EXHIBIT 6

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION

8   **39:21**-**40:17**   Wasson, Robert 2009-07-23   00:01:09   00:03:48   00:30:22

39:21   Q: Because if you hadn't found a company like

39:22   TomorrowNow, then it was your understanding you would

39:23   have needed to upgrade?

39:24   A: Well, I'm not sure what we'd done at that time.

39:25	At that -- if we hadn't have found TomorrowNow, it would
40 1	have well, I don't know where we'd have gone then
40:2	We would have really had to step back and look at some
40:3	stuff on whether or not -- we might have been forced to
40:4	look for another package at that time.
40:5	Q: Do you have an understanding of whether it
40:6	would have been more expensive to look for an entire new
40:7	package than to upgrade to a new version of Oracle?
40:8	A: I think it would have been less expensive to
40:9	look for a new package.
40:10	Q: Why do you believe that?
40:11	A: I think -- actually, I think -- my personal
40:12	view was and my -- if it changes out, my recommendation
40:13	of the Court would have been that PeopleSoft is too
40:14	large a package for local government or for a county our
40:15	size, and I think we could have found a tier 1- or tier
40:16	2-type package that would be a better fit for McLennan
40:17	County with less customization.

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION

---

18   **89:17**-**89:25**   Wasson, Robert 2009-07-23   00:00:36   00:07:26   00:26:44

89:17   Q: (BY MR. RUSSELL) Mr. Wasson, do you recall

89:18   testifying earlier that -- something to the effect that

89:19   if you had not discovered TomorrowNow, your

89:20	recommendation would have been along the lines of
89 21	looking for another product package be ide PeopleSoft?
89:22	A: Correct.
89:23	Q: And -- and did you also state that you believed
89:24	that would be cheaper than doing an upgrade with Oracle?
89:25	A: That, along with the support of PeopleSoft.

19	**90:1** -**90:8**	Wasson, Robert 2009-07-23	00:00:23 00:08:02 00:26:08
	90:1	Q: What -- what understanding did you have at the
	90:2	time of what other product packages there might be which
	90:3	would meet McLennan County's needs?
	90:4	A: Oh, there were two tiers. There's other
	90:5	packages out there, especially since they purchased
	90:6	PeopleSoft. I've looked at other counties that are
	90:7	using it that are more tailored to the county
	90:8	government, in my opinion.

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION

| 23 | **97:6**-**97:16** | Wasson, Robert 2009-07-23 | 00:00:21 | 00:10:22 | 00:23:48 |

97:6	Is McLennan County currently being
97:7	supported on its PeopleSoft releases?
97:8	A: Correct.
97:9	Q: PeopleSoft software? Sorry.
97:10	A: Correct.
97:11	Q: And is it the same versions of the software
97:12	that TomorrowNow is supporting?
97:13	A: Correct.
97:14	Q: And where is McLennan County getting that
97:15	support?
97:16	A: Rimini Street.

| 24 | **98:21**-**99:9** | Wasson, Robert 2009-07-23 | 00:00:56 | 00:10:43 | 00:23:27 |

98:21	Q: You said that you read about Rimini Street in
98:22	some kind of article, and you initiated contact with
98:23	them. Did you ever consider coming back to -- or
98:24	calling Oracle to seek support options?
98:25	A: No.
99:1	Q: Why not?
99:2	A: I just figured it would be too costly and with
99:3	my shop, I needed more of the personal support like the
99:4	third-party type vendors offered to where my techs got
99:5	to know their techs, and the support just seemed so much
99:6	better that way. And you had -- and also the smaller
99:7	shop. That way in my situation, the more you talked to
99:8	somebody who was familiar with our system, it helps,

99:9   too, quite a bit.

TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION