

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 <b>KEVIN LANE KELLER</b> taken at Norwich,
14	Vermont, on October 21, 2010.
15	
16	APPEARANCES:
17	Matthew P. Schaefer, Esquire
18	Brann & Isaacson 184 Main Street, Fourth Floor
19	P.O. Box 3070 Lewiston, Maine, 04243-3070, on behalf of the
20	Plaintiff, The Direct Marketing Association.
21	Jack Wesoky, Esquire Senior Assistant Attorney General 1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor
22	Denver, Colorado, 80203, on behalf of the Roxy Huber in her capacity as Executive Director,
23	Colorado Department of Revenue.

## NORTH COUNTRY COURT REPORTERS

23

40 South Main Street West Lebanon, New Hampshire 03784 87 tel (603)218-6633 fax (603)443-1157 cell (603)298-2987 tel cjfoster71@aol.com

## KEVIN LANE KELLER, DULY SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. WESOKY:

Q MR. SCHAEFER, we've just met. My name is Jack
Wesoky. I represent the state of Colorado,
particularly the Director of the Department of
Revenue, Roxie Huber, in this matter in which
you've been endorsed to testify as an expert
witness. I will be asking you some questions
today, asking you to give me answers and I don't
know if you've ever had your deposition taken, but
I'm just going to go over a few rules of the way
depositions are taken.

It's an oral exercise so please answer orally. No nods or shakes of the head or unh-unh or uh-huh because it's very difficult for our court reporter, Cindy, to make those notes, okay?

- A Yes.
- And I will ask a question and I'll ask you to answer it. I'll try not to jump on your answer. At the same time, please don't try to answer a question before it's over. Okay?
- 23 A Okay.

1	A	The time, yes, mental time where you're actually,
2		yes.
3	Q	And again, just to be sure I understand, in longer
4		cases you might make notes of some time, but in
5		the shorter cases you don't other than in your
6		diary for phone calls?
7	А	If it's a case that spans multiple years, then at
8		some point I will stop and keep track of what I've
9		done, if I haven't invoiced especially, before too
10		much time elapses.
11	Q	Have you done that in this case?
12	A	I have not done that in this case as of yet.
13	Q	Just to make sure I understand. You've not
14		submitted an an invoice yet for your work in this
15		case?
16	A	I have not submitted an invoice yet.
17	Q	To the best of your ability, could you tell me
18		before preparing for this deposition and obviously
19		our time in this deposition, how much time have
20		you spent in this matter?
21	A	Before the preparation of the deposition and the
22		deposition, it would be approximately one day.
23	Q	Eight hours?
	ł	

1	А	Eight hours.
2	Q	In preparation for this deposition, did you make
3		any notes of any kind?
4	А	I don't believe so.
5	Q	In this case, to the best of your recollection,
6		could you tell me what documents you reviewed to
7		prepare your expert opinion?
8	А	Well, they, I think, would be in the Declaration,
9		I believe.
10	Q	Okay.
11	А	Because I was asked that question and then went
12		back to my files and then reported those so the
13		ones associated with my Declaration would be the
14		ones that I've reviewed.
15	Q	Okay. You've not reviewed any, I'll use the term
16		literature, treatises, anything of that nature
17		before giving your expert opinion?
18	А	I'm actually finishing a 15-month project revising
19		my marketing management textbook so over the last
20		15 months I've reviewed a lot of material on
21		consumers and on marketing dealing with lots of
22		different topics. So I actually had a fairly rich
23		background in general to sort of use as part of

1		MR. SCHAEFER: For the record, we produced
2		the press release. I know that's
3		MR. WESOKY: I think I've seen that.
4		MR. SCHAEFER: The summary of complaint,
5		unlike material that might have been otherwise
6		work product which we have not withheld, we
7		withheld nothing on work product grounds, that is
8		an attorney/client communication. So for the time
9		being because frankly I don't think it's a summary
10		of a complaint that he received, so for the moment
11		it's withheld on the grounds that it's an
12		attorney/client communication.
13		MR. WESOKY: We'll cross that bridge when we
14		get to it.
15	Q	But if you retained it, it would be in your files,
16		I assume?
17	А	That's correct.
18	Q	Did you read it or just read the Complaint?
19	А	I believe I read everything that was probably sent
20		to me.
21	Q	Do you remember what it said?
22	А	I don't remember specifically what it said.
23	Q	This is to test your memory. How much time if you

	can recall did you spond roading the Complaint
	can recall did you spend reading the Complaint
	that was sent to you?
A	How many times did I
Q	How much time did you spend reading it?
А	I think the copy of the complaint, I have to think
	about it, but my guess is that's on the order of
	30, 40 minutes maybe.
Q	Did you read it once, twice, three times?
	(Off-the-record discussion)
A	I believe it would be, it certainly would have
	been multiple times since that first time.
	Correct.
Q	So the 30 to 40 minutes would be the first time or
	all the times that you read the Complaint?
A	The 30 or 40 minutes would probably be the initial
	time. I think subsequent times would not take
	nearly as long to go through.
Q	And from your earlier testimony, I take it you
	made no notes on your copy of the Complaint or no
	separate notes about the Complaint?
А	I'm almost certain that's the case but I'm not,
	you know, I'm almost certain that's the case.
<b>i</b>	EXHIBIT 24 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
	Q A Q A

