| -    |  |
|------|--|
| 1    | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 2    | FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO   |
| 3    |  |
| 4    | Civil Action No. 10-CV-01546-REB-CBS   |
| 5    |  |
| 6    | The Direct Marketing Association,  |
| 7    | Plaintiff,   |
| 8    | v.   |
| 9    | Roxy Huber, in her capacity as Executive   |
| 10 . | Director, Colorado Department of Revenue,  |
| 11   | Defendant.   |
| 12   |  |
| 13   | DEPOSITION OF THOMAS J. ADLER, Ph.D. taken at  |
| 14   | Norwich, Vermont, on October 22, 2010.   |
| 15   |  |
| 16   | APPEARANCES:   |
| 17   | Matthew P. Schaefer, Esquire<br>Brann & Isaacson   |
| 18   | 184 Main Street, Fourth Floor<br>P.O. Box 3070   |
| 19   | Lewiston, Maine, 04243-3070, on behalf of the<br>Plaintiff, The Direct Marketing Association.  |
| 20   | Jack Wesoky, Esquire   |
| 21   | Senior Assistant Attorney General<br>1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor                            |
| 22   | Denver, Colorado, 80203, on behalf of the Roxy<br>Huber in her capacity as Executive Director, |
| 23   | Colorado Department of Revenue.  |

r

n 

## NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |                | ourselves, yes.                                   |
|----|----------------|---|
| 2  | Q              | Okay. After you undertook the project, there were |
| 3  | ~              | survey questions drafted, is that correct?        |
| 4  | A              | Yes.  |
| 5  | Q              | And who did the initial draft of the survey       |
| 6  |                | questions?  |
| 7  | A              | Well, I did the draft of our survey questions.    |
| 8  |                | EXHIBIT 42 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 9  | Q              | I show you what's been marked as Exhibit 42, and  |
| 10 |                | it's an e-mail to you from Mr. Schaefer dated the |
| 11 |                | 11th of May of this year. And just to make sure   |
| 12 |                | that I'm correct with that identification.        |
| 13 | A              | It was May 11th, 2010. Yes.                       |
| 14 | <sup>1</sup> Q | And at the bottom it says RSG 696?                |
| 15 | A              | Yes.  |
| 16 | Q              | And that e-mail, Mr. Schaefer says to you and     |
| 17 |                | Mr. Whipple, I attach two versions of survey      |
| 18 |                | questions we offer for your consideration.        |
| 19 | A              | Yes.  |
| 20 | Q              | Was that the first time you got any survey        |
| 21 |                | questions related to this case?                   |
| 22 | A              | That was the first time we received anything from |
| 23 |                | Mr. Schaefer with questions suggested.            |
|    | 1              |   |

| 1  | Q | And had you drafted any questions before receipt   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | of the survey questions from Mr. Schaefer?         |
| 3  | A | I don't recall whether we had begun drafting.      |
| 4  |   | Nelson and I, I believe, had talked over the phone |
| 5  |   | about it, but I'm not sure that we'd put anything  |
| 6  |   | on paper yet.                                      |
| 7  |   | MR. WESOKY: Again, my apologies, Matt. Some        |
| 8  | ŀ | of these didn't get copied as I have asked so I    |
| 9  |   | only have one copy.                                |
| 10 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Okay. I'll be looking on with        |
| 11 |   | the witness.                                       |
| 12 |   | EXHIBIT 43 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 13 | Q | Let me show you Exhibit 43 which shows             |
| 14 |   | DMA/Colorado: Possible Survey Questions, Version   |
| 15 |   | 1 for Discussion, document RSG 676. Is that one    |
| 16 |   | of the versions of the draft survey questions you  |
| 17 |   | received from Mr. Schaefer along with the e-mail?  |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 |   | EXHIBIT 44 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 20 | Q | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 44 called      |
| 21 | Į | DMA/Colorado: Possible Survey Questions, Version   |
| 22 |   | 2 for Discussion. Is that the second version of    |
| 23 | I | the questions you received from Mr. Schaefer in    |
|    |   |  |

|    | <u></u> |  |
|----|---------|--|
| 1  |         | connection with the e-mail we just discussed?      |
| 2  | A       | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q       | Now, my question is had you, you meaning RSG, not  |
| 4  |         | you personally, drafted any survey questions       |
| 5  |         | before receiving documents 43 and 44 related to    |
| 6  |         | the Colorado survey that you eventually did?       |
| 7  | A       | I don't recall whether we had anything on paper at |
| 8  |         | that time. We had certainly discussed over the     |
| 9  |         | phone with Mr. Schaefer the form of the            |
| 10 |         | questionnaire and the kinds of questions we might  |
| 11 |         | ask.   |
| 12 | Q       | Did you provide him any specific questions during  |
| 13 |         | those conversations?                               |
| 14 | A       | I don't recall whether we provided specific        |
| 15 |         | questions during those conversations. We           |
| 16 |         | certainly did at the later date.                   |
| 17 | Q       | Would your notes reflect whether you provided      |
| 18 |         | specific questions to Mr. Schaefer before receipt  |
| 19 |         | of Exhibits 43 and 44?                             |
| 20 | А       | Probably not. If you're referring to the phone     |
| 21 |         | notes, probably not. That's usually the other      |
| 22 |         | side of the conversation rather than my side.      |
| 23 |         | EXHIBIT 45 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
|    |         |  |

| 1  | Q | Takes surveys of various kinds; of consumers,      |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | users of products, whatever, right?                |
| 3  | A | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | I take it then it's your habit to receive draft    |
| 5  |   | questions from your clients to use in your         |
| 6  |   | surveys, is that correct?                          |
| 7  | А | It's not necessarily our habit. In some cases, we  |
| 8  |   | draft with little more than a sentence or two from |
| 9  |   | our client about what their objectives are. In     |
| 10 |   | some cases, we have clients who provide what I     |
| 11 |   | would consider to be close to a complete draft of  |
| 12 |   | a full questionnaire.                              |
| 13 |   | EXHIBIT 48 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 14 | Q | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 48 for         |
| 15 |   | identification. It's an e-mail chain. The top      |
| 16 |   | date is 17th of May, and it's RSG 749 at the       |
| 17 |   | bottom.  |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | And the middle e-mail there is yours to            |
| 20 |   | Mr. Whipple saying that you were going to develop  |
| 21 |   | a first questionnaire that you'll send out for     |
| 22 |   | review, is that correct?                           |
| 23 | A | Yes.   |
|    |   |  |

23

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q | Did you develop a first questionnaire and send it  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | out for review later that morning?                 |
| 3  | A | I couldn't say that I sent it out later that       |
| 4  |   | morning, but I definitely developed that first     |
| 5  |   | draft.   |
| 6  | Q | And that first draft is not Exhibits 43 or 44?     |
| 7  | A | No.  |
| 8  |   | EXHIBIT 49 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 9  | Q | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 49. It's       |
| 10 |   | called DMA/Colorado: DRAFT Questionnaire, Version  |
| 11 |   | 3 RSG for Discussion bearing numbers at the bottom |
| 12 |   | starting with page 612 and ending with 616. Is     |
| 13 |   | this document the draft you referred to in the     |
| 14 |   | prior exhibit?                                     |
| 15 | A | I believe so. The only question, I don't recall    |
| 16 |   | whether those comments were embedded at the time   |
| 17 |   | that I initially transmitted this. They may well   |
| 18 |   | have been. I'd have to read more in detail.        |
| 19 | Q | Those comments are TGA. I assume that is you?      |
| 20 | A | That is. Yes.                                      |
| 21 | Q | For this Version 3, did you use any material from  |
| 22 |   | Exhibits 43 and 44 which are the drafts 1 and 2?   |
| 23 | A | I'd have to check, but I believe I did copy and    |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

24

| 1  |   | paste the descriptions of the law and some other   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | pieces.  |
| 3  | Q | You can look at 43 and 44 and maybe that will help |
| 4  |   | you.   |
| 5  | A | So it appears that question 10, the elements of    |
| 6  |   | it, the description of the law I believe I copied  |
| 7  |   | out of Version, well, it's not exact, but it's     |
| 8  |   | copied out of the pieces, pieces of the text are   |
| 9  |   | copied out of these two versions.                  |
| 10 | Q | Okay. Thank you. Who is Karyn?                     |
| 11 | A | Karyn Dossinger is a senior associate in our       |
| 12 |   | Chicago office.                                    |
| 13 | Q | Where Mr. Whipple is?                              |
| 14 | A | That's correct.                                    |
| 15 | Q | Did she work on this project at all?               |
| 16 | A | I believe that she was involved in some way.       |
| 17 |   | She's under the direction of Mr. Whipple, and I'm  |
| 18 |   | not sure what the full extent of her role was.     |
| 19 | Q | Would Mr. Whipple know what the extent of her role |
| 20 |   | was?   |
| 21 | А | Yes.   |
| 22 | Q | But whatever role she had, he never shared that    |
| 23 |   | with you?  |
|    |   |  |

1 А Sorry. 2 MR. WESOKY: I'm glad. 3 MR. SCHAEFER: In fact, I intended to take it 4 out as unrelated. 5 EXHIBIT 51 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION I show you Exhibit number 51. It's an e-mail 6 0 chain dated the 18th of May from you to 7 8 Mr. Schaefer and Mr. Schaefer to you. It's designated by numbers RSG 750 and 751. 9 This is 778, 779. 10 A 11 MR. SCHAEFER: Could be the same document. 12 They're actually the same. Q Yes. 13 So at least for the one that's MR. SCHAEFER: 14 been marked for the record is 778 and 779. 15 0 And I have another copy with a different number so 16 that's why. Referring to the middle e-mail in 17 that chain? 18 A Yes. It says attached is a first draft of the 19 Q questionnaire that I built around the core 20 questions that you sent last week? 21 22 Α Yes. That refers to the questions in number Exhibits 43 23 0

#### NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | and 44?  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q | And is that first draft the Version 3 that you     |
| 4  |   | had?   |
| 5  | A | I believe it would be Version 1. Sorry. It would   |
| 6  |   | be, there would be a Version 1. This is Version    |
| 7  |   | 3. And I'm not sure what happened to Version 1,    |
| 8  |   | but  |
| 9  | Q | I will represent to you that the Version 1 and     |
| 10 |   | Version 2 that I have are Exhibits 43 and 44.      |
| 11 | A | All right. Okay. So this is, so Version 3, I       |
| 12 |   | guess, I didn't recall that I started numbering    |
| 13 |   | from the version numbers that Matt had provided,   |
| 14 |   | but this does appear to be something close to what |
| 15 |   | I would have drafted as the first draft.           |
| 16 | Q | That would be the draft you referred to?           |
| 17 | A | As Version 3.                                      |
| 18 | Q | As Version 3 which is Exhibit 49.                  |
| 19 | A | 49.  |
| 20 | Q | So in Exhibit 51, you refer to Exhibit 49 as the   |
| 21 |   | questionnaire that you drafted?                    |
| 22 | A | Yes. I believe so.                                 |
| 23 | Q | Also it refers to notes and annotations in the     |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

31

|    | · |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | e-mail?  |
| 2  | A | Yes, it does.                                      |
| 3  | Q | So does that coincide now with Version 3?          |
| 4  | A | Version 3 does have the notes and annotations,     |
| 5  |   | yes.   |
| 6  | Q | So we're confident that this e-mail refers to      |
| 7  |   | what's been called Version 3 of the survey?        |
| 8  | A | I believe it does, but it's also possible that     |
| 9  |   | there is another version. Certainly there were     |
| 10 |   | internal versions before this one.                 |
| 11 |   | EXHIBIT 52 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 12 | Q | Exhibit 52. Sir, I've handed you what's been       |
| 13 |   | marked as Exhibit 52, and it's also an e-mail      |
| 14 |   | chain. The top one is from Nelson Whipple to you?  |
| 15 | A | Yes.   |
| 16 | Q | Dated the 18th of May and it's RSG 759-760?        |
| 17 | A | Yes.   |
| 18 | Q | And it talks about phone conversation or trying to |
| 19 |   | set up a phone conversation.                       |
| 20 | А | Yes.   |
| 21 | Q | Did you have that conversation with Mr. Whipple?   |
| 22 | А | I don't recall for certain. I know I had a         |
| 23 |   | conversation with him, but I'm not sure it was at  |
|    | 4 |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

32

| 1  |   | the time that was described here.                  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Q | If you remember the conversation, what was         |
| 3  |   | discussed between you and Mr. Whipple?             |
| 4  | A | I don't remember that conversation.                |
| 5  |   | EXHIBIT 53 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 6  | Q | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 53. It's an    |
| 7  |   | e-mail chain, you to Mr. Schaefer, then            |
| 8  |   | Mr. Schaefer to you, the last date being May 21st, |
| 9  |   | 2010. It's RSG 846.                                |
| 10 | A | Yes.   |
| 11 | Q | Looking at the earlier of the two e-mails, the May |
| 12 |   | 20th from you to Mr. Schaefer, you talk about a    |
| 13 |   | revised draft that responds to your, meaning       |
| 14 |   | Mr. Schaefer and Mr. Isaacson's, comments and      |
| 15 |   | addresses some of the remaining issues?            |
| 16 | A | Yes.   |
| 17 | Q | Do you remember what those comments and issues     |
| 18 |   | were that, using the terms as in this e-mail Matt  |
| 19 |   | and George raised?                                 |
| 20 | A | Well, let me see. I'm not sure that it             |
| 21 |   | responds to your comments address some of the      |
| 22 |   | remaining issues that we had. So we certainly      |
| 23 |   | responded to marginal comments that I had on       |
|    |   |  |

