22
entities [3] 29/12 139/24 223/18
entitled [4] 15/12 209/11 209/18 238/10
entity [1] 29/3
entries [2] 1/14 $1 / 18$
environment [1] 159/23
environments [1] 60/13
equally [1] 184/14
equipment [1] 273/17
equity [2] 195/4 195/5
equivalent [2] 1/7 72/18
Erman [1] 4/5
Ernst [11] 157/23 193/17 193/18 193/19
193/20 193/22 194/16 198/18 231/24
242/3 248/6
error [4] 26/21 189/1 189/2 273/6
Erwin [1] 2/13
escrow [14] 212/13 213/4 215/9 215/13
215/14 215/15 215/17 215/22 215/24
224/18 226/24 227/1 227/2 227/3
especially [3] 14/24 86/12 213/21
essence [2] 105/2 242/4
essential [1] 145/24
essentially [9] 17/4 19/11 26/12 82/17
113/18 170/13 212/14 219/3 265/2
establish [6] 11/13 42/5 51/7 113/3 129/22 129/24
establishes [2] 107/11 144/15
establishing [1] 112/24
estimate [1] 225/19
et [1] 20/5
evaluate [2] 83/3 96/3
evaluated [2] 142/5 142/6
evaluating [1] 88/9
evaluation [6] 83/12 83/14 83/21 111/12 143/6 188/10
eve [1] 26/16
even [51] 9/8 27/25 31/16 31/22 41/13 41/20 42/5 67/6 67/8 69/17 75/12 75/17 75/17 79/1 81/5 82/1 88/20 101/1 102/22 105/23 109/14 116/24 118/13 120/17 125/19 137/10 158/10 158/25 159/9 161/9 172/8 173/18 181/2 181/15 181/16 182/7 182/9 183/11 183/12 183/24 183/25 189/15 189/17 190/1 191/2 197/14 197/20 205/5 206/6 211/10 268/22
event [6] 41/10 45/19 59/23 60/8 85/25 103/15
events [2] 45/8 135/19
eventually [3] 107/4 109/22 225/23 eventy [1] 41/7
ever [9] 43/1 67/21 75/12 106/13 119/22 119/25 121/23 130/4 180/10
every [14] 16/21 16/22 61/14 62/20 80/1
80/1 82/3 84/20 96/3 99/24 103/17 212/3 223/4 237/16
everybody [8] 73/11 73/12 75/21 84/15 86/20 86/21 102/3 149/1
everybody's [1] 20/14
everyone [13] 4/24 28/14 76/20 76/24
77/8 92/19 92/23 128/23 131/2 141/22 192/13 211/11 219/24
everything [9] 58/22 75/9 89/18 89/22 91/20 93/19 96/11 141/11 141/12
evidence [140] 34/10 57/15 57/17 59/6 59/16 60/2 61/7 61/11 61/13 62/2 62/13 63/3 63/21 64/6 65/12 65/25 66/10 67/11 67/22 69/8 72/14 78/20 79/11 79/17 80/3 81/10 81/20 81/23 82/11 84/2 85/8 85/16
86/3 87/1 87/3 89/13 89/24 90/21 91/12 92/1 93/2 93/9 95/1 96/9 97/1 97/16 100/1 101/17 116/2 117/17 127/9 128/17 129/9 135/21 136/22 136/25 142/8
144/15 144/19 145/15 146/2 146/19
146/24 152/18 153/11 153/13 153/19 155/7 155/19 156/6 156/15 156/23 165/7 165/12 166/2 166/3 167/17 168/5 168/15 169/1 169/13 170/8 171/3 171/5 171/14 171/21 171/23 172/5 172/8 173/20 174/23 175/19 176/21 176/22 177/3 177/21 178/5 178/10 180/8 180/20 180/24 181/12 181/19 182/3 182/10 183/15 185/2 185/5 185/21 186/7 186/14 187/9 187/11 188/6 188/11 188/16 189/14 189/24 190/4 190/11 190/17 191/7 192/6 198/11 204/9 204/18 204/20 204/21 214/22 238/8 241/20 242/14 247/25 257/15 257/22 257/23 265/7 266/24 270/4 270/7
exact [1] 237/5
exactly [10] 23/6 27/21 35/15 62/25
67/16 76/6 87/8 88/12 89/1 89/3
examination [3] 193/8 270/14 272/23
$E$
examinations [1] 20/10
examine [4] 19/16 20/12 23/13 54/19 example [11] 8/7 42/8 101/4 101/6 163/24 172/19 181/18 187/17 197/15 206/18 225/24
examples [4] 65/16 185/23 197/11 226/4
exceed [1] 22/2
exceeding [4] 259/21 260/6 260/8 262/24
Excel [2] 201/9 201/11
exception [4] 21/16 54/15 73/14 192/20
excerpt [3] 116/4 172/19 174/5
excerpts [1] 16/17
excess [2] 159/18 265/24
exchange [2] 65/19 119/14
excludable [1] 271/11
exclude [1] 95/5
excluded [4] 204/9 224/19 224/21 257/13
excuse [11] 17/4 22/6 56/2 93/10 121/7
204/13 216/3 217/21 228/6 255/23
259/22
execute [2] 112/4 256/12
executed [2] 84/16 259/5
executive [2] 17/13 209/14
exercises [1] 73/15
exercising [1] 151/14
exhibit [53] 6/17 7/18 46/22 92/10 92/11
92/20 92/21 110/13 113/23 131/22 132/6 132/8 138/15 147/13 152/1 164/23 198/9 198/10 202/16 204/14 204/17 209/8
209/9 209/14 231/18 238/5 238/6 238/10 241/16 247/24 247/25 248/1 249/17 249/18 251/20 251/20 251/21 251/22 252/8 257/2 257/3 263/2 264/14 264/16 264/16 266/3 266/4 266/5 267/2 267/5 269/7 269/9 273/4
Exhibit 10 [1] 264/16
Exhibit 11 [3] 266/3 266/4 267/5
Exhibit 38 [1] 269/9
Exhibit 4 [1] 113/23
Exhibit 43 [2] 209/8 209/9
Exhibit 44 [2] 209/14 238/6
Exhibit 48 [2] 247/25 248/1
Exhibit 49 [1] 249/18
Exhibit 51 [3] 251/20 251/21 252/8
Exhibit 6 [2] 198/9 198/10
Exhibit 6D [1] 6/17
Exhibit 704 [1] 164/23
Exhibit 720 [1] 147/13
Exhibit 9 [1] 257/3
exhibits [6] 49/19 56/2 94/16 170/19 257/4 270/2
exigent [1] 15/16
exist [2] 206/4 250/19
existed [1] 114/24
existence [1] 181/12
existing [1] 250/22
exists [2] 110/4 266/7
expand [3] 212/17 216/14 224/3
expanded [4] 196/10 196/12 200/25 216/17
expect [4] 29/18 79/23 165/8 165/12
expected [4] 141/12 200/19 216/11 228/1
expecting [1] 29/6
expediency [1] 23/24
expedited [3] 1/15 5/24 6/1
expeditious [1] 148/24
expendable [1] 65/22
expenditures [8] 243/13 243/14 244/25
248/9 265/17 266/6 267/16 267/20
expense [1] 236/23
expenses [11] 173/5 190/3 196/22

196/23 198/22 199/10 206/5 236/22 237/14 237/17
experience [6] 112/5 114/9 114/11 149/6 199/18 213/22
expert [23] 58/11 61/17 61/18 157/10
157/25 158/2 195/21 195/25 204/23
205/3 205/7 206/14 206/23 206/24
206/24 228/11 238/14 239/10 242/4
243/4 244/8 257/12 270/25
expertise [10] 154/18 204/8 205/5 206/12 206/18 206/19 206/22 241/23 243/2 272/14
experts [3] 157/21 157/22 271/19
expired [1] 151/5
explain [5] 56/19 80/1 149/4 165/12
205/19
explained [1] 184/12
explains [1] 112/12
explanation [2] 19/25 151/19
explanatory [1] 216/22
explore [2] 30/12 119/19
explored [1] 119/23
expresses [1] 115/13
expression [1] 70/16
extend [3] 13/2 13/5 13/11
extended [1] 152/21
extensive [8] 17/24 18/6 69/21 72/12
73/5 73/15 96/2 96/8
extensively [3] 6/2 49/11 82/15
extent [19] 36/6 47/22 52/1 52/8 52/24
56/17 92/2 94/6 161/6 161/10 164/1
175/13 175/15 205/5 213/19 232/11
241/15 261/12 272/19
extrapolate [1] 237/13
extrapolations [1] 271/17
extreme [1] 77/24
extremely [3] 112/14 218/23 220/14
EY [12] 194/17 194/18 194/24 194/25
195/4 195/5 195/13 195/21 196/10 200/15 203/17 240/14
EY's [2] 194/18 240/14
F
face [7] 11/10 62/21 130/13 137/20
137/23 138/3 138/11
faced [2] 86/23 222/2
faces [1] 112/1
facing [2] 17/22 243/11
fact [68] 10/14 21/9 30/21 31/3 34/10
34/15 34/21 35/13 35/17 40/20 40/22
41/6 44/10 52/3 54/18 62/4 62/13 63/12
67/25 69/14 71/9 72/19 73/12 78/4 84/4 86/16 86/23 93/13 97/21 98/17 106/4
118/1 118/6 121/4 124/23 125/1 127/22 129/10 136/4 136/7 138/5 138/10 152/5 152/20 157/22 158/19 160/14 163/4
168/17 172/25 174/25 181/2 181/5 182/3 187/3 187/11 187/12 187/23 188/17 195/24 206/3 206/4 213/25 228/9 239/8 270/16 271/9 271/19
factor [3] 41/5 96/5 96/5
factored [1] 191/1
facts [20] 8/5 12/16 14/4 16/7 17/25 29/23 60/25 90/13 90/13 105/8 105/11 105/11 105/14 106/2 122/22 127/24 129/21 146/20 160/13 205/13
factual [14] 49/8 50/23 50/24 60/22
127/13 128/20 138/9 140/18 160/19 165/4 167/6 185/8 213/19 271/16 factually [2] 127/15 129/6
fade [1] 80/10
fail [2] 55/1 149/22
failed [6] 88/18 93/22 165/20 165/23

166/15 188/23
failing [1] 63/13
fails [2] 40/20 148/21
failure [3] 113/5 130/17 146/18
fair [2] 160/13 160/22
fairly [7] 21/7 115/21 136/25 140/22
142/11 143/25 237/6
fairness [1] 46/10
faith [65] 49/16 49/16 69/1 69/1 69/4
71/25 72/3 74/4 79/21 80/7 81/7 82/7 84/23 86/7 88/10 88/22 88/24 89/2 90/23 91/3 91/8 95/20 106/7 108/12 112/18 113/2 113/5 118/12 126/9 144/19 144/20 144/22 145/2 146/14 146/21 158/5 160/11 161/7 161/8 161/11 161/20 162/18 163/15 164/10 165/25 166/18
166/20 166/23 167/15 167/19 167/23
170/21 177/20 177/25 178/2 178/4 178/9
180/5 181/17 183/16 184/6 184/9 185/12
185/14 191/9
fakes [1] 159/19
fall [3] 88/4 148/6 235/3
falls [1] 166/2
false [2] 162/20 162/21
familiar [2] 66/21 85/6
familiarize [1] 50/2
far [8] 19/7 40/8 106/14 141/3 227/17
242/21 243/7 255/25
faring [1] 236/3
fashion [1] 175/20
fast [4] 20/9 108/23 109/9 112/4
faster [1] 1/16
fault [1] 20/8
February [2] 106/23 114/4
federal [10] 46/12 115/22 142/18 175/9 175/25 204/9 205/10 257/21 270/7 270/7 federalism [1] 115/22
fee [1] 211/23
feedback [9] 80/11 80/12 80/13 81/2
81/13 82/24 85/16 159/24 178/24
feel [2] $15 / 11115 / 21$
fees [6] 197/3 197/5 197/12 211/24 212/7 223/25
felt [2] 39/2 114/17
few [14] 39/18 44/23 45/3 63/20 78/22
98/3 105/10 133/10 134/1 134/1 136/1 136/21 205/15 259/10
Field [1] 4/13
fight [1] 63/7
fighters [1] 121/22
fights [1] 45/21
figure [11] 23/18 48/13 66/9 78/10 81/2 82/21 94/23 95/24 101/5 102/19 183/7 file [7] 11/7 34/24 53/17 75/14 75/23 90/17 124/10
filed [29] 16/19 37/24 38/2 38/21 67/16
90/12 106/7 117/23 119/5 121/24 122/1 123/5 123/14 123/24 124/7 124/22 133/1 133/2 133/3 143/21 146/20 150/18 151/6 152/16 156/4 166/23 179/4 185/25 187/13
files [2] 106/24 123/25
filing [47] 11/10 26/14 27/10 35/5 45/24 66/19 87/5 88/2 91/1 91/18 108/9 113/20 117/25 119/2 120/9 120/11 122/4 122/11 122/17 123/12 123/22 125/1 125/17
126/8 158/9 158/11 163/7 165/24 166/13 167/6 167/12 167/14 167/17 168/1 171/19 172/7 172/10 173/19 174/20
176/15 176/23 177/6 177/9 179/6 183/22 185/18 255/2
final [11] 1/14 4/22 55/22 55/25 59/23
90/5 105/5 109/24 131/19 212/11 225/17

| F | flows [5] 64/6 190/24 200/25 207/10 | freely [1] 174/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| finally [13] 25/7 63/10 75/24 103/4 | flurry [1] 191/16 | Friday [4] 22/21 118/25 123/12 124/4 |
| 134/22 140/12 166/21 176/14 183/14 | focused [6] 16/10 76/5 153/12 169/15 | Friedman [1] $4 / 5$ |
| 185/11 190/10 227/8 236/23 | 197/25 251/7 | Frigic [1] 252/14 |
| finance [2] 194/10 200/7 | focuses [2] 64/3 64/3 | front [3] 23/6 100/8 200/17 |
| finances [4] 110/3 116/13 120/20 199/3 | focusing [3] 7/25 93/13 165/14 | frustrating [1] 25/8 |
| financial [60] 27/7 27/10 30/6 35/7 35/7 | folks [3] 31/6 47/15 162/22 | fuel [1] 101/10 |
| 67/20 68/13 73/2 90/8 90/9 90/10 90/14 | follow [5] 96/11 107/8 108/25 134/18 | Fugic [1] 254/13 |
| 91/11 91/13 91/14 91/24 93/14 107/21 | 253/7 | full [10] 140/12 188/7 193/11 194/23 |
| 108/16 110/4 111/12 113/8 114/14 | followed [3] 148/21 178/7 184/4 | 214/20 215/2 215/5 220/18 224/1 267/8 |
| 114/24 115/8 116/4 124/25 134/8 139/7 | following [23] 8/25 80/16 82/18 83/3 | fulling [1] 163/5 |
| 146/8 149/12 154/9 169/24 170/1 170/24 | 97/23 99/17 105/3 111/24 113/13 116/20 | fully [8] 17/25 116/3 129/25 141/22 |
| 170/25 172/17 181/10 186/15 194/12 | 119/8 119/13 121/9 123/14 124/13 | 141/23 158/18 186/12 189/22 |
| 197/1 197/21 198/14 198/15 199/6 199/8 | 126/11 133/14 135/19 138/25 151/20 | fund [61] 64/17 65/5 188/13 188/14 |
| 199/13 199/15 201/3 202/14 203/2 204/7 | 152/11 178/22 239/8 | 188/16 189/14 189/21 190/25 196/13 |
| 251/8 252/7 254/12 254/13 264/17 | follows [4] 134/13 138/22 166/5 177/3 | 196/17 196/19 196/20 196/24 196/25 |
| 271/20 272/1 272/3 | footnote [2] 76/6 128/7 | 197/6 197/14 197/16 197/17 197/19 |
| financials [1] 116/18 | footnotes [1] 74/25 | 197/22 198/1 198/3 198/23 203/13 |
| financing [1] 227/5 | force [1] 40/18 | 203/14 212/25 213/4 217/17 218/14 |
| find [16] 12/8 27/1 64/7 64/20 73/5 89/20 | forecast [41] 173/4 196/5 196/12 207/17 | 219/7 220/9 220/16 221/13 221/13 |
| 89/21 89/21 98/4 100/5 144/16 149/3 | 207/19 208/4 210/20 211/1 213/6 213/8 | 221/14 221/15 221/15 221/22 221/22 |
| 158/23 164/24 199/25 272/13 | 213/18 213/23 214/3 214/16 214/18 | 221/23 221/24 221/25 222/3 222/4 222/4 |
| finding [2] 124/1 150/25 | 214/21 215/7 216/5 218/17 232/12 | 222/5 222/10 222/17 223/2 223/5 224/18 |
| finds [2] 30/21 112/7 | 235/23 236/4 236/21 237/9 248/10 | 225/1 226/10 227/13 235/11 246/12 |
| fine [6] 39/16 50/18 57/12 104/16 162/6 | 251/23 257/11 258/8 263/5 263/11 | 246/14 248/15 258/4 262/2 267/17 |
| 192/23 | 263/19 266/6 269/20 269/23 271/9 | fund's [1] 226/11 |
| finer [1] 28/13 | 271/13 271/14 271/16 272/9 272/11 | fundamental [3] 47/12 134/18 140/22 |
| finite [1] 97/13 | 272/14 | fundamentally [4] 35/21 46/4 47/1 205/4 |
| fire [7] 3/18 121/21 145/18 145/23 229/16 | forecasted [3] 210/12 213/9 231/22 | funded [2] 189/4 189/22 |
| 230/20 247/23 | forecasting [1] 206/7 | funding [7] 63/6 63/24 125/21 137/16 |
| fired [1] 166/18 | forecasts [10] 204/4 206/2 213/14 258/25 | 173/9 229/14 255/20 |
| firefighters [7] 121/10 145/7 150/24 151/7 | 265/2 270/25 271/3 271/18 271/25 272/1 | funds [21] 125/21 189/13 197/4 197/9 |
| 153/17 153/25 154/16 | foreclose [1] 106/17 | 197/10 197/11 197/12 197/23 197/25 |
| firm [14] 4/13 6/21 9/12 30/11 54/4 | foregoing [2] 90/22 140/13 | 198/2 198/24 221/4 221/7 221/10 221/11 |
| 138/25 139/12 139/17 140/17 144/11 | foregone [3] 106/5 106/11 118/3 | 227/8 227/11 229/6 229/8 229/13 263/1 |
| 168/19 176/3 193/19 195/3 | forgot [1] 87/2 | further [21] 4/25 14/3 35/22 42/8 77/10 |
| firms [7] 11/22 28/19 29/5 108/19 111/17 | form [12] 1/9 1/9 30/9 32/11 35/15 45/20 | 88/20 112/19 113/7 116/8 124/19 138/23 |
| 202/1 202/2 | 46/1 66/14 70/3 91/19 140/7 147/1 | 159/10 169/23 170/8 173/1 173/14 |
| first [64] 4/19 4/24 5/20 6/5 6/13 8/2 | formal [1] 120/1 | 184/22 210/21 220/19 222/9 242/25 |
| 18/25 24/1 36/5 39/20 40/13 43/14 45/3 | formally [1] 19/1 | furthermore [3] 40/17 41/14 42/5 |
| 51/4 60/5 60/12 61/4 63/23 65/18 74/17 | formed [1] 154/2 | future [8] 41/11 96/22 122/7 204/4 206/2 |
| 79/6 92/6 92/15 92/18 93/22 96/25 99/4 | former [1] 139/3 | 206/7 236/15 239/9 |
| 102/9 105/2 112/2 119/12 131/8 131/19 | formerly [1] 139/4 | G |
| 132/25 146/5 155/20 164/22 166/12 | formulated [1] 17/18 | G |
| 167/1 168/7 178/5 182/12 183/4 183/7 | forth [4] 21/7 110/14 204/8 225/17 | Gabriel [2] 64/15 64/16 |
| 185/24 192/16 194/14 201/24 201/25 | forthcoming [2] 141/3 141/4 | gaming [2] 211/20 211/20 |
| 204/25 209/8 210/10 210/11 210/24 | fortiori [1] 180/11 | gather [1] 141/16 |
| 212/21 216/20 221/18 223/12 226/18 | fortuitous [1] 45/13 | gave [6] 44/5 58/15 89/17 149/21 200/4 |
| 238/4 247/24 249/21 258/13 273/10 | Forty [1] 238/8 | 240/4 |
| fiscal [40] 63/5 210/12 210/14 210/15 | Forty-four [1] 238/8 | Gee [1] 88/14 |
| 210/17 210/24 212/22 212/24 213/5 | forward [15] 30/8 35/8 35/10 35/24 57/8 | general [58] 3/4 3/6 3/18 56/22 57/5 |
| 213/12 215/5 218/15 219/17 219/18 | 58/12 65/13 116/25 163/25 164/6 164/13 | 66/10 121/17 124/5 129/3 138/13 165/20 |
| 219/19 219/21 220/21 222/13 224/3 | 173/5 173/13 191/9 215/23 | 176/9 178/24 188/13 188/16 189/14 |
| 224/16 226/13 227/18 227/22 228/18 | forward-looking [1] 57/8 | 189/21 196/13 196/17 196/19 196/20 |
| 228/20 229/1 229/10 229/11 230/11 | found [9] 12/11 78/6 88/14 98/1 98/13 | 196/25 197/6 197/19 197/22 198/1 198/3 |
| 231/22 233/3 235/2 250/12 258/5 258/5 | 148/9 189/16 189/18 230/23 | 198/23 203/13 203/14 212/25 217/6 |
| 258/20 259/15 260/18 263/19 266/11 | foundation [4] 57/9 58/11 238/16 268/4 | 217/10 217/17 218/14 220/9 220/15 |
| fit [2] 147/8 147/23 | foundational [1] 29/21 | 221/15 221/15 221/24 221/25 222/5 |
| fits [2] 83/16 165/13 | four [19] 122/11 135/16 142/7 152/9 | 222/10 222/17 223/2 223/5 225/1 226/10 |
| five [17] 42/3 91/9 96/5 117/10 200/18 | 152/12 158/13 193/19 193/21 194/24 | 226/11 227/13 229/15 230/19 235/11 |
| 209/2 248/7 248/14 250/9 251/7 252/20 | 200/18 209/2 238/8 248/7 248/8 250/9 | 248/15 258/4 262/2 263/1 267/17 |
| 253/21 266/5 266/6 267/18 268/2 268/9 | 250/11 251/7 252/20 253/20 | general's [2] 66/18 123/17 |
| fix [1] 131/24 | fourth [4] 79/5 82/4 94/5 95/21 | generally [26] 62/24 69/5 91/4 121/3 |
| fleshed [1] 70/3 | fractured [2] 98/23 98/24 | 128/4 128/8 161/19 182/17 196/2 197/12 |
| floor [1] 131/8 | framed [1] 16/9 | 197/14 199/9 199/23 200/10 200/21 |
| flow [17] 62/19 64/3 64/4 67/7 200/21 | framework [4] 30/24 165/10 209/22 | 200/22 202/6 211/24 212/12 214/5 |
| 208/4 210/12 220/21 224/13 224/13 | 254/19 | 216/25 222/7 231/6 236/20 251/15 254/7 |
| 224/21 225/3 228/20 231/22 251/16 | frankly [16] 15/14 49/10 55/15 59/5 61/17 | generates [1] 186/18 |
| 256/3 263/19 | 71/10 74/6 74/8 78/15 81/4 84/1 86/21 | generation [1] 65/22 |
| Flowers [6] 3/16 24/2 26/6 54/6 133/1 | 91/20 98/6 101/18 102/12 | generations [1] 156/20 |
| 133/4 | fray [1] 133/12 | Geoff [1] 2/13 |
| flowing [1] 137/7 | free [3] 115/13 137/7 273/16 | Geoffrey [2] 2/14 192/15 |

## G

get [54] 7/14 7/15 9/2 9/2 11/21 11/21 21/12 28/20 41/18 42/20 55/21 66/9 70/17 73/6 73/10 73/12 75/13 76/24 77/1 81/11 86/24 88/10 92/17 94/2 95/25 108/20 108/24 109/8 111/5 125/22 131/25 136/12 137/11 142/23 144/6 147/12 159/2 164/8 169/6 169/18 174/21 177/10 181/25 185/8 196/2 196/3 199/12 200/1 217/23 220/11 240/1 263/14 273/7 273/10
gets [4] 8/17 87/13 96/18 97/18
getting [6] 80/10 94/1 107/9 236/24
261/17 261/18
give [15] 39/6 42/14 42/17 64/18 79/13 80/11 80/11 98/2 104/25 105/13 137/7
152/1 158/2 185/22 193/11
given [24] 19/20 20/8 21/9 22/1 22/20
33/20 35/20 54/16 54/17 57/1 58/25
59/17 86/6 111/25 112/5 121/23 122/19
124/11 168/11 206/6 211/3 249/18 252/8 267/22
gives [5] 102/3 115/12 119/16 139/13 198/21
giving [2] 25/3 42/16
glass [1] 140/4
glean [1] 162/14
global [1] 105/14
gloss [2] 61/21 128/23
go [59] 2/10 6/1 7/2 19/24 37/10 37/18 39/19 48/20 48/24 49/10 75/22 76/2 76/12 77/4 77/10 78/9 78/21 79/25 84/21 85/23 93/2 105/2 118/10 125/19 130/20 154/25 159/9 163/25 164/6 164/12 166/1 171/19 174/12 176/25 179/22 203/6 204/2 210/18 210/21 211/7 212/16 216/20 217/19 220/18 220/19 222/15 222/21 224/1 228/15 231/18 232/17 235/8 242/16 248/4 248/18 249/17 255/22 267/7 272/25
goes [14] 27/9 27/10 36/17 36/17 41/14 88/20 102/2 102/20 133/25 141/19 174/7 217/10 232/22 238/11
going [128] 4/25 6/1 6/4 8/2 8/19 20/9 21/10 22/19 26/6 30/7 35/24 36/14 39/4 39/14 41/2 45/21 53/17 57/22 60/14 61/4 61/5 61/7 61/8 61/9 61/10 63/11 64/11 70/5 70/14 73/4 74/16 75/10 75/10 75/19 75/24 75/25 76/17 77/21 77/23 79/4 79/17 79/20 80/19 83/1 84/5 85/11 86/17 86/25 87/25 88/11 88/19 89/1 91/3 92/14 92/14 92/24 93/2 93/3 96/22 98/2 98/3 98/4 98/18 98/21 100/9 101/17 102/9 105/1 105/2 106/14 107/8 108/23 115/20 117/23 121/8 122/22 124/4 135/7 137/9 147/6 147/15 150/6 150/17 152/21 165/9 165/14 167/16 171/19 173/5 173/13 177/23 178/5 180/4 182/16 183/17 187/25 188/11 198/8 200/22 205/1 205/20 205/22 205/23 206/10 208/7 209/24 211/6 215/22 221/8 225/17 227/21 227/22 234/4 235/17 235/18 238/16 238/17 242/20 242/21 257/1 257/18 260/12 260/25 267/21 268/9 268/11 269/17 273/8
golf [1] 110/5
gone [5] 146/3 170/20 180/19 180/23 183/17
good [87] 2/6 2/12 2/16 2/21 3/2 3/7 3/17 3/24 4/4 4/9 34/8 34/12 39/12 49/15 54/3 55/20 60/4 62/13 69/1 69/1 69/4 71/25 72/3 72/13 74/4 74/23 79/21 80/7 80/8

81/7 82/7 84/23 86/7 88/9 88/24 90/23 91/3 91/8 95/20 104/8 108/12 112/17 113/2 118/11 126/9 126/21 133/17 134/25 144/21 145/2 145/6 146/14 146/21 153/4 157/5 158/5 160/11 161/1 161/7 161/8 161/11 161/20 162/18 163/14 164/10 164/19 165/25 166/18 166/20 166/23 167/15 167/19 167/23 177/20 177/25 178/2 178/4 178/9 180/5 181/17 183/16 184/6 184/8 185/12 185/13 191/9 193/10
goods [1] 88/22
Gordon [3] 3/20 3/22 132/4
got [23] 65/9 74/25 75/5 76/6 80/8 81/1 81/9 81/13 86/15 86/18 89/2 94/10 100/20 102/7 108/17 135/6 141/5 155/20 183/7 191/16 191/16 236/16 268/12 gotten [1] 89/22
governing [1] 17/12
government [4] 55/2 93/12 93/13 114/24 governmental [1] 154/20
governor [57] 6/25 8/20 10/15 16/17 18/3 19/13 19/16 19/20 20/10 21/10 22/5 23/9 28/25 34/25 36/14 41/22 53/14 53/18 53/23 54/12 54/13 54/14 55/18 100/6 106/16 106/19 106/21 107/10 107/20 108/13 113/11 114/23 117/12 119/9 120/4 120/23 122/13 122/16 123/6 123/20 124/15 124/19 125/19 133/8 139/20 142/10 142/12 142/25 143/6 143/8 143/14 143/18 148/8 148/9 149/25 152/10 152/11
governor's [9] 19/11 55/4 109/15 111/7 119/2 122/10 123/10 142/24 144/10 governors [1] 61/1
gracey [1] 117/10
graduate [1] 194/8
grant [1] 212/8
graphic [1] 269/11
grapple [1] 93/17
great [3] 105/19 217/24 236/9
greater [4] 63/8 189/17 205/12 238/16 Green [14] 3/18 50/14 50/19 79/14
105/20 128/15 132/3 132/22 133/23 134/6 136/5 143/10 146/4 180/23 Green's [5] 133/19 146/10 147/22 151/24 169/8
gross [1] 223/17
ground [5] 5/14 26/23 140/23 183/4 270/4
grounds [1] 257/14
group [8] 47/15 75/5 77/19 77/21 102/6
102/22 105/17 254/21
groups [8] 74/15 75/3 78/15 78/18 89/6
95/8 136/15 138/21
growth [1] 236/14
GRS [2] 65/4 247/20
guarantee [1] 88/3
guess [6] 21/21 49/21 51/3 136/25 218/9 233/11
guessing [1] 98/8
guests [1] 131/2
guise [1] 159/23
gun [1] 98/18
Gurav [2] 192/16 193/13
Gurwitz [2] 148/20 149/4
H
had [135] 6/24 12/24 15/2 19/13 20/7 20/9 28/21 29/3 29/14 29/17 38/6 38/14 39/3 39/18 40/25 41/18 41/24 41/24 41/25 42/2 42/3 43/22 56/20 57/23 57/24 57/24 59/17 69/2 73/25 79/25 81/2 84/11

88/2 93/15 97/20 100/1 100/23 107/6 109/2 109/11 114/18 114/20 117/18 117/22 118/1 118/13 121/7 122/9 125/11 125/21 127/2 128/18 129/11 130/15 130/20 133/23 135/2 136/11 136/15 141/10 142/12 142/13 148/7 150/25 153/25 154/3 155/25 156/11 156/18 156/19 159/3 168/10 168/17 169/17 176/3 176/8 176/23 176/24 178/23 181/16 184/2 188/22 194/15 199/6 199/10 199/15 200/17 201/19 207/16 208/14 210/18 212/23 213/5 213/18 213/25 214/16 214/17 218/11 221/20 222/11 222/15 224/20 225/1 225/21 226/22 227/2 228/23 229/8 229/18 229/18 230/13 230/23 234/1 236/14 237/6 246/20 248/6 254/4 259/15 260/20 260/23 261/3 261/5 261/6 262/1 264/5 265/14 266/12 266/13 267/22 268/19 268/21 268/24 269/14 273/6 hadn't [1] 187/15
half [5] 45/14 93/23 151/5 265/16 265/19 hall [3] 131/9 249/24 273/20
halls [1] 131/5
hallways [1] 131/4
hand [5] 78/22 138/12 180/19 180/23 249/18
handful [1] 136/17
handle [1] 196/2
handwrites [1] 123/24
hang [1] 57/14
hangs [1] 70/15
happen [8] 42/1 75/10 83/6 103/7 216/7 216/8 216/12 255/13
happened [20] 15/1 16/15 28/12 45/7 45/13 78/16 80/7 82/16 83/19 84/22 86/3 86/4 94/1 94/12 94/20 102/3 102/21
151/19 215/20 222/8
happening [3] 62/2 271/23 271/24
happens [2] 75/20 191/3
happy [3] 22/17 25/6 30/17
hard [12] 30/15 59/4 66/6 74/10 81/5 82/10 89/24 90/1 91/22 149/2 162/15 170/16
has [117] 6/2 6/3 6/15 7/11 16/15 16/19 17/3 17/13 17/21 17/21 17/21 18/3 18/5
18/11 18/14 18/14 18/20 23/22 24/10 24/12 26/14 27/17 30/11 43/1 44/22 49/20 53/12 54/13 59/6 61/17 65/23 67/18 69/7 69/19 70/14 71/22 72/8 74/1 75/4 77/3 77/17 84/20 85/7 86/5 91/2 91/20 92/19 96/23 99/4 99/5 103/8 103/22 106/16 118/19 125/5 128/25 130/7 135/4 138/4 138/8 139/1 140/17 141/3 143/19 148/10 152/17 160/25 161/5 162/9 165/4 165/6 165/22 165/23 165/24 166/17 169/4 175/23 178/6 180/23 181/3 182/12 184/24 184/25 186/1 186/15 186/21 188/2 189/15 198/10 202/12 204/20 205/3 205/5 212/8 213/20 215/20 221/11 221/14 222/7 223/19 223/20 223/21 224/6 225/19 225/25 235/9 238/2 238/13 240/14 244/25 245/3 250/11 256/25 260/22 268/17 269/12 272/25
hasn't [3] 24/24 66/25 187/16
have [368]
haven't [12] 10/24 12/7 12/11 12/23 13/21 15/4 34/13 38/14 81/4 175/12 175/16 227/11
having [12] 30/15 38/21 51/10 59/4 59/25 60/13 74/4 79/23 97/4 97/5 111/5 158/2 hazardous [1] 101/14
hazards [1] 101/4
he [115] 6/7 17/13 18/20 43/10 43/22
44/5 48/18 53/19 55/5 55/5 57/10 65/10 69/19 90/15 108/17 108/18 110/17
110/19 110/24 111/4 114/16 114/16 114/17 114/18 115/18 118/9 119/15 119/16 119/21 119/24 120/2 120/13 120/25 121/2 122/14 122/16 122/18 122/21 122/21 124/9 125/4 125/7 125/8 125/21 129/25 142/14 142/15 142/19 143/20 155/14 169/2 169/4 171/5 171/10 171/10 171/11 171/24 172/2 172/2 172/3 172/16 172/20 173/24 174/7 174/7 174/8 174/9 174/10 174/15 174/18 175/23 175/23 176/7 177/7 178/12 178/19 178/20 178/23 178/24 186/1 186/21 188/1 188/21 189/1 205/2 205/16 205/19 213/16 213/17 213/18 213/21 213/22 230/1 231/4 232/9 232/16 232/21 232/23 233/18 233/23 234/5 235/5 235/6 239/14 239/17 240/1 244/6 244/6 244/9 245/6 245/7 249/16 264/22 265/9 269/13 he's [9] 55/12 90/13 174/1 174/19 183/20 205/2 213/20 261/13 261/16 head [4] 237/4 237/5 240/24 241/3 headed [1] 267/19
headings [1] 218/2
heads [2] 100/19 200/8
health [8] 216/25 237/9 237/11 240/21
241/2 248/11 250/23 266/18
healthcare [4] 140/9 173/6 266/8 268/2 hear [19] 34/1 34/3 37/2 37/3 39/14
50/10 60/5 63/11 66/24 67/11 72/14 79/17 82/14 96/8 146/25 231/12 241/13 244/3 256/4
heard [26] 34/13 35/5 39/15 57/23 70/14 83/3 115/7 141/14 151/15 152/18 153/7 159/15 162/21 165/6 168/9 169/4 176/18 178/16 181/14 185/2 189/19 239/16 239/23 240/9 240/9 271/7
hearing [11] 5/25 124/5 124/8 133/6 133/13 164/4 165/8 165/13 176/19
176/19 177/1
hearings [1] 70/4
hearsay [9] 59/6 59/7 59/8 59/9 59/13
59/15 101/18 229/24 241/18
hearsays [1] 226/5
heart [1] 7/3
Heather [2] 36/12 107/18
heavily [2] 79/24 94/23
held [14] 98/17 99/5 102/9 115/24 119/7
136/17 160/4 208/22 247/13 249/23
249/24 252/3 252/4 253/16
help [9] 89/7 91/6 140/14 145/1 147/1 161/13 161/19 224/4 237/16
helped [6] 89/4 201/3 203/2 207/8 246/14 250/9
helpful [1] 23/19
helping [3] 108/20 154/5 201/1
helps [1] 112/23
her [10] 27/23 28/4 36/12 109/12 123/18 128/10 149/6 202/13 218/2 272/5 here [98] $3 / 104 / 17 / 48 / 108 / 1811 / 23$ 12/20 13/6 14/14 15/1 16/8 16/25 17/11 18/10 19/10 19/23 20/7 24/1 26/4 26/7 26/22 26/25 29/4 29/25 30/14 30/16 30/23 31/3 31/20 32/7 32/21 34/25 35/11 36/25 37/20 38/22 42/1 43/3 44/24 48/1 57/22 57/23 58/4 59/8 61/3 61/6 67/1 67/2 70/22 72/23 75/6 78/14 80/21 87/19 91/4 92/3 97/10 97/15 98/16 101/16

103/12 104/21 116/25 118/6 130/18 131/2 131/6 132/3 138/13 141/23 144/2 145/20 147/16 147/18 152/1 157/17 158/1 160/13 161/19 165/3 175/4 177/22 177/25 180/5 186/9 187/3 192/13 207/25 210/22 211/9 211/14 217/16 218/1 238/19 241/12 248/6 273/14 273/17 here's [7] 92/14 92/18 160/24 169/20 172/19 182/10 183/1 Hickman [1] 8/6 high [4] 97/8 106/16 189/18 241/23 higher [1] 221/16
highest [1] 97/3
highlight [2] 227/17 236/21
highlighted [4] 115/16 221/20 227/10 248/16
highlights [1] 171/20
highly [2] 137/1 137/1
him [44] 5/9 27/23 28/3 37/3 40/5 54/19 57/3 90/14 109/11 114/10 125/20 155/13 171/7 174/12 182/14 192/17 202/5
205/21 205/22 221/8 231/4 232/8 232/16 232/24 234/5 234/23 235/1 238/18 239/16 239/20 239/21 240/2 240/4 240/9 240/9 240/10 242/20 244/9 244/16 257/18 260/12 260/15 264/22 267/14 himself [4] 120/17 170/5 175/23 178/14 hired [8] 7/15 32/11 33/11 40/22 41/20 157/21 196/1 205/3
hiring [1] 113/12
his [73] 5/7 8/8 17/14 17/17 34/25 35/1 39/24 54/17 54/21 55/10 65/9 90/12 106/15 110/17 111/8 114/8 114/22 115/13 119/21 120/10 120/25 123/20 129/25 143/8 143/18 152/10 156/24 168/23 170/8 170/20 171/16 172/15 173/21 173/25 174/5 177/12 177/19 178/7 178/19 182/15 185/18 185/24 186/17 186/24 187/10 187/22 188/23 188/24 189/3 202/13 205/19 205/22 207/3 239/13 239/25 240/2 240/5 240/6 243/1 247/8 257/19 259/4 259/12 262/12 262/18 262/21 264/12 264/20 264/23 267/11 267/23 269/16 272/5
historical [6] 214/11 214/15 235/23 248/9 266/25 272/10
historically [1] 236/14
history [4] 93/9 102/3 124/7 153/22 hold [6] 18/11 31/21 76/20 189/19 225/14 233/4
holder [2] 72/18 82/6
holders [3] 72/19 73/19 159/5
home [1] 193/12
honest [1] 12/6
Honor [198] 2/12 2/15 2/16 2/22 3/1 3/2 3/7 3/16 3/24 4/4 4/9 4/17 5/17 5/20 7/2 8/16 9/10 11/15 12/6 12/23 15/4 15/11 15/14 16/2 18/10 18/16 18/25 20/20 21/18 22/7 22/12 23/16 23/20 23/21 26/9 30/15 30/23 32/18 34/5 36/4 38/21 39/12 40/10 47/18 48/2 50/6 50/8 50/12 50/18 50/23 51/1 53/2 53/7 53/11 54/3 55/1 55/17 56/6 56/14 57/24 58/21 58/22 59/3 59/19 59/21 60/4 61/15 64/2 64/11 64/19 66/21 69/14 69/23 70/4 70/4 70/14 78/12 78/25 79/16 87/5 89/9 97/23 98/4 99/11 100/4 101/20 103/12 104/8 104/14 104/19 104/25 105/20 106/15 126/19 126/21 126/22 127/19 127/23 127/25 128/10 128/13 129/4 129/8 130/18 132/1 132/11 132/13 133/18 133/25 136/9
141/6 144/24 152/17 157/5 161/2 161/21 161/25 162/1 162/7 162/11 163/6 163/21

164/14 164/19 165/3 175/13 175/18 191/6 191/10 191/15 191/25 192/14 193/1 198/9 203/19 203/23 204/11 204/16 205/9 206/1 206/17 208/8 213/13 213/15 214/7 214/11 214/23 215/19 216/9 220/3 220/13 230/4 231/14 232/10 233/1 233/7 233/13 237/21 239/6 239/7 239/22 240/10 241/15 241/21 242/7 242/9 242/13 242/24 243/5 256/7 257/10 257/16 258/7 258/12 258/16 258/21 259/25 260/5 261/11 261/25 262/9 263/4 263/10 263/11 263/24 264/9 264/25 265/11 266/23 268/20 269/3 269/6 270/2 270/21 271/6 272/16 272/21 273/2 Honor's [2] 97/19 100/21
hoping [1] 29/6
hour [2] 101/8 123/25
hours [12] 11/21 19/21 20/9 54/22 61/6 159/18 209/2 248/20 250/1 252/20 253/21 254/5
housekeeping [3] 131/16 132/3 273/3 houses [2] 100/22 109/24
Houston [1] 100/5
how [78] 17/17 19/7 20/4 25/14 32/7 32/7 41/16 42/19 48/11 63/21 66/7 67/5 76/24 77/1 80/23 81/24 83/15 87/12 87/15 89/12 100/20 102/4 105/10 105/11 112/1 112/4 112/8 119/19 125/5 130/3 136/2 137/24 137/24 137/25 148/4 161/17 165/12 166/2 166/3 181/20 182/16 184/17 187/5 193/20 194/17 200/15 200/24 202/5 205/19 207/3 208/24 209/1 210/22 214/11 217/14 218/11 227/14 228/21 228/24 230/16 235/18 236/20 236/21 237/24 238/16 243/23 248/18 249/25 252/18 253/3 253/19 254/3 256/15 256/20 256/21 258/10 261/9 262/25
Howard [1] 109/18
Howell [1] 3/5
however [10] 52/1 74/11 85/13 104/14 138/9 146/11 178/9 230/3 245/1 257/20 huge [5] 74/20 77/19 78/5 186/5 189/10 huh [1] 12/12
hundred [4] 99/2 132/5 173/17 208/25 hype [1] 75/5
hypo [3] 13/24 48/17 48/20
hypothetical [2] 16/12 120/7
4
I'll [34] 45/2 50/8 79/13 81/11 81/14 83/14 91/10 103/23 115/7 130/2 132/20 132/23 136/25 145/1 147/14 162/9 164/20 168/1 168/5 170/23 177/4 185/22 207/6 208/12 214/19 228/17 238/18 242/22 243/4 256/7 258/22 262/18 265/5 272/14
I'm [106] 2/22 3/21 4/25 6/1 6/3 10/13 13/25 14/13 20/20 21/21 22/8 22/10 32/18 36/9 39/4 43/20 55/16 59/4 60/5 60/13 61/4 61/5 61/8 61/8 67/5 67/11 68/19 76/17 79/4 79/20 85/6 89/15 90/17 91/3 92/14 98/2 98/3 100/8 103/24 104/20 109/9 114/2 127/7 130/13 130/14 131/23 141/22 144/23 144/23 144/24 145/19 147/6 147/15 147/17 147/18 150/6 150/12 152/1 152/10 161/14 165/9 165/14 167/16 171/19 175/14 175/18 176/21 177/23 180/4 182/16 183/16 191/21 194/2 194/11 198/8 203/23 203/24 203/25 205/18 205/20 205/22 221/5 221/7 227/21 227/21 231/9 232/14 232/15 233/19 235/17 235/18 238/3


130/17
income [6] 211/17 223/23 236/6 236/8 241/7 272/6
incomplete [3] 124/25 125/2 185/22
inconsistent [3] 39/2 84/9 124/2
incorrect [1] 46/5
increase [1] 268/1
increased [2] 101/10 229/9
increases [1] 237/8
increasing [1] 267/16
incremental [1] 65/22
indeed [3] 187/15 188/6 190/1
indentured [1] 72/16
independent [1] 143/6
India [1] 194/9
indicate [7] 34/8 40/6 45/17 63/18 97/24
105/10 114/20
indicated [10] 23/8 30/2 34/6 34/18 55/18
57/25 59/19 63/17 101/20 228/14
indicates [2] 81/9 185/5
indicating [4] 19/9 21/1 97/8 152/4
indication [1] 11/17
indicative [1] 91/21
indirect [2] 175/3 177/18
individual [6] 30/10 72/16 95/5 95/6
237/15 253/8
individuals [1] 181/21
indulgence [1] 5/21
ineffective [1] 167/12
influx [1] 190/22
inform [1] 148/4
information [47] 25/10 25/16 27/1 33/4
46/15 79/3 89/10 89/15 89/23 90/2 90/3
116/25 117/3 117/5 117/8 119/16 121/11
124/25 140/11 152/7 155/21 162/23
163/1 181/19 182/24 198/6 200/1 200/4
200/5 200/11 205/24 207/10 211/2 211/3
214/15 214/17 235/24 241/16 248/11
252/24 264/5 264/6 265/22 266/8 270/19 272/9 272/10
informational [9] 116/19 119/11 120/8
120/12 120/21 120/24 136/4 155/15 182/22
informed [2] 86/9 151/13
informing [1] 123/18
initial [4] 69/10 149/10 162/16 189/1
initiative [2] 102/23 113/14
initiatives [4] 134/20 135/8 141/20 264/2
injunction [4] 117/15 123/15 133/7
133/13
injury [1] 122/7
inning [5] 66/23 108/12 123/7 124/5 215/17
inquire [2] 15/18 113/12
inquired [1] 140/17
inquiry [3] 99/20 101/14 103/13
insert [1] 238/19
inserted [1] 108/20
insofar [2] 32/14 35/9
insolvency [11] 61/5 61/11 61/22 63/10
64/2 64/22 66/2 67/9 67/15 67/24 166/8
insolvent [2] 61/14 64/1
instance [4] 12/9 44/13 86/15 99/24
instances [4] 80/4 85/3 89/17 89/19
instantaneously [1] 1/7
instead [5] 74/10 121/24 156/3 171/15
181/25
institute [2] 126/4 190/15
institution [1] 107/13
instruction [1] 160/5
instructive [3] 87/20 91/6 99/16
insulate [2] 98/21 107/3
insulated [1] 110/9
insulating [1] 110/19
insurance [1] 140/1
insurer [1] $73 / 15$
insurers [8] 72/21 72/21 72/21 87/4 252/6
252/11 253/9 253/12
integral [1] 82/13
intend [2] 11/2 180/25
intended [9] 8/4 97/23 116/3 168/16 179/9 179/10 180/17 183/16 185/6 intending [1] 172/17
intends [6] 46/8 77/13 77/16 181/5 181/9
184/17
intent [16] 8/18 9/4 49/7 50/20 61/1 72/1
86/14 98/9 101/5 115/13 128/3 128/5
128/9 128/13 167/8 167/17
intention [2] 117/18 149/18
intentional [1] 38/25
intentionally [2] 46/14 177/17
intentions [1] 168/4
inter [1] 233/20
interactions [1] 95/4
interest [17] 16/19 17/11 21/16 21/18
24/8 26/5 26/13 26/24 27/3 27/6 35/3
35/6 51/6 51/15 72/24 246/17 250/20
interested [4] 108/19 111/17 152/5
161/14
interesting [3] 89/11 119/11 161/5
Interestingly [1] 149/10
interests [1] 71/7
internal [10] 27/18 31/11 31/11 31/13
31/22 32/6 36/20 49/21 49/22 199/6
internally [2] 49/3 184/2
interpose [1] 203/20
interpretation [2] 95/10 160/13
interpreted [1] 55/14
interpreting [1] 100/11
interrupt [3] 108/21 219/23 262/10
intervention [1] 35/23
interview [5] 14/2 111/16 115/12 115/16
202/1
interviewing [1] 8/7
intimated [2] 61/15 86/8
introduce [2] 2/17 3/9
introduced [2] 109/23 203/24
introducing [1] 46/22
invade [1] 115/14
investigate [3] 29/17 37/7 37/8
investment [1] 194/22
inviolable [1] 28/7
invitation [3] 161/23 161/24 162/1 invite [1] 155/14
invited [4] 26/17 140/7 159/16 160/3
invoke [1] 106/25
invoked [3] 19/12 20/1 35/10
involve [6] 76/25 127/16 271/19 271/25 272/3 272/14
involved [21] 8/9 11/22 13/6 16/8 17/11 21/5 21/12 25/10 28/19 28/21 37/20 38/4 65/22 65/23 72/22 76/21 84/17 95/15
98/14 271/20 272/2
involves [2] 6/19 21/6
involving [3] 17/6 25/10 155/7
irresponsible [2] 84/6 124/10
Irwin [8] 36/25 37/6 39/24 57/3 57/10 58/3 58/19 273/5
is [754]
Isle [4] 65/18 65/18 65/21 65/24
isn't [11] 13/2 27/4 47/21 70/21 90/16
97/13 97/24 174/14 189/8 218/3 271/13
issuance [1] 213/3
issue [54] 6/15 15/21 16/9 16/20 24/1
24/10 26/4 31/20 32/21 36/17 37/22 42/7
49/8 49/10 49/14 50/19 50/23 50/25 51/4


Kevyn [16] 42/12 90/7 111/20 113/12 114/5 114/10 114/25 115/6 118/8 119/12 168/24 201/24 201/25 230/25 234/20 247/10
key [10] 12/12 20/6 21/2 23/5 40/19
79/14 95/9 118/25 168/6 183/21
kidding [1] 88/14
kind [13] 19/6 23/24 24/25 40/25 69/3
70/16 74/3 75/3 83/8 93/19 130/9 165/25 199/8
kinds [5] 82/9 94/25 95/3 95/3 100/23
King [3] 3/20 3/22 3/23
kit [1] 150/11
knee [1] 144/6
knew [16] 8/22 11/2 28/14 41/1 41/1 87/8 109/2 111/9 122/18 122/21 129/14 142/14 142/15 142/19 232/23 243/23 knitting [1] 144/2
know [79] 8/19 9/1 10/1 10/18 10/19 11/5 12/25 14/2 15/5 17/16 18/12 18/19 21/20 24/9 25/5 35/15 38/13 38/15 39/17 40/5 41/16 41/23 42/11 43/8 45/20 45/21 45/21 45/22 45/23 48/7 48/19 53/16 58/4 58/5 70/24 91/15 101/14 109/9 125/9 125/14 126/1 126/5 126/6 127/23 129/15 133/12 135/14 137/15 139/5 141/3 142/10 142/12 142/21 142/25 143/9 143/18 151/15 168/7 168/13 168/24 181/18 182/2 182/7 182/9 183/10 187/4 187/13 187/23 192/25 206/19 211/9 211/11 214/14 219/16 222/6 230/1 233/10 245/19 246/19
knowledge [7] 9/3 42/24 66/8 111/5 177/12 189/3 254/16
known [1] 148/10
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { knows [5] } & 10 / 8 & 64 / 2 & 84 / 15 & 136 / 9 & 188 / 4\end{array}$

## L

labor [26] 74/15 84/18 86/24 87/8 87/17
134/6 136/23 137/10 137/25 138/20
148/4 148/12 148/19 148/24 150/11
150/14 159/7 159/12 160/3 160/8 160/17 160/23 161/11 161/18 162/13 162/15 labor/retiree [1] 87/8
lack [7] 58/11 144/19 144/19 144/21
145/2 244/21 268/4
laid [2] 143/8 219/4
language [3] 99/8 111/2 259/23
large [5] 21/7 22/12 93/20 155/25 188/17
largely [1] 175/19
larger [2] 200/18 211/10
last [24] 42/21 43/7 49/18 53/15 84/16 94/22 94/24 96/5 96/8 97/18 101/20 103/5 118/24 142/22 152/24 185/5 188/7 206/25 209/1 226/5 248/19 249/25 253/19 270/2
lasted [1] 253/20
lastly [3] 47/1 67/10 121/4
lasts [1] 159/17
late[8] 16/1 16/2 16/3 28/15 34/6 56/4 169/10 256/18
later [26] 32/9 45/14 45/14 45/15 78/20 81/14 93/10 93/11 106/2 106/21 107/1 109/25 117/10 121/25 122/11 123/4 124/9 124/11 133/10 141/17 142/7 143/2 152/9 168/1 211/7 242/9
latter [1] 181/2
launch [2] 135/20 141/11
launched [2] 142/4 142/14
Lauren [4] 203/8 211/11 212/16 227/19
law [75] 9/16 10/2 11/22 12/2 13/1 17/12

28/19 29/4 30/11 41/3 41/5 44/16 47/2 51/1 54/4 68/9 68/11 70/1 70/8 70/11 70/18 74/24 74/25 85/6 99/7 99/14 99/18 101/6 105/15 106/21 108/19 110/6 111/17 113/16 113/18 115/22 115/23 127/1 127/12 127/16 127/18 127/21 128/6 128/25 130/9 130/11 130/14 130/15 142/18 148/4 148/9 150/14 161/11 161/11 161/17 161/18 166/4 166/4 167/5 168/9 168/10 168/16 168/18 170/10 172/4 174/13 174/16 174/18 175/9 176/1 176/3 176/10 179/14 184/23 202/1
lawsuit [3] 123/5 133/1 133/2
lawsuits [6] 30/10 45/23 117/11 124/12 141/7 155/6
lawyer [11] 12/4 12/15 20/5 27/22 28/8 32/23 48/4 48/19 114/17 168/25 169/3 lawyers [4] 8/4 27/23 31/5 48/12 lay [4] 143/14 204/5 228/12 238/16 laying [1] 251/8
lays [1] 118/9
lead [4] 66/5 99/3 103/16 120/4
leaders [3] 154/10 154/12 156/19
leadership [2] 154/2 154/22
leading [7] 85/19 98/10 144/13 205/8 230/3 269/19 269/22
Lear [1] 245/2
learn [3] 64/11 199/3 208/18
learned [4] 101/6 201/19 201/22 208/14 leased [1] 65/19
least [31] 6/20 13/21 21/6 23/2 24/10 25/19 42/3 61/15 61/22 63/4 66/4 71/17 71/17 86/15 89/12 93/8 94/20 103/17
126/24 136/3 136/13 137/3 182/4 186/23 200/1 239/16 242/15 252/15 252/20 254/14 263/14 leastly [1] 232/23
leave [4] 22/12 242/8 272/18 273/16 leaving [1] 144/11
lectern [2] 105/24 126/16
led [1] 77/6
ledge [2] 100/1 101/23
left [8] 68/1 97/9 103/6 194/14 251/13
251/15 253/5 253/7
legacy [14] 96/16 164/7 235/16 236/24
243/14 245/2 248/9 249/5 250/11 265/21 265/23 266/5 267/15 267/20
legal [40] 3/3 27/12 27/22 27/22 27/24
28/5 28/10 29/9 29/18 33/9 34/25 35/1
35/8 35/9 37/19 45/10 45/25 57/23 60/7 60/15 100/15 106/3 115/3 126/23 127/6 138/4 138/8 140/19 141/25 142/15 143/24 143/25 144/4 146/22 154/9 160/10 160/19 165/10 165/13 180/3 legally [3] 17/19 103/9 142/1
legislation [8] 98/18 98/19 99/8 99/17 101/12 106/22 107/11 110/21
legislative [5] 17/14 99/6 99/23 100/17 128/5
legislators [3] 60/25 100/22 101/16 legislature [3] 109/23 128/5 155/6
legitimate [1] 98/1
length [2] 98/9 205/11
lengthy [2] 55/3 173/17
Lennox [4] 36/12 47/24 52/10 107/18
less [8] 9/23 73/25 110/12 135/4 171/24 219/6 220/6 224/14
let [30] 6/13 15/20 19/18 24/9 25/5 50/15
50/16 56/19 92/8 94/12 126/17 201/18
203/6 208/11 209/8 210/4 211/15 216/19
218/25 230/5 234/16 239/19 241/25
245/13 246/5 251/2 253/11 256/10 263/3

273/9
let's [29] 5/14 13/23 37/5 75/5 104/10 130/25 131/10 209/14 210/21 211/12 212/16 216/2 218/25 222/21 224/1 227/19 231/18 235/8 247/12 248/4 248/18 249/17 251/20 255/22 257/2 263/2 264/14 266/3 266/10 letter [33] 47/2 79/7 79/8 87/1 87/3 87/3 116/21 116/23 116/25 119/3 121/10 121/24 122/13 122/14 122/17 136/6 136/6 138/19 140/4 143/3 143/8 143/13 143/14 143/18 143/20 152/2 152/10 155/13 160/16 164/24 182/21 183/2 195/24
letters [2] 119/1 155/14
level [8] 77/5 125/6 125/20 158/15 173/9 220/11 236/9 237/7
levels [6] 29/19 64/9 73/15 173/11 237/3 255/9
leverage [3] 112/16 112/22 134/4 Levine [4] 2/17 104/9 104/20 157/6 Levine's [1] 204/1
liabilities [15] 96/16 108/8 116/6 126/6
126/7 164/7 186/2 186/20 187/22 209/23
235/16 239/2 249/5 250/12 265/21
liability [14] 58/14 182/8 186/6 187/1
187/2 187/5 187/14 187/24 188/5 188/8
189/5 189/11 189/16 190/6
liberty [1] 195/9
library [1] 226/3
lien [2] 201/9 217/22
lieutenants [3] 145/9 150/22 151/9
lifted [1] 170/2
light [2] 17/10 150/16
Lightsey [3] 153/14 153/20 155/18 like [60] 3/9 4/20 9/13 11/19 15/17 18/20 18/25 19/23 29/5 30/18 32/2 32/20 34/3 34/3 34/23 39/15 49/16 50/2 50/5 69/19 72/11 87/10 87/11 87/12 92/22 96/19 96/25 97/12 99/14 115/9 125/12 127/5 127/7 131/7 133/22 134/10 135/10 137/11 137/23 141/14 144/9 157/22 165/25 186/5 198/3 199/24 200/2 203/20 206/9 211/5 214/18 223/15 236/12 264/7
269/7 269/14 269/17 270/3 270/16 271/21
likelihood [1] 122/23
likely [1] 47/8
liken [1] 163/4
likewise [1] 153/18
limine [2] 4/20 4/25
limit [7] 19/21 21/3 22/17 23/2 55/11
101/8 101/9
limitation [1] 22/24
limitations [1] 91/23
limited [7] 46/13 54/22 56/23 58/5 58/6 136/1 143/5
line [30] 38/15 64/10 73/17 79/6 79/7
79/12 79/18 80/12 81/9 81/25 82/4
138/12 157/16 158/17 162/15 212/2
215/9 215/10 215/11 216/20 218/2
223/12 224/6 224/23 226/5 226/18 235/20 258/17 261/17 261/18
line's [1] 159/20
lines [1] 223/7
linger [1] 131/5
link [1] 83/23
linking [1] 34/11
Lippitt [1] 4/3
liquidate [2] 66/19 70/22
liquidation [1] 71/1
liquidity [21] 62/18 62/24 112/8 194/4
196/3 196/4 203/3 218/22 218/22 220/1
liquidity... [11] 220/13 222/2 222/12 231/8 231/15 234/20 234/24 245/20 259/9 259/12 259/14
list [6] 59/24 72/12 94/6 94/6 104/3 108/3
listed [1] 111/23
listen [1] 82/21
listening [1] 256/6
lists [1] 46/22
literally [2] 26/15 26/15
litigated [1] 15/22
litigation [27] 9/9 9/12 10/10 11/14 13/13 30/2 30/4 30/5 40/14 40/23 41/7 41/11 41/15 41/17 42/4 44/10 45/8 45/12 45/17 45/19 45/19 46/15 66/16 66/17 176/17
195/22 195/23
little [14] 25/8 65/3 73/7 91/4 98/24 99/16 104/25 147/16 161/1 163/2 170/16
179/20 179/21 217/22
live [3] 111/23 141/23 193/13
lives [1] 101/11
LLP [2] 3/8 133/18
loading [1] 136/18
lobbied [1] 155/5
local [1] 114/24
locked [1] 273/13
$\log [6]$ 19/24 24/25 25/9 25/17 25/18 25/19
logical [1] 196/25
logically [1] 99/19
logs [7] 19/23 21/1 25/2 37/24 37/25 38/8 38/10
long [26] 20/4 31/25 47/10 81/8 92/5
95/22 101/11 105/10 134/24 148/6
150/17 153/21 163/1 193/20 194/17
201/1 209/1 209/23 235/15 239/2 248/18 249/25 252/18 253/19 254/3 255/21 long-term [5] 134/24 201/1 209/23 235/15 239/2
longer [3] 64/4 99/16 196/15
look [32] 22/3 22/4 23/4 27/3 50/2 50/5 51/16 52/12 69/12 69/18 79/18 98/5 100/5 127/10 128/4 191/9 196/12 196/25 199/2 207/12 208/11 210/21 213/23 227/19 236/11 237/15 242/21 244/23 248/7 250/6 251/20 269/17
looked [17] 15/4 25/19 197/24 198/7 199/5 199/5 199/10 199/14 200/5 200/8 207/10 214/10 214/18 235/22 235/23 235/25 236/12
looking [11] 9/5 57/8 58/12 76/11 137/20 137/23 147/15 147/18 199/20 214/15 219/16
looks [3] 92/22 99/14 158/19
lot [26] 5/22 7/13 7/14 15/15 27/9 49/19
49/21 61/16 73/20 76/1 76/15 79/3 81/13
84/10 85/2 93/24 93/24 97/18 109/8
119/18 158/7 165/7 240/18 253/1 254/1 270/23
lots [5] 28/20 45/6 79/25 93/1 93/1
love [1] 89/7
low [2] 97/8 112/4
Lowenstein [4] 2/18 104/20 157/6 203/25 lower [3] 218/19 222/18 222/19 lunch [4] 105/18 131/1 131/6 131/13 ly [1] 106/17
Lynn [2] 4/10 126/13

## M

ma'am [1] 94/14
MacKenzie [2] 65/1 157/23
made [60] 8/25 18/3 18/13 19/7 19/8

19/19 27/17 35/12 45/3 49/6 50/14 62/17 63/23 66/17 79/23 84/4 86/13 86/14 86/16 95/5 116/7 117/6 118/24 122/16 126/8 160/2 165/24 167/25 168/8 169/5 169/10 171/25 172/15 172/16 173/12 173/15 174/10 177/9 179/4 185/19 200/6 213/18 218/13 218/18 218/20 229/18 229/18 230/8 230/10 230/13 240/14 254/19 255/1 257/23 260/20 261/4 261/5 267/24 270/10 272/10
Madison [1] 205/10
magnitude [8] 231/1 231/7 231/7 231/9 258/6 262/8 262/23 268/1
maintain [3] 65/24 131/3 131/8
maintained [2] 156/19 190/14
maintaining [1] 52/9
maintenance [1] 65/20
major [5] 42/3 82/3 84/17 87/4 170/6 majorities [1] 73/8
majority [6] 128/2 156/8 156/12 186/8 197/25 256/23
make [51] 6/3 20/11 22/8 31/18 43/7 45/5
47/9 47/25 48/23 53/21 58/20 60/12 73/7 75/15 75/19 80/16 84/11 84/13 99/17
104/12 104/15 104/24 111/3 111/15
138/6 140/20 156/11 158/7 166/12 173/1 175/19 186/15 187/25 201/13 217/22 220/10 239/9 240/15 242/18 243/23 243/23 246/25 249/5 251/3 251/6 254/17 254/22 259/16 261/14 261/16 263/25 makers [1] 8/18
makes [14] 46/17 63/20 71/6 75/12
100/18 106/22 126/24 140/4 183/4
184/15 217/19 223/2 225/13 231/19
making [7] 19/15 35/16 84/13 152/6
219/3 240/16 260/19
Malhaltra [1] 240/12
Malhotra [16] 192/16 193/3 193/10
193/13 203/8 208/11 208/13 215/2
216/17 238/19 239/12 243/9 259/4
264/15 267/10 271/21
Mallory [1] 4/13
Malthotra [1] 82/14
man [1] 241/25
management [7] 64/17 66/15 154/6 200/7 221/14 221/23 236/7
manager [80] 8/24 10/9 17/6 17/12 19/14 23/10 25/23 27/2 27/5 27/8 35/1 67/13
109/17 113/13 114/6 114/15 115/1 115/5 115/24 116/11 118/20 119/4 120/17 121/11 123/2 123/6 124/20 129/17 129/24 130/1 142/11 148/15 150/8 152/14 155/12 156/18 156/24 166/11 167/7 167/15 168/8 168/10 168/11 168/22 169/2 171/6 171/25 172/6 172/9 172/14 172/16 172/25 173/21 174/4 175/4 175/22 176/2 176/8 176/11 177/11 178/6 178/11 178/13 180/25 182/12 185/19 185/25 186/17 186/21 186/25 189/15 201/19 202/5 202/12 208/14 243/19 247/8 259/4 259/11 267/11 manager's [9] 6/8 151/12 155/11 168/3 176/4 180/9 183/19 185/14 190/8 managers [1] 154/8
managing [1] 125/3
manner [2] 46/16 143/19
many [39] $31 / 4$ 38/5 60/13 62/10 63/1 70/25 70/25 70/25 71/23 72/8 72/8 72/25 73/18 73/18 73/18 73/18 73/18 73/18 80/4 87/20 89/6 89/9 96/13 96/15 120/8 134/20 135/8 143/7 158/6 158/20 159/4 159/8 174/11 200/15 206/17 208/24 210/22 256/15 271/18

MaQuarry [1] 194/22
MARC [2] 150/21 150/25
March [11] 24/3 24/16 24/17 42/12
114/23 114/25 115/2 144/14 151/13
168/21 201/23
March 12 [3] 24/3 24/16 24/17
March 2013 [1] 168/21
March 28 [1] 115/2
March 28th [1] 151/13
March 3 [1] 42/12
Marched [1] 142/23
Margaret [1] 123/16
mark [4] 79/15 121/19 150/1 151/9
marked [3] 7/17 147/12 191/13
market [2] 9/14 9/15
marketing [1] 10/4
Martin [1] 129/5
Mary [1] 148/19
massive [2] 135/3 136/16
material [9] 9/20 16/22 32/13 76/8 77/17
97/24 103/15 143/3 199/25
materiality [1] 60/25
materially [1] 73/24
materials [11] $7 / 1332 / 532 / 637 / 1841 / 8$
46/21 68/19 136/13 198/5 199/14 209/5 mathematics [1] 206/22
matter [29] 5/23 6/22 13/1 28/5 28/23
29/11 34/14 38/5 44/12 44/18 46/3 46/5 46/13 46/25 50/13 51/16 52/11 75/20 128/14 132/3 138/9 141/25 150/14 161/9 167/6 238/1 261/15 273/3 273/3
matters [11] 6/6 6/9 6/14 29/14 36/5 89/5
127/1 131/16 156/25 251/13 253/5
Matthew [2] 3/3 23/21
mattress [1] 88/15
may [54] 1/8 1/12 7/9 41/22 48/23 49/10
50/23 51/2 54/15 54/18 54/19 56/12
57/21 59/2 63/18 73/24 74/19 97/7 104/3 104/15 104/18 106/14 115/6 125/15 126/10 136/15 139/18 140/11 147/1 148/11 161/21 167/21 171/22 171/24 174/6 189/9 190/20 192/13 193/3 193/7 194/18 195/16 196/1 207/7 208/3 219/23 239/22 242/8 242/10 255/20 255/20 264/3 268/23 273/14
May 12 [1] 115/6
May 2013 [1] 171/24
maybe [14] 9/24 21/11 45/8 66/16 78/9 78/9 87/17 95/19 99/15 101/19 110/22 179/20 189/7 240/8
mayor [4] 67/18 114/4 114/7 114/12
MBA [1] 194/10
MC [1] 104/21
McKenzie [2] 125/4 187/19
MCL [1] 148/10
McNamara [2] 121/21 151/8
me [68] 2/23 3/5 4/7 4/11 6/13 15/20 17/4 19/18 20/24 22/2 22/4 22/6 23/6 36/22 42/16 44/3 44/7 48/23 48/25 56/2 56/19
78/7 81/19 92/8 94/12 109/6 126/11 126/17 126/24 127/6 139/12 147/17 161/13 162/6 164/22 201/18 203/6 204/13 208/11 209/8 210/4 211/15 213/8 216/3 216/19 217/21 218/25 228/6 230/5 234/16 235/7 239/19 245/8 245/13 246/5 247/25 249/21 251/2 253/11 255/23 256/10 256/23 257/25 259/22 263/3 272/13 273/9 273/10
mean [22] $8 / 6$ 9/23 13/21 31/15 32/16 45/9 45/15 59/14 59/16 83/10 125/7 144/21 175/11 195/2 199/23 214/9 219/2 220/1 241/11 258/20 259/24 261/24 meaning [2] 88/23 163/5

## M

means [20] 40/4 52/5 57/18 59/16 76/22 79/14 79/14 80/13 95/10 95/12 95/14 113/6 159/5 159/6 169/18 169/22 172/7 193/25 263/23 263/24
meant [4] 53/3 220/13 258/2 261/25 measure [1] 63/6
measures [3] 63/8 64/4 69/16
mechanics [1] 149/5
media [1] 129/15
mediation [3] 148/21 148/21 148/23
mediators [1] 149/2
medical [1] 195/9
medium [1] 200/22
meet [23] 9/25 46/1 48/21 48/22 107/19
109/11 111/16 119/13 146/12 155/22 157/11 160/11 164/14 165/20 165/22 165/23 166/15 186/22 191/8 201/24 202/5 209/24 252/19
meeting [72] 6/23 13/15 14/5 20/3 20/4 20/5 36/13 37/16 48/5 90/8 107/23 108/13 115/25 116/15 116/23 120/18 121/2 137/2 137/3 137/8 142/11 159/14 159/14 159/16 159/17 159/20 159/25 160/4 160/5 181/20 182/14 189/25 208/15 208/18 208/20 209/3 209/6 209/18 210/17 245/9 245/13 245/15 245/23 247/19 247/22 248/2 248/18 248/19 249/19 249/21 249/25 251/3 251/14 251/17 251/18 251/25 252/3 252/4 252/17 252/21 252/22 253/6 253/20 253/22 253/24 254/3 254/4 254/6 254/7 255/3 255/4 255/12
meetings [48] 19/13 19/15 79/25 80/2 83/14 85/4 95/3 95/5 95/8 116/19 117/5 117/17 118/1 118/13 120/4 120/21 121/9 121/15 135/24 136/4 136/17 136/21 140/7 140/11 155/19 155/20 178/11 178/22 182/19 182/20 182/22 183/23 184/2 184/4 202/8 247/12 247/13 247/17 249/22 249/24 253/7 253/12 253/15 253/16 254/1 268/21 268/24 269/5 meets [1] 57/19
members [13] 105/4 139/3 154/6 154/14 154/16 154/22 154/25 155/3 155/24 200/6 201/2 248/22 248/23
membership [4] 154/23 154/23 156/7 156/10
memo [7] 9/24 14/4 14/8 40/6 42/10 108/9 226/17
memoranda [34] 6/19 6/22 7/20 8/15 9/8 11/13 11/17 15/9 20/18 27/19 27/22 29/20 29/24 30/17 30/19 30/19 30/21 31/11 31/16 31/19 31/22 33/15 33/19 36/7 36/9 36/19 47/23 48/3 48/8 51/22 52/3 52/10 52/11 108/7 memorandum [2] 14/16 242/8
memos [20] 9/1 11/23 11/24 12/24 13/22 15/4 24/14 36/6 37/3 37/15 40/2 40/3 41/21 43/2 48/19 48/24 51/2 108/1 108/3 108/5
men [1] 145/18
mental [1] 28/3
mention [4] 44/9 133/22 134/11 173/18 mentioned [4] 105/25 136/20 138/18 270/5
mere [5] 41/6 52/2 106/10 142/6 163/6
Meredith [1] 4/12
merely [3] 113/19 142/6 178/23
mess [1] 73/17
message [2] 84/25 140/14
messages [1] 183/22
met [13] 20/15 91/2 118/4 159/5 166/10 180/6 185/9 201/25 240/1 252/11 252/12 252/20 254/10
methodology [1] 236/25
methods [2] 183/6 201/8
Metropolitan [1] 115/25
Michigan [51] $2 / 53 / 33 / 512 / 2012 / 23$ 13/8 42/14 97/4 98/6 98/11 98/11 98/14 100/6 102/1 104/11 106/19 107/17 108/15 109/19 109/21 109/23 110/6 113/9 117/12 117/24 118/19 119/10 124/15 124/18 127/14 137/21 139/6 139/18 139/20 142/16 144/17 148/13 167/9 168/16 169/16 169/25 170/22 171/14 172/12 172/18 174/4 176/10 176/13 235/23 236/3 236/17
Michigan's [1] 107/7
microphone [3] 105/23 228/7 255/25 middle [4] 45/7 83/14 125/22 144/14 might [23] 5/2 30/8 30/9 30/9 41/10 63/9 73/10 73/14 74/11 74/21 80/15 83/19 93/19 101/23 137/7 137/8 148/25 148/25 149/3 161/17 262/14 262/15 270/24 Miguel [1] 2/7
mike [1] 179/17
mile [1] 101/7
Miller [9] 4/5 43/3 82/12 107/8 107/19
108/14 111/10 112/7 157/23
Millikin [1] 148/8
Milliman [1] 136/13
million [34] 110/11 188/10 188/13 189/17 213/2 215/8 215/17 215/18 215/21 218/13 218/17 219/20 219/22 221/21 222/3 222/14 222/16 222/19 224/17 224/18 225/7 226/6 226/23 228/22
228/25 229/3 229/9 229/10 246/20 247/5 259/16 260/18 261/2 261/7
millions [1] 157/24
mind [5] 118/12 122/7 161/5 254/15 268/5
mine [1] 144/17
minimum [2] 37/16 185/21
minor [2] 110/11 168/14
minute [8] 44/6 58/3 60/24 92/16 118/24
123/25 208/12 220/19
minutes [5] 105/2 105/10 105/13 109/2 205/15
misapplication [1] 59/18
mischaracterize [1] 72/24
misinterpretation [1] 59/18
misinterpretted [1] 59/2
misleading [4] 46/16 46/17 167/24 185/22
misrepresentation [1] 185/20
missed [1] 25/20
misspelled [1] 1/13
misstated [1] 188/22
misunderstands [1] 270/22
mode [2] 119/11 120/24
modifications [2] 87/25 122/15
moment [4] 106/9 148/1 219/24 271/7
Monday [5] 21/11 50/20 53/22 53/25 133/14
monetary [1] 181/21
monetize [1] 112/7
monetized [2] 190/12 190/20
money [8] 88/15 95/14 101/1 219/6 219/8 219/12 222/5 225/25
monies [2] 212/12 225/20
monitor [2] 202/16 203/7
Montgomery [1] 2/22
month [19] 82/20 83/3 83/21 141/17
144/13 158/9 158/12 158/25 206/6 206/6

210/19 211/1 212/4 213/6 213/9 214/13 214/18 215/7 218/16
monthly [8] 200/23 201/4 203/12 207/18 230/14 231/3 231/23 263/19
months [18] 19/14 41/19 67/2 94/22
106/20 158/13 163/6 163/15 171/24
196/5 210/22 210/24 210/25 213/5 215/6 215/22 218/16 259/10
Moore [6] 5/5 65/1 82/14 125/3 187/20 187/22
Moore's [1] 5/13
moot [1] 59/20
more [52] 9/7 9/11 25/16 26/1 27/9 33/16 35/7 41/23 46/19 47/7 52/17 55/24 71/11 71/22 72/19 73/24 81/7 94/19 97/15 97/18 98/4 101/19 103/24 111/1 116/25 121/11 126/24 134/2 135/4 152/6 154/13 154/14 156/8 156/9 158/13 161/1 161/18 163/2 170/11 172/8 175/20 179/20
179/21 184/1 184/5 187/18 191/23 205/3 219/5 219/25 253/9 271/7
moreover [3] 40/24 100/14 129/23
morning [39] 2/6 2/12 2/16 2/21 3/2 3/7
3/17 3/24 4/4 4/7 4/9 4/12 4/19 39/12
39/24 41/4 49/15 50/5 54/3 60/4 87/3
104/8 126/21 129/6 146/3 147/7 147/10
178/16 203/24 247/19 248/19 251/13
253/20 254/6 254/7 254/11 272/24
273/11 273/21
morphed [2] 16/20 17/3
Morris [4] 3/25 3/25 153/5 153/5
most [18] 7/6 16/16 54/16 63/11 72/15
72/20 73/13 74/8 79/19 88/8 92/7 100/24 142/22 165/16 188/1 188/14 188/15 241/24
motion [24] 4/20 4/25 5/4 5/11 6/17 16/1
19/1 19/2 23/24 27/15 27/16 33/8 34/1 34/11 38/1 39/21 51/5 51/8 51/9 53/17
122/2 123/15 150/18 271/5
motions [6] 4/21 5/15 16/18 50/11 50/17 51/19
motivation [1] 97/21
motivations [2] 8/18 100/13
motive [6] 128/5 128/9 128/13 128/17 129/9 129/22
motives [5] 99/6 99/18 99/21 99/23 99/24
mountain [1] 61/11
mouth [1] 144/25
move [12] 53/19 64/22 126/15 175/20
179/17 229/24 242/11 242/22 246/5 247/12 266/23 270/3
moved [3] 16/19 151/21 176/25
moving [6] 30/7 52/1 72/6 116/25 162/11 245/13
$\mathrm{Mr}[8] 3 / 23$ 5/5 5/13 23/22 65/1 82/14 187/20 187/22
Mr. [154] 18/20 19/4 21/4 21/5 24/1 25/4 25/15 26/3 36/25 37/6 39/24 49/15 52/15 52/19 52/20 53/14 53/14 54/15 54/24
57/3 57/10 58/3 58/19 65/9 82/12 82/14 86/11 86/17 86/25 108/1 109/10 111/14 111/22 111/22 113/13 114/5 114/8 114/10 114/12 114/13 114/13 114/20 115/12 120/9 120/25 122/12 126/10 126/22 127/7 127/11 129/24 130/4 132/4 135/23 137/12 138/19 138/24 139/13 139/16 139/20 141/14 141/18 142/24 143/3 143/8 143/13 143/19 144/11 146/4 146/9 149/10 151/10 152/10 152/22 153/20 155/13 155/18 168/7 168/23 169/10 170/5 170/10 170/12 170/16 170/20 171/3 171/6 171/9 171/9 171/16 171/25 177/4 178/17 178/18 179/6 179/7

## M

Mr.... [58] 187/10 188/21 188/23 188/25 189/3 189/7 193/3 193/10 202/4 202/22 203/8 208/11 208/13 215/2 216/17 230/22 232/2 232/4 232/16 232/21 232/22 233/16 233/22 234/13 238/4 238/19 239/12 240/12 243/9 244/15 249/15 255/23 257/19 259/4 260/11 261/13 261/16 262/5 262/7 262/11 262/15 262/17 262/21 264/11 264/15 264/20 265/1 265/9 265/13 267/10 267/23 268/17 268/21 269/13 269/16 270/22 271/21 273/5
Mr. Baird [5] 53/14 114/5 114/10 114/13 114/20
Mr. Bennett [8] 126/22 127/7 127/11 141/14 146/4 146/9 178/17 189/7
Mr. Bennett's [7] 130/4 135/23 137/12 138/19 141/18 149/10 188/21
Mr. Buckfire [9] 82/12 86/11 86/17 86/25 108/1 109/10 111/14 111/22 111/22
Mr. Ciantra [2] 19/4 49/15
Mr. DeCharia [1] 265/1
Mr. Diaz [1] 151/10
Mr. Dillon [1] 120/9
Mr. from [1] 171/9
Mr. Gordon [1] 132/4
Mr. Irwin [8] 36/25 37/6 39/24 57/3 57/10 58/3 58/19 273/5
Mr. Malhaltra [1] 240/12
Mr. Malhotra [14] 193/3 193/10 203/8 208/11 208/13 215/2 216/17 238/19 239/12 243/9 259/4 264/15 267/10 271/21
Mr. Malthotra [1] 82/14
Mr. Orr [68] 21/4 65/9 113/13 114/8 114/12 115/12 122/12 129/24 138/24 139/13 139/16 139/20 143/8 143/13 143/19 144/11 152/10 155/13 168/7 168/23 169/10 170/5 170/10 170/16 170/20 171/3 171/6 171/16 171/25 177/4 178/18 179/6 179/7 187/10 188/23
188/25 189/3 202/4 202/22 230/22 232/2 232/4 232/16 232/21 232/22 233/16 233/22 234/13 244/15 249/15 257/19 260/11 261/13 261/16 262/5 262/7 262/11 262/15 262/17 262/21 264/11 264/20 265/9 265/13 267/23 268/21 269/13 269/16
Mr. Orr's [8] 54/15 114/13 120/25 142/24 143/3 152/22 170/12 171/9
Mr. Ryan [1] 53/14
Mr. Schneider [1] 54/24
Mr. Snyder [1] 21/5
Mr. Stewart [4] 238/4 255/23 268/17 270/22
Mr. Taylor [2] 153/20 155/18
Mr. Ullman [1] 126/10
Mr. Wertheimer [7] 18/20 24/1 25/4 25/15 26/3 52/15 52/20
Mr. Wertheimer's [1] 52/19
Ms [2] 203/25 272/25
Ms. [26] 47/24 50/14 50/19 52/10 128/15 129/5 132/3 132/22 133/19 133/23 134/6 136/5 143/10 146/4 146/10 146/16 147/22 149/4 149/20 151/21 151/24 153/20 155/18 164/22 169/8 180/23
Ms. Ceccotti [2] 146/16 151/21
Ms. Ceccotti's [1] 149/20
Ms. Green [11] 50/14 50/19 128/15 132/3 132/22 133/23 134/6 136/5 143/10 146/4 180/23

Ms. Green's [5] 133/19 146/10 147/22
151/24 169/8
Ms. Gurwitz [1] 149/4
Ms. Lennox [2] 47/24 52/10
Ms. Lightsey [2] 153/20 155/18
Ms. Nelson [1] 129/5
Ms. Patek [1] 164/22
much [28] 38/19 47/7 63/23 64/12 64/22 78/1 78/2 84/3 85/14 94/11 94/19 100/18 138/8 140/18 143/11 149/4 153/2 165/8 218/11 218/19 228/21 228/24 230/16 256/20 256/21 261/9 263/15 271/20 multiple [1] 140/6
muni [1] 72/20
municipal [2] 197/7 211/23
municipality [4] 77/13 97/4 166/7 196/21 museum [1] 66/16
must [14] $5 / 35 / 8$ 21/5 52/6 76/20 99/5 116/8 121/18 122/15 125/6 134/18 146/23 172/21 240/9
my [31] 2/18 3/9 3/19 10/21 13/9 25/25 42/21 42/24 42/24 44/25 48/6 81/4 120/6 127/4 129/8 136/13 144/25 153/18 161/5 194/9 222/20 232/17 233/1 234/4 239/7 242/22 253/24 254/24 255/2 263/9 263/12
myself [3] 36/16 48/24 60/20 mystery [2] 87/15 163/23