1	Q	Well
2	A	That I couldn't remember. This is the only one I
3		could remember having seen.
4	Q	Let's take a look at Exhibit 17, okay? If you
5		turn to the second page of that exhibit, it has
6		226 at the bottom. You have a couple markings on
7		that page?
8	А	Right.
9	Q	Could you tell me what those mean?
10	А	They don't mean a lot, to be honest. It's just a
11		habit I have of when I read documents I mark them
12		up in part just to, it's just a way I do just to
13		process things so it's just to delineate or just
14		something like that. I'll circle, I'll underline
15		and put things on the side and in this case I did
16		all three.
17	Q	Did you have any issues or problems with those
18		questions 2 and 3 that you kind of drew around?
19	А	Not at all. This was just, literally, just the
20		way I read things.
21	Q	So I take it you had no problems with question 1,
22		question 2, question 3, or question 4?
23	A	That is correct.

No problem with question 5? 1 0 That's correct. 2 Α Now, question 6 you make some notes. 3 Q Perhaps you could tell me what they are. 4 5 Α Question 6, I believe there's only one note there, and I think -- my quess is you can't read this. 6 You guessed correctly. 7 0 And I actually am surprised that I can read this, 8 Α but I'm pretty sure what it says is I would 9 consider is those three words so I would consider 10 reporting my name, billing address, shipping 11 address and the amount of purchase so those are 12 the three words I wrote there. 13 14 Do you know if that was adopted into the final Q 15 version of the survey? I'd have to check to see. 16 Α Why don't we do that if we can. 17 Q So it remained as reporting my name. 18 Α It was not. And then you have some notes also with regard to 19 0 question 7. 20 That's correct. 21 Α Perhaps again you can interpret those for us? 22 0 Oh, boy. I can get some of this. I'll tell you 23 Α

what I can get, and I'll tell you what I'm having trouble, what -- I actually have trouble reading my handwriting, but what I can guess it says and it's just wording, it's nothing I would consider as substantive, is if you were to make this type of purchase again under similar circumstances but assuming this new disclosure requirement were in place, what would you most likely try to do? then what I can't read is what's on that bubble above the 7 on the right there. There's something I added there, and I can't tell what it is, and I can't infer it either. I just don't know. can't read that. It would be easier, it might be easier if I had the original but maybe not. I don't have the original.

Q

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- I don't think I could, I really, I'm pretty good Α about reading what I write and that one's just, but I can't, I'm not perfect, and that's one I'm having a hard time. I can get the word to. Looks like ask but I doubt I would write ask there so I think it's got to be maybe assess, but it doesn't make sense so I don't know what that is.
- What about the bubble at the bottom? 0

1	A	Bubble at the bottom basically just says try to,
2		attempt to, so it was just a restatement of that
3		in that try that I mentioned before in the
4		question.
5	Q	And the next page, part C?
6	A	Yes. I think, again, I just put physical, I think
7		physical store located in Colorado. Instead of
8		from a store. I think in a physical store. I
9		think that's what that refers to.
10	Q	Do you know if those recommendations were or
11		changes were adopted?
12	А	I mean, I think there was some editing that went
13		on. I don't know whether the, some of the
14		specific wording was adopted. I think the, there
15		was some editing that happened there.
16	Q	But if you compare that to the final survey, can
17		you tell if your edits were adopted?
18	А	Not those specific edits, I don't believe so.
19	Q	Okay. Let's look at moving down to question 8.
20	i 	The circle is just for your, to catch your own
21		eye?
22	A	Just, and the check mark is also just the way I
23		read things.
ı		

1 Q And then on the bottom of the page it says a 2 result of this law. What are those notes? 3 Α Says here, so the question is that statement there is as a result of this law, how would your 4 5 internet and catalog purchases from out of state 6 retailers who must report your name, address and 7 amount to the Department of Revenue likely be affected over the coming year. 8 There's several 9 things. One is theese and that's just wording. 1.0 put question mark there because as these other 11 comments were all line editing kind of comments, 12 they're just wording suggestions. And then the 13 question I had here was on the right, the bottom, 14 sorry, the bottom left of the page says makes it 15 seems as if there are some that do not have to 16 report versus given that all of retailers under 17 the law -- and I can't read the rest. I think it 18 just stops there kind of. So it's more of a kind 19 of query or note, if you will, about the use of 20 the word who. 21 Was that change adopted? 22 Α Yes. Yes. The those retailers. Out of state 23 retailers. Yes. That change was adopted.

1	Q	The reason you wanted that change was because it
2		would be inclusive for all out of state retailers
3		because that's who the law affected? All out of
4		state retailers?
5		MR. SCHAEFER: I'm confused by the question.
6		The word they suggested was these and the word I
7		think that he was saying was inserted was those.
8		Not all.
9	А	Actually, I think I suggested those.
10		MR. SCHAEFER: Okay.
11	А	I don't think that's a these, but I'm not
12		positive.
		And you do note that
13	Q	And you do note that
13 14	Q A	I might have said these.
14	А	I might have said these.
14 15	А	<pre>I might have said these that the question made it seem like some don't</pre>
14 15 16	А	<pre>I might have said these that the question made it seem like some don't have to report or the law requires that all have</pre>
14 15 16 17	А	I might have said these.  that the question made it seem like some don't have to report or the law requires that all have to report. Is that an interpretation, a fair
14 15 16 17	А	I might have said these.  that the question made it seem like some don't have to report or the law requires that all have to report. Is that an interpretation, a fair interpretation of your note at the bottom of the
14 15 16 17 18	A Q	I might have said these.  that the question made it seem like some don't have to report or the law requires that all have to report. Is that an interpretation, a fair interpretation of your note at the bottom of the page?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q	I might have said these.  that the question made it seem like some don't have to report or the law requires that all have to report. Is that an interpretation, a fair interpretation of your note at the bottom of the page?  I believe so, but, again, it's hard to remember