Г

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | r <del></del> |  |
|----|---------------|--|
| 1  |               | Exhibit 49 that we were posing back to them, and I |
| 2  |               | don't recall the details of that conversation well |
| 3  |               | enough to recall what George and Matt had raised   |
| 4  |               | at that time.                                      |
| 5  | Q             | Would you have made notes of that?                 |
| 6  | A             | Probably.  |
| 7  |               | EXHIBIT 54 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 8  | Q             | I hand you what's marked as Exhibit 54 called      |
| 9  |               | DMA/Colorado: DRAFT Questionnaire, Version 4 RSG   |
| 10 |               | for Discussion.                                    |
| 11 | A             | Yes.   |
| 12 | Q             | Is that Version 4 which I just handed you the      |
| 13 |               | draft that is described in the previous Exhibit    |
| 14 |               | 53?  |
| 15 | A             | I believe it is, but since I don't have a file     |
| 16 |               | date on this, I couldn't say for sure that this is |
| 17 |               | referring to 4 rather than 5, for example.         |
| 18 | Q             | And I think you said you don't remember the        |
| 19 |               | comments Matt and George made?                     |
| 20 | A             | No.  |
| 21 | Q             | Which led to this version?                         |
| 22 | A             | No. I don't recall the specific comments.          |
| 23 | Q             | You also say in the e-mail, Exhibit 53, that you,  |
|    |               |  |

| 1  |   | meaning Matt and George, may have other issues     |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | that we will need to address.                      |
| 3  | A | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | Do you remember if they had other issues?          |
| 5  | A | I don't recall.                                    |
| 6  | Q | Okay. Look at the top of that e-mail. The first    |
| 7  |   | part. And it's from Mr. Schaefer to you, correct?  |
| 8  | A | Yes.   |
| 9  | Q | It contains suggestions or comments regarding your |
| 10 |   | latest draft of the survey, correct?               |
| 11 | A | Yes.   |
| 12 |   | EXHIBIT 55 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 13 | Q | I show you what's marked Exhibit 55. It's          |
| 14 |   | DMA/Colorado: DRAFT Questionnaire, Version 5 for   |
| 15 |   | Discussion.  |
| 16 | A | Yes.   |
| 17 | Q | Does that refer or is that the version that's      |
| 18 |   | referenced in the last or next to last sentence of |
| 19 |   | the top half of the e-mail of May 21st?            |
| 20 | A | Again, I couldn't say for sure that this is the    |
| 21 |   | version because it doesn't refer to a version      |
| 22 |   | number.  |
| 23 | Q | If you look in the marginal notes, for example, on |
|    |   |  |

### NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | r |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1  |   | page 00625, does that say MS?                     |
| 2  | A | Yes.  |
| 3  | Q | Can we assume that's Matt Schaefer?               |
| 4  | A | I believe it is, yes.                             |
| 5  | Q | So it's likely then that this Exhibit 55 is the   |
| 6  |   | document referred to in e-mail of May 21st which  |
| 7  |   | is Exhibit 53?                                    |
| 8  | A | Exhibit 53. Yes. And I also see just from my own  |
| 9  |   | recollection the attachment is Version 5. So I    |
| 10 |   | believe that's correct then, yes.                 |
| 11 | Q | Okay.   |
| 12 |   | EXHIBIT 56 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 13 | Q | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 56, sir. It   |
| 14 |   | is another e-mail chain. The top date is the 24th |
| 15 |   | of May, 2010. It's designated with the numbers    |
| 16 |   | RSG 733 and 734.                                  |
| 17 | A | Yes.  |
| 18 | Q | In the middle e-mail, it talks about a newly      |
| 19 |   | revised draft that I, meaning you, put together   |
| 20 |   | over the weekend.                                 |
| 21 | A | Yes.  |
| 22 |   | EXHIBIT 57 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 23 | Q | Does it refer to Exhibit 57 which I just handed   |
|    |   |   |

36

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | you, DMA/Colorado: DRAFT Questionnaire, Version 6? |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | It refers to a later draft than 5, and I'm not     |
| 3  |   | sure whether, in this e-mail I don't refer to the  |
| 4  |   | version number so I'm not certain that it's 6.     |
| 5  |   | Likely is.   |
| 6  | Q | And at the top of that e-mail which is 56?         |
| 7  | А | Yes.   |
| 8  | Q | Matt Schaefer writes to you that we, assuming,     |
| 9  |   | meaning his firm, had a couple of additional       |
| 10 |   | thoughts. So I will send you an e-mail with the    |
| 11 |   | next possible version. Now, would that next        |
| 12 |   | possible version be number 6 that I handed you or  |
| 13 |   | is it a different version?                         |
| 14 | А | I couldn't say for certain. It could have been a   |
| 15 |   | marked-up version of 6. I think that RSG was       |
| 16 |   | creating the successive version numbers.           |
| 17 |   | EXHIBIT 58 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 18 | Q | I hand you what's marked as Exhibit 58, and it's   |
| 19 |   | DMA/Colorado: DRAFT Questionnaire, Version 8 for   |
| 20 |   | Discussion. I note that the number 7 is deleted    |
| 21 |   | in the first marginal note. I will represent to    |
| 22 |   | you that I do not have a Version 7. Do you know    |
| 23 |   | if this Version 8 is what was referred to in the   |

37

#### NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | r |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | After a brief discussion with Counsel off the      |
| 2  |   | record, it was his belief that Version 7 of the    |
| 3  |   | survey is embedded in the e-mail and not produced  |
| 4  |   | because it wasn't saved as such as a separate      |
| 5  |   | document, but he believes he can obtain a copy.    |
| 6  |   | Is that a fair statement?                          |
| 7  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, that is a fair statement.       |
| 8  |   | It wouldn't have been saved in the drafts folder   |
| 9  |   | maintained by RSG but should be something that can |
| 10 |   | be extracted from the e-mail, and I'm happy to do  |
| 11 |   | that.  |
| 12 | Q | So with that caveat that you just heard, sir?      |
| 13 | A | Yes.   |
| 14 | Q | Is Version 8, which you have, the version which    |
| 15 |   | your firm would have edited or changed after       |
| 16 |   | receipt of a version from Mr. Schaefer's office as |
| 17 |   | referred to in Exhibit 59?                         |
| 18 | A | Yes. And because it appears that I have made       |
| 19 |   | comments that appear after Mr. Schaefer's comments |
| 20 |   | referring to either changes that were made or not  |
| 21 |   | made based on our review of this draft.            |
| 22 | Q | Okay. So Version 8 then appears to be Version 7    |
| 23 |   | edited by you or your firm?                        |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | A | Yes.   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Q | Okay. Thank you.                                   |
| 3  |   | (Off-the-record discussion)                        |
| 4  |   | EXHIBIT 60 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 5  | Q | Exhibit 60, sir, is another e-mail chain. The top  |
| 6  |   | is Mr. Whipple to you on May 24th, 2010, and the   |
| 7  |   | bottom is Mr. Schaefer on May 24th, 2010. RSG 697  |
| 8  |   | and 698. In it Mr. Whipple says the attached       |
| 9  |   | Version 8 includes my responses to comments and    |
| 10 |   | corresponding changes.                             |
| 11 | A | No. That's actually from me to Matthew.            |
| 12 | Q | Yes. I am sorry. It's from Mr. Whipple's           |
| 13 | А | Right.   |
| 14 | Q | e-mail, but it's a copy?                           |
| 15 | А | Yes.   |
| 16 | Q | Thank you for pointing that out. I appreciate it.  |
| 17 |   | The attached Version 8 includes my responses       |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | to comments and corresponding changes. So if       |
| 20 |   | we look at Version 8, that confirms that Version 8 |
| 21 |   | is what you edited from the Version 7 that you     |
| 22 |   | received, correct?                                 |
| 23 | A | Yes. I believe so. Yes.                            |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

44

1 Q Thank you. And somehow I removed the RSG piece, but it's 2 Α 3 clearly an RSG draft at that point. EXHIBIT 61 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION 4 Sir, I've handed you what's marked as Exhibit 61. 5 0 It's another e-mail chain from you to Messrs. 6 Isaacson and Schaefer, and then a response to you 7 from Mr. Schaefer May 25th of 2010, RSG 762. 8 And you e-mail saying attached is a final version of 9 10 the guestionnaire reflecting our discussions over 11 the past week. Do you know if what you're 12 referring to (in that e-mail is survey Version 9 --EXHIBIT 62 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION 13 -- which I'm handing to you as Exhibit 62? It's 14 Q 15 DMA/Colorado: Ouestionnaire Version 9 for Final 16 Review. It would appear that this is the next version 17 Α 18 that's referred to in this e-mail, yes. And that final version reflects, as you say, our 19 Q discussions over the past week. Did you make 20 notes of those discussions? 21 22 A I may have. I don't recall whether I had them in 23 my notebook or not.

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | - |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | Q | But if you had made notes, you would have produced |
| 2  |   | them?  |
| 3  | А | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | And again in Exhibit 62, Mr. Schaefer responds to  |
| 5  |   | you with some quick edits?                         |
| 6  | A | 61? Exhibit 61.                                    |
| 7  | Q | So I'm sorry. Thank you for pointing that out.     |
| 8  |   | Exhibit 61.  |
| 9  | A | Yes. He does.                                      |
| 10 | Q | And did you make changes or was Version 9 the      |
| 11 |   | final?   |
| 12 | A | The changes were just a matter of lettering of the |
| 13 |   | subitems and so I don't recall whether we made     |
| 14 |   | another version of the questionnaire or just went  |
| 15 |   | from there. Those aren't pieces that would have    |
| 16 |   | appeared in the final questionnaire anyway.        |
| 17 | Q | I'm sorry. I don't understand what you mean.       |
| 18 |   | Those wouldn't have been pieces.                   |
| 19 | A | So it refers to the lettering of subbullets under  |
| 20 |   | number 7. The subbullet or, sorry, the response    |
| 21 |   | choices began with letter D rather than letter A,  |
| 22 |   | and that was just because of the way Microsoft     |
| 23 |   | Word handled those items.                          |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | A | We had conversations with SSI about their          |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | address-based sampling product, and it didn't      |
| 3  |   | appear to us to be ready for use. They had         |
| 4  |   | advertised it, but it didn't appear that they were |
| 5  |   | ready to begin using it. We had had conversations  |
| 6  |   | with Knowledge Networks over a period of a couple  |
| 7  |   | of years about their product and felt that it was  |
| 8  |   | the best alternative for this kind of project.     |
| 9  |   | EXHIBIT 65 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 10 | Q | I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 65, and   |
| 11 |   | it's an e-mail addressed to you from Mr. Schaefer  |
| 12 |   | of May 27th and it's RSG 880, and it attaches a    |
| 13 |   | redline of the questionnaire with a few final      |
| 14 |   | proposed edits and comments for your consideration |
| 15 |   | flowing from our discussions with DMA and Kevin    |
| 16 |   | Keller. And I assume first of all, I               |
| 17 |   | identified that correctly, did I not?              |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | I assume, sir, that you didn't have conversations  |
| 20 |   | with DMA or Kevin Keller referenced in this        |
| 21 |   | e-mail?  |
| 22 | A | I did not have those conversations directly.       |
| 23 | Q | At the top it says survey questions Version 9 B,   |
|    |   |  |

Γ

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster710aol.com

50

|    | r |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | and if you look back at the exhibits, there is a   |
| 2  |   | version, I think, 9 A?                             |
| 3  | A | Exhibit 63.  |
| 4  | Q | But I did not see a Version 9 B.                   |
| 5  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Could be consistent with our         |
| 6  |   | earlier conversation, and I'm happy to extract 9 B |
| 7  |   | as well if it's embedded.                          |
| 8  |   | MR. WESOKY: Thank you.                             |
| 9  |   | EXHIBIT 66 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 10 |   | EXHIBIT 67 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 11 | Q | Sir, I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 66,  |
| 12 |   | and I'm going to also hand you at the same time    |
| 13 |   | Exhibit 67.  |
| 14 |   | If we could just take a look at Exhibit 67         |
| 15 |   | first, that is an e-mail chain between yourself    |
| 16 |   | and Mr. Schaefer, and you appear to be sending him |
| 17 |   | the final script for the survey; is that correct?  |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | And Mr. Schaefer responds, this appears to capture |
| 20 |   | all the changes we discussed. You see that?        |
| 21 | A | Yes.   |
| 22 | Q | Do you remember what those changes were?           |
| 23 | A | I don't remember the substance of them. They were  |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |   | in response to the comments that were received     |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | from Mr. Keller and DMA, I believe.                |
| 3  | Q | But again, you didn't speak directly with          |
| 4  |   | Mr. Keller or with any member of DMA, correct?     |
| 5  | A | No. That's correct.                                |
| 6  | Q | Take a look at Exhibit 66. Is that the Version 10  |
| 7  |   | that we're talking about? Or is there another      |
| 8  |   | one?   |
| 9  | A | This is Version 10. I don't know if there's        |
| 10 |   | another one.                                       |
| 11 |   | EXHIBIT 68 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 12 | Q | Show you what's marked as Exhibit 68. It's         |
| 13 |   | DMA/Colorado: Questionnaire Version 10, Final      |
| 14 |   | Script.  |
| 15 | А | Okay.  |
| 16 | Q | Would that be the document you're referring to in  |
| 17 |   | the e-mail 67?                                     |
| 18 | А | I don't know which of these two I was referring to |
| 19 |   | for sure. I'd have to compare them word for word   |
| 20 |   | and see where they're different, but I'm not       |
| 21 |   | sure. It could be either one of those two. I       |
| 22 |   | don't know which I was referring to in the e-mail. |
| 23 |   | EXHIBIT 69 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
|    |   |  |

|                 | <b>—</b> ——    |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 1               | Q              | <mark>I hand you what's</mark> been marked as Exhibit 69, sir. |
| 2               |                | You can take a minute to arrange them. I'm trying              |
| <mark>3</mark>  |                | to go fast because of our limited time here.                   |
| 4               | A              | Sure. I appreciate that.                                       |
| <mark>5</mark>  | Q              | This is an e-mail from the top one, June 2nd,                  |
| 6               |                | from Mr. Whipple to Mr. Schaefer, a copy to you,               |
| 7               |                | and it's marked RSG 862 and 863.                               |
| 8               | A              | Yes.   |
| 9               | Q              | In the bottom part of the e-mail it says the                   |
| 10              |                | survey has been programmed and tested and we have              |
| <mark>11</mark> |                | coordinated with the sample provider. What does                |
| <mark>12</mark> |                | programmed and tested mean?                                    |
| <mark>13</mark> | A              | We took the script that is described in Exhibit                |
| <mark>14</mark> |                | 68, and we programmed it as an internet-based                  |
| <mark>15</mark> |                | survey. So we did the, did the necessary                       |
| <mark>16</mark> |                | conversion of that so that it would appear as a                |
| <mark>17</mark> |                | survey over the internet.                                      |
| <mark>18</mark> | <mark>Q</mark> | What does tested mean?   |
| <mark>19</mark> | A              | We have a standard testing protocol that we go                 |
| <mark>20</mark> |                | through for all of our surveys to ensure that the              |
| <mark>21</mark> |                | data that are, that the questions follow the flow              |
| <mark>22</mark> |                | of what has been described, that the data that a               |
| <mark>23</mark> |                | respondent puts into the survey are the data that              |
|                 |                |  |

|                  | - |  |
|------------------|---|--|
| 1                |   | we record at the end. And we also do final test    |
| 2                |   | for readability and a number of other factors.     |
| - <mark>3</mark> | Q | Is that done in-house?                             |
| <u> </u>         | A | In-house.  |
|                  |   |  |
| 5                | Q | The top part of the e-mail is from Mr. Whipple to  |
| 6                |   | Mr. Schaefer saying we might want to randomize the |
| 7                |   | choices in question 7 and question 8?              |
| 8                | A | Yes.   |
| <mark>9</mark>   | Q | Was that done or was that not done?                |
| 10               | A | Yes, it was done.                                  |
| 11               | Q | So that was a change after the program and test?   |
| 12               | A | It was a change after the initial program and      |
| <mark>13</mark>  |   | test. We, typically, whenever we make a change,    |
| 14               |   | we go back and retest the piece of the survey      |
| <mark>15</mark>  |   | that's been changed.                               |
| 16               | Q | I understand you ran a pilot survey before the     |
| 17               |   | final survey, is that correct?                     |
| 18               | A | Yes.   |
| 19               | Q | What's the purpose of that?                        |
| 20               | A | Purpose of the pilot was to make sure that there   |
| 21               |   | weren't any significant issues with respondents    |
| 22               |   | interpreting the questionnaire and with the        |
| 23               |   | responses that we received from the questionnaire. |
|                  |   |  |

-

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q | Did you find any?                                  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | А | No.  |
| 3  | Q | With the pilot?                                    |
| 4  | А | No.  |
| 5  | Q | Knowledge Networks did the actual survey for you?  |
| 6  | А | No.  |
| 7  | Q | You used Knowledge Networks' panel?                |
| 8  | A | That's correct.                                    |
| 9  | Q | When was that complete?                            |
| 10 | A | I don't recall. It was, I believe, in June, but I  |
| 11 |   | don't recall the dates off the top of my head.     |
| 12 |   | EXHIBIT 70 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 13 | Q | Exhibit 70 is an e-mail chain marked RSG 865 and   |
| 14 |   | 866. The top date is June 21st of 2010?            |
| 15 | A | Yes.   |
| 16 | Q | I want to call your attention to the e-mail that's |
| 17 |   | on the bottom of page 1, top of page 2, from       |
| 18 |   | Mr. Schaefer to you and Mr. Whipple.               |
| 19 | A | Yes.   |
| 20 | Q | Do you recall receiving that e-mail?               |
| 21 | A | Yes.   |
| 22 | Q | And with respect to that he advises that the       |
| 23 |   | Department of Revenue in Colorado issued           |
|    | 1 |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

55

| 1   |   | regulations different from the ones that you had   |
|-----|---|--|
| 2   |   | had, correct?                                      |
| 3   | A | There was a change. Not completely different but   |
| . 4 |   | there was a change, yes.                           |
| 5   | Q | And you talk about doing another survey, correct?  |
| 6   |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.               |
| 7   | A | He suggested that we might want to discuss the     |
| 8   |   | potential for doing another, some changes and      |
| 9   |   | getting additional sample.                         |
| 10  | Q | And you did discuss that?                          |
| 11  | A | I don't recall there's an indication that we       |
| 12  |   | might discuss that later in the day, and I don't   |
| 13  |   | recall whether we had that, whether I had that     |
| 14  |   | discussion with him. This was an e-mail chain to   |
| 15  |   | Nelson who was at that time managing the technical |
| 16  | ÷ | work on the project.                               |
| 17  | Q | But no second survey was done, was it?             |
| 18  | A | No second survey was done. That's correct.         |
| 19  | Q | And why not?                                       |
| 20  | A | My understanding is that the changes in the law    |
| 21  |   | were relatively minor with respect to the          |
| 22  |   | questions that were asked in the survey.           |
| 23  | Q | Where did you get that understanding from?         |
|     |   |  |

|    | + |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | A | From the nature of the change in the law.          |
| 2  | Q | Did you read it?                                   |
| 3  | A | Yes, I did.  |
| 4  | Q | You read the Regulation that came out about the    |
| 5  | 1 | time of the e-mail you're referring to?            |
| 6  | A | I don't recall when I read the Regulation, but     |
| 7  |   | yes, we were advised as to what the change         |
| 8  |   | involved.  |
| 9  | Q | You were advised by someone or you read it? I'm    |
| 10 | _ | trying to  |
| 11 | A | Well, at one point I read the Regulation, but I    |
| 12 |   | think at the time we were advised as to what the   |
| 13 |   | change was.  |
| 14 | Q | When I say you, I mean RSG, in consultation with   |
| 15 |   | Brann & Isaacson, considered another survey, did   |
| 16 |   | you not?   |
| 17 | A | Well, there was discussion about it. Yes.          |
| 18 | Q | And you, someone looked into the potential cost,   |
| 19 |   | correct?   |
| 20 | A | We did, yes. We actually put together estimates    |
| 21 |   | for it.  |
| 22 | Q | And you also talked about using a different vendor |
| 23 |   | because of repeat offenders possibly appearing if  |
|    |   |  |

•

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | you used KN. When I say repeat offenders, I mean   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | people that had taken the survey the first time?   |
| 3  | A | That's correct. We wouldn't have gone back to      |
| 4  |   | that same knowledge panel.                         |
| 5  | Q | Did anybody ever say to you that the reason they   |
| 6  |   | didn't want you to do the survey, DMA or Brann &   |
| 7  |   | Isaacson, was because of the expense?              |
| 8  | A | I don't recall that, no. And again, I wasn't       |
| 9  |   | involved directly in those conversations as I      |
| 10 |   | recall. It was                                     |
| 11 | Q | Mr. Whipple?                                       |
| 12 | A | Mr. Whipple who was involved in those              |
| 13 |   | conversations.                                     |
| 14 | Q | So if I wanted to find out about why that second   |
| 15 |   | survey wasn't done, I should talk to Mr. Whipple?  |
| 16 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form. Go ahead.         |
| 17 | A | He and I discussed it at one point so I understood |
| 18 |   | that there was not going to be a second survey.    |
| 19 | Q | But you don't know why there wasn't going to be a  |
| 20 |   | second survey?                                     |
| 21 | A | I don't know whether cost was discussed as the     |
| 22 |   | reason for it. I do know that the reason it was    |
| 23 |   | communicated to me was not based on cost.          |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | Q | Who communicated to you the reason why the survey  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | was not done?                                      |
| 3  | A | Nelson, certainly Nelson and I had conversations   |
| 4  |   | about it, and I believe at some point I had a      |
| 5  |   | conversation with Mr. Schaefer.                    |
| 6  | Q | Is one of the reasons the second survey wasn't     |
| 7  | - | done because of the sensitivity or the need to     |
| 8  |   | have it done in time?                              |
| 9  | A | Again, that wasn't part of the discussion that I   |
| 10 |   | had. Nelson may have had that discussion with      |
| 11 |   | Mr. Schaefer, but the, that wasn't the reason that |
| 12 |   | I understood it wasn't being done.                 |
| 13 | Q | And again  |
| 14 | Α | At least my recollection.                          |
| 15 | Q | Those reasons were conveyed to you by Mr. Whipple  |
| 16 |   | or Mr. Schaefer or both?                           |
| 17 | A | I believe both. I certainly had conversations      |
| 18 |   | with Mr. Whipple, and I have subsequently had      |
| 19 |   | discussions with Mr. Schaefer so                   |
| 20 | Q | What were those subsequent discussions with        |
| 21 |   | Mr. Schaefer?                                      |
| 22 | A | Well, we've had discussions over the time from     |
| 23 |   | June to the current about the survey and the       |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |   | interpretation of the survey results.              |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Q | I'm talking about the issue of not doing the       |
| 3  |   | second.  |
| 4  | A | Oh, it was only with respect to the substance and  |
| 5  |   | not with respect to either timing or cost.         |
| 6  | Q | Okay. So from firsthand knowledge, as expressed    |
| 7  |   | to you by Mr. Schaefer, you do not know the reason |
| 8  |   | the second survey was not done?                    |
| 9  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form.                   |
| 10 | A | I know that with respect to substance that we were |
| 11 |   | in agreement that there was not a need to refield  |
| 12 |   | the survey. I don't know whether cost and time     |
| 13 |   | had entered the discussion at any point with       |
| 14 |   | Mr. Whipple.                                       |
| 15 | Q | There was a consensus that the second survey would |
| 16 |   | not be done then, correct?                         |
| 17 | A | Yes.   |
| 18 | Q | The person with the most knowledge as to why that  |
| 19 |   | second survey was not done would be whom, in your  |
| 20 |   | opinion?   |
| 21 | А | Mr. Schaefer.                                      |
| 22 | Q | What about Mr. Whipple? Do you know if he had      |
| 23 |   | conversations with Mr. Schaefer about why the      |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | A | I don't recall receiving it, but I recall in       |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | general having some communication about completing |
| 3  |   | the report and affidavit, yes.                     |
| 4  |   | (Off-the-record discussion)                        |
| 5  | Q | Why don't we take a short break while I'm doing    |
| 6  |   | this.  |
| 7  |   | RECESS TAKEN                                       |
| 8  |   | EXHIBIT 72 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 9  | Q | I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 72. It's  |
| 10 |   | another e-mail chain, and it appears to respond to |
| 11 |   | number 71. And I apologize, I don't have an extra  |
| 12 |   | copy of that one. But could you identify that?     |
| 13 | A | Exhibit 72?  |
| 14 | Q | Yes.   |
| 15 | A | It's marked as RSG 717, and it appears to be       |
| 16 |   | correspondence regarding timing for another        |
| 17 |   | conference with Matt.                              |
| 18 | Q | And it also talks about signing an affidavit, does |
| 19 |   | it not?  |
| 20 | A | It's the same as 71. I believe.                    |
| 21 | Q | I might lean over                                  |
| 22 | A | Oh, yes. Okay. That's correct.                     |
| 23 | Q | Talks about your availability for signing an       |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |   | affidavit?  |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | A | Yes.  |
| 3  | Q | And I take it you didn't draft that affidavit; it |
| 4  |   | was drafted by Mr. Schaefer?                      |
| 5  | A | That's correct.                                   |
| 6  | Q | And he sent it to you?                            |
| 7  | A | Yes, he did.                                      |
| 8  | Q | And would I be correct in saying that that        |
| 9  |   | affidavit is what ultimately became Exhibit 39,   |
| 10 |   | the Declaration?                                  |
| 11 | A | Yes.  |
| 12 | Q | It went through a couple of drafts but it         |
| 13 |   | ultimately became Exhibit 39, correct?            |
| 14 | A | That's correct. Yes.                              |
| 15 | Q | And it was initially drafted by Mr. Schaefer and  |
| 16 |   | sent to you, correct?                             |
| 17 | A | Yes.  |
| 18 |   | EXHIBIT 72 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 19 | Q | I hand you what's marked as Exhibit 72. It's an   |
| 20 |   | e-mail from Mr. Whipple to you, and he's talking  |
| 21 |   | about sending something directly to Matt. And     |
| 22 |   | it's marked RSG 00699.                            |
| 23 | А | Yes.  |
|    |   | -   |

1 0 What is this? 2 Α This was the transmittal of the report describing 3 the results of the survey that we conducted. When you say the report, it was not the report 4 Q 5 that was ultimately generated which was attached 6 to your Declaration, was it? 7 It was an earlier, there were portions of this Α 8 that presumably made it into that report, but that 9 was essentially the Dec describing the results of 10 the study. 11 Q It wasn't in the report form that we see as an 12 exhibit to your Declaration; is that what you're 13 saying? 14 А It was a Power Point Dec and I don't think, the 15 Dec was later expanded to include the full set of 16 materials as indicated in that exhibit. 17 Q What's the date of that e-mail that you just --18 Α July 22nd. 19 Okay. Thank you. Q EXHIBIT 74 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION 20 21 0 I hand you what's marked as Exhibit 74. It's an 22 e-mail transmittal from Mr. Whipple to Schaefer, copy to you, which essentially says 23 Mr.

64

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | · |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | here is our report. Is that correct?               |
| 2  | A | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q | And it's RSG 00869 for identification?             |
| 4  | A | Yes.   |
| 5  | Q | Is the report he refers to the one which I have    |
| 6  |   | just handed to you                                 |
| 7  |   | EXHIBIT 75 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 8  | Q | marked Exhibit 75, Colorado Consumer Survey,       |
| 9  |   | Final Results, July 23rd, 2010, RSG, Inc.,         |
| 10 |   | designated on the first page was RSG 00575.        |
| 11 | A | I believe that that's the one. I wouldn't know     |
| 12 |   | for certain, but it appears to be dated correctly  |
| 13 |   | and appears to be the content that I had a chance  |
| 14 |   | to look at, yes.                                   |
| 15 | Q | Let me represent to you I received several copies  |
| 16 |   | of Colorado Consumer Survey Final Results with     |
| 17 |   | different dates, and this is the one.              |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | The pages that follow are those that came with the |
| 20 |   | one marked July 23rd, 2010.                        |
| 21 | A | Okay.  |
| 22 | Q | And you have no reason to think otherwise, do you? |
| 23 | A | No.  |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | Q | Now, how did that report differ, if at all, from  |
|----|---|---|
| 2  |   | the final report, the one you attached to your    |
| 3  |   | Declaration dated August 9th? And if you'd like a |
| 4  |   | copy of that August 9th one, I can certainly      |
| 5  |   | provide it to you.                                |
| 6  |   | (Off-the-record discussion)                       |
| 7  | Q | Exhibit 21.                                       |
| 8  | A | Would you like me to try to enumerate all the     |
| 9  |   | differences or just say that it is different in   |
| 10 |   | some respects?                                    |
| 11 | Q | Yes, just go through the                          |
| 12 | A | Enumerate the differences?                        |
| 13 | Q | Yes, that would be helpful.                       |
| 14 | A | Okay. Exhibit 21 includes an additional page 4    |
| 15 |   | that describes the survey sample itself.          |
| 16 | Q | On what page is that?                             |
| 17 | A | That's page 4, RSG 328 on Exhibit 21. That's a    |
| 18 |   | new page.   |
| 19 |   | So then the Exhibit 75, page 9, marked RSG        |
| 20 |   | 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588 are not included in  |
| 21 |   | Exhibit 21. Instead, they are summarized on page  |
| 22 |   | 4 at 328.   |
| 23 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Page 4 of Exhibit 21.               |
|    |   |   |

| 1  | A | Right. And on page 13 marked as RSG 337, Exhibit   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | 21, there is an annotation indicating the          |
| 3  |   | qualification essentially for participating in the |
| 4  |   | questionnaire. And then similarly, on page 14,     |
| 5  |   | RSG 338 of Exhibit 21, there's another annotation  |
| 6  |   | indicating qualification.                          |
| 7  | Q | Let me interrupt here for a moment. Why the        |
| 8  |   | change from Exhibit 75 to Exhibit 21?              |
| 9  | A | To make some of the procedures and assumptions     |
| 10 |   | that were made as part of the survey more          |
| 11 |   | explicit, and I believe there were, there was an   |
| 12 |   | exchange, and I don't recall whether I was part of |
| 13 |   | it, but I know I discussed it with Nelson about    |
| 14 |   | the additional edits that might be made to make it |
| 15 |   | clearer, and I believe that was a conversation     |
| 16 |   | with Mr. Schaefer.                                 |
| 17 | Q | Let me see if I understand. The changes from       |
| 18 |   | Exhibit 75 to Exhibit 21 were discussed among      |
| 19 |   | Mr. Whipple, yourself and Mr. Schaefer, and as a   |
| 20 |   | result of that discussion, the changes were made   |
| 21 |   | from 75 to 21.                                     |
| 22 | A | Yes.   |
| 23 | Q | Okay. And I assume I can just look and see what    |
|    |   |  |

-

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | those changes are?                                 |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form, but go            |
| 3  |   | ahead.   |
| 4  | A | Yes.   |
| 5  |   | EXHIBIT 76 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 6  | Q | Let me hand you what is marked, sir, as Exhibit    |
| 7  |   | 76. It's an e-mail chain identified RSG 00842,     |
| 8  |   | and it's between Mr. Schaefer and Mr. Whipple      |
| 9  |   | where Mr. Whipple submits the report to Matt       |
| 10 |   | Schaefer, and Mr. Schaefer responds he wants to    |
| 11 |   | make revisions to tailor and streamline the        |
| 12 |   | document. Correct?                                 |
| 13 | A | Yes.   |
| 14 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: For the record, it goes on           |
| 15 |   | from there, but it speaks for itself.              |
| 16 | Q | When you do your survey work for other clients, do |
| 17 |   | they tailor and streamline the reports that you    |
| 18 |   | send them?   |
| 19 | A | Yes, typically with our review and approval.       |
| 20 | Q | So you let the client change your report to tailor |
| 21 |   | and streamline it?                                 |
| 22 | A | We work with the clients to tailor and streamline  |
| 23 |   | a report and typically accept comments and         |
| 23 |   | a report and typically accept comments and         |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |           | suggestions from our clients to do it to meet     |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2  |           | their purposes, yes.                              |
| 3  | Q         | Do you ever reject comments?                      |
| 4  | A         | Yes.  |
| 5  | Q         | Did you reject any in this case?                  |
| 6  | A         | I don't recall.                                   |
| 7  |           | EXHIBIT 77 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 8  | Q         | Exhibit 77 is an e-mail. The top one is from      |
| 9  |           | Mr. Whipple, I believe. Would you identify it     |
| 10 |           | with the RSG number at the bottom, please?        |
| 11 | A         | RSG 722.  |
| 12 | Q         | And in that e-mail, Mr. Whipple's responding to   |
| 13 | <br> <br> | Mr. Schaefer's comment about tailoring and        |
| 14 |           | streamlining the documents, correct?              |
| 15 | A         | Yes.  |
| 16 | Q         | And he's saying that the information is there; is |
| 17 |           | that what he's saying?                            |
| 18 | A         | Yes. The information is in the report, yes. And   |
| 19 |           | also indicating that it may not be clear.         |
| 20 |           | EXHIBIT 78 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION              |
| 21 | Q         | I show you what's marked as Exhibit 78. It's an   |
| 22 |           | e-mail chain identified with RSG 704 and 705. And |
| 23 |           | it also looks like it's a response to the e-mail  |
|    |           |   |

| 1  |   | regarding tailoring and streamlining the report?   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q | With regard to the e-mail that appears in the      |
| 4  |   | middle of the first page?                          |
| 5  | A | Yes.   |
| 6  | Q | Is that Mr. Schaefer instructing you as to what    |
| 7  |   | needs to be put in the report?                     |
| 8  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form.                   |
| 9  | A | It's actually an instruction for what would be     |
| 10 |   | included in the Declaration.                       |
| 11 | Q | Okay. Then Mr. Whipple at the top of the e-mail    |
| 12 |   | comments on Matt Schaefer's e-mail, correct?       |
| 13 | A | Yes.   |
| 14 |   | EXHIBIT 79 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 15 | Q | I hand you, sir, what's been marked as Exhibit 79. |
| 16 |   | It's an e-mail chain identified with RSG 769       |
| 17 |   | through 717. And the first e-mail in that chain    |
| 18 |   | talks about a revised deck. Is that another        |
| 19 |   | revised report similar to the July 23rd that we    |
| 20 |   | saw earlier?                                       |
| 21 | A | Yes. If you're referring to the reference to the   |
| 22 |   | bottom of 770?                                     |
| 23 | Q | Yes. Appears to be the first e-mail in that        |
|    |   |  |

| n  |
|----|
|    |
| ed |
|    |
|    |
| )  |
|    |
| 1  |
|    |
|    |
| S  |
| )  |
| e? |
| he |
|    |
|    |
|    |
| n. |
|    |
|    |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

71

| 1  | A | Yes.   |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Q | Did you have any changes?                          |
| 3  | A | It appears that I did find some typos.             |
| 4  |   | EXHIBIT 81 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 5  | Q | And there's also another Final Colorado Consumer   |
| 6  |   | Survey Final Results dated July 29th which appears |
| 7  |   | in Exhibit 81 which I've just handed you. That's   |
| 8  |   | another revision to your report of survey results? |
| 9  | A | Yes.   |
| 10 | Q | That's still not the final one. The final one was  |
| 11 |   | dated August 9th, correct?                         |
| 12 | A | Yes.   |
| 13 | Q | And that was Exhibit 21, I believe.                |
| 14 | A | Yes.   |
| 15 | Q | So July 29th was not the final?                    |
| 16 | A | That's correct.                                    |
| 17 | Q | August 9th, Exhibit 21, was what was the final?    |
| 18 | A | Exhibit 21 is the final version.                   |
| 19 | Q | Right. Okay. And the other versions that we've     |
| 20 |   | looked at, the 23rd, the 26th and the 29th were    |
| 21 |   | all changed as they went along based on            |
| 22 |   | suggestions of Brann & Isaacson?                   |
| 23 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection.                           |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

72

| 1  | A | They were modifications made that were reviewed    |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | with, both Nelson and I reviewed those changes and |
| 3  |   | made a number of, I would consider them to be      |
| 4  |   | minor changes.                                     |
| 5  | Q | But they were the suggestion of Brann & Isaacson,  |
| 6  |   | yes or no?   |
| 7  | A | Most of them, yes. Some of them typos and so       |
| 8  |   | forth that were my suggestions.                    |
| 9  |   | EXHIBIT 82 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 10 | Q | Sir, I'll hand you what's Exhibit 82, e-mail chain |
| 11 |   | designated with RSG 775 through 777.               |
| 12 | А | Yes.   |
| 13 | Q | Referring to the last two e-mails in the chain,    |
| 14 |   | you are sending documents to Mr. Schaefer which    |
| 15 |   | includes the revised copy of the Declaration,      |
| 16 |   | correct?   |
| 17 | A | You mean the top two?                              |
| 18 | Q | Yes.   |
| 19 | A | So the ones on page                                |
| 20 | Q | The most recent?                                   |
| 21 | A | 775. Yes.  |
| 22 | Q | The latest in that chain?                          |
| 23 | A | Yes.   |
|    |   |  |

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS 40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

| 1  | Q | Do you remember the revisions that you made?      |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | A | I don't remember them offhand, no.                |
| 3  | Q | Do you remember if they were large revisions,     |
| 4  |   | major revisions or just kind of tweaking words?   |
| 5  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: I'm going to object to form         |
| 6  |   | just because he's not looking at a copy of it.    |
| 7  | A | Yes. I don't recall, but certainly they were, the |
| 8  |   | Declaration was based on the results that we had  |
| 9  |   | presented to Brann & Isaacson and that we had     |
| 10 |   | discussed with Mr. Schaefer and Mr. Schaefer, I   |
| 11 |   | believe, for the most part accurately reflected   |
| 12 |   | the opinions that we had discussed over the phone |
| 13 |   | in the Declaration. So I don't recall any         |
| 14 |   | significant changes in substance.                 |
| 15 | Q | Fair enough. Okay. Then the top e-mail in that    |
| 16 |   | chain or the latest in that chain, looks like     |
| 17 |   | Mr. Schaefer further revises the Declaration?     |
| 18 | A | Yes.  |
| 19 | Q | And it appears he's revising it, tell me if this  |
| 20 |   | is your impression as well, that he's revising it |
| 21 |   | to comport to what Professor Keller said in his   |
| 22 |   | Declaration?                                      |
| 23 | A | Well, I think the intent was to revise it so that |
|    |   |   |

|    | <u> </u> |  |
|----|----------|--|
| 1  |          | it was consistent with the facts which was that    |
| 2  |          | Professor Keller did review the survey.            |
| 3  | Q        | So it would be consistent, your Declaration would  |
| 4  |          | be consistent with his?                            |
| 5  | A        | So that my Declaration would be consistent with    |
| 6  |          | the facts.   |
| 7  |          | EXHIBIT 83 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 8  | Q        | Let me hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 83,  |
| 9  |          | and it's an e-mail from Mr. Schaefer to you dated  |
| 10 |          | September 10th, bearing RSG 00936 and 937.         |
| 11 | A        | Yes.   |
| 12 | Q        | Do you recall receiving this?                      |
| 13 | A        | I don't recall receiving this specific e-mail, but |
| 14 |          | I do recall the request, yes.                      |
| 15 | Q        | Was that the first time you had been told about    |
| 16 |          | the requirements that are set forth in this        |
| 17 |          | e-mail?  |
| 18 | A        | It was the first time that they were listed out.   |
| 19 |          | We may have had a prior phone conversation. I      |
| 20 |          | don't recall.                                      |
| 21 | Q        | Would you look at the second page of that?         |
| 22 | А        | Yes.   |
| 23 | Q        | And I think to capsulize it, Mr. Schaefer's        |
| ļ  | 1        |  |