## N

N2 [1] 41/19
name [1] 193/11
namely [1] 167/10
names [5] 1/13 25/11 25/20 25/21 254/14
narrative [1] 242/25
narrow [1] 134/16
narrowly [2] 16/10 17/10
national [2] 252/14 254/13
natural [1] 155/8
nature [7] 31/2 91/12 91/14 146/22 204/7 242/4 243/1
near [4] 61/24 64/3 68/15 100/7 nearby [1] 72/10
nearly [3] 145/17 190/6 190/7
necessarily [3] 58/16 97/11 157/16
necessary [7] 19/10 22/14 113/19 119/5
122/15 137/18 166/9
necessity [1] 100/2
need [26] 1/18 15/24 30/7 34/22 35/1
35/2 45/18 45/25 69/13 75/21 77/25
80/13 108/21 109/1 116/24 117/3 125/15
131/3 131/16 132/6 159/7 159/12 182/24 217/21 241/13 258/22
needed [5] 97/15 101/1 113/6 164/2 169/22
needs [3] 61/20 218/1 261/21
negative [5] 224/17 224/20 224/22 243/16 260/18
negotiate [21] 75/8 75/11 75/17 75/18
78/11 78/13 80/21 90/16 108/11 112/22 113/5 148/12 155/23 158/14 158/21 159/12 160/20 163/14 183/12 184/25 185/6
negotiated [4] 85/21 118/11 148/16 166/18
negotiating [14] 75/2 80/3 84/14 90/3 90/14 112/16 112/16 115/9 117/18 134/21 149/6 155/10 182/10 184/8 negotiation [20] 77/5 80/20 81/8 87/13 87/16 108/11 156/15 158/18 160/23 161/7 161/9 161/11 161/20 162/17 163/5 178/1 178/4 178/9 179/24 180/6 negotiations [79] 68/12 69/2 71/25 74/4

74/11 74/12 74/20 76/19 76/23 77/12
77/20 81/17 82/2 82/5 82/7 82/9 82/13 83/8 83/20 85/4 85/5 85/22 86/5 86/8 88/14 88/18 88/22 89/2 89/4 90/24 90/24 106/6 106/12 116/17 120/15 120/16 120/19 121/1 121/5 121/8 136/23 140/8 140/15 140/24 145/3 146/15 148/2
149/11 149/19 156/6 160/1 160/4 160/7 160/8 160/10 160/11 160/17 160/21 162/13 162/14 162/15 162/19 163/18 164/3 166/20 178/2 179/14 180/1 180/6 180/11 181/17 182/11 182/15 182/16 183/16 184/6 184/7 184/18 185/1 negotiators [2] 86/25 162/13 Nelson [2] 123/16 129/5 net [12] 190/3 222/14 222/16 224/12 224/13 224/21 225/3 226/5 226/9 228/20 229/1 260/17
never [26] 12/18 14/25 15/2 26/18 26/19 45/20 65/21 86/3 86/3 88/11 89/21 102/21 103/22 146/6 149/15 155/20 155/21 160/23 178/25 179/1 179/2 180/12 180/20 183/15 185/6 270/16 Nevertheless [1] 143/12 new [21] 26/11 34/10 43/14 56/15 56/16 56/17 73/22 73/22 107/11 109/16 111/3 111/7 113/16 127/18 158/22 158/22 170/10 173/11 194/9 232/22 252/4 next [49] 13/10 41/9 66/20 79/12 80/9 80/19 83/5 83/7 83/19 88/13 88/13 89/4 94/5 99/12 100/4 112/10 113/10 122/25 151/19 152/16 182/20 196/5 211/23 212/2 216/24 218/10 222/23 224/6 224/23 227/20 236/6 236/12 236/19 237/14 242/22 245/3 248/13 249/17 251/20 255/10 255/13 257/21 258/16 258/19 259/18 264/14 265/18 266/2 268/2
nice [1] 12/12
nicely [1] 69/16
night [3] 93/4 123/9 124/3
nine [12] 16/24 27/9 45/24 70/13 71/23 72/2 72/4 128/24 139/5 139/15 195/22 231/18
nix [1] 191/2
no [114] 9/15 10/9 10/9 13/9 20/8 23/12
26/13 26/21 26/21 31/24 33/21 33/22
34/6 34/9 34/10 34/11 34/12 35/22 35/24
38/3 38/6 42/23 44/1 54/10 54/21 59/1
59/20 59/25 61/16 61/18 61/20 62/7 65/13 66/14 66/18 67/1 67/16 67/21 68/11 70/8 75/12 75/20 77/17 77/23 79/14 79/16 79/19 80/13 80/13 80/15 81/12 81/13 81/19 83/12 83/25 85/25 89/16 93/10 93/10 97/10 99/22 100/14 100/15 102/9 103/23 104/14 114/22 117/18 119/14 119/24 120/2 121/1 121/3 121/4 121/22 125/8 128/11 128/25 141/2 150/17 172/16 173/14 174/3 174/10 174/18 174/18 174/22 175/5 175/8 177/12 180/9 180/13 181/17 182/1 182/9 182/15 182/17 184/7 184/17 188/4 195/24 198/19 232/20 235/14 238/2 240/14 244/11 249/12 249/14 257/16 258/22 261/17 264/1 269/24
No. [2] 92/11 92/21
No. 104 [1] 92/21
No. 36 [1] 92/11
Nobody [1] 86/2
non [16] 32/1 32/2 47/11 77/7 85/21 88/12 95/10 95/13 116/14 154/13 195/3 236/9 247/19 248/3 266/22 269/22 non-adversarial [1] 47/11

## $N$

non-bankruptcy [1] 77/7
non-CPA [1] 195/3
non-impairment [1] 88/12
non-leading [1] 269/22
non-negotiated [1] 85/21
none [4] 29/1 80/23 182/18 190/25
nonsensical [1] 1/13
nonsequitor [1] 77/8
noon [3] 105/18 109/4 131/10
normal [2] 19/18 19/22
northwest [2] 98/13 100/7
not [389]
notation [2] 107/10 107/25
notations [1] 107/5
note [8] 1/13 1/22 49/6 54/9 54/20 57/25
112/15 141/1
notes [11] $1 / 6$ 1/19 13/15 46/12 48/23
69/21 95/15 107/7 113/1 128/7 182/1
nothing [8] 34/7 84/8 97/9 100/10 120/10
156/3 170/11 175/10
nothings [1] 184/4
notice [2] 134/1 270/11
notified [1] 270/12
notwithstanding [4] 60/6 64/23 138/10 141/11
November [3] 109/20 113/15 168/20
November 2002 [1] 168/20
November 6 [1] 109/20
now [102] 7/11 7/25 17/22 18/13 19/7
24/5 25/20 28/12 32/8 32/19 39/15 39/25 41/1 63/20 68/15 69/25 72/6 79/3 79/22 86/4 91/3 92/15 94/15 96/18 96/19 96/22 100/18 106/21 125/9 129/19 131/1 137/11 141/18 144/24 160/1 164/2 165/18 167/21 168/3 168/20 168/24 169/8 169/19 170/21 171/3 171/20 172/13 173/11 173/16 177/23 178/3 178/16 178/18 179/3 181/14 186/5 186/24 188/21 192/5 194/25 195/10 196/17 197/21 198/5 199/14 200/18 202/16 208/3 209/18 210/1 210/14 212/20 216/2 216/14 216/17 216/17 217/9 218/25 221/2 221/18 222/21 224/1 224/6 227/17 227/17 231/18 232/17 235/8 238/18 242/11 243/22 245/9 248/18 250/11 251/2 255/3 255/22 255/22 256/10 256/25 257/19 272/23 Nowling [2] 118/9 183/19
nuisance [1] 255/24
number [57] 2/4 19/17 21/8 22/12 29/19 31/1 39/11 41/18 56/1 65/6 65/8 79/18 87/2 87/7 91/10 91/17 92/2 92/10 93/12 93/15 93/20 94/14 96/18 96/19 102/7 132/6 132/8 135/13 135/21 135/24 136/1 152/1 154/18 164/23 165/21 181/8 185/3 185/19 187/9 189/8 189/9 189/17 189/18 205/25 214/2 214/3 214/4 218/15 229/12 230/7 231/19 235/9 238/5 241/11 256/17 256/25 267/3
numbers [52] 58/12 58/16 58/17 64/20 64/21 65/14 73/23 131/23 143/10 157/15 157/18 188/25 206/3 207/22 210/23 214/6 229/20 229/21 230/7 234/2 236/16 236/25 237/25 237/25 238/24 238/25 239/11 239/13 239/13 239/14 240/2 240/4 240/12 240/15 240/17 240/18 240/19 240/19 240/21 240/24 241/1 241/4 241/6 241/7 241/18 250/17 250/18 253/3 266/12 266/12 266/15 266/16 numerical [1] 65/3 numerous [7] 28/18 28/19 30/9 44/6
$62 / 1772 / 7116 / 14$

o'clock [1] 39/5
O'Keefe [1] 4/3
OA [1] 149/7
oath [3] 171/6 171/10 171/17
object [8] 5/12 56/1 204/14 213/13 228/9
232/10 232/18 265/3
objected [1] 257/11
objecting [8] 51/21 55/25 61/21 110/10
118/2 126/7 261/12 271/2
objection [36] 24/3 26/19 33/14 56/4 58/1
87/22 104/4 138/7 138/7 203/20 208/8
208/9 213/10 228/3 228/5 229/24 230/2
237/21 237/23 244/1 244/5 244/11
244/17 244/18 257/10 258/24 261/11 261/17 263/4 263/10 263/11 264/25
268/4 269/19 269/24 270/22
objections [12] 56/11 56/15 56/17 56/18 57/8 59/13 59/25 84/17 143/25 242/16 267/1 269/9
objectively [3] 40/17 41/16 41/17
objectors [24] 7/4 24/2 26/6 26/12 27/1
34/18 35/19 55/1 55/6 67/4 67/5 74/9
78/25 79/19 80/23 85/15 90/18 147/6
165/8 165/17 165/20 257/23 270/5 270/12
obligation [5] 139/10 174/8 246/9 246/19 260/1
obligations [9] 63/15 68/5 189/25 190/25
191/4 191/4 209/25 235/15 246/16
observation [1] 121/17
observe [2] 116/17 120/19
observely [1] 61/21
obtain [4] 90/3 140/10 152/24 190/21
obtained [2] 150/21 211/2
obviously [14] 5/21 7/3 7/7 7/13 10/9
17/15 38/20 38/22 92/25 141/5 142/1
143/1 167/13 190/24
occasional [1] 1/13
occur [8] 34/11 42/4 125/6 134/18 135/24
141/15 141/16 141/16
occurred [6] 11/6 49/5 106/6 106/13
118/2 118/13
October [3] 6/16 36/15 109/13
October 15th [2] 6/16 36/15
odd [1] 219/20
odds [1] 177/18
off [8] $5 / 16$ 76/12 158/24 175/11 186/20
227/11 242/12 261/2
offer [3] 49/18 104/2 153/13
offered [6] 34/13 35/17 71/20 155/22
157/21 158/2
offering [1] 149/16
office [11] 102/8 106/19 107/7 109/15
111/7 119/2 122/10 123/17 171/11 183/19 197/7
officers [10] 4/11 25/22 121/20 145/8
145/11 148/19 150/2 150/5 150/23
154/15
official [2] 42/24 43/1
officials [12] 28/25 31/17 33/16 33/20
36/21 47/25 51/23 111/16 112/12 118/9
129/18 157/20
often [3] 81/4 96/24 202/5
oh [1] 161/1
okay [55] 3/23 4/18 4/23 4/24 11/12
13/24 15/20 18/21 21/23 24/22 33/24 39/19 48/7 59/11 59/22 60/3 80/17 83/17 86/10 88/25 92/23 94/18 105/16 105/17
126/12 126/20 127/3 130/25 131/25 132/24 133/16 147/14 147/19 147/19

159/17 162/12 163/22 165/1 211/5 213/8 216/1 217/1 218/4 220/24 224/6 224/19 225/24 231/16 233/14 244/13 246/5 250/11 255/3 268/15 272/16 omission [1] 167/24
omitted [1] 131/23
once [4] 223/17 250/6 253/5 273/19 one [113] 15/24 17/14 19/4 19/17 19/17 20/8 22/25 23/2 24/10 33/16 34/13 41/6 41/18 43/14 45/15 49/5 50/13 50/17 53/11 53/22 55/24 58/18 61/19 62/12 62/20 63/15 67/5 67/12 68/24 70/18 74/24 75/6 75/12 75/16 76/13 77/15 78/22 81/8 83/6 83/18 83/25 84/20 86/15 87/16 88/25 89/16 91/10 91/16 92/22 93/23 94/10 94/13 94/15 94/21 99/1 99/2 100/19 102/2 103/12 103/14 103/18 103/22 108/5 108/7 109/12 111/1 112/4 115/21 120/9 123/25 123/25 134/2 136/3 136/3 136/11 137/2 137/3 137/7 138/16 141/18 148/18 158/9 158/12 161/16 170/19 179/16 180/19 181/16 185/13 188/4 202/2 204/13 205/5 208/12 212/9 213/6 213/9 213/24 214/18 215/6 216/3 218/16 219/23 225/24 228/6 237/18 239/10 239/24 242/13 257/3 259/22 270/15 271/7
ones [6] 79/10 108/2 154/4 199/20 240/12 252/15
ongoing [4] 187/15 219/7 237/17 237/18 online [1] 117/6
only [49] 1/19 38/11 52/17 56/24 58/6 61/25 62/5 76/16 99/7 100/9 101/17 102/12 103/13 104/2 104/5 109/2 110/8
114/7 114/17 118/18 121/16 122/5
141/10 143/1 158/9 158/12 158/22
162/20 163/14 169/15 173/12 178/14
178/19 184/19 188/12 191/3 206/8 206/8 213/16 223/14 232/15 234/4 235/11
237/23 248/15 255/8 265/8 266/25 267/6 OPEB [3] 71/12 108/8 181/24
open [9] 46/24 53/9 68/23 68/25 122/8 144/25 161/24 251/15 272/18
opening [9] 53/9 60/3 104/12 127/5 129/8
131/17 153/7 153/8 153/18
openings [2] 126/18 192/3
opens [1] 46/19
operate [1] 220/9
operated [1] 186/12
operates [1] 47/16
operating [37] 90/8 90/9 90/11 90/14
115/8 190/3 196/22 197/6 202/14 211/8 211/8 211/12 211/16 212/18 212/21 212/23 213/1 213/1 213/11 215/3 215/6
216/15 216/19 222/21 224/9 224/14
227/24 237/14 237/17 243/13 244/21
244/24 244/25 260/6 265/17 265/20 266/1
operational [1] 187/19
operations [4] 219/7 220/12 220/15 226/11
opinion [22] 24/4 58/11 66/11 66/18 99/2 99/4 99/12 100/8 128/1 128/2 128/3 128/11 150/21 204/5 205/2 205/22 206/3 228/12 239/9 239/10 244/6 271/14 opinions [5] 84/24 99/1 192/25 271/11 271/17
opponents [1] 153/9
opportunities [2] 66/19 190/23
opportunity [10] 19/24 20/7 28/21 32/10 38/15 134/23 148/22 156/2 156/11 156/25
opposed [4] 47/5 53/16 137/6 140/13
opposing [2] 56/22 59/12
options [4] 30/12 119/19 119/22 120/1 or would [1] 127/7
oral [3] 4/25 104/22 107/25
Orange [1] 112/6
order [29] 1/4 1/22 4/19 4/22 4/23 20/13 22/2 26/9 27/23 29/9 29/16 31/10 34/22
55/22 59/24 60/1 60/6 72/23 73/11 131/20 131/21 136/10 157/10 162/9 165/9 179/14 194/3 220/5 220/10 orders [1] 133/5
ordinary [3] 40/15 199/16 199/18 organization [2] 102/16 154/16 organizations [4] 138/20 153/22 154/17 156/21
organize [2] 95/8 201/13
organized [6] 75/6 75/7 78/6 78/6 137/1 137/2
organizing [2] 84/9 201/7 orifice [1] 218/12
original [3] 127/16 127/20 128/12 originally [3] 158/11 176/24 214/8 Orr [86] 21/4 42/13 65/9 90/7 111/20 113/12 113/13 113/23 114/6 114/8 114/12 114/20 115/6 115/12 122/12 123/21 123/22 124/9 129/24 138/24 139/13 139/16 139/20 143/8 143/13 143/19 144/11 152/10 155/13 168/7 168/23 168/24 169/10 170/5 170/10 170/16 170/20 171/3 171/6 171/16 171/25 177/4 178/18 179/6 179/7 187/10 188/23 188/25 189/3 191/1 201/24 201/25 202/4 202/22 230/22 230/25 232/2 232/4 232/16 232/21 232/22 233/16 233/22 234/13 234/20 244/15 247/11 249/15 257/19 260/11 261/13 261/16 262/5 262/7 262/11 262/15 262/17 262/21 264/11 264/20 265/9 265/13 267/23 268/21 269/13 269/16 Orr's [10] 54/15 114/10 114/13 118/8 120/25 142/24 143/3 152/22 170/12 171/9
other [100] 1/20 5/2 7/4 19/17 20/4 20/18 23/24 25/10 34/22 49/5 50/17 51/15 52/3 52/11 53/9 53/24 53/25 59/19 60/7 63/1 68/6 68/7 70/20 70/25 71/12 71/23 72/18 72/25 73/4 77/17 78/15 78/17 80/13 81/6 86/13 86/24 92/21 95/9 95/14 96/16 96/24 97/12 97/15 98/7 98/7 101/17 111/17 115/21 126/17 134/10 134/17 134/18 135/2 136/15 141/5 144/7 147/6 153/9 159/4 160/7 161/18 162/18 162/22 164/1 166/9 174/3 174/16 174/18 174/22 177/10 180/22 182/8 182/19 188/18 190/25 191/4 201/2 212/4 212/5 212/6 212/9 221/12 221/17 221/18 221/19 223/11 223/15 223/18 223/20 223/24 225/21 225/24 227/8 237/14 239/20 242/13 256/5 262/7 268/21 270/8 others [9] 81/11 82/13 125/14 136/15 195/12 210/6 231/24 238/1 256/21 otherwise [14] 13/12 14/21 14/23 18/1 18/9 29/23 52/4 62/23 63/9 80/14 113/8 169/24 186/4 270/10
ought [2] 205/23 230/17
our [83] 1/15 4/18 5/14 6/11 19/21 21/7 23/12 31/10 31/21 33/10 38/25 39/21 40/9 41/3 43/14 44/16 45/18 46/21 46/23 49/18 50/4 52/25 53/1 53/9 54/14 55/25 56/8 56/10 57/9 58/4 76/5 77/2 77/25 86/19 100/19 105/12 105/18 106/10

125/8 131/1 131/17 131/20 138/6 138/7 140/10 142/3 143/25 147/8 148/18 149/3 149/16 149/18 150/9 153/12 157/9 166/2 166/5 166/10 179/5 179/6 180/4 184/12 192/16 195/16 195/24 196/3 196/11 198/1 199/12 200/2 200/13 200/25 210/21 212/2 212/17 222/21 224/6 226/5 241/9 256/2 263/2 270/22 270/25 ourselves [1] 85/14
out [91] 15/13 16/16 23/18 30/14 33/2 48/13 51/8 52/25 61/25 62/4 62/8 62/11 63/1 66/9 66/11 67/3 68/9 70/3 70/6 74/6 74/6 78/10 78/22 81/2 82/21 82/22 83/22 84/13 84/22 91/9 94/13 94/24 94/25 95/25 96/1 98/10 101/5 101/8 102/1 102/7 102/19 103/4 105/14 112/12 112/20 113/2 113/11 117/21 118/7 118/7 118/9 118/16 118/23 120/12 121/6 123/23 124/1 127/22 135/7 141/9 143/8 143/14 150/20 158/14 158/17 159/2 159/3 159/7 159/13 165/12 166/16 170/2 178/23 183/7 184/22 185/8 190/16 200/22 205/25 206/10 209/5 217/23 219/4 220/7 222/3 225/23 226/1 245/11 249/18 251/8 262/2 outcome [1] 156/22
outlined [1] 117/4
outs [1] 158/14
outset [2] 146/6 184/12
outside [8] 73/10 83/23 112/2 114/21 134/19 160/15 161/12 173/22 outstanding [1] 72/9
over [63] 3/11 6/1 23/10 24/14 32/4 33/19 41/24 63/23 65/20 69/25 75/5 75/16 85/14 101/12 111/6 114/18 128/23 131/6 135/7 137/9 146/3 152/21 163/15 170/20 173/17 180/1 180/7 182/5 182/10 183/13 186/2 186/3 190/2 195/18 196/5 196/15 207/18 211/7 223/21 229/18 236/6
236/12 236/19 237/2 237/8 237/9 237/13 243/15 245/2 245/4 255/10 255/21 256/3 258/6 259/18 260/9 265/15 265/17 265/24 266/2 268/2 269/3 270/6
overall [10] 71/7 72/3 86/22 156/9 214/14 234/2 235/22 236/18 267/10 267/17 overcome [1] 42/7
overlap [2] 161/16 161/17
overlaps [2] 161/8 161/10
overnight [1] 273/13
overrule [1] 52/7
overruled [2] 230/2 244/18
overturn [1] 35/25
overturned [2] 127/17 129/11
overview [2] 105/14 165/7
owed [8] 172/1 219/8 219/12 225/25 226/21 227/8 229/6 229/13
own [13] 9/8 61/20 94/12 128/16 157/15 157/18 158/10 170/9 180/9 186/19
188/20 197/5 238/19
owned [3] 126/3 190/14 190/16 P
p.m [9] 53/23 53/23 123/9 123/13 123/16 124/4 131/14 192/10 192/10
PA [9] 109/14 168/8 168/10 168/12 168/20 170/9 170/9 170/10 170/13 PA4 [11] 41/18 44/15 44/15 49/6 49/11 50/21 106/22 106/25 108/6 109/14 109/21
PA436 [22] 41/24 50/23 97/22 103/5 103/17 107/3 107/4 109/23 110/6 110/7 110/15 113/14 113/16 115/2 117/13 124/16 128/22 129/7 129/20 149/25

160/3 160/10
PA72 [1] 110/3
page [31] 25/21 76/16 91/7 92/21 93/24
94/22 95/2 134/13 137/20 137/21 172/20 203/6 203/9 210/5 231/18 232/12 234/14 235/8 235/9 238/5 238/10 240/19 248/7
248/7 248/8 248/13 248/14 250/11
262/22 263/2 268/13
pages [9] 68/20 72/11 84/21 84/21 84/21
159/19 173/17 250/9 251/7
paid [6] 157/24 225/22 225/23 226/1
226/22 260/23
pal [1] 72/24
palpable [1] 34/9
paper [3] 122/3 132/6 147/12
papers [21] 5/1 6/2 6/3 6/18 19/2 29/5 30/3 34/7 61/16 61/22 65/6 65/11 76/5 85/2 87/20 87/21 88/21 90/6 91/5 123/22 124/6
paperwork [1] 119/5
paragraph [5] 76/13 76/15 91/7 100/8 100/9
paragraphs [1] 140/13
paren [2] 68/24 68/25
parents [2] 52/17 112/11
part [43] 6/5 6/9 6/13 29/2 37/8 38/25 40/12 40/13 40/20 44/10 60/15 60/18 60/22 69/1 74/8 76/8 81/6 81/8 81/15 82/1 93/22 95/20 96/9 114/11 122/19 139/7 143/16 146/2 170/6 170/17 171/8 181/6 193/22 195/7 202/25 206/20 212/17 212/19 224/20 251/3 256/2 266/10 268/20
participants [1] 251/17
participate [2] 116/17 120/19
participated [3] 19/5 82/15 169/4
participating [1] 116/23
participation [2] 246/7 246/12
particular [27] 16/7 20/2 28/12 74/15 85/4
105/6 105/12 108/10 133/21 154/18 177/4 177/6 177/8 214/13 232/12 233/2 234/1 234/14 249/10 250/10 252/10 254/10 259/20 262/6 262/22 268/13 268/18
particularly [6] 20/24 62/12 87/20 87/21 141/23 167/17
parties [33] 1/20 4/1 4/2 9/4 12/18 15/2 19/19 26/17 27/6 34/14 35/13 35/17 40/14 43/5 43/18 43/22 44/8 47/11 51/11 51/21 52/2 55/25 59/12 82/19 100/13 105/9 110/10 118/2 126/7 148/23 153/6 182/9 192/18
partisan [1] 100/13
partner [8] 2/18 2/25 6/24 80/4 195/3 195/4 195/5 204/1
partners [3] 3/10 36/13 109/12
parts [7] 14/11 60/21 100/9 174/6 188/24
210/2 251/6
party [11] 5/12 10/12 40/7 46/14 46/17 47/7 50/11 59/14 87/6 155/6 192/22 party's [1] 8/4
pass [2] 94/12 214/1
passed [8] 85/9 99/21 109/18 129/2 168/13 168/14 209/5 245/11
passing [1] 128/6
past [15] 38/12 38/23 41/19 42/20 62/10 62/18 63/5 81/16 81/21 111/6 154/7
162/11 220/21 272/7 272/8
Patek [4] 4/5 145/6 164/22 272/25
path [4] 30/8 35/8 35/10 83/22 pause [3] 78/21 92/4 92/8
pay [7] 62/10 88/3 97/14 174/9 219/11 220/6 220/6
payable [2] 189/13 189/22
payables [1] 223/24
paying [5] 62/3 147/17 191/4 220/4 264/4 payment [8] 186/13 196/22 246/21
246/24 246/25 259/17 260/2 261/5 payments [17] 180/18 186/16 190/1 206/5 219/3 222/24 222/25 223/1 223/1 229/17 230/10 230/12 230/17 250/20 250/22 263/25 264/4
payroll [1] 216/20
pays [3] 186/19 188/15 188/20
PC [2] 4/14 149/7
PDF [1] 1/9
pending [1] 176/18
pension [112] 11/11 58/13 63/3 63/8 64/10 64/17 65/5 68/8 70/23 71/14 88/1 106/8 108/8 115/19 116/6 116/9 121/14 121/15 121/17 122/23 123/4 125/21 135/14 135/15 136/13 137/18 139/8 139/14 140/8 142/14 143/10 152/15 154/19 155/7 163/25 167/10 167/18 168/4 169/16 170/2 170/22 171/4 171/7 171/8 171/16 172/1 172/11 172/22 173/1 173/3 173/23 174/1 174/3 174/17 174/20 174/21 174/25 175/3 175/7 180/18 181/1 181/6 181/11 $181 / 24$ 182/8 185/15 187/1 187/2 187/5 187/14 187/21 189/5 189/11 189/16 190/1 190/5 191/4 217/1 217/4 217/19 218/9 218/13 218/17 218/19 218/23 219/1 219/6 219/9 219/11 226/21 229/6 229/8 229/13 229/21 230/8 230/9 230/17 240/22 246/9 246/14 247/14 247/20 248/11 250/23 253/25 254/3 255/10 260/1 261/3 266/8 266/18 268/1 pensioners [1] 17/2
pensions [14] 7/6 8/22 115/14 117/14 119/13 119/21 125/10 173/14 174/9 175/5 176/5 176/10 255/4 255/13 people [43] 11/1 17/16 25/10 28/16 28/17 28/17 28/20 57/1 58/25 60/13 72/13 75/11 78/23 80/5 82/14 82/21 83/5 84/11 84/23 84/25 85/19 86/13 86/24 89/8 89/18 89/21 93/4 93/12 93/21 110/25 129/12 130/12 130/15 130/24 154/10 200/15 208/24 240/3 241/24 245/23 256/3 256/5 273/14
people's [3] 129/14 129/15 129/16
per [8] 19/19 101/8 180/8 202/24 210/9
241/3 264/1 271/10
percent [10] 65/7 65/9 99/3 109/7 132/5
189/7 189/8 189/9 189/10 237/8
percentage [2] 65/4 267/17
perfectly [2] 96/2 273/20
perform [2] 108/15 195/14
performance [1] 204/4
performed [2] 207/24 237/25
performing [2] 200/24 205/6
perhaps [7] 9/7 49/7 54/15 63/12 126/15
150/13 242/8
peril [1] 220/13
period [28] 15/16 21/3 23/10 33/3 33/5
33/7 55/3 76/10 84/3 87/5 141/10 142/10
146/9 148/1 148/20 149/7 149/21 149/23
150/7 152/21 158/25 160/6 163/15 179/5
207/19 237/9 254/16 269/4
periods [2] 62/25 259/13
permanent [1] 75/25
permission [3] 78/23 86/15 92/16
permit [6] 99/22 207/6 214/19 228/15 243/4 265/5
permitted [3] 34/21 39/3 159/22
permitting [1] 99/20
person [10] 80/18 80/20 80/22 87/18
102/16 102/23 167/3 218/1 270/15 272/4 personal [2] 238/20 272/3
personally [1] 171/4
personnel [1] 154/8
persons [5] 102/6 116/10 139/23 154/3 172/23
perspective [4] 61/25 63/1 140/5 142/4
persuaded [1] 272/13
persuasive [1] 101/4
persuasively [1] 61/20
pertinent [2] 108/4 139/7
Peter [3] 3/11 54/4 237/22
petition [23] 76/19 76/23 92/3 93/6
106/25 117/22 123/25 124/11 124/22
125/23 130/6 143/21 146/20 151/6
152/16 156/5 166/23 167/7 167/14 177/6 185/18 186/1 187/12
petitions [1] 130/8
phase [1] $84 / 22$
Phoenix [1] 43/14
phone [4] 108/18 123/17 202/8 217/22
phrase[4] 137/1 259/24 260/3 261/20
picked [1] 240/20
piece [11] 30/4 59/6 75/7 92/6 92/15
92/16 92/18 95/20 146/1 147/20 148/24
pieces [3] 44/17 92/5 92/22
pied [1] 258/11
pitch [24] 7/17 9/13 9/19 11/20 32/12 37/18 48/24 84/9 111/19 111/21 111/25 133/22 133/24 133/25 134/11 169/4 169/9 169/14 169/20 170/4 170/6 170/7 171/1 176/6
pitching [2] 10/15 10/19
Pittsburgh [1] 140/3
place [21] 5/24 13/15 34/17 64/7 102/20 117/17 120/16 158/18 164/11 168/13 176/20 177/2 180/7 180/12 182/20 182/20 183/11 183/25 196/25 227/16 231/2
places [6] 72/8 87/21 88/7 94/20 98/7 98/7
plain [2] 177/18 219/25
plaintiffs [4] 3/16 54/6 122/5 132/20
plan [77] 17/1 17/3 68/4 68/22 68/25 69/3 69/18 69/22 69/23 70/2 70/3 70/15 70/20 70/21 71/2 71/4 71/6 71/18 71/19 71/21
72/2 73/3 73/4 76/25 77/1 80/22 82/12
83/9 83/20 90/8 90/9 90/11 90/15 90/19
91/19 93/5 112/20 113/3 115/8 115/10 116/7 118/10 118/14 134/19 139/8 144/1 144/3 144/8 144/15 145/3 150/16 151/3 173/8 173/8 173/11 178/12 178/15
178/22 178/25 179/8 179/9 180/1 180/2
180/7 180/10 180/15 180/22 181/13
181/15 184/14 184/16 184/21 194/4
247/20 251/22 253/10 254/9
planned [1] 116/13
planning [2] 67/19 84/5
plans [8] 69/15 71/2 134/15 135/6 217/7 217/8 229/21 247/14
plate [1] 140/3
platform [2] 147/2 148/11
play [1] 84/16
player [1] 170/6
players [1] 23/5
please [23] 2/11 39/11 56/13 131/4 131/8
131/11 131/18 131/24 138/25 139/12
139/16 192/12 192/24 193/6 193/10
203/7 220/19 223/9 228/6 244/19 255/24
270/14 273/19
Plecha [1] 4/2
plus [1] 227/18
POC [4] 250/20 250/22 259/24 261/5
POCs [2] 246/22 266/17
point [66] 6/10 7/22 7/25 8/11 9/21 10/8 10/8 10/12 11/19 15/10 15/21 19/8 19/17 19/17 21/7 28/13 32/9 42/21 43/7 54/25 58/2 61/22 63/10 65/12 65/13 71/25
74/17 75/9 76/15 83/15 87/14 88/17 90/5 91/9 103/7 111/8 111/9 118/15 133/9 135/15 137/14 138/6 140/21 149/20 161/5 164/5 167/13 176/14 180/5 181/2 183/14 194/17 203/4 205/21 220/20 225/20 226/12 228/4 235/2 239/7 241/14 242/18 251/23 254/21 254/23 260/21 pointed [2] 41/24 103/4
pointless [3] 74/7 74/7 75/3
points [13] 19/3 39/18 45/3 63/20 66/17 91/9 103/12 132/21 138/16 166/5 168/6 175/19 267/24
police [22] 3/18 4/11 105/4 121/20 145/8
145/9 145/10 145/19 145/23 148/19
150/2 150/4 150/21 150/23 153/17
153/25 154/7 154/15 217/5 229/16
230/20 247/23
policy [4] 17/17 18/13 27/11 194/10 political [5] 18/11 100/12 100/16 139/9 152/25
pool [4] 71/8 71/13 71/14 97/13
pooled [11] 221/4 221/7 221/10 221/11
221/14 221/21 225/2 226/10 260/22 261/5 262/1
pooling [1] 221/16
popping [1] 124/12
populate [1] 90/1
populated [3] 89/13 90/1 207/21
port [1] 210/9
portion [8] 105/5 115/16 118/11 189/4
189/20 217/9 239/17 266/24
portions [3] 147/21 147/21 250/7
portrayed [1] 190/8
posed [1] 141/4
position [56] 6/15 7/14 8/23 17/22 19/20 23/12 26/7 26/8 26/11 28/4 28/9 29/10 29/15 30/13 33/11 47/20 52/7 54/8 77/25 79/9 86/19 107/2 114/7 122/8 126/7 137/19 139/17 188/3 190/21 196/3 197/2 197/22 198/22 199/13 201/5 220/5 220/11 222/12 231/3 231/8 245/21 247/4 247/5 249/3 251/8 258/4 259/9 259/12 259/14 260/12 260/17 260/25 261/1 263/1 269/13 269/17
positive [3] 62/6 99/3 228/22
possesses [1] 100/14
possession [1] 20/22
possibility [6] 41/10 49/13 83/25 103/20 112/21 122/5
possible [17] 2/24 25/20 51/25 52/14 52/22 55/19 66/14 75/18 82/22 94/24 121/14 131/25 134/21 156/7 185/1 185/4 271/15
possibly [3] 77/9 97/16 272/5
post [5] 68/6 71/12 140/1 168/23 194/8 post-graduate [1] 194/8
potential [10] 14/1 27/24 27/25 32/23
43/6 45/16 47/15 107/22 265/25 266/1
potentiality [1] 173/19
potentially [2] 10/23 22/16
power [2] 81/22 154/20
powerful [1] 134/22
PowerPoint [1] 201/9
powers [2] 91/22 168/11
practicable [5] 74/12 74/13 74/21 78/13 184/18
practical [1] 147/2
practice [4] 112/14 193/22 194/2 194/19
pre [21] 4/22 12/3 13/11 52/5 55/22
55/25 59/24 66/19 76/19 76/23 87/5
87/23 88/2 88/21 92/3 93/6 131/20
153/12 179/5 179/7 184/12
pre-filing [3] 66/19 87/5 88/2
pre-petition [4] 76/19 76/23 92/3 93/6
pre-retention [3] 12/3 13/11 52/5
pre-trial [11] 4/22 55/22 55/25 59/24 87/23 88/21 131/20 153/12 179/5 179/7 184/12
prebankruptcy [1] 77/12
precisely [1] 149/20
predicate [1] 143/7
predominantly [8] 3/12 194/2 196/13
212/25 217/17 229/8 229/20 230/8
predominately [1] 95/18
preengagement [1] 32/22
prejudice [1] 5/11
prejudiced [2] 96/6 96/12
preliminary [5] 22/9 110/2 133/6 133/12 258/23
premature [2] 122/6 126/8
preparation [2] 40/18 127/9
prepare [5] 40/21 48/4 48/24 49/3 60/1
prepared [28] 6/20 9/9 9/11 9/14 9/18
9/24 28/9 30/1 33/22 40/13 41/21 41/23
48/4 52/5 127/7 153/24 156/21 170/5
203/18 210/1 210/7 231/25 235/19
235/20 248/7 248/8 250/7 257/7
prepares [3] 14/4 27/21 27/22
preparing [4] 48/19 207/3 207/4 243/22
prerequisite [2] 71/2 90/25
preretention [1] 13/2
present [9] 61/10 61/10 131/15 149/13
153/23 173/10 187/8 202/13 209/3
presentation [24] 6/4 46/18 46/20 66/6
68/3 69/11 82/20 93/5 104/24 106/1 111/19 116/12 116/20 132/7 151/20 151/22 151/25 168/2 169/9 248/2 250/10 251/3 251/6 254/20
presentations [3] 178/7 178/11 201/10
presented [15] 16/21 69/10 70/3 82/11
116/1 118/14 127/18 130/23 158/8
159/15 178/20 180/10 180/15 180/21 181/16
presenting [4] 115/11 155/21 201/7 202/2
presently [1] 193/14
presents [1] 32/10
preserve [4] 8/4 160/2 218/21 221/3
president [7] 121/19 121/21 150/1 151/8
151/10 153/14 153/16
presidents [2] 151/7 152/3
press [5] 115/13 118/8 119/6 123/10 272/23
presume [2] 40/4 139/5
pretense [1] 172/16
pretty [6] 46/11 78/1 78/2 110/21 252/16 261/17
prevent [3] 62/1 98/18 101/24
prevented [1] 67/13
preventions [1] 139/15
previous [2] 30/10 51/5
previously [5] 128/19 129/11 151/10
164/25 176/3
primary [1] 126/2
prince [1] 72/24
principal [6] 7/21 77/6 189/19 195/1
246/17 250/20
principles [1] 8/3
printed [1] 1/9
prior [18] 1/18 41/17 41/23 50/24 62/25
70/4 107/23 113/14 113/18 136/14
156/17 163/7 168/10 169/9 170/13 177/1 179/6 255/2
priorities [1] 143/16
priority [1] 190/2
private [3] 43/17 43/21 45/23
privilege [43] 7/24 9/17 10/2 12/5 13/1
13/10 17/9 17/20 17/24 18/3 18/14 19/7
19/12 19/23 19/24 19/25 20/3 24/8 24/25
25/17 26/13 27/20 29/22 29/25 32/25
33/15 35/10 37/13 37/23 37/25 38/7
39/25 41/12 43/12 43/16 44/3 44/17
44/22 47/8 47/17 51/14 51/15 52/9 privileged [4] 13/17 36/16 39/23 42/16 privileges [4] 19/22 31/1 31/2 47/13 pro [2] 7/19 71/7
probability [1] 271/23
probably [7] 93/7 105/13 141/16 143/4 222/7 248/20 273/14
problem [22] 28/16 29/3 29/4 31/6 46/7
59/1 59/20 62/25 63/18 67/21 75/1 75/2 76/9 87/19 89/24 93/17 93/17 96/17
101/3 110/4 141/6 219/19
problems [19] 47/16 62/19 68/2 68/13
71/16 71/17 71/19 73/2 86/22 91/11 91/13 91/14 96/13 97/5 97/6 100/19 141/21 154/5 222/2
proceed [10] 21/9 21/11 32/7 104/18 124/20 132/18 140/25 143/19 192/13 193/7
proceeding [20] $1 / 6$ 1/20 4/19 4/23 7/19
45/25 53/20 67/4 73/10 74/5 84/3 115/15
150/3 175/2 175/25 177/7 181/4 181/6
182/6 191/10
proceedings [7] 34/16 60/7 60/16 145/12
146/7 146/14 149/1
proceeds [6] 187/8 212/11 213/3 215/11
224/18 226/24
process [28] 1/7 32/12 73/7 76/2 76/2
84/15 85/21 98/22 101/3 102/24 102/25 103/1 106/17 107/9 107/15 110/7 111/6 118/19 120/6 122/20 134/14 134/19
148/17 148/17 149/5 202/1 241/23 255/15
processing [1] 131/21
produce [3] 22/6 52/12 54/8
produced [7] 9/19 15/16 24/4 24/6 49/20 50/1 50/4
product [40] 7/22 8/1 8/3 9/17 9/22 10/11 12/4 12/9 12/14 13/11 14/9 14/11 14/14 14/14 14/15 27/20 28/2 28/8 28/24 29/22 31/23 31/23 31/24 32/4 33/7 33/9 33/15
40/8 41/8 42/6 43/12 43/16 43/24 44/2
47/4 47/9 49/22 49/23 49/25 52/4
production [3] 7/7 37/18 38/23
productive [1] 121/12
professional [1] 223/24
professionals [1] 87/7
proffered [1] 5/7
program [2] 131/21 135/7
progressed [1] 200/25
prohibited [2] 124/19 167/9
prohibiting [1] 68/11
project [1] 200/16
projected [6] 158/11 158/12 215/18
236/15 236/19 250/15
projection [4] 96/20 220/20 239/9 264/18 projections [22] 66/2 66/3 196/15 201/1 203/4 204/7 204/22 228/10 232/13
235/11 242/2 243/20 243/22 244/2 244/7
244/16 248/5 248/8 248/14 253/2 264/24

267/21
projector [1] 126/18
projects [1] 206/2
promptly [3] 51/24 52/13 52/21
prong [7] 95/21 166/19 166/21 178/4
180/6 184/11 185/9
prongs [2] 166/17 177/25
proof [5] 60/10 157/11 164/14 165/6
165/21
proofs [3] 147/5 147/8 270/10
proper [2] 1/13 270/11
properly [4] 35/10 129/1 206/14 244/7
property [13] 97/6 97/7 206/9 211/17
223/13 223/14 223/17 225/11 225/13
236/1 236/5 241/6 273/17
proponent [1] 5/8
proposal [96] 8/24 16/24 62/15 66/4 66/5
68/18 68/18 68/22 69/6 69/9 70/12 71/5
72/9 73/3 79/23 80/6 81/12 83/1 83/13 86/16 87/4 87/10 87/11 88/3 88/5 90/10 97/2 115/11 116/1 116/5 121/23 135/1 135/4 135/11 135/12 135/14 135/15 135/16 135/20 135/25 135/25 136/16 136/19 137/4 137/10 137/10 137/15 137/21 138/3 138/10 140/20 140/24 141/12 142/4 142/14 143/17 150/20 152/6 152/7 155/23 158/8 159/15 159/18 160/18 160/25 162/16 163/3 163/3 172/14 172/15 172/21 172/24 173/14 173/16 173/21 178/8 178/14 178/15 178/23 179/2 179/3 179/10 181/22 182/5 184/21 184/21 209/11 209/15 209/18 254/19 254/20 254/22 254/25 255/1 268/20 269/3
proposals [14] 64/7 82/25 86/13 86/18 86/19 86/24 117/4 117/6 120/2 121/13 134/5 182/25 194/6 254/17
proposed [14] 17/1 17/3 30/24 73/2 78/2
91/19 116/2 140/8 142/13 143/19 162/25
181/24 183/1 209/21
proposes [1] 68/4
proposing [2] 182/3 209/22
proposition [3] 85/20 99/10 177/15
propriety [1] 100/16
prospect [2] 40/21 173/18
prospective [1] 13/5
protect [4] 31/10 31/23 115/20 172/17
protected [16] 10/1 14/8 14/11 14/12
14/15 28/2 32/8 32/24 46/15 52/4 52/6
113/8 169/24 176/10 180/18 181/1
protection [8] 7/5 9/22 32/4 33/1 33/6 43/16 47/12 264/3
protections [5] 8/21 11/11 16/25 68/10 108/8
prove [5] 9/7 10/25 11/1 169/1 177/25 proven [1] 163/16
proves [1] 162/18
provide [12] 25/9 30/17 30/20 63/13
66/24 97/14 121/13 145/23 148/20
202/14 214/23 233/16
provided [11] 11/17 17/1 17/2 132/14 140/11 152/25 172/18 181/20 197/13 212/1 250/25
provides [2] 113/17 139/6
providing [2] 96/14 147/1
proving [1] 191/8
provision [21] 98/17 98/21 103/2 103/7 103/19 110/20 126/23 127/2 127/17 127/20 127/22 127/23 128/23 129/21 130/7 130/18 130/22 152/23 168/14 174/3 176/1
provisions [8] 97/22 101/23 102/10 102/14 103/18 128/18 129/10 129/23


134/1 136/7 136/16 179/7
quota [2] 113/7 169/23
quote [21] 40/13 44/5 85/17 85/18 85/23 90/17 99/15 115/7 116/6 116/8 122/5 122/6 122/21 123/3 124/10 125/4 134/7 139/7 159/24 169/24 172/11 117/1 128/15
quotes [2] 98/3 99/13
R
radio [1] 73/1
raise [5] 7/4 67/14 96/25 138/16 161/4
raised [10] 23/23 24/2 26/19 50/19 99/23
265/1
rakes [1] 185/25
range [3] 52/22 134/16 241/7
ranging [1] 135/8
ra[1] 71/7
rather [7] 16/10 77/24 124/11 127/4
181/19 263/5 263/8
ratified [1] 163/11
RDPFFA [1] 153/16
$\operatorname{Re}[2] 43 / 1843 / 25$
reach [7] 34/22 75/24 82/8 115/20 118/17 183/4 207/25
reached [3] 192/18 265/14 271/22
hes [1] 113/11
react [1] 105/5
read [21] $6 / 335 / 1136 / 1455 / 24$ 61/22
65/7 76/17 98/3 99/10 100/9 122/16
128/15 135/5 136/6 137/6 159/19 170/17
174/23 206/19 236/14 243/4
dable [1] 95/7
reads [2] 134/13 138/22
ready [3] 43/8 53/1 132/17
real [4] 28/14 147/2 182/7 184/7
reality [4] 63/16 70/7 80/25 170/11
realize [1] 54/13
really [42] 6/10 26/6 29/11 56/6 56/7 56/8
67/25 77/22 78/10 80/21 82/10 85/14
87/16 90/1 91/6 92/5 93/20 95/16 96/9
97/24 101/1 106/11 108/25 134/11 135/3 135/4 136/16 136/23 137/13 137/13 141/17 141/25 144/2 144/5 144/12 160/10 183/15 184/4 185/6 185/7 188/4 271/17 reask [1] 262/18
reason [22] 34/8 34/13 34/19 35/25 44/1 49/13 51/9 55/1 57/22 62/5 64/24 69/23 72/9 73/21 101/10 101/13 103/9 103/20
177/8 177/13 179/23 255/4
reasonable [5] 40/17 41/16 41/18 70/8
reasonably [2] 30/25 69/13
reasoning [2] 16/13 98/24
reasons [10] 67/24 71/21 90/22 91/17
100/23 111/1 119/12 157/25 160/19
reasserted [1] 39/23
rebuttal [2] 36/2 48/15
recall [11] 16/14 23/1 35/11 110/20
167/21 182/20 233/8 247/10 249/10
255/1 256/17

Recalling [1] 39/11
recalls [1] 114/7
receipts [28] 199/11 200/9 203/12 206/8
1/16
213/11 213/16 215/3 215/6 224/14
227/24 232/5 235/3 258/14 259/21 260/7
260/8 262/24
received [11] 38/5 38/11 81/12 89/9
89/24 123/1 123/17 214/12 248/12
265/23 266/9
receiving [4] 33/3 108/18 160/16 200/11
recently [3] 142/22 193/21 236/1
recognition [1] 174/25
recognized [2] 12/8 145/16
recognizes [1] 117/1
recognizing [1] 149/12
recollection [3] 233/1 253/25 255/2
reconciled [1] 225/15
reconsider [1] 18/8
reconstruct [1] 233/12
ronstructing [1] 233/5
rocord [50] 32/13 32/19 37/1 38/18 40/1 47/19 49/6 50/13 50/16 50/22 50/25 51/7 51/10 54/9 54/21 72/7 72/15 84/11 84/12 84/13 84/13 84/13 92/9 93/2 93/3 99/11
104/10 112/25 113/3 125/19 126/25
128/9 128/11 132/5 132/8 140/21 146/17

193/11 193/25 197/10 219/24 238/4
242/12 246/11 261/15
recorded [3] 196/21 197/4 197/7
recording [1] $256 / 5$
199/22 205/16 206/19 206/20 270/9
270/13 272/3
recounting [2] 111/21 261/13
red [1] 147/20
redo [3] 113/18 170/13 218/1
reduce [1] 134/8
reduced [3] 121/18 122/24 186/22
reducing [1] 260/23
reductions [1] 68/5
refer [4] 106/22 130/15 141/14 260/4
reference [3] 110/9 140/2 147/10
referenced [2] 6/23 32/22
references [2] 36/13 134/2
101/3 101/24 102/1 102/6 102/10 102/17
102/24 103/20 106/25 107/5 107/15
109/17 110/19 111/4 127/18 127/21
127/23 128/19 129/1 129/11 130/9
168/12
referred [9] 38/11 112/13 145/12 146/16
151/11 151/21 179/15 179/25 186/9
rerring [7] 20/17 20/21 68/19 174/13
259/25 262/3
refinancing [2] 212/11 215/11
reflect [3] 31/4 92/9 212/12
235/14
reflective [1] 224/25

## R

reflects [5] 28/2 47/20 135/17 218/16 266/25
refunding [2] 226/24 227/5
refunds [1] 223/23
regard [15] 29/11 32/3 35/3 52/20 100/11 138/7 140/1 143/20 152/8 157/8 157/9 157/11 158/3 158/4 192/19 regarded [1] 77/3
regarding [24] 11/3 41/5 47/20 91/8 106/4 107/3 108/6 114/5 116/12 116/18 120/20 123/3 128/9 128/12 128/17 135/25 136/7 138/17 140/16 140/19 140/24 141/4 143/7 214/22
regardless [1] 136/2
regards [3] 168/4 175/4 182/13
regauged [1] 111/11
Regrettably [1] 93/21
regular [1] 142/12
regularly [1] 273/15
reimbursements [1] 227/8
reinstruct [1] 83/23
reinvestment [1] 135/10
reject [1] 52/6
rejected [9] 109/14 109/21 113/18 128/19
129/2 130/8 130/13 156/24 170/14
rejection [1] 170/15
rejects [1] 113/15
relate [4] 23/23 44/13 111/25 165/11
related [16] 23/3 24/16 27/12 35/6 35/9
44/15 107/22 114/19 125/12 134/5 134/6
161/7 190/10 196/24 213/2 257/13
relates [5] 19/4 24/2 27/18 143/17 232/13
relating [9] 26/4 32/15 51/17 60/25 61/1
66/17 71/11 101/3 266/12
relation [1] 27/6
relations [1] 148/14
relationship [6] 12/17 12/19 15/3 28/1 28/6 31/8
relative [4] 132/21 167/18 169/12 177/7
relatively [1] 136/1
release [1] 136/12
released [2] 31/4 31/8
relegated [1] 155/24
relevance [11] 8/14 8/14 9/7 10/14 10/21
12/1 30/16 86/5 237/23 237/24 238/2 relevant [25] 10/22 11/5 22/15 22/16 29/23 30/22 40/9 49/14 61/14 64/21 70/6 73/5 78/5 81/23 89/8 91/7 92/7 95/22 100/10 103/3 104/3 117/5 142/3 149/7 174/17
reliability [2] 200/3 213/22
relief [7] 66/24 67/7 70/17 91/2 96/7 96/13 123/8
rely [5] 5/1 21/25 46/8 147/5 198/6
relying [3] 34/15 35/23 239/11
remain [2] 120/7 163/23
remained [1] 64/25
remaining [1] 4/21
remember [23] 201/22 231/4 232/8 233/9
233/25 234/5 234/9 234/10 234/12
234/23 235/6 245/7 245/17 249/2 249/6
249/8 251/12 252/11 252/16 252/25
254/10 254/12 268/11
remembering [3] 87/23 233/6 247/16
remind [3] 131/2 273/12 273/19
removal [1] 150/12
remove [1] 150/10
render [2] 70/12 99/18
rendered [1] 271/18
renders [1] 167/11
reopened [1] 34/14
reopening [1] 34/8
reorganize [1] 63/19
repaying [1] 260/19
repeal [1] 107/14
repealed [2] 149/24 168/12
repeat [3] 175/14 180/4 228/17
repeatedly [1] 99/5
repeating [1] 147/7
repetitive [1] 157/7
rephrase [1] 263/9
replacement [1] 168/9
report [12] 61/17 61/18 90/17 120/22
198/14 202/9 202/11 202/12 202/18
202/23 203/1 203/9
reported [2] 71/23 221/25
reporter's [1] 1/13
reporting [1] 90/13
reports [4] 120/1 199/6 199/8 200/23
represent [18] 6/21 7/15 29/15 30/13
78/17 78/18 79/9 79/13 79/20 80/5 80/18
80/22 89/7 138/1 155/1 202/3 226/8
269/15
representation [3] 12/15 29/13 269/11
representations [1] 185/20
representative [3] 72/19 82/24 140/16
representatives [12] 18/11 74/14 95/6
95/17 117/2 145/17 155/9 155/24 192/21
247/14 250/4 252/1
represented [1] 87/6
representing [5] 4/2 9/13 10/12 42/23
138/21
represents [2] 140/22 194/2
Republican [1] 148/8
request [13] 6/11 15/6 21/4 22/3 27/17
36/7 51/23 52/17 52/19 122/18 142/24 156/2 157/9
requested [1] 37/24
requesting [1] 259/19
requests [3] 89/10 89/15 162/23
require [7] 55/2 130/22 198/2 206/18 206/21 257/12 270/25
required [15] 61/18 86/7 90/11 102/7
130/12 137/5 146/21 166/23 172/18
180/12 202/23 225/6 228/23 228/25 255/9
requirement [3] 160/11 184/13 185/12 requirements [4] 65/21 108/9 157/2 270/18
requires [9] 167/1 167/2 197/18 204/7 206/11 206/19 223/4 228/11 270/11 requiring [2] 93/18 171/6
research [8] 12/7 27/18 29/9 31/22 32/6 33/10 97/25 101/8
reservation [2] 138/23 160/2
reserve [2] 72/19 225/22
residents [7] 17/15 63/14 96/6 96/11
96/14 236/9 236/10
resolve [9] 5/4 22/10 24/6 68/12 149/3
154/5 156/25 161/19 254/17
resolved [2] 24/10 24/13
resolving [1] 73/1
resorting [1] 150/24
respect [53] 6/18 7/12 8/23 9/22 15/12
16/11 16/22 17/4 17/5 36/5 36/18 37/14
37/19 37/23 38/2 38/18 38/20 50/20
65/21 70/10 71/13 73/13 74/22 76/8
81/15 81/25 90/5 97/6 116/6 119/20
126/23 127/1 127/14 142/16 167/22
184/10 184/24 235/24 236/13 237/2
237/7 239/2 240/18 240/19 241/2 241/4
246/23 249/9 253/1 255/8 258/16 262/25 263/10
respectfully [10] 18/8 21/8 106/8 158/5

158/16 159/10 162/20 163/13 164/10 164/13
respective [1] 163/11
respond [8] 23/25 45/2 87/11 87/17 120/7
153/23 155/13 159/7
responded [1] 80/14
respondent [1] 79/12
response [18] 15/25 38/9 79/16 88/10 88/16 88/17 89/3 102/9 114/22 122/2
138/18 142/25 152/5 157/13 160/18
249/13 267/24 268/12
responses [1] 204/12
responsible [4] 154/4 154/22 186/13 188/20
responsive [2] 97/19 154/23
rest [2] 103/9 112/3
restricted [1] 262/1
restructuring [29] 90/19 91/24 95/1
111/18 112/11 113/3 114/19 114/21 116/13 117/4 118/14 119/20 121/14 123/4 135/11 135/12 137/9 152/15 169/6 187/20 193/24 194/1 194/5 194/19 195/7 209/23 235/15 248/15 264/2
restructurings [1] 85/1
resubmit [1] 131/24
result [11] 29/20 81/17 85/9 98/23 99/8
103/17 200/19 213/23 221/16 243/9 265/25
resulted [1] 163/9
results [5] 81/16 163/18 167/9 177/17 205/21
retain [1] 14/5
retained [12] 6/21 7/24 8/10 8/11 10/4 10/6 10/7 29/7 42/2 64/17 195/13 195/21 retaining [2] 13/25 48/22
retention [12] 6/7 6/8 6/14 7/9 11/18 12/3
13/11 14/24 14/25 33/3 52/5 144/12
retired [13] 4/10 105/4 105/9 116/10
117/2 139/3 153/15 153/17 154/13
154/15 155/1 172/23 182/23
retiree [28] 3/12 4/1 8/22 70/10 74/23
78/15 87/8 88/1 88/4 88/20 89/6 95/17 105/12 115/19 119/16 138/20 140/9 153/6 154/1 155/23 156/3 164/8 164/21 165/15 173/6 240/22 266/8 268/2 retireement [1] 2/23
retirees [36] 7/5 74/15 76/6 78/17 78/18
79/9 79/13 79/20 116/14 138/2 138/22
154/12 154/17 154/24 155/2 155/9
155/22 156/7 156/9 156/12 156/17
156/19 156/22 157/1 163/10 172/2 173/2 173/3 181/25 182/1 182/4 248/3 248/23 250/24 266/19 266/19
retirement [25] 3/19 105/1 105/21 119/23
123/5 123/14 123/18 124/1 131/22
137/16 139/8 140/1 147/9 153/8 154/8
217/5 217/6 217/10 217/20 229/15 229/16 230/19 230/20 248/24 250/4
revealed [5] 11/24 13/16 14/19 18/4 19/6
reveals [2] 9/25 13/5
revenue [11] 67/14 97/8 97/10 97/13
212/2 212/8 235/21 236/5 236/21 241/5 241/10
revenues [13] 186/4 186/19 197/3 198/21
199/9 206/2 206/10 236/11 239/3 243/12
244/24 265/15 267/17
reverse [2] 65/8 85/11
reverses [1] 98/20
review [17] 15/6 21/13 22/15 23/11 36/7
36/8 42/25 52/23 98/2 98/14 110/2 130/5
143/2 167/16 168/17 170/9 242/19
reviewed [2] 127/25 254/24
reviewing [2] 44/13 44/14

147/20 148/12 149/13 152/3 152/13 164/24 222/4 266/22 266/22
said [91] 12/23 15/3 15/8 23/3 36/23 42/11 43/10 43/22 44/5 48/18 51/10 56/25 57/10 57/12 58/3 59/3 59/21 62/6 74/10 77/23 79/14 79/15 79/19 80/14 80/18 80/20 80/25 83/2 83/10 85/3 86/2 86/10 86/19 89/6 89/7 90/15 96/7 101/24 119/24 120/2 128/6 144/3 147/7 159/1 160/24 161/1 170/5 172/25 176/7 177/24 178/24 184/19 186/17 188/23 189/3
189/23 231/4 231/5 231/12 231/14 232/8 232/9 232/21 232/24 233/2 233/5 233/5 233/8 233/9 234/7 234/8 234/13 234/23
235/2 235/6 243/12 244/20 244/22
244/22 244/23 245/7 249/13 259/14
259/18 260/11 260/16 261/1 262/17 265/15 265/20 268/8
salaries [1] 237/2
sales [4] 65/15 66/7 66/14 236/18 salient [2] 7/6 114/8
same [29] 9/19 29/3 34/11 44/1 57/3 110/1 123/4 123/9 133/4 139/25 142/9 146/20 149/23 150/20 160/17 170/24 170/25 175/19 179/5 189/19 208/8 220/20 227/21 228/4 228/14 231/18 244/17 251/19 265/1
Sandler [4] 2/19 104/20 157/6 203/25 Sara [1] 123/10
sat [1] 243/18
satisfied [4] 89/16 89/23 91/16 270/17
satisfy [3] 126/5 156/12 157/1
save [2] 100/10 101/9
saved [1] 101/11
savings [4] 66/1 162/24 162/25 163/10
saw [6] 25/20 78/25 135/23 185/5 223/12 236/18
say [75] 21/22 24/12 24/13 31/12 37/3
40/2 44/4 44/19 44/22 46/13 57/6 58/14
61/5 61/9 61/24 62/9 66/7 70/11 74/10
75/10 76/12 77/5 80/6 80/23 83/6 87/25
88/21 95/22 99/4 103/10 109/1 115/7
134/2 138/12 146/5 148/25 153/1 159/16
164/9 166/17 166/19 174/7 194/1 208/25
211/18 219/1 219/5 219/18 231/13 233/6
233/11 234/5 234/6 234/8 234/11 235/5 239/16 241/11 241/22 244/16 245/6 256/4 259/11 262/1 262/5 262/21 263/7 264/22 264/22 264/23 265/13 267/23 268/7 270/15 272/12
saying [17] 37/8 42/15 43/1 58/1 58/17 59/5 91/21 117/8 124/3 157/17 162/12 179/3 181/25 183/20 183/22 191/17 261/13
says [43] 12/3 13/25 40/3 43/15 43/25
65/15 66/11 79/7 80/4 80/21 81/6 87/24 88/6 88/10 95/10 95/16 98/20 99/16 119/14 119/18 120/3 125/7 166/22 169/21 172/20 174/7 174/10 174/10 174/15 174/18 183/3 188/1 205/12 210/12 212/18 215/11 216/22 226/17
227/18 242/15 242/19 265/8 272/13
scenario [3] 88/2 97/15 248/15
scenarios [2] 48/25 49/4
schedule [5] 54/14 229/23 250/23 264/1 265/22
scheduled [12] 6/24 133/13 176/19 176/20 176/24 183/24 208/15 219/3 229/15 230/12 250/18 266/7
schedules [1] 250/21
scheme [1] 69/19
Schneider [2] 3/3 54/24
school [1] 101/7
schools [4] 85/20 195/9 223/16 226/2
scope [7] 19/6 19/14 39/1 126/6 140/14 177/19 196/10
scratched [1] 100/19
screen [8] 147/16 151/24 170/24 207/5
209/8 216/17 269/8 269/10
scrub [2] 200/12 214/9
scrubbed [1] 214/8
se [1] $271 / 10$
search [1] 93/25
seated [2] 39/11 192/12
second [24] 6/8 15/21 23/8 37/22 74/16
81/12 86/4 92/9 92/16 94/3 100/7 108/22
128/22 130/21 132/2 133/4 150/9 161/17
179/16 204/13 216/3 228/6 239/24
259/22
Secondly [2] 24/11 24/23
secrecy [2] 18/9 18/15
secretary [5] 98/12 106/24 110/7 118/8 123/10
secretly [1] 184/2
section [25] 16/24 62/16 77/11 90/5
108/10 124/18 128/24 135/11 139/6
139/15 139/17 139/23 142/16 142/19
146/21 156/13 157/2 161/9 167/1 167/11
167/16 167/23 174/14 185/12 203/2
sector [1] 194/3
secured [4] 62/17 62/21 186/5 190/2 securities [1] 246/17
security [1] 246/6
see [30] 30/19 42/19 55/1 62/13 65/6 69/16 79/10 83/15 83/22 89/10 101/17 105/3 105/10 117/19 131/10 135/21
147/23 170/24 183/25 186/9 203/8 207/4
209/9 211/9 211/11 211/14 216/16 224/7 270/14 270/16
seeing [2] 108/19 152/2
seek [9] 35/22 48/20 52/2 52/23 117/13 138/24 139/25 178/23 181/9
seeking [15] 7/7 31/9 32/14 32/16 32/19
32/25 32/25 112/25 123/7 123/15 123/19
124/2 133/7 152/6 152/11
seem [3] 37/16 40/6 164/4
seems [3] 27/19 36/24 128/23
seen [15] 6/2 10/24 13/21 54/20 92/19
93/3 142/12 157/14 169/8 171/21 174/6
176/16 176/22 202/20 269/14
segment [2] 216/14 216/18
segregate [1] 222/15
segregated [1] 262/2
segue [1] 134/25
select [1] 44/19
selected [2] 44/17 168/23
selective [6] 7/12 42/17 46/3 46/16 46/17 46/25
selectively [3] 9/18 44/11 44/23
self [3] 33/10 74/13 216/21
Senate [1] 109/22
send [3] 87/12 148/23 155/3
sends [2] 116/21 121/10
senior [1] 125/3
sense [7] 20/12 29/12 36/20 100/18
183/4 184/15 239/10
senses [1] 74/13
sensible [1] 84/15
sensitive [1] 86/22
sent [8] 43/2 79/7 84/24 124/3 152/10
152/12 155/12 162/22
sentence [3] 76/22 80/9 100/14
sentences [2] 76/16 76/17
separate [4] 49/14 94/12 94/22 186/12
separately [1] 218/3
September[7] 6/12 15/22 15/22 16/9
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September... [3] 16/21 18/7 26/9
September 19 [1] 26/9
September 19th [2] 15/22 18/7
sequestered [1] 192/20
sequestration [2] 192/19 192/24
sergeants [3] 145/10 150/22 151/9
serially [1] 166/1
series [6] 6/19 99/9 119/6 120/14 136/16 268/23
serious [4] 84/25 93/14 110/3 142/20 serve [4] 114/14 154/17 195/21 195/25 served [2] 133/8 181/8
service [12] 154/11 154/25 196/24 197/5
211/23 240/20 246/16 248/17 250/18 250/19 266/7 266/17
services [9] 9/15 35/17 63/13 96/14
97/14 135/9 145/23 197/13 211/25
serving [1] 111/17
session [2] 39/10 192/11
sessions [2] 136/1 155/15
set [11] 54/11 66/22 141/9 146/18 146/20 158/16 166/16 184/22 212/14 215/14 247/12
sets [2] 110/14 162/1
setting [2] 133/6 149/19
seven [3] 84/17 111/16 265/18
sever [1] 103/6
several [10] 48/8 63/11 67/2 68/16 116/15 117/16 118/13 119/12 144/13 234/1
severe [3] 146/8 190/6 190/8
sewage [1] 126/2
sewer [5] 186/11 188/19 197/15 217/12 217/18
sewerage [3] 189/6 189/12 190/1
sewers [4] 186/15 186/18 189/23 190/19 shadow [3] 112/22 134/4 134/21
shall [2] 139/9 139/10
shape [1] 166/3
share [6] 31/25 32/1 130/14 159/20 182/1 261/20
shared [14] 31/16 31/20 33/16 36/20 37/4 37/15 40/2 40/4 40/6 41/21 48/8 51/22 51/23 252/24
sharing [2] 212/2 241/5
Sharon [5] 2/17 104/9 104/20 105/25 157/6
Sharp [1] 4/13
she [5] 42/9 128/3 128/6 128/7 164/24
sheet [1] 69/21
Sherwood [2] 2/18 203/24
shield [2] 13/7 46/7
shields [1] 29/22
shift [1] 143/15
Shirley [1] 153/13
short [9] 93/17 93/18 95/23 99/20 196/4
200/22 203/3 208/4 235/3
shorter [1] 196/16
shortfall [1] 261/9
shortly [5] 106/20 107/18 108/16 109/20 149/25
should [56] 1/16 2/10 16/4 16/6 17/10 21/24 22/25 22/25 23/1 23/4 23/11 23/13 24/4 26/22 29/24 32/8 34/14 34/21 45/5 46/10 46/24 50/10 54/10 69/18 70/1 70/17 78/9 78/10 84/1 86/20 92/9 99/19 112/3 112/20 125/21 126/15 128/22 134/14 134/20 134/23 141/1 157/10 161/16 164/2 166/3 189/9 192/20 200/14 204/5 204/9 204/23 230/13 240/10 241/18 249/22 257/13
shouldn't [4] 17/18 28/5 29/8 206/15
show [82] 56/24 61/13 62/2 65/25 81/10
82/11 85/8 85/17 86/3 89/11 89/13 89/25 90/21 91/13 93/10 95/2 96/20 97/1 97/16 101/8 106/1 116/2 117/17 129/9 133/6 135/22 136/22 142/9 145/15 146/19 149/16 155/8 155/19 156/6 156/15 156/23 163/2 164/9 166/11 166/19 166/22 167/5 168/15 169/1 169/13 171/3 171/5 171/14 171/21 171/23 172/2 172/5 172/9 173/20 177/21 178/5 178/10 180/20 180/24 181/12 182/3 183/15 184/23 184/24 185/2 185/21 186/7 186/14 187/9 187/11 188/7 188/11 188/17 189/14 189/24 190/4 190/11 190/18 191/7 210/9 232/2 258/2 showed [6] 134/7 136/6 138/19 143/10 230/25 259/8
showing [9] 61/11 69/9 132/22 146/13
165/24 178/2 178/3 209/23 231/6 shown [13] 26/21 59/25 166/17 173/7
188/9 207/25 215/9 216/5 222/14 227/13 228/18 232/6 232/15
shows [9] 62/16 72/7 84/2 95/2 123/11
176/21 176/22 180/8 217/16
shuffle [1] 39/13
shy [1] 83/25
side [7] 50/17 82/6 82/6 95/15 96/24
163/16 176/25
sign [2] 136/11 138/13
signature [1] 138/12
signatures [3] 102/7 102/20 130/6 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { signed [4] } & 133 / 5 & 143 / 1 & 148 / 9 \\ 149 / 25\end{array}$ significance [3] 54/17 54/18 61/16 significant [9] 62/23 66/15 68/4 116/9 137/17 172/21 176/16 189/20 259/19 significantly [2] 222/18 259/21
signs [3] 106/21 110/6 143/20
silence [2] 131/4 131/8
silly [1] 77/25
Silverman [2] 3/25 153/5
similar [8] 62/19 79/25 99/20 129/7
130/19 130/21 184/11 205/6
Simon [5] 3/8 5/17 54/5 133/18 237/22
simple [7] 11/16 13/24 129/8 158/14
177/15 206/22 270/19
simplicity [1] 224/2
simplistic [1] 237/7
simply [15] 33/8 35/5 45/2 61/9 128/13
129/6 138/11 158/1 158/6 205/6 205/23 224/3 238/17 243/6 244/21
since [12] 11/23 16/15 34/17 142/21
154/1 158/7 193/21 195/21 242/14
257/22 266/24 269/8
Sincora [1] 252/15
single [4] 84/20 103/17 158/15 237/16
sir [16] 2/20 5/19 20/2 23/15 33/24 36/1 78/24 95/12 193/7 203/22 204/2 204/24 214/2 216/6 217/21 244/3
sirs [1] 184/18
sit [2] 193/6 215/17
site [2] 90/16 180/3
sites [1] 81/16
sitting [4] 3/10 23/17 130/11 133/11
situation [16] 10/3 29/17 55/4 74/18 77/3 93/14 96/21 102/12 125/18 153/23 177/22 184/11 231/15 234/21 234/24 262/25
situations [2] 46/14 105/12
six [9] 15/8 20/18 42/3 56/21 58/9 58/23 84/16 121/25 158/25
six-month [1] 158/25
Sixth [4] 40/10 43/13 205/8 206/16
size [7] 71/5 71/12 72/13 182/7 183/10
187/13 255/8
skip [2] 100/13 177/4
slashed [1] 173/10
slate [1] 98/9
slated [1] 122/10
sleep [1] 144/24
slide [14] 106/1 113/1 132/7 133/21
133/23 134/7 134/13 135/5 135/24 150/9 163/1 169/20 177/4 185/5
slides [3] 143/9 159/20 191/13
slightest [1] 81/19
slow [3] 109/1 109/5 109/6
small [3] 56/1 146/2 158/14
smaller [1] 157/14
snapshot [3] 198/21 202/14 203/12
Snyder [10] 6/25 19/5 21/5 23/22 106/16
106/18 107/20 108/14 122/13 139/20
Snyder's [2] 16/17 113/11
so [195] 5/10 5/14 5/23 6/13 9/21 14/15 16/4 23/24 24/7 25/6 26/3 26/21 27/8 28/23 29/11 31/21 32/5 34/12 35/20
36/19 37/11 38/6 38/10 38/14 39/18 40/1 41/8 42/2 44/3 44/21 50/1 52/20 53/8 56/10 56/17 61/4 62/21 62/24 64/19 65/12 67/5 69/12 71/21 72/4 72/13 72/23 76/4 76/11 76/17 77/2 77/18 78/23 79/18 79/20 81/25 82/20 83/18 84/24 85/25 88/8 90/17 91/15 92/5 92/18 94/1 94/11 94/12 94/14 94/19 94/22 95/7 95/11 95/19 96/14 97/10 98/2 99/3 101/11 101/13 102/4 102/11 103/6 103/10 104/24 106/17 109/1 113/16 125/13 125/21 126/25 127/4 131/24 131/25 132/7 133/3 133/7 133/9 133/22 134/25 136/15 137/11 137/19 138/3 138/5 140/18 141/18 142/8 143/20 143/23 145/24 147/22 149/2 153/1 157/22 159/17 162/9 162/12 163/3 163/13 165/2 165/25 166/25 167/7 167/16 168/3 170/4 173/13 177/14 179/2 180/11 180/13 181/11 183/11 183/25 184/3 185/8 186/20 188/12 190/4 191/6 192/3 195/4 195/18 196/5 197/4 197/19 200/12 201/2 203/8 204/8 205/14 210/17 210/21 211/14 212/14 213/3 214/10 214/14 216/3 216/16 218/19 219/5 219/8 219/24 221/15 222/1 222/1 223/20 225/12
225/22 226/5 227/21 229/21 230/16 232/24 238/4 238/9 239/7 240/17 242/11 243/4 243/16 243/18 255/25 256/4 258/10 260/11 265/3 267/3 268/20 268/23 269/4 270/15 271/1 273/16 so-called [1] 213/3
software [1] 201/12
sold [3] 66/12 194/20 194/21
solicitation [2] 73/5 73/9
solid [3] 221/13 221/21 222/3
solution [4] 77/7 77/9 82/22 97/10
solutions [3] 93/25 112/13 134/24
solve [1] 67/20
solved [1] 141/6
solvency [3] 157/8 158/3 171/11
solvent [1] 189/25
solving [1] 63/18
some [84] 10/8 23/23 30/22 39/13 40/25 41/5 43/23 45/11 46/1 46/24 49/9 49/12 57/7 58/1 58/11 60/22 66/13 66/17 67/3 71/18 74/13 75/9 77/5 79/1 79/17 83/8 83/15 86/11 89/11 89/17 89/19 92/13 96/20 98/2 101/1 103/9 103/21 108/4 114/18 118/18 128/21 139/23 140/22 148/3 148/7 149/2 151/16 152/24 157/14
some... [35] 162/22 168/6 171/20 171/21 171/22 175/13 181/25 182/10 185/22 195/6 195/11 197/24 198/23 201/5 203/3 205/21 206/12 211/6 211/7 211/15 217/9 222/8 226/4 227/15 239/17 248/23
248/23 249/1 250/3 250/5 250/12 252/15 254/14 254/22 268/23
somebody [2] 80/18 87/16
somehow [5] 103/8 151/16 160/7 162/17 188/22
someone [7] 32/1 80/10 90/13 203/17 223/21 250/8 257/6
something [32] 15/1 34/23 47/14 61/2 67/8 86/1 87/12 90/15 90/20 96/1 96/18 96/19 134/12 141/14 175/6 179/11 189/11 202/9 206/13 217/1 221/2 221/3 221/5 222/24 224/12 225/9 226/17 239/8 271/23 272/25 273/1 273/5
sometime [2] 145/21 256/18
sometimes [2] 84/19 246/9
somewhat [1] 44/12
soon [2] 121/14 131/25
sooner [1] 124/11
sophisticated [3] 160/14 160/15 242/2
sorry [22] 3/21 32/18 43/20 55/16 114/2 144/23 144/23 144/24 152/10 176/21 213/10 215/10 221/5 231/9 233/19 244/3 255/24 256/1 256/8 262/9 263/7 263/21 sort [10] 7/11 43/23 46/24 50/2 58/1 137/6 142/9 143/7 144/8 146/17
sought [3] 85/16 117/14 181/21
sound [2] 34/18 34/23
Sounded [1] 239/25
sounds [1] 186/5
source [3] 97/9 205/15 239/11
sources [1] 239/12
speak [7] 56/12 60/14 82/19 105/22 138/1 209/3 228/8
speaking [6] 2/24 3/12 128/4 128/8 164/20 245/24
speaks [5] 61/19 61/23 69/12 216/18 242/24
special [4] 3/6 20/15 100/15 204/8 specialized [1] 206/12
specific [31] 7/1 11/25 24/24 25/16 30/4 32/9 35/14 45/18 55/11 95/9 121/13 121/22 134/5 165/21 167/8 167/19 174/19 197/5 197/12 199/9 206/25 221/12 227/14 234/14 247/10 249/5 251/12 253/9 256/17 262/22 269/4 specifically [42] 12/3 12/12 20/21 128/25 150/10 156/2 166/10 166/12 167/2 167/2 167/4 169/11 169/12 169/16 169/21 172/8 172/11 172/20 173/23 174/21 177/5 178/13 178/25 181/23 184/19 186/3 188/1 193/24 197/4 199/24 200/2 231/6 233/9 234/13 235/6 235/22 245/7 252/16 262/7 265/20 267/25 268/11 specification [2] 38/3 125/5 specifics [2] 9/3 9/4 specified [5] 67/21 71/3 71/4 102/17 260/9
specify [2] 239/17 268/15
speculative [1] 122/7
speed [2] 101/8 101/9
spend [4] 60/24 91/4 105/2 105/10 spending [12] 126/23 127/2 127/17 127/20 128/18 129/10 129/20 129/23 130/7 130/17 135/7 143/16
spent [2] 7/13 11/21
spirit [1] 53/18
spoke [7] 57/2 116/21 118/7 200/6
213/16 213/17 230/22
sponsor [1] 142/6
spreadsheet [18] 201/11 203/17 205/17 205/18 207/4 207/9 207/21 210/6 210/10 210/11 210/22 210/23 211/9 212/20 216/18 217/15 243/10 243/12
spreadsheets [5] 201/9 205/20 207/9 245/24 246/3
staff [5] 154/10 207/3 273/15 273/15 273/16
stage [3] 120/8 120/13 205/18
stakeholder [1] 140/6
stakeholders [2] 30/10 137/8
stand [6] 61/6 67/1 106/24 107/2 193/4 241/17
standard [17] 1/15 30/3 40/9 43/9 43/11 43/23 46/1 46/5 60/21 61/14 69/17 70/6 74/3 82/1 159/6 161/6 161/8
standards [5] 47/3 68/17 72/5 79/24 100/15
standing [1] 33/23
standpoint [1] 236/11
start [15] 5/16 61/4 75/15 75/15 76/2
79/22 87/15 87/16 101/15 144/9 147/24
147/25 149/8 256/15 257/2
started [8] 86/9 87/13 93/13 103/11
108/18 195/16 237/3 256/19
starting [1] 71/25
starts [3] 118/11 134/15 144/8
state [133] $3 / 57 / 157 / 248 / 2010 / 411 / 18$ 12/20 12/22 13/8 17/7 17/24 18/17 19/2
19/9 21/1 22/6 22/9 22/17 22/25 22/25 23/22 24/5 24/24 25/1 25/22 28/17 28/24 28/25 31/16 31/21 33/16 33/20 36/21 37/4 37/24 38/2 42/11 42/13 44/7 47/25 49/2 51/23 53/3 53/4 53/21 54/8 54/11
55/5 56/2 56/20 65/19 65/19 68/1 93/12 98/6 98/13 104/11 104/11 106/19 106/25 107/7 107/12 107/17 108/14 109/19 110/7 110/12 110/14 110/16 111/15 112/12 113/1 115/18 115/22 115/23 117/12 117/24 118/9 118/19 119/9 120/22 122/3 124/7 124/15 125/16 129/4 132/23 133/12 137/22 139/9 139/19 139/21 144/17 148/4 155/5 163/21 167/4 167/9 169/5 169/16 171/7 171/13 171/13 172/4 174/2 174/9 174/13 174/16 174/18 176/1 176/9 176/10 176/17 177/10
177/16 177/18 212/2 212/3 212/14 215/16 215/25 227/4 235/12 235/13 235/14 235/22 236/3 236/15 236/17 241/5 241/6 264/7 268/5
state's [8] 20/22 26/7 26/8 54/7 121/6 128/16 129/13 144/5
stated [10] 43/10 48/18 48/21 49/15
122/14 186/1 186/8 186/25 187/3 187/10 statement [12] 9/6 50/16 56/3 90/7
104/12 104/15 105/6 137/16 137/17 153/8 153/18 174/11
statements [14] 53/10 59/9 60/3 69/15
69/18 113/21 131/18 153/9 153/10 167/24 192/4 198/15 261/15 265/10 states [14] 27/4 27/5 36/25 41/6 115/18 116/5 116/8 118/24 119/10 119/12 124/16 124/19 128/25 171/12
stating [2] 44/16 121/12
station [1] 99/25
status [1] 259/8
statute [11] 90/11 98/22 99/18 100/12 101/24 102/18 103/3 103/10 107/14 109/17 202/24
statutes [3] 61/1 85/9 101/5
stays [2] 35/6 101/13
steady [4] 235/12 235/13 235/14 264/7
stenographic [2] 1/6 1/13
step [4] 80/19 88/13 118/20 155/21
steps [4] 62/9 62/11 67/17 84/14
Steven [1] $3 / 5$
Stewart [6] 2/14 192/15 238/4 255/23
268/17 270/22
still [36] 21/6 22/11 22/12 22/14 32/4
32/24 41/18 42/7 42/22 47/11 53/9 66/22
75/14 75/21 103/10 119/10 120/23
123/11 $124 / 25$ 125/1 125/9 125/10 126/1
126/4 132/3 143/11 187/16 189/10 190/6
205/18 210/19 212/18 225/14 227/1
227/3 244/25
stipulated [2] 198/10 204/20
stipulating [1] 59/14
stipulation [2] 57/17 192/18
Stockton [3] 91/10 94/6 95/21
stood [2] 42/11 67/2
stop [3] 99/19 109/3 198/8
stopped [2] 22/11 62/5
strain [2] 5/22 189/13
strategy [4] 14/2 112/11 112/19 168/17
street [4] 221/13 221/22 222/3 241/25
stressed [1] 97/9
stretch [1] 93/7
stricken [1] 103/8
strictures [1] 171/15
strike [2] 56/18 229/25
Stroebel [1] 4/13
strong [2] 123/3 152/14
structure [4] 30/24 70/24 74/4 76/9
structured [1] 106/17
structures [2] 71/18 72/20
structuring [1] 95/24
struggle [1] 186/22
struggling [2] 10/13 186/6
sub [3] 166/19 166/21 254/21
subdivisions [1] 139/9
subject [41] 12/4 14/18 15/9 23/11 28/14
38/5 41/11 44/12 44/18 46/3 46/5 46/13
46/25 52/18 61/8 61/10 68/15 91/22
98/19 101/25 107/14 127/21 128/22
130/9 161/14 178/21 181/3 187/3 190/17 206/14 214/21 215/15 215/23 215/24 227/3 227/12 227/12 228/13 244/8 246/5 247/8
subjective [2] 40/14 40/16
subjects [1] 20/4
submit [25] 17/16 17/19 18/2 29/6 30/25
45/5 76/4 106/8 110/11 112/17 118/2 137/5 157/25 158/5 158/16 159/10 162/20 163/13 164/10 164/13 202/23 204/6 242/8 242/24 270/17
submits [1] 110/6
submitted [6] 34/8 61/17 122/12 129/1 131/20 147/5
subpart [3] 179/15 179/24 179/25
subpoena [1] 14/16
subpoenas [1] 53/13
subprong [1] 180/12
subsequent [5] 210/25 215/22 252/22
255/19 259/10
subsequently [1] 194/21
subset [1] 56/21
subsidy [6] 197/19 198/2 222/24 222/25
223/1 223/4
substance [3] 37/15 91/19 251/2
substantial [4] 163/9 190/7 190/12
190/21
substantially [1] 77/16
subtract [1] 225/3
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subtracted [2] 225/9 225/10
subtraction [1] 207/24
succeed [1] 88/19
succeeded [1] 81/18
success [1] 112/24
successful [1] 109/12
such [17] $1 / 1422 / 8$ 29/25 33/19 56/3
67/21 116/7 127/21 140/15 149/19
177/12 188/18 199/20 221/13 255/24 264/2 272/4
sudden [1] 94/10
sufficient [1] 25/2
sufficiently [3] 71/22 130/19 130/21
suggest [9] 15/5 21/9 22/23 23/18 37/12
130/12 130/14 149/18 150/15
suggested [8] 5/2 79/1 108/1 152/23
168/18 188/22 229/18 230/13
suggesting [4] 22/8 76/18 150/12 189/7
suggestion [2] 67/16 97/20
suggestions [2] 81/1 81/1
suggests [4] 29/24 46/4 48/3 52/16
sum [3] 177/14 224/9 230/9
summaries [4] 69/15 257/21 270/6
270/19
summarize [1] 168/6
summarized [2] 97/1 180/24
summarizes [1] 93/1
summarizing [1] 103/11
summary [6] 108/6 122/2 175/20 209/15
248/9 273/4
Sunrise [1] 43/15
supervise [1] 192/24
supervised [1] 118/19
supplant [1] 129/17
supplement [2] 37/25 222/9
supplemental [1] 87/22
support [8] 9/16 16/13 29/6 41/11 67/12
99/9 106/3 171/11
supported [1] 79/24
supporting [1] 100/23
suppose [2] 77/18 242/18
supposed [16] 67/6 80/24 87/9 88/12
89/3 90/17 98/8 119/3 119/5 123/24
141/15 160/8 162/14 177/2 255/13 255/15
Supreme [2] 98/20 140/3
sure [18] 6/3 37/5 47/19 50/21 50/25
58/20 67/5 100/1 105/22 111/3 131/23
141/22 145/20 192/1 212/7 220/3 220/10 268/18
surely [1] 37/15
surplus [3] 243/16 245/1 265/20
surplus/deficit [1] 243/16
surprise [3] 29/8 67/23 81/19
surprised [2] 161/15 267/25
surprising [2] 30/22 84/1
surrounding [1] 141/8
survival [1] 145/24
suspect [2] 66/9 89/19
suspended [1] 85/9
suspension [1] 85/12
sustain [1] 231/2
sustained [4] 208/9 244/12 258/24 269/25
swap [4] 66/20 66/23 67/7 250/22
swaps [3] 247/9 247/11 250/22
switched [1] 173/7
sword [1] 46/7
swore [1] 171/11
sworn [3] 2/9 171/17 193/5
symbols [1] 1/13
system [15] 105/1 119/6 137/16 139/8
217/5 217/6 217/10 217/20 219/6 229/15 229/16 230/19 230/19 230/20 248/24 system's [2] 147/9 230/18
systems [20] 3/19 105/21 119/23 123/5
123/14 123/18 124/1 131/22 153/8 154/9 219/5 219/9 219/11 229/17 230/12
246/15 250/4 253/25 254/3 255/10 T
table [4] 3/11 163/17 179/8 184/20
tables [1] 250/19
tabulate [1] 212/20
tabulating [1] 239/14
tackle [1] 183/8
tactical [1] 156/4
take [39] 5/24 23/4 30/8 30/9 35/15 39/4
45/20 51/16 52/25 64/19 75/5 79/4 100/2
100/3 105/18 118/20 120/12 129/10
130/12 130/25 134/23 135/12 137/7 139/17 148/1 148/5 158/18 164/12 176/20 177/2 180/7 183/11 191/22 192/5 197/22 227/15 242/1 243/3 273/18 taken [12] $1 / 6$ 6/10 7/11 18/5 34/17 39/8 62/1 62/8 84/14 122/8 131/13 192/9 takes [6] 106/18 150/9 158/13 159/20 161/1 177/16
taking [9] 65/20 67/13 94/15 127/22
149/20 162/15 166/25 167/8 231/2
talk [15] 34/22 35/2 35/2 64/10 65/16
74/16 77/22 86/12 86/16 87/18 136/24
150/6 185/11 213/22 243/19
talked [5] 40/11 135/1 221/2 225/4 273/6 talker [1] 109/9
talking [19] 13/18 13/21 14/13 14/14 48/6 50/3 59/7 69/2 70/23 77/8 86/9 135/5 147/25 190/15 213/20 216/4 218/9 222/22 261/22
talks [5] 12/10 66/20 85/22 134/17 216/15
Taunt [1] 4/12
tax [10] 96/15 97/7 197/3 214/14 223/7
223/13 223/23 225/11 236/5 236/6
taxes [22] 97/1 97/3 97/7 196/22 206/9
206/9 211/17 211/18 211/20 211/20
211/21 216/21 223/14 223/17 225/13
236/1 236/8 236/13 236/18 241/6 241/7 241/7
taxing [5] 223/11 223/15 225/14 225/16 225/21
taxpayer [1] 96/17
Taylor [4] 8/6 153/16 153/20 155/18 team [16] 27/23 34/25 35/1 114/11
158/17 169/14 170/7 194/21 194/21
194/23 200/7 200/17 200/18 236/7 241/9 242/3
tech [1] 218/1
technical [3] 97/19 160/2 211/13
technically [1] 160/9
Teicher [1] $4 / 5$
tell [33] 25/23 55/17 80/25 86/17 101/4
125/20 139/12 139/16 150/2 151/11
164/22 193/25 194/7 195/6 198/20 212/6 213/8 215/13 221/10 221/19 223/9
231/21 232/24 235/1 235/18 246/11
247/25 249/21 251/21 260/12 260/15 260/24 266/4
telling [4] 33/13 184/1 200/10 257/25
tells [1] 230/16
temporal [1] 41/5
ten [28] 41/19 135/7 192/6 196/12 235/11
236/6 236/12 236/20 237/14 242/1
243/10 243/15 244/16 245/3 245/4

