Pages 1 - 140

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD M. CHEN, JUDGE

IN RE CHRYSLER-DODGE-JEEP) NO. 17-MD-02777-EMC ECODIESEL MARKETING, SALES) PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY) LITIGATION)

San Francisco, California Wednesday, June 14, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff Jose Chavez, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 1918 Eighth Avenue, Suite 3300

Seattle, WA 98101

BY: STEVE W. BERMAN, ESQUIRE

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN,

BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C. 5 Becker Farm Road Roseland, NJ 07068

BY: JAMES E. CECCHI, ESQUIRE

(Appearances continued on the following pages)

Reported By: Angela Pourtabib, CSR #13714, RPR

Pro Tem Court Reporter

For Plaintiff Jose Chavez, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

COHEN, MILSTEIN, SELLERS & TOLL 2925 PGA Boulevard, Suite 200 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410 THEODORE J. LEOPOLD, ESQUIRE

950 West University Drive, Suite 300

Rochester, MI 48307

THE MILLER LAW FIRM

BY: E. POWELL MILLER, ESQUIRE SHARON S. ALMONRODE, ESQUIRE

SEEGER WEISS LLP 77 Water Street New York, NY 10005

BY: JENNIFER R. SCULLION, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Environmental Protection Agency:

BY:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Environment & Natural Resources Division P.O. Box 7611 Washington, DC 20044

BY: LEIGH RENDE, ESQUIRE EMILY C. POWERS, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Kayla Kelley and John Milligan:

AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC 1016 Palm Avenue West Hollywood, CA 90069 BY: TINA WOLFSON, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Mathue Fasching, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ESQUIRE

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor New York, NY 10013

BY: DAVID S. STELLINGS, ESQUIRE

BRANSTETTER, STRANCH & JENNINGS, PLLC 223 Rosa Parks Avenue, Suite 200 Nashville, TN 37203

BY: J. GERARD STRANCH, IV, ESQUIRE

BAILEY GLASSER LLP 209 Capitol Street Charleston, WV 25301

BY: BENJAMIN L. BAILEY, ESQUIRE

BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 670 Oakland, CA 94612

BY: LESLEY WEAVER, ESQUIRE

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, WA 98101

BY: LYNN L. SARKO, ESQUIRE

MOTLEY RICE LLP
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mr. Pleasant, SC 29464
BY: JOSEPH F. RICE, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Luke Kitchel, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

BARON & BUDD, P.C. 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600 Encino, CA 91436

BY: ROLAND TELLIS, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Luke Kitchel, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

BY: RACHEL L. JENSEN, ESQUIRE

KOPELOWITZ OSTROW FERGUSON WEISERLBERG GILBERT

2800 Ponce De Leon Blvd., Suite 1100

Coral Gables, FL 33134

BY: ROBERT C. GILBERT, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Christopher Walker and Betty Lou Rugg:

LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA 456 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

BY: FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Jason Gaines:

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1210
San Francisco, CA 94111
JOSEPH R. SAVERI, ESQUIRE
NICOMEDES HERRERA, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Charles Marlatt and Stanley Bruce:

BY:

GIRARD GIBBS LLP
601 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
BY: ERIC H. GIBBS, ESQUIRE
AMY M. ZEMAN, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Anthony Leocadio:

HEYGOOD, ORR & PEARSON

2331 W. Northwest Hwy, 2nd Floor

Dallas, TX 75220

BY: MICHAEL HEYGOOD, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Chatom Motor Company:

ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

601 Lexington Avenue, Suite 3400

New York, NY 10022

BY: STACEY P. SLAUGHTER, ESQUIRE

ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

2440 West El Camino Real, Suite 100

Mountain View, CA 94040

BY: MICHAEL F. RAM, ESQUIRE

SUSAN BROWN, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Albert Sebastian:

CASEY GERRY SCHENK FRANCAVILLA

BLATT & PENFIELD LLP

110 Laurel Street

San Diego, CA 92101

BY: DAVID S. CASEY, JR., ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Nathan Friedenfels:

HELMUTH & JOHNSON PLLC

8050 West 78th Street

Edina, MN 55439

BY: RICHARD M. HAGSTROM, ESQUIRE

BERMAN DEVALERIO

One California Street, Suite 900

San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: TODD A. SEAVER, ESQUIRE

GUSTAFSON GLUEK PLLC

120 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600

Minneapolis, MN 55402

BY: CATHY K. SMITH, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Bret Rivero and Jamie Varnado:

PATRICK MILLER LLC
400 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70130
BY: MARC MICHAUD, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Maya Ramirez:

SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP

35 East State Street

Media, PA 19063

BY: JAMES SHAH, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs John Stephens and Bill Turner:

DiCELLO LEVITT & CASEY LLC

Ten North Dearborn Street, 11th Floor

Chicago, IL 60602

BY: ADAM J. LEVITT, ESQUIRE

BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW, METHVIN,

PORTIS & MILES, P.C. 272 Commerce Street Montgomery, AL 36103

BY: W. DANIEL MILES, III, ESQUIRE

For Defendants FCA U.S. and FCS N.V.:

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP

125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004

BY: ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ESQUIRE

DARRELL S. CAFASSO, ESQUIRE

For Defendant Robert Bosch LLC:

CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

BY: MATTHEW D. SLATER, ESQUIRE

Appearances According to the "Confirmed Telephonic Appearance Schedule":

Jonathan Boggs
Kathryn P. Caballero
Katherine Charonko
Jodi W. Flowers
William B. Monahan
Katy Pape
Jon F. Worm

Wednesday - June 14, 2017

10:02 a.m.

2

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

---00---

4

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone.

Let me lay out the ground rules here. Oh, we've got

THE DEPUTY: Good morning. Calling case C-17-2777 in

5

6

to call the case. That's one of the ground rules.

7

Re Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing Sales Practices and

8

Products Liability Litigation.

10

THE COURT: All right. So I'm not going to have

11

everybody make another appearance to start with. You have all

12

checked in with Betty. I have your cards and information, so a

13

record will be made.

14

so you'll -- your appearance will, of course, be noted for the

I will be giving everybody a chance to say something,

1516

record as we move along.

17

What I'm going to do is sort of bifurcate this and

18

invite -- I think there are 11 applicants for lead or colead

counsel positions, and I think I had indicated in my last order

19

that I would allot six minutes for each to make their

20

presentation or answer some questions I might have.

22

And then the next group will be those who have applied

23

for the steering committee, a plaintiff's steering committee position, and I have allocated, I think, four minutes for that,

24

25

which is, of course, double what Judge Breyer allowed. So you

might note that, that I'm twice as generous as he is.

Those who -- the 11 who have applied for leadership positions, just to make clear, this is your chance to make your pitch for both. You know, if you do six and then another four, we might be here all day.

So -- and to be fair, I'm just going to do this in alphabetical order partly because that's the way my binder is organized, and so it's easier for me, but that's a neutral way of proceeding.

But before I do, I want to first see if defendants have any comment -- well, one, I want an update just briefly of whether anything has developed since our initial conference, particularly with the software submission to carve any PA.

MR. GIUFFRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Giuffra with Sullivan & Cromwell for the FCA defendants.

I wanted to report to the Court that we think we're making good progress. This process takes time, and FCA remains optimistic that it can address the EPA and CARB's concerns as reflected in their NOVs and lawsuit without impacting the performance or fuel economy of these vehicles.

And as I mentioned at the last hearing, we had made a mission to EPA and CARB on May 19th, and that was for a certification of the model year 2017 Jeep Grand Cherokees and Ram 1500s. And those are the vehicles at issue in both the NOVs and the lawsuits.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GIUFFRA: And the plan was to -- the request for the certification was for a modified emissions software calibration that would address the concerns expressed by the EPA and CARB.

THE COURT: Has there been any communication or developments since the --

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes, there has, Your Honor. Since the last hearing, which was on May 24th, FCA has had multiple meetings with EPA and CARB. By my account, it's about six. Either meetings or big conference calls.

And those have been to discuss the various calibrations that have been proposed as well as to discuss test results, and there also has been additional testing that has gone on.

FCA has continued to do its own testing at its own test facilities, but within the last week, FCA representatives were present when -- at the CARB testing facility, which is in El Monte, California, for testing that was being conducted by CARB, and then also at testing that was being conducted at the EPA facility in Ann Arbor.

Then there's been, you know, comments that have been made. Questions have been raised by the regulators, and that's obviously consistent with how this process works. It's an iterative process. And we've discussed additional software

calibrations with CARB and EPA.

And yesterday, there was a big telephone call where, you know, in response to our -- the questions that we had been receiving from EPA and CARB, we proposed an additional calibration to the software, and then the regulators asked us in the interim -- because they're going to evaluate the calibration we're putting forward to look at another calibration.

And so we're testing that additional calibration, the changes that they asked of us, and we hope to do that in the next several days. And, you know, again, we expect the change in the calibration will not have an impact in a negative way on emissions or on performance of the vehicles.