-

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

75

| 1  |   | Adler, RSG 939 through 941.                        |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q | In that e-mail, Mr. Schaefer's attaching a draft   |
| 4  |   | of an Expert Report. Correct?                      |
| 5  | A | Yes.   |
| 6  | Q | You didn't draft the Expert Report; he did,        |
| 7  |   | correct?   |
| 8  | A | Yes.   |
| 9  | Q | And is the attachment, RSG 939 through 941, that   |
| 10 |   | draft which is referenced?                         |
| 11 | А | Yes.   |
| 12 | Q | If I didn't identify for the record, the last      |
| 13 | ~ | exhibit was Exhibit 86. I apologize.               |
| 14 |   | EXHIBIT 87 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 15 | Q | Let me hand you what's marked as Exhibit 87. It    |
| 16 | ~ | is an e-mail chain designated with RSG 948, 949    |
| 17 |   | and 950. The most current of the e-mails is        |
| 18 |   | Monday, September 20th, 2010 at 1:51 p.m. This     |
| 19 |   | appears to be a change in addition to the previous |
| 20 |   | exhibit, 86. And in the e-mail, the date is the    |
| 21 |   | bottom of the first page and continues at the top  |
|    |   |  |
| 22 |   | of the second, second page 949, where you state    |
| 23 |   | your Expert Report that Mr. Schaefer drafted looks |

|    | r  |   |
|----|----|---|
| 1  |    | fine to you. Correct?                             |
| 2  | A  | Yes.  |
| 3  | Q  | And you give him your hourly rate?                |
| 4  | A  | Yes.  |
| 5  | Q  | This is a silly question. 344.44 an hour. Why     |
| 6  |    | not 340 an hour?                                  |
| 7  | A  | Because we actually are government-audited rates  |
| 8  |    | and so we have to include the appropriate         |
| 9  |    | multipliers that are set by standard audit        |
| 10 |    | procedures and so forth.                          |
| 11 | Q  | Just struck me as funny, that 44 cents in there.  |
| 12 | A  | Well, that's the rate.                            |
| 13 | Q  | Then Mr. Schaefer responds that he thinks         |
| 14 |    | additional documents should be added to your      |
| 15 |    | Expert Report as documents that you referenced in |
| 16 |    | reaching the results in your report?              |
| 17 | A  | They're actually documents yes, he references     |
| 18 |    | those documents, and those documents are actually |
| 19 |    | documents that I had reviewed prior to this       |
| 20 |    | engagement.                                       |
| 21 | Q  | But it is he who suggests they should be          |
| 22 | I. | incorporated in your Expert Report, correct?      |
| 23 | A  | Yes.  |

86

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | description of their sampling method including     |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | address-based sampling.                            |
| 3  | Q | So the Mantiquila deposition was not something     |
| 4  | ~ | that you relied on or utilized for coming up with  |
| 5  |   | your opinions in this case?                        |
| 6  | А | Not specifically. And as I said, it was a          |
| 7  |   | document that I had reviewed prior to being        |
| 8  |   | engaged in this case.                              |
| 9  |   | EXHIBIT 90 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 10 | Q | Just to complete the record, Exhibit 90 is your    |
|    | Ŷ | final of your Expert Report in this case, is that  |
| 11 |   |  |
| 12 |   | correct?   |
| 13 | А | Yes, it is.  |
| 14 | Q | And I want to make sure that, I'm not intending to |
| 15 |   | include any attachments to it, just the report     |
| 16 |   | itself.  |
| 17 | А | It's right now just the report, yes. Just the      |
| 18 |   | four pages of the report.                          |
| 19 | Q | First I want to establish that your opinion in     |
| 20 |   | this case is related to the survey, not to any     |
| 21 |   | consumer behavior like Professor Keller did but    |
| 22 |   | just, your expertise is in the survey area, is     |
| 23 |   | that correct?                                      |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | A | I have expertise in the survey area, but it's not  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | limited to my expertise in constructing and        |
| 3  |   | conducting a survey.                               |
| 4  | Q | But as I read your Declaration and Expert Report   |
| 5  |   | in this case, I think your opinions are related to |
| 6  |   | the appropriateness of the survey and the          |
| 7  |   | appropriate methodology was used and the           |
| 8  |   | appropriate sample was used to get appropriate     |
| 9  |   | results?   |
| 10 | A | That's the majority of what's contained in there,  |
| 11 |   | but it's not limited to that.                      |
| 12 | Q | What other opinions well, tell me what opinions    |
| 13 |   | you're offering in this case.                      |
| 14 | A | It's the opinions that are contained in the        |
| 15 |   | Declaration.                                       |
| 16 | Q | Tell me what those opinions are.                   |
| 17 | A | You want me to go through all of the opinions in   |
| 18 |   | the Declaration or                                 |
| 19 | Q | Not word for word, but tell me what your opinions  |
| 20 |   | are in this case, what you're being put forth to   |
| 21 |   | offer an opinion on and what that opinion is.      |
| 22 |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.               |
| 23 | A | You'd like me to paraphrase the opinions expressed |
|    |   |  |

|    | F |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | in the Declaration?                                |
| 2  | Q | Sure.  |
| 3  | A | So the opinions, obviously, as you suggested,      |
| 4  |   | relate to the appropriateness of the method, the   |
| 5  |   | opinions include the description of the consumers' |
| 6  |   | response to the law.                               |
| 7  | Q | And when you're saying that, you're just reporting |
| 8  |   | the results of the survey?                         |
| 9  | A | The specific pieces that are included here are the |
| 10 |   | results of the survey. Yes. There's a              |
| 11 |   | description of the methodology and the             |
| 12 |   | appropriateness of the methodology and description |
| 13 |   | of the reliability of the survey methods that are  |
| 14 |   | used.  |
| 15 | Q | So your opinions are related to the survey and     |
| 16 |   | that it was conducted in an appropriate manner     |
| 17 |   | with appropriate methodology, appropriate survey   |
| 18 |   | principles were applied, which should lead to an   |
| 19 |   | appropriate result?                                |
| 20 | A | Yes.   |
| 21 | Q | I just want to make sure that you're not going to  |
| 22 |   | offer opinions on any other area, just on the      |
| 23 |   | methodologies of the survey and its result?        |
|    |   |  |

| 1               | A | I guess the opinions, I'm not sure what you mean   |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               |   | by the Declaration includes those opinions that    |
| 3               |   | you just described.                                |
| 4               | Q | Okay.  |
| 5               | A | And what I'm asked for other opinions by you or    |
| 6               |   | others is not something that I could speculate on. |
| 7               | Q | Now, you state in your Declaration at page 3,      |
| 8               |   | paragraph 4, that RSG designed the survey, is that |
| 9               |   | correct?   |
| 10              | А | Yes.   |
| 11              | Q | Now, I know from our prior discussion that at      |
| 12              |   | least some of the design was provided by Brann &   |
| 13              |   | Isaacson when they sent you some versions of the   |
| 14              |   | questionnaire, isn't that correct?                 |
| 15              |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.               |
| 16              | A | No. So first of all, if you'd like me to explain?  |
| 17              | Q | Yes.   |
| 18              | A | First of all, survey isn't the same, is not        |
| 19              |   | synonymous with questionnaire. Survey is the       |
| 20              |   | process of designing, administering, sampling and  |
| 21              |   | then reporting results that come from a            |
| 22              |   | questionnaire.                                     |
| <mark>23</mark> | Q | Is designing the questionnaire a part of designing |

| 1               |                | the survey?  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| <mark>2</mark>  | A              | It's part of it. One part. Yes.                    |
| <mark>3</mark>  | Q              | You also state that you took appropriate steps to  |
| 4               |                | ensure its objectivity?                            |
| <mark>5</mark>  | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>6</mark>  | Q              | Would you tell me what those steps are?            |
| <mark>7</mark>  | A              | Yes. Most important from our perspective was to    |
| 8               |                | frame the questions in the context, in a very      |
| <mark>9</mark>  |                | specific context in the context of a purchase that |
| <mark>10</mark> |                | was made by a consumer, number one. Number two     |
| <mark>11</mark> |                | was to ask questions in a way that allowed us to   |
| <mark>12</mark> |                | confirm validity, and number 3 was, included       |
| <mark>13</mark> |                | things like the randomizing order so that we       |
| <mark>14</mark> |                | didn't bias by order responses to a question.      |
| <mark>15</mark> |                | (Requested portion read back by reporter)          |
| <mark>16</mark> | <mark>Q</mark> | What do you mean by confirming validity?           |
| <mark>17</mark> | A              | Well, we want to make sure that consumers          |
| <mark>18</mark> |                | understand response choices. So, for example,      |
| <mark>19</mark> |                | with respect to the privacy question, we worded    |
| 20              |                | the privacy question in both an affirmative and a  |
| 21              |                | negative form, if you will, both with slightly     |
| <mark>22</mark> |                | different wording to make sure that consumers      |
| <mark>23</mark> |                | responded consistently independent of the wording. |
|                 |                |  |

| 1               | Q | You oversaw its administration. I assume that's    |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               |   | because Knowledge Networks did the panel, but you  |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | oversaw the administration of the survey, is that  |
| 4               | - | what you mean in the next phrase there, you        |
| <mark>5</mark>  |   | oversaw its administration?                        |
| 6               | A | Yes.   |
| <mark>7</mark>  | Q | How did you ensure that the data were accurately   |
| 8               |   | gathered?  |
| <mark>9</mark>  | A | By checking the data as they came in to make sure  |
| 10              |   | that they were consistent with the specifications  |
| 11              |   | that we gave to Knowledge Networks,                |
| 12              | Q | And then you say they were processed and analyzed, |
| <mark>13</mark> |   | that is the data, in accordance with accepted      |
| <mark>14</mark> |   | statistical principles. What are those             |
| <mark>15</mark> |   | statistical principles?                            |
| <mark>16</mark> | A | The tabulations were first of all, there was a     |
| <mark>17</mark> |   | weighting process applied to make sure that the    |
| 18              |   | data that we collected appropriately represented   |
| <mark>19</mark> |   | the population of the state of Colorado.           |
| 20              | Q | What do you mean by weighting?                     |
| 21              | A | Weighting is a process of applying a factor to     |
| <mark>22</mark> |   | each response to ensure that in aggregate the      |
| <mark>23</mark> |   | responses are representative of the key            |
|                 |   |  |

| 1               |   | characteristics of the Colorado population.                 |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 2               | Q | Who determines the weighting? I'm sorry, I                  |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | didn't mean to jump on your answer.                         |
| 4               | A | In this case, who determines the weighting, the             |
| <mark>5</mark>  |   | weighting criterion, that is that it should be              |
| 6               |   | weighted to the average Colorado consumers, was             |
| 7               |   | specified by us. The calculations of the weights            |
| 8               |   | were done by Knowledge Networks.                            |
| <mark>9</mark>  | Q | Tell me <mark>a little bit</mark> about your weighing. What |
| <mark>10</mark> |   | did you give weight to and how much weight?                 |
| <mark>11</mark> | A | So we wanted to make sure that the key                      |
| <mark>12</mark> |   | demographics of the population of the state of              |
| <mark>13</mark> |   | Colorado were represented in our survey and if              |
| 14              |   | you'd like, I can give you just a simple example            |
| <mark>15</mark> |   | to <mark>illustrate how it</mark> works.                    |
| <mark>16</mark> | Q | That would be great.  |
| <mark>17</mark> | A | Let's say we know that on average there are 50              |
| <mark>18</mark> |   | percent males, 50 percent females in Colorado               |
| <mark>19</mark> |   | which is approximately correct. And let's say               |
| <mark>20</mark> |   | that in our data set we for some reason have,               |
| 21              |   | let's say there are only three responses in our             |
| <mark>22</mark> |   | data set to make it easy, two males and one                 |
| <mark>23</mark> |   | female. In order for that sample to be                      |
|                 |   |   |

| 1               |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 1               |   | representative of the population of Colorado, we   |
| 2               |   | have to apply weights to the individual records.   |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | We downweight the two male responses, let's say    |
| 4               |   | for right now, this isn't correctly right, but we  |
| <mark>5</mark>  |   | weight each of those at .5 and the female gets a   |
| <mark>6</mark>  |   | weight of 1. When we now average those together,   |
| <mark>7</mark>  |   | we get 50 percent males, 50 percent females so     |
| 8               |   | that's the process of weighting.                   |
| <mark>9</mark>  | Q | So if you're heavy on one gender as opposed to the |
| 10              |   | other?   |
| 11              | A | Exactly.   |
| 12              | Q | Or heavy on an age category, you reduce or         |
| <mark>13</mark> |   | increase the other categories by weighting?        |
| 14              | A | That's exactly right, yes.                         |
| <mark>15</mark> | Q | And that's something that's generally accepting    |
| <mark>16</mark> |   | among the statistical world?                       |
| <mark>17</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| 18              | Q | Where could I find some literature on that         |
| 19              |   | subject?   |
| 20              | A | Any elementary survey sampling textbook would have |
| 21              |   | that information.                                  |
| 22              | Q | Can you give me one? Any name?                     |
| 23              | А | Any names? I'm not good at specific names, but I   |
| ,               |   |  |