248/14 251/22 253/2 255/10 264/14 264/17 264/23 265/16 265/16 265/18 265/24 266/2 268/10
ten-year [12] 196/12 235/11 242/1 243/10 243/15 244/16 245/4 248/14 251/22 253/2 264/17 264/23
tended [1] 173/24
tent [1] 51/12
tentative [2] 149/14 163/9
term [22] 61/24 64/3 64/4 69/21 80/13 95/22 134/24 181/10 196/4 196/17 197/9 200/14 200/22 200/22 201/1 203/3 208/4 209/23 210/14 235/15 239/2 255/21 terms [56] 1/15 4/18 21/4 21/7 21/12 31/1 32/10 46/2 72/25 89/12 94/20 100/11 115/9 135/17 135/19 137/9 143/24 143/25 146/2 148/15 176/12 181/21 181/23 186/25 191/3 191/3 196/4 200/10 200/23 201/3 201/4 201/7 201/13 204/4 206/7 207/13 208/5 214/11 225/15 225/17 225/20 227/14 229/12 230/25 235/21 235/25 236/4 236/17 239/3 241/8 241/9 251/8 251/22 253/3 262/24 268/1 terribly [1] 76/14
test [5] 40/12 64/2 95/21 184/15 213/21 testified [13] 106/16 108/17 109/11 110/16 122/21 124/24 125/4 179/6 205/2 205/25 210/1 269/12 271/12
testify [17] 41/25 53/20 55/3 82/16 86/11
87/1 102/11 109/19 116/16 120/18 121/22 125/24 153/20 157/15 206/5 232/21 244/7
testifying [7] 5/6 21/10 111/23 116/16 157/18 241/22 268/5
testimonial [2] 128/9 128/11
testimony [40] 5/7 5/13 6/6 54/11 54/17 54/22 69/13 141/2 151/16 157/10 158/3 171/9 180/9 187/17 204/3 204/5 204/6 204/14 204/19 204/22 204/23 205/8 206/14 206/23 206/24 213/14 214/20 228/11 228/12 232/11 239/25 242/5 244/6 244/8 257/12 257/13 263/6 263/8 265/8 271/1
text [1] 12/9
textbook [2] 99/14 99/15
than [40] 9/7 9/11 20/18 25/11 27/9 35/5 48/20 48/24 49/14 63/9 71/13 71/22 73/25 81/8 86/20 86/21 86/24 93/11 97/15 101/19 110/12 124/11 127/4 134/2
141/5 149/4 154/13 154/14 156/8 156/9 158/13 161/2 170/11 171/24 177/10 184/5 189/17 218/19 240/9 249/25 thank [56] $2 / 193 / 13 / 144 / 15$ 5/21 18/18 18/22 23/15 27/12 27/13 27/14 33/24 36/1 44/25 45/1 48/14 50/6 51/3 53/4 53/6 54/2 54/22 54/24 55/20 60/17 103/25 104/1 104/17 104/19 105/15 114/3 126/10 126/22 132/12 133/14 145/5 153/1 153/3 157/3 157/4 161/25 162/7 164/17 164/18 191/10 191/11 191/14 192/14 193/1 204/10 216/1 218/7 259/1 262/19 265/11 272/20
thanking [2] 116/22 152/13
that [1613]
that's [115] $8 / 9$ 9/5 10/2 10/16 10/19 11/22 11/22 12/21 13/6 13/18 13/20 15/10 17/11 19/16 24/25 26/5 30/3 32/20 33/17 34/24 37/7 39/16 40/5 42/17 48/5 48/23 50/18 57/3 57/21 58/17 58/23 59/21 68/13 68/18 69/17 70/5 70/6 75/25 77/7 80/17 81/24 85/23 87/6 87/12 87/14 88/16 89/17 92/6 92/23 96/16 96/21 115/20 131/11 133/14 134/25 137/20
that's... [59] 141/11 141/17 147/19 147/19 149/20 153/1 153/14 153/16 157/18 158/12 159/18 160/12 160/22 160/22 162/20 170/13 174/10 174/15 177/21 181/4 181/7 181/10 181/12 185/15 188/24 189/12 190/13 190/14 190/16 190/16 192/23 195/19 197/3 198/13 209/21 211/19 211/19 212/3 215/14 215/15 216/4 216/6 216/21 216/22 218/5 218/6 219/15 220/13 224/9 224/14 226/6 228/11 232/14 236/20 240/15 261/14 261/16 262/2 272/20 their [46] 1/7 10/4 14/5 18/12 25/11 28/10 49/22 72/21 74/24 84/24 87/21 87/21 88/21 88/21 94/22 105/5 105/6 112/19 116/22 123/2 123/5 125/25 138/21 148/12 151/17 152/14 153/21 154/11 154/16 154/21 155/3 155/10 155/25 156/18 158/2 183/21 197/5 197/5 229/22 232/5 236/14 237/16 239/13 239/13 253/8 254/18
theirs [1] 252/6
them [85] 9/21 11/25 15/5 20/23 21/1 25/3 25/6 28/9 30/17 30/20 35/25 38/4 38/5 46/8 46/22 46/23 47/25 52/12 52/13 56/18 56/21 58/11 58/13 60/23 63/22 64/7 64/10 64/18 72/17 72/20 74/13 75/10 77/21 77/23 88/24 89/17 91/10 99/11 100/25 101/16 108/20 112/2 116/22 120/12 123/2 132/23 136/2 137/5 140/16 149/16 152/13 160/20 176/12 182/22 190/13 205/17 207/24 211/11 211/14 214/8 216/16 219/12 224/5 239/14 239/15 240/1 240/1 242/1 243/23 243/24 245/18 245/19 249/13 252/8 252/19 252/20 253/17 257/1 257/2 259/7 260/24 270/3 270/12 270/14 270/16 themself [1] 64/17
themselves [7] 40/21 78/12 78/14 146/18 206/21 229/22 265/10
then [85] 4/18 4/20 4/21 4/22 5/14 6/8 6/13 16/16 22/23 26/11 27/15 34/17 39/6 47/1 47/11 59/19 59/22 65/15 73/23 75/6 76/15 77/10 79/12 81/2 94/9 95/24 96/5 100/4 102/10 105/12 107/14 110/24 111/14 114/16 119/6 127/18 129/1 129/2 132/2 134/17 134/17 140/2 140/12 142/5 142/23 148/8 160/6 162/8 162/15 162/17 164/8 168/12 174/12 175/20 176/24 182/19 183/8 189/1 204/19 207/15 212/2 212/17 213/5 215/2 223/8 223/8 223/17 223/20 224/23 225/9 227/19 228/23 229/1 229/4 229/7 238/17 242/21 246/2 253/22 255/18 258/7 260/3 267/7 269/23 273/1
theories [5] 8/5 9/15 12/17 37/20 250/15 theory [1] 17/24
there [237] $3 / 1$ 7/2 10/8 10/9 11/18 $13 / 14$ 15/13 17/9 22/11 23/1 26/2 26/16 26/18 27/25 28/16 28/20 29/17 31/7 31/19 32/8 34/6 34/9 34/11 34/19 35/13 35/18 35/22 35/24 37/10 38/2 39/13 40/12 40/22 41/4 42/2 42/13 44/24 45/6 45/21 45/21 47/2 47/3 47/3 49/13 49/21 53/8 53/11 53/12 54/10 54/18 56/17 57/12 58/1 58/16 59/20 62/6 62/16 62/17 62/19 63/18 64/5 65/12 65/12 66/11 66/14 66/18 66/25 67/10 67/16 67/23 67/25 68/11 68/15 69/25 70/8 71/8 71/13 71/15 72/12 73/4 73/13 73/14 73/18 78/22 79/15 80/2 81/20 82/22 84/6 85/2 85/3 85/10 85/17

85/25 88/17 90/7 93/15 94/3 95/14 95/25 96/2 97/10 100/10 100/15 100/21 100/25 101/2 101/13 101/21 102/15 102/23 103/10 105/24 107/5 107/7 107/25 111/2 113/1 116/8 119/14 119/24 120/14 121/1 121/4 122/22 125/5 125/15 126/17 127/13 128/11 133/22 134/1 134/7 134/17 135/7 135/10 135/11 137/3 142/15 143/5 147/16 149/11 150/3 150/9 150/16 151/22 152/20 157/10 158/6 158/20 159/1 159/2 159/4 161/5 161/15 161/16 161/16 161/20 162/10 162/17 163/14 164/1 166/16 171/2 172/21 174/16 175/8 175/9 175/17 176/16 176/17 176/18 177/8 177/12 177/24 179/22 181/15 181/16 181/17 181/18 182/1 182/9 182/14 182/15 182/15 182/18 182/19 183/12 184/7 184/13 184/17 185/3 189/1 190/18 195/13 196/9 198/8 201/18 206/17 208/13 212/9 212/10 215/24 218/12 219/19 221/3 222/23 223/7 225/14 227/2 230/22 233/18 233/19 233/22 237/6 243/18 245/16 245/19 247/16 248/5 248/21 249/15 250/7 252/13 252/13 253/11 253/22 253/24 254/1 255/15 263/3 267/25 269/4 269/8 271/18 273/6 273/14 there's [73] 7/16 9/15 14/24 14/25 15/13 15/15 23/12 24/23 26/1 26/13 26/21 26/22 31/24 34/7 34/10 34/12 42/25 43/10 44/1 46/2 49/1 54/10 54/21 56/21 57/9 58/3 61/15 62/7 62/15 63/25 64/6 64/8 65/2 66/10 71/14 71/17 74/24 76/12 77/18 79/3 80/13 81/19 84/4 84/10 87/1 92/5 92/5 97/9 98/24 99/1 100/8 103/2 103/11 117/23 130/11 134/13 136/3 140/2 144/5 149/17 151/2 163/16 167/21 174/8 174/18 174/22 175/5 180/13 185/16 189/20 224/12 225/9 270/23 thereabouts [2] 68/21 72/12 thereafter [4] 106/20 107/18 108/16 109/20
thereby [4] 139/11 156/12 255/17 260/8 therefore [12] 26/22 34/12 44/8 44/17 44/18 99/21 118/2 157/1 158/20 159/9 172/2 172/6
therein [1] 173/24
thereof [1] 139/10
these [108] 5/25 6/22 6/22 7/12 7/20 7/20 8/14 9/1 9/8 9/13 11/1 11/13 12/21 20/18 21/14 25/3 29/14 30/21 31/15 34/12 35/15 35/24 36/19 38/25 41/20 41/25 42/25 43/4 43/5 45/11 46/21 47/16 47/23 48/19 49/12 50/11 50/17 52/9 56/24 57/7 58/9 58/12 58/15 58/23 67/24 71/14 71/21 81/24 85/3 88/3 94/16 95/22 106/2 116/18 117/5 119/22 120/20 136/20 136/21 139/23 145/12 146/7 146/13 149/15 154/2 154/10 154/17 159/25 160/6 160/15 160/17 162/12 174/24 186/8 190/22 190/23 199/14 204/22 211/6 211/14 221/17 221/18 221/19 223/18 225/21 225/24 230/6 232/11 232/21 232/24 237/25 239/20 240/12 240/14 240/17 242/1 243/19 248/8 249/22 249/24 250/17 265/18 268/16 268/25 270/2 270/5 270/23 272/2 thesis [1] 99/14
they [222] 7/2 7/4 7/19 7/19 7/23 7/24 7/25 8/11 8/22 8/22 9/10 9/11 9/14 9/16 9/18 10/19 11/2 11/16 11/21 14/3 14/4 17/9 18/12 21/19 26/18 26/19 28/4 28/9 30/7 34/10 34/21 35/2 36/15 36/20 37/13

38/9 39/18 39/25 39/25 40/3 40/4 40/6
40/20 40/20 40/25 41/1 41/1 41/1 41/22 42/5 42/6 42/7 42/9 42/9 42/17 42/18 42/18 42/18 42/19 42/19 44/10 44/13 45/8 45/11 46/13 46/21 47/10 47/14 49/21 49/24 52/5 56/23 56/25 56/25 57/6 58/24 58/25 59/12 59/13 62/3 62/11 62/11 65/16 66/3 69/2 70/11 74/10 74/21 76/14 76/15 77/4 77/5 77/10 78/17 78/18 79/14 79/15 80/11 80/14 80/18 82/15 82/25 83/6 84/11 84/12 85/10 86/13 86/14 86/21 88/21 88/23 89/3 89/22 89/23 91/9 94/10 99/23 99/25 100/25 101/1 101/2 102/10 102/25 111/25 112/1 112/13 112/13 112/15 112/19 116/16 117/8 117/14 119/19 119/25 120/2 120/18 121/2 133/2 133/3 133/12 136/21 136/22 136/24 136/25 138/21 142/1 145/22 146/18 147/23 151/13 152/5 152/6 153/24 154/3 154/11 154/18 154/24 155/1 155/5 155/6 155/15 158/22 159/3 159/16 160/3 160/4 160/6 162/14 164/2 173/7 175/5 175/6 176/7 179/8 180/21 181/8 186/19 199/9 199/23 200/21 205/16 205/17 206/23 209/25 211/10 211/18 211/18 211/19 215/16 219/4 221/8 224/21 236/15 236/18 240/4 240/18 246/4 246/4 249/3 249/4 249/8 251/15 253/1 253/7 253/19 257/22 264/4 267/25 268/7 268/8 268/9 268/10 268/23 270/8 270/15 270/19 270/24 271/3 271/10 271/25 272/3 273/15
They'll [1] 92/12
they're [27] 7/1 7/2 10/12 13/7 20/3 21/20 30/1 42/15 42/16 57/2 57/5 58/5 58/5 70/22 71/18 77/2 80/20 88/19 89/23 91/6 133/10 153/22 160/9 183/22 190/2 271/9 271/11
they've [4] 10/20 42/23 89/22 183/21 thin [3] 113/17 170/11 170/12 thing [10] 39/20 44/1 49/5 49/18 76/17 123/1 133/24 134/10 242/14 273/10 things [11] 27/11 41/25 45/6 49/16 83/18 88/6 135/21 151/21 178/5 206/9 206/18 think [182] 8/16 9/22 10/5 11/4 13/14 14/23 15/8 16/6 16/16 20/11 20/15 20/16 22/14 23/3 24/25 25/2 26/5 26/21 27/20 28/13 29/2 29/3 29/4 29/5 33/5 34/6 34/17 34/24 36/17 39/13 41/12 41/14 $42 / 642 / 843 / 443 / 943 / 944 / 546 / 446 / 11$ 47/1 47/17 48/17 49/1 49/3 49/9 49/13 53/24 55/6 57/8 59/7 59/21 61/2 63/14 68/1 68/20 69/6 70/18 70/24 72/4 72/11 72/14 72/17 75/3 75/3 76/11 76/13 76/22 77/2 77/7 78/12 78/20 78/21 79/2 81/20 82/4 82/8 82/8 83/5 85/19 86/3 87/22 88/6 88/8 88/16 88/16 88/17 90/18 90/18 90/21 90/22 91/16 91/18 91/25 92/19 93/8 93/19 94/7 96/4 97/16 97/23 97/25 98/6 98/15 98/25 99/2 99/15 100/20 101/13 101/14 101/15 101/16 101/19 101/21 102/11 103/4 103/12 103/24 105/16 108/4 115/18 127/9 127/15 130/11 133/21 134/6 134/12 135/20 136/22 137/9 137/13 141/13 141/19 141/24 143/4 143/23 144/1 146/5 148/2 148/3 150/15 160/19 160/21 160/25 161/13 165/16 167/5 168/5 171/20 174/6 176/14 177/14 183/3 187/11 187/11 202/17 204/20 204/21 205/4 205/8 205/9 206/11 206/16 208/19 210/1 212/19 212/21 218/1 227/23 228/4 241/24 244/9 252/13 253/20 254/4 256/18 257/12
think... [5] 261/18 263/14 264/15 265/2 270/21
thinking [2] 13/25 79/22
thins [1] 83/7
third [11] 25/7 26/4 40/7 43/5 43/18 43/22
44/8 47/7 79/6 108/9 186/23
thirds [1] 156/10
this [446]
Thomas [4] 3/25 5/17 117/11 153/4 those [130] 4/2 5/15 7/8 10/1 19/15 21/4 23/7 23/13 23/18 29/1 30/12 31/8 31/9 32/4 33/1 37/3 37/15 38/11 41/12 44/25 45/2 48/25 49/22 49/25 50/2 50/5 53/21 58/14 60/1 61/19 62/20 62/22 65/25 67/17 71/16 73/8 75/11 81/21 82/9 84/20 88/6 90/24 99/21 108/3 108/4 113/21 121/9 125/5 125/13 127/8 129/23 133/8 137/4 140/11 141/22 141/23 141/24 141/25 144/6 147/1 147/3 151/1 153/10 155/19 161/17 163/10 163/11 163/17 164/2 165/13 166/1 168/1 170/12 173/15 178/3 182/6 185/1 186/13 186/16 187/6 189/13 190/23 190/24 192/21 195/10 198/1 198/16 200/24 207/21 211/21 211/24 212/7 212/12 213/9 216/25 217/4 217/7 217/8 217/16 218/11 223/9 223/11 224/19 224/20 225/11 225/18 226/4 226/4 226/25 227/1 229/1 229/20 232/18 236/16 237/18 241/7 241/17 246/2 246/11 246/12 246/17 246/21 246/21 249/10 252/15 253/3 253/15 253/16 266/12 269/5
though [6] 10/25 11/3 31/22 105/23 113/6 191/2
thought [14] 39/22 76/20 84/11 101/1 101/2 125/17 126/25 169/17 227/24 240/8 250/5 262/10 262/13 262/17 thousand [1] 11/21
thousands [2] 76/21 77/1
threat [1] 122/7
three [25] 4/21 5/15 19/21 20/9 53/23 69/3 76/16 87/4 92/2 98/25 106/17 106/20 107/2 108/3 119/25 158/10 192/1 192/6 211/22 223/7 236/13 248/20 250/1 254/4 270/2
through [52] 1/7 40/9 42/24 46/22 49/19 53/1 68/16 75/22 79/5 84/21 92/17 93/16 105/3 115/14 118/18 131/20 133/25 135/13 135/13 135/18 138/13 142/23 144/17 148/7 150/5 151/15 153/13 154/25 156/20 164/3 166/1 171/18 171/20 172/7 175/2 175/12 176/5 180/19 180/23 183/18 188/25 200/12 206/10 214/15 216/20 224/5 235/20 236/8 236/22 252/10 258/17 268/22 throughout [4] 7/18 18/5 84/3 106/4 Thursday [1] 118/23
thus [3] 46/13 90/25 97/14
thwart [1] 171/18
ties [1] 167/13
tight [3] 218/23 220/2 220/14 time [92] 6/10 7/13 11/16 11/19 15/16 20/8 21/3 23/3 23/10 23/12 30/16 32/9 33/5 33/7 35/22 35/25 39/21 45/9 51/8 53/15 54/11 55/3 55/11 57/3 59/4 69/16 71/3 76/1 91/4 93/24 94/4 95/17 100/10 101/11 101/13 102/17 110/1 110/25 111/11 116/22 117/7 129/25 133/10 142/8 142/10 146/8 148/1 149/7 149/11 149/23 152/21 159/3 159/19 164/16 177/9 178/10 179/3 182/4 182/5 187/12

189/4 191/23 192/7 195/13 195/14 195/20 195/20 196/9 200/25 201/18 201/24 201/25 203/5 203/16 203/20 208/13 210/17 212/9 216/11 222/8 225/20 226/12 230/22 232/23 233/18 233/22 237/2 243/18 251/23 259/13 260/21 269/4
timeframe [25] 94/2 94/9 94/10 94/21 141/7 142/3 195/17 196/11 196/15 196/16 208/19 218/22 220/4 229/19 234/19 243/15 245/4 254/2 258/7 258/8 259/9 260/9 261/4 268/22 268/23 timeline [27] 83/15 92/4 92/21 105/3 105/7 105/15 106/2 117/20 117/24 118/22 122/9 123/11 124/3 132/22 133/10 133/19 141/9 141/18 142/23 144/10 144/13 146/3 147/22 149/10 150/7 158/11 158/16
timelines [1] 146/10
times [7] 62/14 73/23 135/14 148/8 174/11 197/9 271/18
timing [5] 45/4 55/7 176/15 177/5 177/7 tire [1] 82/5
Tisher [1] $4 / 7$
title [5] 194/25 209/21 210/11 216/16 235/10
titles [1] 11/24
today [21] 2/24 22/20 26/11 40/11 42/1 42/8 42/11 62/22 67/2 70/6 74/1 87/24 127/24 145/20 151/24 162/8 165/3 187/16 215/18 250/19 266/7
together [21] 11/2 25/1 68/3 70/15 83/16 103/5 104/23 106/1 108/2 127/12 155/1 167/20 172/13 207/9 238/17 242/3 250/9 261/16 269/3 270/8 271/21 told [16] 56/20 57/3 57/24 70/4 82/17 114/10 226/20 227/5 227/23 235/1 239/12 260/11 265/9 269/13 269/15 270/12
Tom [1] 3/10
tomorrow [4] 22/20 145/21 272/24 273/21 too [19] 13/12 20/9 55/15 60/19 80/3 95/20 97/7 97/8 108/23 120/6 158/6 158/20 159/4 159/8 162/22 164/2 167/22 183/24 217/23
took [19] 6/16 13/15 20/4 35/19 62/10 110/8 117/17 120/16 136/14 150/10 171/6 171/10 180/12 182/19 182/20 183/25 222/2 241/23 242/2
tool [5] 134/22 148/25 150/10 150/11 185/7
top [3] 166/25 170/17 212/18
topic [2] 97/18 120/5
tops [1] 120/4
torques [1] 42/24
total [13] 186/20 188/12 213/1 215/5
224/6 224/14 224/14 227/25 228/17
244/24 244/24 260/7 261/9
toward [2] 60/24 72/10
towards [5] 33/8 81/7 125/10 248/4 250/6
track [2] 158/24 163/16
trade [1] 168/25
training [2] 204/8 206/12
transaction [2] 66/25 67/8
transcript [2] 1/14 1/22
transcripts [2] 18/4 124/8
transitioned [2] 194/20 194/23
translate [1] 119/15
translated [1] $1 / 6$
translation [1] 1/8
transmit [1] 119/3
transparency [2] 19/9 20/15
transportation [5] 197/17 197/18 198/4

223/3 223/4
treasurer [13] 40/3 53/14 107/6 110/1 111/14 117/13 119/9 119/17 122/14 123/21 124/15 125/16 133/9
treasurer's [1] 120/22
treasury [2] 109/15 111/9
treated [1] 119/20
treatment [3] 69/20 71/3 71/4
tremendous [1] 94/3
tremendously [1] 85/6
trial [31] 3/13 4/12 4/22 4/23 5/5 5/23 8/15 10/16 17/22 21/11 22/20 26/16 49/9 52/25 53/13 55/22 55/25 59/24 87/23 88/21 106/4 108/5 111/23 116/16 121/19 131/20 146/25 153/12 179/5 179/7 184/12
tried [3] 82/10 185/7 200/12
tries [1] 102/21
triggered [1] 102/25
TRO [8] 123/15 123/19 124/2 124/5
176/18 176/20 177/1 177/7
trouble [1] 28/15
true [9] 40/5 43/13 58/17 58/23 59/21
65/17 136/8 137/14 189/20
truly [1] 163/4
trump [10] 115/23 152/22 172/11 173/25
174/5 174/18 174/19 175/9 175/10 175/25
trumped [1] 174/14
trust [1] 190/17
trustee [1] 154/9
trustees [1] 72/17
truth [9] 57/6 57/11 57/17 58/10 59/15 238/1 261/15 265/9 265/10 try [28] 22/17 23/18 56/19 75/8 78/10 79/4 92/12 93/16 104/23 147/6 149/2 165/10 165/11 169/18 172/9 174/21 177/10 183/4 184/25 185/6 187/25 196/3 199/12 233/11 237/5 255/15 255/25 268/15
trying [31] 21/21 22/10 27/1 40/21 56/15
56/16 68/12 68/13 91/22 94/23 101/5 108/23 135/18 138/19 148/8 174/5 174/17 174/19 175/1 175/4 175/6 175/14 175/18 176/12 178/17 200/1 205/18 218/21 230/5 233/8 256/3
Tuesday [1] 54/1
tune [1] 266/1
turn [9] $5 / 14$ 15/20 24/13 62/11 91/3 94/9 177/23 205/25 223/21
turned [2] 30/14 33/18
turning [1] 168/3
turns [5] 67/3 68/9 98/10 101/8 102/1
two [66] 19/3 23/2 34/12 38/12 40/12
40/15 41/1 41/6 41/13 41/16 42/13 43/14 44/9 45/13 47/13 48/25 49/3 54/22 63/5 65/16 68/25 76/16 91/17 92/5 92/22 94/22 100/9 100/22 103/11 108/13 111/6 121/15 125/13 126/1 128/24 134/2 143/1
151/5 156/9 161/15 162/5 162/6 162/8 166/16 171/24 177/24 178/5 191/17 195/18 204/11 237/8 246/14 247/16 250/1 254/4 255/4 257/21 258/3 258/7 258/13 258/16 258/19 259/18 263/2 271/19 273/9
two percent [1] 237/8
two-part [1] 40/12
two-year [1] 258/7
type [7] 9/19 41/5 64/4 72/12 125/11
160/5 206/12
types [2] 7/12 206/10
U

UAW [25] 3/9 5/18 7/3 16/18 24/2 26/6

UAW... [19] 33/8 54/5 54/6 55/14 87/24 105/8 116/22 133/19 136/6 137/12
138/13 138/23 139/1 139/3 139/3 139/13
139/20 140/14 237/22
UAW's [6] 6/17 18/25 87/19 137/19 140/5 140/15
Ullman [3] 2/25 126/10 164/20
ultimate [3] 28/25 30/13 272/4
ultimately [5] 26/7 28/6 33/11 70/15 189/16
ultra [1] 167/12
unable [2] 172/3 209/24
uncertain [3] 99/18 176/5 176/7
uncertainties [1] 125/14
uncertainty [3] 71/9 71/14 71/15
uncertified [1] 1/12
unclear [1] 36/22
unconstitutional [3] 101/25 124/17 130/23
under [58] 5/10 5/22 17/1 17/3 17/18 30/25 35/20 39/5 41/2 46/16 46/25 47/4 57/19 63/6 63/6 63/8 63/24 73/2 91/8 110/3 112/3 113/8 116/7 124/20 139/21 144/16 144/19 145/3 148/13 150/14 151/14 159/23 160/3 160/12 166/18 166/21 166/24 167/4 167/15 167/19 168/8 169/25 172/4 172/20 172/24 173/14 174/9 176/10 179/13 179/24 180/12 181/22 202/24 204/8 248/15 257/21 263/20 270/7
underfunded [1] 64/15
underfunding [11] 63/25 64/13 64/14 64/24 68/8 70/23 183/7 183/8 183/10 190/5 246/14
underlying [4] 253/2 270/13 270/23 271/2
underring [1] 63/8
understand [19] 35/12 50/12 51/11 57/10
66/7 70/9 93/9 127/10 140/6 147/15
160/9 162/24 163/1 190/22 202/22 206/4 217/9 222/1 255/16
understanding [11] 25/25 30/16 48/6
105/1 111/1 222/20 245/22 254/24
255/18 265/6 273/18
understands [1] 219/25
understood [5] 58/18 121/3 125/18 172/3 173/21
undertaken [1] 100/17
undertook [1] 116/12
unedited [1] 1/12
unfair [2] 46/16 46/18
unfold [1] 111/6
unfortunately [2] 66/13 67/1
unfund [1] 189/4
unfunded [16] 58/13 116/6 125/13 182/8 187/1 187/1 187/4 187/14 187/21 187/24 188/3 188/5 188/8 188/9 189/11 189/16 uniform [3] 116/13 154/13 248/3
uniformed [2] 116/14 247/19
uniformly [1] 124/24
union [10] 95/10 95/11 95/13 95/16 95/18 137/25 138/12 140/10 160/24 160/25 union's [1] 147/20
unions [29] 4/6 78/11 78/14 78/15 78/16 81/18 81/21 84/18 105/8 116/24 123/1 136/23 145/13 145/14 145/16 146/1 146/6 146/11 $147 / 4$ 148/12 149/14 150/11 150/13 152/4 152/13 163/8 163/11 164/24 183/5
united [5] 98/12 98/14 102/2 127/14 171/12
universe [2] 74/20 74/22
unless [1] 99/11
unlike [1] 31/24
unpool [1] 222/15
unpooled [4] 260/23 261/6 261/21 261/24 unpooling [5] 227/12 227/15 260/21
261/10 262/3
unquote [2] 139/11 159/24
unripe [1] 122/6
unsecured [3] 68/7 248/17 264/1
unstable [1] 96/21
unsuccessful [1] 90/25
unsupported [1] 17/19
unsustainable [1] 220/11
until [6] 14/24 39/5 130/6 188/3 192/5
261/4
untimely [1] 16/1
untranslated [1] 1/12
unusual [1] 81/3
up [79] 6/11 13/24 19/18 29/1 38/15
42/11 57/22 58/15 60/14 66/5 69/16
78/21 81/9 92/13 92/20 93/4 94/10 94/11
94/22 96/17 102/4 102/5 102/16 106/24
107/2 107/8 119/24 124/12 131/3 133/21
136/8 143/11 143/23 146/18 147/9 148/5
149/20 151/24 159/20 169/21 170/17
170/23 176/25 177/14 183/17 198/8
202/16 203/7 209/8 209/14 211/10
211/12 211/14 212/14 215/9 215/14
218/2 225/6 230/8 233/23 236/4 236/10
236/20 237/4 240/20 243/6 247/24 249/8 253/4 253/7 257/1 260/23 263/2 264/14
266/3 266/10 268/9 269/8 269/10
updated [1] 123/11
updates [2] 64/9 200/21
updating [1] 201/3
upgrades [1] 135/9
uphold [1] 171/7
upon [14] 6/12 21/25 33/4 70/17 84/16
84/19 99/17 101/6 140/23 146/19 155/10
198/6 227/2 247/3
upset [1] 103/19
us [45] 17/22 27/19 39/1 42/16 46/24
60/5 66/6 79/4 80/25 91/6 103/16 121/13 123/23 127/24 139/16 150/9 163/24
193/11 193/25 194/7 195/6 207/4 211/4 212/6 212/17 215/13 221/10 221/19
223/9 224/4 226/20 227/5 227/23 231/6 231/21 232/24 235/1 235/18 239/12 246/11 250/25 251/21 260/11 266/4 268/16
use [23] 1/18 1/19 22/25 23/1 64/12
70/10 91/22 134/3 137/1 144/1 144/3 144/16 144/18 152/22 169/11 172/10 173/24 175/25 182/16 182/17 185/7 201/8 269/7
used [18] 106/3 112/4 113/6 169/22
180/2 181/11 190/24 191/13 196/17
197/9 200/14 214/6 237/10 237/12 248/2
259/23 260/3 261/20
useful [2] 78/20 149/3
uses [2] 126/17 210/14
using [5] 46/20 46/23 134/8 169/17 255/7 UTGO [1] 223/8
utility [2] 206/9 211/17

## V

vacuum [1] 75/12
valid [1] 145/3
validated [1] 241/8
valuable [1] 190/19
valuation [2] 141/15 188/7
value [2] 126/1 182/2
values [1] 58/12

Variance [1] 200/23
various [9] 30/12 68/10 136/24 141/20
149/24 200/6 200/8 202/1 206/9
vast [1] 186/8
vehicle [3] 171/19 172/10 173/24
veneer [3] 113/17 170/11 170/12
vent [1] 106/8
verbally [1] 83/2
Veronica [1] 117/11
version [2] 109/24 132/7
versions [1] 64/8
versus [6] 43/12 43/24 98/12 100/5 196/15 266/22
very [69] 7/1 7/16 11/20 15/16 17/5 17/19 35/14 36/3 38/19 40/24 50/8 50/22 50/25 61/19 62/22 64/12 64/22 64/23 66/6 69/8 69/21 70/8 70/18 81/3 81/4 91/6 91/16 91/22 93/14 96/24 97/12 98/3 101/4 129/12 129/19 132/10 132/20 133/19 137/13 138/8 140/18 143/10 145/21 147/2 148/7 148/7 150/20 151/11 151/22 153/2 157/7 159/22 164/5 164/11 168/5
168/11 173/17 173/20 173/25 176/15
178/24 180/16 188/17 195/24 218/3
220/4 242/4 243/5 270/24
vested [9] 115/18 116/9 119/17 137/18
139/2 139/14 140/1 172/22 173/14
viable [1] 172/4
view [13] 54/14 56/9 67/18 70/8 70/18
70/19 120/5 120/6 166/2 166/3 167/13 227/14 270/25
viewed [2] 174/16 178/14
viewpoint [1] 185/8
vigorous [2] 79/19 84/17
violated [1] 117/14
violates [1] 137/21
violation [2] 124/17 177/18
vires [1] 167/12
virtually [1] 19/15
vis [8] $19 / 1$ 19/1 $19 / 2$ 19/2 134/4 134/4 134/5 134/5
vis-a-vis [4] 19/1 19/2 134/4 134/5
void [1] 167/12
volume [1] 271/2
volumes [2] 61/23 89/12
voluminous [5] 153/11 205/7 257/22
270/9 270/19
voluntary [1] 43/17
volunteers [1] 156/21
vote [2] 73/9 168/12
voter [2] 168/17 170/15
voters [3] 109/14 113/15 170/14
W
wage [3] 237/3 237/7 241/7
wages [1] 237/2
wait [1] 58/3
waiting [1] 75/22
waive [8] $4 / 2544 / 1644 / 1747 / 17$ 59/12 59/13 85/11 151/17
waived [9] 42/9 42/10 43/16 43/20 44/8 44/11 44/23 47/8 50/1
waiver [15] 26/22 31/24 37/17 42/7 42/17
43/5 43/11 44/2 44/2 46/3 46/3 46/5
46/13 46/25 47/4
waiving [4] 24/7 25/4 39/25 44/23
walk [2] 224/4 258/17
walked [1] 160/23
wander [1] 255/25
want [45] 5/20 6/5 14/2 22/4 22/5 24/5
25/5 36/4 42/18 42/18 42/19 43/7 47/19
50/13 50/21 50/25 51/10 53/16 54/9
54/20 60/5 60/12 60/20 60/24 61/24
want... [20] 76/12 79/5 89/19 89/22 91/5 92/4 108/25 131/1 132/9 132/21 133/20 138/6 140/20 146/5 147/7 148/1 180/14 185/11 240/15 261/14
wanted [10] 24/9 28/20 38/17 39/20
58/20 87/16 102/6 109/11 184/1 192/17
wants [4] 48/22 53/19 55/18 99/11
Warfal [1] 123/10
was [522]
wasn't [13] 8/10 12/21 65/11 87/15 93/4 101/10 136/7 158/25 159/1 159/2 183/12 184/8 268/6
waste [3] 221/13 221/22 222/3
wasted [1] 76/1
watched [1] 111/6
water [12] 126/2 186/11 186/14 186/18 188/19 189/6 189/12 189/23 190/1
197/15 217/11 217/18
waters [1] 190/19
way [46] 21/9 21/11 24/7 30/22 32/2 38/6 53/1 55/15 66/9 70/5 71/8 75/13 76/3 76/12 77/10 79/5 80/12 81/1 82/11 84/8 84/9 85/18 87/10 95/25 97/2 98/23 103/1 107/10 115/21 128/1 141/19 144/16 150/17 172/4 174/22 181/18 182/1 182/9 184/17 191/1 207/8 229/10 229/20 234/17 235/20 269/22
Wayne [2] 223/16 226/3
ways [6] 73/20 93/1 107/3 120/8 136/24 154/18
we [597]
we'd [1] 89/7
we'll [19] 15/18 48/10 66/9 78/19 88/15 91/25 94/2 94/9 131/10 138/14 141/1 144/6 144/7 145/20 147/12 192/5 192/6 272/16 272/18
we're [50] $9 / 5$ 13/18 13/20 14/20 15/12 15/14 21/19 21/22 22/17 22/20 24/7 25/3 25/4 30/15 31/9 31/9 32/5 37/8 48/6 50/3 56/15 57/4 57/11 58/15 58/17 67/6 68/15 74/15 75/19 76/23 77/20 77/22 80/23 87/18 88/11 97/4 102/11 106/14 136/2 157/15 157/17 157/22 159/11 165/3 169/21 190/15 208/7 211/5 267/3 271/1 we've [34] 20/25 21/3 25/2 25/12 25/17 30/2 30/24 31/8 38/24 47/17 63/17 72/4 82/9 94/11 94/21 115/6 135/1 135/2 135/13 144/3 151/15 157/14 159/15 167/22 169/8 170/5 177/24 178/16 183/17 184/19 184/22 202/16 216/17 227/10
wear [1] 72/13
Webster [3] 122/1 133/2 133/5
Websters [1] 117/11
week [13] 83/4 83/14 83/21 96/8 101/20 120/9 125/17 141/15 142/22 145/21 151/23 152/24 191/25
weekly [2] 19/13 202/6
weeks [8] 108/13 142/7 151/5 162/5
162/6 162/8 191/17 192/1
weighing [1] 153/11
weighs [1] 80/15
weight [5] 179/13 238/10 238/12 242/16 267/20
Weiss [5] 3/8 5/17 54/4 133/18 237/22 Welcome [1] 2/20
well [95] 7/8 8/20 8/23 10/18 10/22 13/4 13/14 16/20 22/22 25/12 25/15 29/2 30/1 30/17 31/12 33/6 38/22 42/15 42/19 44/4 44/7 53/24 55/4 55/8 55/16 57/14 60/9 62/12 63/1 64/2 65/7 66/10 72/25 75/8

77/15 84/10 84/12 87/19 87/24 95/16 97/9 98/7 100/24 102/1 105/16 106/5 111/5 128/13 129/15 130/3 130/10 132/10 136/15 136/25 138/16 140/19 144/6 160/9 161/4 173/17 179/4 190/20 190/25 191/5 194/5 196/14 196/23 198/22 198/23 203/3 204/11 204/25 212/9 214/16 218/3 222/13 233/4 236/22 236/23 238/15 238/24 239/19 240/8 242/17 243/3 243/5 250/4 253/23 256/6 261/4 265/5 270/24 271/15 272/8 272/22 went [17] 13/9 40/9 102/7 102/8 102/11 112/5 158/10 194/9 200/12 205/17 205/19 207/3 207/3 235/25 236/8 236/22 252/9
were [271] 8/17 8/20 8/22 9/11 9/13 9/14 10/19 11/2 11/13 11/17 12/21 13/15 14/19 20/4 21/5 21/15 23/1 23/7 25/20 25/21 26/18 28/16 28/20 29/6 31/6 31/16 31/20 33/20 35/13 36/20 37/3 37/20 39/18 40/2 40/3 40/4 40/6 40/21 41/1 41/20 41/21 42/2 43/8 45/16 47/23 47/24 48/8 48/19 52/5 52/10 52/16 53/13 56/22 56/24 56/25 56/25 58/24 58/25 61/3 62/1 62/3 62/8 62/17 62/19 62/20 63/4 66/1 66/2 66/8 66/18 68/13 74/6 74/12 82/5 82/10 83/7 84/23 85/3 85/4 85/11 85/17 86/13 86/18 86/21 87/8 88/14 88/22 89/3 90/25 93/15 93/16 94/7 95/17 95/23 101/2 103/5 107/6 108/2 108/3 111/17 116/19 117/8 119/22 119/25 120/1 120/2 120/14 120/21 121/1 121/2 121/4 121/8 121/16 121/23 122/6 123/18 124/1 124/12 131/23 133/2 133/3 133/7 133/8 136/20 136/21 137/4 137/5 143/10 148/16 149/11 149/13 149/15 149/24 150/9 151/13 152/5 152/6 153/24 155/24 156/21 158/23 159/22 159/22 162/19 162/25 163/3 163/11 166/20 167/25 172/1 173/4 173/5 173/7 174/13 174/17 176/10 176/17 178/3 181/15 181/17 182/6 182/9 182/14 182/18 183/24 184/4 184/4 184/7 185/21 189/16 189/18 194/17 196/1 196/6 199/9 199/14 199/20 199/23 200/1 200/11 200/19 203/4 203/15 205/16 205/21 206/5 207/10 207/12 209/5 209/5 212/21 213/1 214/7 214/12 215/6 215/7 218/9 218/12 218/18 219/4 219/17 220/12 222/22 224/19 224/20 225/21 226/21 227/1 227/24 227/25 230/10 230/14 231/2 236/1 236/5 236/15 236/18 236/19 237/17 238/1 238/21 239/1 240/2 240/4 240/4 241/8 245/14 245/16 245/17 245/19 245/24 246/2 246/4 246/4 247/16 248/5 248/16 248/25 249/1 249/3 249/4 249/8 249/22 249/24 250/20 250/22 250/25 251/10 251/13 251/15 252/25 253/1 253/3 253/5 253/7 253/11 253/16 254/1 255/7 256/11 258/13 258/14 261/4 262/23 267/25 268/9 268/10 268/16 268/23 268/25 269/5
weren't [11] 7/24 8/11 9/10 45/12 48/9 57/1 67/25 81/5 83/1 87/25 175/7
Wertheimer [10] $3 / 15$ 18/20 18/24 24/1 25/4 25/15 26/3 52/15 52/20 132/19
Wertheimer's [1] 52/19
Werthheimer [1] 23/22
west [2] 2/22 208/23
Western [2] 194/11 194/14
what [395]
what's [22] 8/9 10/22 11/22 13/6 15/5 29/21 47/20 57/12 58/10 75/10 80/9

88/13 94/14 103/6 147/16 162/3 186/7 209/21 210/11 225/24 235/10 271/14 whatever [6] 51/21 68/9 132/8 140/10 161/10 179/2
wheat [1] 83/13
when [71] 14/1 22/19 24/12 31/12 32/9 41/21 42/18 43/4 43/23 44/8 45/10 45/10 61/2 62/3 62/18 78/16 84/15 86/8 87/9 88/10 95/10 97/25 98/4 100/20 102/16 103/5 106/18 110/20 117/16 119/21 120/25 125/4 127/12 128/6 132/14 133/10 133/25 141/5 152/17 160/16 171/5 177/1 177/9 178/18 184/7 194/1 195/13 196/9 197/1 201/18 201/22 201/24 208/18 213/21 217/23 218/25 222/6 223/12 225/12 227/14 227/22 230/22 233/22 240/2 241/11 243/18 245/1 245/22 255/1 256/18 268/16 whenever [2] 53/1 144/9
where [85] 9/24 10/11 13/15 17/22 19/8 19/22 21/18 25/14 25/21 26/5 28/4 28/9 29/15 30/13 33/3 46/12 47/14 47/14 61/19 67/22 73/14 74/18 80/20 85/3 95/16 97/12 101/15 102/8 102/12 102/12 103/11 103/22 111/4 121/15 137/3 137/3 146/9 146/17 147/8 147/23 149/17 159/14 160/23 171/10 172/20 175/23 176/2 176/8 181/8 181/24 196/20 197/3 197/6 201/4 202/1 206/21 208/22 211/2 213/24 215/16 218/22 220/12 222/13 225/16 227/10 229/12 230/6 236/2 236/14 236/18 238/24 249/22 250/17 251/13 252/3 253/5 253/15 253/15 256/3 266/13 266/15 267/18 267/19 268/9 268/10
wherein [1] 238/19
Whereupon [3] 39/8 131/13 192/9 wherewithal [1] 186/15
whether [42] 21/20 25/21 34/23 40/13 40/16 41/14 45/4 46/2 46/6 47/3 64/12 68/17 68/21 69/4 70/2 74/11 78/10 78/13 78/16 84/23 87/13 91/11 91/17 94/24 95/25 96/6 102/13 102/14 103/1 119/22 127/19 128/21 130/18 130/20 139/16 151/18 160/1 161/20 180/14 180/17 184/18 200/21
which [160] $1 / 14$ 6/6 10/23 10/24 11/7 11/9 11/20 14/25 19/5 20/3 21/4 21/14 22/24 26/17 29/11 30/14 31/11 33/7 35/4 37/18 42/6 45/17 46/14 48/8 48/9 48/21 49/15 51/1 54/19 58/2 59/7 63/15 64/21 66/21 68/17 74/17 75/7 77/20 79/6 79/7 79/10 80/15 84/19 87/18 90/9 90/17 93/23 94/2 94/11 95/2 95/17 97/11 99/19 100/6 100/16 101/7 102/24 102/25 109/22 110/12 112/17 116/15 119/1 121/7 122/8 124/2 127/1 128/1 128/25 129/20 129/20 130/13 131/21 134/11 139/10 140/7 140/17 140/23 141/15 143/19 144/8 145/22 147/3 148/12 148/17 150/8 153/13 153/22 155/15 156/21 157/14 158/24 158/25 159/21 161/6 161/10 163/9 165/5 165/5 165/15 166/18 166/21 166/23 168/10 169/10 169/20 171/8 171/21 171/22 171/24 175/8 175/15 178/21 179/4 179/5 185/12 186/11 187/19 188/13 188/15 188/19 189/11 198/3 198/10 198/14 205/10 213/2 213/19 214/6 215/7 223/2 225/25 226/15 226/20 227/18 230/8 232/13 235/9 237/12 238/18 239/17 239/20 240/2 240/12 249/17 250/11 252/11 256/5 257/3 257/11 257/23 263/23
which... [8] 264/16 265/25 268/19 268/25 270/25 271/1 271/22 272/13
while [10] 17/8 23/17 54/13 68/15 75/23 112/12 131/4 146/22 163/1 217/25 who [76] 5/15 8/7 10/8 12/18 12/21 25/23 25/24 28/8 28/20 31/6 32/1 36/10 38/3 38/4 38/5 42/22 47/11 47/15 47/16 48/21 55/4 55/9 72/13 73/9 79/19 80/5 80/10 80/18 80/20 80/22 82/13 84/25 89/21 99/1 99/21 109/12 109/18 111/20 113/10 116/14 120/18 129/17 141/23 145/11 154/3 154/10 155/3 156/17 157/21 157/24 160/16 177/16 184/16 187/18 187/18 192/21 192/25 193/16 205/5 217/4 217/11 230/16 230/16 240/3 240/17 241/17 245/18 245/19 247/22 248/21 249/10 250/2 252/5 254/10 258/9 271/21
who's [1] 80/19
whoever [1] 67/18
whole [4] 73/21 76/17 99/9 100/21
wholly [3] 28/1 31/10 31/12
whom [5] 3/12 36/10 185/1 185/4 223/19 why [32] $9 / 5$ 13/11 $16 / 4$ 19/25 24/25 28/23 34/13 34/19 35/18 50/10 57/4 62/6 70/20 101/13 106/14 125/21 126/25 149/21 160/19 163/19 177/8 196/25 202/22 205/14 218/19 224/2 224/19 232/14 259/7 267/14 269/9 271/13 wide [1] 135/8
will [211] $1 / 141 / 153 / 124 / 225 / 105 / 15$ 5/16 6/3 7/18 9/2 14/2 26/2 27/14 31/18 35/15 37/7 37/8 37/9 39/6 41/11 42/14 43/7 45/20 45/22 45/22 45/23 48/11 50/15 51/16 52/11 52/25 53/21 53/25 55/6 59/23 60/1 61/9 61/13 62/2 62/9 63/3 63/21 64/6 64/20 64/24 65/1 65/2 65/6 65/12 65/17 65/25 66/23 67/3 67/11 67/23 69/16 72/14 73/8 79/10 80/2 81/10 81/20 81/23 82/11 82/14 82/15 85/8 85/16 86/3 86/11 86/25 88/5 89/10 89/13 89/19 89/20 89/21 89/21 89/25 90/21 91/13 91/16 93/9 95/2 96/8 96/11 97/1 97/16 99/23 99/24 99/25 101/3 104/6 105/4 105/9 105/13 106/2 106/4 106/13 107/4 109/5 109/19 111/22 111/24 113/3 113/4 115/23 116/2 116/7 116/15 116/16 117/3 117/6 117/17 117/19 118/17 118/24 119/12 119/14 119/15 119/20 120/18 121/22 125/24 126/17 129/9 129/12 129/14 129/16 129/16 129/21 132/13 135/21 136/22 140/14 142/9 143/15 145/15 146/19 146/25 147/4 147/8 147/11 147/13 148/17 149/4 149/17 150/2 151/11 151/18 152/18 153/13 153/18 153/20 155/8 155/19 156/6 156/15 156/23 168/15 169/1 169/13 171/3 171/5 171/14 171/21 171/23 172/2 172/5 172/9 173/20 177/21 178/10 180/20 180/24 181/12 182/3 182/24 183/15 185/2 185/9 185/21 186/7 186/14 187/6 187/7 187/9 187/11 188/6 188/16 189/14 189/24 190/4 190/11 190/18 191/7 191/12 192/16 193/2 195/25 214/23 224/4 225/23 228/14 239/21 263/9 267/2 272/23 273/13 273/14 273/20
William [3] 3/15 18/24 132/19
willing [7] 24/13 47/25 53/20 55/5 56/3 82/19 140/9
willingness [1] 51/20
win [1] 107/1
wind [1] 102/4
wise [1] 238/2
wish [4] 33/25 104/12 104/15 270/14 withdrawing [1] 56/10
withdrawn [1] 7/23
withheld [6] 7/9 7/20 21/15 21/21 39/2 52/16
withhold [1] 90/2
withholds [1] $46 / 9$
within [11] 38/11 38/21 47/15 59/6 93/12
102/17 106/23 107/1 122/10 168/21 177/19
without [15] 5/11 8/25 24/4 44/4 63/18
66/15 103/18 129/2 158/2 184/16 189/13 236/24 257/25 260/21 263/10
withs [2] 74/4 111/22
witness [34] 5/9 51/12 51/13 54/16 55/9 63/17 65/2 109/18 110/16 128/16 138/15 192/16 193/5 205/1 205/5 206/4 232/20 237/24 238/13 238/18 241/17 241/22 242/15 242/19 243/1 261/13 261/23 262/10 262/13 265/5 269/12 269/14 269/15 272/21
witness's [2] 51/13 265/7
witnesses [18] 8/8 20/1 46/23 53/21 53/24 53/25 54/8 54/11 61/9 63/11 116/14 120/17 125/24 148/18 157/22 157/25 192/20 192/25
woman [1] 145/18
won't [5] 65/12 99/10 144/6 232/16 272/22
Wonderful [1] 109/8
word [5] 1/14 137/1 170/24 182/17 182/17
wording [1] 12/14
words [8] 152/22 170/2 170/12 170/25 173/25 182/8 223/20 270/8 work [80] 7/22 7/25 8/3 8/5 9/17 9/21 10/11 $11 / 21$ 11/21 12/3 $12 / 4$ 12/8 $12 / 13$ 13/11 14/9 14/11 14/13 14/14 14/15 22/17 26/2 27/20 28/2 28/8 28/24 29/22 31/22 31/23 31/24 32/4 33/6 33/9 33/15 40/8 41/8 42/6 43/12 43/16 43/24 44/2 44/3 47/4 47/9 48/20 49/2 49/22 49/23 49/24 52/4 52/24 53/1 55/6 62/25 74/6 75/23 84/2 95/1 96/22 104/23 126/3 145/23 156/20 156/22 158/14 187/25 188/4 193/23 195/7 195/8 195/9 195/14 195/16 196/10 198/5 199/3 200/20 200/25 203/2 217/11 242/2 worked [10] 87/14 89/25 193/20 195/6 195/8 195/10 195/11 200/15 239/4 240/1 working [16] 12/16 12/20 25/6 28/16 31/6 45/16 47/16 93/5 96/21 149/2 154/4 156/10 203/18 218/3 239/1 256/15 world [1] 184/1
worry [1] 63/7
worse [1] 261/2
worth [1] 63/21
would [238] 3/9 4/19 7/4 8/14 9/16 10/15 11/4 12/1 13/16 13/16 13/17 14/12 14/20 15/5 15/5 15/13 15/16 17/19 18/2 18/7 18/20 18/25 20/11 21/8 22/11 22/12 22/14 22/18 22/23 23/13 23/18 23/19 29/9 29/18 30/18 30/25 31/23 32/4 33/6 34/2 34/3 34/5 36/7 37/12 37/16 37/16 39/15 42/4 42/21 44/22 45/5 45/7 47/6 48/5 49/14 49/18 49/22 50/1 50/5 51/23 52/3 53/23 54/20 54/22 55/2 55/8 58/1 58/22 62/4 62/8 67/20 69/14 70/2 74/7 76/24 77/1 77/24 81/2 82/18 82/25 83/2 83/6 83/6 83/7 83/19 83/24 84/6 87/13

89/4 90/18 95/21 96/6 100/4 100/20 101/25 102/15 103/10 103/16 105/19 108/5 108/19 109/22 112/4 112/8 114/22 116/24 118/15 120/12 121/12 122/19 122/23 124/10 125/11 127/5 127/7 128/10 129/17 130/11 130/13 130/14 130/22 131/7 133/22 134/1 134/10 137/6 137/11 137/18 138/21 139/23 144/9 149/19 152/25 154/4 158/5 159/10 159/11 161/13 161/13 163/13 163/20 164/10 164/11 164/13 165/25 172/25 173/15 175/8 175/9 181/22 181/25 183/22 184/3 184/5 184/18 189/19 196/15 203/19 203/21 208/5 208/25 211/5 213/24 214/18 215/19 216/12 219/5 219/18 219/25 222/6 222/8 222/9 222/11 222/14 222/17 222/19 224/21 224/25 226/2 226/2 226/3 226/4 226/9 226/15 227/11 227/15 229/14 229/16 230/9 230/11 233/2 233/3 233/5 233/8 233/9 233/19 234/7 234/8 234/13 235/1 235/14 236/11 237/24 237/25 240/20 240/23 240/25 241/3 241/5 241/22 241/25 243/12 243/13 243/13 243/14 248/10 250/24 251/7 257/12 260/16 261/2 261/6 263/5 263/8 265/3 265/25 266/16 266/17 266/19 266/23 268/19 268/21 269/7 269/14 270/3 270/15 270/16 271/10
wouldn't [3] 95/7 101/24 136/22
wound [2] 29/1 102/5
wrestle [1] 146/24
write [1] 256/21
writes [1] 99/1
writing [5] 80/4 83/2 155/12 159/7 159/12 written [5] 26/19 120/1 127/8 256/21
256/23
wrong [3] 43/9 65/9 112/6
wrote [4] 170/16 182/22 206/17 216/11
Y
yeah [6] 14/23 33/25 93/10 176/21 253/24 263/16
year [74] 6/20 9/11 $10 / 15$ 15/1 44/9 45/14 45/15 93/23 196/9 196/11 196/12 206/11 208/6 208/16 210/12 210/13 210/14 210/15 210/17 210/24 212/22 212/24 213/5 214/20 215/2 215/5 215/5 218/11 218/12 218/15 219/17 219/18 219/19 219/21 220/21 220/22 222/13 223/5 224/3 224/16 226/13 227/18 227/23 228/18 229/2 229/10 229/11 230/11 231/22 231/23 233/3 235/2 235/11 237/8 237/8 242/1 243/10 243/15 244/16 245/4 248/14 251/22 253/2 258/5 258/5 258/7 258/20 259/15 259/20 260/18 263/19 264/17 264/23 269/18
years [40] 41/1 41/13 41/16 45/14 62/10 62/18 63/5 106/17 111/7 114/18 135/7 148/6 193/21 194/24 195/18 236/6 236/12 236/20 237/14 245/3 250/12 255/10 258/3 258/13 258/16 258/19 259/18 260/13 265/16 265/18 265/25 266/2 266/5 266/6 266/11 266/12 267/18 268/3 268/9 268/10
yellow [2] 115/17 118/11
yes [101] 20/2 23/16 23/20 31/14 32/18 34/2 34/2 48/2 48/16 53/2 53/6 59/10 78/24 79/15 80/16 87/25 111/4 111/8 111/9 114/16 126/19 132/16 137/14 137/19 137/19 138/3 161/23 171/10 174/10 174/15 175/17 186/17 193/15 195/16 196/11 196/18 198/13 198/17

```
Y
yes... [63] 199/1 199/17 199/21 199/23
201/17 201/21 202/8 202/10 202/19
203/10 208/2 208/17 209/7 209/20 210/8
210/19 212/12 216/6 216/23 217/8
219/15 222/7 222/9 222/20 223/22 224/8
225/5 226/16 226/19 227/7 232/1 232/3
232/5 233/13 234/3 236/23 243/21
245/12 245/16 246/4 246/8 246/10
246/18 247/2 247/21 249/8 249/20 250/9
250/16 252/9 252/13 253/14 253/18
254/24 256/14 257/8 259/6 260/14
264/13 264/19 264/21 267/13 269/2
yesterday [4] 49/5 57/24 79/1 129/13
yet [12] 46/9 54/20 66/25 117/8 118/1
    118/13 124/22 125/19 129/19 136/8
    190/25 225/22
yield [1] 208/5
York [4] 73/23 158/22 158/22 252/4
York's [1] 73/22
you [544]
you'll [4] 62/13 79/10 83/15 133/25
you're [22] 14/14 21/23 23/17 50/11
56/10 56/16 59/5 59/7 59/19 63/10 75/24
77/8 80/3 80/10 94/15 101/17 159/6
159/6 191/22 195/4 197/1 216/4
you've [15] 74/25 75/5 76/1 80/8 105/23
159/5 162/21 165/6 168/9 176/16 176/18
181/14 185/2 189/19 202/20
young [11] 151/9 157/23 193/17 193/18
    193/19 193/20 194/16 198/18 231/25
242/3 248/6
Young's [1] 193/22
your [279]
yourself [3] 50/3 202/25 203/21
Z
zero [1] 79/5
```
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ROUGH DRAFT - DAY 2 - 10/24/13

Court Clerk: Case No. 13-53846, City of Detroit, Michigan.

THE COURT: Is anybody not here? All right. Let's assume everyone is here and we don't have to repeat appearances

A couple of housekeeping matters.
Mr. Stewart, I received and actually read the memorandum that was filed a few minutes ago on this issue of allowing the witness to testify about projections. Thank you to ever on your staff stayed up all night doing that.

MR. STEWART: Fortunately, Mr. DiPompeo did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thanks to him. As a matter of process, however, before we have any further argument on it, it is appropriate to take some time not only for us, but for the objecting parties to study it and look at the case ish ish ish that have been cited and prepare, so I think we'll proceed with his cross examination and perhaps reconsider the issue after lunch.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Your Honor

THE COURT: The second housekeeping item is in regard to the Governor's testimony. Is Mr. Schneider here? Mr. Howell is here.

MR. HOWELL: Steven Howell, Dickinson Wright, special assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of the state.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Is it the parties' agreement and the Governor's intention to appear at 1:00 on Monday?

MR. HOWELL: I don't know that -- I believe that's the plan without the limitations suggested. Is that --

MR. DeCHIARA: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I was distracted for a moment.

MR. HOWELL: If I may, Your Honor, I believe there is ongoing discussions between Matthew, he is meeting today with the Governor to work those details out, but I thought the offer was 1:00 o'clock on Monday

MR. DeCHIARA: Yes, the state offered to produce the Governor on 1:00 Monday and there has been no agreement on the limitation of his testimony how.

MR. HOWELL: That is correct, Your Honor
THE COURT: Then in that circumstance,
he Court will change its plans and we will run Court until 5:00 instead of -- had previously scheduled time of $3: 00$ because I don't want to have to require the Governor to come back a second day on account of my schedule, so we will plan ongoing until at least five on Monday to try to get all of his testimony in in one day

MR. DeCHIARA: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HOWELL: Thank you, Your Honor, we ppreciate the accommodation. Thank you very much

THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed
with the testimony, Your Honor.
MR. RUEGGER: Your Honor, excuse me. Art Ruegger for Dentons on behalf of the Retiree Committee. We respectfully request a little more time to read the memo from Jones Day and respond

THE COURT: Do what you can over lunch
and then we'll see if you need more time.
MR. RUEGGER: Very well, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sir, would you resume the
witness stand? And you're still under oath so you may just have a seat and we'll continue with the examination.

1 MR. SHERWOOD: Good morning, Your Honor. 2 3 4 6 BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. You were engaged by the City of Detroit in May of 2011, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So as of now, you've been on the job for the City for over two years, is that fair to say?
A. That is correct.
Q. And when you were initially engaged in May of 2011 through the appointment of Mr. Orr as the emergency manager, you reported to officials, City officials; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And some of those City officials include Kirk Lewis, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And who is Kirk Lewis?
A. Kirk Lewis was the former chief of staff for Mayor Bing.
Q. And Chris Brown, do you know that name?
A. I do.
appointed?
A. No, our general updates are with Mr. orr.
Q. And since March of this year, you're not reporting to the City council of the City of Detroit, isn't that right, since March of this year when Mr. Orr was appointed?
A. Not specifically, no.
Q. Now Mr. Orr was appointed in March of this year, so at the time of his appointment, you had been on the job with Ernst \& Young for about a year and ten months, correct?
A. Sounds about right.
Q. And yesterday you testified on direct about various conversations, things you told Mr. Orr and the other professionals for the City, correct? Do you remember that testimony from yesterday?

## A. Yes.

Q. So I assume that when you were updating Mr. Orr and the rest of the City's professionals, you drew on your year and ten months worth of experience that you had working for the City up to that point?
A. For certain aspects of those updates, yes.
Q. Do you recall in the course of your services for the City, before the appointment of the Emergency Manager March 2013, providing services in
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A. Can you shorten the question, sir? Which financial review team?
Q. Do you recall in late 2012, early 2013, working with people from the City concerning the financial review team's report?
A. We were working during that timeframe on the specific -- improving our mechanisms for improving the cash flows of the City, yes.
Q. okay. And as you just testified, one of the topics you were working on during that period was improving cash flows, correct?
A. That's right. We were looking at different alternatives, how the City could improve its cash flow position.
Q. And you were doing that work for the City and its officials, correct, before Mr. Orr got involved?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did you attend meetings in December of 2012 where the issue of the City's cash flows was discussed?
A. Meetings with whom?
Q. Members of the City, members of the City council, members of the mayor's staff?
A. yes.
Q. document. It's AFSCME 551, document 551. And Your Honor, I believe there are -- are you okay with the screen or -- because I think there might be some hard copies too?
A. I'm okay
Q. okay.
A. Thank you.
Q. Now this letter is dated February 22, 2013, correct?
A. That is correct
Q. And I would like you to scroll down to the bottom of the letter, the paragraph marked cash crisis. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there is a reference to Ernst \& Young in that paragraph and the administration, counsel president pew, Council President Brown, Council Member Cockrel fiscal staff, Ernst \& Young consultants, along with Miller Canfield met over the December holiday break to come up with a cash plan about counter measures to get the City through June 30 th, 2013. Do you recall participating in those

## meetings?

## A. yes, I do.

Honor. I was just asking him using it to refresh his recollection in terms of things that happened.
Q. And you see that in this letter, the authors conclude on the first sentence that a satisfactory plan exists to resolve the City's cash crisis. Do you see that?
A. I see it. I didn't write this, but I see it.
Q. You do see it. But this was written after your lengthy meetings over the holiday break, correct?
A. This was written on February 22nd. We met during the December timeframe to come up with different ideas how the City could preserve cash, which included a significant amount of deferrals, yes.
Q. Okay. But as a result --

THE COURT: One second, counsel. Have you seen this letter before?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, this letter was handed to me during --

THE COURT: That would be a yes or no. THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: You've never seen this letter before. THE WITNESS: I have seen it, I have not read it is my answer. I was given it during my deposition.

THE COURT: Is this letter in evidence? MR. SHERWOOD: I believe it is not, Your

THE COURT: It's proper to refresh a witness' recollection when he says he doesn't have a recollection. I haven't heard that yet.

MR. SHERWOOD: Okay.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. Did you believe in February of -- February 22nd, 2013, that a satisfactory plan existed to address the City's cash crisis?
A. What a satisfactory plan means is subjective. What I can say is during the December timeframe, we had a lot of meetings with the City officials to see how the City could preserve cash to increase the cash position over the next few months and that predominantly resulted in the City coming up with a plan that said most of these would have to come through deferrals because what the City could actually impact in terms of permanent cost reductions, those options are very limited, so the majority of any savings that would come or any cash increase would come would come through the deferral of either pension related costs or additional healthcare related costs. That's at least the -what I view as what the plan was at that point in
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Q. Did you ever cite size the City or the council with respect to their plans to address cash flow issues during the February 2013 time period?
A. Criticize, directly criticize in terms of what the satisfactory plan was?
Q. Did you ever go to the City council or the City professionals and say I disagree with your cash management, cash flow plan, do something else?
A. During this timeframe, I made very clear that based on the experience that I had over the past 18 months working with the City that options that the City was undertaking to preserve cash were predominantly based on deferrals and not actual structural cost savings. That's what I clearly highlighted.
Q. Let me ask you about additional revenue collection during the period of early 2013. Do you recall whether the City was concerned about revenue collection from the 36 th District Court citations which the City -- where the City's share would be $\$ 199$ million?
A. No, I do not.
Q. You don't -- do you recall that that was an issue?
A. No, I do not.

| $13-\mid$ |
| :--- | :--- |
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Q. Do you recall being asked to look into the level of collections from the 36 th District Court in the amount of $\$ 199$ million?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you know what -- do you know whether the 36 th District Court is a source of revenue for the City of Detroit?
A. I think there are some collections, yes, that come through the 36th District Court. I'm not exactly sure of the amount off the 36 th District Court collections.
Q. You can't even estimate what the amount of the collections are from the 36th District Court for 2013?
A. No, I cannot off the top of my head.
Q. So Ernst \& Young didn't look into those collections or whether they were slower than they should be, is that fair to say?
A. That is fair. Ernst \& Young did not go into any specific analysis on 36 th District Court on their collections.
Q. Now you discussed a little bit yesterday about the general fund and the -- is all of the City's debt attributable to the general fund?
A. no.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I can at least

BY MR. SHERWOOD: Does that sound right to you?
A. That could be an approximation based on the existing assumptions with respect to unfunded
liabilities from a pension and OPEB standpoint. existing assumptions with respect to unfunded
liabilities from a pension and OPEB standpoint.
Q. And the City has other business type activity funds, department of water and sewage, department of transportation and municipal parking, and those
funds are not part of the general fund, correct?
A. That is correct. They are enterprise funds.
Q. And do you know whether the total pension
obligation of the City, is that all attributable to the general fund or is some of that attributable to
Q. Does the total amount of debt that the City has, does the number 14.9 billion, does that sound in the ballpark?
A. The amount of debt of 14 billion sounds a little high because in my mind, I remember the $\$ 18$ billion of long-term like its as a total number of which -so that sounds a little high to me. If you could break it down for me, it will rerefresh your recollection my recollection.
Q. Let me -- can we put the letter up again and turn to page three. Under long-term liabilties there -MR. STEWART: Your Honor, I object. We've been over this that he's not testifying to a lack of recollection. He hasn't seen the letter unless there is.

THE COURT: No, the witness did indicate some uncertainty about this question, so if this refreshes his recollection, I'll permit it. Does this refresh your recollection about the debt of the City?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, it's the long-term liabilities of the City, which as noted here it's $\$ 14.8$ billion, so.

THE COURT: But the question for you is not what the letter says because the letter's not
$\square--\frac{1}{14}-$
in evidence. The question is what do you remember after having seen this letter. frame up what was being asked of me in terms of the total indebtedness because when I look at debt, I consider it as pure debt versus other long-term liabilities. Yes, it does at least give me a frame of reference to what the question was.
THE COURT: Okay.

Q. And does this document, do you agree with the
statement in the document that only 15 percent or
7.36 billion is attributable to the general fund?
statement in the document that only 15 percent or
7.36 billion is attributable to the general fund?
Q. And the City has other business type activity
A. That is correct. They are enterprise funds.

the enterprise funds?
A. The pension liability is due to the systems, the general rear time systems and the police and fire systems. The general retirement system is comprised of the general fund employees as well as water and sewer employees, as well as department of transportation employees.
Q. So is it fair to say that some of the pension obligation is the responsibility of water and sewer yes, that would be -- that would be a fair assumption in terms of what they've been doing.
Q. Now in again, early 2013, are you aware that the

City of Detroit was in the process and had been in the process of trying to achieve certain cost saving initiatives?
A. I don't recall a specific initiatives in early of 2013, but the City has been in a constant effort to reduce costs and looking for cost savings initiatives.
Q. And would you agree that by March of 2013 , $\$ 150$ million of cost saving initiatives had been achieved by the City of Detroit?
A. compared to about what timeframe?
Q. Simply do you agree that $\$ 150$ million of cost savings had been achieved prior to March 2013?
A. It's difficult for me to answer a question on cost savings achieved by a particular date unless you can frame for me over what course of time your question is related to.
Q. Can you put up Exhibit 419, please. Your Honor, I think this is in evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
0
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And certainly on March 2013, the recovery plan for the City of Detroit was not finished,
A. I'm sorry, what recovery plan are you referring to?
agree that the debt obligations of the general fund in March of 2013 were $\$ 400$ million lower than five years prior to that?
A. You're referring to the outstanding debt obligations, I assume. I do not know what the outstanding debt balance was five years ago to be able to draw inference to a five or $\$ 400$ million number.
Q. And I think we've covered this already, but if you look at -- would you agree that as of March 201, approximately $\$ 6$ billion of City debt was owed by the water and sewer department and does not have an impact on the general fund?
A. I agree with the first part of that statement that there's roughly about $\$ 6$ billion of revenue bonds outstanding for the water and sewer department, yes.
Q. Now again, March 2013, you had no idea that the emergency manager was going to be appointed, isn't that right?
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Q.

Well, were there other cost saving initiatives that the City and its advisors, including yourself, had planned?
A. Going back to December of 2012?
Q. ㄴ
A. I'll just finish.
Q. Go ahead. I'm sorry?
A. And I'll answer your question.

As I testified earlier, in December 2012, the City, along with us and some of the other advisors went through a detailed process to figure out how to improve the city's cash position, as I testified earlier. The majority of those were related to predominantly deferrals of bills that the City had due, not paying them on time.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. I asked a specific question. The specific question was in March of 2013, were there future initiatives that the City had planned. And with due respect, I thought the answer was non-responsive. I think he was going back to 2012. So I would ask you just to answer that question.

THE WITNESS: I do not recall of specific initiatives as of March 2013 from a cost saving standpoint that were either not in progress or had
not been achieved that were of significance in my mind that stand out that were of significance as of March of 2013.
MR. SHERWOOD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. (By Mr. Sherwood): As of March 2013 -- and again, this is before the appointment of Mr. Orr, the City had not only retained you but it also had retained the Miller Buckfire firm and it had retained Conway MacKenzie, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So they were on the scene in March 2013 before the emergency manager was appointed, correct?
A. yes.
Q. And it was yourself and Mr. Moore and Mr. Buckfire, basically the same team of professionals were advising the City in their restructuring effort before Mr . Orr was appointed and those same restructuring advisors are advising Mr. Orr now, true?
A. We were all collectively advising the City from a restructuring standpoint, yes.
Q. okay. So those advisors and yourself had been retained and if you look at the document, page five, again, going down to paragraph C, again, we
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talked about future cost saving initiatives, you said you didn't recall anything specific, but scrolling through those items in C, would you agree that those had been identified by the City and its professionals as potential future cost saving
initiatives that were in process?
A. Yes.
Q. Now the last one there is asset monetization
strategies. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Who was the person that was involved from the professional side in the asset monetization strategy?
A. It would have been Miller Buckfire.
Q. And what is your -- asset monetization strategy, that means taking City's assets and either financing them or selling them to raise cash to pay liabilities, can we agree with that, agree on that?
A. or any other -- I would say any other monetization strategy to create cash for the City. That's the way I would frame it.
Q. And to the extent that assets were monetized in 2013, those monetized assets would enhance the cash profile, the actual cash collections during that period for the general fund? . Let me just add
that.
A. If you sell something, you would intuitively have more cash, however, to answer the second part of your question, which is to improve the cash profile, my personal experience is selling assets to improve cash versus and not addressing the operational structural in balance that exists. I don't know if that improves the cash profile as you put it, but if you sell assets that generate cash, you will have more cash, yes.
Q. And you can use that cash to satisfy your liabilities, correct?
A. Cash is cash, so if you have more cash, you have more cash.
Q. Now let's stay in the period of time before the appointment of Mr. Orr. Were there discussions among the professionals and the City concerning asset monetization strategies?
A. Not that I was specifically a part of, so I do not know.
Q. And do you recall any conversations with Miller Buckfire concerning asset monetization strategies?
A. Yes

Q. Was Miller Buckfire concerned that asset monetization in March 2013 or thereabouts would (l) | ROUGH - DAY 2 |
| :---: |

have a negative impact on the City of Detroit's ability to prove that it was eligible for Chapter 9 bankruptcy?
A. That's a long question. And you asked if Miller Buckfire was concerned.
Q. Right?
A. I can't answer the question if Miller Buckfire was concerned or not. Would you have to ask Miller Buckfire.
Q. Did Miller Buckfire say anything to you -- and Mr. Buckfire or any of his colleagues -- did he say anything to you or in your presence where he or they suggested that they were concerned that if the City of Detroit monetized assets in 2013, early 2013, March, February, January, that that would have a negative impact on the City of Detroit's ability to prove that it was eligible for Chapter 9 bankruptcy?
A. I do not recall of a conversation like that.
Q. Did Miller Buckfire express any opposition in your presence to strategies that would call for short term monetization of assets in early 2013?
A. I do not recall.
Q. You were at the Jones Day meeting at the airport on January 29th -- I'm sorry, not the Jones Day
meeting. That's not fair. The counsel interview

## meeting on January 29th, 2013, at the airport, yes?

A. Yes, I was at that meeting.
Q. And were you there when Jones Day gave their presentation?
A. I was.
Q. And is it safe to assume when Jones Day or any other attorneys that were giving their presentation were presenting, you were particularly interested in statements that they had to make about liquidity and cash flow and such, yes?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. Can you put up 418 , please. This is a pretty lengthy document. If you need a hard copy, we can get it for you, but let's try it without because the statements -- I'm not going to go through the whole thing. Is that okay, Your Honor?
the court: sure, try it.
MR. SHERWOOD: It is in evidence.
By MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. Was this presentation handed out during the meeting at the airport?
A. Yes.
Q. And just to be clear, this presentation was given not only by Jones Day, but Mr. Orr was also giving

this presentation to the group?
A. He was part of the team that presented, yes.
Q. okay. Can we turn to -- let's start with page 30 of the presentation.
the court: Excuse me, sir. Has the
Court been given copies of these exhibits? MR. SHERWOOD: Yes, Your Honor. I think we gave two to the law clerks and. THE COURT: Are they up here somewhere? MR. SHERWOOD: I believe so. This is marked in the Retiree Committee's exhibits as Exhibit 418. It might also be an AFSCME exhibit. I think everybody offered this one. THE COURT: Okay. So the tabs in the binder don't correspond to the numbers of the exhibits.

MR. SHERWOOD: I think, Your Honor,
that's because we didn't decide on the prefix. THE COURT: Okay. And we're looking at what exhibit number now? MR. SHERWOOD: It's 418, Your Honor. THE COURT: I have it. We're all set.
Thank you. MR. SHERWOOD: You're welcome. A lot of documents.

BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. Turning to page 30, Mr. Malhotra, and if you look at the third line down, it says asset sales pose challenges to generating substantial revenue. Do you see that?
A. I see that line, yes.
Q. And do you recall whether this slide was presented at the meeting?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you recall any discussion about the next line, sale of assets to pay creditors may not promote revitalization. Do you recall that being presented by Mr. Orr or anyone else at Jones Day?
A. Not specifically.
Q. Okay. Now if you turn to the next page, page 31, and these are the speaker notes for the slide. And if you go right to the middle, there's a thing called -- a line called note. And it says asset monetization outside of bankruptcy may implicate eligibility requirement that the City be insolvent, e.g., measured by short term cash. During the presentation, did anyone from Jones Day suggest to the group that it was not a good idea to engage in
Per
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asset monetization outside of bankruptcy because it could hurt the City's case on insolvency?
A. I do not recall that. They had five presentations for every presenting group.
Q. Let's look at page 62 and 63 of this presentation. I know it's a long presentation, but Mr. Malhotra, did you recall any discussion by Mr. Orr or the rest of the team at Jones Day about evaluating the impact of any asset sale on Chapter 9 eligibility? Do you recall anything about that date? Does this slide refresh your recollection at all?
A. It does not. No, I do not recall.
Q. And let me just ask one more question about -- on this topic. If you turn to the next page, maybe this will help you. If you look at this speaker notes at the top under asset sales, again, we talk -- it says concerns regarding eligibility for Chapter 9 may be implicated. Any transaction should be reviewed and structured to address any eligibility issues, EG ear marking of funds. Do you recall any discussions by Jones Day during this presentation where they suggested that funds that come from asset monetization be ear marked so that they don't end up in the general fund and thereby jeopardize the Chapter 9 eligibility?
A. No, I do not recall.
Q. Do you recall any discussions during that or with Mr. Buckfire where the idea was to the extent that we monetize any assets, let's make sure they don't -- that the proceeds don't end up in the general fund? Anything like that?
A. I do not remember of any specific conversation of ear marking or highlighting assets like this. I mean, Your Honor, our general discussions were always asset sales were one time sources and but we needed to continue to work to fix the ongoing operating deficit that -- and the cash deficit that's been existing at the City for a long time.
Let me ask you one more question about that meeting. Do you recall any suggestions by Mr. Orr or Jones Day during that presentation that the City's policy should be to defend against approaches that focus on monetization of assets to pay creditors?
A.
Q. Can you turn to page 26?