1		received the August 9th version of the survey?
2	A	It would seem if this e-mail was August 10th that
3		he, I would think that's when I would have
4		received that.
5	Q	And do you also receive Mr. Adler's Declaration at
6		that time?
7	A	I believe that the e-mail seems to indicate that.
8	Q	From my recollection, you had not received a copy
9		of his Declaration before this time?
10		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection.
11	A	Again, the time line is hard to remember as to
12		when I got something. It refers to the final
13		versions and so I can't be specific about that in
14		particular.
15		EXHIBIT 32 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
16	Q	I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 32. It's
17		an e-mail from Mr. Schaefer to you dated September
18		10th.
19	A	Correct.
20	Q	And it discusses certain requirements for this
21		lawsuit.
22	A	That seems to be correct.
23	Q	Is that the first time that you became aware of
	İ	

1		put it.
2	Q	And then let's go to the last page on that exhibit
3		which is your page of notes. Would you tell me
4		what they say?
5	A	They're going to be hard. Okay. The top part has
6		DMA and NYC for New York City and it looks like it
7		has the name of a Senior Vice President perhaps.
8	Q	Did you speak with that individual?
9	A	No. And then it says Colorado legislation, state
10		revenue department, and looks like remote sales
11		and March 1.
12	Q	Do you know why you wrote those down?
13	A	I think there was some description of the case,
14		and I was just writing down words, I think, from
15		that description.
16	Q	Would that have been on your initial contact with
17		Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Schaefer? Because these
18		notes are undated. That's why I'm asking.
19	A	They are undated, and that would be my guess, but
20		I can't say for sure when and I also unfortunately
21		can't say that this was all from one phone
22		conversation. This could have been from multiple
23		phone conversations because it was in the file.

	[	
1	Q	Taking notes, Colorado legislation, state revenue
2		department, so forth. Then you have the word
3		nexus and something below that and I can't make
4		that out. Could you tell me what that is?
5	A	I got nexus, too. But below it it's really hard
6		to tell. So I'm sorry about that. It looks like
7		it could be high, but, you know, the first word,
8		but I'm not sure. It could be ruling or
9		something. You know, R, even though it doesn't
10		look like it, that second word underneath there,
11		it could be R U Y because a lot of times when
12		you're on a phone conversation you just don't have
13	=	time to get full words. You're just trying to get
14		as many of the letters as you can.
15	Q	Then I see over to the right there it's a little
16		arrow, physical presence, employees/facility?
17	A	Facilities, I think probably.
18	Q	And below that agents and then an arrow pointing
19		down, economic pressure?
20	А	Presence.
21	Q	Okay. Economic presence. State?
22	A	Tried.
23	Q	State tried. What does that mean?

1	А	I think these are just notes about the background
2		to the case and just talking about different, the
3		development of the case through, that they were
4		giving me as general background and I just was
5		taking notes that related to that.
6	Q	They meaning, I'll use your words, George and
7		Matt?
8	А	George and Matt. Correct.
9	Q	Giving you background about the case and what it
10		was about?
11	А	Descriptive background, correct.
12	Q	Could it be that they were describing their theory
13		of the case to you?
14		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form. Go
15		ahead.
16	А	No. I think this was very much sort of an
17		historical account of what had happened in the
18		development in the case. As I recall it was very
19		historical and like a reporter kind of descriptive
20		account.
21	Q	Over on the right it says Tom Adler, RSG,
22		something below that?
23	А	Unbiased sample from and what I can't read is, it

	1	
1		may, from Colorado. Probably should be of
2		Colorado. That's CO, I think, in the bottom
3		right. So unbiased sample from Colorado. That
4		was going to be a survey that was going to be
5		conducted, I guess.
6	Q	So you were told by George and Matt that Tom Adler
7		from RSG was going to conduct an unbiased survey
8		from Colorado?
9	A	All I know is, I don't know when I was told this
10		because I don't know when I wrote this, but it is
11		just the fact that Tom Adler RSG and I've got
12		something about an unbiased sample from Colorado.
13	Q	And you knew Mr. Adler before this?
14	А	I don't think we actually ever met in person, but
15		I know of him.
16	Q	Then you have a line, it appears, and below that
17		are more notes?
18	А	Right. Right.
19	Q	Can you tell me what those notes are?
20	А	Looks like it says talks about noncollecting
21		retailer.
22	Q	And the one next to that looks like, is it
23		collecting retailer?