| 1               |   | could find them for you and provide them if you'd  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               |   | like.  |
| 3               | Q | Not at this time. But did you review any of that   |
| 4               |   | material in connection with this survey in doing   |
| 5               |   | your weighting?  |
| 6               | A | No. I've taught graduate level Probability and   |
| 7               |   | Statistics so it's kind of engaged in my mind. So  |
| 8               |   | I didn't have to review it for this case.  |
| 9               | Q | And what do you mean by statistically valid  |
| 10              |   | results as it appears in the last sentence of  |
| 11              |   | paragraph 4?   |
| <mark>12</mark> | A | That the results themselves have, the sample size  |
| 13              |   | was large enough that the results themselves have  |
| 14              |   | small error or confidence intervals compared to  |
| 15<br>10        | _ | the conclusions that were reached.   |
| 16              | Q | I assume, Dr. Adler, that in connection with your  |
| 17              |   | work in this case you did not review or look at  |
| 18              |   | any Colorado statutes requiring that information   |
| 19<br>20        |   | received by the state Department of Revenue be   |
| 20              | А | kept confidential?<br>I didn't review any specific Colorado laws, no.                            |
| 21              | Q | I didn't review any specific Colorado laws, no.<br>If you would look at paragraph 7, please. You |
| 23              | ¥ | state, in light of the target population, subject  |
| 20              |   | State, in right of the target population, subject  |

| 1               |   | would have otherwise really wanted to look at.     |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               | Q | Okay. Is there anything you would like to have     |
| 3               | ž | done in connection with the survey which you       |
| 4               |   | didn't do?   |
| 5               |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Same objection.                      |
| 6               | A | Not that I can think of.                           |
|                 |   |  |
| 7               | Q | So if you had to do this assignment all over       |
| 8               |   | again, you would do it the same way?               |
| <mark>9</mark>  | A | Well, we couldn't do it the same way. We've        |
| 10              |   | already interviewed these people. But if we were   |
| 11              |   | starting from scratch again?                       |
| 12              | Q | Yes.   |
| <mark>13</mark> | A | I would recommend doing it the way that we did it. |
| 14              | Q | The exact same way with no changes, no tweaks, no  |
| <mark>15</mark> |   | modifications?                                     |
| <mark>16</mark> | A | No. Given the criteria that we had and the         |
| <mark>17</mark> |   | objectives of the survey, I think it was an        |
| 18              |   | appropriate method.                                |
| <mark>19</mark> | Q | Nothing you would have done differently, I take    |
| <mark>20</mark> |   | it?  |
| 21              | A | Nothing substantive. You know, I think obviously   |
| <mark>22</mark> |   | we went through ten drafts of the questionnaire.   |
| <mark>23</mark> | 1 | I probably would have started closer to number 10  |
|                 |   |  |

|    | r |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   | than number 1, but                                 |
| 2  | Q | And in paragraph 9, you state that you drafted and |
| 3  |   | revised the survey questionnaire?                  |
| 4  | А | Yes.   |
| 5  | Q | Working with others at RSG. That would be          |
| 6  |   | Mr. Whipple?                                       |
| 7  | А | Yes.   |
| 8  | Q | Anybody else?                                      |
| 9  | А | Ms. Dossinger was involved in some review.         |
| 10 | Q | Of the questionnaire?                              |
| 11 | А | Of the questionnaire. Yes.                         |
| 12 | Q | Do you know what her input was to the              |
| 13 |   | questionnaire?                                     |
| 14 | А | I don't know. Nelson works closely with Ms.        |
| 15 |   | Dossinger, and they had discussions, but I'm not   |
| 16 |   | privy to those.                                    |
| 17 | Q | We talked about the drafting and revising that     |
| 18 |   | Brann & Isaacson did, didn't we?                   |
| 19 | A | Yes.   |
| 20 | Q | And I think you said you never talked to Professor |
| 21 |   | Keller?  |
| 22 | А | I never talked to him directly with respect to     |
| 23 |   | this case, no.                                     |
|    |   |  |

102

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q | Anything that he may have said would have been     |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | passed on to you through Brann & Isaacson?         |
| 3  | A | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | Okay. Let's turn if we could, please, to Exhibit   |
| 5  |   | 21. The final final. Here it is. Let me give it    |
| 6  | 5 | to you. I shouldn't have taken that. I'm going     |
| 7  |   | to ask if you'd look, please, at, it's page 18.    |
| 8  |   | Okay?  |
| 9  | A | Yes.   |
| 10 | Q | Is this one of the questions that you said you     |
| 11 |   | framed in the, to give alternatives?               |
| 12 | A | Yes.   |
| 13 | Q | I think we talked about that a little bit. To      |
| 14 |   | check and see consistency?                         |
| 15 | A | Yes.   |
| 16 | Q | In the second part of that question, I think these |
| 17 |   | are called focal questions, is that correct?       |
| 18 | A | I don't call them that, but maybe others do.       |
| 19 | Q | What do you call them as opposed to qualifying     |
| 20 |   | questions?   |
| 21 | A | I don't call these qualifying. I'm not sure        |
| 22 | Q | Like qualifying question, are you over the age of  |
| 23 |   | 18?  |
|    |   |  |

-

Г

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

|    | <b>—</b> |  |
|----|----------|--|
| 1  | A        | Oh, but that's not page 18.                        |
| 2  | Q        | No. I said a qualifying question is like are you   |
| 3  |          | over the age of 18. Did you buy on the internet    |
| 4  |          | in the last six months. Those are qualifying       |
| 5  |          | questions?   |
| 6  | A        | We call them screener questions.                   |
| 7  | Q        | Okay. And what do you call the meat and potatoes   |
| 8  |          | questions? Like question 8, like the question      |
| 9  |          | appearing on page 18, what term of art do you use? |
| 10 | A        | This is an opinion question.                       |
| 11 | Q        | Okay. Now, this opinion question, if you look at   |
| 12 |          | the second part of that?                           |
| 13 | A        | Yes.   |
| 14 | Q        | The second, it says I do not mind the state of     |
| 15 |          | Colorado knowing the kinds of products I buy, from |
| 16 |          | whom I buy them, where I have them shipped and how |
| 17 |          | much I spend. Did I read that correctly?           |
| 18 | A        | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q        | Now you know, do you not, that the Colorado law    |
| 20 |          | doesn't require a reporting to the Department of   |
| 21 |          | Revenue of the kinds of products that an           |
| 22 |          | individual buys, correct?                          |
| 23 | A        | I know that it's not the specific item that was    |
|    |          |  |

| 1  |   | purchased. It's the amount and so forth. Yes.     |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | Q | And then if you look at the first question, it    |
| 3  |   | says reporting my name, billing address, shipping |
| 4  |   | address and amount of my purchases is an invasion |
| 5  |   | of my privacy?                                    |
| 6  | A | Yes.  |
| 7  | Q | So that correctly states what the requirements of |
| 8  |   | the reporting law are, doesn't it?                |
| 9  | A | Yes.  |
| 10 | Q | The second one doesn't correctly state the        |
| 11 |   | requirements of the reporting law, does it?       |
| 12 |   | Because it says kinds of products. And there's no |
| 13 |   | reporting requirement for the kinds of products,  |
| 14 |   | is there?   |
| 15 | A | Not directly, but the reporting does include the  |
| 16 |   | entity from which the product is purchased from   |
| 17 |   | which a kind of product can be inferred.          |
| 18 | Q | So if I buy from Lands End, are you familiar with |
| 19 |   | that company?                                     |
| 20 | A | Yes, I am.  |
| 21 | Q | Lands End, I could buy a briefcase?               |
| 22 | A | Yes.  |
| 23 | Q | Or I could buy a pair of socks?                   |
|    |   |   |

| 1   | A | That's correct.                                    |
|-----|---|--|
| 2   | Q | Are they similar kinds of products?                |
| 3   | A | They're hard goods. Yes.                           |
| 4   | Q | So a briefcase is like an article of clothing?     |
| 5   | A | I didn't say it was an article of clothing. I      |
| 6   |   | said it was a hard good.                           |
| 7   | Q | A good as opposed to a service?                    |
| 8   | A | As opposed to a service, that's correct, or as     |
| 9   |   | opposed to food or other kinds of consumables.     |
| 10  | Q | Do you know if I could buy food from Lands End?    |
| 11  | A | I don't know.                                      |
| 12  | Q | So you don't think this question adds a piece,     |
| 13  |   | quote, kinds of products, that is unnecessary?     |
| 14  | A | No. Because no.                                    |
| 15  | Q | That's fine.                                       |
| 16  | A | If you'd like me to explain?                       |
| 17  | Q | No. I don't need you to explain. Why did you add   |
| 18  |   | that in there, kinds of products I buy, when it's  |
| 19  |   | not in the first half of that question?            |
| 20. | A | It's to rephrase the question in an affirmative    |
| 21  |   | form so that we can check consistency between the  |
| 22  |   | two questions.                                     |
| 23  | Q | So you could not have said I do not mind the state |
|     |   |  |

| 1               |                | of Colorado knowing from whom I make purchases, my |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 2               |                | name, billing address and shipping address? You    |
| 3               |                | couldn't have said that?                           |
| 4               | A              | You could say that. I don't understand.            |
| 5               | Q              | Would that be more in line with what the law is?   |
| 6               | A              | It's a phrasing that is more consistent with the   |
| 7               |                | literal phrasing of the law.                       |
| 8               | Q              | Do you think, sir, that the inclusion of the words |
| 9               |                | "kinds of products" in that question had any       |
| 10              |                | residual effect on the survey respondents for the  |
| 11              |                | following questions?                               |
| 12              |                | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.               |
| <mark>13</mark> | A              | No.  |
| <mark>14</mark> | <mark>Q</mark> | You don't think that it was possible that a survey |
| <mark>15</mark> |                | respondent would have that in mind that they have  |
| <mark>16</mark> |                | to report the kinds of products when answering the |
| <mark>17</mark> |                | following questions?                               |
| <mark>18</mark> | A              | No. First of all, the heading is very clear as to  |
| <mark>19</mark> |                | what's being collected and reported; and second of |
| <mark>20</mark> |                | all, as described on page 20, there's a more       |
| 21              |                | literal reporting of what the law looks like.      |
| 22              | Q              | With respect to that question on page 18 that we   |
| 23              |                | talked about, the question at the top of the page, |
|                 |                |  |

|                 | F |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 1               |   | the assumptions, talk about reporting to the       |
| 2               |   | Colorado Department of Revenue.                    |
| 3               | A | Yes.   |
| 4               | Q | Do you think that the mention of the Colorado      |
| 5               |   | Department of Revenue caused any of the            |
| 6               |   | respondents to think in terms of an increase in a  |
| 7               |   | product price because the Department of Revenue is |
| 8               | - | the tax man?                                       |
| 9               |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form.                   |
| 10              | A | No.  |
| 11              | Q | Okay. Fair enough. And you don't think there are   |
| 12              |   | people that responded knowing that the reporting   |
| 13              |   | was to Colorado Department of Revenue because many |
| 14              |   | people are just tax averse?                        |
| 15              |   | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.               |
| 16              | A | No. I don't think that would be the reason for     |
| 17              |   | the responses that were given, no.                 |
| 18              | Q | Do you think that could have influenced any        |
| 19              |   | responses?   |
| 20              | A | It's conceivable.                                  |
| <mark>21</mark> | Q | But you don't think it did?                        |
| <mark>22</mark> | A | I don't think it was a material effect, no.        |
| <mark>23</mark> | Q | Are you familiar with the term reactivity bias?    |
|                 |   |  |

|                 | r |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 1               | A | Reactivity bias, no.                              |
| 2               | Q | Maybe I'm using the wrong term, but it's where a  |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | question puts a response in the head of the       |
| 4               |   | respondent. For example, I go to buy a car or I'm |
| <mark>5</mark>  |   | surveyed about buying a car and they ask me how   |
| <mark>6</mark>  |   | important is the location of outside turn is an   |
| 7               |   | outside turn signal indicator important to you.   |
| <mark>8</mark>  |   | And I would never have thought of that. And all   |
| <mark>9</mark>  |   | of a sudden, I think, well, it's a little         |
| <mark>10</mark> |   | important. In other words, the question suggests  |
| <mark>11</mark> |   | an answer. Do you think any of that occurred in   |
| <mark>12</mark> |   | your questionnaire?                               |
| <mark>13</mark> | A | No.   |
| <mark>14</mark> | Q | Why not?  |
| <mark>15</mark> | A | It's the kind of questions that we've used        |
| <mark>16</mark> | : | previously in quantitative surveys. We've also, I |
| <mark>17</mark> |   | personally have done many focus groups dealing    |
| 18              |   | with issues of privacy, and I find that           |
| <mark>19</mark> |   | individuals who have concerns about privacy bring |
| <mark>20</mark> |   | those up of their own. It's not something that's  |
| 21              |   | suggested to them from outside. And there are     |
| <mark>22</mark> |   | others who simply don't react to the issue of     |
| <mark>23</mark> |   | privacy, for example. So I've done a significant  |
|                 |   |   |