Does that refresh your recollection? Fourth bullet point down, "Defend against calls for expense reduction and monetizing assets to pay creditors"?

A. No, I do not recall a specific conversation like that.
Q. Now just to -- just so I understand your testimony from yesterday, when you talked about the revenues that you knew about through May of 2013, to the extent that there was any type of asset monetization before May of 2013, the proceeds of asset monetization would enhance -- could have enhanced the general fund, is that fair to say?
A. Yes, if you sell assets that generate cash, you get more cash.
Q. All right. I would like -- lets me switch topics real quick. And can we -- 408.

Your Honor, 408 and Mr. Malhotra, is the proposal for creditors. I think you talked about this yesterday on direct. And again, we'll give awe copy if you need it, but we'll try to make due with the screen?

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SHERWOOD: Okay.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. If you look at pages 54 and 55, of 408, I'm looking for 54 and -- well, hold on. Let's try 83 and 84 . I'm sorry, Your Honor, there's kind of two sets of numbers on this one. Let's do 83 and 84 . There we could stay with the same exhibit, I think there is a discussion about taxes. Do you know what the
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outstanding tax obligations of the City of Detroit
were in or about say June of this year?
A. I do not recall, no.
Q. Well, I think that the presentation, if you turn to page 87 -- let me make sure I'm using the right numbers here. Page -- page 79, please. Actually, page 80. I'm sorry. Do you recognize this page of the presentation? It talks about taxes.
A. It does talk about taxes.
Q. And if you look at about the fourth bullet point down it says, "Compuware has identified historical non-payers with outstanding tax obligations totaling approximately $\$ 250$ million," correct?
A. That's what the sentence says.
Q. And have you heard numbers substantially in excess of 250 million in terms of the outstanding obligations of taxpayers to the City of Detroit?
A. I have heard numbers like this and I've been hearing numbers like this for the last two years, the city's property taxes and income taxes.
Q. But there are a lot of outstanding taxes and they're in the hundreds of millions of dollars, fair?
A. I cannot say that
Q. And you can't say that because you didn't look into
the issue of outstanding taxes in your two years
plus?
A. That is correct. We were not going out and looking for delinquent taxes, especially of numbers that
were highlighted of this magnitude, that's correct.
Q. Do you know who from the City or on behalf -- let's start with the City. Who from the City was in charge of improving tax collection efforts?
A. Yeah, it was Cheryl Johnson, who was the City's treasurer, was working, I believe, with Compuware to try and get their arms around what taxes were outstanding, and I believe that project has been going on for a long time. That's what $I$ know about it.
you would agree that if the tax collection efforts of the City in late -- in fiscal year 2013, which ends June of 2013, correct? If those tax collection efforts were better, that would have enhanced the general fund, is that fair to say?
A. The City is already implemented not to at least one amnesty program for sure and I think that probably yielded single digit millions of dollars in the three to $\$ 5$ million range in terms of its amnesty program. The City has repeatedly done a efforts in order to maximize the collections on taxes that

Q. they could, at least identified from their records
Q. And who from the City is involved in that effort?
A. Specifically, on the amnesty, it was, I'm sure, the tax department that has been involved, I think, with respect to any past due or these outstanding obligations, I would say that you would have to talk to Cheryl Johnson who is the Treasurer in context of the Compuware discussion.
Q. But you were not charged at Ernst \& Young in doing an analysis of the effectiveness of the City's efforts prior to May, June of 2013, to collect
taxes from taxpayers, is that fair to say?
A. yes, that is
Q. what about abatemenets, do you know anything about abatements?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you know that the City has a program for
industrial tax abatements?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know anything about Renaissance zone abatements here in the City in terms of property taxes?
A. Not specifically. I know it is a component of the property tax forecast build up, but not specifically on Renaissance zone and the

## abatements.

Q.
kne city has taken any effort to review the existing tax abatements that are enjoyed by certain of the property owners here in the City of Detroit to make sure that they are fair and up to speed and current?
A. I do not know of a specific effort on reviewing the abatements.
Q. Do you know who the -- who the tax assessor is for the City of Detroit?
A. It used to be Linda Beatty, she has recently retired. I'm blanking out on the name of the new assessor. I think it's Alvin.
Q. Do you know, has Ernst \& Young been charged with trying to figure out how the assessment -- the tax assessment process works here in the City of Detroit?
A. No, Ernst \& Young has not been. What I do know is that there are several reviews that are happening to assess ascertain whether the assessed values are too high currently or not in terms of the City's property taxes.

## Q. What about too low?

A. From what I understand, the general view is that the assessments are too high.
had during that timeframe with all of the creditors in some fashion or the other.
Q. But June 14 th was the first. And during that June 14th meeting, this -- the proposal was handed out and presented, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. During all the meetings from June 14 th to July l1th, whatever, after all of those meetings, are you aware of a single change to the June 14th proposal by the City?
A. Not specifically that I recall whether we were making changes or not to the June 14 th proposal.
Q. But you can't cite to a single specific change to the proposal that was made on June 14 th, correct?
A. Not that I can recall off the top of my head, yes.
Q. Now were any of those meetings with union
representatives or retiree representatives?
A. I think both were present on June 14 th.
Q. And you were at that meeting?
A. I was.
Q. And let me ask you this. In terms of dealing with the employee issues, when Mr. Orr was appointed, did you tell him about your personal experience with dealing with the City's unions?
A. Yes.
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Q. And you had been involved on behalf of the city before the arrival of Mr . Orr in some pretty substantial negotiations between the City and many many of its unions, true?
A. I was -- I was involved in those meetings from the standpoint of helping ascertain the financial implications, yes.
Q. Okay. And in February of 2012, and I know we're going way back now, so if you started May 2011, you're only on the job about seven months this time, there were negotiations between the City and a number of unions and those negotiations were successful, correct?
A. I don't understand the meaning of successful or not. They were negotiations that were held.
Q. But they led to an agreement between the City and the unions, correct?
A. They led to tentative agreements.
Q. Let's look at Exhibit 505, please.

Actually, before I ask any questions about this, you said they -- well, let me ask you about 505. Is this a copy of the tentative agreement between the City and the coalition of unions of the City of Detroit?
A. yes.
Q. And if we turn to the?

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, may I interpose a foundation objection? This has been objected to. If counsel is laying a foundation for admissibility, I have no objection. If that's all you're doing. But if he's going to question the witness about it, I would have an objection. MR. SHERWOOD: I'm going to try to lay a foundation, Your Honor, with this.

```
                THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
```

                    MR. SHERWOOD: There may be other
    witnesses, but I would like to get his
understanding of this document, some testimony, what he knows about this document on the record so when we move it into evidence later, you have the benefit of that.

THE COURT: I'll permit that subject to its ultimate admission.

BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. Page 17, please, of the agreement. City of Detroit. Do you recognize that as Chris Brown's signature by any chance?
A. I do think that is Chris Brown's signature.
Q. And that's dated February 1, 2012. And he was the chief operating officer for the City of Detroit,

correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And just if you can take that down. Let's look at the signatures on the right. I'm not going to ask you to identify those signatures, but the parties to the right, you know, you see IO USA A. Are these -- do you understand this to be like various union representatives that signed on to this agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was a union coalition, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now did you participate with any of the members of the union during the negotiation of this tentative agreement?
A. I was present in those negotiations from -- to ascertain the financial impact, as I said earlier.
Q. And you were working for the City at that point, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And Chris Brown from the City signed this agreement and agreed to it, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. During those negotiations, did you talk about any wage concessions by the employees of the City?
A. I think there were discussions around wage concessions, yes.
Q. And in fact there were wage concessions, do you recall that?
A. Are you referring specifically to this tentative agreement or are you referring --
Q. Yes?
A. To broadly?
Q. This tentative agreement in February of of 2012?
A. I would have to go back and look awe because whether it was new wage concessions or whether it was a continuance of wage concessions that had already been provided in the past.
Q. Was there discussions about giving back some of the wage concessions to the extent that there was net surplus for 2012, 2013 and 2014?
A. Yes, there were discussions around how to give back wage concessions at the active employees were giving if the City can get back on its footing from a financial standpoint, yes.
Q. And you were involved in that part of the discussion, correct?
A. I was involved in at least trying to ascertain how to ensure either asset sales or refinancings were not considered as an operational fix or not one

time --
Q. I'm just asked if you were involved in that part of the discussions?
A. And I was giving you context of how I was involved, yes.
Q. But during those discussions, weren't you saying to the union members that based on the work of you and other people in the City that the City was going to get back into the black in 2013 and 2014? Was that part of your pitch with respect to this?
A. The discussions that the City was having with its unions was to try and come up with cash to try and deal with the cash short fall issues that were forthcoming, especially after fiscal year 12 where the City continued to borrow and defer and the City was in active discussions with its active employees how to try and address some of the on coming fiscal year 13 cash issues, yes.
Q. The question was obviously you've got labor representatives sitting on the other side of the table and one of the terms was these give backs, right? Give backs of wage concessions, right? Certainly the people -- the labor people that were talking to you wanted to know what's the likelihood of my people getting these givebacks --
think his question --
THE COURT: I agree. Rephrase the
question, please.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. During the negotiations, was it your perception, based on things said to you by the labor representatives, that they were concerned about or they wanted to know what the likelihood was that they would get their give backs in terms of salary wage concessions?
A. Sorry, can you rephrase that question? It's too long a question.
Q. During the negotiations concerning the tentative agreement, did anyone on the labor side ask you to tell them if the wage concessions would happen or the give backs on the wage concessions would happen, yes or no?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. Let me ask you this about those discussions. There were -- there were negotiations that surrounded
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healthcare, correct?
A. yes.
Q. And one of the objectives in the healthcare part of the negotiation was to attain $\$ 60$ million in healthcare savings; is that right?
A. That sounds right.
Q. okay. And those healthcare savings were going to come from not only the existing employees of the City of Detroit, but also the retired employees, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure about that. I think majority of those savings were coming from the active employees. I don't recall if a specific amount from the retirees.
Q. You said the majority. So some of the savings were coming from the retired employees, isn't that right?
A. I do not recal1 that.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I would like to mark a document that has not been marked before. It try to refresh the witness's ex recoveries?

MR. STEWART: Before he uses it, I would like to frame very carefully exactly what failure of recollection this is intended to address. MR. SHERWOOD: Yes, this is a document
that talks about cost savings in fiscal year 2012, and there is a line that talks about

THE COURT: Well, let's not say what the document says because it's not in evidence. But the document can be used to refresh the witness' recollection if it has that effect.

MR. STEWART: May I also ask where it comes from? I understand for pure purposes of refreshing recollection what is allowed, on the other hand, is this part of a larger document? What is this?

MR. SHERWOOD: I believe it was part of a presentation that was made during the course of the negotiations in 2012 with respect to the tentative agreement.

MR. STEWART: We have an objection to its use generally, but.

THE COURT: All right. To the extent there's an objection to the use of the document to refresh the witness' recollection, it is overruled. You may present it to the witness.

MR. STEWART: Once again, could we frame again exactly which failure of recollection --

THE COURT: I think the record is clear enough on that point. Let's proceed.
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MR. SHERWOOD: May I approach the witness and hand him the document, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please.
MR. SHERWOOD: And for the record, can
I -- can we mark this as 505A?
THE COURT: Sure. Whatever is convenient
for you is fine.
MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, may I hand a
copy to the Court?
THE COURT: Not if its use is for
refreshing recollection.
MR. SHERWOOD: Okay.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. So Mr. Malhotra, I've showed you what I will mark as 505A. And if you would look at the box to the left, relating -- that's called retirees, and then the data to the right of that, does that -- you testified that the majority of the savings related to current employees and you didn't know about whether any of these savings also impacted retirees. Do you remember that testimony?
A. I testified that the tentative agreements as reached, if they had any impact on retiree medical or not, that's what I testified to, yes.
Q. Okay. And having reviewed this document, does this
refresh your recollection that in fact there were certain savings projected to be achieved from retirees for fiscal year 2012 and 2013?

THE COURT: All right. Now here I want to caution you. This does not ask you what that document says, in fact, turn it over. Do you have a recollection now, having reviewed that document, of what the answer to counsel's question is?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, my answer is
the same as it was earlier.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. Do you recognize 505n? Have you ever seen it before? Can he look at it for that purpose? THE COURT: Yes, yes. THE WITNESS: Yes, I recall seeing this in that 2012 timeframe, yes.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. And can you describe what it is?
A. It is trying to describe the projected ask or the targeted savings the City was looking to get for fiscal year 13 .
Q. So this was prepared by the City and these were part of the request by the City to the labor
representatives in 2012, correct?
This would have framed some of those discussions,
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Q. And were you present when this document was discussed with representatives of the unions in 2012?
A. I do not recall of a specific meeting, but I would have generally been having some of these discussions in terms of the quantification of some of these numbers.
Q. Let's go back to 505. Now this agreement, this tentative agreement, although it was executed by the City in various union representatives, was it implemented for the City of Detroit?
A. I do not think this exact tentative agreement was implemented.
Q. Do you know why this tentative agreement was not implemented for the City of Detroit?
A. I think the City employment terms were implemented instead.
Q. Isn't it true that the state refused to authorize the City to implement this agreement?
A. I was not a part of those discussions with the state.
Q. And this agreement -- scratch that.

Let me just ask a few more random questions and then I'll be done.
A. That is correct.
Q. And neither you nor Ernst \& Young have ever prepared a balance sheet for the City of Detroit, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. You began to prepare the schedules for the filing of this bankruptcy case in may of 2013, isn't that right?
A. It was May June timeframe. I don't remember the specific date.
Q. Could have been May 2013, May, June 2013?
A. Like I said, May June timeframe, yes, that sounds right.
Q. Okay. Now in early July, your opinion was not solicited by anyone before the bankruptcy filing about the decision to file bankruptcy, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So you and Ernst \& Young, you didn't have any input whatsoever on whether or not Chapter 9 was the only alternative for the City of Detroit, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, may I have a two-minute -- 30 second break just to consult with a colleague?
THE COURT: Yes, we'll sit here while you do that.
MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I would like to mark another document to -- which addresses the issue of impact on retiree benefits and just see if the witness recognizes it, not to refresh his recollection, just to see if he recognizes it and can authenticate it.
MR. STEWART: This is a new exhibit?
MR. SHERWOOD: I believe it is.
MR. SHERWOOD: We would object to it, Your Honor, for any reason other than refreshing recollection. It was not identified.
THE COURT: Well, let's get it marked and when it's offered into evidence, I'll hear your objection. What number would you propose?
MR. SHERWOOD: 505B.
THE COURT: Are we out of numbers?
MR. SHERWOOD: I just think we're in the
fives and I don't know what we're up to.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me see if I can help you.

MR. SHERWOOD: 505B.
THE COURT: Hold on one second. We have used every number from 500 to 599. All right. Fine. 505 B it is

MR. SHERWOOD: May I approach, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
Are you asking the witness if he
recognizes this?
MR. SHERWOOD: Yeah.
THE COURT: Do you recognize that
document, sir?
THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, I do.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. And can you describe it for us?
A. It's a discussion document dated July 16, 2012.
Q. And did you -- were you involved in the preparation of this document?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And was this document presented to -- who was this document presented to?
A. I don't recall.
Q. For what purpose was this document prepared?
A. It would have been for trying to ascertain the tentative agreements and the savings that would

have come from some of the tentative agreements.
A. I would have to go to that specific section.
Q. Yes, please do.
the court: Well, hold on. It's not proper to ask the witness a question about the contents of the document until it's admitted into evidence.

MR. SHERWOOD: I move it into evidence, Your Honor.

MR. STEWART: We object, Your Honor. Well, first of all, I'm not sure what its relevance is, but more to the point, it wasn't identified as part of the pre-trial process we engaged in to identify, have timely objections and have an opportunity to review documents.

MR. SHERWOOD: I agree that it wasn't identified pre-trial, Your Honor. We did identify the tentative agreement, however. We have maintained in this case that on the impracticability issue, that indeed it was and is possible to negotiate with a large number of unions for this City and to negotiate with respect to the
rights of retirees in the context of those negotiations.

Our -- I was at the deposition of one of our clients in Washington where this issue was raised and probed. We were -- we believed that this witness, having been involved in those negotiations, would testify that indeed some of the give backs in this tentative agreement impacted retirees and he hasn't clearly done that, so I'm using this to refresh recollection, Your Honor. There are a lot of documents in this case. This is a fast track case with a lot of document review and production that has been done. This is a City of Detroit document that certainly this witness and I assume the other professionals are intimately familiar with and I do not think that the failure to put it on our exhibit list in this case and on this track should prevent the admission into evidence. It's otherwise relevant for the reasons that I've set forth and I don't see any prejudice whatsoever to the City.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, I think it is prejudicial. We see this for the first time while the witness is on the stand. In fact, so fresh is it we don't even know how to number it as an
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exhibit.
And to the point that he didn't get the answer from the witness he wanted. If he fails in trying to refresh recollection, the answer is for him to call his own witness, not to bring in documents outside of the normal structure that we had all agreed upon.

THE COURT: I agree that this record does not establish cause to add an exhibit to the established witness list. Accordingly, the objection is sustained. The document may be used to refresh recollection.

MR. SHERWOOD: Excuse me one second, Your Honor.

BY MR. SHERWOOD:
Q. I'm going to try to use this to refresh your recollection. Can you turn to page seven, please? Now again, we're on the topic of whether this negotiation involved savings on benefits that impacted retirees. If you look at the second block down on the left, have you read that block?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you -- and does that block and the numbers to the right of it refresh your recollection as to whether or not in the context of these negotiations
the City was -- or the union reps were negotiating
with respect to rights of retirees?
A. No. In fact, my recollection --

THE COURT: The only question is does that document refresh your recollection on that question.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, Your Honor. No.
BY MR. SHERWOOD:
0
A. That is my testimony, yes.
Q. That you don't recall?
A. That's what I just said.

MR. SHERWOOD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Mr. Malhotra. I have nothing further

THE COURT: All right. At this time we'll take our morning 15 -minute recess.

COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.
Q. And just to be clear on this point, it's your --
you don't recall during these negotiations whether
the City and the representatives of the unions
negotiated and reached an agreement that impacted
the rights of the City's retirees, is that your
testimony?
Q. That you don't recall?
A. That's what I just said.
MR. SHERWOOD: Okay. Thank you, Your
Honor.
Thank you, Mr. Malhotra. I have nothing
further.
d
-
OUGH - DAY
(Whereupon a break was taken
from 10:37 a.m. to 10:59 a.m.)
COURT CLERK: Court is in session.

Please be seated.
MR. DeCHIARA: Good morning, YOur Honor.
Peter DeChiara from the law firm of Cohen, Weiss \& Simon, LLP for the UAW International Union. Good morning, Mr. Malhotra. THE WITNESS: Good morning. EXAMINATION
BY MR. DechIARA:
Q. One preliminary question, Mr. Malhotra. Between the time that you completed your direct testimony at the end of the day yesterday and when you began your cross examination today, did you consult with counsel about the subject of your testimony?
A. No, I did not.
Q. You're not and never have been an officer of the City of Detroit, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you've never -- and you don't currently and you never have held any elected or appointed position with the City; is that correct?
A. That is right.
Q. And you don't -- you're not involved in the direct
running of the City, the direct operation of the City, correct?
A. yes.
Q. Yes, I'm correct?
A. Yes, you're correct.
Q. Let me ask you about the June 14th, 2013 meeting at which the Emergency Manager made his presentation of the creditor proposal. Do you remember your testimony about that meeting yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you testified on direct that there were questions that were asked by the people who were in attendance at that meeting, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Am I correct that the procedure at that meeting was that if an attendee wanted to ask a question or make a comment, they had to write it down on a card which would then be passed up to the front and then would be read out by someone in the front of the room? Wasn't that the procedure?
A. As I recall, I think, yes.
Q. And let me now draw your attention to the June 20 th meeting. Do you recall your testimony about the
June 20th meeting?
A. yes.
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Q. And the Emergency Manager was not present, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the people who were presenting at the meeting were City advisors, including yourself, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anyone from the City tell you that you had authority to negotiate for the City at that meeting?
A. I was presenting at that meeting.
Q. Is the answer to my question no?
A. That is correct.
Q. And it was not your understanding, was it, that you had authority to negotiate for the City at that meeting, am I correct?
A. I was not negotiating for the City at that meeting, that is correct.
Q. And is it -- do you have any knowledge that any of the other advisors who were attending that meeting on behalf of the City had authority to negotiate for the City?
A. I can't say what the authority was of the other advisors. Would you have to ask them.
Q. So you have no knowledge -- you have no affirmative knowledge that any of the other advisors were authorized to negotiate on behalf of the City; is
that correct?
A. I have no knowledge one way or the other, that is correct.
Q. Were there any other meetings besides the June 14 th and June 20 th meeting that you attended where there were presentations made to labor retiree groups?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. As you sit here today, you don't recall any others?
A. I do not recall any others as of now.
Q. You testified, I believe, on direct about a July ninth meeting. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And who were the attendees -- what category of attendees attended the July 9 th meeting?
A. My recollection is that it was the City's advisors and members of the retirement systems or advisors for the retirement systems and other retirees.
Q. So the -- so I'm going to distinguish between the presenters and the attendees. The attendees were advisors to the retirees and the retirees?
A. That's my recollection, yes.
Q. okay. And were there negotiations -- did you engage in negotiations on behalf of the City at
that meeting?
A. We had discussions about the City's financial
profile as well as discussions around pensions, as I recall in that meeting.
Q. And I believe your direct testimony was that the purpose of that meeting was to discuss actuarial assumptions; is that correct?
A. No, what I said on my testimony is that at the end of the meeting, there was discussion or dialogue about trying to get the retirement system and the City's advisors on the same page with respect to the actuarial assumptions.
Q. And the reason -- and you were involved in that effort; is that correct?
A. Not really. I was not intimately involved with the actuarial assumptions at all.
Q. Okay. Did you have an understanding -- did the City advisors want to achieve an understanding with the retiree system advisors as to actuarial assumptions?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you have an understanding about why the City advisors wanted to obtain that understanding?
A. I do. It was generally to try and ascertain the amount of the underfunding in the two pension systems, yes.
Q. Would it be fair to say that as a predicate for
meaningful negotiations, it's often helpful to have

## shared assumptions between the parties?

A. Yes.
Q. Did anyone tell you that from the City -- did anyone from the City tell you that you were
authorized at the July 19th -- I'm sorry, the anyone from the City tell you that you were
authorized at the July 19th -- I'm sorry, the July 9 th meeting to negotiation on behalf of the City?
A. No.
Q. You testified about certain meetings you had with the Emergency Manager, Mr. Orr, at which you orally
presented to him certain findings or analysis that the Emergency Manager, Mr. Orr, at which you orally
presented to him certain findings or analysis that you had prepared. Do you recall that testimony on direct?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. And how many of those meetings were there?
A. I cannot count the number of meetings or conference calls that we had. There were numerous.
Q. okay. So there were numerous face to face meetings and also numerous conference calls?
A. Can you clarify what timeframe is your question related to?
Q. Well, you tell me. I'm just asking about the meetings that you had -- well, okay. I can do this.

[^1] 2

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { A. } & \text { No. } \\ \text { Q. You }\end{array}$
 From the time the Emergency Manager became
the Emergency Manager until the bankruptcy filing. Let's say that's the timeframe. How many face to face meetings did you have with the Emergency Manager at which you presented conclusions or findings or analysis?
A. I can't recall the specific number, but there were several.
Q. Okay. And were these one on one meetings that you had with the Emergency Manager?
A. We may have had -- yes, there were a couple one on one meetings as I thought, as I recall, and there were meetings in a broader group setting with the City's other advisors.
Q. And the ones that took place in a broader group setting with the City's other advisors, those were prescheduled meetings?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. okay. And who were the other City advisors who attended those meetings?
A. It would have been representatives from Jones Day, from Miller Buckfire, Conway MacKenzie, our team, and -- but there were several meetings and there wasn't a set schedule that everybody was at a particular meeting is my recollection.
Q. But some of meetings where there were other advisors were present where you presented conclusions or findings or analysis to the Emergency Manager were meetings were Jones Day attorneys were present, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. DeCHIARA: Your Honor, I don't have anything further on that line of questioning. I would note for the record that the City has on the direct of Mr. Malhotra had Mr. Malhotra testify on direct about meetings he had with Mr. Orr in the presence of counsel.

## BY MR. DeCHIARA:

Q. You testified about a meeting that you attended in New York, I believe with the bondholders and the insurers of the bondholders; is that correct?
A. Yes
Q. And when was that meeting?
A. I think it was June 25 th, maybe, is my recollection.
Q. I would like now to direct your attention to the proposal to creditors, which is Exhibit 43. Do you have the exhibit book or could somebody call up Exhibit 43, please?
A. I'm happy to get it if you just let me know what
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folder it is. What folder, 43?
Q. I don't know what folder it is, but?

MR. STEWART: It was your 408 .
MR. DeCHIARA: No, I'm correct. It's
City Exhibit 43.
THE COURT: Can you help the witness find
it, please.
MR. DeCHIARA: Absolutely. Do you have
it?
THE WITNESS: I got it. Thank you.
MR. DeCHIARA: Okay.
BY MR. DeCHIARA:
Q. Mr. Malhotra, if I could ask you to turn to page 114 of Exhibit 43. Are you on page 114?
A. yes.
Q. Okay. Let me direct your attention to the last column on the right. It says insurer. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And do you see there's a list of insurers there?
A. yes.
Q. And those are the insurers for the bondholders?
A. Yes.
Q. And were representatives of those insurers present at the June 25 th meeting?
A. I can't recall if all of them were there, but they were representatives from the bond insurers at that meeting, yes.
Q. Do you remember specifically which ones were there and which ones were not?
A. No, I do not
Q. Can you testify whether they were all there or they were not all there?
A. No, I cannot.
Q. Okay. So they may all have been there; is that correct?
A. It could be, yes.
Q. Okay. Let me turn your attention to page 120 . It's Appendix E. There's a similar column, the right column, says insurer -- and let me just ask the same question. Were representatives of those insurers at that -- at the June 25 th meeting?
A. I cannot recall specifically if all of them were there. My assumption -- I think most of them were there, all the advisors, but I do not recall specifically if each and every one of these were there or not.
Q. Okay. Do you have an understanding of what percentage of the bondholders of the unsecured bondholders of the City of Detroit were insured by

ROUGH - DAY 2
the insurers that are listed in appendix A through E of Exhibit 43?
A. No, I do not.
Q. It's the majority, isn't it?
A. I would assume, but I'm not sure. I haven't done the percentage of all of the unsecured notes, what percentage are insured versus not. I haven't done that calculation.
Q. Am I correct if we wanted to -- if someone wanted to determine that, one could add up the numbers on the appendices under the balance column and determine the percentage that are insured?
A. Presumably, if if they're still insured at that particular timeframe or not, presumably yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And just so I understand correctly, when a bondholder is insured, that means that if the municipality defaults on the bond, the bondholder has recourse against the insurer?
A. That is my understanding, yes.

MR. DeCHIARA: No further questions.
THE COURT: Anyone else have any cross examination questions for the witness?

MR. RUEGGER: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. DechiARA: Your Honor, I would just ask to reserve the right to ask additional cross
A.
and ascertain what part of those collections were related to property taxes versus not. It was to track the monthly gaming taxes, it was too look at the activity in the other receipts, it was to highlight any sort of one time bond related or escrow related proceeds that were come inning that were further augmenting the general funds cash
balance.
Q. And did you assign any of your team members any of those particular matters to be their responsibility?
A. No, they were generally a team effort.
Q. Can you tell us beyond what you've just answered, in general, what was the process of compiling those figures?
A. Our team tracks the pretty much daily cash activity of the City to ascertain what receipts are coming in, what disbursements are going out, to at least help able to quantify where that activity is going on a day in, day out basis, and because we have to try our best to assure the City did not run out of cash, and that's the reason we had our team working specifically on the receipts and disbursements activity, looking at the bank accounts, looking at the bank statements, to ensure that we could
Q. And specifically, if we could look at page eight. And I'm going to ask you some questions about the fiscal year 2012 figures that are on that page. So if you could expand that, that a would probably make it easier for us to see. Great.

First, Mr. Malhotra, when were these
figures -- and specifically the fiscal year 2012
figure -- when were they finalized?
A. This is cash activity, so it's -- it would have been right around that end of fiscal year 2012, so July 2012. This is cash activity.
Q. Okay. And how large was the E\&Y team at that time?
A. At what time?
Q. When these figures were finalized?
A. Probably four or five.
Q. And did they have specialized roles?
A. Yes, our team was focused very focused on looking
at all of the cash activity, yes.
Q. So can you tell us what the individual roles were on your team?
A. They were to ascertain what receipts were timing versus permanent, any variances, looking at all of the property taxes, looking at the income taxes. The City generally receives a lot of its collections in certain lockboxes. We had to try
examination questions if the Court decides to

THE COURT: Yes. That right is reserved for everyone.

On that point, just so I don't forget later, I have reconsidered my suggestion that we revisit this after lunch and to give both you all and us time to review the memorandum and the issue, we'll take it up again tomorrow morning.

MR. RUEGGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You're welcome.
MR. RUEGGER: May I proceed.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. RUEGGER: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Malhotra. My name is Arthur Ruegger from the Dentons firm. We haven't met before. I represent the Retirees Committee here. EXAMINATION

BY MR. RUEGGER: want to raised yesterday. It was City Exhibit 44. It's I believe the executive version of the June 14 th proposal. Is it on your screen?

It is, yes.
Q. Don't mean audit
A. In terms of all the cash that comes in gross tax collections, our team is to try our best ability what collections were for property taxes and what taxes were due to the City and versus what property taxes were related to distributions that the City had to make to other taxing authorities.
Q.

With all respect, sir, I'm not sure that was responsive. I'm trying to determine to what extent anyone on your team verified the figures and specifically the property tax figure there.
A. This would have been the number that we had to the best of our ability
Q. And you had it from what source, sir?
A. It would have been from a -- for fiscal year 2012, from a combination of the bank accounts or the City's internal reports.
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you, the City's what reports?
A. Internal reports.
Q. Internal reports?
A. yes.
Q. Did you consider the CAFR for this analysis at all?
A. This is fiscal year 2012 cash activity. The CAFR, the CAFR doesn't come out for months after that.
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Q. So I thought he yesterday you testified and correct me if I'm wrong that someone from your team contacted the City to check the property tax figures, is that not correct?
A. You can go back to my testimony. I don't remember that specific piece. We looked at the cash activity of the City in a considerable amount of detail.
Q. Dropping down to the next item, income and utility taxes. How were -- how was that figure derived?
A. That figure was derived from the information we had from the bank accounts as well as the City's internal reports.
Q. And when you say City's internal reports, what kind of reports were those?
A. They're various internal reports that the City tries its best ability to track this cash activity
Q. Did anyone on your team ever try to get behind any of those figures?
A. In order to --
Q. Check their accuracy.
A. Cash is generally cash. If you're trying to ask the classification of those receipts? You know there's always classification issues, but cash is generally cash. I don't know what verification you
do of cash. This is not audited statements.
Q. Your team didn't have the cash, right?
A. We tracked cash.
Q. Your team was not counting the cash, it was looking at reports from the City?
A. That is accurate. We were not counting dollar bills if that's your question.
Q. That was true for both the bank reports and the internal City reports?
A. We were tracking cash to the best of our ability.
Q. Based on the City's reports?
A. Based on our review of the City's reports and our review of the bank statements.
Q. And I don't mean to belabor the issue, but you didn't check the City's reports, did you, you reviewed them and accepted them?
A. We used to track cash compared to bank activity, so we used to check them, we used to review them, ask questions, but generally tracking cash was not going to accruals or anything like that, it was tracking cash.
Q. All right. Back to my question about the income and utility taxes. How did you derive that figure?
A. This would be a combination as I already testified based on the City's internal reports and the bank
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accounts and even other discussions we may have had with the City personnel.
Q. Did you have any personal conversations with City personnel related to that item?
A. I may have. I don't recall specifically. This is going back to fiscal year 2012.
Q. Do you recall having any personal conversations with anyone at the City related to the property tax item?
A. I don't remember a specific conversation. We used to track these daily or actually in fiscal year 2012, at least weekly to get our arms around the cash activity.
Q. So you and your team?
A. That is correct.
Q. What about the gaming taxes, do you recall where that figure came from?
A. I think it comes from the City's bank activity.
Q. The City's bank activity?
A. Its bank statements.
Q. Bank statements. And how often did you receive the City's bank statements?
A. It has varied from time to time, but we are
receiving statements right now on a weekly basis if not on a daily basis that checks --
Q. orry, I didn't mean to speak over you. An back in 2012, do you recall how often you were receiving those statements.
A. I do not recall, but we started getting the bank statements on a regular basis as soon as we gotten gauged because that was the best proxy to track cash.
Q. And that would have been 2011, correct?
A. Calendar year 2011, that's right.
Q. But I'm asking now about 2012. Do you recall how often you got statements relating to gaming taxes?
A. Talking about fiscal year 2012? I just want to make clear, that includes a part of 2011. We would have received activity on a regular basis, that's what I would say.
Q. And you can't recall now whether that was weekly or twice a month or monthly?
A. That is correct, I can't recall.
Q. How about the municipal service fee to casinos?
A. Consistent with how we received the gaming taxes information.
Q. Reports from the City?
A. Reports, bank activity, discussions with from the City's management team.
Q. I'm sorry, discussions with who at the City?
I'm sorry, discussions with who at the city:

$$
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A. The City's management team.
Q. Okay. Do you recall having any personal conversations with the City's management team relating to that line item?
A. No, I do not.
Q. So any conversations would have been between your team and the people at the City?
A. No, that's not right.
Q. okay. What would -- who was part of those conversations to your knowledge?
A. Like I said earlier, I was intimately involved with the tracking the cash activity of the City given how precarious the cash position was. I had several discussions with members of the City's management team with respect to cash. Your question was if $I$ had a specific conversation on this particular line item. I do not recall. I had specific conversations on the cash activity with various members of the City's management team.
Q. over what period of time?
A. Since the time we gotten gauged.
Q. How frequently?
A. I cannot recall. It was frequent.
Q. Just so we're clear, you don't recall having any conversations specifically related to the municipal
service fees to casinos; is that correct?
A. I do not recall the a specific conversation, you are correct.
Q. How about the state revenue sharing? I think you talked about that yesterday. Did you have any personal involvement in any conversations with the state relating to the revenue sharing figure that's reflected in this exhibit?
A. It's -- no, cash that's received every second month pretty regularly.
Q. I thought you testified yesterday, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, that there was a conversation with the state related to what the revenues that came from the state to the City, is that wrong?
A. No, you're correct, but my testimony was related to the forecast specifically and I'm happy too talk about it and also the ten-year forecast in terms of the assumptions behind it.
Q. I understand you might be happy about that, but let's talk to these figures now?
A. I was just clarifying your question and my testimony. This is for fiscal year 2012.
Q. correct.
A. I did not have specific discussions with the state.
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We used to track this cash activity through a
combination of the City's reports, the bank activity and discussions with the management team on a regular basis.
Q. How about the last item there, fairly large one, other receipts. What goes into that?
A. That includes grant receipts, it includes any sort of fines that are collected, includes any sort of fees that are charged by the different departments, it also includes some of the utility charges that come through, so it's a variety of items that makes up that line item.
Q. And did your -- what was the source for your team's collection of that data?
A. It was the same as I highlighted before.
Q. Reports from the City?
A. Bank statements, reports from the City, and
discussions with the management team.
Q. Did the bank statements that come in, do they break out these line items as set forth in Exhibit 44 on this page?
A. Some of those items are broken out, I believe, but that was a part of the process in which we used to look at that activity and try and ascertain where those dollars belonged so that we could be updating accurately, based on the information we received.
antion 765 milli ion; is that correct?
A. That is correct, including 50 million of refinancing.
Q. And is it correct that that's simply cash, that's not something that could be the subject of discussion or adjustment?
A. That's right. It's cash.
Q. Okay. Did you have any conversations or did your team, to your knowledge, have any conversations with anybody from Conway MacKenzie relating to the fiscal year 2012 figures?
A. We had discussions around the fiscal year 2012 figures with all of the advisors in terms of what the cash activity for fiscal year 2012 was.
Q. So in essence, your team or you just relate to Conway MacKenzie what the cash figures were?
A. We related to their cash activity of fiscal year 2012 as shown on this page was discussed with
Conway Mackenzie and all of the other advisors.

## Q. Now these -- this is the general fund figure; is

 that correct?A. Predominantiy, yes. It does not include the

activity for water and sewer department or the receipts for DDOT.
Q. or receipts for?
A. I'm sorry, the department of transportation.
Q. It does not or it does include department of transportation?
A. It does not include the receipts of the department of transportation. The subsidy that's given to the department of transportation from the general fund is shown under the disbursements section.
Q. And tell us why those enterprise funds receipts are not included in these figures.
A. The department of transportation receipts are not included because it's the net subsidy that the general fund sends to the department of transportation. After they go through their own receipts and disbursements activities, the net subsidy that the general fund sends to the department of transportation are included here. With respect to the water and sewer department, there are receipts and disbursements activity are not included in here.
Q. And you said I think earlier here that the departments of water and sewer are self sustaining or break even, correct?
A. That's generally correct.
Q. So they can generally handle their own debts and take care of their own business?
A. yes.
Q. I would like to ask the help to put up Exhibit 6, which is also in evidence, and in this instance, I believe it's the CAFR for 2012. And if you could turn to page 20 of that exhibit. If you could highlight please just the 2012 total receipts and compare it with, if you could, Exhibit 44, which we were just looking at.

I believe on the top, we have an excerpt from Exhibit 6, which is the 2012 CAFR. You're familiar with that document, Mr. Malhotra?
A. Yes, Iam.
Q. And at the bottom is figure -- we were actually looking at the left hand column, but that's the figure from Exhibit 44. Am I correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. You'll note there is a discrepancy between the total operating receipts figure, which we were talking about in the bottom and the total revenues figure that's recorded in the top. Can you explain for us please what the differences are between those two figures?

A. Sure, I'll focus on your top table, which is for

## Q. Rempre

A. The billion 765 includes cash receipts that the City collects in its property taxes line for distribution to other taxing authorities. If you go back to the cash flows, you will see there's a deduct of a significant amount of disbursements going to other taxing authorities for collections that have come -- so again, I just want to clarify. So we're tracking cash, so the City receives a gross tax collection, then distributes the taxes that it's collected on behalf of other entities for a net tax number. Generally that net tax number is what's reported in the CAFR as property tax revenue.
Q. So the 1.5 figure reflects a net figure for the taxes that you just described; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that's reflected below the revenue line there or it should be -- oh, forgive me. It's reflected in the tax figure itself?
A. You are correct.
Q. And if you could drop the Exhibit 44, and just stay with, yes, that page.

Just so I'm sure I understand it, the
figures on the top -- again, this is from CAFR, not your document -- show that the governmental activities column, the 1.5 , is really just a -that's far short of the total operational receipts for the City of Detroit, correct?
A. For the reasons that $I$ just clarified, yes.
Q. And that's the business type activities, those are -- that's water, sewer, transportation?
A. I believe so. I have not focused on the business type activity. I would believe so, but I'm not sure.
Q. Isn't it true that when your engagement began in 2011, the business type activities were part of the financial review that your team under took, correct?
A. we were looking at the receipts and disbursements activity of some of the enterprise funds, that is
Q. (By Mr. Ruegger): No further questions, your Honor

> THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. RUEGGER: Thank you, Mr. Malhotra.
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THE COURT: Any other questions for the witness?

MS. PATEK: Good morning, Mr. Malhotra.
Barbara Patek. I represent the Detroit Firefighters, the Detroit Police Officers Association, and the Detroit Police Command Officers Association and the Detroit Police, Lieutenant \& Sergeants Association. I have just a few questions for you this morning. EXAMINATION
BY MS. PATEK:
Q. Mr. Stewart asked you some questions about negotiations with various City unions in late 2011 and 2012. Were you involved in similar negotiations with the Detroit Firefighters association during that same time period?
A. Yes, me and my team members were involved, yes.
Q. And was Chris Brown a member of that team?
A. Chris Brown was representing the City.
Q. And do you recall whether or not -- let's start with the Detroit Firefighters -- whether or not you were able to, your team, negotiate an agreement with the firefighters that resulted in some cost savings?
A. Yes, we did not negotiate it, we helped ascertain
the financial impact, but $I$ believe there was a tentative agreement that was reached with the

Detroit Firefighters association and the City.
Q. Can I have 714, please? Mr. Malhotra, can you -do you recognize Exhibit 714?
A. It's the tentative agreement to --
Q. And can you tell the court, going down to the first full paragraph in the agreement, with whom that appears to be?

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, we've objected to this as not in evidence. If she's laying a foundation, no objection, but if she's going to question the witness about the substance, we do object.

MS. PATEK: I am just laying a
foundation, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, the question you asked
was not exactly a question to establish foundation.
BY MS. PATEK:
Q. Can you tell us what Exhibit 714 is?
A. It's the tentative agreement entered the 23 rd of March between the City of Detroit and the Detroit Firefighters association.
Q. And can we flip to page six of that agreement,
please. I'm sorry, seven. Do you recognize in the
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upper left hand corner of that, the signature that appears?
A. I think that is the signature of Chris Brown.
Q. And Chris Brown was at that time the chief operating officer of the City of Detroit?
A. That is correct.
Q. can we bring up 717?

Did you have similar discussions with the
Detroit Police Command Officers Association during the same time period, 2011 and 2012?
A. We helped ascertain some of the financial impact of those discussions.
Q. And you participated and were there in those negotiations?
A. I was participating from a financial standpoint, yes.
Q. Do you recall whether or not the agreement negotiated with the Detroit police -- well, strike that.

If we can jump ahead to the signature page, which $I$ believe on this one is page five. And same question here. If you look on the left hand side of the page about a little better than halfway down on Exhibit 717, do you recognize that signature?
A. I think that is the signature of Chris Brown.
Q. And again, he was the chief operating officer of the City of Detroit at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall whether or not as a result of the negotiation of the tentative agreement the agreement that resulted provided for some cost savings to the City of Detroit?
A. It was a combination of cost savings and deferrals, yes.

MS. PATEK: I have nothing further at this time.

THE COURT: Any other questions for the witness? Any redirect?

MR. STEWART: Not very much, Your Honor. further examination

By MR. Stewart:
Q. Mr. Malhotra, when you were questioned, you mentioned something called structural cash flow problems.
A. Yes.
Q. What are structural cash flow problems?
A. As shown in the City's cash flow activity, for fiscal year 12 and 2013, the disbursements continued to exceed receipts for both of those ROUGH - DAY 2
years, which in my mind are structural cash flow issues, especially given the fact that the City had already made or gotten a lot of concessions from some of the active employees, but yet other than borrowing new cash or pooling accounts or deferrals, the core structural problems were -- or cash flow problems were that the disbursements continued to exceed the receipts.
Q. Now when you used that term, it was in connection with the questions you were asked about the monetization of City assets. What effect, if any, would the monetization of City assets have upon the City's structural cash flow problems?
A. None.
Q. why not?
A. Because in my view, those are one time proceeds from asset sales that do not address the issues with respect to the ongoing operating disbursements and the legacy cost disbursements, the combination of which continue to exceed the receipts that the City generates from its operations.
Q. Now you also were asked at various times about cost savings that had been negotiated or realized or what have you in previous years. To the extent cost savings had been achieved by the City, what if
anything did you do in your financial analyses with respect to those savings?
A. Those savings were clearly reflected in the cash activity on a monthly basis all through fiscal year 2013, so the fiscal year 2013 would already reflect those cash savings that had occurred during that timeframe. We also adjusted for additional cost savings from a forecast basis over the forecast timeframe, which were already incorporated in the cash flow assumptions.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: All right. Sir, you may step down. Thank you very much. I will ask you to be here again tomorrow morning in case we have more questions for you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Your next
witness, sir?
MR. STEWART: Charles Moore.
Your Honor, before Mr. Moore comes into
the courtroom, there's a foreseeable evidentiary point I think it might be best just to raise outside of the presence of the witness.

THE COURT: Okay.
yes, Your Honor. I believe that's just an effort to introduce opinion testimony, expert testimony through a witness who is supposed to be a lay witness. And I don't believe Mr. Ullman's opening related to that figure opened any doors to allow that kind of expert testimony so we object. We can

MR. STEWART: I didn't mean to interrupt. THE COURT: I actually meant for him to remain quiet so you could finish. MR. STEWART: I wasn't sure who was where.

MR. RUEGGER: We would simply object, Your Honor, for the reasons that I think we've raised with you in the past. It's just. THE COURT: And please recall to speak right into the microphone.

Any other objections before I get back to Mr. Stewart?

MR. SHERWOOD: Yeah, on behalf of AFSCME,
Jack Sherwood. We would join in the objection. We would submit that any testimony by Mr. Moore about pension underfunding is clearly -- I don't think there's any dispute that that type of testimony involves extremely specialized knowledge, training, the microphone.
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 person. is without a person. It is without a doubt the subject of what should be expert testimony and for the City to try to use that testimony in this proceeding by a witness who is not been qualified as an expert, who has not rendered an expert report, is improper. And only experts can rely on hearsay and that is what this witness would be doing. So on behalf of AFSCME, we would also oppose any testimony by this witness concerning the value of the pension underfunding. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. CIANTRA: Thomas Ciantra for the UAW, Your Honor. We would join in those objections and note that Mr. Moore is not an actuary and has not been proffered. We understand as an expert qualified to provide actuarial testimony.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Go
ahead. I didn't mean to cut you off.
MR. STEWART: I think there may be some
firm.
Q. How long have you worked for Conway MacKenzie?
A. For approximately 12 years.
Q. Tell us if you could about your education, college and after college, if you have it, post-graduate
A. I have a bachelor's degree in accounting from Michigan State University, I have a master's of business administration from Michigan State University in professional accounting, and I have various certifications as well.
Q. Well, first of all, if you could give me the dates of your degrees from Michigan State.
A. Sure. I completed both degrees in 1994. It was a combined degree program and both degrees are granted at the same time.
Q. Then you mentioned your professional
certifications. Could you tell us what those are?
A. Yes, sir. I am a certified public accountant, a certified turn around professional and I'm certified in financial forensics.
Q. And who does the certifications for those qualifications?
A. The American institute of certified public accountants is the CPA body, the turn around
other areas of our firm such as investment banking and litigation support.
management association is the body for the
certified turn around professional designation, and then the AICPA, the American institute of certified public accountants also does the financial
forensics certification.
Q. Tell us if you could about your employment since your graduation from Michigan State.
A. My first job was with Deloitte \& Touche. I was employed there for approximately five and a half years. After that, I was at a company by the name of horizon technology, where I was chief financial officer, and then I joined Conway MacKenzie.
Q. And you told us you've been there 12 years.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where is Conway MacKenzie head quartered?
A. We are head quartered in Birmingham, Michigan.
Q. And what Conway Mackenzie office do you work out
of?
A. I work out of the Birmingham Michigan office.
Q. What title do you hold at Conway MacKenzie?
A. I am senior managing director and shareholder
Q. And tell us, if you could, what kind of practice you have at the firm.
A. My work primarily involves turn around restructuring services. I also perform services in
Q. Could you, to the extent they're probably disclosable, could you tell us some of the clients you have worked for while at Conway MacKenzie?
A. Certainly. As you mentioned, there are client confidentiality restrictions, but publicly known clients recently would include the City of Detroit, Detroit Public Schools, the common wealth of Puerto Rico, Jefferson county Alabama, Greektown casino and hotel.
Q. Have your clients included unions?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Which unions?
A. I have done work on behalf of AFSCME and the UAW.
Q. And what project was that on, if you can tell us?
A. Yes. I was engaged jointly by AFSCME and the UAW related to the common wealth of Puerto Rico.
Q. Now in 2007, did you sit on a commission appointed by the Michigan government?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Please tell us what that work involved.
A. The commission was the legislative commission on government efficiency. It was a nine person panel appointed by legislatures from the State of

Michigan.
Q. And how long did you work with that commission?
A. It was approximately a two-year assignment.
Q. And what did you do in those two years?
A. The primary objective of the commission was to find operational efficiencies for the state government.
Q. And did there come a time in 2012 you began working for the City of Detroit?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us about that work.
A. In late 2012, Conway MacKenzie did some pro bono work for the City of Detroit.
Q. And what was -- what work -- sorry.
What work did you do?
A. Conway MacKenzie was asked to perform analysis on certain areas related to cashiering operations.
Q. And can you tell us what a cashiering operation is?
A. Cashiering generally means areas where cash is coming into the City.

## Q. And then what areas did you look into?

A. There were, as I mentioned, about five areas. Some were more of a focus than others. Municipal parking was a primary area of focus. We also looked at fire operations including the fire marshal, where fees are generated, and we also
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looked at aspects of building safety and
engineering.
Q. Did there come a time earlier this year when conway MacKenzie was hired by the City of Detroit on a non pro bono basis to do work for the City?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And how did that come about?
A. The City of Detroit issued an RFP, a request for proposal, in November of 2012 for restructuring services. Conway MacKenzie was one of the firms that responded to that RFP and was eventually engaged in January of 2013 .
Q. And by restructuring services, what are you
referring to?
A. Restructuring services is not really a defined
term, but because of the financial distress that
the City was experiencing, there was a desire to
bring in outside expertise to help the City deal with that financial distress.
Q. And so Conway MacKenzie became a operational restructuring advisor to the City?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What areas did you look at?
A. We've looked at pretty much every area of the City's operations. terms of looking at the City's operations in the area of public safety?
A. Public safety involves multiple areas. It includes police, fire, EMS, and department of Homeland Security. We spent quite a bit of time understanding how those departments function currently, what are the major impediments to improving their performance, and working with individuals in those departments to develop a plan for improving performance.
Q. Tell me if you could, how did you go about doing this work?
A. The City has had multiple consultants performing work over the last several years and so one of the items that Conway MacKenzie did was to first understand work that has been done in the past by outside organizations, so that we could leverage that work.

In addition to that, we worked very
closely with the people within the departments as well as outside organizations to not only gather facts in terms of how the department is performing currently, but also to benchmark as to how the

department stacks up compared to other areas that would be relevant.
Q. Did there come a time when you made recommendations to the City relating to public safety?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what did you recommend?
A. In the June time period of this year, there was a document that was put together, a creditor proposal, which incorporated our work and specifically had initiatives related to public safety in both restructuring expenses as well as capital expenditures.
Q. And if we corks let's put up exhibit -- if we could, let's put up Exhibit 43.

```
                Mr. Moore, is the creditor proposal you
```

referred to a few minutes ago?
A. This appears to be the title slide of it, yes.
Q. And could you direct us to the portion of this that contains the recommendations and analysis you told us about just a few minutes ago?
A. If I recall correctly, this document is about 130 pages. There are multiple areas where recommendations related to public safety would exist. If we're able to scroll through it, I could get to those pages. I can tell you at the very end
of the document, that has a summary listing of capital expenditures which you would be able to
look at from the standpoint of public safety.
Q. We will - -art ve vill do chat onee we cover all these areas.

And then what did you do, if anything,
with regard to the water and sewer department?
A. Conway MacKenzie was asked to prepare a long term -- long term being defined as ten-year business plan for both the water and sewer funds.
Q. And what do you mean when you say business plan?
A. A business plan essentially involves how the department will operate over a period of time, anticipated revenues, expenses, as well as other cash needs such as capital improvements.
Q. And did there come a time when you made a recommendation to the City or to the emergency manager based on the work that you had done?
A. yes.
Q. And when did you make that recommendation?
A. At the end of the September of 2013, we delivered that ten-year business plan for the water and sewer funds.
Q. Now have you also been asked to look into the monetization of the water and sewer department?

A. Yes, sir.
Q. When did you begin your work looking into the monetization of that department?
A. The business plan which our work began in July of 2013, the development of the business plan for the water and sewer funds, was to be used as a basis for evaluating strategic alternatives for the water and sewer funds, and among those strategic alternatives was the potential creation of a regional water authority, and that was one area that this business plan is currently being used.
Q. And how, if you can disclose to us, how would the creation of a regional water and sewer authority lead to its monetization?
A. What is currently being discussed -- and this is a publicly available aspect, and I have to be careful because the negotiations are on going and they are confidential -- but what has been publicly discussed is the form mischaracterization of a regional authority would potentially involve the City of Detroit leasing the water and sewer assets to a regional authority and then receiving a payment in return.
Q. So the monetization would take the form of lease payments?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And did I hear you correctly, this is under discussion as we speak?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Let me direct your attention to the Detroit department of transportation. What if anything was Conway MacKenzie asked to do with regard to DDOT?
A. DDOT, as you mentioned, the department of transportation, is another department that we looked at and there are both short term as well as longer term items that we evaluated there. In the short term, we looked at ways of potentially improving the operation, perhaps through as an example fair increases to try to get more revenue into the department, identify ways that the department could operate more efficiently, as an example, getting more buses on the road, maintenance tends to be an issue in that department, and also the management of the department.

The longer term is still a question and
that could involve eventually merging into more of a regional transportation authority.
Q. And that merger would be done for what reason?
A. If the authority, if a regional authority could
1t the autnorly, it a regronal autnorly coura
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provide better service to residents and it could also save the City money, then that certainly is something that we would look at.
Q. Were you also asked to look at the Detroit lighting authority?
A. yes.
Q. What if anything did you do with regard to the Detroit lighting authority?
A. Mr. Stewart, I'll just clarify, you're referring to the public lighting authority.
Q. I stand corrected. Thank you?
A. So the public lighting authority was an authority established within the past year and the primary purpose of that lighting authority is to improve the lighting within the City. That needs to be funded and then the efforts to replace lights will occur. And is we worked with the City and to the state as it relates to the initial financing for the public lighting authority, which is ongoing right now, as well as we were involved with a request for proposal related to the management of the public lighting department.
Q. What were you asked to do, if anything, with regard to tax and revenue collection operations for the City?
A. The City takes in a variety of taxes. The primary items for taxes are property taxes, income taxes and utility taxes, among others, and we looked at those operations as to how they could be made more efficient as well as potentially increase the amount of revenue that was coming in.
Q. what did you find in the course of your investigation into the operations of the City's tax and revenue functions?
A. As it relates to property taxes, there had been efforts that were underway for the last few years where the City had been using some outside assistance to try to improve that area. The City, its ability to operate in the property tax area was very broken. Simple things such as getting bills out on time and to the right addresses as well as having the right number of resources available to accept payment were both significant deficiencies.
Q. Were measures implemented to correct those deficiencies?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Tell us, if you could, what those measures were or are?
A. There are a number of things as it relates to property tax collections that are underway. First
 of all, the property tax billing process has been improved significantly and so the bills have gone out on time. In addition to that, a number of additional resources were brought in in July and August of this year in order to be able to process the receipts, the payments that residents and others would make. We also changed some of the bank information so that payments would be received quicker as well as larger amounts for property tax payments could actually be received.
Q. And do I understand correctly you're continuing to work in the area?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What did you do with regard to investigating the problem of housing blight here in the City of Detroit?
A. Blight, which is the term that most people use for structures as well as non structural areas that could be abandoned, burned out buildings, over growth of brush, certainly was an area that we kept running into in a number of the departments that would drive department activity. As an example, within the fire department, approximately 60 percent of the fire department's runs relate to abandoned buildings. We also noticed on the
property tax side that areas where there was significant amounts of blight, both structural and non structural, that property taxes -- or the property tax values would deteriorate very quickly and so there was an initiative identified as part of the plan that was put together to eliminate the residential blight within the City of Detroit.
Q. (By The Court): Excuse me, you used the phrase non structural blight?

A

## A. yos, sir

Q. In fact, was that not something also discussed in the June 14 presentation?
A. yes, sir.
Q. If you could, just explain to us what the revenue initiatives were. Actually, I should first ask, what were the amount of the expenses?
A. The amount of expenses added expenses over the ten-year period, which is the period that we developed for the restructuring and reinvestment plan, was approximately $\$ 250$ million.
Q. And what did you calculate the benefits would be financially from the restructuring?
A. We had other revenue initiatives, where revenue initiatives would revolve around areas where the City could receive additional cash in flows revenue of approximately $\$ 280$ million. There were some offsets to that as well. As we looked at changing some departments, it would result in some lower revenue as well and so as a result, there was net revenue improvements of about $\$ 250$ million as well.
Q. Okay. Now then the term was used reinvestment.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Tell me -- tell the court what you mean or meant when you used the term reinvestment.
A. Reinvestment is referred to as the category of planned expenditures that would relate to the infrastructure of the City. As an example, whether that is facility improvements, vehicle fleet,
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information technology, or even in the case of blight, spending on blight elimination.
Q. And why is reinvestment -- this was something you recommended?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Why did you recommend it?
A. What became very clear is that over the years, as
the City's finances suffered and deteriorated, that there was not the necessary reinvestment made in the structural assets. As an example, there are parking garages where large portions of the parking garages are actually blocked off because the structures themselves are in disrepair. And that's a source of revenue for the City and that unless those items are fixed, the City will have continued issues with just performing functions. And so what became very clear to Conway MacKenzie and formed the basis of our recommendations is that without spending money on the infrastructure, the ability to perform services and actually have hard assets where those services are performed would continue to be challenged.
Q. Now is the removal of blighted structures part of reinvestment?
A. yes, sir.
Q. And why, as a matter of economics, is MR. STEWART: At this point, yes THE COURT: All right. With that limited ecommend removal of blighted properties, correct?
A. Blighted residential properties, yes.
Q. Why is that economically sensible to do?
A. As I mentioned before, blight seems to touch on a number of the areas that we've looked at, whether it is public safety, property taxes, or even appearance, and so by spending money on eliminating that, you change the dynamics of where people's time gets spent as well as the basis for how the City receives revenue.
Q. Did you have an estimate of what it would cost to remove the blighted residential properties?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what was your estimate?
A. $\$ 500$ million during this time period.
Q. And the time period for removal was how many years?
A. We forecasted $\$ 500$ million over six years.
Q. And where did the number 500 million come from?
A. This was an estimate based on discussions with people that have been involved with blight removal in the past with in the City. The City has been undertaking blight removal efforts for some time. As well as outside parties that have been involved
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 Now --

Mr. RUEGER: I'm sorry, Mr. Stewart. I would object to the last testimony as hearsay, Your нonor.

THE COURT: Could you speak into the microphone please?

MR. RUEGGER: Objection to the last question and answer as it called for hearsay and his answer was hearsay. I also want to object that I believe this is bordering into expert testimony and the witness is supposed to be a lay witness. Is.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, he made recommendations that resulted in a number for restructuring and reinvestment during the openings yesterday that number too was challenged. In particular, I remember one of the openings saying how could the City in good faith budget for this when it is not going to be able to pay others. So as a matter of dealing with the good faith issue, and the reliability of the data, I wanted to a dues testimony of where these numbers came from.

THE COURT: Is that the sole purpose you're offering this for?
A. It was approximately $\$ 1$ billion
Q. over ten years?
A. Over ten years, yes.
A. Excuse me, Mr. Stewart. In your question, did you ask restructuring and reinvestment?
Q. I did?
A. Okay. The total with both of those would be approximately $\$ 1.25$ billion. A billion on the reinvestment.
Q. okay. Let me move to another area.

As part of your work for the City or the Emergency Manager, were you asked to do something called tax benchmarking?
A. Yes, sir
Q. could you tell us what tax benchmarking is?
A. As part of the -- our initial efforts, when we were
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looking at potential sources of cash, we looked at the current level of taxation for residents in businesses within the City of Detroit to understand whether that -- whether those could be increased as a potential source of cash and so we looked at City of Detroit's taxation and we compared that to a few of the surrounding communities.
Q. And what did you conclude?
A. That the City of Detroit residence were taxed far more than surrounding communities and in fact had the highest taxation within the State of Michigan. MR. STEWART: Your Honor, this is a good breaking point for me, but I'm prepared to continue if the Court would like.

THE COURT: No, let's stop now for lunch
and reconvene at 1:45, please.
COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is in
recess.
(Whereupon a break was taken
from 12:15 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.)
MR. IRWIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
Geoff Irwin from Jones Day.
Might we return to a brief housekeeping
matter from yesterday morning to update the Court? THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.

MR. IRWIN: In regard to the UAW motion to compel -- and I've conferred with Mr. Ciantra on this -- as you may recall, there were some Jones Day research memoranda that were the subject of motion to compel, and I indicated we would do our very best to investigate whether these memoranda were, in fact, shared with the state, and that if they were, we would, in fact, disclose them to objectors here.

We have done our very best and it is proving too difficult to know. People just don't recall as they look at individual memoranda whether they did or didn't.

So I have conferred with Mr. Ciantra. I am perfectly prepared to share them with the court. I think the Court invited for us to submit them in camera for the Court to consider before deciding what to do, and I'm prepared to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. I will accept that and give you a decision tomorrow morning.

MR. CIANTRA: Thank you, Your Honor. In connection with that, I would just ask that the Court focus with respect to the cover email that was -- that described --

THE COURT: Is that there, too, or is
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that in evidence?
MR. CIANTRA: I believe it is --
MR. IRWIN: It's not in there.
MR. CIANTRA: It was read into the record yesterday by Ms. Green.

THE COURT: Okay. So I think I have --
so it's in here, opposing parties opening statement --

MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, I don't believe it is in there. I believe Ms. Green read it into the record in connection with her argument on the retirement system's motion.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll have to get it from the transcript. Can you help us?

MS. GREEN: The date of the email is listed in the PowerPoint presentation and it's June 5, 2012. The whole email, I don't believe is in it, I think it's maybe a piece of it perhaps.

THE COURT: Let me just ask, does anyone have the email?

MS. GREEN: I do. It is in our exhibit
binders that we gave to the court.
THE COURT: Can you give me the number?
MS. GREEN: I will give you the number in
one second. I will look it up. I have the binder back here.

MR. CIANTRA: Thank you for the court's patience with this.

THE COURT: Ms. Green, take your time and look for that -- or do you have it right at hand? MS. GREEN: I have it. THE COURT: All right. MS. GREEN: I believe it is 844. 844 in the Retirement Systems' binder.

THE COURT: Okay. We are all set. Thank you. And we got the envelope, so we're all set.

May we proceed?
You may proceed, sir.
MR. STEWART: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Mr. Moore, let me direct your attention to June 14, 2013. Did you have occasion that day to attend a meeting given by the Emergency Manager?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What was the purpose of that meeting?
A. The purpose of that meeting was to present what is referred to as the proposal to creditors to various creditors of the City of Detroit.
Q. Can we put up Exhibit 43, please? And could you
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see on the monitor in front of you, Mr. Moore, a document, Exhibit 43?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is that?
A. This appears to be the title of that presentation.
Q. And that was a presentation made that day?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What role if any did you have in making the presentation?
A. I spoke to a couple of parts in that presentation.
Q. How long was your part of the meeting?
A. I would estimate about 15 minutes or so.
Q. And what was the general reason for the meeting, if you know?
A. The general reason for the meeting as I indicated was to present the current situation that the City found itself in and the plan that the City wanted to pursue regarding restructuring and reinvestment, as well as to lay out a proposal as to how various classes of creditors would be treated.
Q. Were particular questions asked of you that day?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Let me ask you if you could, to go to -- and let's also ask Lori -- to go to page 98 of the document, which you can see on your monitor. And is this
a -- actually, let's go one page earlier just so the witness has his attention focused on it.
A. yes.
Q. And go back to the page we just had. And this page as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand what these pages depict?
A. Yes
Q. And what do they depict?
A. This is a ten-year financial forecast indicating the proximate amount of cash that was anticipated to be available for unsecured claims.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I object to this testimony.

THE COURT: First of all, pull the mike closer; second of all, please talk louder.

MR. SHERWOOD: I object on the grounds that this is improper opinion testimony from a non expert.

THE COURT: Well, the last question certainly didn't ask him an opinion, so to that extent it's overruled. When you think there is an opinion being given, $I$ invite your objection at that time.
Q. Unfunded in what sense?
A. The liability for the pension system in excess of the plan assets of the pension system.
Q. And those two numbers add up to about $\$ 3.474$ billion?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you know where that number came from?
A. yes.
Q. Where did it come from?
A. From me.
Q. And why -- who did you give it to?
A. I gave it to Mr. Malhotra.
Q. And anyone else?
A. I gave it to the other restructuring advise theirs would have put it into the document.
Q. And did you also share it with Mr. Orr?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And where did you get it from?
A. I got it from Milliman.
Q. And for the record, who is Milliman?
A. Milliman is the actuary engaged by the City of Detroit.
Q. Do you know how Milliman derived those numbers?
A. Yes.
Q. And could you tell us briefly how they did it and
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then I'm going to show you some exhibits.
MR. RUEGGER: With respect, Mr. Stewart, objection.

THE COURT: Into the microphone please. MR. RUEGGER: This is getting into expert
opinion testimony, Your Honor. We object.
THE COURT: The objection is overruled. THE WITNESS: Would you please restate
the question?
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Could you tell us how Milliman, to your knowledge,
came up with these numbers?
A. yes.
Q. The restructuring team has a task force?

THE COURT: Excuse me one second. How do you know how Milliman came up with these numbers? THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I lead a task force for the City of Detroit on pensions and I specifically received this information from Milliman.

THE COURT: Okay. You may answer the question.

THE WITNESS: The task force that I
indicated that is specifically focused on pensions asked Milliman to run a variety of scenarios.

BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Now let me -- and do you understand how Milliman in these scenarios came up with its numbers?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And how did they come up with their numbers?
A. Milliman used the Gabriel Roeder actuarial valuation.
Q. Stop you there. Who is Gabriel Roeder?
A. Gabriel Roeder is the actuary that is used by each pension system.

MR. STEWART: Sorry to interrupt you, but --

MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, I'm going to pose a hearsay objection on this. He is testifying to out-of-court statements presumably by actuaries at Milliman as to how they provide the numbers. It's rank hearsay. THE COURT: And who has Milliman retained by?

MR. CIANTRA: Milliman was retained by
the City of Detroit.
THE COURT: Who was Milliman retained by? MR. CIANTRA: The City of Detroit.

THE COURT: Is that your understanding?
MR. STEWART: Yes, it's being offered for
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state of mind. As we -- before he took the stand, I raised this saying we're not offering these for the truth, we're offering these numbers to rebut the argument that has been made that about Mr. Orr did not have a good faith basis in this document and other documents representing that the pension claims would be 3.5 million collars.

THE COURT: Did you tell Milliman -- I'm sorry, did you tell Mr. Orr how Milliman came up with these numbers?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir
THE COURT: All right. Tell us what you told Mr. Orr

THE WITNESS: I told Mr. Orr that
Milliman had taken the Gabriel Roeder actuarial valuation and modified a couple of assumptions based on that actuarial valuation.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will receive that testimony. Again, only for purposes of demonstrating what Mr. Orr was told, not for the truth of it.

## BY MR. STEWART:

Q. And did you have reason to believe that Milliman's conclusions were reliable?

MR. CIANTRA: Again, object to this.

He's not an actuary, he's not being proffered for actuarial expertise. I don't know what the basis of him offering that opinion would be.

MR. STEWART: Foundational question, Your Honor, but also, once again, since what we're
talking about is good faith reliance, an element of reliance is.

THE COURT: Here's a better question:
Did you express to Mr. Orr any doubt about the
reliability of the information that you had given him?

THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Let me put up page one of Exhibit 69, please. Can you tell me what Exhibit 69 is?
A. This is the draft actuarial valuation report from Gabriel Roeder for the general retirement system of the City of Detroit as of June 30, 2012.
Q. And the general retirement system is the system representing non uniformed employees of the City of Detroit?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you know what percentage of those non uniformed employees worked for the department of water and sewer?

A. Approximately 40 percent of the contributions that typically are made relate to water and sewer employees.
Q. Now let me ask if we could please put up page three of this document?

THE COURT: Is this in evidence?
MR. STEWART: It is -- yes, Your Honor.
It has not been objected to.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. And in particular, could I ask the court technician to expand the box at the bottom. First of all,
have you seen this document before, Mr. Moore?
A. yes.
Q. And tell us what it is?
A. This is the actuarial valuation as of June 30 of 2012 in draft and this indicates what the estimated unfunded actuarial accrued liability is as of that date in the previous year.
Q. And how does one get from the information you see here for the GRS, in other words, the general retirement system, to the amount of the unsecured claim that GRS would have?
A. Focusing on the column on the left, which is as of June 30 of 2012, the 800 -- approximately \$830 million.
Q. Go back please.
A. The approximately $\$ 830$ million in the column on the left is the UAAL, unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities.
Q. And may I stop you there and ask you to explain to us what a UAAL is?
A. A UAAL is based on an actuarial calculation for liabilities and assets. So the first item in terms of the unsecured claim amount was to look at the market value of the assets rather than the actuarial value of the assets. The actuarial value of the assets at that date was approximately $\$ 2.8$ million, the actual market value, so the value of the assets at that point in time, was actually approximately $\$ 650$ million lower than what was showed for actuarial purposes.

In addition to that, the top line, the actuarial accrued liabilities, is based on a discount rate and the discount rate that is used here is 7.9 percent, and in the claim unsecured claim calculation, a discount rate of seven percent was used.
Q. And so how using those numbers do you come up with the amount of the claim -- the unsecured claim of this pension plan against the City?
page of the document again.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. This is a document you've seen before, Mr. Moore?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How did it come to you?
A. I received this as part of my role on the pension task force.
Q. And you received it from who?
A. We received this report from the retirement system itself.
Q. And Gabriel Roeder is employed by the retirement system?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what use did you make of the document?
A. I reviewed this document for actuarial information related to the general retirement system.

MR. STEWART: I would move it into evidence, Your Honor, on the grounds it is if nothing else an admission of a party owe opponent since the GRS is an object err here and this is an agent of an objector.

MR. RUEGGER: It's hearsay, expert opinion and coming in through a lay opinions, your Honor. We press the objection.

```
                                    THE COURT: The objection is overruled. THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
```

A. Yes, sir.
Q. So tell me how you then take those numbers and turn it into a figure.
A. The accrued asset number, 2. --

MR. RUEGGER: Objection, Your Honor. I apologize for the tardiness on this, but I believe Mr. Stew was misinformed. Sixty-nine was objected to on hearsay and expert opinion and foundation grounds?

MR. STEWART: Then I stand corrected. I had been told it had not been objected to.

MR. RUEGGER: We would press those objections, Your Honor.

MR. STEWART: It's confirmed, it was indeed on thed to. However, Your Honor, I believe the witness has laid a foundation for it as a document he has seen, has worked with. Let me ask two more questions and then I'm going to move it into evidence so that it can be.

MR. RUEGGER: I object to the testimony.
MR. STEWART: Foundation testimony?
THE COURT: I'll let the witness testify or be asked about foundational questions to see if it's admissible and then we'll move on from there. MR. STEWART: So let's put up the cover
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The document, 69, is admitted in evidence.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Let's please go back to page 3. So Mr. Moore, let's go back to our calculation. We have at the bottom unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities and then two numbers above it. From the numbers you have described to us -

THE COURT: I want to be sure what we're doing here again.

MR. STEWART: Yes.
THE COURT: This evidence is solely in relation to the representation that Mr . Orr made to the court regarding the unfunded pension liability.

MR. STEWART: Yes.
THE COURT: Well, in that regard, again,
I'm much more interested in what the witness told
Mr. Orr than how he did his calculations or really
anything else because otherwise it sounds too much like him testifying as an expert.

MR. STEWART: Let's take the document
down. I think Your Honor already asked that
question of the witness, but.
THE COURT: Let's just be sure.
MR. STEWART: Yes.
THE COURT: Did you tell Mr. Orr anything
about how you made the adjustments that you made? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: What did you tell him? THE WITNESS: I told Mr. Orr that two
variables were adjusted based on the Gabriel Roeder actuarial valuation and that included the using the market value of the assets as well as using a different discount rate.

THE COURT: And did you disclose anything more specific about those two adjustments than just that much?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.
THE COURT: All right. That's it.
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. Let me then wrap up very quickly with this witness, Your Honor. Did you attend other meetings with -held on behalf of the Emergency Manager with creditors of the City?
A. During what time period.
Q. After June 14?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And let me direct your attention in particular to a meeting held on June 20th. Do you remember two meetings held that day?
A. yes, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. What do you remember?
A. I recall one question from an attorney representing the UAW questioning how we -- we being the City of Detroit -- would be able to accomplish some of what was in the proposal outside of bankruptcy.
Q. And do you remember what answer was given to that person?
A. I believe that the answer that was given by counsel
to the City was we want to move forward with these discussions and determine whether or not something could actually occur with all the parties outside of court.
Q. Thank you. Could we put Exhibit 70 on the screen, please?

Mr. Moore, Exhibit 70 for identification has been placed on the screen before you. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What is it?
A. This is the actuarial valuation report as of June 30 of 2012 for the police and fire retirement system.
Q. And who was it prepared by?
A. By Gabriel Roeder.
Q. And how did it come to you?
A. Through my role on the task force, pension task force.
Q. And what use did you make of the document?
A. I used this document to obtain actuarial and other information on the pension system.

MR. STEWART: Your Honor, I would move Exhibit 70 into evidence on the same grounds as recite in addition moving Exhibit 69 into evidence.
 force.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. CIANTRA:
Q. Now you had mentioned in your direct examination that you formed part of a pension task force; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that task force was created when?
A. In February or March of this year.
Q. So around the time the Emergency Manager was appointed, would that be correct?
A. Prior to the Emergency Manager being appointed.
Q. All right. Let's focus on from the time the Emergency Manager was appointed. You remained on the task force obviously?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. There were also individuals from the Milliman actuarial consulting firm who were on the task force?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And there were lawyers from the Jones Day law firm that were on the task force?
A. Yes
Q. And that task force met on a regular basis?
A. Met or had calls, yes.
other members of the task force present at that in person meeting?
A. Well, there were multiple in person meetings. I can't recall if anyone else from the task force was in the in person meetings or not.
Q. Okay. Were lawyers from Jones Day in those meetings with Mr. Orr?
A. Yes.

MR. CIANTRA: All right. I'm going to move, Your Honor, that his testimony a with respect to those meetings be struck because it is in effect a selective waiver of attorney-client privilege that they are engaging in here. We have had multiple deposition questions cut off on the grounds of attorney-client privilege with respect to the workings of this task force and other areas and they are obviously now making selective use of this to get in those figures. He has just testified that counsel for Jones Day was present in the meeting, he testified about it in direct, we would request that it be struck.

THE COURT: Can you give me an example of such an assertion?

MR. CIANTRA: From prior testimony? THE COURT: You said that attorney-client ROUGH - DAY 2
privilege had been asserted in relation to that meeting. I'm asking you for an example.

MR. CIANTRA: Well, in relation to the workings of the pension task force.

THE COURT: Give me an example.
MR. CIANTRA: I question Mr. Moore in his
deposition with respect to deliberations of that pension task force concerning the provisions of the Michigan constitution that protect pension obligations and the inquiry was stopped on the grounds of attorney-client privilege.

THE COURT: Have you got it? Can you show me?

MR. CIANTRA: If this had an index, it would be easier. If you give me a moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure. Well, let me ask you to pause from that and ask you a slightly different question or very different question, sir.

MR. CIANTRA: Sure.
THE COURT: Why wouldn't the remedy here be, based on the testimony that was given, that privilege is waived as of now and that therefore you can ask any questions without fear of privilege being asserted or at least a privilege claim

## sustained

MR. CIANTRA: Well, Your Honor, the problem with that is that there's been weeks of discovery and deposition testimony that's been taken where we have had questions cut off on the grounds of privilege, so I don't -- I can't do a redo of that at this point.

THE COURT: He's right here. Redo all you like.

MR. CIANTRA: Well, with respect to this question, I can, but not with respect to questions or documents that weren't produced during the course of this litigation, I can't.

THE COURT: Can you identify a document that wasn't produced that related to this pension task force?

MR. CIANTRA: There are multiple documents that --

THE COURT: Can you identify one?
MR. CIANTRA: I can find the log of their production. There are multiple documents that were withheld. I don't have it right with me.

THE COURT: It doesn't sound like you're quite ready to deal with your questions relating to your request here so let's move on and I will
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consider your request to strike the testimony when you are ready to argue it.

MR. CIANTRA: Thank you, Your Honor
BY MR. CIANTRA:
Q. I'm going to ask you some questions, Mr. Moore, with respect to the City proposal for its creditors, the June 14th proposal. Now with respect to that proposal, I understand an important component of it is reinvestment in the
infrastructure and operations of the City of
Detroit?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And we are projecting approximately $\$ 1$ billion price tag for that, for that program over the next ten years?
A. 1 billion on the reinvestment, if you will, the capital expenditures, yes.
Q. And then there's an additional quarter of a billion dollars with respect to other restructuring initiatives?
A. There are -- there is -- yes, that's correct, about a quarter of a billion dollars for expenses. There are also about a quarter of the billion dollars in revenue initiatives.
Q. Okay. And you also indicated that the emergency
manager's of the view that there is no possibility for material increases in the tax revenues that are
A. I testified that we looked into that and that was our conclusion, yes.
Q. You can't raise taxes to pay for that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's also correct, isn't it, that -- well, over the past ten years, there's been a substantial reduction in the amount of revenue sharing that's come to the City of Detroit from the State of Michigan?
A. That's correct, the revenue sharing has decreased, yes.
Q. And that is discussed in the proposal for creditors, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's just for the record, do you have it? It's Exhibit 43. City Exhibit 43. Do you have it there?
A. Nothing is up yet. THE COURT: Is it on the table there? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I have it.

BY MR. CIANTRA:
Q. So if we turn to page four of the document, the
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bullet point at the top of that page is state revenue sharing. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And so that quantifies that you've seen
approximately a 48 percent reduction in the City in approximately 48 percent reduction in the amount of revenue sharing it's received from the State of Michigan since fiscal year 2002?
A. yes.
Q. And you're off approximately 30.6 percent since 2008?
A. There's been a reduction of 30.6 percent since 2008, yes, that's correct.
Q. And would you agree those amounts are material?
A. They've certainly have been -- had a significant impact on the City's revenue, yes.
Q. Okay. And part of the projection that is included in the proposal for creditors Exhibit 43 are projections with respect to the amount of the revenue sharing going forward, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is, if you would turn to page 90 of that
document.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Towards the top of the page, you list the
A. Yes.
Q. So would I be correct that year over year you're projecting an increase in that of it looks like a little over one percent?
A. That's about right, yes.
Q. Is that a number you calculated or is that part of your contribution to this report?
A. No, sir, I did not calculate that.
Q. But that's -- that was the assumption that the increase in the revenue sharing would be approximately one percent year over year?
A. I can't speak to the assumption, but the number looks like about one percent per year.
Q. Yeah, that's the arithmetic?
A. Yes.
Q. And the revenues of the City are -- other revenues of the City are also projected there, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you have there on the first line the municipal income tax?
A. Yes.
Q. And the income tax in the City of Detroit now is
$\square$
the highest in the State of Michigan?
A. Yes, for individuals, the income tax rate for residents is the highest in the State of Michigan.
Q. okay. so you're seeing -- I'm looking there at increases in the order of a couple of percent per year?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So that's -- those two items are staying -- well, one would agree that probably not exceeding the rate of inflation, correct?
A. I'm not sure because I did not put together an assumption regarding inflation.
Q. okay. But one or two percent increases year over year?
A. That's what appears to be the math, yes.
Q. so sort of putting it together, it would be correct, isn't it, that the source of the funding for the reinvestment and restructuring that the City would like to undertake here is basically going to come from a reduction in the legacy costs, the bond debt and the accrued pension and other post retirement benefits?
A. I don't think that's the case.
Q. Where's the money coming from? If the revenues are staying the same and you're coming up with an extra
billion dollars, where is the money coming from

## other than from cut inning those areas?

A. The projections show approximately $\$ 250$ million in additional revenue that $I$ indicated as well as $\$ 350$ million in also other categories of additional revenue which total about $\$ 600$ million in new revenue during this ten-year period.
Q. Okay. So you've got 600 million new and you've got the rest of that 1.25 and that's coming from reductions in the legacy cost?
A. Could you define legacy costs?
Q. Sure. The pensions that are owed to the people I represent, their post retirement benefits and the bondholders, the debt on the existing bonds.
A. Yes, those three categories, that is what the proposal indicates is an adjustment to those categories.
Q. Let me go back to Exhibit 43 just for a moment and ask you to turn to page 109 of that document. And there's a bullet point on that page, a little more than halfway down, claims for unfunded pension liabilities.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And in the first bullet point, it indicates that because of the preliminary analysis with respect to
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the underfunding, that the City will not be making future contributions to the retirement plans for its employees. Is that correct?

## A. Yes.

Q. And that on account of that, in the third bullet point it says there must be significant cuts in accrued vested pension amounts for both active and currently retired persons. Do you see that?
A. yes.

And you were at the June 14 th meeting where this was presented to -- well, among others -- labor unions and other organizations representing retirees, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I am correct that there was no number that was put on the level of cuts that were -- that the City believed were necessary under this plan, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And in fact, as you sit here today, there has been
no number that has been put on that, correct?

## A. correct.

MR. CIANTRA: I have no further
questions. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, if I could

MR. CIANTRA: Your Honor, if I could
just address that privilege issue. And this is at Mr. Moore's deposition that was taken on the 18 th of September, and I can read from the transcript if Your Honor would.

```
THE COURT: Go ahead.
```

MR. STEWART: What page, please?
MR. CIANTRA: Certainly. This -- I'm
looking at the minuscript of the transcript, page 154, beginning the bottom of the page --

THE COURT: Is there a line number? MR. CIANTRA: Yeah, I'm looking. Let me see where to start here.

THE COURT: Here we have it on the
screen. MR. CIANTRA: Beginning on page 153. We'll see at page line 14, actually I'm asking the questions. You indicated earlier that you were part of a pension task force that has been considering pension issues since I guess the springs of this this year. And my question is during the discussions, the meetings of that task force, have you -- has that provision of the Michigan State constitution and that obviously is Article IX, section 24 -- been a subject of discussion? Witness answers yes. And he goes on.


And then continuing on to page 155 at the top, line one, and was there more than one discussion or did that come up on just one occasion? It probably came up more than -- I seem to recall more than one occasion where a discussion about whether the City would have to file for Chapter 9 took place and the pension element was discussed. And what was the -was the consensus that was developed with respect to that issue? And Mr. Miller, counsel for the City, responds. I'm going to object and ask the witness before he answers that question whether in connection with any discussion that might have led to a consensus that discussion included lawyers and counsel.

Mr. Ciantra, I'm not asking him.
And counsel that was provided by those

## lawyers.

I'm not asking about discussion with counsel, I'm asking whether this task force that was looking at the pension issues reached a consensus and it continues.

But the task force included counsel. He testified to that.