	i .	
1	А	Yes. That's correct. In parentheses, yes.
2	Q	And over on the right the preliminary
3		injunction/damages, what does that mean?
4	А	Again, that's part of the chronicle I believe I
5		got about the, whether initially or subsequent
6		time about the nature of the case.
7	Q	And the terms noncollecting retailer and
8		collecting retailer were given to you by George
9		and Matt?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	There's, it looks like a little chain on the
12		right-hand side. I'm sorry. On the left-hand
13		side.
14	А	A list or
15	Q	Looks like there's, on the far left, a chain?
16		MR. SCHAEFER: Do you want to indicate it to
17		him?
18	Q	With an arrow?
19	А	Oh, yes. There's a name, there are two names
20		circled that go down, and one, there's an arrow
21		that goes down that says the word survey.
22	Q	What are those names?
23	A	Those were names of two other academics who also

1		serve as experts so I suspect I wrote those down
2		in the context of thinking about other experts
3		that they may want to use.
4	Q	Who are they? Can you give me their names?
5	A	Eric Joachimsthaler. It's a German name so it's a
6		little hard. Actually was with him yesterday. J
7		O A C H I M S T H A L E R.
8	Q	And the other one below that?
9	A	That's actually hard, too. Dhruv, D H R U V, and
10		I believe the last name is Grewal. It's an Indian
11		name. G R E W A L.
12	Q	And you suggested them as experts to George and
13		Matt or you just wrote them down as possible
14		people to talk to?
15	A	I think, I'm not sure exactly the context. They
16		are ones who have, I know are experts on consumers
17		and retailing and certainly the facts of the case.
18	Q	You didn't consult with them regarding your expert
19		opinion, did you?
20	A	I did not.
21	Q	And you didn't refer them any work on this case, I
22		take it?
23	А	I don't believe so.

Q	Next is much of consumer privacy or something like
	that?
A	It looks like invasion of consumer privacy.
Q	And whose words are those? Yours or George and
	Matt's?
A	Could be mine.
Q	Could be. Could be George and Matt's then?
A	Well, I don't know at that point in time where we
	are in terms of these notes. That's part of the
	problem. As we go farther down, they may be, it's
	harder to say exactly where they come from.
Q	Okay. And then there's a list of three things.
A	Correct.
Q	And are those notes you got from the statute or
	are those notes that you got from your
	conversation with George and Matt?
A	My guess is the conversation with George and Matt.
	But whether I had the statute or read the statute
	and I don't know where that fits into the picture.
Q	Over on the right, under preliminary
	injunction/damages, threatened irreparable harm?
А	Threat of or threat of irreparable harm or
	something like that. Yes.
	A Q A Q A

1	Q	And the reason that's down there, is it because
2		that's what Matt and George wanted you to focus
3		on, that there would be irreparable harm to
4		retailers?
5	А	I don't know the exact context of that. My belief
6		it would be there's discussions about different
7		legal aspects and the implications and, again,
8		background context to the case.
9	Q	With regard to that exhibit, the survey
10		questionnaire, did you provide a copy of that to
11		anybody with your notes on it?
12	A	Not, I don't believe so.
13	Q	Did you discuss your editorial comments with
14		anybody?
15	А	I did.
16	Q	And who would that be?
17	А	I believe it would be someone from RSG and could
18		have also included, but I don't remember if it
19		did, I'm not sure it did, anyone from, Matt or
20		George from Brann & Isaacson.
21	Q	Was that a telephone conference?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Do you remember the person at RSG?
	_	

1	Q	I hand you, MR. SCHAEFER, what's been marked
2		Exhibit 24, and it's an e-mail from Mr. Isaacson
3		to you, and it states that we, meaning his firm,
4		anticipates having a draft for your review of the
5		Affidavit in support of preliminary injunction.
6		Do you remember receiving this e-mail, Exhibit 24?
7	А	I mean, generally so, yes.
8	Q	So I take it from the content of this e-mail that
9		you didn't draft the Affidavit. It was drafted
10		for you by Brann & Isaacson?
11	A	The first draft was drafted based on our
12		conversations and my input that I then got a
13		chance to review.
14	Q	And you say your input. I assume that was in
15		phone conversations?
16	А	Correct.
17	Q	How long would you guess or guess is a bad word.
18		Would you estimate that you spent on phone
19		conversations with either Mr. Isaacson or
20		Mr. Schaefer or both in discussing the contents of
21		your Affidavit or Declaration?
22		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form but go
23		ahead.

1	A	It's hard to say. My guess is we easily would
2		have spent an hour or two, I think, having gone
3		through this material.
4	Q	And again, from your earlier testimony, you made
5		no notes as to what you wanted in your Declaration
6		or Affidavit and you made no notes as to what
7		either Mr. Isaacson or Mr. Schaefer said regarding
8		what would be in that Declaration or Affidavit,
9		correct?
10	A	That's correct.
11		EXHIBIT 25 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
12	Q	Let me hand you what's marked as Exhibit 25, and
13		that is an e-mail to you from Mr. Schaefer dated
14		July 30 in which he references attaching a draft
15		of a Declaration for use in this case, and it also
16		attaches a draft of Mr. Adler's Declaration and
17		the RSG's report of the survey. I take it this
18		was the first time then, first, let me ask you.
19		Did I state that correctly what Exhibit 25 states?
20	А	I believe so in terms of that e-mail. Yes.
21	Q	Then I take it this was the first time you saw a
22		draft of your Declaration to be used in this case?
23	А	I believe that's true.
	<b>]</b>	