And the plan here, and I think this is important to note, that once the calibration is approved for the 2017 vehicles, we would then seek approval to apply that calibration to the model year 2014 and 2017 vehicles, which are the vehicles at issue in the litigation.

THE COURT: 2014?

MR. GIUFFRA: 2016.

THE COURT: To '16.

MR. GIUFFRA: And I think the reason that becomes important is the hardware in the vehicles is the same, and so if we can get the approval for the 2017, and the issue, we think, is one of the calibration of the software, this is not a

case where we believe we have to change the hardware of the vehicles which, obviously, would make it a more expensive and complicated process.

So -- and I think the point, Your Honor, and I've learned this over the last several years. You know, cars have become like computers. And it's -- really, the calibration of the software is a very complicated process.

But the key point here is, you know, we believe we can recalibrate the software for the emissions control units in the vehicles and that will address the issues that are being raised in the lawsuits without affecting performance.

THE COURT: Any further guess as to timeline based on what --

MR. GIUFFRA: Yeah, let me talk about that. Now, this is a process that takes time. You know, we're hopeful that it will not be many months. You know, obviously, EPA and CARB need to be satisfied.

You know, we know from experience that this sort of certification process can take time. It takes time whether it's in a context of, say, a VW or in the context of a new car certification.

But I think it's fair to say, Your Honor, that all sides are operating in good faith. There's a lot of technical people on both the government's side and the FCA side that are working extremely hard.

And this process is one that requires a lot of tests, and it's important, obviously, that the software calibration be a durable one and actually work. And the government, you know, wants us -- to put us through our proof, and that's their right. And, you know, again, we remain optimistic that we can pull this off.

Just to be clear about this, once we get the approval of the 2017, we immediately try to get the approval for the 2014 and 2016. It's possible the government might want us to address that — their approval of that in the context of a resolution of the government lawsuit, and we would obviously be open to that and that might make a lot of sense.

But then once the approval comes, the company thinks it can put the approval -- put the new calibration out in the field in literally a matter of weeks because what's involved is a software reflash whereby customers would bring their trucks back to the dealership, and they would be reflashed, and that's a process that takes under a half hour per vehicle.

And it's not very expensive and is something that we think that, assuming it can work, will, we believe, resolve many of the issues in the litigation including issues like, you know, whether there's a diminution of value to these vehicles caused by the software issues that we've -- that we're discussing right now with the regulators.

THE COURT: All right. Well, appreciate that update.

1 Thank you. 2 MR. GIUFFRA: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Betty, you said you need to get -- do we 4 have people phoning in and trying to listen? Do you have to dial each of these, or are they --5 6 (Telephonic interruption.) 7 THE COURT: All right. Well, welcome everyone. This 8 is Judge Chen, and we had just started our proceeding, and we 9 just got an update from defendants, Mr. Giuffra, about his 10 communications with CARB and EPA. 11 I'm now going to actually ask Department of Justice, 12 whether it's Ms. Powers or Ms. Rende, whether you have any 13 updates, comments that you'd like to make at this point. 14 MS. RENDE: Good morning, Your Honor. Leigh Rende for 15 the United States. 16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Rende. 17 MS. RENDE: And also for EPA, who is listening by 18 phone. Just a couple clarifications. Mr. Giuffra was 19 referencing "when" approval is given. Just to be clear, "if" 20 21 approval is given. 22 THE COURT: Yes. MS. RENDE: There is uncertainty currently regarding 23 an effective fix. It could be weeks or months away. So there 24 25 is agreement with Mr. Giuffra or defendants that it will take

1 some time. 2 Discussions and testing are still ongoing. And the 3 regulators, California and EPA, are currently reviewing the 4 testing plan, which was provided last night. THE COURT: Mm-hmm. 5 MS. RENDE: So it will take a little bit of time to 6 7 come to an agreement. THE COURT: And you're not going to hazard a guess at 8 9 this point where this will lead to? 10 MS. RENDE: You know, the timing is out of the control of the lawyer's hands. So this is really a technical decision. 11 THE COURT: Well, in addition to the timing, the "if" 12 13 question that you --14 MS. RENDE: If. Absolutely. 15 THE COURT: What do you know about CARB's position? 16 They have not formally entered, I think, the litigation in any 17 way. Do you know anything about that? 18 MS. RENDE: I do know that the California Attorney General's Office is currently listening. Jon Worm, I believe, 19 is on the phone, and we did speak with them earlier this 20 21 morning. 22 And they have not formally joined. We are working very closely with California both at the technical level as 23 24 well as on the legal side. 25 THE COURT: All right. So that remains to