And then he goes -- and then I interject, I'm interested in whether there was a discussion,
not necessarily what your counsel might have advised. But to the extent that the concensus was reached and that concensus was based on legal advice, that consensus would be in my judgment privileged. So that's why I asked him. And he goes on, and then at the end, if so I would instruct you, Mr. Moore, not to expound. So our inquiry with respect to the consensus that was developed by this pension task force was cut off by attorney-client privilege assertions yet the witness has testified with respect to conversations in the presence of lawyers for the City with respect to where these actuarial numbers came from. It seems to be just a selective use of the privilege depending on circumstance and it's put news a difficult position, Your Honor, because I, you know, as I said before, I can't turn back the time -- the hands of time and, you know, retake Mr. Moore's deposition, go back and look at the, you know -- review the tense of thousands of documents that is have been produced to deal with it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. CIANTRA: It just seems unfair THE COURT: Mr. Stewart?
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MR. STEWART: Perhaps, Your Honor, I'm
just confused, but -- and let's put that transcript
back up on the screen. Mr. Ciantra paraphrased
parts of it, but the fact of the matter is there
was no instruction in and his question got
answered. And if we could blow up the bottom
quadrant of our document there. And there's this
colloquy between Mr. Miller and Mr. Ciantra and
Mr. Miller makes an objection. And Mr. Ciantra.
I'm not asking him that. And if so, I would ask
you not to expound. So let me ask the question
again. Let's make the record straight. Question,
did the task force you were part of reach a
consensus on the question of what effect the
provision of the Michigan State constitution that
protects accrued pension benefits would have on a
Chapter filing? He answered it. No. Question,
there was no consensus? No. And if we went to the
following page with a follow up question, there's
no instructions either.
up, so we can all see them.
the next page?
mR. STEWART: You'll have to blow those

## have now?

MR. STEWART: Okay. So I can keep reading, Judge, but as I go down this, I don't see an instruction not to answer a question. I don't see what was withheld. And then I can go further, I have other reasons too, but this to me seems to be the most important one. And perhaps I just misunderstood it and we're in the wrong page and why don't I sit down and Mr. Ciantra can stand up and guide us to where maybe I should have looked.

THE COURT: Mr. Ciantra, this is an
important motion that you have made to strike? MR. CIANTRA: Yes.

THE COURT: So I don't want to press you for a response to my question so let's take our time and you can research this properly and present your best case to the Court as to maybe even more than one example of situations in which you assert that the privilege claim was selectively advanced. So there's no need to rush through this.

MR. CIANTRA: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate it. I will review the transcript and I will respond.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does anyone else have any questions for Mr. Moore? Yes,
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sir.
MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, just on the last point, before I -- this privilege was also asserted at the deposition of Mr. Bowing (ph) from Milliman.

THE COURT: Let's add that one to the group that you'll put together together and we'll deal with it in due course.

MR. SHERWOOD: Good afternoon, Mr. Moore. Jack Sherwood on behalf of AFSCME.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon,
Mr. Sherwood

## EXAMINATION

## BY MR. SHERWOOD.

Q. Let me ask you about some of your conversations with Mr. Orr about the underfunding of the position of the pensions. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And during those conversations between you and Mr. Orr, did you advise him that the analysis of the unfunded position had not yet been completed?
A. Could you be more clear on which conversations?
Q. In any conversations that you had with Mr. Orr before the bankruptcy was filed, did you advise him
that the City's analysis with respect to the unfunded position on the pension had not been
completed?
A. I spoke with Mr. Orr regularly as to the status of all analyses and what the sources of where numbers were coming from.
Q. Okay. But I'm just asking specifically if you remember telling Mr. Orr that the City's analysis and its actuary's analysis of the unfunned position had not been completed. Do you recall that?
A. I recall specifically telling him the source that we were using for numbers as well as additional activities that the pension task force would undertake for other analysis.
Q. So that means that additional analysis was in process, is that fair to say?
A. Yes, and to this day additional analysis is in process.
Q. Do you recall telling Mr. Orr that the City was trying to undertake a process to develop a more concrete valuation model to analyze the amount of the unfunded position?
A. I did tell Mr. Orr that the analyses that we were giving him were based on Gabriel Roeder valuation and that Milliman would be developing its own ROUGH - DAY 2
Q. And did you also tell Mr. Orr that because the analysis of the unfunded position was still in process, that it was hard to negotiate with respect to that number because there wasn't a common assumption with respect to what the number should be?
A. No, I never told Mr. Orr that it was hard to negotiate.
Q. Did you tell him it was difficult to negotiate with respect to a pension underfunding amount when that amount was still in process of being developed?
A. No, I never told him that.
Q. Was that your belief in September of this year?
A. My belief in September of this year certainly was not that it was difficult to have a discussion or a negotiation over these numbers.
Q. Did you say it was premature -- would you say it was premature to negotiate over the pension underfunding if the -- if the number was not known?
A. No.
Q. So it's your view that you can negotiate with respect to a pension under funding amount even though you don't know exactly what that amount is?
A. Any pension under funding amount is an estimate and
we have an estimate, there are other estimates out there and certainly you can engage in discussions around those estimates.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What about taxes on people or entities other than individuals?
A. There is a corporate tax rate as well, corporate income tax rate.
Q. Are they the highest in the State of Michigan?
A. I believe that's the case, yes.
Q. Have you investigated the operations of the tax people in Michigan?
A. Could you define tax people.
Q. The tax department.
A. Tax department of the State of Michigan?
Q. No, of the City of Detroit?
A. Which tax are you referring to?
Q. Any
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And have you analyzed -- have you looked into
rebates, tax rebates for corporations in the State of Michigan -- I'm sorry, in the City of Detroit?
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A.

Corporate taxes are only approximately $\$ 6$ million per year, so we have not spent a whole lot of time on corporate income taxes.
Q. And what about tax rebates, have you spent a lot of time on that?
A. No, sir.
Q. At the meeting on June 14th, you were present, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And then you testified about a meeting on June 20th, also, correct?
A. Yes
Q. Were you present -- were you present at that meeting?
A. There were two meetings on the 20th, and yes, I was present for both.
Q. Was Mr. Orr at either of those meetings?
A. No.
Q. And at either of those meetings, did you have authority to negotiate with the parties at that meeting, at those meetings? Did you have authority to negotiate with the parties at those meetings on behalf of the City?
A. Could you define what you mean by authority
Q. Just the general understanding of authority that
you would have. You don't understand what
authority means?
A. Mr. Sherwood, I certainly was authorized to go to those meetings, to present information and to
receive information back, so yes, I was authorized.
Q. You were authorized to go to the meeting, to present information, and to receive information back, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And is it your testimony that that constitutes grounds to negotiate?
A. If you're
Q. A party to negotiate. I'm sorry.
A. Yes, sir, my understanding not in the context of collective bargaining agreements, but in the context of negotiations where there's give and take, yes.
Q. Were you consulted by Mr. Orr in connection with the decision of the City to file Chapter 9?
A. No, I was not.

MR. SHERWOOD: I have nothing further.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Any other questions?
MR. KING: Good afternoon, Your Honor Ron King with Clark Hill. I'm a colleague of
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Ms. Green and Mr. Gordon's. Pleasure to be in front of you today.

BY MR. KING:
Q. Mr. Moore, I just have a handful of questions and I'll try to jump around a little bit just because I don't want to be cumulative?
A. okay, Mr. king.
Q. As we sit here today, is it true that the City and its actuarial actuaries have not completed their analysis on the unfunded pension liabilities?
A. The City has completed its analysis from the standpoint of coming up with the 3.5 billion. The City desires to undertake additional analysis.
Q. So it's not completed, the analysis yet?
A. The City would like to continue to refine that estimate.
Q. So there's additional work that needs to be done before they'll complete their analysis?
A. Not that needs to be done, but that we would like to do.
Q. And so I understand your earlier testimony, to date, the City hasn't proposed any specific restructuring of the pension plans or a cut in pension benefits to any retiree; is that correct?
A. The city has proposed a process, a couple of times, with which to undertake, but there have not been specifics as to any cuts, if you will, in a pension
Q. Now let me refer you back to Exhibit 43, if we could have that put back on the screen, please. And specifically page 101, please. And this is -now can we go next page, please.

Now I'm looking for the page related to the pension plans. 109. I'm sorry. Thank you. And referring you to provision that you testified on previously, related to the claims for the unfunded pension liabilities. Do you see that section?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Outside of this presentation, have there been any other presentations or proposals presented to any of the objectors with respect to the treatment of the unfunded pension liabilities?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And which ones are those?
A. The two meetings on June 20th, there were documents that were handed out that had specifics as it relates to pension in those documents.
Q. what specifically?
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A. There were some specific thoughts as to ideas for modifying benefits of the pensions.
Q. But again, no specific numbers in terms of no specific numbers that reflect a cut to a pension benefit?
A. There were a lot of numbers in the June 20 th document regarding the pensions, yes.
Q. But my question is pretty simple. There wasn't a specific proposal that would say that the pension benefit of a particular retireey is going to be cut by $X$ percent?
A. correct.
Q. And was there ever an effort undertaken by you or the City to develop a plan or proposal that didn't contemplate an impairment or of accrued pension benefits?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that plan presented to any of the objectors?
A. Similar to what I indicated before, I don't believe there's anything specifically that has been presented in terms of pension benefits.
Q. so you're saying -- I should be clear. Pre-petition, so prior to July 18 th , was there ever a plan presented to any of the objectors that
contemplated not impairing or diminishing pension benefits?
A. Yes, sir, the June 14 th presentation, the financial projections, the baseline show what we anticipate the contributions would be without any cuts to pension plans.
Q. But that same June 14 th proposal specifically states that there will be significant cuts in accrued vested pension amounts, correct?
A. It indicates that, yes.

MR. KING: I don't have any further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Other questions for the witness? MR. RUEGGER: A few, Your Honor. Good afternoon, Mr. Moore. We met a month ago.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
MR. RUEGGER: I just have a couple questions.

```
EXAMINATION
```

BY MR. RUEGGER:
Q. The first one relates to the June 20 meeting. You
testified about that on direct. Do you remember?
5 A. Yes, sir.
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Q. At that meeting, did you have authority to accept any counter proposals from any of the participants?
A. Except from the standpoint of receive and then bring it back to City officials, yes.
Q. So you could have informed Mr. Orr and the other City officials, but you couldn't have agreed to anything at that meeting that had been countered; is that correct?
A. I think it would be highly unlikely that anything like that would happen at that meeting.
Q. Just answer my question, though. You couldn't have agreed to anything that might have been proposed by any of the other participants, correct?
A. No, sir.
Q. Only a couple questions. Switching subjects.

> On your conversations with Mr. Orr,
related to the alleged underfunding figure, did any of those occur prior to the June 14 th proposal that was just mentioned?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Approximately how many?
A. This is a guess, but perhaps five to seven meetings or conversations.
Q. on that issue, before that meeting?
A. Yes, sir.
0. Mr. Orr on that figure occurred between the June 14 th proposal and the July 18 th petition filing?
A. I woula gesess aspoe tuo.
Q. Did your information relating to that figure change at all between the June 14 th proposal and the July 18th filing?
A. no, sir.

MR. RUEGGER: Thank you. No further questions.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Any redirect?
MR. STEWART: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you very much for coming today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I will have to really maintain your status as a witness here until we resolve the earlier issue that was raised about the privilege, so your sequestration still applies, okay, sir?

THE WITNESS: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
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MR. CULLEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Thomas Cullen of Jones Day, and I'm going to be presenting the next witness, Ken Buckfire.

THE COURT: What is your last name, sir?
MR. CULLEN: Cullen, C-U-L-L-E-N.
Sorry, Your Honor. He was in the men's
room.
THE COURT: While we're waiting,
Ms. Patek, may I have your attention, please?
MS. PATEK: Sure.
THE COURT: Do you have one or two extra copies of your exhibits or your exhibit book that we can have for my law clerk or law clerks? We'll start with your offer of one if we can have yet one more at a later time, that would be great. Okay?

MS. PATEK: NO problem.
THE COURT: Thank you so much.
(Witness sworn.)
THE COURT: Please sit down.
MR. CULLEN: Good afternoon,
Mr. Buckfire.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. CULLEN:
Q. Could you state your full name and address for the
record, please?
A. Kenneth Buckfire. I reside at 1175 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
Q. And where are you from originally?
A. Detroit, Michigan.
Q. Born and raised?
A. Born an raised in Detroit and suburbs, then went to the University of Michigan where I graduate in addition 1980, and then I went to New York.
Q. Could you tell me something -- you're employed now?
A. I am.
Q. And where are you employed?
A. I am the co founder and co president of Miller Buckfire and company an investment banking firm based in New York City.
Q. And prior to that, what was your employment
history?
A. Prior to that, I began my career as a restructuring banker in 1987 with Dillon Read \& Company, after several years with that firm, I joined Lehman Brothers, where I was a senior restructuring banker. In 1996, I joined Wasserstein Perella to help them found their financial restructuring practice, which my partner Henry Miller and I then bought in 2002 to form Miller Buckfire.
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Q. And what does it mean -- explain exactly what Miller Buckfire does. Miller Buckfire is an investment bank specializing in restructuring advisory services to governments and companies. Our mission is to work with those entities when they have financial difficulties, either paying their debts when due or need specific skills in negotiating with their creditors and other stakeholders.
Q. Unpack that for me a little bit, if you would, Mr. Buckfire. Restruction advisory services. What does that mean?
A. Our typical engagement is with a company or government which is experiencing financial difficulty and does not quite know what to do about it. So our first mission would be to help them with diagnosis, to identify the causes of their financial pressures, to identify what can be done about those, in terms of a diagnostic, and then make recommendations on how to solve the problem, which normally means for a company making sure they have adequate liquidity to operate in the ordinary course and maximize values for their stakeholders in the case of the government, making sure they have adequate access to capital markets and the
Q. And in these engagements, what is your personal

March or April of 2012 for a 60 day review. They wanted us to review the public information of the City to try to ascertain what their financial challenges were and to put that in a format that could be useful for decision makers to understand the situation more accurately. That put us in contact with members of the mayor's administration, Jack Martin and Chris Andrews in particular, so I began a relationship with them.
Did there come a time in the fall of 2012 when the City issued a request for proposal for certain financial services?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you describe that for me please?
A. Well, the City had entered into a consent decree with the state in March of 2012, pursuant to which the state promised to provide financing to the City in support their restructuring efforts as long as the City was meeting certain milestones that were incorporated in that agreement.

I wasn't paying that much attention at the time, but then in the fall, Jack Martin called me and said you know, we're probably going to have to put out a request for financial advisor because we're about to enter into a new agreement with the ROUGH - DAY 2
state and they're going to require us to hire advisors to help implement the restructuring program that we first had described in the March 2012 consent agreement.

```
So we were invited to submit our
```

qualifications to the City at that time.
Q. Now did you become familiar in the course of your work with the consent agreement?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And does the term milestone agreement mean anything to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me show you Exhibit 23. In the book beside you, there's a book Exhibit 6 through 50 and we'll throw it up on the screen as well. And it will be on the screen in front of you. Do you see it, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Is that the consent agreement to which you referred?

## A. Yes.

Q. What understanding did you derive of the concept and purpose of this consent agreement?
A. Well, the consent agreement as I reviewed it describes a transaction really between the state and the City in which the state agreed to help the

## A. I do.

Q. Is that the reform program and the quid pro quo, if you will, by the treasury?
A. Yes.
Q. And why did the state want the reform agreement in your understanding?
A. Well, the City as I understood it had asked for financial assistance from the state. The City was under liquidity stress, they didn't have sufficient cash and they needed to find cash somewhere and the state agreed to facilitate the City's sale of bonds, a portion of which would be given to the City and in consideration for that assistance, my understanding is the City agreed to implement the reform program.
the court: Excuse me one second. It turns out you are now too close to the microphone and as a result our over flow rooms are getting
City raise funding to support its liquidity while it began a reform program, which was very clearly delineated in I think section 2.4 and more fully described in annex $B$ of this agreement.
Q. could I direct your attention to, I believe it's section -- well, let's look at 2.4 and 2.5. Do you see that, sir?
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2 A
Q. At what point were you actually hired by the city in 12 ?
wel1, as I recal1, we submitted to the Rep process
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { ROUGH - DAY } 2 \\
& \text { in -- might have been late November. We were told } \\
& \text { we had won in December and we signed our agreement } \\
& \text { with the City I believe on January the fifth of } \\
& 2013 \text {. } \\
& \text { When you first came into your responsibilities as } \\
& \text { the restructuring firm for the City, did you } \\
& \text { undertake an assessment of the city's finances and } \\
& \text { operations? }
\end{aligned}
$$

Q.
have on your hiring?
A. Well, this is what led to our retention. We had stayed in touch with Chris Andrews, who was the program management director and Jack Martin, who was the CFO all during this period even though we had no role and they had called me in November after this was signed and said we decided we really need expert outside help to implement our reform program and look forward to getting an RFP.
Q. Now was there any borrowing in connection with the milestone agreement?
A. Well, the original consent agreement had contemplated a financing I believe was $\$ 130$ million of which I believe it was 50 or 60 million was released to the City upon that funding and the rest was retained in an escrow account, which was still in effect as of the date of this agreement.
Q. And so was there some relation between progress on the agreement and draws from the escrow account?
A. Yes, the state was requiring the cuty to oxeouto its milestones in order for further cash to be released to it pursuant to this agreement.

$\square$
$\square$
A. Yes, we did, and we already were familiar with that because of the review we had done seven months before for the state.
Q. All right. Now in terms of the consent agreement and the milestone agreement, did you come to an understanding of the degree to which those agreements had been a success in promoting or helping the City to achieve the identified reforms?
A. yes.
Q. What was that view?
A. That it had been a very mixed outcome. The City had been successful in delivering really for the first time good financial information on a monthly basis to the FAB, which had been a responsibility required of it as part of the original consent agreement, but they had very, very limited success in implementing any of the other objectives of that

March agreement, and that's why this milestone agreement goes into such specificity about what is now required of the City to do in order for the state to continue to release money from the escrow account.
Q. But let's -- let me be clear or let me allow you to be clear. Did the division of responsibility or authority for these reforms remain the same under the milestone agreement or was it changed?
A. No, it was still with the City.
Q. And ultimately, as of the date that the emergency financial manager was named, had the City made substantial progress on this reform program?
A. No.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. Because they hadn't. I mean, they simply had failed to address any of the major items first identified in March of 2012, in particular no blight removal, restoration of public safety, there had been no initiatives made no, money spent, simply nothing had happened.
Q. Let me direct your attention to Exhibit 7 at Roman two, eight, C. It says any future draws to be negotiated between the administration and the state are contingent on the following, provided that the
A. Well, the escrow account had been created with some of the proceeds from the $\$ 130$ million bond offering that had been done in the late -- early spring of 2012.

> THE COURT: Speak up again, please. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. of the
$\$ 130$ million bond offering that had been done a year prior, that was the money that had been put into escrow by the state on behalf of the City.

## By Mr. CULLEN:

Q. And what was the significant -- did you attain an understanding of the significance of the minimum balance of $\$ 50$ million its importance?
A. Well, the City has an aggregate a billion dollars plus budget, has nearly 10,000 employees, and \$50 million represents approximately three weeks of expenditure on the part of the City and that's relevant because the City's revenues come in in a fairly lumpy way for a variety of different sources, so to make sure they have adequate liquidity to meet their obligations, particularly payroll, the state felt it appropriate to make sure

Q. Pardon me?
A. The state could step in and release this money in an emergency.
Q. All right. You say the revenues came in in a lumpy way. What does that mean?
A. Well, the City -- the City relies on four primary streams of revenue, gaming tax revenue, state revenue share, property tax, and income tax. Property tax income in particular comes in on a quarterly basis because that's when assessments are made, income taxes come in likewise in a fairly irregular fashion. The only revenue that is predictable and coherent is gaming revenue because it is being collected by the casinos on behalf of the City and readmitted to the City pursuant to a fairly complex set of accounts on a monthly basis.
Q. And so there will be times when the City is more flush than others?
A. correct.
Q. or more importantly, less flush.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Objection, Your Honor. I believe that's a leading question that is not
there was always $\$ 50$ million in reserve. If it turned out the City had miss estimated its cash reserves, the state could step in and help.
Q. In terms of analyzing the finances of the city at that time, what preliminary conclusions did you draw?
A. Well, we were very concerned about the City's ability to operate in the ordinary course for a number of reasons. The first one, which I was aware of because of my earlier work for the City, was the default to the swap counter parties. The City in 2009 had entered into agreement with the swap providers that were giving interest rate swap protection to the certificate of participation bonds that had gone against the City, that is, the present value of those swap contracts was a significant cost to the City, not a benefit. In 2009, because of a default at that
as to whether you had the right help in $E$ and $Y$ and Conway Mackenzie?
A. From a financial perspective, I thought we had an excellent team that could adequately address all the financial and operational issues of the City.
Q. And as you went forward to make judgments and to give strategic advice to the City, were you relying on the advice and the work of Conway MacKenzie and $E$ and $Y$ ?
time, the City settled that default by granting a collateral interest in the gaming revenues to UBS and Bank of America, Merrill Lynch. However, because of another credit down grade in March of 2012, the City was again in default to those banks.
I was.
MS. GREEN: Objection. To the extent he is testifying to the legal conclusion of what was. THE COURT: Speak into the Mike. MS. GREEN: I object to the extent that he's testifying to a legal conclusion of what constitutes an event of default under the swap contracts.

THE COURT: I don't understand him to be testifying to that, so the objection is overruled. MS. GREEN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may continue, sir. THE WITNESS: Thank you. I was very concerned about this uncured default and the threat that at any moment the swap counter parties could exercise their remedies and block the City's access to its gaming revenues, which was and still is the highest quality source of revenue the City has. Approximately $\$ 180$ million a year. Which represents close to 20 percent of its annual
budget. And that was an immediate issue that we addressed and we had to deal with in order to preserve the City's ability to operate while we're trying to figure out what the long term strategy should be.
by Mr. CULLEN:
Q. Now did you go about -- did you do anything to evaluate the assets of the City?
A. We did. Together with the City and again, we had a lot of familiarity with the City because of our earlier work.
Q. I'm just talking about in this initial phase when you're first getting yourself oriented.
A. We had begun to do what we always do is to address the City's assets and liabilities to understand what value did we have to work with to settle with the City's creditors and perhaps monetize to create a incremental liquidity for the City to operate, so we began to examine all the City's assets to determine whether any of them were, in our words, non-core, not essential for City operations, and could be available for sale and if they were available for sale, how much could be realized.
Q. Okay. Did you at that point evaluate the time necessary to effectuate a sale and turn an asset
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into cash?
A. yes.
Q. Now at the time you came into your responsibilities as head of this restructuring effort for the City of Detroit, was there talk about the possibility of Chapter 9?
A. Yes.
Q. could you describe that for me?
A. Well, when a company or government is in default, the threat of bankruptcy is always he real. The lack of cash is normally what would push a company into a Chapter 11, in the case of a government, it's more complex, but clearly we had to be concerned about that being in the necessary way of protecting the City given this unsecured default of the swap banks and in January of this year, that was our primary concern.
Q. What was your primary concerns?
A. That the swap banks could take unilateral action to deprive of us access to the gaming revenues and that would cause the City incredible damage because we would immediately have to make massive cut backs to services and we weren't sure what we would do about it, so we had to consider Chinas an alternative to protect the City.
Q. position, what was your first set of advice to the City about what more they should do or what more you should do?
A. Well, in addition to accelerating our analysis of the City's financial condition, which we obviously had undertaken to do, we recommended the City consider bringing in a law firm with the multi disciplinary skills and experience to help the City with contingency planning for whatever might occur
 E\&Y or Conway MacKenzie in terms of what they should try to accomplish in the short term?
A. I did.
Q. Let's start with $E$ and $Y$ ?
A. With E and Y, I suggested to them even no their RFP had only required testimony to do a five-year forecast that really we should extend that to ten years. For a City or government to look at a long term financial picture, the longer you can look out, the safer you are in terms of understanding what you need to do. Five years is simply too short a period for any realistic appraisal of its performance. And they agreed to extend out their analysis to ten years even though that did impose a
tax collections
Q. And did you feel that you had a competent team in E\&Y to do this?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell them what you were going to use it
for?
A. yes.
Q. Did you intend to rely on it?
A. I did.
Q. And did you rely on it?
A. I did.
Q. And do you as you sit here now feel justified in your reliance upon it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did there come a time when Detroit turned its attention to hiring legal counsel?

## A. Yes.

Q. What was your involvement in that process?
A. Well, about a week after we had been officially retained, I met with the City and we concluded that at a minimum, the City needed to focus on strategies, particularly legal strategies to protect itself from the swap banks in terms of any actions they might take to take the gaming revenues away. It was their conclusion that bringing
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another law firm at least considering bringing in another law firm in to supplement other attorneys already working for the City was a sensible thing to consider. They asked me to recommend the firms that might meet the qualifications required, so we basically gave them a list of law firms that we felt had all the qualifications to provide it to the full range of services the city might require under any scenario.

## Q. And how many law firms were there?

A. Well, I think we ended up with about 14 or 15 law firms. Many of them were well known to the City having done work for them before. The rest were so-called national law firms that had had very little exposure to the City but did have the experience in complex reorganizations, has had some experience with the Chapter 9s, had a lot of experience out of Court restructurings, and in addition to that had sufficient familiarity with healthcare regulation and pension reform to deal

## as well.

## Q. (By Mr. Cullen): <br> Was there a meeting at which

these law firms presented themselves?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you at that meeting?
A. I was.
Q. who else was at that meeting?
A. Well, we had a large group from both the state and the City represented there for the purpose of interviewing the law firms they did not know. As I testified earlier, the City already knew quite a few law firms especially in Detroit that it was quite comfortable with, they did not feel they needed to interview those firms again, so they interviewed the firms they did not know, and I was present at that meeting with Andrew Dillon state Treasurer, Tom sacks ton who I believe is titled the senior deputy treasurer, Brom Stibitz, which S-T-I-B-I-T-Z, who was a senior advisor to the Treasurer, and Richard Baird who my understanding at the time he was the Governor's aide for human resources and things like that. And from the City, we had Chris Andrews, program management director, Jack Martin, CFO, and I believe we had somebody from the legal department but I can't recall their name.
A. I apologize, we had two members also from the financial advisory board, Sandy Pierce and Ken Wibble.
Q. In your understanding, who was to make the

## suggesting the Emergency Manager?

A. No.

THE COURT: All right. Sir, let's pause now for our afternoon recess. It's $3: 30$. We'll resume at $3: 45$, please.

> COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is in
recess.
(Whereupon a break was taken
from 3:29 p.m. ing, ,
COURT CLERK: Court is in session.
Please be seated?
THE COURT: It appears everyone is
present. You may proceed.
MR. CULLEN: Thank you.
By MR. CULLEN:
Q. Mr. Buckfire, as Ernst \& Young worked on these cash projections, did they keep you informed of their progress?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Was there any particular run of these projections that stand out in your mind as having significance to this matter?
A. Yes. In early May of this year, they showed me a draft 12 -month cash flow forecast.
Q. And what is it that cash flow forecast indicate to
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## you?

A. Well, it indicated to me that the City's cash position was far worse than $I$ had ever feared. The City would effectively be operating with no cash by the end of that period of time, even on their current projections, which incorporated certain deferrals of expenses that in the ordinary course they should not be making. Now I was very alarmed by this because I was acutely aware of the fact we still had no solution to the default under the swap agreements and that at any moment the City's ability to provide services could be eliminated.
Q. How would you describe the city's cash situation at that time as presented in those projections?
A. The City had minimal cash, they had a few tense of millions of dollars, it was erratic, they had no real ability to project because as I testified earlier, cash would come in in a somewhat lumpy and unpredictable manner, and so at any given time, the City could find itself with no cash.
Q. Broader group those cash flow projections memorialized in any of the documents in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. If I could show you Exhibit 75, at page 40. If you can blow up the numbers there, please. Are these
the numbers that you just testified to?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Could you tell us what your understanding was at the time based upon these numbers?

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I object to this witness' testifying about forecasted receipts for the period set forth there. That -- the proper subject for expert testimony and this is a lay witness.

MR. CULLEN: May I lay some foundational questions, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Okay
BY MR. CULLEN:
Q. In your work as a restructuring analyst, do you normally commission cash flow forecasts?
A. Routinely.
Q. Is it one of the ordinary tools of your trade?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you make decisions based on those cash flow forecasts?
A. I make recommendations based on these forecasts, yes.
Q. And when you make those forecasts, what kind of people do you use to do them?
A. We use -- we rely upon outside professionals, such
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as Ernst \& Young and Conway MacKenzie as well as the finance staff of our client.
Q. In this situation, did you think that a cash flow forecast of this type was necessary for the City to have?
A. yes
Q. Was it necessary for you to make informed recommendations?

## A. Yes

Q. And based upon these forecasts, did you indeed make recommendations to the City about its strategy in the restructuring?
A. I did.
Q. And did you have any other -- any better options available to you at that time to make this kind of a cash flow forecast which you said was necessary to your job on behalf of the City?

## A. мо.

MR. CULLEN: I would move the admission of this cash flow forecast, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the exhibit number? MR. CULLEN: The exhibit number is 75 ,
page 40. It's the financial operating plan, page 40 of same.

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, rule 702 of
evidence is specifically designed so that when a party offers testimony requiring expertise, knowledge, tools of the trade, the trade of this witness is not a simple trade. It requires expertise, experience and so forth. And just because he relied on these and he does, it does not take this outside of the scope of rule 702 and frankly I just think this is sort of an end run around the Court's decision to deny the testimony or not give weight to the testimony with respect to the projections of Ernst \& Young.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Your Honor, could I joint for a moment if I might? May $I$ join in objection?

THE COURT: Of course you may. I'm not sure why you think you need to do that, but okay.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I just wanted to point out one --

THE COURT: There's an additional
argument you want to make? Okay.
MR. MONTGOMERY: Your Honor, very simply, to the extent that the City was going to try to rely on an officer, director or owner type exception, obviously this witness does not fall within that category.
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THE COURT: Yeah, I don't hear that quite at issue here, but thank you.

Just so the record is clear and I'm
clear, too, this was prepared by Ernst \& Young?
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MR. CULLEN: Your Honor, if I might?
THE COURT: And it's not otherwise in
evidence at this point?
MR. CULLEN: It is otherwise in evidence The Exhibit 75 as a whole is in evidence, subject to the fight about these parts of the exhibit and what they're in for and what they're not in for.

THE COURT: I will admit the document but for the limited purpose of establishing what this witness relied upon for his work and not for purposes of establishing the truth of anything in it.

MR. CULLEN: I take it, Your Honor, just to be clear, that when we close up this matter, depending on how you rule on the motions tomorrow, that it is some evidence, weight or not, of the state of the City that Mr. Buckfire will testify that he believed this was the state of the City, Mr. Orr will testify that he believed this was the state of the City, and that they had a reasonable
Q. What conclusions did you --

THE COURT: I will comment I have refrained to make this comment until now but I will make it now that you have asked the question. It's actually hard for me to comprehend why you didn't offer the Ernst \& Young witnesses who prepared these projections as experts. You may proceed. MR. CULLEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. CULLEN:
Q. what inpact did these numbers have upon your forward planning and advice with respect to the Detroit restructuring?
A. Well, we were extremely alarmed by these numbers. Remember, we received these numbers in early May. We knew how unpredictable the City's ability to

collect property and income taxes were and we immediately realized in June of 2013, which was only a month away from this forecast date, that the City was operating on a razor's edge. If it were to make the $\$ 40$ million bond payment on June 15 th to the POC bondholders, that would only make sense if indeed collected all of its anticipated tax revenues on schedule in the amounts stipulated here. A $\$ 7$ million cushion on a budget of this magnitude is almost effectively nothing.

That also alarmed me because I knew we still had a continuing problem with the swap banks, Bank of America and UBS, we knew we would have to negotiate some kind of agreement with them to retain our access to the gaming revenues which you'll see here for this short period of time is \$105 million, you'll notice how regularly it's projected to come in, and that is a matter of historical record is quite accurate. The City has always been able to rely on those revenues in the absence of anything else because they're collected by the gaming casinos themselves.

We realize that if it turned out that our recommendation to the City in order to reserve -preserve cash was to not make the $\$ 40$ million bond
payment, that would be another default to the swap counter parties. At that point, we already had two defaults to them. The original ratings down grade of March of 2012, which had not been cured, and indeed the appointment of Kevyn Orr as Emergency Manager also in and of itself constituted a event to default. The swap bangs which were continuing to get paid had not shown any indication they might change their minds, nonetheless, it was a significant risk to the City. So we immediately turned our attention in early May to deciding what should we do about this in order to make sure the City continued to have adequate cash to operate and provide services. future that you had to decide whether to make or not?
A. Yes. If you look at the schedule, you'll notice under June 13, column -- second column to the left, there's a line in the middle of the page called POC and debt related payments. There's approximately a $\$ 40$ million payment due by the City on June 15 th
Q. And was there a decision to be made with respect to that payment?
A. There was. Given how tight the City's cash
position was, they only had even on the projections 7 million cash if they made that payment -- we had to consider the necessity of not making it in order to preserve liquidity.
Q.


Were there any other ways that you haven't discussed to preserve or enhance the City's cash position in May of 2013?
A. Well, as I testified earlier, we had looked at all of the City's assets to find out if any of them could be marshaled to create significant cash for the City and that began in January. We revisited that in early May. We unfortunately came to the same conclusion we came to in January that really there was nothing that was readily convertible into cash. The City effectively had mortgaged all of its real assets years before. The City did have potentially $\$ 60$ million left in the escrow account established with the state in 2012. I called senior deputy Treasurer sacks ton to ask whether that might be available to the state if we really found ourselves in an emergency and he said that it would really depend on our overall recommendation and dealing with the City's long-term financial problems.
Q. All right. Did you and the advisors ever come to a
A.

MR. SHERWOOD: Objection. I object to any testimony about insolvency. This is not an expert witness and it calls for a legal conclusion.

## BY MR. CULLEN.

Q. In the course of your work, do you -- are you always or often called upon to address that question and advise on that issue?
A. yes
Q. What is your understanding of insolvency?

MR. SHERWOOD: Your Honor, I renew the objection. I assume when this witness is called upon to testify in other matters concerning insolvency, he is qualified as an expert witness. THE COURT: Hold on one second. MR. CULLEN: Pardon me?
THE COURT: Hold on one second for me, please.

MR. CULLEN: Sure.
THE COURT: I do think it is appropriate to ask the witness about the facts that constitute insolvency under 101.32C, of the Bankruptcy Code. ROUGH - DAY 2
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by mr. cullen:
Q. Did you come to the conclusion that the City was unable to pay its debts as they came due?
A. yes.
Q. What was the basis for that conclusion?
A. Well, there were two sets of facts that we relied upon. One was this schedule, which was very short term in nature and therefore we felt had -- could be relied upon because it wasn't very long dated. And it clearly showed that the City was operating on a raiser's edge liquidity.

Secondly, we knew because we were in constant communication with the City's finance staff that they were routinely stretching out payables and attempt to conserve cash. They were not paying their trade creditors when due even at date of the May 13 report.
Q. In your view as of -- as of May of 1913, was the City able to pay its debts as they came due?
A. No, in fact, they were continuing to stretch out and defer payments whenever possible to conserves cash.
Q. Was there any probability in your view of the City's operations and cash flow of its remedying either of those situations without aide in the
foreseeable future?
A. We didn't see a possibility of that. The City had lost.

MR. SHERWOOD: I'm sorry to interrupt again, Your Honor. I object. Calls for a lay opinion. Again, talking about. THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

Go ahead, sir.
THE WITNESS: Well, as a banker, the
first thing we always evaluate is whether a company or a government can borrow to cover a short term financing requirement. In the case of Detroit, it's access to the capital markets had been cut off long before the most recent downgrade made it impossible for the City to borrow in the ordinary course on the markets, and in fact, had nothing left to pledge to gain access to the capital market. So that source of financing was closed. And that's why indeed the prior year the state had to step in and assist the City even in raising the 130 million it did raise because without that it never would have been able to do that.

We then looked again at all of the
so-called non core assets of the City and determined again whether any of those could be
readily converted to cash. We again came to the
conclusion that there was nothing of any
significance that could be converted to cash in the
timeframe required to a vert a cash crisis in June
or July of this year.

By Mr. CULLEN:
Q. Turning your attention now to the June 14 th proposal to creditors. Did you have input into the strategy and concept of that document?
A. I did.
Q. Could you tell me what your understanding of what that proposal was meant to achieve was?
A. Going back to the --

MR. CULLEN: If that's an understandable
sentence.
THE COURT: Close enough.
THE WITNESS: Going back to the consent
decree of 2012, between the City and the state, Annex B clearly -- the state expected the City and the City agreed to review comprehensively all of its operations and its long-term financial stability in order to come up with a strategy that would, if implemented, result in the rebirth and rejuvenation of the City as well as paying its creditors what they were owed.

We were specifically tasked with working on that list of activities, especially with regard to long-term obligations, and when we got hired by the City in January this year to assist with that project, we explained to the City that the only way in which we could establish a proper foundation to negotiate with our stakeholders, whenever that deemed necessary to take advantage of, would require us to give our stakeholders as much information about the City's financial condition as we could.

And until they had as much information as we could reasonably develop about the short term forecast as well as the long-term condition of the City, they could not be in a position to properly evaluate whatever restructuring proposal we ultimately made to them in consideration of their claims.

So in January, when we first sat down with Ernst \& Young and Conway MacKenzie, we all agreed that that would be the goal to where we would work, would be to develop a set of information that all policymakers and our stakeholders could rely upon to evaluate whatever we deemed our strategy to be. And that was our
goal and that was our objective from January until May of this year.

## BY MR. CULLEN:

Q. In terms of putting out all of the proposal and informing the stakeholders of the state of the City, can you tell me what your input was into the structure of the offer itself, the structure of the plan?
A. Well, the structure of the -- the restructuring proposal we made in the June 14 th document that was publicly made available on that date really relied upon the ten-year forecast that Ernst \& Young had put together to show what a realistic view of the City's revenues would be and that would be assuming the impact of the reinvestment plan of over $a$ billion dollars over the next ten years would allow the City to stop its decline and set a foundation for renewal. Based on the financial implications of that program, we then were able to calculate what was available to give to our stakeholders in consideration of their claims, which in and of itself was very complicated analytical challenge because until Ernst \& Young and Conway had really examined the off balance sheet liabilities of the City, we really didn't know what the real
liabilities of the City were.

> on publicly available information, which was accurate insofar as the funded debt went, but we really did not know whether the projections and liabilities associated with other liabilities, particularly healthcare and pension, were accurate or could be relied upon, and that was a very important focus of our analytical work this year until the release of the June 14 th plan.

So our role was after we received the information, was to then review with counsel the appropriate way to construct an offer to all of our stakeholders, which recognized what the City's true debt capacity was and then decide what would be an appropriate way of allocating that across our stakeholders.
Q. Now you talked about a level of services consistent with sustaining the population and the tax flow revenues of the City, did you not?
A. I did.
Q. How did you go about identifying that level of services?
A. Well, again, going back to March of 2012 , the City itself had identified a long list of areas in which

it felt it needed to restore or invest services, blight removal, police, fire, lighting, a whole list of things, but there was no budget against them. We didn't know what it would cost, nor did we know how long it would take to implement any of those potential program areas. And that was the primary focus of Conway MacKenzie's work together with the City's own staff was to identify precisely how much it might cost to implement all of those objectives.
Q. And in terms of your previous discussions of time and cash, how did they play into this June 14 th proposal?
A. Well, we had discussed with the City back in January of this year what we would do once we came to a conclusion about what the City really could afford in terms of its obligations while reinvesting in rehabilitation. And we explained to the City that as long as we had cash, as long as we had liquidity, we would be able to construct an out of Court negotiating strategy that would, with enough time, allow us to negotiate with all of our creditors and not have to result in immediately a Chapter 9 filing, although that would always have to be considered if for no other reason than when

## 8 A. Well, normally you would want to have enough cash

 to operate without interruption from thenegotiations for at least six months to a year.
Q. And how much money would that be in this case?
A. Several hundred million dollars.
Q. Did the City have that?
A. No.
Q. If I could direct your attention to page 41 of the --
A. May I correct one thing? I apologize. The City did not have the money, and the only way it could get cash would be to pay its unsecured obligations such as the POC bonds but that would have created another level of defaults which would have brought us right back to the problem I had with the swap counter parties which they had right due to remedies to block our access to gaming revenues, so if we did try to solve our liquidity with not
negotiating with creditors, if you don't let them know that that's a possibility, it's hard to get them to take you seriously in a negotiation to keep a country or a City or a company out of bankruptcy Court.
Q. So could you make that concrete for me, how much cash equals how much time?
paying our unsecured creditors, we may lose it because we lose the gaming revenues.
Q. Exhibit 43, page 41.
A. Sorry, I've lost you. What exhibit are you on.
Q. I haven't asked a question yet. All right. THE COURT: It's on your screen there. THE WITNESS: Yes.
By MR. CULLEN:
Q. Does this accurately reflect what about purports to reflect, the key objectives for the financial rehabilitation and restructuring?
A. Yes, these are the objectives set out to us by the City.
Q. Were these objectives new in this report?
A. No, these were all reflected in the consent agreement of March of 2012.
Q. Had substantial progress been made on any of these?
A. No.
Q. In terms of the discussions internally within the brain trust of the City, as I might call it that, the mayor and his advisors, what was the -- was there an intention to make this proposal a take it or leave it proposition?
A. No.
Q. What was the intention?
A. Well, the intention was to provide our stakeholders with the best possible information about the City's true condition that we could develop and we had been working around the clock on this for months. We also wanted to make sure that when we did begin discussing with stakeholders, they would see what we thought made sense for all of our stakeholders at the same time so that there would be no doubt that the City was approaching this in the most even handed and fair way possible.
Q. And when you say even handed and fair, what aspect of the proposal can you point to that reflects that determination or that principal?
A. Well, just to pick out one example, we felt it important to start out by delineating our creditors into whether they were secured or unsecured, and we proposed that our secured creditors would receive 100 cent recoveries, our unsecured creditors would share pro rata in what we believed was the value available to them pursuant to our restructuring plan which was $\$ 2$ billion of notes.

THE COURT: Which was what?
THE WITNESS: \$2 billion of notes. That was all we calculated the City could afford post this restructuring in terms of debt capacity. We also wanted to make sure that when we did begin
)

 ( $>$
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By mR. CULLEN:
Q. And have you used the words in the past pari passu to explain that model as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Now there's been a lot of discussion in the case about asset sales and you've discussed it some today, but I would like to direct your attention to pages 83 to 89 of Exhibit 43. And take you through this list of assets so that you can talk about -and I apologize for the nature of this question, but I think it will move things along -- so you can talk about the consideration of the nature and effort given to each asset, the values available, and the hurdles to be overcome or to be avoided in getting -- turning the asset into money. If I can proceed that way, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. MR. CULLEN: With respect to each of the assets.

```
            THE COURT: Go ahead.
```


## BY MR. CULLEN:

Q. Detroit Water \& Sewage?
A. Well, the Detroit Water \& Sewer Department is a very complicated situation. It had been operating under federal Court order for a very long time. At
the time of our engagement in January, it was the still operating under the supervision of the so-called root cause committee, which was really effectively the governance body, although the assets were owned by the City and are still owned by the City, the City has never received any cash flow from its ownership stake.

The department has operated on the basis of zero profit, it is allowed to recover its operating maintenance and debt services from rate pairs and that's all so it's never been a source of cash flow to the City.

And furthermore, in addition to that, we had no ability to raise rates to generate cash. That would not be allowed under the utilities laws of the State of Michigan. And we also had no ability to pick up and sell it overnight because as I mentioned before, it was under a Court order until March of this year.

So we began to evaluate after that Court order was I guess dismissed is the correct phrase whether or not we could in fact realize cash from the system but because of its public nature, we recognize it would be extremely complicated to do and that the only way to do it would really be to
$\square$
either sell it to its customers in exchange for a lease payment or a pilot payment, or consider some version of a privatization.

We've been contacted by a number of private equity firms which have expressed an interest in buying it if they could, but only if they could charge higher rates to recover their own cost of capital. So we recognize, even though this would be potentially a source of great value to the City, it would be a long and complex process with a low probability of success.
Q. The Coleman Young Airport. Next page. Coleman Young Airport.
A. The airport is currently not being used for
commercial services, it's being used for so-called general aviation only. It's a very small airport, it's run ways are too short to allow regular commercial service by major carriers. The airport itself is dilapidated and would require reinvestment to bring it up to commercial standard. It's effectively worth nothing and likely not to be worth anything unless these reinvestments are made.

And we did explore it actively about one of my partners who is an airlines expert. We came to the conclusion that, you know, we would have to
pay someone to take it.
Q. Move on to the Belle Isle Park, if we would,
please. I'm sorry, Detroit Windsor tunnel.
A. Well, the City owns half the tunnel, Windsor owns the other half. Under prior administration, Detroit leased its portion of the tunnel in exchange for rent equal to 20 percent of annual revenues. The last year, I believe it collected $\$ 750,000$. The City has no ability to vacate the lease which turns through 2020, there is no ready buyer for it. Given the lease which encumbers the asset, there was no value to be realized there. Indeed, we recommended instead that the City audit the operations of the operator to find out whether it would be getting a fair allocation of revenue and that audit is still ongoing.
Q. Belle Isle Park.
A. Belle Isle Park is a major park of the City. We did not believe that it would have any material value as any other -- any other application. First of all, it would require a rezoning. Rezonings are typically long and complex undertakings. It is an important social asset of the City. Converting it into any kind of private use would again be long and contentious process. We did not believe it ROUGH - DAY 2
could be converted in any form of cash at any time soon.
Q. Next page, please. Detroit Institute of Arts. The number of words under states the interest in the problem. Could you tell us what investigations and efforts have been done with respect to the Detroit Institute of Arts?
A. Well, back in January when we first began our engagement, we discovered and we had not known this before, that the City of Detroit actually does own the building and the art collection of the Detroit Institute of Arts, which is operated on the City's behalf by the DIA corp which is the founders society as a contractor to the City.

We obviously were concerned about this and had to decide whether or not this might be a source of value for the City. I did meet with trustees and managers of the DIA in May and explained to them that they should be concerned about the fact that in the worst scenario, the collection and the art might need to be dealt with as part of a restructuring and it would be in their interest as trustees of the operator to try to secure funding from whatever source they could to give to the City in exchange for a protective covenant. I thought
A. Well, we originally hoped that this land could be quite valuable. It's not every day that 22 square miles within a massive urban area becomes available for redevelopment. We thought that should be of interest to some set of developers, but again, the land is in disparate parcels, it's held in disparate hands, there are at least count five different government entities that control different parts of the property represented by the 22 square miles. There is no coherent strategy for disposal, marshaling or redevelopment of this property.

In addition, much of the land is still encumbered with blight. It would require significant investment to remove that blight. And lastly, a lot of the land is subject to liens which have not been cleared. And the cost of clearing those liens would not be in substantial here. Again, even though individual parcels might be available for cash, there is no substantial value to be realized from this today.
Q. Parking operations.
A. Again, the City owns nine garages, many of which are being operated by others. We actually are in

the process of putting together an auction to sell the rights to use those parking garages to others. I would note that many of the garages are in such a dilapidated condition they are unsafe. Ironically enough, the garage supporting the DIA has been condemned. It has not been used for any commercial purpose for a number of years because it's in such bad condition. I'm not sure what anyone would pay us for that.
Q. Joe Louis Arena.
A. Again, you know, it's an old facility, currently obsolete. We're entertaining alternatives for it, but we haven't received any.
Q. And with respect to all of these asset sale possibilities or asset monetization possibilities, had they all to your knowledge been the subject of discussion before they appeared in this report?
A. Well, prior to our involvement, I can't testify to that, but as soon as we were engaged, we immediately began to systematically look at all these assets to find out whether any of them could be turned into cash, and it was the subject of intensive analysis by my firm beginning in January of this year.
Q. All right. And -- pardon me, Your Honor.
that would be a clever way of realizing short term equire the arduous process of trying to take the
art and seiling it on a fire sale basis.
Q. Has that progressed any further?
A. somewhat.
Q. Has there been an attempt to value it?
A. At our recommendation to the Emergency Manager,
Christie's, which is an internationally known
auction house with expertise in these matters has
been engaged in an appraisal of that portion of the

In the -- in the proposal itself, was there any discussion of what would happen to further unsecured payments of debt going forward?
A. Well, on June 14 th, we told the creditors and we had over a hundred people show up at that meeting, that we had taken the decision because of the City's dire cash position to not make the $\$ 40$ million bond payment due on June 15 th and that we would be suspending all other unsecured debt payments for the foreseeable future in order to conserve cash.
Q. And did you view that as necessary in light of the circumstances of the City?
A. We did, but we also felt we could take that step because we were able to negotiate an agreement in principal just prior to that date with the swap banks which we felt would allow us to continue to have access to our gaming revenues, which was an essential condition to allowing the City sufficient time to negotiate with the stakeholders.
Q. So again, what was the relationship between the settlement with the swap banks and the ability to negotiate?
A. Well, the swap banks already had one uncured default, the ratings down grade, the appointment of
Q. Now what did you persona11y do to try to talk to
contact various stakeholders?
A. well, we were fortunate in one respect. we had had

Kevyn Orr was in and of itself a default be and we knew once we took the decision to not make the bond payment, that would be another default, at some point, especially after the swap banks saw the financial condition of the City, they might feel they had no option, but to be defensive in protecting their own position, even if they didn't want to, and block our access to gaming revenues. So having an agreement with them in place prior to taking a decision to not make the bond payment was crucial.
After the June 14 th proposal in the public meeting at which it was presented, did you make further efforts -- did you make any efforts to generate counter proposals, discussions, other interests?
A. Yes.
Q. What -- could you describe generally those efforts? First let me put up on the screen Exhibit 44, the full version of the creditors proposal -- well, pages 61 and 62. And is this the calendar that you set forth for your efforts in the proposal?
A. Yes.
Q. Now what did you personally do to try to talk to contact various stakeholders?

Well, we were fortunate in one respect. We had had

a very robust response to our invitation to the meeting on June 14, we had been able to identify all of the bond trustees and all of the bond insurers that insured much of the City's debt. They effectively could be relied upon to speak for if not actually vote the interest of their underlying bondholders and so we were very happy that they all agreed to come and hear our proposal because we knew we could begin our discussions with them, they already were organized.

We also knew who could speak for the
pension trusts and they were invited and we also invited union representatives who we hoped could speak for both the active and retired employees of the City so they were all present on the 14 th of June.
Q. And was it your desire to promote discussions and counter proposals?
A. Well, that was the whole intent of the meeting. We in spent months developing the financial information, we felt our stakeholders deserved to be able to evaluate not only their current positions relative to the City, but evaluate the proposal that we made to them at that meeting. We wanted them to have exactly the same information
that we did, we wanted to make sure they could rely upon it to be accurate, and we wanted them to also understand that despite all the promises that had been made to both bondholders and others, the City did not have the resources and likely would never have the resources to honor those promises. We felt they had to have that information in order to understand what we were asking them to do in terms of compromising their claims to allow fair treatment for everybody.
Q. In the discussions you had with any of the stakeholders, did you encounter any resistance to the idea of compromising their claims at less than 100 percent?
A. Nobody was willing to consider any proposal in which they compromised their claims.
Q. You when you say nobody, who do you mean?
A. Well, I was primarily responsible for discussions with the bondholders and other funded debt holders of the City and I would further break that down between the Detroit Water \& Sewer revenue bondholders and the general obligation and cop bondholders of the City. Given our expertise as investment bankers and the fact we had relationships with most of these people, that made

sense so I took primary responsibility for those discussions. The discussions with our other claim holders, primarily the pension funds and retirees and active employees were led by Conway MacKenzie and Jones Day as well as some of my partners at Miller Buckfire
Q. And what kind of response did you get in those discussions?
A. Well, speaking with the bondholders, and again, I'm using that between both the secured bondholders and the unsecured bondholders, nobody was willing to consider any compromise of their claims whatsoever. In fact, even the secured bondholder bondholders, that is, those bondholder bondholders who held debt at the water and sewer department were very unhappy because our plan contemplated if we were to create a new authority controlled by the customers of it, that we would want to take advantage of the fact that that authority could borrow at a much higher credit rating than Detroit could and even though we were going to give them 100 cent recovery, it would not be in the form of new bonds that would have the same old interest rates. In other words, they wanted to have the benefit of a strong investment grade rating but retain bonds that were giving them
interest at double B costs, so even they didn't like the proposal. I was not surprised by that, but I hoped that they would at least counter with something else, which they did not do.

## Q. (By The Court): what does the phrase double B cost

 mean?A. It refers, Your Honor, to credit rating. Cities as do companies borrow in the markets at a spread over the so-called risk free rate although some could argue today I'm not sure what that is, but let's assume for the moment that's the treasury yield curve. The Double B cost would be perhaps a spread of 400 or 500 basis points over the treasury cost where the Single A cost of borrowing might be a hundred basis points over. So the difference would be obviously reflecting the risk of a lower rated credit.
Q. Did you receive any indications in your discussions with any of these bondholders that some of the considerations in their negotiations are non negotiations you with had to do with considerations that extended beyond the City of Detroit?
A. Yes, in discussions with the bond insurers who insured the water and sewer debt, about five and a half billion dollars of that, several of them also
insured GO debt, general obligations bonds of the City, and they made it very clear to me that they were not willing to consider any impairment of the GO bonds because they believed that the GO pledge was so much more valuable in every other jurisdiction in which they insured bonds that creating a precedent of impairment here would damage their businesses elsewhere.
Q. And when you say GO bonds, explain to the court what you mean?
A. The City up until recent times had been able to issue unsecured debt, that is not secured by a specific revenue pledge but secured instead by the full faith and credit obligation to raise taxes sufficient to pay that debt when due and there are two different kinds -- unlimited tax and limited tax general obligation bonds -- both of which have been considered for many years to be of higher credit and less risk than revenue bonds because a revenue bond is specifically secured only by the revenues of a project or an authority or a utility whereas bonds secured by taxing authority are considered to be much safer because the City is required to raise taxes in the ordinary course until that bond can be repaid.

Now in the case of Detroit of, of course, they've come to the end of the road because on the property tax side for a moment, we know that the property tax millage that the City has already assessing is already at the state maximum, so the City would have no ability to raise taxes or tax rates to pay this debt.

That was an anathema to the bond insurers because they had operated, as does the municipal bond market, on the theory that general obligation debts are higher credit and less risky than revenue bonds.

We, on the other hand, when we did the math, recognized the City could never begin to satisfy its unsecured obligations which would include the general obligation bonds, and we had classified those bonds pari passu with the other unsecured obligations of the City, in this case our underfunded pension claims and healthcare claims. If I could have you take a look at Exhibit 37 . This is a set of meetings that $I$ won't go through completely, but if you'll just look down the left hand side and across the top, can you tell me, did you or a representatives of Miller Buckfire participate in virtually all of these meetings?
A. Yes.
Q. Did the city ever receive a proposal from anybody?
A. We did.
Q. How many?
A. We received I would say one and a half, one that was actually written out and meant to be responsive. The second was really just a letter saying the they would like to come talk to us again about something, but only if we would stipulate they get 100 percent recovery.
Q. And was that the one of the one and a half proposal that was attractive enough to follow up on?
A. No, because they were linking any willingness to negotiate on water and sewer debt to our treatment of the GO bonds, that they also insured.
Q. What in your view is the alternative for the City if the plans set forth in the June 14 th proposal is not achieved?
A. Well, first the City will not be able to execute
its reinvestment program. It would simply not have the money. That would mean the City would continue to be liquidated for the benefit of its
stakeholders revenues are likely to continue to decline, services will continue to deteriorate, that would be the condition of the City in the

## that a long term sustainable future for Detroit?

A. believe if you want to measure sustainable future as having access to the capital markets that under that scenario Detroit would ever have access to the capital markets. They would have no credit. MR. CULLEN: That's all I have, Your

Honor.
MR. MONTGOMERY: If I may at this point, I would like to strike from the testimony all of the opinion testimony given by the witness for the last several questions starting with how the capital markets are reacting not through conversations with the witness, but in general, and I think this witness has given classic wonderfully prepared, rather wonderfully delivered expert witness testimony relying on hearsay, relying on specialized knowledge, relying on years of accumulated talent and education that this gentleman clearly has, but none of which was offered prior to the pre-trial or offered to Your Honor as expert witness testimony. I believe it should be stricken. MR. CIANTRA: The UAW would join in that
notion.
THE COURT: I wish you had objected at the time.

MR. CULLEN: Your Honor, part of our job here is to set forth before the Court the story of the decisions that were made and the reasons that they were made on behalf of the City of Detroit. This witness has done that. He was an operative figure in realtime. He has testified candidly as to the bases on which his decisions were made, the things he looked at, the advice he gave to the City s it faced these difficult decisions.

This story -- this is a factual story. It may need a man of rare experience to tell it, but it is nonetheless a factual story about things that were done in realtime, not about a piece of paper that was given to an independent person to look at and a set of assumptions from which to draw opinions. This is the actor. This is the actor at the heart of the story and he is telling his story, and as such, it has to be admissible, if that, as nothing else. He is the man who made the recommendations, he is the man who presided over the analyses. He has told that story and told of the basis for making these.

Because it's somewhat upside down, an expert witness is qualified by his expertise and nothing else, that's why we let expert witnesses testify only rarely and under certain circumstances, but we let percipient witnesses testify all the time, all the time, to their experience, to what they saw, did, decided. This man tells the story. And that story is a factual story by a percipient witness of rare gifts but a percipient witness.

THE COURT: What you say it's as good as far as it goes, but it doesn't really meet the objection because the objection is that beyond explaining what the witness did and why he did it, is the question of whether that constitutes proof f the truth of the facts on which he relied to make the decisions that he made.

MR. CULLEN: And I would submit, Your Honor, that the judgment of a sophisticated person in real time is some proof of the truth of what they relied on

I think that that happens in virtually every case -

THE COURT: Well, it strikes me that -
MR. CULLEN: -- at some level.
brief. If you want to, obviously, I can't prevent it. The sooner you file it, the more likely it is we'll be able to read it and actually comprehend it, so I would ask that if you do file something, you do not file it at ten minutes to nine tomorrow morning, please. But if there are authorities you want me to consider, feel free to just bring them to Court tomorrow and we will deal as best we can given the expedited nature of this.

MR. CULLEN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: So we will be in recess. COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is adjourned.
$\qquad$

| \$ | 100 percent [2] 227/14 232/10 | 99/11 100/9 118/18 127/18 128/16 128/24 135/13 170/21 171/1 171/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$1 [2] 115/10 142/13 | 101.32C [1] 205/24 | 171/16 172/4 176/13 179/18 180/7 184/9 |
| \$1 billion [2] 115/10 142/13 | 109 [2] 147/19 161/10 | 186/5 203/4 204/18 208/18 211/2 211/24 |
| \$1.25 [1] 115/17 | 10:37 [1] 58/2 | 214/16 |
| \$1.25 billion [1] 115/17 | 10:59 [1] 58/2 | 2013 [53] 7/25 8/5 9/9 9/23 11/9 12/4 |
| \$105 [1] 202/17 | 10th [1] 38/21 | 12/18 13/14 16/12 16/17 16/20 16/25 |
| \$105 million [1] 202/17 | 11 [1] 188/12 | 17/9 19/9 19/16 20/18 21/2 21/18 21/22 |
| \$130 [3] 177/13 180/5 180/10 | 114 [2] 66/14 66/14 | 22/18 22/24 23/3 23/6 23/12 24/23 25/25 |
| \$130 million [3] 177/13 180/5 180/10 | 1175 [1] 167/2 | 26/14 26/15 26/22 27/2 32/5 32/7 35/16 |
| \$14.8 [1] 14/23 | 11th [3] 38/17 38/21 39/8 | 35/17 36/11 43/16 44/9 49/3 51/9 51/13 |
| \$14.8 billion [1] 14/23 | 12 [5] 44/14 89/24 96/3 97/13 177/24 | 51/13 59/6 89/24 91/5 91/5 100/12 |
| \$150 [6] 16/21 16/24 19/24 20/2 20/12 | 12-month [1] 195/24 | 103/21 104/5 119/18 122/7 178/4 202/2 |
| 20/20 | 120 [1] 67/13 | 204/7 |
| \$150 million [6] 16/21 16/24 19/24 20/2 | 12:15 [1] 116/20 | 2014 [2] 43/16 44/9 |
| 20/12 20/20 | 13 [6] 1/2 2/2 44/18 49/21 203/19 206/17 | 2020 [1] 219/10 |
| \$150,000 [1] 182/10 | 13-53846 [1] 2/4 | 20th [9] 38/21 59/22 59/24 61/5 133/23 |
| \$18 [1] 14/5 | 130 [1] 102/21 | 158/11 158/15 161/22 162/6 |
| \$18 billion [1] 14/5 | 130 million [1] 207/21 | 22 [3] 9/9 222/3 222/11 |
| \$180 [1] 186/24 | 134 [1] 33/2 | 22nd [2] 10/8 11/8 |
| \$180 million [1] 186/24 | 135 [1] 33/1 | 23 [2] 172/13 175/3 |
| \$199 [2] 12/22 13/3 | 13th [1] 38/11 | 23rd [1] 87/21 |
| \$199 million [2] 12/22 13/3 | 14 [7] 109/24 119/17 122/7 133/20 | 24 [1] 149/24 |
| \$2 [2] 215/21 215/23 | 149/16 192/11 226/2 | 250 million [1] 34/16 |
| \$2 billion [2] 215/21 215/23 | 14 billion [1] 14/4 | 25th [3] 65/19 66/25 67/17 |
| \$2.8 [1] 129/13 | 14.9 billion [1] 14/2 | 26 [1] 31/21 |
| \$2.8 million [1] 129/13 | 14th [32] 38/13 38/14 38/16 38/17 38/20 | 29th [3] 26/25 27/2 194/14 |
| \$250 [4] 34/13 111/7 111/17 147/3 | 39/3 39/4 39/7 39/9 39/12 39/14 39/18 | 3 |
| 147/3 | 158/7 163/3 163/7 164/18 165/3 165/7 | 3.5 billion [1] 160/13 |
| \$280 [1] 111/13 | 208/7 210/10 211/10 212/12 224/4 | 3.5 million [1] 126/7 |
| \$280 million [1] 111/13 | 225/12 226/15 232/17 | 30 [7] 28/3 29/2 52/2 127/18 128/15 |
| \$3.474 [1] 123/5 | 15 [1] 192/11 | 128/24 135/13 |
| \$3.474 billion [1] 123/5 | 15 minutes [1] 120/12 | 30.6 percent [2] 144/10 144/12 |
| \$3.5 [2] 92/9 138/6 | 15 percent [1] 15/12 | 30th [1] 9/22 |
| \$3.5 billion [1] 138/6 | 15-minute [1] 57/23 | 31 [1] 29/17 |
| \$3.5 million [1] 92/9 | 150 million [1] 20/22 | 36 th [7] 12/20 13/2 13/5 13/9 13/10 13/13 |
| \$350 [1] 147/5 | 153 [1] 149/15 | 13/20 |
| \$350 million [1] 147/5 | 154 [1] 149/9 | 37 [1] 231/20 |
| \$40 [4] 202/5 202/25 203/22 224/8 | 155 [1] 150/1 | 3:00 [1] 4/3 |
| \$40 million [4] 202/5 202/25 203/22 | 15th [3] 202/5 203/22 224/8 | 3:29 [1] 195/9 |
| 224/8 | 16 [1] 53/16 | 3:30 [1] 195/4 |
| \$400 [2] 21/2 21/7 | 17 [1] 41/20 | 3:45 [1] 195/5 |
| \$400 million [2] 21/2 21/7 | 18 [1] 12/11 | 4 |
| \$5 [1] 35/23 | 18th [4] 149/2 162/24 165/3 165/8 |  |
| \$5 million [1] 35/23 | 1913 [1] 206/18 | 40 [3] 196/24 198/23 198/24 |
| \$50 [4] 180/2 180/16 180/19 181/1 | 1980 [1] 167/9 | 40 percent [1] 128/1 |
| \$50 million [4] 180/2 180/16 180/19 | 1987 [1] 167/19 | 400 [1] 229/13 |
| 181/1 | 1994 [1] 96/14 | 408 [4] 32/13 32/14 32/22 66/3 |
| \$500 [3] 113/17 113/19 115/7 | 1996 [1] 167/22 | 41 [2] 213/15 214/3 |
| \$500 million [3] 113/17 113/19 115/7 | 19th [1] 63/6 | 418 [3] 27/13 28/12 28/21 |
| \$6 [3] 21/11 21/15 158/1 | 1:00 [2] 3/9 3/21 | 419 [5] 17/5 17/16 18/1 18/2 18/3 |
| \$6 billion [2] 21/11 21/15 | 1:00 o'clock [1] 3/19 | 43 [16] 65/22 65/24 66/1 66/5 66/14 68/2 |
| \$6 million [1] 158/1 | 1:45 [2] 116/16 116/20 | 102/14 119/25 120/2 143/19 143/19 |
| $\$ 60 \text { [2] 46/4 204/17 }$ | 2 | 144/18 147/18 161/5 214/3 216/8 |
| \$600 [1] 147/6 | 2.4 [2] 173/3 173/6 | 85/1 225/18 |
| \$600 million [1] 147/6 | 2.5 [1] 173/6 | 48 percent [2] 144/5 144/6 |
| \$650 [1] 129/15 | 20 [2] 83/8 163/23 | 4:42 [1] 237/15 |
| \$650 million [1] 129/15 | 20 percent [2] 186/25 219/7 | 5 |
| \$7 [1] 202/9 | 2002 [2] 144/8 167/25 |  |
| \$7 million [1] 202/9 | 2007 [1] 98/19 | 50 [2] 172/14 177/14 |
| \$750,000 [1] 219/9 | 2008 [2] 144/11 144/13 | 50 million [1] 81/5 |
| \$830 [2] 128/25 129/2 | 2009 [3] 170/1 185/19 185/25 | 500 [2] 53/3 229/13 |
| \$830 million [2] 128/25 129/2 | 201 [1] 21/10 | 500 million [1] 113/20 |
| 1 | 2011[10] 5/8 5/13 20/16 40/9 77/8 77/9 | 505 [3] 40/19 40/22 50/9 |
| 1 billion [1] 142/16 | 2012 [63] 8/5 8/20 22/4 22/9 22/21 40/8 | 505B [3] 52/20 53/1 53/4 |
| 1.25 [1] 147/9 | 41/24 43/9 43/16 47/1 47/14 49/3 49/16 | 522 [1] 18/18 |
| 1.5 [2] 84/19 85/6 | 49/24 50/4 53/16 70/3 70/7 70/10 70/11 | 537 [1] 84/3 |
| 10,000 [1] 180/18 | 72/23 73/15 73/24 76/6 76/12 77/2 77/10 | 53846[1] 2/4 |
| 10/24/13 [2] 1/2 2/2 | 77/12 79/23 81/3 81/14 81/15 81/17 | 54 [2] 32/22 32/23 |
| 100 [2] 215/18 228/21 | 81/21 83/7 83/9 83/13 86/14 88/10 99/7 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 55 & \text { [1] } \\ 551 & 32 / 22 \\ \text { [2] } & 9 / 2 \\ 9 / 2 \end{array}\right.$ |


ago [5] 2/11 21/6 102/16 102/20 163/17
agree [19] 1/18 15/11 16/20 16/24 20/5 21/1 21/10 21/14 24/3 24/18 24/18 35/15 45/7 54/19 56/8 144/14 146/9 182/18 182/25
agreed [16] 42/22 56/7 164/6 164/12 172/25 173/18 173/21 174/16 175/5 175/9 182/7 183/13 189/24 208/20 209/21 226/8
agreement [67] 3/8 3/22 20/9 40/16 40/22 41/20 42/9 42/15 42/21 43/6 43/9 45/19 47/15 50/9 50/10 50/13 50/15 50/20 50/23 54/21 55/8 57/12 86/22 87/2 87/6 87/8 87/21 87/24 88/17 89/6 89/7 171/20 171/25 172/4 172/8 172/10 172/18 172/22 172/23 173/4 173/12 174/10 175/11 175/21 176/1 176/2 176/5 176/9 176/25 177/11 177/12 177/17 177/19 177/22 178/2 178/12 178/13 178/24 179/1 179/2 179/9 184/9 185/19 202/14 214/16 224/15 225/9
agreements [7] 40/18 48/22 53/25 54/1 159/15 178/15 196/11
ahead [9] 22/7 41/10 88/20 94/18 116/25 149/5 207/8 216/20 236/11
AICPA [1] 97/3
aide [2] 193/16 206/25
airlines [1] 218/24
airport [9] 26/24 27/2 27/22 33/8 218/12 218/13 218/14 218/16 218/18
Alabama [1] 98/10
alarmed [3] 196/8 201/23 202/11
all [127] 1/14 2/6 2/14 4/6 4/11 9/1 13/23 15/24 18/17 23/21 28/22 30/11 32/12 33/16 33/21 38/22 39/1 39/7 39/8 41/5 47/18 49/4 53/3 54/14 56/7 57/22 57/24 62/14 67/1 67/7 67/8 67/10 67/18 67/20 68/6 69/7 70/18 70/22 72/13 73/2 73/8 73/23 75/22 81/16 81/22 91/4 91/13 91/18 94/17 95/10 96/12 103/4 108/1 115/2 116/17 118/13 119/8 119/11 119/12 121/16 121/17 126/12 126/18 128/11 133/13 135/3 136/10 136/12 137/13 139/9 141/8 151/23 152/24 153/24 155/5 165/7 165/25 170/25 177/5 178/12 180/2 181/7 184/2 184/23 185/4 187/19 192/7 194/6 194/25 195/3 195/6 201/7 202/7 204/8 204/15 204/25 207/23 208/20 209/20 209/23 210/4 211/13
212/9 212/22 214/5 214/15 215/7 215/24 217/11 219/21 223/14 223/16 223/20 223/25 224/9 226/3 226/3 226/8 226/15 227/3 231/25 233/8 233/11 235/6 235/6 236/10 237/12
alleged [2] 92/5 164/17
allocating [1] 211/16
allocation [1] 219/15
allow [7] 93/5 179/6 210/16 212/22 218/17 224/17 227/9
allowed [3] 47/9 217/9 217/15
allowing [2] 2/12 224/19
almost [1] 202/10
along [4] 9/20 22/10 136/5 216/11 already [16] 21/9 35/20 43/13 75/24 90/3 91/5 91/9 132/21 178/9 192/3 193/6 203/2 224/24 226/10 231/4 231/5
also [56] 1/22 23/8 27/25 28/12 46/9 47/7 48/20 63/20 79/18 80/10 83/6 90/22 91/7 94/9 97/4 97/25 99/23 99/25 101/25 103/24 105/19 106/2 106/4 108/7 108/25 109/16 109/23 110/24 114/10 120/24

123/16 127/5 137/17 142/23 142/25
143/8 145/20 147/5 154/3 156/2 158/11 169/18 174/19 184/8 190/1 193/22 202/11 203/6 215/5 217/16 224/14 226/11 226/12 227/2 229/25 232/15 alternative [3] 51/23 188/25 232/16 alternatives [4] 8/15 104/7 104/9 223/12 although [4] 50/10 212/24 217/4 229/9 Alvin [1] 37/13 always [10] 31/10 74/24 169/24 181/1 187/14 188/10 202/20 205/9 207/10 212/24
am [13] 59/15 60/14 68/9 83/15 83/18 87/15 95/17 96/19 97/21 117/15 148/15 167/11 167/13
America [2] 186/3 202/13
American [2] 96/24 97/3
amnesty [3] 35/21 35/23 36/3
among [4] 25/17 104/8 107/3 148/11 amount [28] $10 / 11$ 13/3 13/10 13/12 $14 / 1$ 14/4 19/17 46/13 62/23 74/7 84/10 107/6 111/3 111/4 121/12 128/21 129/9 129/24 143/10 144/6 144/19 155/21 156/11 156/12 156/23 156/24 156/25 174/20 amounts [7] 108/9 109/2 122/24 144/14 148/7 163/9 202/8
analyses [4] 91/1 155/5 155/23 234/24 analysis [26] 13/20 36/10 63/12 64/6 65/3 73/23 99/15 102/19 147/25 154/20 155/1 155/8 155/9 155/14 155/15 155/17 156/3 160/11 160/12 160/14 160/15 160/19 189/5 189/25 190/21 223/23
analyst [1] 197/14
analytical [2] 210/22 211/9
analyze [1] 155/21
analyzed [1] 157/23
analyzing [1] 185/11
anathema [1] 231/8
and/or [2] 1/13 6/4
Andrew [1] 193/11
Andrews [3] 171/8 177/3 193/18
annex [4] 173/4 175/3 184/13 208/19 annual [3] 19/25 186/25 219/7 another [10] 52/7 105/9 115/19 186/4 192/1 192/2 194/11 203/1 213/21 225/3 answer [22] 10/22 17/1 22/8 22/20 22/22 25/3 26/7 33/19 38/4 49/8 49/9 56/3 56/4 60/10 92/16 114/9 114/10 124/21 134/23 134/25 153/4 164/11
answered [3] 71/13 152/6 152/17
answers [2] 149/25 150/11
anticipate [1] 163/4
anticipated [3] 103/14 121/12 202/7 any [152] $1 / 191 / 20$ 2/18 6/15 11/21
11/21 13/19 19/6 20/5 20/13 24/19 24/19 25/21 26/11 26/20 27/7 29/12 30/7 30/9 30/18 30/19 30/21 31/2 31/4 31/7 31/15 32/6 36/5 37/2 39/16 40/20 41/22 42/13 42/24 48/20 48/23 51/21 52/15 55/20 58/22 60/17 60/17 60/24 61/4 61/8 61/9 68/21 70/22 71/5 71/9 71/9 72/4 74/18 76/3 76/7 78/2 78/6 78/24 79/5 79/6 80/7 80/8 81/11 81/12 86/1 89/13 89/14 90/11 92/24 93/5 93/18 93/22 93/24 94/9 120/8 127/9 134/15 140/24 150/12 153/25 154/24 156/25 157/21 159/23 160/23 160/25 161/3 161/16 161/17 162/18 162/25 163/5 163/11 164/2 164/2 164/13 164/17 165/13 177/10 178/25 179/17 179/23 182/21 182/23 184/13 186/20 187/20 189/23 191/23 192/9 194/25
195/20 196/11 196/19 196/22 198/14 198/14 203/8 203/15 204/5 204/9 205/1

205/5 206/23 207/25 208/2 212/5 214/17
217/6 219/19 219/20 219/20 219/24
220/1 220/1 221/9 221/13 221/16 223/6 223/13 223/21 224/2 225/14 227/11 227/12 227/15 228/12 229/18 229/19 230/3 232/13 236/6
anybody [4] 2/6 81/13 221/7 232/2
anymore [1] 109/14
anyone [16] 29/15 29/24 45/19 51/17 60/6 63/4 63/5 68/21 73/10 74/18 76/8 118/20 123/13 139/4 153/25 223/8 anything [28] 24/2 26/10 26/12 30/10 $31 / 6$ 36/14 36/20 38/6 65/8 75/20 91/1 101/2 103/6 105/6 106/7 106/23 132/18 132/25 133/9 162/21 164/7 164/9 164/12 172/10 187/7 200/16 202/21 218/22 apologize [5] 92/3 130/6 193/22 213/17 216/10
Apparently [1] 236/17
appear [2] 3/9 122/11
appearance [1] 113/9
appearances [1] 2/8
appeared [1] 223/17
appearing [1] 3/6
appears [6] 87/9 88/2 102/17 120/5
146/15 195/12
appendices [1] 68/11
appendix [2] 67/14 68/1
application [1] 219/20
applies [1] 165/21
appointed [13] 7/1 7/6 7/8 21/19 23/13 23/18 39/22 58/22 98/19 98/25 137/11 137/12 137/14
appointment [8] 5/14 7/9 7/24 23/7 25/16
183/3 203/5 224/25
appraisal [2] 189/23 221/22
appreciate [3] 4/10 136/21 153/22
approach [4] 17/17 18/25 48/1 53/5
approaches [1] 31/18
approaching [1] 215/9
appropriate [6] 2/19 175/15 180/25
205/22 211/13 211/16
approved [2] 175/9 175/19
approximately [29] 20/2 21/11 34/13 96/3
97/9 99/3 108/23 111/7 111/13 115/10 115/17 128/1 128/24 129/2 129/12 129/15 138/6 142/13 144/5 144/6 144/10 145/14 147/3 158/1 164/21 165/1 180/19 186/24 203/21
approximation [1] 15/15
April [2] 170/20 171/1
arduous [1] 221/3
are[145] 1/6 6/5 6/7 6/24 7/2 9/3 9/3 11/20 13/8 13/13 15/21 15/22 16/12 18/5 19/4 19/11 19/15 21/25 23/19 28/9 29/18 33/13 34/21 37/3 37/5 37/19 37/19 37/20 37/25 38/1 38/24 39/9 42/6 43/5 43/6 52/21 53/8 55/11 55/15 66/14 66/22 68/1 68/7 68/12 70/3 71/17 71/18 76/23 79/3 80/8 80/9 80/22 82/11 82/13 82/19 82/21 82/21 82/24 83/24 84/25 85/11 89/22 90/1 90/16 95/19 95/25 96/15 96/18 97/16 98/6 99/25 100/13 101/9 102/22 104/17 104/17 105/10 107/2 107/23 107/24 107/25 110/6 112/10 112/12 112/13 112/15 112/21 119/11 122/9 122/24 128/2 139/13 139/17 141/17 141/21 142/2 142/13 142/21 142/23 143/2 144/14 144/18 145/19 145/20 146/8 146/24 147/12 157/1 157/5 157/12 157/20 158/1 161/21 167/4 167/12 169/8 169/20 173/24 173/25 179/25 181/13 182/20 189/21 196/25 197/2 205/8 214/4

## A

are... [18] 214/12 217/5 218/17 218/22 219/21 222/8 222/25 222/25 223/3 223/4 229/20 230/15 230/22 231/11 232/23 233/14 236/20 237/6
area [14] 99/23 100/24 101/4 104/10 107/13 107/14 108/12 108/20 109/17 115/5 115/19 122/20 170/7 222/4
areas [20] 98/1 99/16 99/18 99/20 99/21 100/23 101/5 102/1 102/22 103/5 108/18 109/1 110/6 111/11 113/7 139/16 147/2
183/25 211/25 212/6
Arena [2] 33/11 223/10
argue [3] 142/2 229/10 236/4
argument [5] 2/19 118/11 126/4 199/20 236/22
arithmetic [1] 145/17
arms [3] 35/11 76/12 183/4
around [22] 20/18 35/11 43/1 43/17 62/1 70/10 76/12 81/15 95/25 96/20 96/25 97/2 97/24 110/7 110/17 111/11 137/10 157/3 160/6 183/4 199/9 215/4
arrival [1] 40/2
art [5] 4/13 220/11 220/21 221/4 221/12
Arthur [1] 69/15
Article [1] 149/24
Arts [4] 33/10 220/3 220/7 220/12 as [259]
ascertain [13] 37/20 40/6 42/17 43/23 53/24 62/22 70/21 71/1 71/17 80/24 86/25 88/11 171/3
ASCII [1] 1/9
ASCII/PDF [1] 1/9
ask [60] 12/17 17/20 22/22 26/8 30/13
31/14 39/21 40/20 40/21 42/4 45/19 45/24 47/7 49/5 49/19 50/24 54/8 59/6 59/16 60/22 66/13 67/15 68/25 68/25 69/20 70/2 74/22 75/18 83/5 91/14 92/11 92/13 92/20 101/1 111/2 115/14 117/22 118/20 120/23 120/24 121/22 122/16 128/4 128/10 129/5 130/17 134/3 140/17 140/18 140/24 142/5 147/19 150/10 152/10 152/11 154/15 176/24 204/19 205/23 237/4
asked [32] 13/1 15/4 22/17 26/4 38/5 44/2 59/12 86/12 87/17 90/10 90/22 99/15 101/2 103/8 103/24 105/7 106/4 106/23 115/21 120/21 124/25 130/23
132/21 134/15 151/5 173/14 174/19
182/5 192/4 194/4 201/14 214/5
asking [14] 11/1 45/4 45/5 53/8 63/23
77/10 140/2 149/16 150/15 150/18
150/19 152/10 155/7 227/8
aspect [2] 104/16 215/11
aspects [2] 7/22 100/1
assert [1] 153/18
asserted [3] 140/1 140/25 154/4
assertion [1] 139/23
assertions [1] 151/11
assess [1] 37/20
assessed [1] 37/20
assessing [1] 231/5
assessment [5] 37/15 37/16 38/2 178/7 194/8
assessments [2] 37/25 181/13
assessor [2] 37/9 37/13
asset [28] 24/8 24/12 24/15 25/18 25/22 25/24 29/3 29/20 30/1 30/9 30/16 30/23 31/10 32/6 32/8 33/19 33/20 43/24 90/17 130/4 187/25 216/6 216/13 216/15 219/12 219/23 223/14 223/15
assets [40] 24/16 24/22 24/23 25/5 25/9

26/14 26/22 29/13 31/4 31/8 31/18 31/24
32/10 33/4 33/13 33/14 33/16 33/21
90/11 90/12 104/21 112/10 112/20 123/3 129/8 129/10 129/11 129/12 129/14 133/7 187/8 187/15 187/19 204/9 204/16 207/24 216/9 216/19 217/5 223/21
assign [1] 71/9
assignment [1] 99/3
assist [2] 207/20 209/4
assistance [4] 107/13 173/15 173/20 176/17
assistant [1] 3/5
associated [1] 211/6
association [8] 86/6 86/7 86/8 86/16 87/3
87/23 88/9 97/1
assume [8] 2/7 7/18 21/5 27/7 55/15 68/5
205/14 229/11
assuming [1] 210/14
assumption [6] 16/11 67/19 145/12
145/15 146/12 156/6
assumptions [10] 15/16 62/5 62/10 62/14 62/18 63/2 79/19 91/10 126/16 234/18 assure [1] 71/21
attain [2] 46/4 180/14
attempt [3] 72/21 206/15 221/18
attend [4] 8/20 119/18 133/16 194/19
attendance [1] 59/13
attended [4] 61/5 61/14 64/20 65/14 attendee [1] 59/16
attendees [4] 61/13 61/14 61/19 61/19 attending [1] 60/18
attention [23] 59/22 65/21 66/16 67/13
105/5 119/17 121/2 122/16 133/22
166/10 169/25 170/4 170/11 171/21
173/5 175/2 175/25 179/22 191/16
203/11 208/7 213/15 216/7
attorney [8] 3/5 134/19 139/12 139/15
139/25 140/11 151/10 221/11
attorney-client [5] 139/12 139/15 139/25 140/11 151/10
attorneys [4] 17/20 27/8 65/5 192/2
attractive [1] 232/12
attributable [4] $13 / 24$ 15/13 15/24 15/25 auction [2] 221/21 223/1
audio [1] 174/6
audit [5] 38/5 72/25 73/1 219/13 219/16 audited [1] 75/1
augmenting [2] 1/19 71/7
August [1] 108/5
authenticate [1] 52/11
authorities [4] 73/7 84/8 84/11 237/6
authority [29] 60/7 60/13 60/19 60/21
104/10 104/13 104/20 104/22 105/23
105/25 105/25 106/5 106/8 106/10
106/12 106/12 106/14 106/19 158/20
158/21 158/24 158/25 159/2 164/1 179/8
228/17 228/19 230/21 230/22
authorize [1] 50/19
authorized [5] 60/25 63/6 159/3 159/5 159/6
authors [1] 10/1
automated [1] 1/7
avail [1] 190/22
available [18] 1/9 104/16 107/17 121/13
187/22 187/23 190/10 190/18 198/15
204/20 210/11 210/20 211/3 215/20
216/13 221/7 222/4 222/21
Avenue [1] 167/2
average [1] 94/1
aviation [1] 218/16
avoided [1] 216/14
aware [4] 16/12 39/9 185/17 196/9
away [4] 170/12 174/1 191/25 202/3
awe [2] $32 / 1743 / 10$
B
bachelor's [1] 96/7
back [39] 4/4 19/20 20/23 22/4 22/21 40/9 43/10 43/14 43/17 43/19 44/9 50/9 74/5 75/22 76/6 77/2 84/9 93/18 119/2 121/5 129/1 132/3 132/4 138/14 147/18 151/18 151/19 152/3 159/5 159/8 161/5 161/6 164/4 208/13 208/17 211/24 212/14 213/22 220/8
backs [6] 44/21 44/22 45/14 45/21 55/8 188/22
bad [3] 92/5 94/22 223/8
Baird [1] 193/15
balance [8] 21/6 25/7 51/5 68/11 71/8 180/1 180/16 210/24
ballpark [1] 14/3
bangs [1] 203/7
bank [23] 33/18 71/24 71/25 73/16 74/12
75/8 75/13 75/17 75/25 76/18 76/19
76/20 76/21 76/22 77/4 77/23 80/2 80/17
80/19 108/8 168/3 186/3 202/13
banker [3] 167/19 167/22 207/9
bankers [2] 169/4 227/24
banking [2] 98/1 167/14
bankruptcy [14] 26/3 26/18 29/21 30/1 51/1 51/9 51/17 51/18 64/2 134/22 154/25 188/10 205/24 213/4
banks [9] 186/5 188/16 188/19 191/23 202/12 224/17 224/22 224/24 225/4 Barbara [1] 86/4
bargaining [1] 159/15
based [28] 12/10 12/14 15/15 44/7 45/11
75/11 75/12 75/25 81/1 81/2 92/17
103/18 113/21 122/10 126/17 129/7
129/18 133/5 136/1 140/22 151/3 155/24 167/15 197/4 197/19 197/21 198/10 210/18
baseline [1] 163/4
bases [1] 234/10
basic [1] 110/13
basically [3] 23/16 146/19 192/6
basis [29] 1/15 71/20 76/24 76/25 77/5 77/14 80/4 91/4 91/8 92/8 94/21 100/5
104/6 112/18 113/11 126/5 127/2 137/24 178/22 181/13 181/19 183/21 201/1 206/5 217/8 221/4 229/13 229/15 234/25 be [205] 1/14 9/4 10/17 12/21 13/17 15/15 16/10 16/10 18/6 21/6 21/19 27/24 28/12 29/22 30/18 30/19 30/23 31/17 33/14 37/11 41/11 42/7 47/5 49/2 50/25 54/3 56/11 57/9 58/4 59/18 59/19 62/25 67/12 71/10 75/24 79/20 80/25 81/8 84/23 87/9 91/14 91/23 92/16 92/21 92/22 93/3 94/3 94/8 94/19 102/2 102/17 103/2 104/6 104/16 105/18 105/24 106/15 107/4 108/5 108/8 108/10 108/19 109/16 109/17 110/6 110/19 111/8 112/22 114/12 114/20 115/16 116/4 120/5 120/20 121/13 122/11 126/7 127/3 130/19 130/23 132/8 132/23 134/21 137/11 139/11 139/21 140/15 140/22 145/5 145/13 146/15 146/16 148/1 148/6 151/4 151/14 153/7 154/23 155/25 156/7 160/1 160/7 160/18 160/20 162/10 162/23 163/5 163/8 164/9 166/3 166/16 168/16 168/18 170/6 171/5 172/15 173/19 174/23 175/8 175/19 177/21 179/6 179/7 179/23 181/20 182/21 183/14 186/14 187/5 187/22 187/23 188/13 195/11 196/4 196/8 196/12 200/19 201/9 203/1 203/23 204/10

## B

be... [64] 204/20 206/9 207/25 208/3 209/15 209/21 209/22 209/25 210/14 210/14 211/8 211/15 212/20 212/25 213/11 213/19 215/8 216/14 216/14 217/15 217/24 217/25 218/9 218/10 218/21 219/12 219/15 219/24 220/1 220/16 220/19 220/21 220/22 221/1 221/6 221/12 222/2 222/5 222/19 222/20 222/22 223/22 224/9 225/1 225/3 225/6 226/5 226/22 227/2 228/22 229/12 229/14 229/16 230/18 230/23 230/25 232/6 232/19 232/22 232/25 233/24 234/21 237/3 237/11
Beatty [1] 37/11
became [5] 64/1 100/20 112/7 112/17 170/2
because [71] 4/3 9/4 11/18 14/5 14/25
15/5 27/15 28/18 30/1 33/20 34/25 43/10 47/4 71/20 77/6 82/14 90/16 92/10 95/5 100/16 104/17 112/12 132/18 139/11 146/11 147/25 151/17 156/2 156/5 160/6 171/24 178/10 179/16 180/21 181/13 181/16 182/22 182/24 183/22 184/3 185/17 185/25 186/4 187/10 188/21 196/9 196/17 199/6 202/11 202/21 206/9 206/12 207/21 210/23 214/2 217/17 217/23 223/7 224/6 224/15 226/9 228/16 230/4 230/19 230/23 231/2 231/9 232/13 233/3 235/1 235/13
become [3] 169/22 170/18 172/7 becomes [1] 222/4
been [128] 2/22 3/22 5/10 6/17 6/18 7/9 14/13 16/11 16/13 16/17 16/21 16/25 19/10 19/23 19/24 23/1 23/23 24/4 24/14 28/6 31/13 34/18 35/12 36/4 37/14 37/18 38/5 40/1 41/3 43/13 46/20 50/6 51/13 53/24 55/6 55/13 58/18 64/21 67/10 70/10 73/12 73/15 77/8 78/6 90/23 90/25 94/5 94/15 94/22 97/13 101/18 103/24 104/18 107/10 107/12 108/1 113/22 113/23 113/25 122/4 122/20 126/4 128/8 130/11 130/11 135/8 138/20 140/1 141/3 141/4 143/9 144/12 144/15 148/19 148/20 149/18 149/24 151/21 154/21 155/2 155/10 161/2 161/16 162/21 164/7 164/12 169/18 169/25 175/5 175/19 176/7 176/12 178/1 178/15 178/19 178/20 178/22 179/20 180/4 180/6 180/10 180/11 184/11 191/19 194/7 194/18 202/20 203/4 207/13 207/22 214/17 215/4 216/5 216/24 217/11 218/4 220/6 221/14 221/18 221/22 222/18 223/5 223/6 223/16 226/2 227/4 230/11 230/18
before [46] 2/18 7/24 8/18 10/14 10/20 23/7 23/12 23/18 25/15 32/7 38/9 40/2 40/20 46/20 46/22 49/13 51/17 69/16 80/15 91/21 93/18 113/6 117/17 121/3 126/1 128/12 131/3 135/8 135/9 136/19 150/11 151/17 154/3 154/25 160/19 162/20 164/24 178/11 184/23 192/13 204/16 207/14 217/18 220/10 223/17 234/5
began [15] 51/8 58/14 85/15 99/7 104/4
110/4 167/18 170/16 171/9 173/2 187/19 204/11 217/20 220/8 223/20
begin [5] 104/2 182/16 215/5 226/9 231/14
beginning [3] 149/9 149/15 223/23 begun [1] 187/14
behalf [23] $3 / 64 / 1435 / 640 / 160 / 19$

60/25 61/23 63/7 84/15 92/25 93/20 94/9 98/15 133/17 154/10 158/23 170/20 176/12 180/12 181/17 198/17 220/13 234/7
behind [2] 74/18 79/19
being [23] 1/6 13/1 15/4 20/11 29/14 95/4
103/9 104/11 104/15 121/24 125/25
127/1 134/15 134/20 137/12 140/25
156/12 169/24 181/17 188/14 218/14 218/15 222/25
belabor [1] 75/14
belief [2] 156/14 156/15
believe [54] 3/11 3/16 9/3 10/25 11/8 28/10 35/10 35/12 47/12 52/13 59/11 61/10 62/3 65/15 69/23 80/22 83/7 83/12 85/12 85/13 87/1 88/21 92/2 92/15 93/1 93/4 114/11 118/2 118/9 118/10 118/18 119/9 126/23 130/6 130/15 134/25 157/13 162/20 173/5 177/13 177/14 178/3 181/25 183/1 193/12 193/19 194/14 194/21 201/1 219/8 219/19 219/25 233/4 233/23
believed [6] 55/5 148/17 200/23 200/24 215/19 230/4
Belle [4] 33/9 219/2 219/17 219/18 belonged [1] 80/25
below [2] 20/1 84/22
benchmark [1] 101/25
benchmarking [2] 115/22 115/24
benefit [7] 41/16 110/20 162/5 162/10 185/24 228/24 232/22
benefits [11] 52/8 56/19 111/8 146/22 147/13 152/16 160/25 162/2 162/16 162/22 163/2
beside [1] 172/13
besides [2] 61/4 190/12
best [13] 71/21 73/3 73/13 74/17 75/10 77/6 91/23 117/6 117/10 153/17 190/17 215/2 237/8
better [8] 35/18 88/23 106/1 127/8 174/2 174/6 194/8 198/14
between [28] 3/16 38/17 40/3 40/11
40/16 40/23 58/12 61/18 63/2 78/6 83/20
83/24 87/22 152/8 154/19 165/2 165/7
172/24 174/9 176/9 177/18 179/24
182/12 183/18 208/18 224/21 227/21 228/10
beyond [4] 71/13 94/1 229/22 235/13 bias [1] 182/24
big [1] 110/7
billing [1] 108/1
billion [28] 14/2 14/4 14/5 14/23 15/13 21/11 21/15 81/4 84/3 84/4 84/6 115/10 115/17 115/17 123/5 138/6 142/13 142/16 142/18 142/22 142/23 147/1 160/13 180/17 210/16 215/21 215/23 229/25
bills [5] 22/14 75/7 107/15 108/2 110/14 binder [7] 18/4 18/7 18/10 18/15 28/15 119/1 119/10
binders [2] 18/11 118/23
Bing [2] 5/23 170/14
Birmingham [3] 95/18 97/16 97/19
bit [6] 13/22 69/21 101/7 160/6 168/10 174/1
black [1] 44/9
blanking [1] 37/12
blight [16] 108/15 108/17 109/2 109/7 109/9 112/2 112/2 113/6 113/22 113/24 114/1 115/7 179/19 212/2 222/15 222/16 blighted [5] 112/23 113/2 113/3 113/4 113/14
block [6] 56/20 56/21 56/23 186/21

213/24 225/8
blocked [1] 112/12
blow [5] 122/3 152/6 152/23 176/22 196/25
board [5] 175/10 175/12 175/13 175/20 193/23
body [3] 96/25 97/1 217/4
bond [18] 67/2 68/17 71/5 146/21 180/5
180/10 202/5 202/25 224/8 225/2 225/10 226/3 226/3 229/23 230/20 230/25 231/8 231/10
bondholder [4] 68/16 68/18 228/13 228/14
bondholders [18] 65/15 65/16 66/22
67/24 67/25 147/14 202/6 226/7 227/4 227/19 227/22 227/23 228/9 228/10 228/11 228/13 228/14 229/19
bonds [18] 21/15 147/14 173/19 185/22
213/20 228/22 228/25 230/1 230/4 230/6 230/9 230/17 230/19 230/22 231/12
231/16 231/17 232/15
bono [2] 99/11 100/5
Bonshoff [1] 6/18
book [4] 65/23 166/13 172/13 172/14
bordering [1] 114/11
Born [2] 167/6 167/7
borrow [5] 44/15 207/11 207/15 228/19 229/8
borrowing [3] 90/5 177/10 229/14
both [21] 39/18 69/7 75/8 89/25 96/14
96/15 102/11 103/10 105/10 107/18
109/2 115/16 138/23 148/7 158/16 190/2
193/3 226/14 227/4 228/10 230/17
bottom [8] 9/12 83/16 83/22 128/11 132/5
149/9 152/6 176/14
bought [1] 167/25
Bowing [1] 154/4
box [3] 48/15 122/3 128/11
brain [1] 214/20
break[13] 9/21 10/7 14/8 52/2 58/1 80/19 82/25 116/19 195/8 227/20 236/12
236/15 236/19
breaking [1] 116/13
breeds [1] 109/17
brief [3] 116/23 170/19 237/1
briefed [1] 236/3
briefly [2] 19/6 123/25
bring [6] 56/5 88/7 100/18 164/4 218/20 237/7
bringing [3] 189/8 191/25 192/1
broader [3] 64/13 64/15 196/21
broadly [1] 43/8
broken [3] 80/22 107/15 110/10
Brom [1] 193/13
Brothers [1] 167/21
brought [3] 95/4 108/4 213/21
Brown [11] 5/24 6/1 6/5 6/18 9/18 42/21
86/18 86/19 88/3 88/4 89/1
Brown's [2] 41/21 41/23
brush [1] 108/20
Buckfire [26] 23/9 23/15 24/14 25/22 25/24 26/5 26/7 26/9 26/10 26/11 26/20 31/3 33/17 64/22 166/4 166/22 167/2 167/14 167/25 168/2 168/2 168/11 195/16 200/22 228/6 231/24
budget [6] 114/19 180/18 184/11 187/1
202/9 212/3
build [1] 36/24
building [3] 100/1 170/17 220/11
buildings [2] 108/19 108/25
built [2] 182/9 182/13
bullet [6] 31/23 34/10 144/1 147/20
147/24 148/5
burden [1] 190/1
burned [1] 108/19
buses [1] 105/17
business [13] 15/18 83/3 85/10 85/12 85/16 96/9 103/10 103/11 103/12 103/22 104/4 104/5 104/11
businesses [2] 116/3 230/8
buyer [1] 219/11
buying [1] 218/6

## C

C-U-L-L-E-N [1] 166/6
CAFR [7] 73/23 73/24 73/25 83/7 83/13 84/17 85/4
calculate [3] 111/8 145/11 210/19
calculated [2] 145/9 215/24
calculation [4] 68/8 129/7 129/21 132/4
calculations [3] 132/17 138/16 138/17
calendar [2] 77/9 225/20
California [1] 169/19
call [4] 26/21 56/5 65/23 214/20
called [19] 1/8 19/8 29/20 29/20 48/16
89/19 114/9 115/22 171/22 177/6 192/14
203/20 204/18 205/9 205/14 207/24 217/3 218/15 229/9
calls [7] 31/23 63/18 63/20 137/25 138/23 205/6 207/5
Calpine [1] 169/16
came [21] 76/17 79/14 92/13 114/23
123/7 124/12 124/16 125/3 126/9 150/4 151/14 178/5 181/7 188/3 204/12 204/13 206/3 206/19 208/1 212/15 218/24 camera [1] 117/17
can [97] $4 / 178 / 3$ 11/12 14/10 15/3 17/3 17/5 17/18 18/12 18/18 18/22 19/19 24/18 25/11 27/13 27/14 28/3 31/21 32/13 38/24 39/15 42/3 43/19 45/16 47/5 48/4 48/5 49/13 49/18 52/11 52/24 53/15 56/17 63/21 63/24 66/6 67/7 70/19 71/13 74/5 83/2 83/23 87/4 87/4 87/7 87/20 87/24 88/7 88/20 93/6 94/7 98/16 99/17 102/25 104/12 109/17 110/6 118/14 118/24 119/25 120/25 127/14 130/19 139/22 140/12 140/24 141/11 141/14 141/19 141/20 149/3 152/21 152/24 153/2 153/5 153/9 153/16 156/22 157/2 161/8 166/14 166/15 168/18 176/22 183/1 184/2 189/20 196/25 207/11 210/6 215/12 216/9 216/11 216/15 230/25 231/23 237/8
can't [22] 13/12 20/13 26/7 33/19 34/25
39/13 60/21 64/7 67/1 77/16 77/18 134/6
139/4 141/6 141/13 143/6 145/15 151/17
183/23 193/20 223/18 237/1
candidly [1] 234/9
Canfield [1] 9/20
cannot [8] 13/15 20/8 34/24 38/4 63/17
67/9 67/18 78/23
capacity [2] 211/15 215/25
capital [13] 102/12 103/2 103/15 142/17 168/25 170/3 184/15 207/13 207/17
218/8 233/5 233/7 233/14
card [1] 59/18
care [1] 83/3
career [1] 167/18
careful [1] 104/16
carefully [1] 46/23
carriers [1] 218/18
case [25] 2/4 2/21 30/2 51/2 51/9 54/22 55/11 55/12 55/17 91/15 92/11 92/19 112/1 146/23 153/17 157/13 168/24

188/12 196/22 207/12 213/11 216/5
231/1 231/18 235/23
cash [146] 8/10 8/13 8/15 8/21 9/13 9/21 10/3 10/10 11/10 11/14 11/15 11/21 12/3 12/8 12/9 12/13 22/12 24/17 24/20 24/23 24/24 25/3 25/4 25/6 25/8 25/9 25/10 25/11 25/13 25/13 25/13 25/14 27/11 29/23 31/12 32/10 32/11 33/15 44/12 44/13 44/18 70/9 70/11 70/18 71/7 71/16 71/22 72/2 73/2 73/24 74/6 74/17 74/22 74/22 74/24 74/25 75/1 75/2 75/3 75/4 75/10 75/17 75/19 75/21 76/13 77/7 78/12 78/13 78/15 78/18 79/9 80/1 81/7 81/10 81/17 81/19 81/20 84/6 84/9 84/13 89/19 89/22 89/23 90/1 90/5 90/7 90/13 91/3 91/6 91/10 99/18 103/15 111/12 116/1 116/5 121/12 173/17 173/17 177/21 181/2 184/5 188/1 188/11 195/16 195/24 195/25 196/2 196/4 196/13 196/15 196/18 196/20 196/21 197/15 197/19 198/3 198/16 198/20 202/25 203/13 203/25 204/2 204/6 204/10 204/15 206/15 206/22 206/24 208/1 208/3 208/4 212/12 212/19 213/7 213/8 213/19 217/6 217/12 217/14 217/22 220/1 221/2 222/21 223/22 224/7 224/11 cashiering [3] 99/16 99/17 99/18 casino [1] 98/10
casinos [4] 77/19 79/1 181/17 202/22
categories [3] 147/5 147/15 147/17
category [3] 61/13 111/22 199/25
cause [3] 56/9 188/21 217/3
causes [1] 168/17
caution [1] 49/5
CD [1] 1/9
cent [2] 215/18 228/21
certain [13] 7/22 16/14 37/4 49/2 63/10
63/12 70/25 92/20 99/16 171/11 171/19
196/6 235/4
certainly [14] 21/22 44/23 55/14 98/6
106/2 108/20 121/22 144/15 149/7
156/15 157/2 159/3 170/1 236/24
certificate [1] 185/21
certification [2] 1/18 97/5
certifications [3] 96/11 96/18 96/22
certified [9] 1/4 1/14 1/22 96/19 96/20
96/21 96/24 97/2 97/3
CFO [2] 177/5 193/19
challenge [3] 95/2 183/23 210/22
challenged [2] 112/22 114/17
challenges [2] 29/4 171/4
chance [1] 41/22
change [6] 4/1 39/9 39/13 113/10 165/6 203/9
changed [2] 108/7 179/9
changes [1] 39/12
changing [2] 110/16 111/14
Chapter [14] 26/2 26/17 30/9 30/18 30/25
51/1 51/22 150/6 152/17 159/19 188/6
188/12 192/17 212/24
charge [2] 35/8 218/7
charged [3] 36/9 37/14 80/9
charges [1] 80/10
Charles [2] 91/20 95/17
check [5] 20/23 74/3 74/21 75/15 75/18
checks [1] 76/25
Cheryl [2] 35/9 36/7
chief[7] 5/22 6/2 6/19 41/25 88/4 89/2 97/11
Chinas [1] 188/24
Chris [14] 5/24 6/1 41/21 41/23 42/21
86/18 86/19 88/3 88/4 89/1 171/8 177/3 183/7 193/18

Christie's [1] 221/20
Ciantra [10] 94/12 117/2 117/14 136/24
150/15 152/3 152/8 152/9 153/9 153/11
circumstance [2] 3/25 151/15
circumstances [2] 224/13 235/5
citations [1] 12/20
cite [3] 1/19 12/2 39/13
cited [1] 2/22
Cities [1] 229/7
City [441]
city's [83] 7/19 8/21 10/3 11/10 12/21
13/23 22/12 24/16 30/2 31/17 33/15
34/20 35/9 36/10 37/21 39/24 57/13
61/15 61/25 62/9 64/14 64/16 73/17
73/18 74/12 74/14 75/11 75/12 75/15
75/25 76/18 76/19 76/22 77/24 78/1 78/3 78/14 78/19 80/2 89/23 90/13 100/25
101/3 107/8 112/8 144/16 155/1 155/8 173/18 174/16 176/20 176/21 178/7 180/21 183/6 183/12 183/15 185/14 186/21 187/3 187/15 187/17 187/19 189/1 189/6 196/2 196/11 196/13 201/25 203/25 204/6 204/9 204/23 206/13 206/24 209/10 210/14 211/14 212/8 215/2 220/12 224/7 226/4
City-Owned [1] 222/1
claim [9] 128/22 129/9 129/20 129/21
129/24 129/24 140/25 153/19 228/2
claims [18] 92/9 121/13 122/7 122/8
122/10 122/12 122/14 126/7 147/21
161/12 209/18 210/21 227/9 227/13
227/16 228/12 231/19 231/19
clarified [1] 85/9
clarify [3] 63/21 84/12 106/9
clarifying [1] 79/22
Clark [1] 159/25
classes [1] 120/20
classic [1] 233/16
classification [2] 74/23 74/24
classified [1] 231/17
clear [17] 12/10 27/24 47/24 57/9 77/13
78/24 112/7 112/17 154/23 162/23 179/6
179/7 200/3 200/4 200/19 201/8 230/2
cleared [1] 222/18
clearing [1] 222/18
clearly [9] 12/15 55/9 91/3 93/23 173/2
188/13 206/10 208/19 233/21
clerk [1] 166/14
clerks [2] 28/8 166/14
clever [1] 221/1
client [9] 98/6 139/12 139/15 139/25
140/11 151/10 169/6 182/23 198/2
clients [5] 55/4 98/4 98/8 98/12 169/5
clock [1] 215/4
close [8] 169/24 170/11 173/24 183/20
186/25 200/19 208/16 236/20
closed [1] 207/18
closely [1] 101/22
closer [3] 17/21 121/17 176/17
co [2] 167/13 167/13
coalition [2] 40/23 42/11
Cockrel [1] 9/19
Code [1] 205/24
Cohen [1] 58/6
coherent [3] 181/16 183/15 222/11
Coleman [3] 33/8 218/12 218/12
collaborative [1] 183/20
collars [1] 126/7
collateral [1] 186/2
colleague [2] 52/3 159/25
colleagues [2] 26/11 236/15
collect [2] 36/11 202/1
collected [6] 80/8 84/15 181/17 202/7
collected... [2] 202/21 219/8
collection [12] 12/17 12/20 35/8 35/15
35/18 80/14 84/14 106/24 220/11 220/20 221/14 221/23
collections [15] 13/2 13/8 13/11 13/13 13/16 13/21 24/24 35/25 70/25 71/1 73/3 73/4 84/11 107/25 191/1
collective [1] 159/15
collectively [2] 23/21 183/14
collects [1] 84/7
college [2] 96/4 96/5
colloquy [1] 152/8
column [10] 66/17 67/14 67/15 68/11
83/17 85/6 128/23 129/2 203/19 203/19 combination [7] 72/6 73/16 75/24 80/2 89/9 90/19 138/12
combinations [1] 1/14
combined [1] 96/15
come [45] 4/4 9/21 10/9 11/17 11/21
11/22 11/22 13/8 30/23 44/12 46/8 54/1 71/6 73/25 80/11 80/19 84/12 99/7 100/3 100/7 102/3 103/16 113/20 123/9 125/5 129/23 131/5 135/17 143/11 146/20 150/3 171/10 178/13 180/21 181/14 184/25 191/15 196/18 202/18 204/25 206/2 208/22 226/8 231/2 232/8
comes [5] 47/8 73/2 76/18 91/21 181/12 comfortable [1] 193/8
coming [16] 11/16 44/17 46/12 46/16
71/17 99/19 107/6 131/23 143/3 146/24
146/25 147/1 147/9 155/6 160/13 165/16
Command [2] 86/6 88/9
comment [3] 59/17 201/12 201/13
commercial [4] 218/15 218/18 218/20 223/6
commission [6] 98/19 98/23 98/23 99/2 99/5 197/15
committee [4] 4/15 69/17 92/25 217/3
Committee's [2] 18/7 28/11
common [3] 98/9 98/18 156/5
communication [1] 206/13
communities [2] 116/7 116/10
companies [2] 168/4 229/8
company [10] 97/10 167/14 167/19
168/13 168/21 182/17 188/9 188/11
207/10 213/4
compare [1] 83/10
compared [5] 16/23 75/17 84/3 102/1 116/6
comparison [1] 194/5
compel [2] 117/2 117/5
competent [1] 191/2
compiling [1] 71/14
complete [1] 160/19
completed [8] 58/13 96/14 154/22 155/3
155/10 160/10 160/12 160/15
completely [1] 231/22
complex [7] 169/14 181/19 184/24
188/13 192/16 218/10 219/22
complicated [3] 210/22 216/24 217/24
component [2] 36/23 142/9
comprehend [2] 201/15 237/3
comprehensive [1] 175/22
comprehensively [1] 208/20
comprised [1] 16/5
compromise [1] 228/12
compromised [1] 227/16
compromising [2] 227/9 227/13
Compuware [3] 34/11 35/10 36/8
concensus [2] 151/2 151/3
concept [3] 172/21 176/4 208/9
concern [1] 188/17
concerned [11] 12/19 25/24 26/5 26/8
26/13 45/12 185/14 186/19 188/14 220/15 220/19
concerning [7] 8/6 25/17 25/22 45/18 94/10 140/8 205/15
concerns [2] 30/17 188/18
concessions [12] 42/25 43/2 43/3 43/11 43/12 43/15 43/18 44/22 45/15 45/20 45/21 90/3
conclude [2] 10/2 116/8
concluded [1] 191/20
conclusion [15] 20/6 20/6 143/5 184/25
186/8 186/11 191/25 204/13 205/1 205/6
206/2 206/5 208/2 212/16 218/25
conclusions [6] 64/5 65/3 126/24 185/12 190/3 201/11
concrete [2] 155/21 213/6
condemned [1] 223/6
condition [16] 176/10 183/6 183/9 183/16
189/6 190/4 190/8 190/10 209/10 209/14
215/3 223/4 223/8 224/19 225/5 232/25
conditional [1] 174/24
conference [2] 63/17 63/20
conferred [2] 117/2 117/14
confidential [1] 104/18
confidentiality [1] 98/7
confirmed [1] 130/14
confused [1] 152/2
confusion [1] 94/20
connection [9] 8/1 33/18 90/9 117/22
118/11 150/12 159/18 170/7 177/10
consensus [8] 150/8 150/13 150/21
151/4 151/9 152/14 152/18 205/1
consent [12] 171/15 172/4 172/8 172/18
172/22 172/23 176/9 177/12 178/12
178/23 208/17 214/15
conserve [2] 206/15 224/11
conserves [1] 206/21
consider [14] 15/6 73/23 117/17 142/1
188/24 189/8 192/4 204/3 218/2 221/8
227/15 228/12 230/3 237/7
considerable [1] 74/7
consideration [4] 173/20 209/17 210/21 216/12
considerations [2] 229/20 229/21
considered [4] 43/25 212/25 230/18 230/23
considering [2] 149/19 192/1
consistent [3] 77/20 175/20 211/18
constant [2] 16/17 206/13
constitute [1] 205/23
constituted [1] 203/6
constitutes [4] 1/22 159/10 186/12 235/15
constitution [3] 140/9 149/23 152/15
construct [2] 211/13 212/20
consult [2] 52/2 58/15
consultants [2] 9/19 101/15
consulted [1] 159/18
consulting [1] 137/18
contact [2] 171/7 225/24
contacted [3] 72/15 74/3 218/4
contain [1] $1 / 12$
contains [1] 102/19
contemplate [1] 162/15
contemplated [4] 163/1 177/13 182/8 228/16
contentious [1] 219/25
contents [3] 17/11 17/13 54/9
context [7] 20/10 36/8 44/4 55/1 56/25
159/14 159/16
contingency [1] 189/10
contingent [1] 179/25
continuance [1] 43/12
continue [12] $4 / 22$ 31/11 90/20 112/21
116/13 160/16 179/4 186/17 224/17
232/21 232/23 232/24
continued [6] 44/15 89/25 90/8 112/15 190/5 203/13
continues [1] 150/21
continuing [5] 108/11 150/1 202/12 203/7 206/20
contractor [1] 220/14
contracts [2] 185/23 186/13
contribute [1] 170/8
contribution [1] 145/10
contributions [3] 128/1 148/2 163/5
control [1] 222/9
controlled [1] 228/17
convenient [1] 48/6
conversation [7] 26/19 31/7 32/1 76/10
78/16 79/2 79/13
conversations [21] 7/14 25/21 76/3 76/7 78/3 78/6 78/10 78/18 78/25 79/6 81/11 81/12 151/12 154/15 154/19 154/23
154/24 164/16 164/23 165/1 233/15
converted [3] 208/1 208/3 220/1
convertible [1] 204/14
Converting [1] 219/23
Conway [35] 23/9 64/22 81/13 81/19
81/22 95/22 95/23 96/2 97/12 97/15
97/17 97/20 98/5 99/11 99/15 100/3
100/10 100/20 101/17 103/8 105/7 110/4 112/17 183/11 183/19 184/18 185/2
185/8 189/12 190/2 198/1 209/20 210/23 212/7 228/4
cooperative [1] 190/14
cop [1] 227/22
copies [3] 9/5 28/6 166/13
copy [8] 1/4 1/22 18/13 18/23 27/14
32/17 40/22 48/9
core [3] 90/6 187/21 207/24
corks [1] 102/13
corner [1] 88/1
corp [1] 220/13
corporate [5] 157/10 157/10 158/1 158/3 182/10
Corporation [3] 169/16 169/16 169/17 corporations [1] 157/24
correct [135] 1/18 3/24 5/9 5/12 5/17 5/19 6/12 7/11 7/15 8/13 8/18 8/19 9/10 9/11 10/7 15/21 15/22 20/17 21/21 21/24 23/11 23/13 25/12 34/13 35/3 35/5 35/17 38/7 38/18 38/19 39/6 39/14 40/13 40/17 42/1 42/2 42/12 42/19 42/20 42/22 43/22 46/1 49/24 51/2 51/3 51/6 51/7 51/20 51/25 58/19 58/20 58/23 59/2 59/4 59/5 59/13 59/15 60/1 60/2 60/4 60/11 60/14 60/16 61/1 61/3 62/5 62/12 65/5 65/16 66/4 67/11 68/9 72/17 74/1 74/4 76/15
77/8 77/18 79/1 79/3 79/16 79/24 81/4
81/5 81/7 81/24 82/25 83/1 83/18 83/19
84/20 84/21 84/25 85/8 85/18 85/21 88/6
107/19 113/3 137/6 137/11 138/7 138/17
138/18 142/21 143/3 143/8 143/13
143/16 144/13 144/20 145/3 145/5
145/20 146/10 146/17 148/3 148/13
148/15 148/17 148/18 148/20 148/21
158/8 158/11 159/8 160/25 162/12 163/9
164/8 164/13 181/22 200/5 213/17 217/21
corrected [3] 1/14 106/11 130/10 correctly [5] 68/16 102/21 105/2 108/11 136/17
correspond [1] 28/15
cost [38] 11/19 12/15 16/14 16/18 16/21 16/24 17/1 19/20 19/22 20/1 20/11 20/19 20/21 22/1 22/24 24/1 24/5 47/1 86/23 89/7 89/9 90/19 90/22 90/25 91/7 110/11 113/13 147/10 185/24 190/15 212/4 212/9 218/8 222/18 229/5 229/12 229/13 229/14
costs [8] 11/23 11/24 16/18 110/6 146/20 147/11 184/10 229/1
could [142] 8/15 10/10 11/14 11/18 14/7 15/15 18/9 30/2 32/8 33/14 33/24 36/1 47/22 51/13 54/3 65/23 66/13 67/12 68/10 70/1 70/4 71/25 72/13 80/25 81/8 83/7 83/8 83/10 85/1 93/10 95/15 95/23 96/4 96/12 96/18 97/6 97/22 98/3 98/4 101/13 101/19 102/14 102/18 102/24 105/16 105/22 105/25 106/1 107/4 107/22 108/10 108/19 110/1 110/18 110/19 111/1 $111 / 12$ 114/6 114/19 115/24 116/4 119/25 120/23 123/25 124/11 128/4 128/10 135/3 135/5 147/11 148/25 152/6 154/23 157/16 158/24 161/6 164/5 166/25 167/10 169/11 170/6 170/24 171/5 171/14 173/5 174/13 175/2 175/25 181/3 181/5 183/15 185/4 186/20 187/22 187/23 188/8 188/19 190/7 190/17 196/12 196/20 196/24 197/3 199/12 204/10 206/8 207/25 208/3 208/11 209/6 209/11 209/13 209/15 209/24 211/8 212/16 213/6 213/15 213/18 215/3 215/24 217/22 218/6 218/7 220/1 220/5 220/24 221/12 222/2 223/21 224/14 225/17 226/5 226/9 226/11 226/13 227/1 228/19 228/20 229/9 231/14 231/20
couldn't [4] 18/8 110/12 164/6 164/11
council [7] 7/4 8/23 9/18 9/18 12/2 12/7 175/9
counsel [17] 9/17 10/13 27/1 41/4 58/16 65/12 134/25 139/19 150/9 150/14 150/16 150/19 150/22 151/1 191/16 211/12 236/10
counsel's [2] 1/19 49/8
count [2] 63/17 222/8
counter [9] 9/22 164/2 185/18 186/20 203/2 213/23 225/15 226/18 229/3 countered [1] 164/7
counting [2] 75/4 75/6
country [2] 169/20 213/4
country's [1] 190/20
county [1] 98/10
couple [8] 2/9 64/11 120/10 126/16 146/5
161/1 163/19 164/15
course [18] 7/23 17/3 47/13 92/4 107/7
141/13 154/8 168/23 172/7 184/3 185/15 190/13 196/7 199/15 205/8 207/16 230/24 231/1
court [47] 1/19 4/1 4/2 12/20 13/2 13/6 13/9 13/10 13/13 13/20 28/6 48/9 57/24 58/3 69/1 87/7 94/25 95/15 111/20 115/3 116/14 116/17 116/24 117/15 117/16 117/17 117/23 118/23 125/15 126/18 128/10 132/13 135/4 153/17 169/11 192/18 195/6 195/10 212/21 213/5 216/25 217/18 217/20 230/9 234/5 237/8 237/12
court's [2] 119/3 199/9
courtroom [2] 91/22 95/5
covenant [1] 220/25
cover [4] 103/4 117/23 130/25 207/11 covered [1] 21/9

CPA [1] 96/25
create [4] 24/20 187/17 204/10 228/16 created [5] 137/8 175/14 180/4 184/11 213/20
creating [1] 230/7
creation [2] 104/9 104/13
credibility [1] 95/2
credit [8] 186/4 228/20 229/7 229/17
230/14 230/19 231/11 233/7
creditor [3] 59/8 102/8 102/15
creditors [27] 29/13 31/19 31/25 32/15
39/1 65/22 119/23 119/24 120/20 122/13 133/18 142/7 143/16 144/18 168/8 187/17 206/16 208/8 208/25 212/23
213/1 214/1 215/15 215/17 215/18 224/4 225/19
crime [1] 109/17
crisis [5] 9/13 10/3 11/10 170/1 208/4 criticize [2] 12/5 12/5
cross [5] 2/23 58/15 68/21 68/25 236/11 crucial [1] 225/11
Cullen [2] 166/2 166/6
cumulative [1] 160/7
cured [1] 203/4
current [6] 37/6 48/19 116/2 120/16 196/6 226/22
currently [10] 37/21 58/21 101/9 101/25 104/11 104/15 148/8 169/20 218/14 223/11
curve [1] 229/12
cushion [1] 202/9
customers [2] 218/1 228/17
cut [10] 94/18 139/14 141/5 147/2 151/10
160/24 162/4 162/10 188/22 207/13
cuts [6] 110/11 148/6 148/16 161/3 163/5 163/8

## D

daily [4] 71/16 76/11 76/25 183/21
damage [2] 188/21 230/8
Dana [1] 169/17
data [3] 48/17 80/14 114/22
date [14] 6/10 17/2 30/10 51/12 118/16
128/18 129/12 160/23 177/17 179/11
202/3 206/17 210/11 224/16
dated [6] 9/9 17/9 19/9 41/24 53/16 206/9
dates [1] 96/12
day[38] 1/2 2/2 4/4 4/7 4/16 6/21 6/21
26/24 26/25 27/4 27/7 27/25 29/15 29/24
30/8 30/21 31/16 58/14 64/21 65/4 71/20
71/20 116/22 117/4 119/18 120/6 120/21
133/24 137/21 139/6 139/19 155/17
166/2 170/21 171/1 194/24 222/3 228/5
day-to-day [1] 6/21
DDOT [3] 82/2 105/7 105/8
deal [9] 44/13 92/22 100/18 141/24
151/21 154/8 187/2 192/20 237/8
dealing [4] 39/21 39/24 114/21 204/23
dealt [1] 220/21

20/25 21/1 21/4 21/6 21/11 146/21
147/14 203/21 211/4 211/15 215/25
217/10 224/3 224/9 226/4 227/19 228/14
229/24 230/1 230/12 230/15 231/7
232/14
debts [5] 83/2 168/7 206/3 206/19 231/11
December [7] 8/20 9/20 10/9 11/12 22/4 22/9 178/2
December 2012 [1] 22/9
DeChiara [1] 58/6
decide [4] 28/18 203/16 211/15 220/16
decided [2] 177/7 235/7
decides [1] 69/1
deciding [2] 117/17 203/11
decision [11] 51/18 117/20 159/19 171/5
194/1 194/3 199/9 203/23 224/6 225/2 225/10
decisions [5] 197/19 234/6 234/10
234/12 235/17
declaration [1] 92/8
decline [2] 210/17 232/24
decreased [1] 143/13
decree [2] 171/15 208/18
deduct [1] 84/10
deemed [2] 209/8 209/25
default [15] 185/18 185/25 186/1 186/5
186/12 186/19 188/9 188/15 190/6
196/10 203/1 203/7 224/25 225/1 225/3
defaults [3] 68/17 203/3 213/21
defend [2] 31/17 31/23
defensive [1] 225/6
defer [2] 44/15 206/21
deferral [1] 11/22
deferrals [7] 10/11 11/18 12/14 22/14
89/9 90/6 196/7
deficiencies [2] 107/18 107/20
deficit [3] 19/25 31/12 31/12
define [3] 147/11 157/16 158/24
defined [2] 100/15 103/9
degree [3] 96/7 96/15 178/14
degrees [3] 96/13 96/14 96/15
deliberations [1] 140/7
delineated [1] 173/3
delineating [1] 215/15
delineation [1] 72/9
delinquent [1] 35/4
deliver [1] $1 / 15$
delivered [2] 103/21 233/17
delivering [1] 178/20
delivery [2] 1/15 1/16
Deloitte [1] 97/8
demonstrating [1] 126/20
Dentons [2] 4/14 69/16
deny [1] 199/9
department [41] 15/19 15/19 16/6 21/12 21/16 33/7 36/4 82/1 82/4 82/5 82/7 82/9 82/13 82/15 82/19 82/20 101/6 101/24
102/1 103/7 103/13 103/25 104/3 105/6 105/8 105/9 105/15 105/16 105/19 105/20 106/22 108/22 108/23 110/16 127/24 157/17 157/18 193/20 216/23 217/8 228/15
department's [1] 108/24
departments [13] 80/9 82/24 101/8
101/11 101/22 108/21 110/3 110/5 110/9
110/10 110/12 110/18 111/15
depend [1] 204/22
depending [3] 33/1 151/15 200/20
depict [2] 121/8 121/10
deposition [8] 10/23 55/3 139/14 140/7
141/4 149/2 151/19 154/4
deprive [1] 188/20
deputy [2] 193/13 204/19
derive [2] 75/23 172/21
derived [3] 74/10 74/11 123/23
describe [7] 49/18 49/19 53/15 171/14
188/8 196/13 225/17
described [6] 33/13 84/20 117/24 132/7 172/3 173/4
describes [1] 172/24
deserved [1] 226/21
designation [1] 97/2
designed [2] 175/19 199/1
designing [1] 174/15
desire [3] 1/16 100/17 226/17
desires [1] 160/14
despite [2] 221/13 227/3
detail [1] 74/8
detailed [1] 22/11
details [1] 3/18
deteriorate [2] 109/4 232/24
deteriorated [1] 112/8
determination [1] 215/13
determine [6] 68/10 68/12 73/9 110/20 135/2 187/20
determined [1] 207/25
Detroit [100] 2/5 5/7 6/6 7/4 13/7 16/13 16/22 19/8 21/23 26/14 33/6 33/9 33/9 34/1 34/17 37/5 37/10 37/17 38/2 40/24 41/21 41/25 46/9 50/12 50/16 51/5 51/23 55/14 58/19 67/25 85/8 86/4 86/5 86/6 86/7 86/15 86/21 87/3 87/22 87/22 88/5 88/9 88/18 89/3 89/8 98/8 98/9 99/8 99/12 100/4 100/8 104/21 105/5 106/4 106/8 108/16 109/7 116/3 116/9 119/24 122/13 122/15 122/25 123/22 124/18 125/21 125/23 127/18 127/21 134/21 142/11 143/11 145/25 157/19 157/25 167/5 167/7 169/25 170/2 188/5 191/15 193/7 201/22 207/12 216/22 216/23 219/3 219/6 220/3 220/6 220/10 220/11 221/15 227/21 228/20 229/22 231/1 233/2 233/6 234/7
Detroit's [7] 26/1 26/16 116/6 157/4 169/22 190/8 190/9
develop [6] 101/11 155/20 162/14 209/13 209/22 215/3
developed [5] 111/6 115/8 150/8 151/9 156/12
developers [1] 222/6
developing [4] 155/25 175/16 190/24 226/20
development [1] 104/5
DIA [3] 220/13 220/18 223/5
diagnosis [3] 168/17 169/5 182/19
diagnostic [1] 168/19
dialogue [1] 62/7
Dickinson [1] 3/4
did [221] $2 / 168 / 2011 / 8$ 12/2 12/7 13/19 14/16 17/20 18/1 19/17 20/19 26/10 26/11 26/20 29/24 30/7 39/23 42/13 42/24 45/2 45/19 53/17 54/20 58/15 58/17 60/6 61/22 62/15 62/15 62/20 63/4 63/4 64/4 70/16 71/9 71/21 72/4 72/8 72/10 72/10 72/21 73/23 74/18 75/15 75/23 76/3 76/21 79/5 79/25 80/13 80/19 81/11 81/11 86/25 88/8 91/1 92/7 92/13 92/14 98/19 99/2 99/4 99/7 99/11 99/14 99/20 100/3 100/7 100/23 101/13 101/17 102/3 102/6 103/6 103/16 103/20 104/2 105/2 106/7 107/7 108/14 111/8 112/6 113/2 113/13 113/20 115/13 115/15 116/8 117/13 119/18 120/8 122/10 123/9 123/11 123/16 123/18 123/25 125/5 126/5 126/8 126/9 126/23 127/9 131/5 131/14 132/17 132/25 133/3 133/9 133/16 135/17 135/20 138/17 138/22 145/11 146/11 150/2 152/13 154/20 154/25 155/23 156/2 156/10 156/18 158/19 158/21 164/1 164/17 165/6 169/22 170/10 170/18 171/10 172/7 172/9 172/21 173/12 174/11 174/12 174/21 175/22 178/6 178/9 178/13 179/7 180/14 182/5 183/3 183/5 183/10 184/24 185/12 187/7 187/7 187/9 187/16 187/24 189/11 189/14 189/25 191/2 191/5 191/8 191/9 191/10 191/11 191/15 192/15

193/5 193/8 193/10 194/9 194/25 195/17 195/19 198/3 198/10 198/13 198/14 201/11 201/20 204/16 204/25 206/2 207/21 208/8 208/10 211/5 211/20 211/21 211/22 212/4 212/12 213/13 213/18 213/25 215/5 218/23 219/19 219/25 220/17 221/9 224/12 224/14 225/13 225/14 225/23 227/1 227/5 227/12 228/7 229/4 229/18 231/13 231/23 232/2 232/3 235/7 235/14 235/14 didn't [26] 10/5 13/16 24/2 28/18 34/25 48/19 51/21 56/2 73/18 75/2 75/15 77/1
93/8 94/18 117/13 121/22 138/15 162/14 173/16 194/18 201/15 207/2 210/25 212/4 225/7 229/1
difference [2] 182/14 229/15
differences [1] 83/24
different [13] 8/14 10/9 33/21 33/22 80/9 133/8 140/18 140/19 180/22 183/13 222/9 222/10 230/16 difficult [6] 17/1 117/11 151/16 156/10 156/16 234/12
difficulties [1] 168/6
difficulty [1] 168/15
digit [1] 35/22
dilapidated [2] 218/19 223/4
Dillon [2] 167/19 193/11
diminishing [1] 163/1
DiPompeo [1] 2/15
dire [1] 224/7
direct [27] 7/13 32/16 58/13 58/25 59/1
59/11 61/10 62/3 63/14 65/10 65/11
65/21 66/16 102/18 105/5 119/17 122/16 133/22 137/4 139/20 163/24 173/5 175/2 175/25 179/22 213/15 216/7
directly [1] 12/5
director [4] 97/21 177/4 193/18 199/23
disagree [2] 12/8 20/6
disagreement [1] 20/9
disbursements [12] 71/18 71/23 82/10 82/17 82/21 84/10 85/19 89/24 90/7 90/18 90/19 176/11
disciplinary [1] 189/9
disclosable [1] 98/4
disclose [3] 104/12 117/8 133/9
discount [4] 129/19 129/19 129/21 133/8
discovered [1] 220/9
discovery [1] 141/4
discrepancy [1] 83/20
discuss [1] 62/4
discussed [14] 8/21 13/22 50/3 81/21 104/15 104/19 109/23 138/11 138/13 143/15 150/7 204/6 212/14 216/6 discussing [1] 215/6
discussion [20] 29/12 30/7 33/25 36/8 43/22 53/16 62/7 81/9 105/3 149/25 150/2 150/5 150/12 150/13 150/18 150/25 156/16 216/5 223/17 224/2 discussions [44] 3/16 25/16 30/21 31/2 31/9 43/1 43/14 43/17 44/3 44/6 44/11 44/16 45/24 49/25 50/7 50/21 61/25 62/1 76/1 77/23 77/25 78/14 79/25 80/3 80/18 81/15 88/8 88/12 113/21 135/2 149/21 157/2 212/11 214/19 225/15 226/9 226/17 227/11 227/18 228/2 228/2 228/8 229/18 229/23
diskette [1] 1/9 diskette/CD [1] 1/9 dismissed [1] 217/21
disparate [2] 222/7 222/8
disposal [1] 222/12
dispute [1] 93/24
disrepair [1] 112/13
distinguish [2] 61/18 182/12
distracted [1] 3/14
distress [2] 100/16 100/19
distribute [1] 1/20
distributes [1] 84/14
distribution [1] 84/8
distributions [1] 73/6
 13/13 13/20
division [2] 174/9 179/7
do [232] 4/17 5/24 5/25 7/15 7/23 8/5 9/14 9/23 9/25 10/3 10/6 12/9 12/18 12/23 12/24 12/25 13/1 13/4 13/5 13/5 15/1 15/11 15/23 16/24 17/18 17/22 17/25 20/2 20/5 20/21 21/5 22/23 24/9 24/10 25/19 25/21 26/19 26/23 29/4 29/7 29/11 29/12 29/14 30/3 30/10 30/12 30/20 31/1 31/2 31/7 31/15 32/1 32/25 33/25 34/3 34/7 35/6 36/14 36/16 36/17 $36 / 1936 / 2037 / 237 / 737 / 937 / 1437 / 18$ 38/4 41/21 41/23 42/7 43/3 46/18 48/21 49/6 49/12 50/5 50/13 50/15 52/5 53/11 53/13 54/6 55/16 59/8 59/23 60/17 61/9 61/11 62/22 63/13 63/24 65/22 66/8 66/17 66/19 66/20 67/4 67/6 67/20 67/23 68/3 69/20 72/4 75/1 76/7 76/16 77/2 77/4 77/10 78/2 78/5 78/17 79/2 80/19 86/20 87/5 87/13 87/25 88/17 88/24 89/5 90/17 91/1 95/21 97/17 97/20 99/4 99/14 100/5 101/2 103/4 103/6 103/11 105/7 106/7 106/23 108/11 108/14 113/5 115/21 117/5 117/18 117/18 118/22 119/6 121/3 121/8 121/10 122/3 122/17 122/20 123/7 123/23 124/15 125/2 127/23 129/23 133/23 134/15 134/18 134/23 136/16 138/16 141/6 143/18 143/19 144/2 148/8 152/21 154/17 155/10 155/19 160/21 161/13 163/24 166/12 168/15 169/5 169/7 170/10 172/16 172/17 173/6 173/8 174/22 179/3 179/15 182/5 182/6 182/18 182/21 183/3 183/24 184/5 187/7 187/14 187/14 188/23 189/3 189/4 189/7 189/17 189/22 190/17 191/3 191/12 194/20 197/14 197/19 197/24 197/24 199/16 203/12 205/8 205/22 207/22 212/15 217/24 217/25 225/23 227/8 227/17 229/4 229/8 229/21 236/6 236/8 236/10 236/25 237/4 237/5
document [70] 9/2 9/2 15/11 15/12 19/5 19/7 20/7 20/18 23/24 27/14 41/13 41/14 46/20 46/25 47/4 47/5 47/10 47/19 48/2 48/25 49/6 49/7 50/2 52/7 53/12 53/16 53/18 53/20 53/21 53/23 54/2 54/9 55/12 55/14 56/11 57/5 69/21 72/23 83/14 85/5 102/8 102/21 103/1 120/2 120/24 123/15 126/5 128/5 128/12 130/17 131/1 131/3 131/14 131/15 132/1 132/20 135/9 135/20 135/21 136/4 136/8 141/14 143/25 144/23 147/19 152/7 162/7 200/13 208/9 210/10
documents [13] 28/25 54/18 55/11 56/6 126/6 136/3 141/12 141/18 141/21 151/21 161/22 161/24 196/22 does [43] 14/1 14/2 14/2 14/18 15/7 15/11 15/14 21/12 30/10 30/12 31/22 34/9 48/17 48/25 49/5 54/2 56/8 56/23 57/4 81/25 82/5 82/5 82/7 96/22 97/4 118/20 128/19 153/24 168/1 168/2 168/12 168/15 172/10 181/8 182/14 182/22 199/6 199/6 199/24 214/9 220/10 229/5 231/9
doesn't [4] 11/4 73/25 141/23 235/12
doing [10] 2/14 8/17 16/11 17/19 36/9 41/6 94/8 101/13 132/9 174/18 dollar [1] 75/6
dollars [12] 34/22 35/22 80/25 142/19 142/22 142/23 147/1 180/17 196/16 210/16 213/12 229/25
don't [75] 2/7 3/10 4/3 6/9 6/9 12/24 16/16 18/3 19/3 19/6 25/8 28/15 29/9 29/10 30/24 31/5 31/5 38/23 40/14 45/23 46/13 51/11 52/23 53/22 55/20 55/25 57/10 57/16 58/21 58/25 61/7 61/8 65/7 66/2 69/5 69/20 72/9 72/18 72/19 72/24
73/1 74/5 74/25 75/14 76/5 76/10 78/24 79/11 93/4 93/23 109/13 117/11 118/9 118/18 127/2 136/4 141/6 141/22 146/23 153/3 153/4 153/9 153/14 156/24 159/1 160/7 162/20 163/11 182/17 182/24 186/14 200/1 201/8 213/1 233/3
done [25] 20/18 35/24 50/25 55/9 55/13 68/5 68/7 98/15 101/18 103/18 105/24 117/10 160/18 160/20 168/18 170/19 178/10 180/6 180/10 183/14 192/13 194/22 220/6 234/8 234/16
doors [1] 93/5
double [3] 229/1 229/5 229/12
doubt [3] 94/2 127/9 215/8
down [31] 9/12 14/8 23/25 29/3 31/23
$33 / 7$ 34/11 42/3 56/21 59/18 74/9 87/7
88/24 91/14 95/10 132/21 147/21 153/3
153/9 165/15 166/20 170/3 170/24
183/10 186/4 203/3 209/19 224/25
227/20 231/22 235/1
downgrade [1] 207/14
draft [9] 1/2 1/4 1/8 1/12 1/19 2/2 127/16
128/16 195/24
draw [4] 21/7 59/22 185/13 234/18
draws [2] 177/19 179/23
drew [1] 7/19
drive [1] 108/22
drop [1] 85/1
Dropping [1] 74/9
due [17] 1/18 16/2 22/15 22/20 32/17
36/5 73/5 154/8 168/7 170/3 203/22
206/3 206/16 206/19 213/23 224/8 230/15
dues [1] 114/22
during [39] 8/8 8/12 10/8 10/16 10/22 11/12 12/4 12/10 12/18 20/19 24/24 27/21 29/23 30/21 31/2 31/16 38/24 39/1 39/3 39/7 42/14 42/24 44/6 45/10 45/18 47/13 57/10 86/16 88/9 91/6 113/17 114/16 133/19 141/12 147/7 149/21 154/19 177/5 184/12
dynamics [1] 113/10

## E

e.g [1] 29/23
each [5] 33/22 67/21 125/9 216/13
216/18
ear [3] 30/20 30/23 31/8
earlier [20] 6/13 22/9 22/13 42/17 49/10
78/11 82/23 100/3 110/13 121/1 149/17
157/4 160/22 165/20 183/8 185/17
187/11 193/6 196/18 204/8
early [12] $8 / 5$ 12/18 16/12 16/16 26/14
26/22 51/16 180/6 195/23 201/24 203/11 204/12
easier [2] 70/5 140/15
economically [1] 113/5
economics [1] 113/1
edge [2] 202/4 206/11
education [2] 96/4 233/20 effect [5] 47/6 90/11 139/11 152/14 177/17
effectively [6] 196/4 202/10 204/15 217/4 218/21 226/5
effectiveness [1] 36/10
effectuate [1] 187/25
efficiencies [1] 99/6
efficiency [1] 98/24
efficient [1] 107/5
efficiently [1] 105/16
effort [12] 16/17 23/17 36/2 37/2 37/7
62/12 71/12 72/11 93/1 162/13 188/4

## 216/13

efforts [16] 35/8 35/16 35/18 35/24 36/11
106/16 107/11 110/5 113/24 115/25
171/18 220/6 225/14 225/14 225/17 225/21
EG [1] 30/20
eight [3] 33/21 70/1 179/23
Eighty [1] 33/1
Eighty-three [1] 33/1
either [14] 11/23 18/21 22/25 24/16 43/24
134/15 152/20 158/17 158/19 168/6
183/21 189/11 206/25 218/1
elected [1] 58/22
elective [1] 190/2
element [2] 127/6 150/7
eligibility [5] 29/22 30/9 30/17 30/20
30/25
eligible [2] 26/2 26/17
eliminate [1] 109/6
eliminated [1] 196/12
eliminating [1] 113/9
elimination [1] 112/2
else [13] 12/9 29/15 68/21 123/13 131/19
132/18 139/4 153/25 193/2 202/21 229/4
234/22 235/3
elsewhere [1] 230/8
email [4] 117/23 118/16 118/18 118/21
emergency [28] 5/14 7/24 21/19 23/13
59/7 60/1 63/11 64/1 64/2 64/4 64/10
65/4 92/5 103/17 109/21 115/21 119/19
133/17 137/10 137/12 137/14 142/25
179/11 181/6 195/1 203/5 204/21 221/19 employed [6] 6/5 95/19 97/9 131/11
167/10 167/12
employee [1] 39/22
employees [21] 16/5 16/6 16/7 42/25
43/18 44/16 46/8 46/9 46/12 46/16 48/19
90/4 110/21 127/20 127/24 128/3 134/5
148/3 180/18 226/14 228/4
employment [3] 50/17 97/6 167/16
EMS [1] 101/6
encounter [1] 227/12
encumbered [1] 222/15
encumbers [1] 219/11
end [11] 30/24 31/5 58/14 62/6 70/10
102/25 103/21 151/6 196/5 199/8 231/2
ended [2] 176/24 192/11
ends [1] 35/17
engage [3] 29/25 61/23 157/2
engaged [10] 5/7 5/13 54/16 98/17
100/12 123/21 170/18 170/25 221/22
223/19
engagement [8] 85/15 168/13 182/4
182/9 182/14 182/16 217/1 220/9
engagements [2] 169/2 169/12
engaging [1] 139/13
engineering [1] 100/2
English [1] 1/7
enhance [3] 24/23 32/8 204/6
enhanced [2] 32/9 35/19
enjoyed [1] 37/3
enough [7] 47/25 208/16 212/22 213/8
223/5 232/12 236/20
ensure [2] $43 / 2471 / 25$
enter [1] 171/25
entered [4] 87/21 171/15 176/9 185/19
enterprise [4] 15/22 16/1 82/11 85/20
entertaining [1] 223/12
entirely [2] 174/16 236/2
entities [4] 84/15 157/8 168/5 222/9
entries [2] $1 / 141 / 18$
envelope [1] 119/12
equal [1] 219/7
equals [1] 213/7
equity [1] 218/5
equivalent [1] 1/7
Ernst [23] 7/10 9/16 9/19 13/16 13/19
19/10 36/9 37/14 37/18 51/4 51/21
183/11 183/19 184/6 190/19 195/16
198/1 199/11 200/4 201/16 209/20
210/12 210/23
err [1] 131/20
erratic [1] 196/16
escrow [10] 71/6 176/11 177/16 177/19
179/4 180/1 180/3 180/4 180/12 204/17
especially [6] 35/4 44/14 90/2 193/7
209/2 225/4
essence [1] 81/18
essential [2] 187/21 224/19
essentially [1] 103/12
establish [3] 56/9 87/18 209/6
established [4] 56/10 106/13 176/12
204/18
establishing [2] 200/14 200/16
estimate [9] 13/12 113/13 113/16 113/21
120/12 156/25 157/1 160/17 221/24
estimated [4] 122/6 122/24 128/16 181/2
estimates [2] 157/1 157/3
evaluate [8] 187/8 187/24 207/10 209/16
209/24 217/20 226/22 226/23
evaluated [1] 105/11
evaluating [2] 30/8 104/7
even [25] 13/12 55/25 76/1 82/25 112/1 113/8 136/19 153/17 156/23 177/5
189/16 189/25 194/18 196/5 204/1
206/16 207/20 215/9 215/11 218/8
222/20 225/7 228/13 228/20 229/1
event [2] 186/12 203/6
eventually [3] 100/11 105/22 170/13
ever [13] 2/13 12/2 12/7 49/12 51/2 51/4 74/18 162/13 162/24 196/3 204/25 232/2 233/6
every [8] 30/4 53/3 67/21 79/9 100/24
222/3 230/5 235/23
everybody [3] 28/13 64/24 227/10
everyone [3] 2/7 69/4 195/12
evidence [29] 10/24 15/1 17/6 27/19 41/15 47/4 52/18 54/10 54/11 55/19 83/6 87/11 95/1 118/1 128/6 130/19 131/18
132/1 132/11 135/24 135/25 136/8
136/11 199/1 200/8 200/9 200/10 200/21
201/6
evidentiary [1] 91/22
ex [1] 46/21
exact [2] 6/10 50/13
exactly [8] 13/9 46/23 47/23 87/18
156/24 168/1 184/10 226/25
examination [18] 2/23 4/23 5/5 58/10
58/15 68/22 69/1 69/18 86/10 89/16
95/13 137/2 137/4 154/13 160/3 163/21
166/23 236/11
examine [1] 187/19
examined [1] 210/24
example [12] 72/22 105/14 105/17
108/22 111/24 112/10 139/22 140/2
140/5 153/18 201/5 215/14
exceed [3] 89/25 90/8 90/20
exceeding [1] 146/9
excellent [1] 185/4
Except [1] 164/3
exception [2] 94/24 199/24
excerpt [1] 83/12
excess [2] 34/15 123/2
exchange [3] 218/1 219/7 220/25
excuse [7] 4/13 28/5 56/13 109/8 115/13 124/15 173/23
execute [4] 169/8 177/20 183/1 232/19
executed [1] 50/10
executing [1] 174/19
executive [1] 69/23
exercise [1] 186/21
exhibit [64] 17/5 28/12 28/12 28/20 33/24
40/19 52/12 55/17 56/1 56/9 65/22 65/23 65/24 66/5 66/14 68/2 69/22 72/14 79/8 80/20 81/3 83/5 83/8 83/10 83/13 83/18
85/1 87/5 87/20 88/24 102/13 102/14
118/22 119/25 120/2 127/14 127/15
135/5 135/7 135/24 135/25 136/11
143/19 143/19 144/18 147/18 161/5
166/13 172/13 172/14 175/2 175/3
175/25 179/22 196/24 198/21 198/22
200/10 200/11 214/3 214/4 216/8 225/18 231/20
Exhibit 23 [2] 172/13 175/3
Exhibit 37 [1] 231/20
Exhibit 418 [1] 28/12
Exhibit 419 [1] $17 / 5$
Exhibit 43 [15] 65/22 65/24 66/5 66/14
68/2 102/14 119/25 120/2 143/19 143/19
144/18 147/18 161/5 214/3 216/8
Exhibit 44 [7] 69/22 72/14 80/20 83/10
83/18 85/1 225/18
Exhibit 505 [1] 40/19
Exhibit 6 [3] 83/5 83/13 172/14
Exhibit 69 [3] 127/14 127/15 135/25
Exhibit 7 [2] 175/25 179/22
Exhibit 70 [3] 135/5 135/7 135/24
Exhibit 714 [2] 87/5 87/20
Exhibit 717 [1] 88/24
Exhibit 75 [2] 196/24 200/10
exhibits [6] 28/6 28/11 28/16 92/19 124/1 166/13
exist [1] 102/24
existed [1] 11/9
existing [5] 15/16 31/13 37/3 46/8 147/14
exists [2] 10/3 25/7
expand [2] 70/4 128/11
expanded [1] 122/4
expect [1] 221/23
expected [1] 208/19
expedited [2] 1/15 237/9
expeditiously [1] 176/18
expenditure [1] 180/20
expenditures [4] 102/12 103/2 111/23 142/17
expense [2] 31/24 110/21
expenses [11] 102/11 103/14 110/8
110/18 110/23 111/3 111/4 111/4 142/22 176/16 196/7
experience [11] 7/20 12/11 25/5 39/23
189/9 192/16 192/17 192/18 199/5
234/14 235/7
experiencing [2] 100/17 168/14
expert [22] 93/2 93/6 94/3 94/5 94/6

94/15 114/11 121/20 124/5 130/8 131/22 132/19 136/5 177/8 197/8 205/6 205/16 218/24 233/17 233/23 235/2 235/3 expertise [8] 100/18 127/2 170/16 199/2 199/5 221/21 227/23 235/2
experts [3] 94/7 190/21 201/17
explain [6] 83/23 111/1 129/5 168/1 216/3 230/9
explained [4] 136/2 209/5 212/18 220/18 explaining [1] 235/14
explore [1] 218/23
exposure [1] 192/15
expound [2] 151/7 152/11
express [2] 26/20 127/9
expressed [1] 218/5
extend [2] 189/18 189/24
extended [1] 229/22
extent [13] 24/22 31/3 32/6 43/15 47/18
73/9 90/24 98/3 121/23 151/2 186/7 186/10 199/22
extra [2] 146/25 166/12
extremely [3] 93/25 201/23 217/24

## F

FAB [1] 178/22
face [4] 63/19 63/19 64/3 64/4
faced [1] 234/12
facilitate [1] 173/18
facility [2] 111/25 223/11
fact [22] 43/3 49/1 49/6 55/24 57/3 90/2
109/23 116/10 117/7 117/8 148/19 152/4 174/21 196/9 206/20 207/16 217/22 220/19 221/13 227/24 228/13 228/18
facts [4] 101/24 205/23 206/6 235/16
factual [4] 92/7 234/13 234/15 235/8
failed [1] 179/17
fails [1] 56/3
failure [3] 46/23 47/23 55/16
fair [20] 5/11 6/16 13/18 13/19 16/8 16/10
27/1 32/9 34/23 35/19 36/12 37/5 62/25
105/14 155/16 174/23 215/10 215/11
219/15 227/9
fairly [5] 80/5 175/22 180/22 181/14 181/19
faith [10] 92/5 94/21 94/22 95/3 114/19
114/21 126/5 127/6 201/4 230/14
fall [4] 44/13 171/10 171/22 199/24
familiar [6] 19/4 55/16 83/14 169/22
172/7 178/9
familiarity [2] 187/10 192/19
far [4] 85/7 116/9 196/3 235/12
fashion [2] 39/2 181/15
fast [2] 55/12 190/6
faster [1] $1 / 16$
fear [1] 140/24
feared [1] 196/3
February [10] 9/9 10/8 11/8 11/8 12/4
26/15 40/8 41/24 43/9 137/9
February 1 [1] 41/24
February 2013 [1] 12/4
February 22 [1] 9/9
February 22nd [2] 10/8 11/8 federal [1] 216/25
fee [1] 77/19
feel [5] 191/2 191/12 193/8 225/5 237/7
fees [4] 79/1 80/9 99/25 182/13
felt [9] 180/25 192/7 206/8 212/1 215/14 224/14 224/17 226/21 227/7
few [12] 2/11 11/15 33/7 50/24 86/9
102/16 102/20 107/11 116/6 163/15
193/7 196/15
fields [1] 184/25
fifth [1] 178/3
fight [1] 200/11
figure [29] 22/11 37/15 70/8 72/22 73/11 74/10 74/11 75/23 76/17 79/7 81/3 81/23 83/16 83/18 83/21 83/23 84/19 84/19 84/24 93/5 130/3 164/17 165/2 165/6 170/5 170/11 187/4 190/7 234/9 figures [15] 70/3 70/7 70/14 71/15 73/10 74/4 74/19 79/21 81/14 81/16 81/19 82/12 83/25 85/4 139/18
file [7] 51/18 150/6 159/19 236/25 237/2 237/4 237/5
filed [3] 2/11 154/25 236/24
filing [8] 38/9 51/8 51/17 64/2 152/17
165/4 165/8 212/24
fill [1] 122/4
final [1] 1/14
finalized [2] 70/8 70/14
finance [2] 198/2 206/13
finances [3] 112/8 178/7 185/11
financial [66] $6 / 198 / 28 / 38 / 640 / 642 / 17$ 43/20 61/25 85/17 87/1 88/11 88/15 91/1 96/21 97/4 97/11 100/16 100/19 121/11 134/12 163/3 167/23 168/6 168/14 168/18 169/10 169/21 169/23 170/1 170/19 170/23 171/3 171/12 171/24 173/15 175/10 175/12 175/13 175/16 175/20 178/21 179/12 182/7 182/10 182/12 182/19 183/6 183/16 183/23 184/14 185/3 185/5 189/6 189/20 190/3 190/5 193/23 198/23 204/23 208/21 209/10 210/18 214/10 225/5 226/20 233/3
financially [1] 111/9
financing [6] 24/17 106/18 171/17 177/13 207/12 207/18
find [13] 18/8 66/6 99/5 107/7 110/5 141/20 170/8 170/15 173/17 196/20 204/9 219/14 223/21
findings [3] 63/12 64/6 65/3
fine [3] 48/7 53/4 236/19
fines [1] 80/8
finish [2] 22/6 93/10
finished [1] 21/23
fire [9] 16/3 99/24 99/24 101/6 108/23 108/24 135/13 212/2 221/4
firefighters [6] 86/5 86/15 86/21 86/23 87/3 87/23
firm [22] 23/9 58/6 69/16 96/1 97/23 98/1 137/18 137/21 138/17 138/20 167/14 167/20 170/6 176/19 178/6 182/15 182/24 189/8 192/1 192/2 223/23 236/3 firms [13] 100/10 192/4 192/6 192/10 192/12 192/14 192/23 193/5 193/7 193/9 193/10 194/6 218/5
first [45] 10/2 19/22 21/14 39/3 51/1 54/14 55/23 70/6 87/7 96/12 97/8 101/17 107/25 110/4 111/2 121/16 128/11 129/8 134/7 136/15 145/22 147/24 163/23 168/16 169/22 170/18 170/25 172/3 175/7 176/14 178/5 178/21 179/17 180/2 183/3 183/5 185/16 187/13 189/2 207/10 209/19 219/20 220/8 225/18 232/19 fiscal [25] 9/19 35/16 44/14 44/17 47/1 49/3 49/21 70/3 70/7 70/10 72/23 73/15 73/24 76/6 76/11 77/12 79/23 81/14 81/15 81/17 81/20 89/24 91/4 91/5 144/8 five [16] $4 / 6$ 19/19 21/2 21/6 21/7 23/25 30/3 70/15 88/21 97/9 99/21 164/22
189/17 189/22 222/8 229/24
five-year [1] 189/17
fives [1] 52/23
fix [2] 31/11 43/25
fixed [1] 112/15
fleet [1] 111/25
flip [1] 87/24
flow [25] 8/16 12/3 12/9 27/11 33/15 89/19 89/22 89/23 90/1 90/7 90/13 91/10 173/25 195/24 195/25 196/21 197/15 197/19 198/3 198/16 198/20 206/24 211/19 217/7 217/12
flows [5] 8/10 8/13 8/21 84/9 111/12 flush [2] 181/21 181/23 focus [12] 31/18 84/1 99/22 99/23 110/7 117/23 137/13 138/25 183/25 191/21 211/9 212/7
focused [5] 70/17 70/17 85/12 121/2 124/24
Focusing [1] 128/23
folder [3] 66/1 66/1 66/2
folks [1] 6/20
follow [2] 152/19 232/12
following [4] 33/8 152/19 179/25 194/15
footing [1] 43/19
force [26] 124/14 124/18 124/23 131/7 135/18 135/19 137/5 137/8 137/15 137/19 137/22 137/24 138/2 139/1 139/4 139/16 140/4 140/8 141/16 149/18 149/22 150/19 150/22 151/10 152/13 155/13
forecast [19] 36/24 72/1 79/17 79/18 81/1 91/8 91/8 121/11 145/1 189/18 190/24 195/24 195/25 198/4 198/16 198/20 202/3 209/14 210/12
forecasted [2] 113/19 197/6
forecasts [5] 197/15 197/20 197/21 197/23 198/10
forensics [2] 96/21 97/5
foreseeable [3] 91/22 207/1 224/10
forget [1] 69/5
forgive [2] 72/19 84/23
form [11] $1 / 9$ 1/9 104/19 104/24 167/25
170/12 183/15 184/14 190/3 220/1 228/22
format [1] 171/4
formed [2] 112/17 137/5
former [4] 5/22 6/2 6/4 6/19
formulate [1] 169/7
formulation [1] 174/18
forth [7] 55/20 80/20 197/7 199/5 225/21
232/17 234/5
forthcoming [1] 44/14
fortuitously [1] 190/19
fortunate [1] 225/25
Fortunately [1] 2/15
forward [8] 95/7 135/1 144/20 177/9
183/17 185/6 201/21 224/3
found [4] 110/8 120/17 167/23 204/21
foundation [11] 41/3 41/4 41/9 87/12
87/16 87/18 130/8 130/16 130/21 209/6
210/17
foundational [3] 127/4 130/23 197/10
founder [1] 167/13
founders [1] 220/13
four [3] 70/15 143/25 181/9
fourth [2] 31/23 34/10
frame [6] 15/4 15/7 17/3 24/21 46/23 47/22
framed [1] 49/25
frankly [1] 199/8
free [2] 229/9 237/7
frequent [1] 78/23
frequently [1] 78/22
fresh [1] 55/24
Friday [2] 194/13 194/15
front [5] 59/19 59/20 120/1 160/2 172/16 full [6] 87/8 95/15 166/25 192/8 225/19 230/14
fully [1] 173/3
function [2] 101/8 110/19
functions [3] 107/9 110/13 112/16
fund [18] $13 / 23$ 13/24 15/13 15/21 15/25
16/5 20/25 21/1 21/13 24/25 30/24 31/6
32/9 35/19 81/23 82/9 82/15 82/18
funded [3] 106/16 211/4 227/19
funding [8] 138/7 146/17 156/23 156/25
173/1 174/17 177/15 220/23
funds [15] 15/19 15/21 15/22 16/1 30/20
30/22 71/7 82/11 85/20 103/10 103/23
104/6 104/8 176/11 228/3
further [24] 2/18 57/21 65/8 68/20 71/7
85/22 89/11 89/16 91/12 115/4 136/13
148/22 153/5 159/21 163/11 165/10
174/1 176/10 177/21 221/16 224/3
225/13 227/20 236/6
furthermore [1] 217/13
future [10] 22/19 24/1 24/5 148/2 179/23
203/16 207/1 224/10 233/2 233/4

## G

Gabriel [9] 125/6 125/8 125/9 126/15
127/17 131/11 133/5 135/16 155/24 gain [1] 207/17
gaming [16] 71/3 76/16 77/11 77/20
181/10 181/16 186/2 186/22 188/20
191/24 202/15 202/22 213/24 214/2
224/18 225/8
garage [1] 223/5
garages [5] 112/11 112/12 222/24 223/2 223/3
Gary [1] 6/18
gather [1] 101/23
gauged [2] 77/6 78/21
gave [7] 27/4 28/8 118/23 123/12 123/14 192/6 234/11
general [48] 3/5 7/2 13/23 13/24 15/13
15/21 15/25 16/3 16/4 16/5 20/25 21/1
21/13 24/25 30/24 31/6 31/9 32/9 35/19
37/24 71/7 71/14 81/23 82/9 82/15 82/18
110/8 120/13 120/15 127/17 127/19
128/20 131/16 158/25 169/9 169/16
170/16 182/7 182/12 182/18 218/16
221/11 227/22 230/1 230/17 231/10
231/16 233/15
generally [16] 19/4 33/16 47/17 50/6
62/22 64/18 70/24 71/12 74/22 74/25
75/19 83/1 83/2 84/16 99/18 225/17
generate [4] 25/9 32/10 217/14 225/14
generated [1] 99/25
generates [1] 90/21
generating [1] 29/4
gentleman [1] 233/21
Geoff [1] 116/22
get [35] 4/6 6/22 9/22 18/15 27/15 32/10
35/11 41/12 43/19 44/9 45/14 49/20
52/17 56/2 62/8 65/25 74/18 76/12 92/14
93/18 102/25 105/14 110/14 118/14
123/18 128/19 139/18 183/4 190/9 203/8
213/2 213/19 221/23 228/7 232/10
gets [1] 113/11
getting [11] 19/20 44/25 77/4 105/17
107/15 124/5 173/25 177/9 187/13
216/15 219/15
gifts [1] 235/9
give [30] 15/7 32/16 43/17 44/21 44/22
45/14 45/21 55/8 69/7 92/13 95/15 96/12
117/20 118/24 118/25 123/11 139/22
140/5 140/15 159/16 169/11 170/6 184/5