1	Q	Okay. From your memory, can you tell me how that
2		differed from your final Declaration, if at all?
3	А	I know there were comments that were made and
4		discussion that occurred, but I can't specifically
5		state exactly how the two versions differed.
6		EXHIBIT 26 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
7	Q	I hand you what's been marked Exhibit 26. And I
8		will represent to you that it is a document I
9		received from Mr. Schaefer from your file, I can
10		tell because it's marked KLK at the bottom and
11		this is a draft of the Declaration because on page
12		6 there's in bold, Kevin, let's discuss.
13	А	Yes.
14	Q	So this Exhibit 26 is a draft of your Declaration.
15	А	Correct.
16	Q	Do you know if this was the draft that came with
17		Exhibit 25 or if that was a different draft?
18	А	I can't say for sure. I mean I can't, it's hard
19		to know what an attachment was, whether or not it
20		was or not. I'm sorry.
21	Q	Let me call your attention to page 3. There is a
22		blank in paragraph 4?
23	А	Yes. I see that.

1		correct?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	For August 6th it's the final in the chain?
4	A	Yes. That's what I was trying to okay.
5	Q	And you responded to the August 3rd e-mail which
6		we looked at a moment ago, exhibit, I believe 28?
7		MR. SCHAEFER: 28 I think, is it dated August
8		3rd? It's not 28. Because 28 was the one about
9		the survey link.
10	Q	Okay. I'm sorry. 27?
11		MR. SCHAEFER: Might be as far back as 25
12		because 27 was also about the link.
13	Q	In any event, let's move on. Thank you. The
14		first in that chain was an e-mail of August 3rd to
15		you attaching the draft of the Declaration. And
16		you responded with some suggested revisions.
17	A	Um-hum.
18	Q	Is that correct?
19	А	That's correct.
20		MR. SCHAEFER: Jack, for purposes of clarity
21		this thing is set up a little funny. The August
22		3rd e-mail you see was from Kevin so he's
23		capturing some language from another e-mail. He's

1		writing from August 3rd. Do you see that in the
2		middle of the page?
3	Q	Right. And he is responding to the e-mail.
4	А	We don't know the original date of the, although
5		maybe we do actually.
6	Q	Thank you very much. It's July 30th.
7	А	Exactly. And then I'm August 3rd. And then
8		Matt's August 6th.
9	Q	And August 6 is the response.
10	А	It's the weird Dartmouth e-mail system is
11		really goofy that way because it goes to the
12		bottom and it just throws people off.
13	Q	Thank you.
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	But you're responding to the e-mail where the
16		draft of your Declaration was attached. You
17		responded with some suggestions. Is that correct?
18	А	That's correct.
19	Q	And then you got a reply which talked about your
20		suggestions to the draft; is that correct?
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	And you state in your response to the July 30
23		e-mail, be sure Adler report aligns. What do you

1 mean by that? Well, there was a passage that talked about the 2 Α survey questionnaire and its development, and 3 Adler talked about the input that he got and it 4 5 was my recollection that that was something that 6 I'd also provided input on and I just wanted to be 7 clear that that was the case. That that had happened, one, and that the two reports were 8 consistent about that if that was in fact what had 9 10 happened. And then the reply to that was to reject that 11 Q 12 because you were reviewer of the survey whereas Tom Adler was the draftsman? 13 Objection. 14 MR. SCHAEFER: I think the way I'd characterize it was they 15 Α wanted, the response basically just pointed out 16 how they wanted to handle that issue in terms of 17 draftsmen and reviewers. So it was more of the 18 language and how to best kind of present that. 19 EXHIBIT 30 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION 20 Let me hand you what's been marked an Exhibit 30 21 Q and at the top it's dated August 9th. 22 Hope your weekend went well. Okay. Sorry. 23 Α

	1	
1	Q	In appears to be your response to the e-mail we
2		just talked about where they sent you a revised
3		Declaration?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And you talk about followup conversation? Did
6		that occur?
7	A	I believe so.
8	Q	Do you remember when that occurred?
9	A	I don't know specifically.
10	Q	Do you remember what was discussed?
11	А	I suspect, think this was all as part of the
12		review and just making sure that in terms of the
13		report that it had been, was finalized.
14		EXHIBIT 31 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
15	Q	Exhibit 31 is an e-mail to you dated August 10
16		from Mr. Schaefer attaching the final version of
17		your Declaration with the minor edits we
18		discussed. Do you remember what those minor edits
19		were?
20	А	I don't right now. I'm sorry.
21	Q	And I attach the final version of the RSG final
22		documents and Tom Adler's Declaration referenced
23		in your report. So I take it that's when you

1		what the requirements were with respect to your
2		expert opinion in this case?
3	А	I can't say exactly what I learned when. I'm sure
4		there were conversations early on about my role in
5		the case as an expert witness and what would be
6		expected and required from me.
7	Q	Let me amend that by saying the requirements which
8		are mandated by the rules as opposed to what they
9		expected in your opinion. They meaning Brann
10		Isaacson.
11		MR. SCHAEFER: And the question with regard
12		to those?
13		MR. WESOKY: Pardon me?
14		MR. SCHAEFER: I don't think that was
15		actually a question so I just wanted to make sure.
16		MR. WESOCKY: Well, I was modifying the last
17		one. I will start again.
18		MR. SCHAEFER: Okay.
19	Q	Is the e-mail of September 10th, Exhibit 32, the
20		first time that you received information from
21		Brann & Isaacson regarding what the legal
22		requirements were for your expert opinion? When I
23		say legal requirements, those required by the