|                | <b>[</b> |  |
|----------------|----------|--|
| <mark>1</mark> |          | amount of both qualitative and quantitative        |
| 2              |          | research, and I don't find that to be the case.    |
| 3              | Q        | Did you consider the use of an open-ended question |
| 4              |          | with a "don't know" response?                      |
| 5              | А        | We do have some other, we have some open-ended     |
| 6              |          | questions. For example, on page 19 there is an     |
| 7              |          | open end there.                                    |
| 8              | Q        | But on 20, you don't have a "don't know" answer,   |
| 9              |          | do you?  |
| 10             | А        | We do not have a "don't know" but it's the same as |
| 11             | 1        | remain the same so they don't know presumably      |
| 12             | -        | would remain the same.                             |
| 13             | Q        | So you're equating don't know with remain the      |
| 14             |          | same?  |
| 15             | А        | Yes. Because it's                                  |
| 16             | Q        | On page 20?  |
| 17             | А        | Yes. Because it's, as a result of this law, if     |
| 18             |          | they don't have an opinion about the result of     |
| 19             |          | this law, presumably they remain the same. It      |
| 20             |          | wouldn't affect them.                              |
| 21             | Q        | I'm certainly not a survey expert, but the surveys |
| 22             |          | that I've seen or heard have a margin of error?    |
| 23             | A        | Yes.   |
|                |          |  |

| 1               | Q              | The political, X is ahead of Y by 3 points.        |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 2               |                | Margin of error is one.                            |
| 3               | A              | Yes.   |
| 4               | Q              | There's no margin of error here that I saw, is     |
| 5               |                | that correct?                                      |
| 6               | A              | There's clearly a margin of error in this sample.  |
| 7               | <mark>Q</mark> | I didn't see it reported.                          |
| 8               | A              | That's because it's trivial. It's trivially        |
| 9               |                | calculated. For a sample size of a thousand, it's  |
| 10              |                | widely know it's plus or minus 3 percent at the    |
| <mark>11</mark> |                | mid point.   |
| <mark>12</mark> | Q              | So three percent, you have a 67 percent figure in  |
| <mark>13</mark> |                | here for one result, that 64, maybe 70?            |
| 14              | A              | Yes. That's correct.                               |
| 15              | Q              | Again, I'm not a survey expert. Was that a         |
| 16              |                | probability or nonprobability survey?              |
| 17              | A              | It's a probability sample. Not a probability       |
| 18              |                | survey.  |
| 19              | Q              | What's the difference between a probability sample |
| 20              |                | and nonprobability?                                |
| 21              | A              | Recall that the survey is a process. It's not the  |
| 22              |                | questionnaire, it's not the sample. It's a whole   |
| 23              |                | process. The sample was constructed as a           |
|                 |                |  |

111

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

1 question is to what extent will consumers be 2 willing to purchase or acquire electronic tolling 3 devices given a number of issues. One being the 4 cost and the, you know, all of the issues dealing 5 with using toll facilities, for example, as well as the issues of potential issue of privacy around 6 7 the fact that the electronic transponder is recording travel, essentially details of travel 8 9 movements. 10 Q Any surveys with regard to the, similar to this 11 one where it's product based, intention to buy a 12 product? Well, in that case that is a product. It's the 13 A 14 intention to buy that --15 Let's leave that one aside and see if there are 0 any others. 16 17 We've done a tremendous amount of product work. A 18 We've done work on cell phone purchases for 19 Motorola. A large number of surveys where we use 20 similar techniques to what we've done here, 21 behavioral intentions to understand purchase 22 patterns, potential purchase patterns of new 23 products.

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1               | Q              | And you found before and after that the consumers  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 2               |                | intend to buy a Motorola product and the same      |
| <mark>3</mark>  |                | number do?   |
| <mark>4</mark>  | A              | Not the same number, but the behavioral intention  |
| <mark>5</mark>  |                | is a reasonable predictor of actual behavior.      |
| 6               | Q              | When you say reasonable, what do you mean by       |
| <mark>7</mark>  |                | reasonable?  |
| 8               | A              | Meaning if 67 percent said that they were going to |
| 9               |                | buy a phone, we wouldn't expect that only 10       |
| 10              |                | percent would.                                     |
| <mark>11</mark> | Q              | You'd expect 30 percent would?                     |
| <mark>12</mark> | A              | No. I would expect something over 50 percent.      |
| 13              | Q              | I assume you've not found a phone where people     |
| 14              |                | would buy, over 50 percent of the population would |
| <mark>15</mark> |                | buy a phone?                                       |
| <mark>16</mark> | A              | No. Unfortunately not. If that were the case, it   |
| <mark>17</mark> |                | would be quite favorable to the product.           |
| <mark>18</mark> | Q              | Any other consumer surveys come to your mind where |
| <mark>19</mark> |                | the intentioned behavior was                       |
| <mark>20</mark> | A              | Oh, virtually every survey that we do is           |
| 21              |                | intentioned behavior survey.                       |
| 22              | <mark>Q</mark> | Talking about consumer.                            |
| <mark>23</mark> | A              | Yes. Consumer. And we do a tremendous amount of    |
|                 |                |  |

|                 | <b></b> |  |
|-----------------|---------|--|
| <mark>1</mark>  |         | work with consumer products companies.           |
| 2               | Q       | Like who?  |
| <mark>3</mark>  | A       | You want me to list all of our clients?          |
| 4               | Q       | Give me a few.                                   |
| <mark>5</mark>  | A       | Heinz, Samsung. I'm trying to think of ones that |
| <mark>6</mark>  |         | are specifically consumers. Ford Motor Company,  |
| <mark>7</mark>  |         | American Airlines.                               |
| 8               | Q       | And it's American Airlines, they don't exist     |
| 9               |         | anymore.   |
| 10              | A       | Don't put that on the record.                    |
| 11              |         | MR. SCHAEFER: One of the largest ones left.      |
| 12              | Q       | Oh, I'm sorry. American Airlines. I was thinking |
| 13              |         | of Eastern Airlines.                             |
| 14              | A       | Oh, Eastern Airlines.                            |
| 15              | Q       | No. They're long gone.                           |
| 16              | A       | Anyway, yes. Large number of consumer product    |
| <mark>17</mark> |         | companies of different types.                    |
| 18              | Q       | And they're all intentioned behaviors?           |
| <mark>19</mark> | A       | Yes. Absolutely.                                 |
| <mark>20</mark> | Q       | And you found across those surveys that          |
| 21              |         | intentions                                       |
| 22              | A       | Are good predictors of behavior.                 |
| <mark>23</mark> | Q       | Of subsequent behavior?                          |
|                 | 1       |  |

|                 | [ |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| <mark>1</mark>  | A | Yes.   |
| 2               | Q | And isn't that effect best seen when the product   |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | or service you're measuring becomes more specific? |
| 4               | A | As I mentioned previously, it is very important    |
| <mark>5</mark>  |   | that people have a specific context in mind and    |
| <mark>6</mark>  |   | the more vague the context, the more difficult it  |
| 7               |   | is to predict the behavior. So, for example, for   |
| 8               |   | radical new technologies where people really don't |
| 9               |   | understand the context in which those technologies |
| <mark>10</mark> |   | might be placed, it's much more difficult to       |
| <mark>11</mark> |   | predict behavior. But for products and services    |
| <mark>12</mark> |   | and circumstances which can be described and       |
| <mark>13</mark> |   | understood by a consumer, our experience has been  |
| <mark>14</mark> |   | that behavioral intentions are good predictors of  |
| <mark>15</mark> |   | actual behavior.                                   |
| 16              | Q | Okay. Let me turn my attention for a minute to     |
| 17              |   | the pilot survey that you took. Mark that as the   |
| 18              |   | next exhibit in line there.                        |
| 19              |   | EXHIBIT 91 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 20              | Q | Just briefly, I hand you what's marked as Exhibit  |
| 21              |   | 91. This is the Colorado Survey Pilot Phase        |
| 22              |   | Results, October the 15th.                         |
| 23              |   | MR. SCHAEFER: As a matter of clarification         |
|                 |   |  |

1 MR. WESOKY: Right. MR. SCHAEFER: Just for the record, I don't 2 3 want to make, get confusing --With that explanation, that the Pilot Survey was 4 Q 5 conducted at some point in June, did you provide these results to Brann & Isaacson? 6 Well, to be clear, I personally didn't. 7 Α Yes. RSG did? 8 0 9 I understand they were provided, yes. А The pilot survey is 250 people? 100 11 А 252 people. What I wanted to do was look at, again, your final 12 0 survey which is I think Exhibit 21? 13 That's correct. 14 A And I wanted to look at your Declaration. I'm 15 0 We have 45 minutes left. We 16 going great here. 17 should be done on time. If you could get those two in front of you? 18 Yes, I have them. 19 Α 20 And if you look at your Declaration? Q 21 A Yes. Paragraph, I believe it's 2? 22 0 Okay. 23 A

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q      | Talks about the objectives of the survey?         |
|----|--------|---|
| 2  | A      | No. That's not paragraph 2.                       |
| 3  | Q      | Thank you. It's paragraph 3.                      |
| 4  | A      | All right.  |
| 5  | Q      | If you look at, it says the objectives of the     |
| 6  |        | survey. Do you see that?                          |
| 7  | A      | Objectives, yes.                                  |
| 8  | Q      | And would you look at Exhibit 21 and see what the |
| 9  |        | objectives of the survey are? They aren't the     |
| 10 |        | same, are they? Exhibit 21, the objectives, and   |
| 11 |        | the   |
| 12 | A      | The objective as stated on page 3 is the same as  |
| 13 |        | objective 2 which is or equivalent to objective 2 |
| 14 |        | which is stated on                                |
| 15 | Q      | Exhibit 21, paragraph 3, right?                   |
| 16 | A      | Well, actually, I have Exhibit 39, paragraph 3.   |
| 17 | Q      | I'm sorry. I was confusing the survey with the    |
| 18 | -<br>- | Declaration.                                      |
| 19 | A      | Right. Right. 39 is the Declaration.              |
| 20 | Q      | For clarity of the record, the objective number 2 |
| 21 |        | in 39 is the same as objective stated in the      |
| 22 |        | survey, Exhibit 21, is that correct?              |
| 23 | A      | Yes.  |
|    |        |   |

124

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q | Why not make the two the same objective?           |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q | You don't know?                                    |
| 4  | A | I'm not sure. I think they're both objectives as   |
| 5  |   | stated on page 3 and the report only included one  |
| 6  |   | of them. Well, in the project approach on page 3   |
| 7  |   | of Exhibit 21, there is a description of the fact  |
| 8  |   | that we are also dealing with the invasion of      |
| 9  |   | privacy issue.                                     |
| 10 | Q | That's not in the objectives, the project          |
| 11 |   | approach?  |
| 12 | A | No. It's not stated.                               |
| 13 | Q | And that doesn't say the project approach, it says |
| 14 |   | the objective in Exhibit 39?                       |
| 15 | A | Yes. That's correct.                               |
| 16 | Q | Now, you and your team drafted Exhibit 21,         |
| 17 |   | correct?   |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | And Mr. Schaefer drafted Exhibit 39, correct?      |
| 20 | A | Yes.   |
| 21 | Q | Give me a few minutes. I want to wrap some things  |
| 22 |   | up.  |
| 23 |   | (Off-the-record discussion)                        |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

125

there's a correlation between those two, and as a result if you use a probability based sample, that correlation is substantially reduced, and so the probability based sample is, can serve as the base for adjustment of the responses to those other --To the opt-in group? Q To the opt-in. А Yes. In this case for the Colorado survey that was done Q but not to the degree as shown in the graph? That's correct in general, yes. А Is there some document or documents which shows 0 the weighting? In fact one of the, at least one of the Α Yes. files that we gave you has the actual weighting included. I see it's starting to snow. Just a few more 0 questions. (Off-the-record discussion) EXHIBIT 92 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION Let's go through the pages at the top so we can Q all have a correct copy. First one is 4/9/10?

22 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23 Q What's your second page?

## NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster71@aol.com

133

| 1  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: They have Bates numbers, by        |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | the way.   |
| 3  | Q | Yours doesn't. I copied them poorly.             |
| 4  | A | 5/2 is the next one.                             |
| 5  | Q | Okay.  |
| 6  | A | Next one is 5/7.                                 |
| 7  | Q | Okay.  |
| 8  | A | And the next one is 5/19.                        |
| 9  | Q | Okay.  |
| 10 | A | Next one is 7/19. Next one is 7/26. And then the |
| 11 |   | last one that I have in this package is 9/15.    |
| 12 | Q | Okay. That should be a complete package. This is |
| 13 |   | Exhibit 92. 4/9 is the first one?                |
| 14 | A | Yes.   |
| 15 | Q | 5/2 is the second one. Correct?                  |
| 16 | A | Yes.   |
| 17 | Q | Okay. Then I'm sorry. Again?                     |
| 18 | A | 5/7.   |
| 19 | Q | 5/19?  |
| 20 | A | 5/19. 7/19. 7/26. And 9/15.                      |
| 21 | Q | Okay.  |
| 22 |   | MR. WESOKY: Matt, please make sure you have      |
| 23 |   | the full set.                                    |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |   | MR. SCHAEFER: I do.                                |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Q | Okay. These are your notes?                        |
| 3  | A | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | Let's take a look at 4/9.                          |
| 5  | A | Yes.   |
| 6  | Q | What is the, this note says and you can paraphrase |
| 7  |   | for me, I just want to make sure                   |
| 8  | A | This, I believe, was an initial call from Matt     |
| 9  |   | describing the context of a study that he was      |
| 10 |   | requesting us to provide a scope for and the fact  |
| 11 |   | that it was a survey of Colorado residents and     |
| 12 |   | basically the context of the law.                  |
| 13 | Q | Okay. The next page?                               |
| 14 | A | Next page.   |
| 15 | Q | And the note is 5/2?                               |
| 16 | A | Yes.   |
| 17 | Q | And you're talking about the timing?               |
| 18 | A | Yes. And this was a discussion basically that we   |
| 19 |   | told him that it was going to take four weeks      |
| 20 |   | minimum for the project, that we would want a      |
| 21 |   | minimum of a thousand sample and then a response   |
| 22 |   | that he had to move quickly to get funding         |
| 23 |   | arranged for this study.                           |
|    |   |  |

135

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  | Q | Was the thousand sample yours?                     |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | A | That was ours.                                     |
| 3  | Q | And the 18 plus is yours?                          |
| 4  | A | It might have been a discussion that we had about  |
| 5  |   | what the appropriate age group would be.           |
| 6  | Q | The next note is May 5th and that was just talking |
| 7  |   | about a call on Friday?                            |
| 8  | A | Yes. Call coming up on the 7th.                    |
| 9  | Q | The next day is the 7th of May?                    |
| 10 | A | Yes.   |
| 11 | Q | What was that conversation about?                  |
| 12 | A | This was a more detailed discussion about the      |
| 13 |   | context of the project and a description of their  |
| 14 |   | theory of the case and the fact that, and then     |
| 15 |   | some of the mechanics that Kevin Keller and others |
| 16 |   | would be, would also be involved in the project.   |
| 17 | Q | So that second part there where it says theory,    |
| 18 |   | that was the theory of the case as described to    |
| 19 |   | you by Mr. Schaefer?                               |
| 20 | A | Yes. And Mr. Isaacson.                             |
| 21 | Q | And the second, and below that kind of a           |
| 22 |   | logistical discussion?                             |
| 23 | A | Yes.   |
|    |   |  |

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 (603)298-2987 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell cjfoster710aol.com

136

| 1  | Q           | About Professor Keller commenting on the survey?   |
|----|-------------|--|
| 2  | A           | Yes.   |
| 3  | Q           | And that Mr. Schaefer will file the Keller         |
| 4  |             | affidavit and the survey report?                   |
| 5  |             | MR. SCHAEFER: Objection. Mischaracterizes          |
| 6  |             | the document.                                      |
| 7  | A           | Yes.   |
| 8  | Q -         | Well, you were not going to file a Keller          |
| 9  |             | affidavit, were you?                               |
| 10 | A           | No.  |
| 11 | Q           | I didn't think so. It says May 2 in effect. What   |
| 12 |             | does that mean? May 1 in effect.                   |
| 13 | A           | My recollection was that the law was in effect on  |
| 14 |             | May 1.   |
| 15 | Q           | Okay. Next is May 19th. Can you tell me what       |
| 16 |             | that note is?                                      |
| 17 | A           | So this looks like kind of a repeat of the         |
| 18 |             | specific objectives, what we wanted to find out.   |
| 19 | Q           | So you wanted to find out whether turning over the |
| 20 | :<br>:<br>: | information will cause people to not purchase?     |
| 21 | A           | Right, versus not paying taxes. We wanted to       |
| 22 |             | avoid getting into the issue of people not liking  |
| 23 |             | to pay taxes because we know nobody does.          |
|    |             |  |

| 1  | Q | And it says don't care about summary collateral,  |
|----|---|---|
| 2  |   | what does that mean?                              |
| 3  | A | I was looking at that. I don't recall what that   |
| 4  |   | means. Oh, I know what that I think in            |
| 5  |   | providing a, probably in providing the scope of   |
| 6  |   | the project they didn't care about us putting in  |
| 7  |   | company qualifications and all that stuff because |
| 8  | - | they only knew about our company.                 |
| 9  | Q | And then the last part is those that have to make |
| 10 |   | the report?                                       |
| 11 | A | That was my understanding.                        |
| 12 | Q | That was conveyed to you by Mr. Schaefer, I take  |
| 13 |   | it?   |
| 14 | A | Yes.  |
| 15 | Q | What does the thing on the right mean, private    |
| 16 |   | purchase?   |
| 17 | A | No. That was my own note. It's put purchase into  |
| 18 |   | future context meaning we wanted to make sure it  |
| 19 |   | was in the context of an actual purchase.         |
| 20 | Q | Next is 7/19?                                     |
| 21 | A | Yes.  |
| 22 | Q | And these notes reflect a conversation?           |
| 23 | A | Yes.  |
|    |   |   |

| 1  | Q | That talks about the amended regulation,           |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | Mr. Schaefer informed you of that?                 |
| 3  | A | Yes.   |
| 4  | Q | And we talked about that earlier.                  |
| 5  | A | That's right.                                      |
| 6  | Q | What about the remainder of this note?             |
| 7  | A | Well, this is the mechanical pieces of having to   |
| 8  |   | put together an affidavit or some sort of a report |
| 9  |   | and the fact that it had to be on file at that     |
| 10 |   | time by July 30th.                                 |
| 11 |   | (Off-the-record discussion)                        |
| 12 | Q | Thank you for pointing that out. As I say, these   |
| 13 |   | were copied in a haphazard fashion.                |
| 14 |   | The next one I have is 7/26. Is that               |
| 15 |   | correct?   |
| 16 | A | Yes.   |
| 17 | Q | That's a call with Mr. Schaefer and tell me what   |
| 18 |   | the note reflects?                                 |
| 19 | A | Well, it was that he wanted a results report that  |
| 20 |   | contained the survey results, the content of the   |
| 21 |   | survey; that we had a discussion of whether we     |
| 22 |   | should include in that report a very detailed      |
| 23 |   | discussion of the sampling methodology and the     |
|    |   |  |

| 1  |   | Knowledge Networks panel, and I think agreed that  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | we didn't need to do it there. That we'd use       |
| 3  |   | documents that Knowledge Networks had provided us, |
| 4  |   | that we needed to specify who had been screened    |
| 5  |   | out of the survey and make that specific. And      |
| 6  |   | these were just the edits that were described in   |
| 7  |   | the, from the draft of the final version of the    |
| 8  |   | report.  |
| 9  | Q | Eliminate?   |
| 10 | A | Fifth bullet. It was a bullet that, and I'm not    |
| 11 |   | sure which this was from the draft to the final    |
| 12 |   | so there was apparently some item that was         |
| 13 |   | eliminated.  |
| 14 | Q | And that would track from the different            |
| 15 | A | Yes, it should track.                              |
| 16 | Q | from the different dates of the final report,      |
| 17 |   | 7/23, 26 and so forth?                             |
| 18 | A | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | And 9/15 is the last one that I have.              |
| 20 | A | Right.   |
| 21 | Q | And tell me the content of this note.              |
| 22 | A | This was just the remaining items that we had to   |
| 23 | ł | do. We wanted to provide an updated copy of my     |
|    | Ì |  |

Г

NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

| 1  |   | resume. In addition to material that we'd already  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   | provided, provide billing info, time records,      |
| 3  |   | notes, this was the, essentially, the discovery    |
| 4  |   | process that we discussed.                         |
| 5  | Q | Now, I noticed in the documents that you billed,   |
| 6  |   | I'll call it "by the piece" for this project. You  |
| 7  |   | didn't bill an hourly rate?                        |
| 8  | А | Yes. That's correct. It's our standard.            |
| 9  | Q | You billed a project rate?                         |
| 10 | A | Yes.   |
| 11 | Q | And that was \$39,900?                             |
| 12 | A | Yes. I believe so.                                 |
| 13 | Q | And you didn't do an itemized bill. You just did   |
| 14 |   | one bill for the project, is that correct?         |
| 15 | А | That's correct.                                    |
| 16 | Q | And then your time is billed at the 344.44 an hour |
| 17 |   | after completion of the project?                   |
| 18 | А | Yes.   |
| 19 | Q | Other than the two hours you met with              |
| 20 |   | Mr. Schaefer, what did you do to prepare for this  |
| 21 |   | deposition?  |
| 22 | A | Well, prior to meeting with Mr. Schaefer, I        |
| 23 |   | reviewed the substantive pieces of our report, the |

| 1               | Q | For travel that's been long scheduled. Just        |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               |   | housekeeping matters for starters. You submitted   |
| <mark>3</mark>  |   | an updated CV in connection with your Expert       |
| 4               |   | Report?  |
| 5               | A | Yes.   |
| 6               | Q | I'm going to show you, let's mark it if we can.    |
| <mark>7</mark>  |   | EXHIBIT 93 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION               |
| 8               | Q | I'm going to show you what been marked as Exhibit  |
| <mark>9</mark>  |   | 93. Does that appear to be the updated version of  |
| <mark>10</mark> |   | your CV?   |
| <mark>11</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| 12              | Q | Now, your Expert Report is marked as Exhibit 90.   |
| <mark>13</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| <mark>14</mark> | Q | And I believe your Declaration is marked as        |
| <mark>15</mark> |   | Exhibit 39.  |
| <mark>16</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| <mark>17</mark> | Q | And I believe the final Survey Results document is |
| 18              |   | marked as Exhibit 21?                              |
| <mark>19</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| 20              | Q | And we've just marked Exhibit 93 as your current   |
| 21              |   | CV.  |
| <mark>22</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| <mark>23</mark> | Q | Okay. Feel free if you need to to consult Exhibit  |
|                 |   |  |

| 1               |   | 90, but do those documents together comprise the   |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 2               |   | packet that is your Expert Report in this case?    |
| <mark>3</mark>  | A | Yes.   |
| 4               | Q | And I'm not going to ask you to do it because we   |
| 5               |   | don't have, time is short. You were shown          |
| 6               |   | different drafts of what ultimately became Exhibit |
| 7               |   | 21?  |
| 8               | А | Yes.   |
| 9               | Q | We didn't look at them in great detail. But am I   |
| 10              |   | correct that one could by looking at what's been   |
| 11              |   | marked as Exhibit 80, the July 26th version, and   |
| 12              |   | Exhibit 81, the July 29 version, and Exhibit 21,   |
| 13              |   | the August 9th version, one could determine        |
| 14              |   | whether or not there were revisions made between   |
| 15              |   | those versions?                                    |
| 16              | A | Yes.   |
| 17              | Q | You just were handed some notes that indicated     |
| 18              |   | that your first discussion with Brann & Isaacson   |
| <mark>19</mark> |   | in this matter was on or about the 9th of April?   |
| <mark>20</mark> | A | Yes.   |
| 21              | Q | And your Expert Report, well, your Declaration was |
| 22              |   | filed dated August 10th?                           |
| <mark>23</mark> | A | Yes.   |
|                 |   |  |

| 1               | Q              | Do I have that date right? Exhibit 39?             |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 2               | A              | 10th.  |
| <mark>3</mark>  | <mark>Q</mark> | You had a number of conversations over the         |
| 4               |                | intervening months between April 9 and August 10   |
| <mark>5</mark>  |                | with Brann & Isaacson regarding this?              |
| 6               | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>7</mark>  | <mark>Q</mark> | And you did all the work on the survey, both       |
| 8               |                | develop the questionnaire, administer the survey,  |
| 9               |                | create the report of the results during that same  |
| <mark>10</mark> |                | time frame?  |
| <mark>11</mark> | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>12</mark> | Q              | And you're comfortable that your Declaration as    |
| <mark>13</mark> |                | submitted in this case which you signed under oath |
| <mark>14</mark> |                | accurately reflects your opinions in this matter?  |
| <mark>15</mark> | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>16</mark> | Q              | And your Expert Report which is marked as, well,   |
| <mark>17</mark> |                | first of all, your Declaration marked as 39, you   |
| <mark>18</mark> |                | looked at certain drafts, you had every            |
| <mark>19</mark> |                | opportunity to review those drafts?                |
| <mark>20</mark> | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>21</mark> | <mark>Q</mark> | And you were comfortable upon review that changes  |
| <mark>22</mark> |                | were made as necessary?                            |
| <mark>23</mark> | A              | Yes.   |
|                 |                |  |

| 1               | Q              | Exhibit 90, your Expert Report, you're comfortable |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 2               |                | that Exhibit 90 that you signed under oath         |
| <mark>3</mark>  |                | accurately reflects your opinions and the other    |
| 4               |                | substance contained in the Expert Report?          |
| <mark>5</mark>  | A              | Yes.   |
| 6               | Q              | And we looked at certain drafts and I believe you  |
| <mark>7</mark>  |                | had an opportunity to review those drafts?         |
| 8               | A              | Yes.   |
| <mark>9</mark>  | Q              | To suggest changes?                                |
| 10              | A              | Yes.   |
| 11              | Q              | And you did that to the extent you felt it was     |
| 12              |                | necessary?   |
| <mark>13</mark> | A              | Yes.   |
| 14              | Q              | We looked at a number of questionnaires, draft     |
| <mark>15</mark> |                | questionnaires today as well. In your experience,  |
| <mark>16</mark> |                | is it typical and consistent with your ordinary    |
| <mark>17</mark> |                | practice in the field to work on a questionnaire   |
| 18              |                | with the client interested in fielding a survey?   |
| <mark>19</mark> | A              | Absolutely. Yes.                                   |
| 20              | <mark>Q</mark> | Is it something that's commonplace?                |
| 21              | A              | Yes. Virtually every survey that we do has some    |
| <mark>22</mark> |                | degree of back and forth with clients.             |
| 23              | Q              | Thank you, Doctor. I don't have anything further.  |
|                 |                |  |