185/7 189/11 199/10 209/9 210/20
220/24 228/21
givebacks [1] 44/25
given [25] 10/22 27/24 28/6 78/12 82/8 90/2 92/17 119/19 121/24 127/10 134/23 134/25 140/22 173/19 188/15 190/4 196/19 203/25 216/13 219/11 227/23 233/12 233/16 234/17 237/9
giving [10] 27/8 27/25 43/14 43/19 44/4
155/24 185/20 190/14 194/7 228/25 go [45] 12/7 13/19 20/23 22/7 27/16 29/19 33/1 41/10 43/10 50/9 54/5 74/5 82/16 84/9 94/17 101/13 116/25 120/23 120/24 121/1 121/5 129/1 132/3 132/4 147/18 149/5 151/19 152/21 153/3 153/5 159/3 159/6 161/8 187/7 190/17 201/4 207/8 211/22 216/20 230/1 230/4 230/4 230/9 231/21 232/15
goal [2] 209/21 210/1
goals [2] 175/4 175/21
goes [6] 80/6 149/25 150/24 151/6 179/2 235/12
going [54] 21/19 22/4 22/21 23/25 27/16
33/4 35/3 35/13 40/9 41/6 41/8 42/4 44/8
46/7 56/16 61/18 70/2 71/18 71/19 72/3
75/20 76/6 84/11 87/7 87/12 92/13 92/16
104/17 109/16 114/20 124/1 125/13
130/18 139/9 142/5 144/20 146/20
150/10 162/10 166/3 169/25 171/23
172/1 174/22 176/15 182/21 191/5
199/22 208/13 208/17 211/24 224/3
228/21 236/4
gone [2] 108/2 185/22
good [32] 5/1 5/3 5/4 29/25 58/5 58/8
58/9 69/14 86/3 94/21 95/2 95/11 95/12
114/19 114/21 116/12 116/21 126/5
127/6 136/18 136/23 154/9 154/11
159/24 163/16 166/1 166/21 178/21
183/24 190/16 201/4 235/11
Gordon's [1] 160/1
got [12] $8 / 18$ 38/22 44/19 66/10 77/11
119/12 123/19 140/12 147/8 147/8 152/5
209/3
gotten [3] 77/5 78/21 90/3
governance [1] 217/4
government [11] 98/20 98/24 99/6 168/14
168/24 182/16 188/9 188/12 189/19
207/11 222/9
governmental [2] 84/2 85/5
governments [1] 168/4
Governor [3] 3/17 3/21 4/4
Governor's [3] 3/2 3/8 193/16
grade [5] 170/3 186/4 203/3 224/25
228/25
graduate [2] 96/5 167/8
graduation [1] 97/7
grant [1] 80/7
granted [1] 96/16
granting [1] 186/1
great [3] 70/5 166/16 218/9
Greektown [1] 98/10
Green [4] 118/5 118/10 119/5 160/1
gross [2] 73/2 84/14
ground [1] 194/17
grounds [9] 121/18 130/9 131/18 135/24
136/9 139/15 140/11 141/6 159/11
group [10] 28/1 29/25 30/4 64/13 64/15
154/7 190/19 193/3 194/21 196/21
groups [1] 61/6
growth [3] 108/20 109/15 169/16
GRS [3] 128/20 128/22 131/20
guess [6] 33/11 145/2 149/19 164/22
165/5 217/21

| G | 217/8 219/9 221/16 221/18 221/21 223/5 223/6 231/4 233/16 233/21 234/8 234/9 | hiring [3] 110/22 177/1 191/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| quide [1] 153/10 | 234/21 234/24 | 26/11 41/12 45/6 52/9 56/5 59/7 92/4 |
| H | hasn't [3] 14/14 55/9 160/23 | 92/8 92/16 114/10 121/2 132/17 139/10 |
| had [203] 4/2 6/17 6/18 7/9 7/21 11/12 | haven't [8] 11/5 38/5 68/5 68/7 69/16 | 234/20 235/2 |
| 12/11 16/13 16/21 16/25 19/6 19/10 | 204/5 214/5 223/13 | historical [2] 34/11 202/19 |
| 19/12 19/14 21/18 22/2 22/15 22/19 | having [15] 15/2 44/11 48/25 49/7 50/6 | history [1] 167/17 |
| 22/25 23/8 23/8 23/9 23/23 24/4 27/10 | 55/6 76/7 78/2 78/24 107/17 183/7 | hold [7] 32/23 53/2 54/7 97/20 205/17 |
| 30/3 38/23 39/1 40/1 43/12 48/23 56/7 | 192/13 195/21 225/9 233/5 | 205/19 236/5 |
| 59/17 60/6 60/13 60/19 61/25 63/10 | he [62] 3/17 6/2 11/4 11/4 14/14 17/18 | holders [2] 227/19 228/3 |
| 63/13 63/18 63/24 64/10 64/11 65/10 | 22/21 26/11 26/12 28/2 41/14 41/24 | holiday [2] 9/21 10/7 |
| 65/11 70/25 71/22 72/2 73/7 73/12 73/14 | 46/22 49/13 52/10 53/8 55/9 56/2 56/3 | home [1] 95/16 |
| 74/11 76/1 78/13 78/16 78/17 81/15 90/2 | 56/3 65/11 74/1 89/2 92/10 92/13 92/14 | Homeland [1] 101/6 |
| 90/23 90/25 91/6 101/15 102/10 103/18 | 92/18 92/23 114/14 125/14 126/1 130/17 | honor [140] 2/16 2/25 3/13 3/15 3/24 4/8 |
| 107/10 107/12 111/10 116/10 121/5 | 132/17 139/18 139/20 149/25 150/11 | 4/9 4/12 4/13 4/19 5/1 9/3 10/15 11/1 |
| 126/15 127/10 130/11 130/11 137/4 | 150/22 150/24 151/5 152/17 166/7 186/7 | 14/12 14/21 15/3 17/5 17/12 17/24 18/9 |
| 137/25 138/20 139/13 140/1 140/14 | 188/10 193/16 199/6 199/6 200/23 | 18/23 20/8 22/16 27/17 28/7 28/17 28/21 |
| 141/5 144/15 154/21 154/24 155/2 | 200/24 204/21 205/16 234/8 234/9 | 31/9 32/14 32/24 41/2 41/9 46/19 48/2 |
| 155/10 161/23 164/7 170/2 170/19 | 234/11 234/11 234/20 234/22 234/23 | 48/8 49/9 52/1 52/6 52/15 53/6 53/13 |
| 171/15 172/3 173/14 175/5 175/14 | 234/24 235/14 235/16 235/17 | 54/12 54/13 54/20 55/10 55/22 56/14 |
| 175/18 176/7 176/12 177/2 177/6 177/6 | he's [8] 14/13 17/19 41/6 45/3 127/1 | 57/7 57/19 58/5 65/7 68/23 68/24 69/10 |
| 177/12 178/2 178/10 178/15 178/19 | 127/1 141/8 186/11 | 85/23 87/10 87/16 89/15 91/17 91/21 |
| 178/20 178/22 178/24 179/12 179/16 | head [5] 13/15 39/15 97/15 97/16 188/4 | 93/1 93/7 93/14 94/11 94/13 95/6 109/10 |
| 179/20 179/21 180/4 180/6 180/10 | healthcare [10] 11/24 46/1 46/3 46/5 46/7 | 114/5 114/14 116/12 116/21 117/21 |
| 180/11 181/2 183/8 183/14 184/11 185/1 | 54/4 134/14 192/20 211/7 231/19 | 118/9 119/15 121/14 122/1 124/6 124/17 |
| 185/3 185/19 185/22 187/2 187/9 187/14 | hear [5] 52/18 73/18 105/2 200/1 226/8 | 125/13 127/5 127/12 128/7 130/5 130/13 |
| 188/13 188/24 189/7 189/17 190/13 | heard [4] 11/5 34/15 34/18 109/19 | 130/15 131/18 131/24 132/21 133/16 |
| 190/17 191/2 191/19 192/7 192/14 | hearing [1] 34/19 | 135/23 136/1 136/2 136/6 136/14 139/10 |
| 192/14 192/16 192/17 192/19 193/3 | hearsay [11] 94/7 94/24 114/4 114/9 | 140/16 141/2 142/3 148/25 149/4 151/16 |
| 193/18 193/19 193/22 194/7 194/18 | 114/10 125/14 125/17 130/8 131/22 | 152/1 153/21 154/2 159/24 163/15 |
| 194/21 194/24 196/3 196/10 196/15 | 136/5 233/18 | 165/12 165/14 165/17 165/24 166/1 |
| 196/15 196/16 200/25 202/12 203/2 | heart [1] 234/20 | 166/7 174/2 174/5 181/24 186/16 197/5 |
| 203/4 203/8 203/16 204/1 204/2 204/8 | held [7] 40/15 58/22 133/17 133/23 | 197/11 198/20 198/25 199/12 199/21 |
| 204/15 206/8 207/2 207/13 207/16 | 133/24 222/7 228/14 | 200/6 200/18 201/7 201/18 205/13 207/5 |
| 207/19 209/12 210/12 210/23 211/25 | help [20] 17/17 30/15 33/14 52/25 66/6 | 216/16 223/25 227/6 229/7 233/9 233/23 |
| 212/14 212/19 212/20 213/22 213/23 | 71/19 83/5 100/18 118/15 167/23 168/16 | 234/4 235/19 236/8 236/14 237/10 |
| 214/17 215/3 216/24 217/14 217/16 | 169/7 170/16 172/2 172/25 177/8 181/3 | hope [1] 236/17 |
| 220/9 220/16 221/14 223/16 224/5 224/6 | 184/24 185/1 189/9 | hoped [3] 222/2 226/13 229/3 |
| 224/24 225/6 225/25 225/25 226/2 227/3 | helped [2] 86/25 88/11 | horizon [1] 97/11 |
| 227/7 227/11 227/24 229/21 230/11 | helpful [2] 63/1 170/6 | hotel [1] 98/11 |
| 231/9 231/16 234/2 | helping [2] 40/6 178/16 | house [1] 221/21 |
| hadn't [1] 179/16 | Henry [1] 167/24 | housekeeping [3] 2/9 3/1 116/23 |
| half [6] 97/9 219/4 219/5 229/25 232/5 | her [1] 118/11 | housing [1] 108/15 |
| 232/11 | here[51] 2/6 2/7 3/3 3/3 14/23 28/9 34/6 | how [89] 3/23 8/15 10/10 11/14 22/12 |
| halfway [2] 88/24 147/21 | 36/21 37/4 37/16 49/4 52/4 61/8 69/17 | 37/15 38/20 43/17 43/23 44/4 44/17 |
| hall [1] 95/5 | 82/19 82/22 82/23 88/22 91/15 92/1 92/6 | 55/25 63/16 64/3 70/12 74/10 74/10 |
| hand [10] 18/22 47/10 48/2 48/8 83/17 | 92/19 108/15 117/9 118/7 119/2 128/20 | 75/23 76/21 77/2 77/10 77/19 77/20 |
| 88/1 88/23 119/6 231/13 231/23 | 129/20 131/20 132/9 139/13 140/21 | 78/13 78/22 79/4 80/5 96/2 99/2 100/7 |
| handed [6] 10/16 27/21 39/4 161/23 | 141/8 141/25 146/19 148/19 149/12 | 101/8 101/13 101/24 101/25 103/12 |
| 215/10 215/11 | 149/13 160/9 165/19 169/24 170/4 | 104/12 104/12 107/4 110/3 110/16 |
| handful [1] 160/5 | 191/12 200/2 202/9 202/16 222/19 230/7 | 113/11 113/18 114/19 120/11 120/19 |
| handle [1] 83/2 | 234/5 236/3 236/23 | 123/23 123/25 124/11 124/15 124/16 |
| hands [2] 151/18 222/8 | Here's [1] 127/8 | 125/2 125/5 125/16 126/9 128/19 129/23 |
| happen [5] 45/2 45/20 45/22 164/10 | hides [1] 109/15 | 130/2 131/5 132/17 133/1 134/20 135/17 |
| 224/2 | high [4] 14/5 14/7 37/21 37/25 | 136/4 136/8 138/13 138/14 164/21 165/1 |
| happened [3] 11/2 110/11 179/21 | higher [5] 190/1 218/7 228/19 230/18 | 168/20 169/22 170/18 184/15 187/23 |
| happening [1] 37/19 | 231/11 | 192/10 196/13 200/20 201/8 201/25 |
| happens [1] 235/22 | highest [6] 116/11 146/1 146/3 157/5 | 202/17 203/25 211/22 212/5 212/9 |
| happy [4] 65/25 79/17 79/20 226/7 | 157/12 186/23 | 212/12 213/6 213/7 213/11 232/4 233/13 |
| hard [7] 9/5 27/14 112/20 156/4 156/8 | highlight [2] 71/5 83/9 | Howell [2] 3/3 3/4 |
| 201/15 213/2 | highlighted [4] 12/16 35/5 80/15 122/21 | however [6] 2/18 25/3 54/21 109/14 |
| has [74] 3/21 14/1 15/18 16/17 28/5 | highlighting [1] 31/8 | 130/15 186/3 |
| 34/11 35/12 35/24 36/4 36/17 37/2 37/11 | highly [1] 164/9 | human [1] 193/16 |
| 37/14 37/18 41/3 46/20 47/6 55/13 65/9 | Hill [1] 159/25 | hundred [3] 213/12 224/5 229/15 |
| 68/18 76/23 92/18 94/6 94/14 94/22 | him [30] 2/17 11/1 17/17 39/23 45/5 48/2 | hundreds [1] 34/22 |
| 101/15 101/18 103/1 104/18 108/1 | 56/5 63/12 92/13 92/15 92/17 92/18 | hurdles [1] 216/14 |
| 113/23 121/2 122/4 122/20 124/14 | 92/20 93/9 121/22 127/3 127/11 132/19 | hurt [1] 30/2 |
| 125/18 126/4 128/8 130/16 130/17 | 133/3 138/5 150/15 151/5 152/10 154/20 |  |
| 130/17 135/8 139/18 143/13 148/19 | 154/25 155/11 155/24 156/10 156/13 |  |
| 148/20 149/18 149/22 151/11 160/12 | 186/14 | I'll [10] 14/18 22/6 22/8 41/17 50/25 |
| 161/1 162/21 180/17 180/18 183/25 | hire [1] 172/1 | 52/18 84/1 106/9 130/22 160/6 |
| 186/23 190/19 192/16 202/19 217/6 | hired [4] 100/4 177/23 182/21 209/3 | I'm [96] 3/13 6/22 6/23 9/6 13/9 18/14 |


|  | 169/19 176/21 | 67/2 67/17 68/1 226/4 229/23 231/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I'm... [90] 19/16 21/25 22/7 22/16 26/25 | 107/2 145/23 145/25 146/2 157/11 158/3 | intend [3] 92/11 92/19 191/8 |
| 27/16 32/22 32/24 33/4 34/5 34/7 36/3 | 181/11 181/12 181/14 190/25 202/1 | intended [1] 46/24 |
| 37/12 38/11 41/8 42/4 44/2 46/11 54/14 | incorporated [4] 91/9 102/9 171/20 196/6 | intensive [1] 223/23 |
| 55/9 56/16 59/4 61/18 63/6 63/23 65/25 | increase [5] 11/14 11/22 107/5 145/6 | intent [1] 226/19 |
| 66/4 68/5 70/2 73/8 73/9 73/18 74/2 77/1 | 145/13 | intention [4] 3/8 214/22 214/25 215/1 |
| 77/10 77/25 79/17 82/4 85/3 85/13 87/25 | increased [1] 116/4 | interest [11] 122/11 170/8 185/20 186/2 |
| 92/3 92/13 92/20 93/7 96/20 114/3 | increases [4] 105/14 143/2 146/5 146/13 | 218/6 220/4 220/22 222/6 226/6 228/23 |
| 116/13 117/18 124/1 125/13 126/8 | incredible [1] 188/21 | 229/1 |
| 130/18 132/16 136/7 136/24 136/24 | incremental [1] 187/18 | interested [3] 27/9 132/16 150/25 |
| 139/9 140/2 142/5 146/4 146/11 149/7 | indebtedness [1] 15/5 | interests [1] 225/15 |
| 149/11 149/16 150/10 150/15 150/18 | indeed [8] 54/23 55/7 130/15 198/10 | interject [1] 150/24 |
| 150/19 150/25 152/1 152/10 155/7 | 202/7 203/5 207/19 219/13 | internal [8] 73/17 73/20 73/21 74/13 |
| 157/25 159/13 159/25 161/9 161/10 | independent [1] 234/17 | 74/14 74/16 75/9 75/25 |
| 166/2 175/3 176/17 180/9 187/12 199/15 | index [1] 140/14 | internally [1] 214/19 |
| 200/3 207/4 219/3 223/8 228/9 229/10 | indicate [2] 14/16 195/25 | International [1] 58/7 |
| I've [5] 34/18 48/14 55/20 117/2 214/4 | indicated [8] 117/5 120/15 124/24 142/25 | internationally [1] 221/20 |
| idea [5] 21/18 29/25 31/3 169/11 227/13 | 147/4 149/17 162/20 196/2 | interpose [1] 41/2 |
| ideas [2] 10/10 162/1 | indicates [4] 128/16 147/16 147/24 | interrupt [4] 22/17 93/8 125/11 207/4 |
| identification [1] 135/7 | 163/10 | interruption [1] 213/9 |
| identified [13] 19/24 24/4 34/11 36/1 | indicating [1] 121/11 | interview [2] 27/1 193/9 |
| 52/16 54/15 54/20 109/5 110/23 110/24 | indication [1] 203/8 | interviewed [2] 193/10 194/7 |
| 178/16 179/18 211/25 | indications [1] 229/18 | interviewing [1] 193/5 |
| identify [11] 42/5 54/17 54/20 105/15 | individual [5] 70/19 72/16 117/12 157/5 | interviews [2] 194/4 194/22 |
| 141/14 141/19 168/17 168/18 170/22 | 222/20 | intimately [6] 55/15 62/13 72/6 72/7 |
| 212/8 226/2 | individuals [4] 101/11 137/17 146/2 157/9 | 72/11 78/11 |
| identifying [1] 211/22 | industrial [1] 36/18 | introduce [2] 93/2 170/14 |
| immediate [1] 187/1 | industry [1] 110/7 | intuitively [1] 25/2 |
| immediately [5] 188/22 202/2 203/10 | inference [1] 21/7 | invest [1] 212/1 |
| 212/23 223/20 | inflation [2] 146/10 146/12 | investigate [1] 117/6 |
| impact [13] 11/19 21/13 26/1 26/16 30/9 | information [34] 74/11 77/21 81/2 108/8 | investigated [1] 157/14 |
| 42/17 48/23 52/8 87/1 88/11 144/16 | 112/1 124/19 127/10 128/19 131/15 | investigating [1] 108/14 |
| 201/20 210/15 | 134/11 134/11 134/13 135/22 159/4 | investigation [1] 107/8 |
| impacted [5] 48/20 55/8 56/20 57/12 | 159/5 159/7 159/7 165/6 170/22 171/2 | investigations [1] 220/5 |
| 176/25 | 175/16 178/21 183/24 190/14 190/17 | investment [7] 33/18 98/1 167/14 168/3 |
| impairing [1] 163/1 | 209/10 209/12 209/23 211/3 211/12 | 222/16 227/24 228/24 |
| impairment [3] 162/15 230/3 230/7 | 215/2 226/21 226/25 227/7 | invitation [1] 226/1 |
| impediments [1] 101/9 | informed [4] 164/5 194/23 195/17 198/7 | invite [1] 121/24 |
| imperfect [1] 92/6 | informing [1] 210/5 | invited [5] 117/16 172/5 194/18 226/12 |
| implement [9] 50/20 169/9 172/2 173/21 | infrastructure [3] 111/24 112/19 142/10 | 226/13 |
| 176/21 177/8 184/17 212/5 212/9 | ing [2] 81/1 195/9 | involve [2] 104/20 105/22 |
| implemented [8] 19/23 35/20 50/12 50/14 | initial [5] 106/18 115/25 187/12 189/1 | involved [27] 8/18 24/11 36/2 36/4 40/1 |
| 50/16 50/17 107/19 208/23 | 194/13 | 40/5 43/21 43/23 44/2 44/4 53/17 55/6 |
| implementing [3] 174/15 178/25 184/10 | initially [1] 5/13 | 56/19 58/25 62/11 62/13 72/6 72/7 72/11 |
| implicate [1] 29/21 | initiative [1] 109/5 | 78/11 86/14 86/17 98/22 106/20 113/22 |
| implicated [1] 30/18 | initiatives [21] 16/15 16/16 16/19 16/21 | 113/25 169/18 |
| implications [2] 40/7 210/18 | 19/20 19/23 20/2 22/1 22/19 22/24 24/1 | involvement [3] 79/6 191/18 223/18 |
| importance [1] 180/16 | 24/6 102/10 110/24 111/2 111/10 111/11 | involves [4] 93/25 97/24 101/5 103/12 |
| important [6] 142/8 153/7 153/12 211/9 | 142/20 142/24 175/23 179/20 | IO [1] 42/6 |
| 215/15 219/23 | inning [2] 71/6 147/2 | Ironically [1] 223/4 |
| importantly [1] 181/23 | input [7] 19/12 19/14 19/18 51/21 194/3 | irregular [1] 181/15 |
| impose [1] 189/25 | 208/8 210/6 | Irwin [1] 116/22 |
| impossible [2] 207/15 221/6 | inquiry [2] 140/10 151/8 | is [478] |
| impracticability [1] 54/23 | insofar [1] 211/4 | ish [3] 2/21 2/21 2/21 |
| improper [2] 94/6 121/19 | insolvency [5] 30/2 205/5 205/12 205/16 | Isle [4] 33/9 219/2 219/17 219/18 |
| improve [6] 8/15 22/12 25/4 25/6 106/14 | 205/24 | isn't [14] 5/8 7/4 21/19 23/10 46/10 46/16 |
| 107/13 | insolvent [2] 29/22 205/2 | 50/19 51/9 51/18 51/23 68/4 85/15 143/8 |
| improved [1] 108/2 | instance [1] 83/6 | 146/17 |
| improvements [3] 103/15 111/17 111/25 | instances [1] 110/17 | issue [28] 2/12 2/24 8/21 12/24 35/1 52/8 |
| improves [1] 25/8 | instantaneously [1] 1/7 | 54/23 55/4 69/8 75/14 92/11 95/6 105/18 |
| improving[7] 8/9 8/9 8/13 35/8 101/10 | instead [5] 4/2 50/18 92/23 219/13 | 114/21 136/6 149/1 150/9 164/24 165/20 |
| 101/12 105/13 | 230/13 | 187/1 200/2 201/2 201/5 205/10 221/10 |
| inability [1] 110/14 | institute [6] 33/10 96/24 97/3 220/3 220/7 | 230/12 236/1 236/2 |
| Inc [2] 95/22 95/24 | 220/12 | issued [3] 100/8 171/11 221/11 |
| include [7] 5/18 81/25 82/5 82/7 98/8 | instruct [1] 151/7 | issues [18] 12/3 30/20 39/22 44/13 44/18 |
| 169/15 231/16 | instructed [1] 169/6 | 74/24 90/2 90/17 112/16 149/19 150/20 |
| included [11] 10/11 82/12 82/14 82/19 | instruction [2] 152/5 153/4 | 169/21 169/23 184/4 184/13 185/5 |
| 82/22 98/12 133/6 138/2 144/17 150/13 | instructions [2] 152/20 189/11 | 192/21 236/23 |
| 150/22 | insured [10] 67/25 68/7 68/12 68/13 | it [420] |
| includes [8] 33/21 77/13 80/7 80/7 80/8 | 68/16 226/4 229/24 230/1 230/6 232/15 | it's [80] 9/2 11/3 14/21 14/23 17/1 17/16 |
| 80/10 84/6 101/5 | insurer [3] 66/17 67/15 68/18 | 18/19 18/21 19/9 20/8 20/12 28/21 30/6 |
| including [7] 22/2 60/4 81/5 99/24 115/7 | insurers [10] 65/16 66/20 66/22 66/24 | 37/13 45/16 47/4 52/18 53/16 54/7 54/9 |

 68/4 69/22 70/9 79/9 80/11 81/10 82/14 83/7 84/15 84/23 87/6 87/21 93/15 118/3 118/7 118/17 118/19 121/23 125/17 125/25 130/14 130/24 131/22 136/5 143/8 143/19 144/7 151/16 156/22 160/15 173/5 183/1 183/22 188/13 195/4 198/23 200/7 201/6 201/14 202/17 207/13 213/2 214/6 217/11 218/15 218/16 218/17 218/21 222/3 222/7 223/7 223/11 235/1 235/11 236/19 item [10] 3/1 74/9 76/4 76/9 78/4 78/17 80/5 80/12 129/8 145/2 items [10] 24/3 80/11 80/20 80/22 101/17 105/11 107/2 112/15 146/8 179/17 its [64] 4/1 8/15 8/17 14/6 22/2 24/4 35/23 40/4 41/18 43/19 44/11 44/16 47/16 48/10 54/14 69/2 70/24 74/17 76/20 84/7 90/21 104/14 107/14 110/4 125/3 142/6 148/3 155/9 155/25 160/10 160/12 169/21 170/3 173/1 174/18 175/12 177/21 180/16 181/2 186/22 186/25 189/23 190/4 191/15 198/11 202/7 204/16 206/3 206/19 206/24 208/21 208/21 208/24 210/17 212/17 213/19 217/7 217/9 217/23 218/1 219/6 231/15 232/20 232/22
itself [12] 84/24 120/17 131/10 191/23 196/20 203/6 210/7 210/22 211/25 218/19 224/1 225/1
IX [1] 149/24

## $J$

Jack [8] 5/2 93/21 154/10 171/8 171/22 177/4 183/7 193/19
January [16] 26/15 26/25 27/2 100/12 178/3 188/16 194/14 204/11 204/13 209/4 209/19 210/1 212/15 217/1 220/8 223/23
January 29th [3] 26/25 27/2 194/14
Jefferson [1] 98/10
jeopardize [1] 30/25
Jim [1] 6/18
job [9] 5/10 7/10 19/11 40/10 97/8 169/9
183/24 198/17 234/4
Joe [2] 33/11 223/10
Johnson [2] 35/9 36/7
join [4] 93/21 94/13 199/13 233/25
joined [3] 97/12 167/20 167/22
joint [2] 176/16 199/13
jointly [1] 98/17
Jones [21] 4/16 26/24 26/25 27/4 27/7
27/25 29/15 29/24 30/8 30/21 31/16
64/21 65/4 116/22 117/3 137/21 139/6
139/19 166/2 194/24 228/5
Judge [1] 153/3
judgment [2] 151/4 235/19
judgments [1] 185/6
July [17] 38/17 38/21 38/21 39/8 51/16
53/16 61/10 61/14 63/6 63/7 70/11 104/4
108/4 162/24 165/3 165/8 208/5
July 10th [1] 38/21
July 11th [3] 38/17 38/21 39/8
July 16 [1] 53/16
July 18th [3] 162/24 165/3 165/8
July 19th [1] 63/6
July 2012 [1] 70/11
July 9th [2] 61/14 63/7
jump [2] 88/20 160/6
June [69] 9/22 34/2 35/17 36/11 38/11
38/13 38/14 38/16 38/17 38/20 38/21

39/3 39/4 39/7 39/9 39/12 39/14 39/18
51/11 51/13 51/14 59/6 59/22 59/24 61/4 61/5 65/19 66/25 67/17 69/23 102/7 109/24 118/18 119/17 122/7 127/18 128/15 128/24 133/20 133/23 134/11 135/13 142/7 148/10 158/7 158/11 161/22 162/6 163/3 163/7 163/23 164/18 165/3 165/7 202/2 202/5 203/19 203/22
208/4 208/7 210/10 211/10 212/12 224/4 224/8 225/12 226/2 226/16 232/17 June 13 [1] 203/19
June 13th [1] 38/11
June 14 [5] 109/24 119/17 122/7 133/20 226/2
June 14th [31] 38/13 38/14 38/16 38/17 38/20 39/3 39/4 39/7 39/9 39/12 39/14 39/18 59/6 61/4 69/23 134/11 142/7 148/10 158/7 163/3 163/7 164/18 165/3 165/7 208/7 210/10 211/10 212/12 224/4 225/12 232/17
June 15th [3] 202/5 203/22 224/8
June 20 [1] 163/23
June 2013 [1] 51/13
June 20th [8] 38/21 59/22 59/24 61/5 133/23 158/11 161/22 162/6
June 25th [3] 65/19 66/25 67/17
June 30 [4] 127/18 128/15 128/24 135/13 June 30th [1] 9/22
June 5 [1] 118/18
jurisdiction [1] 230/6
just [96] 4/22 6/22 8/11 11/1 18/15 22/6
22/22 24/25 27/24 30/13 32/3 32/3 38/8
42/3 44/2 50/24 52/2 52/8 52/10 52/22
57/9 57/17 63/23 65/25 67/15 68/15
68/24 69/5 71/13 77/12 78/24 79/22
81/18 83/9 83/11 84/12 84/20 85/1 85/3 85/6 85/9 86/8 87/15 91/23 93/1 93/15
102/20 106/9 110/13 111/1 112/16
117/11 117/22 118/20 121/1 121/5
122/20 132/23 133/10 136/2 136/5
139/18 143/18 147/18 149/1 150/3
151/14 151/24 152/2 153/7 154/2 155/7
158/25 160/5 160/6 163/19 164/11
164/19 170/16 170/21 174/1 175/7
182/19 187/12 197/1 199/5 199/8 199/17 200/3 200/18 215/14 224/16 231/22 232/7 236/23 237/7
iustified [1] 191/12

## K

keep [4] 72/3 153/2 195/17 213/3
Ken [2] 166/3 193/23
Kenneth [1] 167/2
kept [1] 108/20
Kevyn [3] 6/17 203/5 225/1
key [1] 214/10
kind [10] 32/24 74/14 93/6 97/22 194/5 197/23 198/15 202/14 219/24 228/7
kinds [1] 230/16
King [2] 159/25 160/8
Kirk [3] 5/18 5/21 5/22
Kmart [1] 169/17
knew [10] 32/5 193/6 201/25 202/11
202/13 206/12 221/7 225/2 226/9 226/11 know [69] 3/10 5/24 6/9 6/10 6/11 13/5
13/5 15/23 19/10 20/21 21/5 25/8 25/20
30/6 33/25 35/6 35/13 36/14 36/17 36/20 36/23 37/2 37/7 37/9 37/14 37/18 38/4
38/23 40/8 42/6 44/24 45/13 48/19 50/15
52/23 55/25 65/25 66/2 72/25 74/23
74/25 117/11 120/14 123/7 123/23
124/16 127/2 127/23 136/24 151/17
151/18 151/20 156/24 168/15 171/23

182/17 184/15 193/5 193/10 194/20 201/8 210/25 211/5 212/4 212/5 213/2 218/25 223/11 231/3
knowing [1] 182/23
knowledge [11] 60/17 60/23 60/24 61/2 78/10 81/12 93/25 124/11 199/3 223/16 233/19
known [8] 98/7 156/20 169/14 169/18 170/2 192/12 220/9 221/20
knows [1] 41/14

## L

labels [1] 18/5
labor [7] 44/19 44/23 45/11 45/19 49/23 61/6 148/11
lack [3] 14/14 188/11 194/7
LaGuardia [1] 194/17
laid [1] 130/16
land [6] 33/10 222/1 222/2 222/7 222/14 222/17
large [6] 54/24 70/12 80/5 112/11 169/20 193/3
largely [2] 194/21 236/2
larger [2] 47/10 108/9
last [15] 24/8 34/19 45/4 66/16 80/5
101/16 107/11 114/4 114/8 121/21 154/3
166/5 176/6 219/8 233/13
lastly [1] 222/17
late [6] 8/5 35/16 86/13 99/11 178/1 180/6
later [3] 41/15 69/6 166/16
law [16] 28/8 58/6 137/21 166/14 166/14
189/8 192/1 192/2 192/6 192/10 192/11
192/14 192/23 193/5 193/7 194/6
laws [1] 217/15
lawyer [1] 136/24
lawyers [5] 137/21 139/6 150/13 150/17 151/12
lay [9] 41/8 93/3 114/12 120/19 131/23
134/10 197/8 197/10 207/5
laying [4] 41/4 87/11 87/15 194/5
lead [2] 104/14 124/17
leader [1] 184/19
leading [2] 181/25 190/20
Lear [1] 169/17
lease [4] 104/24 218/2 219/10 219/11
leased [1] 219/6
leasing [1] 104/21
least [15] $4 / 6$ 6/20 11/24 15/3 15/7 35/20
36/1 43/23 71/18 76/12 140/25 192/1
213/10 222/8 229/3
leave [1] 214/23
led [5] 40/16 40/18 150/12 177/2 228/4
left [12] 6/10 48/16 56/21 83/17 88/1
88/22 128/23 129/3 203/19 204/17
207/17 231/22
legacy [4] 90/19 146/20 147/10 147/11 legal [7] 151/3 186/8 186/11 191/16 191/22 193/20 205/6
legislative [1] 98/23
legislatures [1] 98/25
Lehman [1] 167/20
lengthy [2] 10/7 27/14
less [4] 181/23 227/13 230/19 231/11
let [51] 12/17 14/10 20/15 24/25 30/13
31/14 34/5 38/8 38/9 39/21 40/21 45/24
50/24 52/24 59/6 59/22 65/25 66/16 67/13 67/15 101/1 105/5 115/19 118/20 119/17 120/23 122/16 125/2 127/14 128/4 130/17 130/22 133/15 133/22 134/3 138/14 140/17 147/18 149/11 152/11 154/15 161/5 172/13 176/24 179/6 179/6 179/22 213/1 225/18 235/3

## L

219/24 233/2
long-term [11] 14/6 14/11 14/22 15/6 183/16 184/4 184/14 204/23 208/21 209/3 209/14
longer [3] 105/11 105/21 189/20 look [46] 2/21 13/1 13/16 15/5 19/21
19/25 21/10 23/24 29/2 30/5 30/15 32/22
34/10 34/25 40/19 42/3 43/10 48/15 49/13 56/20 70/1 71/3 72/13 80/24 88/22 99/20 100/23 103/3 103/24 106/3 106/4 117/12 119/1 119/6 129/9 151/19 173/6 176/14 177/9 189/19 189/20 203/18 223/20 231/20 231/22 234/18
looked [17] 74/6 99/24 100/1 100/24
105/10 105/12 107/3 111/14 113/7 116/1 116/5 143/4 153/10 157/23 204/8 207/23 234/11
looking [26] 8/14 16/18 28/19 32/22 33/2 35/3 49/20 70/17 70/22 70/23 71/24
71/24 75/4 83/11 83/17 85/19 101/3
104/2 116/1 146/4 149/8 149/11 150/20 161/9 170/21 175/7
looks [2] 145/6 145/16
Lori [1] 120/24
lose [2] 214/1 214/2
lost [3] 170/2 207/3 214/4
lot [21] 11/13 19/14 20/21 28/24 33/5
34/21 55/11 55/12 69/20 70/24 90/3
109/12 109/13 109/16 158/2 158/4 162/6
187/10 192/17 216/5 222/17
lots [1] 109/13
louder [1] 121/17
Louis [2] 33/11 223/10
low [3] 37/23 38/3 218/11
Lowenstein [1] 5/2
lower [4] 21/2 111/15 129/15 229/16
lumpy [3] 180/22 181/7 196/18
lunch [4] 2/24 4/17 69/7 116/15
Lynch [1] 186/3
M
M-O-O-R-E [1] 95/17
MacKenzie [31] 23/10 64/22 81/13 81/19
81/22 95/22 95/23 96/2 97/12 97/15 97/17 97/20 98/5 99/11 99/15 100/4
100/10 100/20 101/17 103/8 105/7 110/4 112/17 183/12 183/19 185/2 185/8 189/12 198/1 209/20 228/4
MacKenzie's [2] 184/18 212/7
made [41] 12/10 39/14 47/13 59/7 61/6
90/3 92/15 102/3 103/16 107/4 112/9
114/14 120/6 126/4 128/2 132/12 133/1 133/1 153/12 179/12 179/20 181/14 194/12 203/23 204/2 207/14 209/17
210/10 210/11 214/17 215/7 218/22
226/24 227/4 227/25 230/2 234/6 234/7 234/10 234/22 235/17
magnitude [2] 35/5 202/10
maintain [2] 165/19 180/1
maintained [1] 54/22
maintenance [2] 105/18 217/10
major [5] 19/6 101/9 179/17 218/18 219/18
majority [6] 11/21 22/13 46/11 46/15 48/18 68/4
make [53] 17/12 20/8 20/9 27/10 31/4 32/17 34/5 37/5 59/17 70/5 73/7 77/13 103/20 108/7 131/14 135/20 136/16 136/20 152/12 168/20 174/20 175/14 180/23 180/25 182/14 184/2 185/6 188/22 193/25 197/19 197/21 197/23 198/7 198/10 198/15 199/20 201/13 201/14 202/5 202/6 202/25 203/12

203/16 213/6 214/22 215/5 224/7 225/2
225/10 225/13 225/14 227/1 235/17
makers [1] 171/5
makes [2] 80/11 152/9
making [10] 39/12 120/8 139/17 148/1 168/21 168/24 175/17 196/8 204/3 234/25
Malhotra [21] 5/3 17/10 18/19 29/2 30/6 32/14 48/14 57/20 58/8 58/12 65/10 65/10 66/13 69/15 70/6 83/14 85/25 86/3 87/4 89/18 123/12
man [4] 234/14 234/22 234/23 235/8 manage [1] 169/4
management [14] 12/9 77/24 78/1 78/3
78/15 78/19 80/3 80/18 97/1 105/19
106/21 176/20 177/4 193/18
manager [25] 5/15 7/25 21/19 23/13 59/7
60/1 63/11 64/1 64/2 64/5 64/10 65/4
92/5 103/18 109/21 115/21 119/19
133/17 137/10 137/12 137/14 179/12
195/1 203/6 221/19
manager's [1] 143/1
managers [1] 220/18
managing [1] 97/21
manner [1] 196/19
many [19] 19/22 38/20 40/3 40/4 63/16
64/3 110/12 110/17 113/18 164/21 165/1
169/13 176/7 192/10 192/12 222/24
223/3 230/18 232/4
March [38] 6/23 6/25 7/3 7/5 7/8 7/25
16/20 16/25 17/9 19/9 19/16 20/18 21/2
21/10 21/18 21/22 22/18 22/24 23/3 23/6
23/12 25/25 26/15 87/22 137/9 170/20
171/1 171/16 172/4 176/13 179/1 179/18
184/9 186/4 203/4 211/24 214/16 217/19
March 201 [1] 21/10
March 2012 [2] 172/4 184/9
March 2013 [9] 7/25 16/25 19/16 21/18 21/22 22/24 23/6 23/12 25/25
mark [4] 46/20 48/5 48/14 52/7
marked [5] 9/13 28/11 30/23 46/20 52/17
market [5] 129/10 129/13 133/7 207/18 231/10
markets [8] 168/25 170/3 207/13 207/16
229/8 233/5 233/7 233/14
marking [2] 30/20 31/8
marshal [1] 99/25
marshaled [1] 204/10
marshaling [1] 222/12
Martin [4] 171/8 171/22 177/4 193/19
massive [2] 188/22 222/4
master's [1] 96/8
material [3] 143/2 144/14 219/19
math [2] 146/15 231/14
matter [9] 2/17 113/1 114/21 116/24
152/4 195/22 200/19 202/18 221/24
matters [4] 2/9 71/10 205/15 221/21
Matthew [1] 3/17
maximize [2] 35/25 168/23
maximum [1] 231/5
may [65] 1/8 1/12 3/15 4/22 5/7 5/13
17/16 18/25 20/16 29/13 29/21 30/18
32/5 32/7 33/22 36/11 40/9 41/2 41/11
47/7 47/21 48/1 48/8 51/9 51/11 51/13
51/13 51/14 52/1 53/5 56/11 64/11 67/10
69/12 76/1 76/5 91/13 94/19 109/16
117/3 119/13 119/14 124/21 129/5
165/15 166/10 186/17 195/13 195/23
197/10 199/13 199/15 201/17 201/24
203/11 204/7 204/12 206/17 206/18
210/2 213/17 214/1 220/18 233/10 234/14
May 13 [1] 206/17

## M

May 2011 [2] 20/16 40/9
May 2013 [1] 51/13
maybe [6] 30/14 65/19 118/19 153/10 153/17 165/5
mayor [5] 5/22 6/24 170/14 175/9 214/21 mayor's [5] 6/24 8/24 19/12 19/14 171/7 me [108] $4 / 13$ 10/16 12/17 14/7 14/8 14/10 15/4 15/7 17/1 17/3 20/8 20/15 24/25 28/5 30/13 31/14 32/12 34/5 38/8 38/9 39/21 40/21 45/24 50/24 52/24 56/13 59/6 59/22 63/23 65/25 66/16 67/13 67/15 72/7 72/19 74/2 84/23 86/17 96/12 101/1 101/13 105/5 109/8 111/20 115/13 115/19 116/13 118/20 118/24 119/17 120/23 122/16 123/10 124/15 125/2 127/14 127/15 128/4 130/2 130/17 133/15 133/22 134/3 138/14 139/22 140/5 140/13 140/15 140/17 141/22 147/18 149/11 152/11 153/6 154/15 161/5 167/10 168/10 170/8 171/14 171/22 172/13 173/23 174/13 176/24 177/6 179/6 179/6 179/22 181/4 188/8 192/4 195/23 196/2 201/15 202/11 205/18 205/19 208/11 210/6 213/6 221/6 223/25 225/18 230/2 231/23 235/24 237/7
mean [20] 31/9 72/19 72/25 73/1 75/14 77/1 93/8 94/18 103/11 111/20 158/24 168/1 168/12 172/10 179/16 181/8 227/17 229/6 230/10 232/21
meaning [1] 40/14
meaningful [1] 63/1
means [7] 11/11 24/16 68/16 99/18 155/15 159/2 168/21
meant [5] 93/9 110/1 111/20 208/12 232/6
measure [1] 233/4
measured [1] 29/23
measures [3] 9/22 107/19 107/22
mechanisms [1] 8/9
medical [1] 48/23
meet [4] 180/24 192/5 220/17 235/12
meeting [85] 3/17 26/24 27/1 27/2 27/3 27/21 29/8 31/15 38/11 38/14 38/16 38/20 38/21 39/4 39/19 50/5 59/6 59/9 59/13 59/16 59/23 59/24 60/3 60/8 60/9 60/14 60/15 60/18 61/5 61/11 61/14 61/24 62/2 62/4 62/7 63/7 64/25 65/14 65/18 66/25 67/3 67/17 119/19 119/21 119/22 120/11 120/13 120/15 133/23 134/3 134/4 134/7 134/8 138/4 138/9 138/13 138/22 139/2 139/20 140/2 148/10 158/7 158/10 158/14 158/21 159/6 163/23 164/1 164/7 164/10 164/24 171/19 192/22 192/25 193/2 193/11 194/11 194/15 194/16 194/20 224/5 225/12 226/2 226/19 226/24
meetings [53] 8/20 8/22 9/24 10/7 11/13 38/17 38/23 38/25 39/7 39/8 39/16 40/5 61/4 63/10 63/16 63/17 63/19 63/24 64/4 64/9 64/12 64/13 64/17 64/20 64/23 65/1 65/4 65/11 133/16 133/24 134/9 134/10 134/16 138/2 138/10 138/11 138/23 138/25 139/3 139/5 139/7 139/11 149/21 158/15 158/17 158/19 158/21 158/22 159/4 161/22 164/22 231/21 231/25 member [2] 9/18 86/18
members [13] 8/23 8/23 8/24 42/13 44/7 61/16 71/9 78/14 78/19 86/17 139/1 171/7 193/22
memo [1] 4/16
memoranda [3] 117/4 117/6 117/12
memorandum [3] 2/11 69/8 236/24
memorialized [1] 196/22
men's [1] 166/7
mentioned [9] 89/19 96/17 98/6 99/21 105/8 113/6 137/4 164/19 217/18 merger [1] 105/24
merging [1] 105/22
Merrill [1] 186/3
met [7] 9/20 10/8 69/16 137/24 137/25 163/16 191/20
Michigan [26] 2/5 95/18 96/8 96/9 96/13 97/7 97/16 97/19 98/20 99/1 116/11
140/9 143/12 144/8 146/1 146/3 149/23 152/15 157/5 157/12 157/15 157/18 157/25 167/5 167/8 217/16
microphone [7] 17/21 17/22 93/17 114/7 124/4 136/16 173/24
middle [2] 29/19 203/20
might [27] 9/4 28/12 79/20 91/23 116/23 150/12 151/1 164/12 170/15 178/1 182/17 189/10 191/24 192/5 192/8 199/13 200/6 201/4 203/8 204/20 212/9 214/20 220/16 220/21 222/20 225/5 229/14
mighty [1] 170/13
mike [2] 121/16 186/9
miles [2] 222/4 222/11
milestone [7] 172/10 176/1 176/25
177/11 178/13 179/1 179/9
milestones [3] 171/19 176/8 177/21
millage [1] 231/4
Miller [22] 9/20 23/9 24/14 25/21 25/24
26/4 26/7 26/8 26/10 26/20 33/17 64/22
150/9 152/8 152/9 167/13 167/24 167/25 168/2 168/2 228/6 231/24
Milliman [22] 123/19 123/20 123/21
123/23 124/11 124/16 124/20 124/25
125/2 125/6 125/16 125/18 125/20
125/22 126/8 126/9 126/15 137/17
138/16 138/20 154/5 155/25
Milliman's [1] 126/23
million [54] 12/22 13/3 16/21 16/24 19/24
20/2 20/12 20/20 20/22 21/2 21/7 34/13
34/16 35/23 46/4 81/4 81/5 92/9 111/7
111/13 111/17 113/17 113/19 113/20
115/7 126/7 128/25 129/2 129/13 129/15 147/3 147/5 147/6 147/8 158/1 177/13 177/14 180/2 180/5 180/10 180/16
180/19 181/1 186/24 202/5 202/9 202/17 202/25 203/22 204/2 204/17 207/21 213/12 224/8
millions [3] 34/22 35/22 196/16
mind [5] 14/5 23/2 90/1 126/1 195/21
minds [1] 203/9
minimal [1] 196/15
minimum [3] 180/1 180/15 191/21
minuscript [1] 149/8
minute [3] 33/23 52/2 57/23
minutes [5] 2/11 102/16 102/20 120/12 237/5
mischaracterization [1] 104/19
misinformed [1] 130/7
miss [1] 181/2
mission [2] 168/5 168/16
misspelled [1] $1 / 13$
misstate [1] 72/19
misunderstood [1] 153/8
mixed [1] 178/19
model [3] 155/21 156/1 216/3
modified [1] 126/16
modifying [1] 162/2
Mohawk [1] 169/15
moment [8] 3/14 140/15 147/18 186/20 196/11 199/13 229/11 231/3
Monday [4] 3/9 3/19 3/21 4/6
monetization [22] 24/8 24/12 24/15 24/19 25/18 25/22 25/25 26/22 29/21 30/1 30/23 31/18 32/7 32/8 33/19 90/11 90/12 103/25 104/3 104/14 104/24 223/15 monetizations [1] 33/20
monetize [2] 31/4 187/17
monetized [4] 24/22 24/23 26/14 33/14 monetizing [1] 31/24
money [14] 106/2 112/19 113/9 146/24 147/1 179/4 179/20 180/11 181/5 213/11 213/18 216/15 221/7 232/21
monitor [3] 120/1 120/25 122/5
month [6] 77/17 79/9 163/17 182/11 195/24 202/3
monthly [5] 71/3 77/17 91/4 178/21 181/19
months [12] $7 / 11$ 7/20 11/15 12/12 19/11 40/10 73/25 178/10 183/7 213/10 215/4 226/20
Moore [27] 23/15 91/20 91/21 92/7 92/12 93/22 94/14 95/4 95/11 95/17 95/19
102/15 119/17 120/1 128/12 131/3 132/3
135/7 136/7 136/23 140/6 142/5 151/7
153/25 154/9 160/5 163/16
Moore's [2] 149/2 151/19
more [46] 4/15 4/18 25/3 25/10 25/13 25/14 30/13 31/14 32/11 38/8 50/24 54/15 81/1 91/15 92/22 99/22 105/14 105/16 105/17 105/22 107/4 116/10 130/18 132/16 133/10 134/11 147/20 150/2 150/4 150/4 153/17 154/23 155/20 166/16 169/14 170/4 171/6 173/3 181/20 181/23 188/13 189/3 189/3 201/8 230/5 237/2
morning [24] 5/1 5/3 5/4 57/23 58/5 58/8
58/9 69/9 69/14 86/3 86/9 91/15 95/11
95/12 116/24 117/20 134/1 236/3 236/4
236/13 236/21 236/22 236/24 237/6 mortgaged [1] 204/15
most [8] 11/17 67/19 108/17 110/12 153/7 207/14 215/9 227/25
motion [5] 117/1 117/5 118/12 153/12 234/1
motions [1] 200/20
mouth [1] 79/12
move [15] 41/15 54/11 115/19 130/18
130/24 131/17 135/1 135/23 139/10
141/25 174/1 190/6 198/19 216/11 219/2
movement [1] 72/1
moves [1] 136/4
moving [1] 135/25
Mr [26] 23/15 91/21 92/7 92/11 93/22 94/14 95/4 95/11 95/19 102/15 119/17 120/1 128/12 131/3 132/3 135/7 136/7 136/23 140/6 142/5 149/2 151/7 151/19 154/9 160/5 163/16
Mr. [119] 2/10 2/15 3/3 3/3 5/3 5/14 6/4 6/5 6/25 7/2 7/5 7/8 7/14 7/18 8/18 17/10 17/19 18/19 23/7 23/15 23/18 23/19 25/16 26/11 27/25 29/2 29/15 30/6 30/7 31/3 31/15 32/14 39/22 40/2 48/14 57/20 58/8 58/12 63/11 65/10 65/10 65/11 66/13 69/15 69/21 70/6 83/14 85/25 86/3 86/12 87/4 89/18 92/3 92/4 92/14 93/4 93/19 94/22 95/2 106/9 114/3 115/13 117/2 117/14 123/12 123/16 124/2 126/4 126/9 126/13 126/14 126/20 127/9 130/7 132/12 132/17 132/25 133/4 136/7 138/1 138/5 138/19 138/24 139/7 150/9 150/15 151/25 152/3 152/8 152/8 152/9 152/9

| M | N | 212/25 213/14 214/15 214/18 214/24 215/8 217/14 217/16 219/9 219/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mr.... [27] 153/9 153/11 153/25 154/4 | name [10] 5/24 37/12 69/15 95/15 97/10 | 219/12 221/6 222/11 222/21 225/6 231/6 |
| 154/12 154/16 154/20 154/24 155/4 | 136/19 166/2 166/5 166/25 193/21 | 232/13 233/3 233/7 236/17 |
| 155/8 155/19 155/23 156/2 156/8 158/17 | named [1] 179/12 | nobody [3] 227/15 227/17 228/11 |
| 159/3 159/18 160/1 160/8 164/5 164/16 | names [1] 1/13 | non [14] 22/21 34/12 100/4 108/18 109/3 |
| 165/2 166/22 168/11 195/16 200/22 | national [1] 192/14 | 109/8 121/19 127/20 127/23 134/4 134/6 |
| 200/24 | nature [7] 94/23 190/5 206/8 216/10 | 187/21 207/24 229/20 |
| Mr. Bowing [1] 154/4 | 216/12 217/23 237/9 | non-core [1] 187/21 |
| Mr. Brown [1] 6/5 | near [1] 203/15 | non-payers [1] 34/12 |
| Mr. Buckfire [7] 23/15 26/11 31/3 166/22 | nearly [1] 180/18 | non-responsive [1] 22/21 |
| 168/11 195/16 200/22 | necessarily [2] 151/1 221/2 | none [2] 90/14 233/21 |
| Mr. Ciantra [8] 117/2 117/14 150/15 | necessary [10] 112/9 148/17 182/1 | nonetheless [2] 203/9 234/15 |
| 152/3 152/8 152/9 153/9 153/11 | 187/25 188/14 198/4 198/7 198/16 209/8 | nonsensical [1] 1/13 |
| Mr. DiPompeo [1] 2/15 | 224/12 | normal [1] 56/6 |
| Mr. Gordon's [1] 160/1 | necessity [1] 204/3 | normally [5] 168/21 182/18 188/11 |
| Mr. Howell [1] 3/3 | need [12] 1/18 4/18 27/14 32/17 153/20 | 197/15 213/8 |
| Mr. King [1] 160/8 | 168/7 177/8 184/16 189/22 199/16 | not [276] |
| Mr. Lewis [1] 6/4 | 220/21 234/14 | notable [1] 169/15 |
| Mr. Malhotra [21] 5/3 17/10 18/19 29/2 | needed [9] 31/11 173/17 183/2 184/9 | note [7] 1/13 1/22 29/20 65/9 83/20 94/14 |
| 30/6 32/14 48/14 57/20 58/8 58/12 65/10 | 184/15 190/6 191/21 193/9 212/1 | 223/3 |
| 65/10 66/13 69/15 70/6 83/14 85/25 86/3 | needs [5] 103/15 106/15 160/18 160/20 | noted [1] 14/22 |
| 87/4 89/18 123/12 | 184/24 | notes [7] 1/6 1/19 29/18 30/16 68/6 |
| Mr. Miller [3] 150/9 152/8 152/9 | negative [2] 26/1 26/16 | 215/21 215/23 |
| Mr. Moore [1] 153/25 | negotiate [24] 54/24 54/25 60/7 60/13 | nothing [13] 57/20 89/11 131/19 143/21 |
| Mr. or [1] 138/24 | 60/19 60/25 86/22 86/25 156/4 156/9 | 159/21 179/21 202/10 204/14 207/16 |
| Mr. Orr [53] 5/14 6/25 7/2 7/5 7/8 7/14 | 156/10 156/19 156/22 158/20 158/22 | 208/2 218/21 234/22 235/3 |
| 7/18 8/18 23/7 23/18 23/19 25/16 27/25 | 159/11 159/13 202/14 209/7 212/22 | notice [2] 202/17 203/18 |
| 29/15 30/7 31/15 39/22 40/2 63/11 65/11 | 224/15 224/20 224/23 232/14 | noticed [1] 108/25 |
| 92/14 94/22 123/16 126/4 126/9 126/13 | negotiated [4] 57/12 88/18 90/23 179/24 | November [4] 100/9 176/6 177/6 178/1 |
| 126/14 126/20 127/9 132/12 132/17 | negotiating [5] 57/1 60/15 168/8 212/21 | now [78] 5/10 6/11 7/8 9/9 13/22 16/12 |
| 132/25 133/4 136/7 138/1 138/5 138/19 | 213/1 | 20/24 21/18 23/19 24/8 25/15 28/20 |
| 139/7 154/16 154/20 154/24 155/4 155/8 | negotiation [7] 42/14 46/4 56/19 63/7 | 29/17 32/3 39/16 40/9 42/13 49/4 49/7 |
| 155/19 155/23 156/2 156/8 158/17 | 89/6 156/17 213/3 | 50/9 51/16 56/18 59/22 61/9 65/21 76/24 |
| 159/18 164/5 164/16 165/2 200/24 | negotiations [26] 38/9 40/3 40/11 40/12 | 77/10 77/16 79/21 81/23 90/9 90/22 |
| Mr. Orr's [1] 95/2 | 40/15 42/16 42/24 45/10 45/18 45/25 | 92/11 92/22 98/19 103/24 106/20 109/19 |
| Mr. Schneider [1] 3/3 | 47/14 55/2 55/7 56/25 57/10 61/22 61/23 | 111/18 112/23 114/2 116/15 122/3 122/4 |
| Mr. Sherwood [2] 154/12 159/3 | 63/1 86/13 86/15 88/14 104/17 159/16 | 122/20 125/2 128/4 137/4 138/4 139/17 |
| Mr. Stew [1] 130/7 | 213/10 229/20 229/21 | 140/23 142/7 145/25 153/1 161/5 161/8 |
| Mr. Stewart[10] 2/10 17/19 69/21 86/12 | neither [1] 51/4 | 161/9 167/10 172/7 173/24 177/10 |
| 93/19 106/9 114/3 115/13 124/2 151/25 | net [7] 43/15 82/14 82/17 84/16 84/16 | 178/12 179/3 187/7 188/3 191/12 195/4 |
| Mr. Ullman [2] 92/3 92/4 | 84/19 111/16 | 196/8 201/13 201/14 208/7 211/18 216/5 |
| Mr. Ullman's [1] 93/4 | never [11] 10/19 58/18 58/21 58/22 156/8 | 225/23 231/1 236/12 236/19 236/23 |
| Ms. [5] 118/5 118/10 119/5 160/1 166/10 | 156/13 207/22 217/6 217/11 227/5 | number [54] 14/2 14/6 18/16 21/8 28/20 |
| Ms. Green [4] 118/5 118/10 119/5 160/1 | 231/14 | 33/2 40/12 52/19 53/3 54/24 55/25 63/17 |
| Ms. Patek [1] 166/10 | new[15] 37/12 43/11 52/12 65/15 90/5 | 64/7 73/12 84/16 84/16 92/13 92/14 |
| much [25] 4/10 71/16 89/15 91/14 100/24 | 147/6 147/8 167/3 167/3 167/9 167/15 | 92/16 107/17 107/24 108/3 108/21 110/9 |
| 132/16 132/18 133/11 136/21 165/16 | 171/25 214/14 228/17 228/22 | 110/11 110/24 113/7 113/20 114/15 |
| 166/18 171/21 184/15 187/23 209/9 | news [1] 151/16 | 114/17 115/8 118/24 118/25 123/7 130/4 |
| 209/12 212/9 213/6 213/7 213/11 222/14 | next [16] 11/15 29/12 29/17 30/14 74/9 | 138/6 138/12 138/14 138/15 145/9 |
| 226/4 228/19 230/5 230/23 | 91/18 142/14 152/22 152/25 161/8 166/3 | 145/15 148/15 148/20 149/10 156/5 |
| multi [1] 189/8 | 176/15 176/22 210/16 218/12 220/3 | 156/6 156/20 183/13 185/16 198/21 |
| multiple [9] 101/5 101/15 102/22 138/9 | Niagra [1] 169/15 | 198/22 218/4 220/4 223/7 |
| 138/11 139/3 139/14 141/17 141/21 | night [1] 2/14 | numbers [40] 28/15 32/25 34/6 34/15 |
| municipal [7] 15/20 77/19 78/25 99/22 | nine [5] 98/24 130/7 183/7 222/24 237/5 | 34/18 34/19 35/4 50/8 52/21 56/23 68/10 |
| 145/22 169/18 231/9 | ninth [1] 61/11 | 114/23 123/4 123/23 124/12 124/16 |
| municipalities [1] 190/22 | no [119] 2/4 3/22 6/7 7/2 7/7 10/17 10/18 | 125/3 125/5 125/17 126/3 126/10 129/23 |
| municipality [1] 68/17 | 12/23 12/25 13/4 13/15 13/25 14/16 | 130/2 132/6 132/6 138/12 151/14 155/5 |
| must [1] 148/6 | 19/12 21/18 22/5 29/11 30/12 31/1 31/20 | 155/12 156/17 162/3 162/4 162/6 196/25 |
| mutually [1] 175/8 | 32/1 34/3 36/16 37/18 41/5 45/22 57/3 | 197/1 197/4 201/2 201/20 201/23 201/24 |
| my [64] 4/5 10/22 10/22 13/15 14/5 14/9 | 57/7 58/17 60/10 60/23 60/23 61/2 62/6 | numerous [3] 63/18 63/19 63/20 |
| 23/1 25/5 39/15 44/25 49/9 57/3 57/15 | 63/9 66/4 67/6 67/9 68/3 68/20 71/12 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 60/10 61/15 61/21 62/6 64/25 65/19 $67 / 19$ 68/19 69/6 69/15 72/10 72/18 74/5 | 78/5 78/8 79/9 79/16 85/22 87/12 91/11 |  |
| 67/19 68/19 69/6 69/15 72/10 72/18 74/5 | 116/15 127/12 133/12 136/13 143/1 | o'clock [1] 3/19 |
| 75/22 79/16 79/22 86/17 90/1 90/16 97/8 | 145/11 148/15 148/20 148/22 152/5 | oath [1] 4/21 |
| 97/24 131/6 135/18 136/19 149/20 151/4 | 152/17 152/18 152/18 152/20 153/20 | object [23] 14/12 17/22 45/3 52/14 54/13 |
| 153/15 156/15 159/14 162/8 164/11 | 156/8 156/13 156/21 157/19 158/6 | 87/14 93/6 93/13 114/4 114/10 121/14 |
| 166/2 166/14 167/18 167/24 169/4 169/9 | 158/18 159/20 162/3 162/3 164/14 165/9 | 121/18 124/6 126/25 130/20 131/20 |
| 170/5 170/6 173/20 174/14 175/13 176/6 | 165/10 165/14 166/17 174/6 177/6 | 136/1 136/9 150/10 186/10 197/5 205/4 |
| 183/22 185/17 193/15 194/17 218/24 | 179/10 179/14 179/18 179/20 179/20 | 207/5 |
| 223/23 228/5 236/14 | 182/8 182/13 182/20 184/11 189/16 | objected [6] 41/3 87/10 128/8 130/7 |
| myself [1] 183/21 | 190/16 194/17 195/2 196/4 196/10 196/16 196/20 198/18 206/20 212/3 | 130/11 234/2 <br> objecting [2] 2/20 17/20 |

objection [32] 41/3 41/5 41/7 45/1 47/16 47/19 52/19 56/11 87/12 92/21 93/21 114/8 115/3 121/24 124/3 124/7 125/14 130/5 131/24 131/25 136/10 152/9 181/24 182/2 186/7 186/15 199/14 205/4 205/14 207/7 235/13 235/13
objections [5] 54/17 92/24 93/18 94/13 130/13
objective [2] 99/5 210/1
objectives [6] 46/3 178/25 212/10 214/10 214/12 214/14
objector [1] 131/21
objectors [4] 117/9 161/18 162/19 162/25
obligation [7] 15/24 16/9 227/22 230/14
230/17 231/10 231/16
obligations [16] 20/25 21/1 21/5 34/1
34/12 34/17 36/6 134/14 140/10 180/24
209/3 212/17 213/19 230/1 231/15
231/18
obsolete [1] 223/12
obtain [2] 62/21 135/21
obviously [10] 44/19 137/15 139/17
149/23 170/6 189/6 199/24 220/15 229/16 237/1
occasion [3] 119/18 150/3 150/5
occasional [1] 1/13
occasions [1] 138/1
occur [4] 106/17 135/3 164/18 189/10 occurred [2] 91/6 165/2
off [11] 13/10 13/15 39/15 94/18 112/12 139/14 141/5 144/10 151/10 207/13 210/24
offer [5] 3/18 166/15 201/16 210/7 211/13
offered [6] 3/20 28/13 52/18 125/25 233/22 233/22
offering [8] 94/20 94/21 114/25 126/2
126/3 127/3 180/5 180/10
offers [1] 199/2
office [5] 6/25 97/17 97/19 176/20 221/9
officer [8] 6/2 6/19 41/25 58/18 88/5 89/2 97/12 199/23
Officers [3] 86/5 86/7 88/9
officially [1] 191/19
officials [8] 5/15 5/15 5/18 6/15 8/18 11/13 164/4 164/6
offsets [1] 111/14
often [6] 63/1 76/21 77/2 77/11 110/5 205/9
oh [2] 84/23 118/13
okay [82] 6/11 6/23 8/11 9/3 9/6 9/7
10/12 11/6 15/9 18/12 18/17 19/19 20/15 20/24 21/22 23/4 23/23 27/17 28/3 28/14 28/19 29/17 32/19 32/20 38/5 40/8 41/10 46/7 48/12 48/25 51/16 52/24 57/18 59/15 61/22 62/15 63/16 63/19 63/24 64/9 64/19 65/1 66/11 66/16 67/10 67/13 67/23 68/15 70/12 78/2 78/9 81/11 91/25 101/1 111/18 113/1 115/16 115/19 117/19 118/6 118/13 119/11 124/21 133/22 138/13 139/6 142/25 144/17 146/4 146/13 147/8 153/2 153/24 154/19 155/7 160/8 165/22 166/16 187/24 197/12 199/16 199/20
old [2] 223/11 228/23
once [7] 47/22 103/4 127/5 169/6 175/18 212/15 225/2
one [80] 4/7 8/11 10/13 18/19 20/13 24/8 28/13 30/13 31/10 31/14 32/25 33/22 35/20 38/8 43/25 44/21 46/3 53/2 55/3 56/13 58/12 61/2 64/9 64/9 64/11 64/12

67/21 68/10 71/5 80/5 88/21 90/16 100/10 101/16 104/10 114/18 115/4 119/1 121/1 124/15 127/14 128/19 134/1 134/1 134/19 138/9 141/19 145/7 145/14 145/16 146/9 146/13 150/2 150/2 150/3 150/4 153/7 153/18 154/6 163/23 166/12 166/15 166/15 173/23 183/25 185/16 197/17 199/18 205/17 205/19 206/7 213/17 215/14 218/23 224/24 225/25 232/5 232/5 232/11 232/11 one percent [3] 145/7 145/14 145/16 ones [7] 18/19 38/24 64/15 67/4 67/5 161/21 169/15
ongoing [6] 3/16 4/5 31/11 90/18 106/19 219/16
only [30] $1 / 19$ 2/20 15/12 23/8 27/25 40/10 46/8 51/22 57/4 94/7 101/23 126/19 158/1 164/15 181/15 182/10 182/22 189/17 202/3 202/6 204/1 209/5 213/18 217/25 218/6 218/16 226/22 230/20 232/9 235/4
OPEB [2] 15/17 122/17
open [1] 176/24
opened [2] 92/10 93/5
opening [4] 92/2 92/4 93/4 118/7 openings [2] 114/16 114/18
operate [11] 103/13 105/16 107/14 110/4 168/22 184/3 185/15 187/3 187/18 203/13 213/9
operated [4] 217/8 220/12 222/25 231/9 operates [1] 110/16
operating [15] 6/2 31/12 41/25 83/21 84/3 88/5 89/2 90/18 196/4 198/23 202/4 206/10 216/24 217/2 217/10
operation [4] 59/1 99/17 105/13 175/18 operational [7] 25/7 43/25 85/7 99/6 100/20 169/23 185/5 operations [18] 33/11 90/21 99/16 99/24 100/25 101/3 106/24 107/4 107/8 142/10 157/14 174/18 178/8 187/21 206/24
208/21 219/14 222/23
operative [1] 234/8
operator [2] 219/14 220/23
opinion [13] 51/16 93/2 121/19 121/22
121/24 124/6 127/3 130/8 131/23 136/5
207/6 221/11 233/12
opinions [2] 131/23 234/19
opponent [1] 131/19
opportunity [1] 54/18
oppose [1] 94/9
opposing [1] 118/7
opposition [1] 26/20
option [1] 225/6
options [4] 11/20 12/12 190/10 198/14
orally [1] 63/11
order [20] 1/4 1/22 33/14 35/25 74/20
108/5 146/5 177/21 179/3 184/14 187/2
202/24 203/12 204/3 208/22 216/25
217/18 217/21 224/10 227/7
orderly [1] 92/22
ordinary [7] 168/22 184/3 185/15 196/7
197/17 207/15 230/24
organizations [3] 101/19 101/23 148/12
organized [1] 226/10
oriented [1] 187/13
original [5] 176/8 177/12 178/23 203/3 211/2
originally [2] 167/4 222/2
Orr [56] 5/14 6/17 6/25 7/2 7/5 7/8 7/14 7/18 8/18 23/7 23/18 23/19 25/16 27/25 29/15 30/7 31/15 39/22 40/2 63/11 65/11 92/14 94/22 123/16 126/4 126/9 126/13 126/14 126/20 127/9 132/12 132/17

132/25 133/4 136/7 138/1 138/5 138/19
139/7 154/16 154/20 154/24 155/4 155/8 155/19 155/23 156/2 156/8 158/17 159/18 164/5 164/16 165/2 200/24 203/5 225/1
Orr's [1] 95/2
other [88] 1/20 7/15 15/6 15/18 22/1 22/10 24/19 24/19 27/8 39/2 41/11 44/8 44/20 47/10 52/15 55/15 60/18 60/21 60/24 61/2 61/4 61/17 64/14 64/16 64/19 65/2 71/4 73/7 76/1 80/6 81/22 84/8 84/11 84/15 86/1 89/13 90/4 93/18 98/1 102/1 103/14 111/10 123/14 126/6 128/20 133/16 135/21 138/12 139/1 139/16 142/19 145/19 146/21 147/2 147/5 148/12 153/6 155/14 157/1 157/8 159/23 161/17 163/13 164/5 164/13 168/8 170/14 178/25 183/10 183/18 192/2 198/14 204/5 205/15 211/6 212/25 219/5 219/20 219/20 221/13 224/9 225/15 227/19 228/2 228/23 230/5 231/13 231/17
others [12] 19/23 61/8 61/9 99/22 107/3 108/7 114/20 148/11 181/21 222/25 223/2 227/4
otherwise [4] 55/19 132/18 200/7 200/9 our [105] 1/15 6/21 7/2 8/9 18/14 31/9 55/3 55/4 55/17 57/23 64/22 70/17 71/16 71/21 71/22 73/3 73/3 73/13 75/10 75/12 75/12 76/12 81/1 92/11 92/19 98/1 102/9 104/4 112/18 115/25 117/5 117/10 118/22 132/4 143/5 151/8 152/7 153/15 168/5 168/13 168/16 169/4 169/5 169/5 170/15 172/5 173/25 177/2 177/8 178/2 182/9 182/23 182/24 183/5 183/24 187/10 187/20 188/17 189/5 190/3 195/4 198/2 202/15 202/23 203/11 204/22 209/7 209/9 209/23 209/25 209/25 210/1 210/20 211/2 211/9 211/11 211/13 211/16 212/22 213/24 213/25 214/1 215/1 215/7 215/15 215/17 215/18 215/20 217/1 220/8 221/19 223/18 224/18 225/8 226/1 226/8 226/9 226/21 227/23 228/2 228/16 231/18 232/14 234/4 236/22
ourselves [2] 190/23 204/21
out [58] 3/18 22/12 23/2 27/21 35/3 37/12 37/15 39/5 52/21 59/19 71/18 71/20
71/21 72/2 73/25 80/20 80/22 95/17 97/17 97/19 107/16 108/3 108/19 110/14 110/21 120/19 125/15 134/10 157/1 161/23 170/5 170/12 171/24 173/24 181/2 182/6 187/4 189/21 189/24 190/7 190/19 192/18 194/6 195/21 199/18 202/23 204/9 206/14 206/20 210/4 212/20 213/4 214/12 215/14 215/15 219/14 223/21 232/6
out-of-court [1] 125/15
outcome [1] 178/19
outside [15] 29/21 30/1 56/6 91/24 100/18 101/19 101/23 107/12 113/25 134/22 135/3 161/16 177/8 197/25 199/7 outstanding [10] 21/4 21/6 21/16 34/1 34/12 34/16 34/21 35/1 35/12 36/5 over [43] 4/17 5/11 9/20 10/7 11/15 12/11 14/13 17/3 17/14 17/15 20/12 49/6 77/1 78/20 91/8 101/16 103/13 108/19 109/15 110/11 111/4 112/7 113/19 115/11 115/12 142/14 143/8 145/5 145/7 145/14 146/13 156/17 156/19 169/13 173/25 194/4 210/15 210/16 224/5 229/8 229/13 229/15 234/23
overall [1] 204/22
overcome [1] 216/14
overlaps [1] 236/1
overnight [1] 217/17
overrule [1] 115/3
overruled [7] 47/20 121/23 124/7 131/25
136/11 186/15 207/7
oversight [3] 169/10 174/20 175/15 owe [1] 131/19
owed [3] 21/11 147/12 208/25
own [9] 56/5 82/16 83/2 83/3 155/25
212/8 218/7 220/10 225/7
owned [4] 33/10 217/5 217/5 222/1
owner [1] 199/23
owners [1] 37/4
ownership [1] 217/7
owns [3] 219/4 219/4 222/24

## P

p.m [3] 116/20 116/20 195/9
page [72] 14/11 19/19 19/21 20/4 23/24 28/3 29/2 29/17 29/17 30/5 30/14 31/21
34/5 34/6 34/6 34/7 34/7 41/20 56/17
62/9 66/13 66/14 67/13 70/1 70/3 80/21 81/21 83/8 85/2 87/24 88/21 88/21 88/23 120/24 121/1 121/3 121/5 121/5 122/4 127/14 128/4 131/1 132/3 143/25 144/1 144/22 144/25 147/19 147/20 149/6 149/8 149/9 149/15 149/16 150/1 152/19 152/22 152/25 153/8 161/7 161/8 161/9 176/14 176/22 196/24 198/23 198/23 203/20 213/15 214/3 218/12 220/3
pages [8] 32/22 33/8 33/13 102/22
102/25 121/8 216/8 225/20
paid [5] 169/24 170/11 203/8 221/14 221/23
pairs [1] 217/11
panel [1] 98/24
paper [1] 234/17
paragraph [4] 9/13 9/17 23/25 87/8 paraphrased [1] 152/3
parcels [2] 222/7 222/20
pardon [3] 181/4 205/18 223/25
pari [2] 216/2 231/17
park [6] 33/9 167/2 219/2 219/17 219/18 219/18
parking [7] 15/20 33/10 99/23 112/11 112/11 222/23 223/2
part [44] 15/21 19/6 19/22 21/14 25/3 25/19 28/2 43/21 44/2 44/10 45/4 46/3
47/10 47/12 49/23 50/21 54/16 71/1 72/7 72/8 72/10 72/13 72/18 77/13 78/9 80/23 85/16 109/5 112/23 115/20 115/25 120/11 122/3 131/6 137/5 144/17 145/9
149/18 152/13 178/23 180/20 220/21 221/14 234/4
participants [2] 164/2 164/13
participate [2] 42/13 231/25
participated [1] 88/13
participating [2] 9/23 88/15
participation [1] 185/21
particular [22] 17/2 18/10 19/16 19/18
64/25 68/14 71/10 78/17 92/12 101/1
114/18 120/21 128/10 133/23 162/10
170/15 171/8 179/18 181/12 190/15 190/18 195/20
particularly [5] 27/9 180/24 190/25
191/22 211/7
parties [13] 1/20 2/20 42/5 63/2 113/25
118/7 135/3 158/20 158/22 185/18
186/20 203/2 213/23
parties' [1] 3/8
partner [1] 167/24
partners [2] 218/24 228/5
parts [4] 120/10 152/4 200/11 222/10
party [3] 131/19 159/13 199/2
passed [1] 59/18
passu [2] 216/2 231/17
past [9] 12/11 36/5 43/13 93/15 101/18
106/13 113/23 143/9 216/2
Patek [2] 86/4 166/10
patience [1] 119/4
pause [2] 140/18 195/3
pay [13] 24/17 29/13 31/19 31/24 114/20 143/6 206/3 206/19 213/19 219/1 223/8 230/15 231/7
payables [1] 206/15
payers [1] 34/12
paying [7] 22/15 168/6 170/4 171/21
206/16 208/24 214/1
payment [12] 104/23 107/18 202/5 203/1
203/22 203/24 204/2 218/2 218/2 224/8 225/3 225/10
payments [9] 104/25 108/6 108/8 108/10
203/15 203/21 206/21 224/3 224/10
payroll [1] 180/25
PDF [1] 1/9
pension [63] 11/23 15/17 15/23 16/2 16/8 62/23 92/8 92/17 93/23 94/11 122/17 122/25 123/2 123/3 125/10 126/6 129/25 131/6 132/13 134/14 135/18 135/22 137/5 138/7 140/4 140/8 140/9 141/15 146/21 147/21 148/7 149/18 149/19 150/7 150/20 151/9 152/16 155/2 155/13 156/11 156/19 156/23 156/25 160/11 160/24 160/25 161/4 161/10 161/13
161/19 161/24 162/4 162/9 162/15
162/22 163/1 163/6 163/9 192/20 211/7 226/12 228/3 231/19
pensions [7] 62/1 124/18 124/24 147/12 154/17 162/2 162/7
people [20] 8/6 44/8 44/23 44/23 44/25
59/12 60/3 78/7 101/22 108/17 113/22
117/11 147/12 157/8 157/15 157/16
170/14 197/24 224/5 227/25
people's [1] 113/10
per [3] 145/16 146/5 158/2
percent [19] 15/12 108/24 128/1 129/20
129/21 144/5 144/6 144/10 144/12 145/7
145/14 145/16 146/5 146/13 162/11
186/25 219/7 227/14 232/10
percentage [5] 67/24 68/6 68/7 68/12
127/23
perception [1] 45/10
percipient [3] 235/5 235/9 235/10
Perella [1] 167/22
perfectly [1] 117/15
perform [4] 97/25 99/15 110/12 112/20 performance [3] 101/10 101/12 189/24 performed [2] 110/19 112/21
performing [3] 101/15 101/24 112/16 perhaps [8] 2/23 105/13 118/19 152/1
153/7 164/22 187/17 229/12
period [23] 8/12 12/4 12/18 20/19 24/25 25/15 78/20 86/16 88/10 102/7 103/13
111/5 111/5 113/17 113/18 133/19 147/7
177/5 184/12 189/23 196/5 197/7 202/16 permanent [2] 11/19 70/22
permit [2] 14/18 41/17
person [12] 24/11 94/2 98/24 134/24
138/22 138/23 138/25 139/2 139/3 139/5 234/17 235/19
personal [10] 25/5 39/23 76/3 76/7 78/2
79/6 169/2 169/4 170/7 170/7
personally [3] 72/4 184/19 225/23
personnel [2] 76/2 76/4
persons [1] 148/8
perspective [2] 185/3 233/3
Peter [1] 58/6
petition [2] 162/24 165/3
pew [1] 9/18
ph [2] 6/19 154/4
phase [1] 187/12
phone [1] 183/20
phrase [4] 109/8 122/8 217/21 229/5
pick [3] 17/23 215/14 217/17
picture [3] 189/20 190/7 190/9
piece [3] 74/6 118/19 234/16
Pierce [1] 193/23
pilot [1] 218/2
pitch [1] 44/10
place [3] 64/15 150/6 225/9
placed [1] 135/8
plan [41] $3 / 114 / 5$ 9/21 10/3 11/9 11/11
11/17 11/25 12/6 12/9 19/9 19/13 19/15
21/23 21/25 101/11 103/10 103/11
103/12 103/22 104/4 104/5 104/11 109/6 111/7 120/17 123/3 129/25 138/7 148/17 162/14 162/18 162/25 174/19 198/23 210/8 210/15 211/10 215/21 228/16 233/1
plan's [1] 92/18
plane [1] 194/17
planned [3] 22/3 22/19 111/23
planning [2] 189/10 201/21
plans [7] 4/1 12/3 148/2 160/24 161/10 163/6 232/17
plaque [1] 18/19
play [1] 212/12
please[51] 17/5 18/13 18/24 27/13 34/6 40/19 41/20 45/8 48/3 54/6 56/17 58/4 65/24 66/7 83/9 83/24 87/4 87/25 93/16 95/7 95/10 95/15 98/22 110/1 114/7 116/16 119/25 121/17 124/4 124/8 127/14 128/4 129/1 132/3 135/6 149/6 161/6 161/7 161/8 166/10 166/20 167/1 171/14 180/8 195/5 195/11 196/25 205/20 219/3 220/3 237/6
Pleasure [1] 160/1
pledge [3] 207/17 230/4 230/13
plus [2] 35/2 180/18
POC [3] 202/6 203/20 213/20
point [32] 6/15 7/21 11/25 31/23 34/10
42/18 47/25 54/15 56/2 57/9 69/5 91/23
115/1 116/13 129/14 141/7 144/1 147/20
147/24 148/6 154/3 177/23 183/17
187/24 199/17 200/8 203/2 205/1 215/12 225/4 233/10 236/9
pointless [1] 184/4
points [2] 229/13 229/15
police [9] 16/3 86/5 86/6 86/7 88/9 88/18
101/6 135/13 212/2
policy [2] 31/17 190/21
policymakers [1] 209/23
pooling [1] 90/5
population [1] 211/19
portion [4] 102/18 173/19 219/6 221/22
portions [1] 112/11
pose [2] 29/3 125/14
position [20] 8/16 11/15 22/12 58/22
78/13 151/16 154/16 154/21 155/2 155/9
155/22 156/3 184/1 189/2 196/3 204/1
204/7 209/15 224/7 225/7
positioned [1] 136/16
positions [1] 226/23
possibilities [2] 223/15 223/15
possibility [4] 143/1 188/5 207/2 213/2
possible [6] 54/24 176/18 190/4 206/21

| $P$ | 188/18 212/7 | property [36] 34/20 36/21 36/24 37/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| possible... [2] 215/2 215/10 | printed [1] 1/9 | 73/5 73/11 74/3 76/8 84/7 84/17 107/2 |
| post [4] 96/5 146/22 147/13 215/24 | prior [18] 1/18 16/25 21/3 36/11 69/2 | 107/10 107/14 107/25 108/1 108/9 109/1 |
| post-graduate [1] 96/5 | 137/12 139/24 162/24 164/18 167/16 | 109/3 109/4 110/14 113/8 181/11 181/12 |
| potential [5] 24/5 104/9 116/1 116/5 | 167/18 180/11 207/19 219/5 223/18 | 190/25 202/1 222/10 222/13 231/3 231/4 |
| 212/6 | 224/16 225/9 233/22 | proposal [47] 32/15 39/4 39/10 39/12 |
| potentially [5] 104/20 105/12 107/5 | prioritization [1] 175/8 | 39/14 59/8 65/22 69/24 100/9 102/9 |
| 204/17 218/9 | private [2] 218/5 219/24 | 102/15 106/21 119/23 120/19 134/22 |
| Power [1] 169/15 | privatization [1] 218/3 | 142/6 142/7 142/8 143/15 144/18 147/16 |
| PowerPoint [1] 118/17 | privilege [14] 139/12 139/15 140/1 | 162/9 162/14 163/7 164/18 165/3 165/7 |
| practice [2] 97/22 167/24 | 140/11 140/23 140/24 140/25 141/6 | 171/11 208/8 208/12 209/16 210/4 |
| pre [4] 54/16 54/20 162/24 233/22 | 149/1 151/10 151/15 153/19 154/3 | 210/10 212/13 214/22 215/12 224/1 |
| Pre-petition [1] 162/24 | 165/21 | 225/12 225/19 225/21 226/8 226/24 |
| pre-trial [3] 54/16 54/20 233/22 | privileged [1] | 227/15 229/2 232/2 232/11 232/17 |
| precarious [1] 78/13 | pro [4] 99/11 100/5 173/9 215/19 | proposals [4] 161/17 164/2 225/15 |
| precedent [1] 230/7 | probability [2] 206/23 218/11 | 226/18 |
| precisely [1] 212/8 | probably [10] 18/20 35/21 70/4 70/15 | propose [1] 52/19 |
| predicate [1] 62/25 | 98/3 146/9 150/3 171/23 183/21 190/2 | proposed [4] 160/23 161/1 164/12 215/17 |
| predictable [1] 181/16 | probed [1] 55/5 | proposition [1] 214/23 |
| predictions [1] 190/16 | problem [8] 108/15 141/3 166/17 168/20 | protect [4] 140/9 182/22 188/25 191/23 |
| predominantly [4] 11/16 12/14 22/14 | 183/4 202/12 213/22 220/5 | protecting [2] 188/15 225/7 |
| 81/25 | problems [7] 89/20 89/22 90/6 90/7 90/13 | protection [1] 185/21 |
| prefer [1] 236/12 | 170/4 204/24 | protective [1] 220/25 |
| prefix [1] 28/18 | procedure [2] 59/15 59/20 | protects [2] 152/16 182/24 |
| prejudice [1] 55/20 | proceed [9] 2/22 4/11 47/25 69/12 119/13 | prove [2] 26/2 26/17 |
| prejudicial [1] 55/23 | 119/14 195/13 201/17 216/16 | provide [14] 94/16 106/1 125/16 169/1 |
| preliminary [5] 58/12 145/1 147/25 | proceeding [3] 1/6 1/20 94/4 | 171/17 174/17 182/7 182/18 182/25 |
| 185/12 221/24 | proceeds [6] 31/5 32/7 71/6 72/3 90/16 | 192/7 194/10 196/12 203/14 215/1 |
| premature [2] 156/18 156/19 | 180/5 | provided [5] 43/13 89/7 150/16 175/10 |
| preparation [1] | process [25] 1/7 2/18 16/13 16/14 22/11 | 179/25 |
| prepare [3] 2/22 51/8 103 | 24/6 37/16 54/16 71/14 80/23 108/1 | providers [1] 185/20 |
| prepared [11] 49/22 51/5 53/23 63/13 | 108/5 155/16 155/18 155/20 156/4 | providing [2] 7/25 182/9 |
| 116/13 117/15 117/18 135/15 200/4 | 156/12 161/1 170/21 177/25 191/18 | proving [1] 117/11 |
| 201/16 233/17 | 218/10 219/25 221/3 223/1 | provision [3] 149/22 152/15 161/11 |
| prescheduled [1] 64/17 | produce [2] 3/21 18/12 | provisions [1] 140/8 |
| presence [5] 26/12 26/21 65/12 91/24 | produced [3] 141/12 141/15 151/21 | proximate [1] 121/12 |
| 151/12 | production [2] 55/13 141/21 | proxy [1] 77/6 |
| present [23] 39/18 42/16 47/21 50/2 60/1 | professional [5] 24/12 96/10 96/17 96/20 | public[22] 96/19 96/24 97/4 98/9 101/4 |
| 65/2 65/5 66/24 119/22 120/16 139/1 | 97/2 | 101/5 102/4 102/10 102/23 103/3 106/10 |
| 139/19 153/16 158/7 158/13 158/13 | professionals [9] 7/15 7/19 12/8 23/16 | 106/12 106/19 106/22 113/8 169/12 |
| 158/16 159/4 159/7 185/23 193/11 | 24/5 25/17 55/15 184/21 197/25 | 170/22 171/2 179/19 217/23 221/12 |
| 195/13 226/15 | proffer [1] 94/23 | 225/12 |
| presentation [25] 27/5 27/8 27/21 27/24 | proffered [2] 94/ | publicly [5] 98/7 104/16 104/18 210/11 |
| 28/1 28/4 29/24 30/5 30/6 30/22 31/16 | profile [4] 24/24 25 | 211/3 |
| 33/12 34/4 34/8 47/13 59/7 109/24 | profit [1] 217/9 | Puerto [2] 98/9 98/18 |
| 118/17 120/5 120/6 120/9 120/10 134/12 | program [27] 35/21 35/24 36/17 96/15 | pull [2] 17/21 121/16 |
| 161/16 163/3 | 142/14 170/17 172/3 173/2 173/9 173/22 | pure[2] 15/6 47/8 |
| presentations [4] 30/3 61/6 161/17 | 174/5 174/15 174/25 175/4 175/18 | purports [1] 214/9 |
| $194 / 13$ | 176/20 176/21 177/4 177/9 179/13 | purpose [18] 1/19 49/13 53/23 62/4 95/1 |
| presented [17] 28/2 29/7 29/14 39/5 | 183/13 184/11 184/17 193/18 210/19 | 106/14 114/24 115/3 119/21 119/22 |
| 53/20 53/21 63/12 64/5 65/2 148/11 | 212/6 232/20 | 134/9 134/10 172/22 176/5 193/4 200/14 |
| 161/17 162/18 162/22 162/25 192/23 | progress [6] 22/25 174/24 177/18 179/13 | 221/13 223/7 |
| 196/14 225/13 | 195/18 214/17 | purposes [5] 47/8 126/19 129/16 136/12 |
| presenters [1] 61/19 | progressed [1] 221 | 200/16 |
| presenting [5] 27/9 30/4 60/3 60/9 166/3 preserve [7] 10/10 11/14 12/13 187/3 | project [5] 35/12 98/16 196/17 209/5 230/21 | pursuant [4] 171/16 177/22 181/18 |
| \|202/25 204/4 204/6 | projected [4] 49/2 49/19 145/20 202/18 | pursue [1] 120/18 |
| presided [1] 234/23 | projecting [2] 142/13 145/6 | push [1] 188/11 |
| president [3] 9/17 9/18 167/13 | projection [1] 144/17 | put [33] 14/10 17/5 19/18 20/13 25/9 |
| press [4] 130/12 131/24 153/14 236/11 | projections [14] 2/13 144/19 147/3 163/4 | 27/13 55/17 79/12 83/5 102/8 102/13 |
| pressures [1] 168/18 | 195/17 195/20 196/6 196/14 196/21 | 102/14 109/6 119/25 123/15 127/14 |
| presumably [3] 68/13 68/14 125/15 | 199/11 201/6 201/17 204/1 211/5 | 128/4 130/25 135/5 146/11 148/16 |
| presumption [1] 182/20 | projects [1] 183/14 | 148/20 151/16 152/2 154/7 161/6 171/4 |
| pretty [6] 27/13 40/2 71/16 79/10 100/24 $162 / 8$ | promised [1] 171/17 <br> promises [2] 227/3 227/6 | 171/6 171/24 180/11 194/5 210/13 225/18 |
| prevent [2] 55/18 237/1 | promote [2] 29/13 226/17 | putting[4] 19/7 146/16 210/4 223/1 |
| previous [3] 90/24 128/18 212/11 previously [2] 4/2 161/12 | promoting [1] 178/15 proof [2] 235/15 235/20 | Q |
| price [1] 142/14 | proper [5] 1/13 11/3 54/8 197/7 209/6 | quadrant [1] 152/7 |
| primarily [4] 95/25 97/24 227/18 228/3 primary [12] 99/5 99/23 106/13 107/1 | properly [2] 153/16 209/15 <br> properties [5] 113/2 113/3 113/4 113/14 | qualifications [5] 96/23 172/6 192/5 192/7 194/6 |
| 181/9 183/25 184/6 184/18 188/17 |  | qualified [4] 94/5 94/16 205/16 235/2 |