1 rules? 2 Α It may be the first time I got e-mail and that I 3 can't be sure of, but there may have been phone 4 discussions that would have reviewed this early on 5 or any point in that process. I can't say for sure right now. 6 7 Do you remember what you did when you read this? 0 8 When I say did, I mean with respect to this case? 9 I don't mean you went and had lunch. I mean what you did with respect to your opinion in this case? 10 11 Α I don't know. I would have thought I would have 12 replied back to this e-mail one way or another at 13 some point in time. This is a Friday afternoon 14 e-mail, 4 p.m., Matt Schaefer working late into 15 the week, so actually I don't know. It was going 16 into the weekend. To be honest, I'm not sure 17 exactly when I read and replied back to this. 18 EXHIBIT 33 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION 19 0 I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 33. It's 20 identified at KLK 294 and ask if that is an e-mail 21 chain reflecting a setting up of a telephone call 22 to discuss Exhibit 32. 23 Α I believe so. I mean the timing is, it's the

1		Tuesday after that weekend. So my guess is that's
2		what that was referring to.
3	Q	Okay. Did you have that phone conversation?
4	А	I believe so. It's only like a month ago. Seems
5		like a long time ago.
6	Q	Do you remember anything about it?
7	A	I remember, I just remember again going, reviewing
8		the process and what was involved in the
9		Declaration, I believe, and it was going through
10		it. So I think pretty much went through the
11		e-mail as I recall, but I don't remember all the
12		specifics.
13	Q	Okay.
14		EXHIBIT 34 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
15	Q	Let me hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 34.
16		This is an e-mail from Mr. Schaefer to you dated
17		the 15th of September of this year. Do you recall
18		receiving this?
19	A	I think. Yes, I believe so.
20	Q	And you remember discussing it with Mr. Schaefer
21		at a subsequent phone conversation?
22	A	I believe so.
23	Q	Do you remember what you discussed?

1	A	I believe this was just talking about the, in
2		terms of principles and methods it was just sort
3		of the, what was the sort of methodology, if you
4		will, that I would use in analysis kind of
5		approach that were involved in coming, in arriving
6		at my Expert Report, written report, and that was
7		I think we discussed those.
8	Q	What did you tell him about the principles,
9		methods and so forth that you just referenced in
10		that e-mail?
11	А	I can't remember specifically the whole, that
12		whole conversation on that.
13	Q	And do you remember generally?
14	А	I think, generally, I think would have talked
15		about, I think we talked some about sort of
16		experiences and knowledge that I've gained on
17		consumer behavior and consumer privacy and
18		retailing and loyalty relationships in my academic
19		work and consulting work, and we talked about
20		that, but I don't remember all the specifics.
21	Q	And I take it from your past testimony and your
22		habit, you didn't make any notes of this
23		conversation?

1		deposition and every second of your preparation
2		time. You're not going to give me a gift, are
3		you?
4	A	Well
5		MR. SCHAEFER: If you had a phone call, you
6		might get one. This one is too easy to know.
7		There will be a transcript that tells us when we
8		started and when we finished.
9	A	Very well defined.
10	Q	Okay. Let me hand you the next exhibit in order.
11	:	EXHIBIT 35 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
12	Q	MR. SCHAEFER Keller, I handed you what's been
13		marked Exhibit 35. It's an e-mail, the top date
14		is September the 19th, 2010. And it appears, it's
15		an e-mail from Mr. Schaefer to you and then a
16		response. Using the Dartmouth e-mail system, the
17		response is at the bottom?
18	А	That's correct.
19	Q	Now, this e-mail attaches a draft of your Expert
20		Report. Is that the first time you saw a draft of
21		your Expert Report, differentiating it from your
22		Declaration?
23	А	I believe so. But again, I can't be certain of

1		all the different correspondence.
2	Q	Okay.
3		EXHIBIT 36 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
4	Q	Let me hand you what's marked as Exhibit 36, and
5		that's a draft of your Expert Report in this
6		matter, is it not?
7	A	Yes, it is.
8	Q	And if you'd look at the last page there's a
9		blank, to date my fees in this matter are blank.
10	A	Correct.
11	Q	And the final version didn't have that in it. Did
12		it?
13	A	I'd have to check the final version.
14	Q	Assume with me it didn't. Would that be because
15		you hadn't totaled up fees as of that date?
16	A	Haven't invoiced yet.
17	Q	So you don't know as you sit here today what your
18		fees to date are?
19	А	I know
20		MR. SCHAEFER: Well, asked and answered
21		earlier, but go ahead.
22	А	I know roughly what those are.
23	Q	But as of September 19th, 20th, you didn't know