## Q

qualitative [1] 194/8
quality [1] 186/23
quantification [1] 50/7
quantifies [1] 144/4
quantify [1] 71/19
quarter [3] 142/18 142/22 142/23
quartered [2] 97/15 97/16
quarterly [1] 181/13
question [74] 8/3 14/17 14/24 15/1 15/8
17/1 17/4 22/8 22/17 22/18 22/22 25/4 26/4 26/7 30/13 31/14 33/12 38/4 41/6 44/19 45/6 45/8 45/16 45/17 49/8 54/8 57/4 57/6 58/12 59/17 60/10 63/21 67/16 75/7 75/22 78/16 79/22 87/13 87/17 87/18 88/22 105/21 114/9 115/4 115/13 121/21 124/9 124/22 127/4 127/8 132/22 134/19 140/6 140/19 140/19 141/11 149/20 150/11 152/5 152/11 152/12 152/14 152/17 152/19 153/4 153/15 162/8 164/11 181/25 201/14 205/10 214/5 216/10 235/15
questioned [1] 89/18
questioning [2] 65/8 134/20
questions [41] 33/19 40/20 50/25 59/12
68/20 68/22 69/1 70/2 75/19 85/22 86/1 86/9 86/12 89/13 90/10 91/12 91/16 120/21 130/18 130/23 134/15 136/14 139/14 140/24 141/5 141/11 141/24 142/5 148/23 149/17 153/25 159/23 160/5 163/12 163/14 163/20 164/15 165/11 197/11 233/13 236/6
quick [1] 32/13
quicker [1] 108/9
quickly [3] 109/4 133/15 183/13
quid [1] 173/9
quiet [1] 93/10
quite [8] 101/7 141/24 168/15 193/6
193/8 200/1 202/19 222/3
quo [1] 173/9
R
raise [10] 24/17 91/23 143/6 173/1 184/16 207/21 217/14 230/14 230/24 231/6
raised [8] 55/5 69/22 93/15 126/2 165/20 167/6 167/7 236/23
raiser's [1] 206/11
raising [1] 207/20
random [1] 50/24
range [2] 35/23 192/8
rank [1] 125/17
rare [2] 234/14 235/9
rarely [1] 235/4
rata [1] 215/19
rate [11] 129/19 129/19 129/21 133/8
146/2 146/10 157/10 157/11 185/20
217/10 229/9
rated [1] 229/16
rates [5] 81/1 217/14 218/7 228/23 231/7
rather [2] 129/10 233/17
rating [3] 228/20 228/25 229/7
ratings [2] 203/3 224/25
razor's [1] 202/4
reach [1] 152/13
reached [5] 48/23 57/12 87/2 150/20 151/3
reacting [1] 233/14
read [12] 2/10 4/16 10/22 19/3 56/21 59/19 118/4 118/10 149/3 167/19 176/17 237/3
readily [2] 204/14 208/1
reading [1] 153/3
readmitted [1] 181/18
ready [3] 141/24 142/2 219/10
real [6] 32/13 188/10 196/17 204/16
210/25 235/20
realistic [2] 189/23 210/13
realization [1] 33/4
realize [2] 202/23 217/22
realized [5] 90/23 187/23 202/2 219/12
222/22
realizing [1] 221/1
really [25] 62/13 85/6 100/15 132/17
136/7 165/18 172/24 174/16 177/7
178/20 183/1 189/18 190/16 204/13
204/20 204/22 210/11 210/23 210/25
211/5 212/16 217/3 217/25 232/7 235/12
realtime [7] 1/4 1/8 1/8 1/12 1/18 234/9 234/16
rear [1] 16/3
reason [9] 20/5 52/15 62/11 71/22 105/24
120/13 120/15 126/23 212/25
reasonable [2] 174/20 200/25
reasonableness [1] 201/1
reasonably [1] 209/13
reasons [6] 55/19 85/9 93/14 153/6
185/16 234/6
rebates [3] 157/24 157/24 158/4
rebirth [1] 208/23
rebut [1] 126/3
recall [84] 7/23 8/5 9/23 12/18 12/24 13/1
16/16 22/23 24/2 25/21 26/19 26/23 29/7 29/9 29/10 29/12 29/14 30/3 30/7 30/10
30/12 30/21 31/1 31/2 31/15 32/1 34/3
39/11 39/15 43/4 45/23 46/13 46/18
49/15 50/5 53/22 57/10 57/16 59/21
59/23 61/7 61/8 61/9 61/11 62/2 63/13
64/7 64/12 67/1 67/18 67/20 72/18 76/5
76/7 76/16 77/2 77/4 77/10 77/16 77/18
78/2 78/17 78/23 78/24 79/2 86/20 88/17
89/5 93/16 102/21 117/3 117/12 120/22
134/6 134/19 138/3 139/4 150/4 154/17
155/10 155/11 155/19 177/25 193/20 receipts [25] 70/21 71/4 71/17 71/23
74/23 80/6 80/7 82/2 82/3 82/7 82/11 82/13 82/17 82/21 83/9 83/21 84/4 84/6 85/7 85/19 89/25 90/8 90/20 108/6 197/6 receive [10] 1/8 76/21 111/12 126/19 159/5 159/7 164/3 215/17 229/18 232/2 received [17] 2/10 77/14 77/20 79/9 81/2 108/8 108/10 124/19 131/6 131/8 131/9 144/7 201/24 211/11 217/6 223/13 232/5 receives [3] 70/24 84/13 113/12 receiving [3] 76/24 77/3 104/22
recent [2] 207/14 230/11
recently [2] 37/11 98/8
recess [6] 57/23 57/25 116/18 195/4 195/7 237/11
recite [1] 135/25
recognize [9] 34/7 41/21 49/12 53/11
87/5 87/25 88/24 217/24 218/8
recognized [2] 211/14 231/14
recognizes [3] 52/9 52/10 53/9
recollection [32] $11 / 2$ 11/4 11/5 14/9 14/9
14/14 14/18 14/19 30/11 31/22 46/24
47/6 47/9 47/20 47/23 48/11 49/1 49/7
52/10 52/16 54/2 55/10 56/4 56/12 56/17
56/24 57/3 57/5 61/15 61/21 64/25 65/20 recommend [4] 102/6 112/6 113/3 192/4 recommendation [5] 103/17 103/20 202/24 204/22 221/19
recommendations [11] 102/3 102/19 102/23 112/18 114/15 168/20 182/20 197/21 198/8 198/11 234/23
recommended [4] 112/4 189/7 190/2
219/13
reconsider [1] 2/23
reconsidered [1] 69/6
reconvene [2] 116/16 236/20
record [14] 41/14 47/24 48/4 56/8 65/9
118/4 118/11 123/20 136/20 143/18
152/12 167/1 200/3 202/19
recorded [1] 83/23
records [1] 36/1
recourse [1] 68/18
recover [2] 217/9 218/7
recoveries [2] 46/21 215/18
recovery [4] 21/22 21/25 228/21 232/10
redevelopment [2] 222/5 222/12
redirect [2] 89/14 165/13
redo [2] 141/7 141/8
reduce [1] 16/18
reduced [1] 110/6
reducing [1] 110/8
reduction [7] 20/24 31/24 143/10 144/5
144/6 144/12 146/20
reductions [2] 11/20 147/10
refer [2] 9/1 161/5
reference [4] 9/16 15/8 20/14 33/6
referred [7] 20/11 102/16 110/13 111/22
119/23 172/19 176/1
referring [10] 19/15 21/4 21/25 43/5 43/6
100/14 106/9 122/9 157/20 161/11
refers [2] 110/3 229/7
refinancing [2] 72/3 81/6
refinancings [1] 43/24
refine [1] 160/16
reflect [4] 91/5 162/4 214/9 214/10
reflected [6] 79/8 84/22 84/23 91/3 174/10 214/15
reflecting [1] 229/16
reflects [2] 84/19 215/12
reform [14] 173/2 173/9 173/12 173/22
174/15 174/25 175/4 175/23 176/21 177/8 179/13 183/12 184/11 192/20 reforms [2] 178/16 179/8 refrained [1] 201/13 refresh [18] 11/1 11/3 14/19 30/11 31/22
46/21 47/5 47/20 49/1 52/9 54/2 55/10
56/4 56/12 56/16 56/24 57/5 183/5
refreshes [1] 14/18
refreshing [3] 47/9 48/11 52/15
refused [1] 50/19
regard [9] 3/2 103/7 105/7 106/7 106/23
108/14 117/1 132/15 209/2
regarding [7] 30/17 120/18 132/13
134/12 146/12 162/7 236/22
regional [6] 104/10 104/13 104/20 104/22
105/23 105/25
regular [5] 77/5 77/14 80/4 137/24
218/17
regularly [3] 79/10 155/4 202/17
regulation [1] 192/20
rehabilitation [2] 212/18 214/11
reinvesting [1] 212/18
reinvestment [19] 109/20 111/6 111/18
111/21 111/22 112/3 112/9 112/24
114/16 115/9 115/14 115/18 120/18
142/9 142/16 146/18 210/15 218/20 232/20
reinvestments [1] 218/22
rejuvenation [1] 208/24
relate [4] 81/18 108/24 111/23 128/2
related [31] 11/23 11/24 17/4 22/14 48/18 63/22 71/2 71/5 71/6 73/6 76/4 76/8 78/25 79/13 79/16 81/20 93/5 98/18
99/16 102/10 102/23 106/21 122/24

## R

related... [8] 131/16 134/13 141/15 161/9 161/12 164/17 184/8 203/21
relates [5] 106/18 107/10 107/24 161/24 163/23
relating [8] 48/16 77/11 78/4 79/7 81/13
102/4 141/24 165/6
relation [4] 132/12 140/1 140/3 177/18
relationship [3] 171/9 183/18 224/21
relationships [3] 170/13 170/17 227/25
relative [2] 194/9 226/23
relaying [1] 138/19
release [3] 179/4 181/5 211/10
released [2] 177/15 177/22
relevance [1] 54/14
relevant [3] 55/19 102/2 180/21
reliability [2] 114/22 127/10
reliable [2] 92/15 126/24
reliance [4] 127/6 127/7 191/13 201/2
relied [10] 199/6 200/15 206/6 206/9
210/11 211/2 211/8 226/5 235/16 235/21
relies [1] 181/9
rely [9] 72/2 94/7 191/8 191/10 197/25
199/23 202/20 209/24 227/1
relying [4] 185/7 233/18 233/18 233/19
remain [2] 93/10 179/8
remained [1] 137/14
remedies [2] 186/21 213/24
remedy [1] 140/21
remedying [1] 206/24
remember [20] 7/16 14/5 15/1 31/7 38/12
38/25 48/21 51/11 59/8 67/4 74/5 76/10
114/18 133/24 134/15 134/18 134/23 155/8 163/24 201/24
removal [10] 112/23 113/2 113/3 113/18
113/22 113/24 114/1 115/8 179/19 212/2
remove [2] 113/14 222/16
Renaissance [2] 36/20 36/25
rendered [1] 94/6
renew [1] 205/13
renewal [1] 210/18
rent [1] 219/7
reorganizations [1] 192/16
repaid [1] 230/25
repeat [1] 2/8
repeatedly [1] 35/24
rephrase [2] 45/7 45/16
replace [1] 106/16
report [17] 6/15 6/17 8/2 8/7 17/9 17/13
19/16 19/18 19/19 94/6 127/16 131/9
135/12 145/10 206/17 214/14 223/17
reported [2] 5/15 84/17
reporter's [1] 1/13
reporting [7] 6/14 6/17 6/18 6/20 6/24 7/3 175/17
reports [22] 73/17 73/19 73/20 73/21
74/13 74/14 74/15 74/16 75/5 75/8 75/9
75/11 75/12 75/15 75/25 77/22 77/23
80/2 80/16 80/17 92/17 92/18
represent [3] 69/16 86/4 147/13
representation [1] 132/12
representatives [16] 39/17 39/17 42/8
44/20 45/12 49/24 50/3 50/11 57/11
64/21 66/24 67/2 67/16 134/4 226/13
231/24
represented [3] 72/24 193/4 222/10
representing [5] 86/19 126/6 127/20
134/19 148/12
represents [2] 180/19 186/25
reps [1] 57/1
request [10] 4/15 49/23 100/8 106/21 139/21 141/25 142/1 171/11 171/24

236/25
require [8] 4/4 172/1 192/8 209/9 218/19 219/21 221/3 222/15
required [8] 169/8 174/17 178/23 179/3
189/17 192/5 208/4 230/24
requirement [2] 29/22 207/12
requirements [1] 176/8
requires [1] 199/4
requiring [2] 177/20 199/2
rerefresh [1] 14/8
research [2] 117/4 153/16
reserve [3] 68/25 181/1 202/24
reserved [1] 69/3
reserves [1] 181/3
reside [1] 167/2
residence [1] 116/9
residential [4] 109/7 109/13 113/4 113/14
residents [4] 106/1 108/6 116/2 146/3
resistance [1] 227/12
resolution [1] 236/5
resolve [2] 10/3 165/20
resource [1] 190/23
resources [6] 107/17 108/4 190/11
193/17 227/5 227/6
respect [46] 12/3 15/16 22/20 36/5 44/10
47/14 54/25 57/2 62/9 73/8 78/15 82/20
90/18 91/2 109/20 117/23 124/2 138/6
139/10 139/15 140/7 141/10 141/11
142/6 142/8 142/19 144/19 147/25 150/8
151/8 151/12 151/13 155/1 156/4 156/6
156/11 156/23 161/18 190/25 199/10
201/21 203/23 216/18 220/6 223/14
225/25
respectfully [1] 4/15
respective [1] 184/25
respond [2] 4/16 153/23
responded [1] 100/11
responds [1] 150/10
response [5] 8/1 153/15 221/5 226/1 228/7
responsibilities [2] 178/5 188/3
responsibility [10] 16/9 71/11 72/5 174/9
174/14 178/22 179/7 184/6 184/18 228/1
responsible [2] 72/16 227/18
responsive [3] 22/21 73/9 232/7
rest [5] 7/19 30/8 147/9 177/15 192/13
restate [1] 124/8
restoration [1] 179/19
restore [1] 212/1
restrictions [1] 98/7
Restruction [1] 168/11
restructuring [49] 19/9 19/12 19/15 23/17
23/19 23/22 95/25 97/25 100/9 100/13
100/15 100/21 102/11 109/19 110/2
110/3 110/15 111/6 111/9 114/16 115/9
115/14 120/18 123/14 124/14 142/19
146/18 160/24 167/18 167/21 167/23
168/3 171/18 172/2 176/16 176/16
176/19 178/6 184/20 188/4 197/14
198/12 201/22 209/16 210/9 214/11 215/20 215/25 220/22
restructurings [3] 169/14 169/19 192/18
result [11] 10/12 89/5 110/10 111/15
111/16 173/25 182/22 189/1 194/23 208/23 212/23
resulted [4] 11/16 86/23 89/7 114/15
results [1] 138/19
resume [3] 4/20 195/5 236/12
retain [3] 176/19 202/15 228/25
retained [9] 23/8 23/8 23/9 23/24 125/18
125/20 125/22 177/16 191/20
retake [1] 151/19
retention [1] 177/2
retired [5] 37/12 46/9 46/16 148/8 226/14
retiree [10] 4/14 18/7 28/11 39/17 48/23
52/8 54/3 61/6 62/17 160/25
retirees [15] 46/14 48/16 48/21 49/3 55/1
55/9 56/20 57/2 57/13 61/17 61/20 61/20
69/17 148/13 228/3
retireey [1] 162/10
retirement [16] 16/4 61/16 61/17 62/8 118/12 119/10 127/17 127/19 128/21 131/9 131/11 131/16 135/13 146/22 147/13 148/2
return [2] 104/23 116/23
revenue [49] 12/17 12/19 13/6 19/22 21/15 29/4 79/4 79/7 84/18 84/22 105/14 106/24 107/6 107/9 110/24 111/1 111/10 111/10 111/12 111/16 111/17 112/14 113/12 142/24 143/10 143/13 144/2
144/7 144/16 144/20 145/1 145/13 147/4 147/6 147/7 181/10 181/10 181/11
181/15 181/16 186/23 190/21 190/24
219/15 227/21 230/13 230/19 230/20

## 231/11

revenues [30] 32/4 79/14 83/22 84/2
103/14 143/2 145/1 145/19 145/19
146/24 180/21 181/7 186/2 186/22
188/20 190/16 191/24 202/8 202/15
202/20 210/14 211/20 213/24 214/2
219/8 221/15 224/18 225/8 230/21
232/23
reverse [1] 69/2
review [21] 8/2 8/4 8/7 37/3 54/18 55/12 69/8 75/12 75/13 75/18 85/17 151/20 153/22 170/19 171/1 171/2 178/10 189/1 208/20 211/2 211/12
reviewed [9] 19/3 30/19 48/25 49/7 75/16 131/15 138/5 172/23 183/12
reviewing [1] 37/7
reviews [1] 37/19
revisit [2] 69/7 183/9
revisited [1] 204/11
revitalization [2] 29/14 170/9
revolve [1] 111/11
revolved [1] 110/17
rezoning [1] 219/21
Rezonings [1] 219/21
RFP [5] 100/8 100/11 177/9 177/25
189/16
Richard [1] 193/15
Rico [2] 98/10 98/18
right [91] 2/7 4/11 5/8 5/16 7/5 7/12 8/14
9/1 15/14 18/16 18/17 18/20 21/20 23/10 26/6 29/19 32/12 34/5 39/5 42/4 42/6 42/11 44/22 44/22 46/5 46/6 46/10 46/17 47/18 48/17 49/4 51/10 51/15 51/19
51/24 53/3 56/24 57/22 58/24 66/17 67/15 68/25 69/3 70/10 72/13 75/2 75/22 76/24 77/9 78/8 81/10 84/5 91/13 91/18 93/17 94/17 95/10 106/20 107/16 107/17 115/2 118/13 119/6 119/8 126/12 126/18
133/13 136/10 137/13 139/9 141/8
141/22 145/8 151/23 153/24 157/6
165/25 170/25 178/12 181/7 184/23
185/1 194/25 195/3 201/7 204/25 213/22
213/23 214/5 223/25 236/10
rights [4] 55/1 57/2 57/13 223/2
rise [4] 57/24 116/17 195/6 237/12
risk [4] 203/10 229/9 229/16 230/19
risky [1] 231/11
road [2] 105/17 231/2
robust [1] 226/1
Roeder [9] 125/6 125/8 125/9 126/15
127/17 131/11 133/5 135/16 155/24
role [9] 120/8 131/6 135/18 169/3 169/4
role... [4] 175/12 177/6 194/25 211/11
roles [2] 70/16 70/19
Roman [1] 179/22
Ron [1] 159/25
room [2] 59/20 166/8
rooms [1] 173/25
root [1] 217/3
rough [5] $1 / 21 / 41 / 81 / 12 \quad 2 / 2$
roughly [1] 21/15
routinely [2] 197/16 206/14
Ruegger [2] 4/14 69/15
rule [3] 198/25 199/7 200/20
ruling [1] 69/2
run [8] 4/1 71/21 72/2 81/1 124/25
195/20 199/8 218/17
running [2] 59/1 108/21
runs [1] 108/24
rush [1] 153/20

## S

S-T-I-B-I-T-Z [1] 193/14
sacks [2] 193/12 204/19
safe [1] 27/7
safer [2] 189/21 230/23
safety [9] 100/1 101/4 101/5 102/4 102/11 102/23 103/3 113/8 179/19 said [26] 6/13 11/17 24/2 38/10 38/16 40/21 42/17 45/5 45/11 46/15 51/14 57/17 62/6 78/11 82/23 92/6 136/6 136/7 139/25 151/17 171/23 174/21 177/7 184/23 198/16 204/21
salary [1] 45/14
sale [8] 29/13 30/9 173/18 187/22 187/23 187/25 221/4 223/14
sales [6] 29/3 30/16 31/10 43/24 90/17 216/6
same [21] 23/16 23/18 33/24 49/10 62/9 67/16 80/15 86/16 88/10 88/22 96/16 135/24 146/25 163/7 179/8 194/21 198/24 204/13 215/8 226/25 228/23 Sandler [1] 5/2
Sandy [1] 193/23
sat [2] 183/10 209/19
satisfactory [4] 10/2 11/9 11/11 12/6
satisfy [2] 25/11 231/15
save [1] 106/2
saving [9] 16/15 16/21 19/20 19/23 20/2 22/1 22/24 24/1 24/5
savings [29] 11/21 12/15 16/18 16/25
17/2 20/12 20/20 20/21 46/5 46/7 46/12
46/15 47/1 48/18 48/20 49/2 49/20 53/25 54/3 56/19 86/24 89/8 89/9 90/23 90/25 91/2 91/3 91/6 91/8
saw [3] 20/21 225/4 235/7
say [38] 5/11 6/4 6/16 11/12 12/8 13/18 16/8 18/1 24/19 26/10 26/11 32/9 34/2
34/24 34/25 35/19 36/6 36/12 47/3 60/21 62/25 64/3 74/14 77/15 103/11 136/19 155/16 156/18 156/18 162/9 174/23 179/15 181/7 215/11 227/17 230/9 232/5 235/11
saying [7] 19/11 19/17 44/6 114/18 126/2 162/23 232/8
says [17] 11/4 14/25 19/22 20/1 29/3
29/20 30/17 34/11 34/14 47/4 49/6 66/17 67/15 122/17 148/6 176/15 179/23
scenario [3] 192/9 220/20 233/6
scenarios [2] 124/25 125/3
scene [1] 23/12
schedule [5] 4/5 64/24 202/8 203/18 206/7
scheduled [1] 4/3
schedules [1] 51/8
Schneider [1] 3/3
Schools [1] 98/9
scope [1] 199/7
scratch [1] 50/23
screen [13] 9/4 32/18 69/24 122/5 135/5
135/8 149/14 152/3 161/6 172/15 172/16 214/6 225/18
scroll [3] 9/12 33/7 102/24
scrolling [1] 24/3
seat [1] 4/22
seated [2] 58/4 195/11
second [19] 3/1 4/4 10/13 25/3 52/2 53/2
56/13 56/20 79/9 119/1 121/17 124/15
134/7 145/2 173/23 203/19 205/17 205/19 232/7
Secondly [2] 184/8 206/12
section [6] 54/5 82/10 149/24 161/14
173/3 173/6
secure [1] 220/23
secured [8] 215/16 215/17 228/10 228/13
230/12 230/13 230/20 230/22
security [2] 101/7 122/11
see [48] $4 / 18$ 9/14 10/1 10/4 10/5 10/5
10/6 11/13 17/11 18/3 18/10 20/3 20/19
24/9 29/5 29/6 42/6 52/8 52/10 52/24
55/20 55/23 66/17 66/20 70/5 84/9 120/1
120/25 121/3 122/3 122/17 122/20
128/19 130/23 136/4 144/2 148/8 149/12
149/16 152/24 153/3 153/5 161/13
172/16 173/7 202/16 207/2 215/6
seeing [2] 49/15 146/4
seem [1] 150/4
seems [4] 113/6 151/14 151/24 153/6
seen [12] 10/14 10/19 10/21 14/14 15/2
17/9 49/12 128/12 130/17 131/3 135/9
144/4
select [1] 176/18
selected [1] 194/24
selecting [1] 194/25
selection [2] 194/12 194/14
selective [3] 139/12 139/17 151/14
selectively [1] 153/19
self [1] $82 / 24$
sell [6] 25/2 25/9 32/10 217/17 218/1 223/1
selling [3] 24/17 25/5 221/4
sends [2] 82/15 82/18
senior [5] 97/21 167/21 193/13 193/14
204/19
sense [4] 123/1 202/6 215/7 228/1 sensible [2] 113/5 192/3
sentence [4] 10/2 34/14 45/5 208/15 separate [1] 201/2
September [4] 103/21 149/3 156/14 156/15
sequestration [2] 95/6 165/21
Sergeants [1] 86/8
seriously [1] 213/3
service [6] 77/19 79/1 106/1 182/13 182/25 218/18
services [25] 7/23 7/25 97/25 97/25
100/10 100/13 100/15 110/19 112/20
112/21 168/4 168/11 169/1 171/12 182/8 188/23 192/8 196/12 203/14 211/18 211/23 212/1 217/10 218/15 232/24 session [2] 58/3 195/10
set [21] 28/22 55/20 64/24 80/20 119/11 119/12 175/22 181/19 182/6 182/19 189/2 197/7 209/22 210/17 214/12 222/6 225/21 231/21 232/17 234/5 234/18 sets [2] 32/24 206/6
setting [2] 64/13 64/16
settle [1] 187/16
settled [1] 186/1
settlement [1] 224/22
seven [6] 40/10 56/17 87/25 129/21
164/22 178/10
seven percent [1] 129/21
several [12] 37/19 38/23 38/25 64/8
64/23 78/14 101/16 167/20 169/18
213/12 229/25 233/13
severely [1] 110/10
sewage [2] 15/19 216/22
sewer [24] 16/6 16/9 21/12 21/16 33/6 82/1 82/20 82/24 85/11 103/7 103/10 103/22 103/25 104/6 104/8 104/13 104/21 127/25 128/2 216/23 227/21 228/15 229/24 232/14
share [5] 12/21 117/15 123/16 181/11 215/19
shared [2] 63/2 117/7
shareholder [1] 97/21
sharing [9] 79/4 79/7 143/10 143/13
144/2 144/7 144/20 145/2 145/13
she [1] 37/11
she's [2] 87/11 87/12
sheet [3] 51/5 194/5 210/24
Sherwood [5] 5/2 93/21 154/10 154/12 159/3
short [16] 26/21 29/23 44/13 85/7 105/10
105/12 183/16 184/1 189/13 189/23
202/16 206/7 207/11 209/13 218/17 221/1
shorten [1] 8/3
should [23] 1/16 13/17 30/19 31/17 55/18
84/23 94/3 111/2 153/10 156/6 162/23
174/4 187/5 189/3 189/4 189/13 189/18
196/8 203/12 220/19 222/5 233/24
236/15
show [9] 85/5 124/1 140/13 147/3 163/4
172/13 196/24 210/13 224/5
showed [4] 48/14 129/16 195/23 206/10
shown [4] 81/21 82/10 89/23 203/8
side [7] 24/12 44/20 45/19 88/23 109/1
231/3 231/23
signature [7] 41/22 41/23 88/1 88/3 88/20 88/25 89/1
signatures [2] 42/4 42/5
signed [4] 42/8 42/21 177/7 178/2
significance [5] 23/1 23/2 180/15 195/21 208/3
significant [14] 10/11 19/17 84/10 107/18 109/2 144/15 148/6 163/8 180/14 185/24 203/10 204/10 221/14 222/16
significantly [2] 108/2 190/1
similar [4] 67/14 86/14 88/8 162/20 Simon [1] 58/7
simple [3] 107/15 162/8 199/4
simply [8] 16/24 81/7 93/13 179/16
179/21 189/22 199/21 232/20
since [12] 6/23 6/25 7/3 7/5 78/21 97/6 127/5 131/20 144/8 144/10 144/12 149/19
single [5] 35/22 38/1 39/9 39/13 229/14 sir [89] 3/7 4/20 8/3 18/8 28/5 53/12 73/8 73/14 85/24 91/13 91/19 95/8 95/20 96/19 97/14 98/13 98/21 100/6 100/22 102/5 104/1 105/1 105/4 107/21 108/13 109/22 109/25 111/19 112/5 112/25 113/15 115/23 119/14 119/20 120/7 123/6 123/17 125/4 126/11 127/22 130/1 131/4 131/13 133/2 133/12 133/21 133/25 135/10 136/22 137/1 137/7 137/16 137/20 138/8 140/19 142/12
sir... [33] 143/23 144/24 145/11 145/21 146/7 147/23 148/24 154/1 154/18 157/7 157/22 158/6 158/9 159/9 159/14 161/15 161/20 163/3 163/13 163/18 163/25 164/14 164/20 164/25 165/9 165/22 166/5 172/16 173/7 175/3 186/17 195/3 207/8
sit [9] 52/4 61/8 95/10 98/19 148/19 153/9 160/9 166/20 191/12
sitting [1] 44/20
situation [7] 33/15 120/16 134/12 171/6 196/13 198/3 216/24
situations [2] 153/18 206/25
six [3] 87/24 113/19 213/10
Sixty [1] 130/7
Sixty-nine [1] 130/7
size [1] 12/2
skills [2] 168/7 189/9
slide [4] 29/7 29/18 30/11 102/17
slightly [1] 140/18
slow [1] 170/24
slower [1] 13/17
small [1] 218/16
so [186] $2 / 224 / 54 / 215 / 107 / 87 / 18$
11/20 13/16 14/7 14/17 14/23 16/8 17/11 17/21 18/8 22/22 23/12 23/23 25/13 25/19 28/10 28/14 30/23 32/3 33/19 38/1 40/9 41/14 46/15 48/14 49/22 51/21 55/9 55/24 60/23 61/18 61/18 63/19 67/10 68/15 69/5 70/3 70/9 70/10 70/19 72/1 74/1 75/17 76/14 78/6 78/24 80/11 80/25 81/18 83/2 84/12 84/13 84/13 84/19 85/3 85/12 85/13 91/5 92/19 93/6 93/10 94/8 94/22 100/20 101/16 101/19 104/24 106/12 108/2 108/8 109/5 109/15 110/7 110/14 110/18 111/16 112/16 113/9 114/20 116/5 117/14 118/6 118/7 118/13 119/12 120/12 121/1 121/22 129/8 129/13 129/23 130/2 130/19 130/25 132/3 136/8 137/10 138/19 141/6 141/25 143/25 144/4 145/5 146/4 146/8 146/16 147/8 151/5 151/6 151/8 152/10 152/11 152/24 153/2 153/14 153/15 153/20 155/15 156/22 158/2 159/5 160/15 160/18 160/22 162/23 162/24 164/5 165/21 166/18 168/16 170/10 171/8 172/5 174/1 177/18 180/23 181/20 183/3 183/14 184/6 186/15 187/18 188/24 190/22 192/5 192/14 193/9 196/19 199/1 199/5 200/3 201/1 203/10 207/18 207/24 209/19 211/11 213/6 213/24 215/8 216/9 216/11 217/3 217/11 217/20 218/8 218/15 224/21 225/9 226/7 226/15 228/1 229/1 229/9 229/15 230/5 231/5 236/4 236/20 237/4 237/11
so-called [5] 192/14 207/24 217/3 218/15 229/9
social [1] 219/23
society [1] 220/14
sole [1] 114/24
solely [1] 132/11
solicited [1] 51/17
solution [1] 196/10
solve [2] 168/20 213/25
some [68] 2/19 5/18 9/4 13/8 14/17 15/25 16/8 22/10 33/5 39/2 40/2 41/13 43/14 44/17 46/15 49/25 50/6 50/7 54/1 55/7 65/1 70/2 80/10 80/22 85/20 86/12 86/23 88/11 89/7 90/4 94/19 98/4 99/11 99/21 101/1 107/12 108/7 109/13 111/13 111/15 111/15 113/24 117/3 124/1

134/21 138/1 142/5 154/15 162/1 169/11
169/14 170/5 170/12 177/18 180/4
192/16 197/10 200/21 202/14 216/6 218/2 222/6 225/3 228/5 229/9 229/19 235/20 235/25
somebody [2] 65/23 193/19
someone [6] 18/12 59/19 68/9 72/15 74/2 219/1
something [15] 12/9 25/2 81/8 89/19
106/3 109/23 112/3 115/21 135/2 167/10 175/8 221/8 229/4 232/9 237/4
somewhat [3] 196/18 221/17 235/1 somewhere [2] 28/9 173/17
soon [4] 77/5 190/4 220/2 223/19 sooner [1] 237/2
sophisticated [1] 235/19
sorry [30] 3/13 21/25 22/7 22/16 26/25
32/24 34/7 45/3 45/16 57/7 63/6 73/18
77/1 77/25 82/4 87/25 93/7 99/13 114/3
125/11 126/9 157/25 159/13 161/10
166/7 175/3 180/9 207/4 214/4 219/3
sort [6] 20/13 71/5 80/7 80/8 146/16 199/8
sound [3] 14/2 15/14 141/23
sounds [7] 7/12 14/4 14/7 46/6 51/14 132/18 136/18
source [14] 13/6 73/14 80/13 112/14
116/5 146/17 155/11 184/16 186/23
207/18 217/11 218/9 220/16 220/24
sources [4] 31/10 116/1 155/5 180/23 sovereign [1] 169/20
speak [12] 17/22 77/1 93/16 105/3 114/6
145/15 170/24 180/8 186/9 226/5 226/11 226/14
speaker [2] 29/18 30/15
speaking [1] 228/9
special [1] $3 / 5$
specialized [4] 70/16 93/25 184/24 233/19
specializing [1] 168/3
specific [36] 8/9 13/20 16/16 22/17 22/18
22/23 24/2 31/7 32/1 37/7 39/13 46/13
50/5 51/12 54/5 64/7 72/9 72/18 74/6
76/10 78/16 78/18 79/2 79/25 122/11
133/10 134/13 160/23 162/1 162/3 162/4
162/9 168/7 169/11 189/11 230/13
specifically [33] 7/7 25/19 29/16 33/20
36/3 36/23 36/25 39/11 43/5 45/23 61/7
67/4 67/18 67/21 70/1 70/7 71/23 73/11
76/5 78/25 79/17 102/10 124/19 124/24
155/7 155/11 161/7 161/25 162/21 163/7
199/1 209/1 230/20
specificity [1] 179/2
specifics [2] 161/3 161/23
speculation [1] 45/4
speed [1] 37/6
spend [1] 33/5
spending [3] 112/2 112/19 113/9
spent [6] 101/7 113/11 158/2 158/4
179/20 226/20
spoke [2] 120/10 155/4
spread [2] 229/8 229/12
spring [1] 180/6
springs [1] 149/20
square [2] 222/3 222/11
squarely [1] 92/10
stability [1] 208/22
stacks [1] 102/1
staff [7] 2/13 5/22 8/24 9/19 198/2 206/14
212/8
stake [1] 217/7
stakeholders [18] 168/9 168/23 175/17
209/7 209/9 209/24 210/5 210/20 211/14

211/17 215/1 215/6 215/7 224/20 225/24
226/21 227/12 232/23
stand [8] 4/21 23/2 55/24 106/11 126/1 130/10 153/9 195/21
standard [2] 1/15 218/20
standpoint [9] 15/17 22/25 23/22 40/6
43/20 88/15 103/3 160/13 164/3
start [8] 28/3 35/7 86/20 110/2 149/12 166/15 189/15 215/15
started [4] 20/15 40/9 77/4 170/4 starting [1] 233/13
state [72] 3/6 3/20 50/19 50/22 79/4 79/7
79/13 79/14 79/25 92/8 96/8 96/9 96/13
97/7 98/25 99/6 106/18 116/11 117/7
126/1 143/11 144/1 144/7 146/1 146/3
149/23 152/15 157/12 157/18 157/24 166/25 170/20 170/25 171/16 171/17 172/1 172/24 172/25 173/12 173/15 173/18 174/10 174/16 174/19 174/23 174/24 175/6 176/10 176/12 177/20 178/11 179/4 179/24 180/12 180/25 181/3 181/5 181/10 193/3 193/11 200/22 200/23 200/25 204/18 204/20 207/19 208/18 208/19 210/5 217/16 221/9 231/5 statement [4] 15/12 20/11 21/14 118/8 statements [16] 27/10 27/16 71/25 75/1 75/13 76/20 76/21 76/22 76/24 77/3 77/5 77/11 80/17 80/19 125/15 136/2
states [3] 163/8 190/22 220/4
static [1] 174/1
status [2] 155/4 165/19
stay [3] 25/15 33/24 85/1
stayed [2] 2/14 177/3
staying [2] 146/8 146/25
stenographic [2] 1/6 1/13
step [8] 91/13 95/7 138/14 165/15 181/3 181/5 207/20 224/14
Steven [1] 3/4
Stew [1] 130/7
Stewart [10] 2/10 17/19 69/21 86/12
93/19 106/9 114/3 115/13 124/2 151/25
Stibitz [1] 193/13
still [16] 4/21 6/5 68/13 105/21 156/3
156/12 165/21 177/16 179/10 186/22
196/10 202/12 217/2 217/5 219/16
222/14
stipulate [1] 232/9
stipulated [1] 202/8
Stockton [1] 169/19
stop [4] 116/15 125/8 129/5 210/17
stopped [1] 140/10
story [10] 234/5 234/13 234/13 234/15
234/20 234/20 234/24 235/8 235/8 235/9
straight [2] 6/22 152/12
strategic [3] 104/7 104/8 185/7
strategies [6] 24/9 25/18 25/22 26/21
191/22 191/22
strategists [1] 183/23
strategy [14] 24/13 24/15 24/20 169/7
169/9 169/10 184/14 187/4 198/11 208/9
208/22 209/25 212/21 222/11
streams [1] 181/10
strengths [1] 194/9
stress [2] 173/16 190/5
stretch [1] 206/20
stretching [1] 206/14
stricken [1] 233/24
strike [5] 88/18 142/1 153/12 175/22
233/11
strikes [1] 235/24
strong [2] 183/8 228/24
struck [2] 139/11 139/21
structural [13] 12/15 19/25 25/7 89/19
structural... [9] 89/22 90/1 90/6 90/13 108/18 109/2 109/3 109/9 112/10 structure [6] 56/6 109/14 190/15 210/7 210/7 210/9
structured [1] 30/19
structures [3] 108/18 112/13 112/23
stuck [1] 194/17
study [1] 2/21
subject [11] 41/17 58/16 81/8 94/2 117/4
149/24 197/8 200/10 222/17 223/16
223/22
subjective [1] 11/11
subjects [2] 164/15 175/5
submit [4] 93/22 117/16 172/5 235/18
submitted [1] 177/25
subparagraph [1] 20/1
subsequently [1] 221/9
subsidy [3] 82/8 82/14 82/18
substance [2] 87/13 201/5
substantial [7] 29/4 40/3 143/9 179/13
214/17 222/19 222/21
substantially [1] 34/15
suburbs [1] 167/7
success [3] 178/15 178/24 218/11 successful [3] 40/13 40/14 178/20
such [13] 1/14 27/11 98/1 103/15 107/15 139/23 179/2 182/15 197/25 213/20 223/3 223/7 234/21
suffered [1] 112/8
sufficient [4] 173/16 192/19 224/19 230/15
suggest [2] 29/24 236/4
suggested [5] 3/12 26/13 30/22 189/16 236/15
suggesting [1] 195/1
suggestion [1] 69/6
suggestions [1] 31/15
summary [1] 103/1
supervision [1] 217/2
supplement [1] 192/2
support [3] 98/2 171/18 173/1
supporting [1] 223/5
supposed [2] 93/3 114/12
sure [46] 13/10 17/12 18/14 27/18 31/4 34/5 35/21 36/3 37/5 46/11 48/6 54/14 68/5 73/8 84/1 85/3 85/14 93/11 96/14 116/25 132/8 132/23 136/7 136/16 136/20 140/17 140/20 146/11 147/12 166/11 168/21 168/24 174/20 175/14 175/18 180/23 180/25 184/2 188/23 199/16 203/12 205/21 215/5 223/8 227/1 229/10
surplus [1] 43/16
surprised [1] 229/2
surrounded [1] 45/25
surrounding [2] 116/7 116/10
suspending [1] 224/9
sustain [1] 174/17
sustainable [2] 233/2 233/4
sustained [3] 56/11 141/1 182/2
sustaining [2] 82/24 211/19
swap [18] 185/18 185/20 185/20 185/23
186/12 186/20 188/16 188/19 191/23
196/10 202/12 203/1 203/7 213/22
224/16 224/22 224/24 225/4
switch [1] 32/12
Switching [1] 164/15
sworn [2] 95/9 166/19
symbols [1] 1/13
system [17] 16/4 62/8 62/17 123/2 123/3 125/10 127/17 127/19 127/19 128/21

131/9 131/12 131/16 135/14 135/22 174/7 217/23
system's [1] 118/12
systematically [1] 223/20
systems [7] 16/2 16/3 16/4 61/16 61/17 62/24 122/25
Systems' [1] 119/10

## T

table [5] 17/14 17/15 44/21 84/1 143/22 tabs [1] 28/14
tag [1] 142/14
take [28] 2/19 42/3 57/23 69/9 83/3 93/7
104/24 119/5 130/2 132/20 153/15
159/17 188/19 191/24 191/24 199/7
200/18 209/8 212/5 213/3 214/22 216/8
219/1 221/3 224/14 228/18 231/20 236/25
taken [9] 1/6 37/2 58/1 116/19 126/15
141/5 149/2 195/8 224/6
takes [1] 107/1
taking [2] 24/16 225/10
talent [1] 233/20
talk [14] 30/17 33/23 34/9 36/7 42/24
69/21 79/17 79/21 121/17 188/5 216/9
216/12 225/23 232/8
talked [6] 24/1 32/4 32/15 33/3 79/5 211/18
talking [8] 6/23 44/24 77/12 83/22 110/15
127/6 187/12 207/6
talks [3] 34/8 47/1 47/2
tardiness [1] 130/6
targeted [1] 49/20
task [27] 124/14 124/17 124/23 131/7 135/18 135/18 137/5 137/8 137/15
137/18 137/22 137/24 138/2 139/1 139/4
139/16 140/4 140/8 141/16 149/18
149/21 150/19 150/22 151/9 152/13
155/13 184/24
tasked [1] 209/1
$\operatorname{tax}[59] \quad 34 / 134 / 1235 / 835 / 1535 / 1736 / 4$ 36/18 36/24 37/3 37/9 37/15 72/22 73/2
73/11 74/3 76/8 84/14 84/16 84/16 84/17
84/24 106/24 107/8 107/14 107/25 108/1
108/9 109/1 109/4 110/14 115/22 115/24
143/2 145/23 145/25 146/2 157/10
157/11 157/14 157/16 157/17 157/18
157/20 157/24 158/4 181/10 181/11
181/11 181/12 190/21 191/1 202/7
211/19 221/15 230/16 230/17 231/3
231/4 231/6
taxation [3] 116/2 116/6 116/11 taxed [1] 116/9
taxes [48] 33/23 33/25 34/8 34/9 34/20
$34 / 2034 / 2135 / 135 / 435 / 1135 / 2536 / 12$
36/22 37/22 70/23 70/23 71/2 71/3 72/16 73/4 73/5 73/6 74/10 75/23 76/16 77/11 77/20 84/7 84/14 84/20 107/1 107/2
107/2 107/2 107/3 107/10 109/3 113/8
143/6 157/5 157/8 158/1 158/3 181/14
202/1 230/14 230/24 231/6
taxing [4] 73/7 84/8 84/11 230/22 taxpayers [2] 34/17 36/12
team [47] 8/2 8/4 23/16 28/2 30/8 64/22 70/12 70/17 70/20 71/9 71/12 71/16 71/22 72/8 72/10 72/11 72/12 72/15 72/15 72/21 73/3 73/10 74/2 74/18 75/2 75/4 76/14 77/24 78/1 78/3 78/7 78/15 78/19 80/3 80/18 81/12 81/18 85/17 86/17 86/18 86/22 124/14 169/4 183/22 184/20 185/4 191/2
team's [3] 8/7 72/5 80/13
teams [1] 176/19
technician [1] 128/10
technology [2] 97/11 112/1
tell [51] 39/23 45/20 60/6 63/4 63/5 63/23 70/19 71/13 72/7 82/11 87/7 87/20 95/23 96/4 96/18 97/6 97/22 98/4 98/16 98/22 99/10 99/17 101/13 102/25 107/22 110/1 111/20 111/20 115/24 123/25 124/11
126/8 126/9 126/12 127/15 128/14 130/2 132/25 133/3 155/23 156/2 156/10 167/10 174/13 191/5 197/3 208/11 210/6 220/5 231/23 234/14
telling [4] 155/8 155/11 155/19 234/20 tells [1] 235/8
ten [20] 7/10 7/20 19/11 33/21 79/18 103/9 103/22 111/5 115/11 115/12 121/11 142/15 143/9 147/7 189/18 189/25 190/9 210/12 210/16 237/5 ten minutes [1] 237/5
ten-year [8] 79/18 103/9 103/22 111/5
121/11 147/7 190/9 210/12
tends [1] 105/18
tense [2] 151/20 196/15
tentative [19] 40/18 40/22 42/14 43/5 43/9 45/18 47/14 48/22 50/10 50/13
50/15 53/25 54/1 54/21 55/8 87/2 87/6 87/21 89/6
term [35] 14/6 14/11 14/22 15/6 26/22 29/23 90/9 100/16 103/9 103/9 105/10 105/11 105/12 105/21 108/17 111/18 111/21 172/10 183/16 183/16 184/1 184/4 184/14 187/4 189/13 189/20 204/23 206/8 207/11 208/21 209/3 209/13 209/14 221/1 233/2
terminated [2] 6/8 6/9
terms [43] $1 / 15$ 6/22 11/2 11/19 12/5 15/4 16/11 34/16 35/23 36/21 37/21 39/21 44/21 45/14 50/7 50/17 73/2 79/18 81/16 101/3 101/24 109/19 110/2 129/8 162/3 162/22 168/19 174/9 175/15 178/12 182/4 185/11 189/12 189/21 190/11 190/23 191/23 210/4 212/11 212/17 214/19 215/25 227/8
testified [31] 7/13 8/11 22/9 22/13 33/3 48/18 48/22 48/24 59/11 61/10 63/10 65/14 72/14 74/1 75/24 79/11 138/4 139/19 139/20 143/4 150/23 151/11 157/4 158/10 161/11 163/24 193/6 196/17 197/1 204/8 234/9
testify [11] 2/12 55/7 65/10 67/7 130/22 200/22 200/24 205/15 223/18 235/4 235/6
testifying [8] 14/13 92/23 125/15 132/19 186/8 186/11 186/15 197/6
testimony [60] 3/2 3/23 4/7 4/12 7/16
32/3 41/13 48/21 57/14 57/15 58/13
58/16 59/9 59/23 61/11 62/3 62/6 63/13
72/18 72/20 74/5 79/16 79/23 93/2 93/2
93/6 93/22 93/24 94/3 94/4 94/10 94/16
114/4 114/11 114/23 121/15 121/19
124/6 126/19 130/20 130/21 136/4
139/10 139/24 140/22 141/4 142/1
154/17 159/10 160/22 189/17 197/8
199/2 199/9 199/10 205/5 233/11 233/12 233/18 233/23
than [25] 13/17 21/2 52/15 88/23 90/4 99/22 116/10 129/10 129/15 132/17 133/10 147/2 147/21 150/2 150/4 150/4 153/18 157/8 181/21 196/3 212/25 227/13 228/20 230/19 231/11 thank [53] 2/13 2/25 3/7 4/8 4/9 4/10 9/8 17/7 17/24 23/4 28/23 38/14 57/18 57/20 66/10 68/15 69/10 69/14 85/24 85/25 91/11 91/14 94/11 94/17 106/11 117/21
thank... [27] 119/3 119/11 119/15 122/1 135/5 136/13 142/3 148/23 148/24 151/23 153/21 159/22 161/10 163/13 165/10 165/12 165/13 165/15 165/17 165/23 166/18 186/16 186/18 195/14 200/2 201/18 237/10
Thanks [1] 2/17
that [1127]
that's [73] 3/115/9 6/13 8/14 11/24 12/15 20/4 23/11 24/20 26/4 27/1 28/18 31/13 33/1 34/14 35/5 35/13 41/5 41/24 48/16 48/24 57/17 61/21 64/3 71/22 72/22 75/7 77/9 77/14 78/8 79/7 79/9 81/7 81/7 81/10 82/8 83/1 83/17 83/23 84/22 85/7 85/10 85/11 93/1 112/13 121/3 133/13 141/4 142/21 143/10 143/13 144/13 145/8 145/12 145/17 146/8 146/15 146/23 147/9 151/5 157/13 179/1 180/20 181/13 181/25 200/5 207/19 208/14 213/2 217/11 229/11 233/8 235/3 thed [1] 130/15
their [56] 1/7 12/3 13/20 23/17 27/4 27/8 35/11 36/1 45/14 71/10 74/21 81/20 82/16 83/2 83/3 101/10 125/5 141/20 147/13 160/10 160/19 167/23 168/7 168/8 168/17 168/23 171/3 171/18 180/24 183/9 186/21 189/16 189/24 190/15 191/25 193/20 194/8 195/17 196/5 201/1 203/9 206/16 209/17 210/21 218/7 220/22 225/7 226/6 226/22 227/9 227/13 227/16 228/12 229/20 230/8 235/6
theirs [1] 123/14
them [55] 6/14 22/15 24/17 24/17 38/22 45/20 60/22 67/1 67/18 67/19 75/16 75/16 75/18 75/18 109/14 110/22 117/8 117/15 117/16 152/24 167/23 168/16 169/7 171/9 183/21 187/20 189/16 190/1 191/5 192/6 192/12 192/13 194/7 197/24 202/14 203/3 204/9 209/17 212/4 213/1 213/3 215/20 220/19 221/24 223/21 225/9 226/10 226/24 226/25 227/2 227/8 228/21 228/25 229/25 237/7
themselves [3] 112/13 192/23 202/22 then [50] 3/25 4/18 19/25 48/16 50/25 59/18 59/19 84/14 96/17 97/3 97/12 99/20 103/6 104/22 106/2 106/16 111/18 122/20 124/1 130/2 130/10 130/18 130/24 132/6 133/15 134/7 134/13 142/18 150/1 150/24 150/24 151/6 153/5 158/10 164/3 167/7 167/9 167/24 168/19 169/6 169/8 171/22 175/17 183/10 194/14 207/23 210/19 211/12 211/15 236/5
theory [1] 231/10
there[194] $3 / 163 / 219 / 39 / 49 / 16 ~ 13 / 8$
14/11 14/15 17/15 17/15 18/15 18/20 18/21 19/22 22/1 22/18 24/8 25/16 27/4 32/6 32/25 33/24 34/21 37/19 38/1 38/20 38/23 38/25 40/11 41/11 43/1 43/3 43/14 43/15 43/17 45/24 45/25 47/2 49/1 55/11 59/11 61/4 61/5 61/22 62/7 63/16 63/18 63/19 64/7 64/11 64/12 64/23 64/23 65/1 66/20 67/1 67/4 67/7 67/8 67/10 67/19 67/20 67/22 73/11 79/12 80/5 82/21 83/20 84/22 87/1 88/13 92/20 92/21 94/19 94/23 97/9 97/13 98/6 99/7 99/21 100/3 100/17 102/3 102/7 102/22 103/16 105/10 105/11 107/10 107/24 109/1 109/5 110/6 111/13 111/16 112/9 112/10 117/3 117/25 118/3 118/10 121/23 122/3

122/10 125/8 129/5 130/24 137/17 137/21 138/4 138/9 138/11 138/23 139/3 141/17 141/21 142/21 142/21 142/22 143/1 143/20 143/22 145/2 145/20 145/22 146/4 148/6 148/15 148/19 149/10 150/2 150/25 152/4 152/7 152/18 156/5 157/1 157/2 157/10 158/15 161/2 161/16 161/22 162/1 162/6 162/8 162/13 162/24 163/8 170/12 171/10 175/7 177/10 177/18 179/19 181/1 181/20 182/8 184/11 188/5 190/15 191/15 192/10 192/22 193/4 194/11 195/20 196/25 197/7 203/15 203/15 203/23 203/25 204/5 204/14 206/6 206/23 208/2 212/3 214/6 214/22 215/8 219/10 219/12 219/12 221/18 222/8 222/11 222/21 224/2 230/15 236/17 236/18 237/6 there's [32] 21/15 29/19 32/24 33/6 33/8 38/1 47/19 66/20 67/14 72/9 74/24 84/9 91/22 93/24 109/14 141/3 142/18 143/9 144/12 147/20 152/7 152/19 153/20 159/16 160/18 162/21 170/5 172/14 199/19 203/20 203/21 216/5
thereabouts [1] 25/25
thereby [1] 30/24
therefore [4] 140/23 174/23 184/13 206/8 these [73] 11/17 18/10 28/6 29/18 33/13 33/13 33/16 36/5 42/7 44/21 44/25 48/20 49/22 50/6 50/8 56/25 57/10 64/9 67/21 70/6 70/14 76/11 79/21 80/20 81/23 82/12 103/5 109/13 110/21 114/23 117/6 121/8 122/24 124/12 124/16 125/3 126/2 126/3 126/10 135/1 136/3 151/13 156/17 169/2 179/8 192/23 195/16 195/20 196/25 197/4 197/21 198/10 199/6 200/11 201/2 201/6 201/17 201/20 201/23 201/24 214/12 214/14 214/15 214/17 218/22 221/21 223/14 223/21 227/25 229/19 231/25 234/12 234/25 they [141] 6/5 6/7 6/8 6/9 6/10 13/17 13/17 15/22 18/5 20/22 23/12 26/13 26/13 27/10 28/9 30/3 30/22 30/24 31/4 36/1 37/5 40/15 40/16 40/18 40/21 45/5 45/12 45/13 45/14 48/23 59/17 67/1 67/7 67/7 67/10 70/8 70/16 70/21 71/12 80/19 82/16 83/2 104/17 107/4 117/8 117/12 117/13 121/10 123/25 125/5 125/16 139/13 139/17 157/12 168/6 168/21 168/24 169/6 171/1 173/16 173/17 174/21 174/21 177/6 178/24 179/16 179/16 180/23 187/22 189/3 189/12 189/24 190/14 191/24 192/4 193/5 193/8 193/8 193/9 193/10 195/17 195/19 195/23 196/8 196/15 196/16 197/2 200/25 203/8 204/1 204/2 206/3 206/14 206/15 206/19 206/20 208/25 209/12 209/15 212/12 213/23 215/6 215/16 218/6 218/7 220/19 220/24 221/6 221/7 221/8 223/4 223/16 223/17 225/5 225/6 225/7 226/5 226/8 226/10 226/12 226/15 227/1 227/7 227/16 228/23 229/1 229/3 229/4 230/2 230/2 230/4 230/6 231/9 232/8 232/10 232/13 232/15 233/7 234/7 235/7 235/21
they'll [1] 160/19
they're [10] 6/11 34/22 68/13 74/16 92/19 98/3 172/1 200/12 200/12 202/21 they've [3] 16/11 144/15 231/2 thing [8] 19/4 27/17 29/19 136/15 183/5 192/3 207/10 213/17
things [10] $7 / 1411 / 2$ 45/11 107/15 107/24 193/17 212/3 216/11 234/11 234/15
|think [65] 2/22 9/4 13/8 17/6 17/11 18/6 18/19 19/6 21/9 22/21 28/7 28/13 28/17 $32 / 15$ 33/16 33/24 34/4 35/21 36/4 37/13 38/10 38/16 39/18 41/23 43/1 45/6 46/11 47/24 50/13 50/17 52/22 55/16 55/22 59/21 65/19 67/19 72/9 72/14 76/18 79/4 82/23 88/3 89/1 91/23 93/14 93/23 94/19 109/12 117/16 118/6 118/19 121/23 132/21 134/6 146/23 164/9 173/3 192/11 198/3 199/8 199/16 205/22 216/11 233/16 235/22
third [2] 29/3 148/5
this [351]
Thomas [3] 94/12 136/24 166/2 those [134] 3/18 5/18 6/20 7/22 9/23 11/20 13/16 15/20 22/13 23/18 23/23 24/3 24/4 24/23 35/17 38/24 38/24 39/8 39/16 40/5 40/12 42/5 42/16 42/24 44/6 45/24 46/7 46/11 49/25 50/21 55/1 55/6 63/16 64/16 64/20 66/22 66/24 67/16 71/1 71/10 71/14 74/15 74/19 74/23 77/3 78/9 80/22 80/25 82/11 83/25 85/10 88/12 88/13 89/25 90/16 91/2 91/3 91/6 92/18 94/13 96/18 96/22 99/4 101/8 101/11 102/25 104/8 107/4 107/19 107/22 110/1 112/15 112/21 115/16 116/4 123/4 123/23 127/23 129/23 130/2 130/12 133/10 134/9 134/10 134/16 138/1 138/2 138/16 138/17 139/6 139/11 139/18 144/14 146/8 147/2 147/15 147/16 150/16 152/23 154/19 157/3 158/17 158/19 158/21 158/22 159/4 161/21 161/24 164/18 168/5 168/19 170/17 178/14 185/23 186/5 192/21 193/9 196/14 196/21 197/19 197/23 202/20 206/25 207/25 212/6 212/9 222/19 223/2 225/17 227/6 228/1 228/7 228/14 231/17
though [8] 156/24 164/11 177/5 189/25 194/18 218/8 222/20 228/20
thought [10] 3/18 22/20 64/12 74/1 79/11
92/21 185/3 215/7 220/25 222/5
thoughts [1] 162/1
thousands [1] 151/20
threat [2] 186/19 188/10
three [8] 14/11 18/10 20/12 33/1 35/23 128/4 147/15 180/19
through [26] 1/7 5/14 9/22 11/18 11/22 13/9 22/11 24/3 27/16 32/5 68/1 80/1 80/11 82/16 91/4 93/3 102/24 105/13 131/23 135/18 153/20 172/14 216/8 219/10 231/21 233/14
throw [1] 172/15
tight [1] 203/25
time [99] 2/19 4/3 4/16 4/18 6/16 6/23 7/9 12/1 12/4 16/3 17/3 19/10 22/15 25/15 31/10 31/13 33/5 35/13 40/11 44/1 55/23 57/22 58/13 64/1 69/8 70/12 70/13 71/5 76/23 76/23 78/20 78/21 86/16 88/4 88/10 89/3 89/12 90/16 96/16 99/7 100/3 101/7 102/3 102/7 103/13 103/16 107/16 108/3 113/11 113/17 113/18 113/24 119/5 121/25 129/14 133/19 137/10 137/13 151/18 151/18 153/16 158/2 158/5 166/16 171/10 171/22 172/6 178/21 182/5 183/11 184/5 184/12 185/12 186/1 187/24 188/3 190/11 191/15 193/16 196/5 196/14 196/19 197/4 198/15 202/16 212/11 212/22 213/7 215/8 216/25 217/1 220/1 224/20 234/3 235/6 235/6 235/20 236/12 236/25 time systems [1] 16/3 timeframe [16] 8/8 10/9 11/12 12/10
trust [2] 214/20 221/12
trustees [3] 220/17 220/23 226/3
timeframe... [12] 16/23 20/10 39/1 49/16 51/11 51/14 63/21 64/3 68/14 91/7 91/9 208/4
timely [1] 54/17
times [6] 90/22 161/1 180/2 181/20 184/2 230/11
timing [3] 70/21 175/8 184/10
title [4] 19/21 97/20 102/17 120/5 titled [1] 193/12
today [10] 3/17 58/15 61/8 148/19 160/2
160/9 165/16 216/7 222/22 229/10
together [14] 6/15 19/7 102/8 109/6
146/11 146/16 154/7 154/7 183/12 187/9 194/5 210/13 212/7 223/1
told [17] 7/14 97/13 102/19 126/13
126/14 126/20 130/11 132/16 133/4
156/8 156/13 178/1 194/24 221/6 224/4 234/24 234/24
Tom [1] 193/12
tomorrow [10] 69/9 91/15 117/20 200/20
236/4 236/16 236/21 236/22 237/5 237/8 ton [2] 193/12 204/19
too [17] 9/5 37/21 37/23 37/25 38/2 45/16
71/3 79/17 114/17 117/11 117/25 132/18
153/6 173/24 189/22 200/4 218/17
took [6] 64/15 85/17 126/1 150/6 225/2 228/1
tools [2] 197/17 199/3
top [15] 13/15 30/16 39/15 83/12 83/23
84/1 85/4 129/17 144/1 144/25 150/1
175/7 176/15 176/23 231/23
topic [2] 30/14 56/18
topics [3] 8/11 32/12 38/8
total [13] 14/1 14/6 15/5 15/23 83/9 83/21
83/22 84/2 84/3 85/7 115/8 115/16 147/6
totaling [1] 34/13
touch [2] 113/6 177/3
Touche [1] 97/8
tough [1] 20/8
tow [1] 190/3
Towards [1] 144/25
track [8] 55/12 55/18 71/3 74/17 75/17
76/11 77/6 80/1
tracked [1] 75/3
tracking [6] 72/4 75/10 75/19 75/21 78/12
84/13
tracks [1] 71/16
trade [5] 197/17 199/3 199/3 199/4 206/16
training [2] 93/25 174/4
transaction [3] 30/18 172/24 182/25
transactional [1] 182/13
transactions [3] 169/8 182/8 182/21
transcript [8] 1/14 1/22 92/6 118/14 149/3
149/8 152/2 153/22
translated [1] 1/6
translation [1] $1 / 8$
transportation [13] 15/20 16/7 82/4 82/6
82/8 82/9 82/13 82/16 82/19 85/11 105/6 105/9 105/23
treasurer [6] 35/10 36/7 193/12 193/13 193/15 204/19
treasury [3] 173/10 229/11 229/13
treated [1] 120/20
treatment [3] 161/18 227/10 232/14
tremendous [1] 109/15
trial [3] 54/16 54/20 233/22
tried [1] 170/11
tries [1] 74/17
true [9] 23/20 40/4 50/19 75/8 85/15 160/9 190/7 211/14 215/3
trusts [1] 226/12
truth [6] 94/20 126/3 126/21 200/16 235/16 235/20
try [33] 4/6 18/18 20/15 27/15 27/18
32/17 32/23 35/11 41/8 44/12 44/12
44/17 46/21 56/16 62/22 70/25 71/21 73/3 74/18 80/24 94/3 105/14 107/13 160/6 170/8 171/3 184/4 189/13 190/3 199/22 213/25 220/23 225/23
trying [15] 16/14 37/15 38/11 43/23 49/19 53/24 56/4 62/8 73/9 74/22 155/20 170/5 170/22 187/4 221/3
tunnel [4] 33/9 219/3 219/4 219/6 turn [27] 14/10 19/19 28/3 29/17 30/14 31/21 34/4 38/8 38/9 41/1 49/6 56/17 66/13 67/13 83/8 95/25 96/20 96/25 97/2 97/24 110/7 130/2 143/25 144/22 147/19 151/17 187/25
turned [6] 181/2 190/18 191/15 202/23
203/11 223/22
turning [3] 29/2 208/7 216/15
turns [2] 173/24 219/10
twice [1] 77/17
two [32] 5/11 20/13 28/8 32/24 34/19 35/1 38/8 52/2 62/23 83/25 99/3 99/4
122/25 123/4 130/18 132/6 133/4 133/10 133/24 134/16 146/8 146/13 158/15
161/22 165/5 166/12 179/23 183/25
193/22 203/2 206/6 230/16
two percent [1] 146/13
two-minute [1] 52/2
two-year [1] 99/3
type[8] 15/18 32/6 85/10 85/13 85/16
93/24 198/4 199/23
typical [1] 168/13
typically [2] 128/2 219/22
U
UAAL [3] 129/3 129/6 129/7
UAW [8] 58/7 94/12 98/15 98/17 117/1
134/20 136/25 233/25
UBS [2] 186/2 202/13
Ullman [2] 92/3 92/4
Ullman's [1] 93/4
ultimate [1] 41/18
ultimately [2] 179/11 209/17
unable [1] 206/3
uncertainty [1] 14/17
uncertified [1] 1/12
uncured [3] 186/19 190/5 224/24
under [26] $4 / 21$ 14/11 30/16 68/11 82/10
85/17 105/2 138/7 148/17 156/23 156/25
173/16 179/8 186/12 192/9 196/10
203/19 205/24 216/25 217/2 217/15
217/18 219/5 220/4 233/5 235/4
underfunded [1] 231/19
underfunding [8] 62/23 93/23 94/11 148/1
154/16 156/11 156/20 164/17
underlying [1] 226/7
understand [25] 17/12 20/10 32/3 37/24
40/14 42/7 47/8 68/15 79/20 85/3 94/15
101/18 108/11 116/3 121/8 125/2 142/8
159/1 160/22 171/5 184/9 186/14 187/15
227/3 227/8
understandable [1] 208/14
understanding [35] 41/13 60/12 62/15
62/16 62/20 62/21 67/23 68/19 94/1
101/8 125/24 158/25 159/14 172/21
173/13 173/21 174/11 174/13 174/14
175/11 175/13 176/4 176/6 176/24
178/14 180/15 183/6 183/8 183/15

189/21 193/15 193/25 197/3 205/12
208/11
understood [2] 165/23 173/14
undertake [6] 146/19 155/14 155/20
160/14 161/2 178/7
undertaken [2] 162/13 189/7
undertaking [2] 12/13 113/24
undertakings [1] 219/22
underway [2] 107/11 107/25
unedited [1] $1 / 12$
unfair [1] 151/24
unfortunately [1] 204/12
unfunded [15] 15/16 122/24 123/1 128/17 129/3 132/5 132/13 147/21 154/21 155/2 155/22 156/3 160/11 161/13 161/19
unfunned [1] 155/9
unhappy [1] 228/15
uniform [1] 134/6
uniformed [4] 127/20 127/23 134/5 134/7
unilateral [1] 188/19
union [9] 39/16 42/8 42/11 42/14 44/7
50/11 57/1 58/7 226/13
unions [13] 39/24 40/4 40/12 40/17 40/23 44/12 50/3 54/24 57/11 86/13 98/12 98/14 148/12
University [3] 96/8 96/10 167/8
unless [8] 14/15 17/2 45/4 112/14 182/25
183/24 184/5 218/22
unlikely [1] 164/9
unlimited [1] 230/16
Unpack [1] 168/10
unpredictable [2] 196/19 201/25
unsafe [1] 223/4
unsecured [21] 67/24 68/6 121/13 122/6
122/8 122/17 128/21 129/9 129/20
129/24 188/15 213/19 214/1 215/16
215/18 224/3 224/9 228/11 230/12 231/15 231/18
until [16] 4/2 4/6 20/9 54/9 64/2 165/19
201/13 209/12 210/1 210/23 211/10
217/19 230/11 230/25 236/5 236/16
untranslated [1] 1/12
up [67] 2/14 7/21 9/21 10/9 11/16 14/10 15/4 17/5 17/23 18/15 27/13 28/9 30/24
31/5 36/24 37/5 44/12 52/23 59/18 65/23 68/10 69/9 80/12 83/5 88/7 102/1 102/13 102/14 119/1 119/25 122/3 123/4 124/12 124/16 125/3 125/5 126/9 127/14 128/4
129/23 130/25 133/15 143/21 146/25
150/3 150/4 152/3 152/6 152/19 152/24
153/9 160/13 170/24 172/15 175/7
176/23 180/8 192/11 196/25 200/19 208/22 217/17 218/20 224/5 225/18
230/11 232/12
update [1] 116/24
updates [2] 7/2 7/22
updating [2] 7/18 80/25
upon [22] 56/7 90/12 92/17 175/9 176/20
177/15 183/3 191/13 197/4 197/25
198/10 200/15 201/20 205/9 205/15
206/7 206/9 209/24 210/12 211/8 226/5 227/2
upper [1] 88/1
upside [1] 235/1
urban [1] 222/4
us [56] $2 / 20$ 22/10 53/15 69/8 70/5 70/19 71/13 82/11 83/24 87/20 92/7 95/23 96/4 96/18 97/6 97/13 97/22 98/4 98/16 98/22 99/10 99/17 102/18 102/20 104/12
107/22 110/1 111/1 115/24 117/16 118/15 123/25 124/11 126/12 128/14 129/6 132/7 153/10 169/7 170/14 171/2 171/6 172/1 188/20 190/14 190/18 194/4

## U

us... [9] 197/3 209/9 212/22 213/22 214/12 220/5 223/9 224/17 232/8 USA [1] 42/6 use [20] 1/18 1/19 25/11 47/17 47/19 48/10 56/16 94/4 108/17 122/8 131/14 135/20 136/3 139/17 151/15 191/5 197/24 197/25 219/24 223/2 used [28] 37/11 47/5 53/3 56/11 75/17 75/18 75/18 76/10 80/1 80/23 90/9 104/6 104/11 109/8 109/20 110/15 111/18 111/21 125/6 125/9 129/19 129/22 135/21 216/2 218/14 218/15 221/12 223/6
useful [1] 171/5
uses [1] 46/22
using [9] 11/1 34/5 55/10 107/12 129/23 133/6 133/7 155/12 228/10
utilities [1] 217/15
utility [5] 74/9 75/23 80/10 107/3 230/21

## V

vacate [1] 219/9
valuable [2] 222/3 230/5
valuation [10] 125/7 126/16 126/17 127/16 128/15 133/6 135/12 155/21 155/24 156/1
value [17] 33/4 94/10 129/10 129/11 129/11 129/13 129/13 133/7 185/23 187/16 215/19 218/9 219/12 219/20 220/17 221/18 222/21
values [4] 37/20 109/4 168/23 216/13
variables [1] 133/5
variances [1] 70/22
varied [1] 76/23
variety [4] 80/11 107/1 124/25 180/22
various [11] 7/13 42/7 50/11 74/16 78/19
86/13 90/22 96/11 119/23 120/19 225/24
vehicle [1] 111/25
verification [1] 74/25
verified [1] 73/10
verify [2] 72/21 72/24
version [3] 69/23 218/3 225/19
versus [7] 15/6 25/6 68/7 70/22 71/2 72/10 73/5
vert [1] 208/4
very [47] $4 / 104 / 1911 / 2012 / 1019 / 6$ 46/23 70/17 89/15 91/14 101/21 102/25 107/15 109/4 110/5 112/7 112/17 117/6 117/10 133/15 136/21 140/19 165/16 170/19 173/2 178/19 178/24 178/24 183/8 183/20 183/22 185/14 186/18 190/14 192/14 196/8 199/21 206/7 206/9 210/22 211/8 216/24 216/25 218/16 226/1 226/7 228/15 230/2
vested [2] 148/7 163/9
view [11] 11/25 37/24 90/16 143/1 156/22 178/18 206/18 206/23 210/13 224/12 232/16
virtually [2] 231/25 235/22
vote [1] 226/6
W
wage [11] 42/25 43/1 43/3 43/11 43/12 43/15 43/18 44/22 45/15 45/20 45/21 waiting [1] 166/9
waived [1] 140/23
waiver [1] 139/12
want [25] 4/3 6/22 49/4 62/16 69/20 77/12 79/11 84/12 114/10 132/8 135/1 136/15 136/20 153/14 160/7 173/12 182/24 199/20 213/8 225/8 228/18 233/4 236/11 237/1 237/7
wanted [17] 44/24 45/13 56/3 59/16 62/21 68/9 68/9 114/22 120/17 171/2 183/9 199/17 215/5 226/25 227/1 227/2 228/24
was [497]
Washington [2] 55/4 190/20
wasn't [10] 54/15 54/19 59/20 64/24
93/11 141/15 156/5 162/8 171/21 206/9 Wasserstein [1] 167/22
water [27] 15/19 16/6 16/9 21/12 21/16 33/6 82/1 82/20 82/24 85/11 103/7
103/10 103/22 103/25 104/6 104/7
104/10 104/13 104/21 127/24 128/2
216/22 216/23 227/21 228/15 229/24 232/14
way [20] 20/15 24/21 40/9 61/2 94/1 170/5 170/8 176/24 180/22 181/8 182/23 188/14 209/5 211/13 211/16 213/18 215/10 216/16 217/25 221/1
ways [4] 105/12 105/15 204/5 218/17 we [418]
we'll [16] 2/22 4/18 4/22 32/16 32/17 52/4 57/23 69/9 118/14 130/24 149/16 154/7 166/14 172/14 195/4 237/3
we're [24] 28/19 28/22 40/8 52/22 52/23
56/18 78/24 84/13 94/20 94/21 102/24 110/15 119/12 126/2 126/3 127/5 132/8
153/8 166/9 171/23 171/25 187/3 223/12 236/3
we've [9] 14/13 21/9 87/10 93/14 100/24
113/7 169/13 169/17 218/4
weaknesses [1] 194/9
wealth [2] 98/9 98/18
week [1] 191/19
weekly [3] 76/12 76/24 77/16
weeks [4] 38/24 141/3 180/19 221/25
weigh [2] 110/21 221/9
weight [2] 199/10 200/21
Weiss [1] 58/6
welcome [2] 28/24 69/11
well [117] 4/19 16/5 16/6 22/1 32/23 34/4
38/18 40/21 47/3 52/17 54/7 54/14 62/1
63/23 63/24 74/12 87/17 88/18 96/11
96/12 101/23 102/11 103/14 105/10
106/20 107/5 107/16 108/9 108/18
110/25 111/14 111/16 111/17 113/2
113/11 $113 / 25$ 114/1 120/19 121/6
121/21 132/15 133/7 139/3 140/3 140/17
141/2 141/10 143/8 146/8 147/4 148/11
155/12 156/1 157/10 169/13 169/13 169/18 169/24 170/2 171/15 172/15 172/23 173/6 173/14 174/14 175/4 175/13 176/6 176/22 177/2 177/12 177/25 180/4 180/17 181/9 182/16 183/5 185/14 188/9 189/5 190/13 190/23 191/19 192/11 192/12 192/21 193/3 196/2 198/1 201/23 204/8 206/6 207/9 208/24 209/14 210/9 211/24 212/14 213/8 215/1 215/14 216/3 216/23 219/4 220/8 222/2 223/18 224/4 224/24 225/19 225/25 226/19 227/18 228/5 228/9 232/19 235/24
went [6] 22/11 152/18 167/7 167/9 185/6 211/4
were [288]
weren't [3] 44/6 141/12 188/23
what [297]
what's [7] 17/12 20/4 44/24 84/17 169/25

## 175/3 198/21

whatever [8] 39/8 48/6 169/8 184/16
189/10 209/16 209/24 220/24
whatsoever [3] 51/22 55/21 228/12
when [70] $5 / 13$ 6/4 6/8 6/25 7/5 7/18 11/4

15/5 17/22 27/4 27/7 32/4 33/12 39/22 41/15 50/2 52/18 58/14 65/18 68/16 70/6 70/8 70/14 74/14 85/15 89/18 90/9 100/3 102/3 103/11 103/16 103/20 104/2 110/4 110/15 111/21 114/20 115/25 121/23 122/8 137/8 142/1 156/11 168/5 168/7 170/1 171/10 178/5 181/13 181/20 182/12 182/16 187/12 188/9 191/15 197/23 199/1 200/19 205/14 206/16 209/3 209/19 212/25 215/5 215/11 220/8 227/17 230/9 230/15 231/13
whenever [2] 206/21 209/7
where [58] 8/20 12/21 20/10 26/12 30/22 31/3 38/2 44/14 47/7 55/4 61/5 65/1 65/2 71/19 72/1 76/16 80/24 92/12 92/14 93/12 95/21 97/11 97/15 99/18 99/25 102/22 107/12 109/1 110/6 111/10 111/11 112/11 112/21 113/10 113/20 114/23 123/7 123/9 123/18 138/5 138/11 138/13 141/5 147/1 148/10 149/12 150/5 151/13 153/10 155/5 159/16 167/4 167/8 167/12 167/21 176/15 209/21 229/14 Where's [1] 146/24
whereas [1] 230/22
Whereupon [3] 58/1 116/19 195/8 whether [48] 12/19 13/5 13/17 15/23 20/12 29/7 37/20 39/11 43/11 43/11 48/20 51/22 56/18 56/25 57/10 67/7 77/16 86/20 86/21 88/17 89/5 110/20 111/24 113/7 116/4 116/4 117/6 117/12 135/2 150/5 150/11 150/19 150/25 170/12 185/1 187/20 203/16 204/19 205/1 207/10 207/25 211/5 215/16 217/22 219/14 220/16 223/21 235/15 which [111] $1 / 14$ 8/3 10/10 12/21 14/6 14/22 18/4 18/15 25/4 33/2 33/22 35/17 47/23 52/7 59/7 59/18 63/11 64/5 65/22 67/4 67/5 80/23 83/6 83/10 83/13 83/21 84/1 88/21 90/1 90/20 91/9 98/14 102/9 103/2 104/4 106/19 108/17 111/5 115/7 120/25 122/4 122/10 128/23 147/6 153/18 154/23 157/20 161/2 161/21 167/24 168/14 168/21 169/12 171/16 172/18 172/25 173/2 173/19 177/14 177/16 178/14 178/22 183/9 183/25 185/16 186/22 186/24 189/6 190/20 192/22 193/13 194/9 194/11 196/6 198/16 202/2 202/15 203/4 203/7 206/7 209/6 210/21 211/3 211/14 211/25 213/21 213/23 215/21 215/22 217/3 218/5 219/10 219/11 220/12 220/13 221/2 221/20 222/17 222/24 224/17 224/18 225/13 227/16 229/4 230/6 230/17 231/15 233/21 234/10 234/18 235/16
while [10] 17/19 52/4 55/23 92/23 98/5 166/9 173/1 174/18 187/3 212/17 who [55] 5/21 6/1 6/19 24/11 35/6 35/7 35/9 36/2 36/7 37/9 37/9 53/20 59/12 60/3 60/18 61/13 64/19 64/19 77/25 78/9 92/4 93/3 93/11 94/5 94/5 94/22 96/22 122/12 122/14 123/11 123/20 125/8 125/18 125/22 131/8 135/15 137/18 170/15 177/3 177/4 193/2 193/12 193/14 193/15 193/25 194/20 201/16 218/24 226/11 226/13 227/17 228/14 229/23 234/22 234/23
whole [7] 19/4 27/17 118/18 158/2 200/10 212/2 226/19
whom [2] 8/22 87/8
why [20] 50/15 62/20 82/11 90/15 112/3 112/6 113/1 113/5 123/11 140/21 151/5 153/9 173/12 179/1 179/15 199/16

| W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149/11 200/1 } \\ & \text { year [78] } 6 / 24 \text { 6/25 7/3 7/5 7/8 } 7 / 100 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| why... [4] 201/15 207/19 235/3 235/14 | 19/11 20/13 34/2 35/16 44/14 44/18 47/1 |
| Wibble [1] 193/24 | 49/3 49/21 70/3 70/7 70/10 72/23 73/15 |
| will [51] 1/14 1/15 4/1 4/1 4/5 14/8 17/23 | 73/24 76/6 76/11 77/9 77/12 79/18 79/23 |
| 17/25 25/10 30/15 48/14 84/9 91/14 | 81/14 81/15 81/17 81/20 89/24 91/4 91/5 |
| 92/20 94/25 103/4 103/4 103/13 106/16 | 99/3 100/3 102/7 103/9 103/22 106/13 |
| 112/15 115/3 117/19 118/25 119/1 | 108/5 111/5 121/11 128/18 137/9 144/8 |
| 126/18 141/25 142/16 148/1 153/22 | 145/5 145/5 145/14 145/14 145/16 146/6 |
| 153/23 161/3 163/8 165/18 172/15 | 146/13 146/14 147/7 149/20 156/14 |
| 173/10 176/17 176/18 180/1 181/20 | 156/15 158/2 176/7 180/11 186/24 |
| 200/13 200/22 200/24 201/12 201/13 | 188/16 189/17 190/9 195/23 207/19 |
| 216/11 232/19 232/24 236/19 236/20 | 208/5 209/4 210/2 210/12 211/9 212/15 |
| 237/8 237/11 | 213/10 217/19 219/8 223/24 |
| willing [3] 227/15 228/11 230/3 | years [33] 5/11 20/13 20/13 21/3 21/6 |
| willingness [1] 232/13 | 34/19 35/1 90/1 90/24 96/3 97/10 97/13 |
| Windsor [3] 33/9 219/3 219/4 | 99/4 101/16 107/11 110/12 112/7 113/18 |
| wish [2] 169/7 234/2 | 113/19 115/11 115/12 142/15 143/9 |
| Wit [1] 18/9 | 167/20 169/13 189/19 189/22 189/25 |
| withheld [2] 141/22 153/5 | 204/16 210/16 223/7 230/18 233/19 |
| within [11] 101/22 106/13 106/15 108/23 | yes [280] |
| 109/7 110/9 116/3 116/11 199/25 214/19 | yesterday [18] 7/13 7/16 13/22 17/21 |
| 222/4 | 32/4 32/16 38/10 58/14 59/9 69/22 72/14 |
| without [9] 3/11 27/15 94/2 112/18 | 74/1 79/5 79/11 92/2 114/17 116/24 |
| 140/24 163/5 206/25 207/21 213/9 | 118/5 |
| witness [64] 2/12 4/21 14/16 18/13 18/22 | yet [8] 11/5 90/4 143/21 151/11 154/21 |
| 41/7 47/21 48/1 52/9 53/8 54/8 55/6 | 160/15 166/15 214/5 |
| 55/14 55/24 56/3 56/5 56/10 66/6 68/22 | yield [1] 229/11 |
| 86/2 87/13 89/14 91/19 91/24 93/3 93/4 | yielded [1] 35/22 |
| 94/5 94/8 94/10 95/9 114/12 114/12 | York [5] 65/15 167/3 167/3 167/9 167/15 |
| 121/2 130/16 130/22 132/16 132/22 | you [839] |
| 133/15 149/25 150/11 151/11 163/14 | you'll [7] 83/20 152/23 154/7 202/16 |
| 165/19 166/3 166/19 197/9 199/4 199/24 | 202/17 203/18 231/22 |
| 200/15 205/6 205/14 205/16 205/23 | you're [28] 4/21 6/14 6/14 7/3 21/4 28/24 |
| 233/12 233/15 233/16 233/18 233/23 | 33/2 40/10 41/6 58/18 58/25 59/5 69/11 |
| 234/8 235/2 235/9 235/10 235/14 236/7 | 74/22 79/16 83/13 106/9 108/11 114/25 |
| witness' [4] 11/4 47/5 47/20 197/6 | 141/23 144/10 145/5 146/4 146/25 |
| witness's [1] 46/21 | 159/12 162/23 167/10 187/13 |
| witnesses [4] 41/12 201/16 235/3 235/5 | you've [13] 5/10 10/19 44/19 51/2 58/21 |
| won [1] 178/2 | 71/13 97/13 131/3 144/4 147/8 147/8 |
| won't [1] 231/21 | 169/12 216/6 |
| wonderfully [2] 233/16 233/17 | Young [26] 7/10 9/16 9/19 13/16 13/19 |
| word [3] 1/14 110/15 194/8 | 19/10 33/8 36/9 37/14 37/18 51/4 51/21 |
| words [6] 79/12 128/20 187/20 216/2 | 183/11 183/19 184/7 190/19 195/16 |
| 220/4 228/23 | 198/1 199/11 200/4 201/16 209/20 |
| work [43] 3/18 8/17 31/11 44/7 95/21 | 210/12 210/23 218/12 218/13 |
| 96/6 97/17 97/19 97/24 98/15 98/22 99/2 | your [310] |
| 99/10 99/12 99/13 99/14 100/5 101/14 | yours [1] 182/15 |
| 101/16 101/18 101/20 102/9 103/18 | yourself[5] 22/2 23/15 23/23 60/4 187/13 |
| 104/2 104/4 108/12 109/20 115/20 | Z |
| 138/20 160/18 168/5 172/8 185/8 185/17 | Z |
| 187/11 187/16 192/13 197/14 200/15 | zero [1] 217/9 |
| 205/8 209/22 211/9 212/7 | zone [2] 36/20 36/25 |
| worked [11] 51/2 96/2 98/5 101/21 |  |
| 106/17 127/24 130/17 169/12 169/13 |  |
| 183/7 195/16 |  |
| working [16] 6/12 7/21 8/5 8/8 8/12 12/12 |  |
| 35/10 42/18 71/22 99/7 101/10 169/5 |  |
| 183/17 192/3 209/1 215/4 |  |
| workings [2] 139/16 140/4 |  |
| works [1] 37/16 |  |
| worse [1] 196/3 |  |
| worst [1] 220/20 |  |
| worth [3] 7/20 218/21 218/22 |  |
| would [245] |  |
| wouldn't [1] 140/21 |  |
| wrap [1] 133/15 |  |
| Wright [1] 3/5 |  |
| write [2] 10/5 59/17 |  |
| written [4] 10/6 10/8 20/4 232/6 |  |
| wrong [4] 74/2 79/15 92/3 153/8 |  |
| Y |  |
| yeah [7] 18/2 35/9 53/10 93/20 145/17 |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ Lighting Lube, Inc. v. Witco Corp, 4 F.3d 1153 (3rd Cir. 1993) (court focused on damages, interpreted Rule 701 almost 20 years before the 2000 amendment went into effect); Miss. Chem. Corp. v. Dresser-Rand Co., 287 F.3d 359, 373 (5th Cir.
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