İ		
1		what they were?
2	А	I hadn't invoiced it so I hadn't done any
3		calculations.
4	Q	Okay. That's fair enough.
5		EXHIBIT 37 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
6	Q	I think it's the final version of your Expert
7		Report. Is that correct? I want you to read that
8		and be sure that it is.
9	А	I believe so. Looks like the final report.
10	Q	Now, again, those words were provided to you by
11		Messrs. Schaefer and Isaacson after talking to you
12		on the phone, is that the way that worked?
13	А	That's correct.
14	Q	And again, you didn't draft anything up to send to
15		them? They provided you with the document after
16		discussion?
17	А	Yes. Based on my input. Correct.
18	Q	Let's take a short break.
19		RECESS TAKEN
20	Q	In your Declaration, Exhibit 16, I believe? Let's
21		take a look at paragraph 2, please.
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	You say in the first sentence that much of your
	1	

what I did. 1 Again, just so I understand what you're saying, 2 0 because of this ongoing project revising your 3 textbook, you didn't find it necessary to refer to 4 any specific treatises or literature but just your 5 general knowledge from revising that textbook you 6 7 used in connection with formulating your expert 8 opinions, is that correct? What I did was in the process of revising this 9 Α textbook there were lots of different topics that 10 would be relevant to the case that I certainly had 11 a chance to read about and think about and write 12 about as part of the revision of the textbook. 13 But as I understand it, you didn't go to the 14 0 revisions of that textbook, specifically, in 15 connection with your expert opinion, but it was 16 just the knowledge that you accumulated in doing 17 that that you transferred to this expert opinion, 18 19 is that right? There was enough before the revision of the 20 Α textbook general knowledge that I already had, and 21 then the updating that occurred with the actual 22 revision of the textbook, that gave me a good 23

foundation going into the preparation of the case. 1 But again, just so I can understand. You didn't 2 Q in preparation for your expert opinion say oh, I 3 need to refer to my notes on the textbook or the 4 material on the textbook. It was just your 5 knowledge gained from doing that that helped you 6 7 with your expert opinion? It was the knowledge gained but there was, when 8 Α you talk about general knowledge, general 9 knowledge is the accumulation of a lot of specific 10 articles and readings that you do so even though 11 it's general knowledge it's based on a lot of 12 specific articles and material that you read and 13 review which then, which in some cases would be 14 relevant to this particular case. 15 As you sit here today, could you give me just a 16 Q few of those articles that you think would, that 17 you've accumulated over the last years that would 18 be relevant to this expert opinion? 19 They would be ones that would be referenced in the 20 Α textbook or included in my files associated with 21 the different chapters in the textbook. 22 Would you tell me today what some of those are? 23 Q

1	A	Couldn't give you the specific names and authors,
2		if you will, of those articles because I've got,
3		there are literally thousands that I review and
4		maybe even reference. I don't know. Certainly
5		the hundreds that I reference.
6	Q	In your textbook, you mean?
7	A	In my textbook and then or included in my files,
8		too. So it's all part of that set of material, if
9		you will.
10	Q	And again, just so I understand, you didn't go to
11		those files for particular reference for this
12		expert opinion?
13	A	Well, and again, it's one of those where I've gone
14		through those files as part of the textbook so
15		it's not as if I didn't have access to that
16		because I'd already reviewed and worked through a
17		lot of that as part of the textbook.
18	Q	But again, you didn't say oh, I could look at
19		Jones & Brown, to name a fake article, that will
20		help support my opinion. I think that's relevant.
21		There was no thinking along that line?
22	A	The thinking would be more along the lines that
23		there's a set of material that I've used that

1		inform my decision or my judgments as I kind of go
2		through this, and the time that this was done,
3		whether I could remember the specific titles, I'm
4		not sure. I certainly could remember what those
5		were about because that's what I would have
6		reviewed and be included into the textbook.
7	Q	What were some of those, to use your words, about?
8	A	They talked a lot about consumers and consumer
9		behavior, talked about issues on privacy and
10		consumers' opinions about privacy. Relationships
11		with retailers, relationships with brands,
12		purchase decision factors. So it's kind of a
13		range of topics.
14	Q	But you can't think of any specifically today,
15		correct?
16	А	Specific articles?
17	Q	Yes.
18	А	I can think of the body of work that I used that
19		related to that. I can't remember the specific
20		authors and titles of those papers. I can
21		remember having consulted those and included and
22		incorporated some of that material into the
23		textbook.

1		of being an expert in this case?
2		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form. Go ahead.
3	A	I would say that probably the most pertinent is
4		just the Ph.D. in marketing with emphasize on
5		consumer marketing that I received in the mid
6		'80s. And then the second thing I would say would
7		be all of the work that I've done since then that
8		have been involved consumer marketing and research
9		and writing in the last 25 years, I guess.
10	Q	I take it from your Declaration that you're an
11		expert in consumer behavior, is that correct?
12	A	That's one of my areas of focus.
13	Q	And that's what, one of your areas of expertise in
14		this case, is that correct?
15	А	That's correct.
16	Q	And what other area of expertise are you bringing
17		in this case?
18	А	Branding.
19	Q	Okay. How about survey methodology and
20		technology?
21	А	Survey methodologies is another area that I've
22		emphasized since 1979, I guess, or 1980.
23	Q	But you didn't design the survey in this case; is

1		that correct?
2	A	I did not design the survey.
3	Q	Are you familiar with the methodology used?
4	A	I am.
5	Q	So you're familiar with what Knowledge Networks
6		did in this case for this survey?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And what is that? Could you tell me?
9	A	Survey involved an online panel that was assembled
10		and involved an online questionnaire that asked a
11		sample of respondents some questions that were
12		relevant to the matters in this case.
13	Q	Do you know about their weighting and calibration?
14	A	I believe that is part of the sample composition
15		that involved some weighting in terms of
16		representativeness of the sample population.
17	Q	Do you know how that was done or are you just
18		relying on Knowledge Networks?
19	A	I'm relying on Knowledge Networks and RSG,
20		supplier to the RSG firm.
21	3	EXHIBIT 18 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
22	Q	MR. SCHAEFER, I've handed you Exhibit 18 which is
23		Knowledge Networks Field Report Colorado Tax

1		Policy Survey. Simple question. Did you ever see
2		that before today?
3	А	I don't believe so.
4	Q	Okay. You can set that aside.
5		EXHIBIT 19 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION
6	Q	I hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 19, and
7		it's called Knowledge Networks Project Statement
8		CO Tax Policy Project number blank. Have you ever
9		seen that document before?
10	A	I don't believe so.
11		MR. SCHAEFER: Jack, just to make sure, I
12		think this one has sequential but appended I think
13		is this and I don't know whether it's part of the
14		same document literally or not. I don't recall
15		specifically, but there's a Knowledge Panel
16		Calibration document that begins at page RSG
17		00316.
18		MR. WESOKY: I don't know if it was appended
19		either because it came, you know, one page at a
20		time, but let's attach them for purposes of this
21		question.
22		MR. SCHAEFER: I don't have any problem with
23		it. I just thought I would mention it.

1		MR. WESOKY: Thanks. I appreciate that.
2	Q	So MR. SCHAEFER, I assume that you've not seen
3		that appendix, if we can, called Knowledge Panel
4		Calibration?
5	A	I have not.
6	Q	So then it's, you didn't read that or consider
7		that when you reviewed the survey results and gave
8		your opinion, correct?
9	A	Correct.
10	Q	Let me ask you, do you think it would be important
11		to review these documents and learn about
12		Knowledge Networks and their calibration function,
13		if that's the correct word, with respect to the
14		results of the survey?
15	А	I've known Knowledge Networks
16	Q	Simple yes or no question.
17		MR. SCHAEFER: No. He can answer the
18		question.
19		MR. WESOKY: No. I can ask the question. He
20		can answer it. If you want him to elaborate on
21		it, then you can examine him.
22	:	MR. SCHAEFER: No
23	Q	The question is, do you think, I'm sorry. Would

1	Q	Do you think in your opinion that with all those
2		advantages that the behavior change attributed to
3		the loss of privacy by the survey is overstated
4		based on these other advantages to consumers that
5		the internet has?
6		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form. Go
7		ahead.
8	А	No. I don't. I don't think it's overstated.
9	Q	So you think the concern of loss of privacy will
10		drive a large number of consumers away from using
11		the internet to make purchases?
12		MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form.
13	А	Well, there are many ways to purchase over the
14		internet and so I think that the loss of privacy
15		will affect those retailers who are associated
16		with that.
17	Q	Associated with the Colorado
18	А	The loss of privacy.
19	Q	With the Colorado law, you mean?
20	А	Colorado law.
21	Q	Let's take a look at the survey for a minute.
22		Okay?
23		EXHIBIT 21 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION

1 necessarily an open-ended question. I think it's 2 more understanding respondents and how they may be 3 thinking as they respond to a survey and phrasing questions that give you the clearest understanding of that. 6 0 From the survey, we can't tell how important the consumers' belief, consumers' negative reaction, let me put it that way, to the reporting of their 8 9 name, address and purchases to the State is in 10 their hierarchy of concerns about internet 11 purchases, do we? 12 MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to form. 13 Well, we know that, we know two things and we know Α 14 that they consider the Act to have negative 15 effects on their privacy and we also know that 16 they would subsequently be less likely to purchase 17 from retailers, and from that you can draw the 1.8 conclusion of the relationship between the privacy 19 and the ultimate, and its importance in their 20 decisions to purchase from a retailer outside the 21 state. 22 But we don't know where that importance is on 0 23 their scale, if you will, of concerns about the

MR. SCHAEFER: Objection to the form. 1 There's a whole host of concerns that consumers 2 A have with privacy and certainly one would be how, 3 what, how information could be used, whether it's 4 family members or other personal relationships 5 that might result in unwanted outcomes. 6 Now, did you see a copy of any Colorado statute Q that deals with the confidentiality and privacy of 8 information given to the Colorado Department of 9 Revenue? 10 Could you be more specific? 11 Α Did you see any Colorado statute other than 12 0 Sure. the law in question in this case concerning the 13 reporting by retailers to the Department of 14 Revenue and to their customers? 15 I'm not sure. 16 Α Do you remember seeing any Colorado law which 17 0 dealt with the obligation of the Department of 18 Revenue to keep material and information that they 19 received confidential and not to disperse it to 20 21 anybody? I'm not, again, I'm not sure. 22 Α I'm correct, am I not, in stating that consumer 23 0

1		behavior is driven by many factors?
2	А	Correct.
3	Q	Price is one certainly?
4	А	Correct.
5	Q	Product is another?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	A brand is certainly another?
8	А	Correct.
9	Q	Quality of the product is certainly another?
10	А	Correct.
11	Q	Convenience is certainly another?
12	А	Correct.
13	Q	Past experience with a merchant, be it a web site
14		or a catalog, is another?
15	А	Correct.
16	Q	And certainly Internet shopping is influenced by
17		its ability to save time for a consumer?
18	А	Certainly one of the benefits of internet shopping
19		is saving time.
20	Q	And you certainly you have an ability to research
21		and compare products and prices?
22	А	Internet, that's one of the advantages of the
23		internet is you can compare prices more easily.