1 be seen. 2 MS. RENDE: Correct. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Any comments you might have before 4 we embark on this next journey here about any thoughts you might have with respect to the structure of the plaintiff's 5 steering committee, et cetera, et cetera, from where you sit? 6 7 MS. RENDE: From where we sit, the United States will 8 work with any member that you select to be part of the 9 plaintiff's steering committee as well as lead counsel. 10 And the same, obviously, goes for settlement master. 11 We will gladly work with any of the capable candidates whom the 12 Court is considering. 13 THE COURT: Great. All right. Thank you very much. 14 MS. RENDE: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Let me first observe that I'm 16 disappointed. I was told this was going to be a dog and pony 17 show, and I see neither a dog or a pony in the audience, so 18 somebody didn't get the memo. 19 But, in any event, why don't we start the process? 20 do have a clock. How rigid it will be, we'll see. 21 But what I'd like for those who have applied for lead 22 counsel, you know, I'm interested -- obviously, I don't need to hear what you have in your papers about your past experience, 23 and I'm aware of that, and I've gone through that. 24 25 I'd really like your sort of analysis of more details

of what the leadership structure should look like. Not just the size, but how you see it, whether it should be you foresee some division by formal subcommittees, liaisons, et cetera, et cetera, any thought that you might have in that regard.

And then also sort of the path that you see this litigation going down, maybe in contrast to or parallel, similar to VW, and what you see as sort of the unfolding of this case. Obviously, you can't predict in any precise terms, but I'd like to get sort of your vision.

And then, finally, what would you do in terms of controlling for expenditures, fees, and costs, which is, of course, always a concern.

So I know it's a lot to cover in six minutes, but that's what I'm mainly interested in. I'm not as interested -- because everybody here is, obviously, very well experienced and qualified, so I'm aware of that. So if you could use your time in that regard, that would be appreciated.

And why don't we just start with the top of the alphabetical list, and that's Mr. Berman.

MR. BERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. BERMAN: Before I address your questions, I would like to address one thing because I think I stand uniquely situated, and that is the Rule 23(q) of investigation.

I'm the only firm that actually was out there testing

the cars with such rigor and sufficiency that we actually filed the lawsuit before the EPA issued its violation notices. And because of that, there's a policy behind Rule 23(g) to look at that factor, and that is to encourage lawyers to undertake the expense to bring new cases to light.

And because of that, I don't think there's a lawyer in the room that I'm aware of that would say I don't deserve to be one of the lead counsel. They may want to be colead counsel, but there's kind of an unwritten rule in the plaintiff's part that when someone develops a case like this on their own with considerable expense, they are deserving of leadership.

Then I want to talk about how that experience dovetails with your questions. The first question is -- or one of your questions was how does -- where do you see the case going in light of Mr. Giuffra's remarks?

Because we've been testing these cars -- and by way of background, we bought one of these PEMS machines. We own one. We may be the only plaintiff's lawyer in the country that does. They are hundreds of thousands of dollars.

And when I heard Mr. Giuffra say that these cars are going to be fixed and the litigation is going to be over, I say, "Wrong."

What my experts are telling me is that there's a reason there were eight different cheat devices. And the reason is that the car manufacturer wanted to improve fuel

economy and power, and if you mess with the cheat devices, you're going to lose fuel economy and power. And so people are not going to -- they will not have gotten what they thought they got when they bought these cars.

Second, as we have discussed in the MyFord Touch case, there's a benefit of the bargain kind of case going there where you thought you bought something and you didn't get what you received. And under the case law, we went back and forth with the MyFord Touch. People are entitled to the delta.

So I do not see this case going away, and I see litigation over the fix, whether it works. And so my qualifications in that regard is I'm working with the experts.

And I also bring something to that fix issue that other lawyers don't, and that is I have emissions cases against everyone. General Motors, Mercedes. Mr. Giuffra in Detroit on the 2500 and 3500 Fiat cars.

And because of that, I'm thinking about this every day. My experts and I are on the phone every day talking about emissions cases. I'm talking to attorney generals, to regulators because they recognize our work in this case, in this field.

And so that's going to help us respond to Mr. Giuffra's technical arguments because I now see there's going to be a big technical one.

THE COURT: So assuming that it's not -- it's going to

be some months before any resolution for the EPA and CARB, and you're not optimistic, obviously, there's going to be a resolution, what do you see happening in the next 12 months in this case?

MR. BERMAN: I see --

THE COURT: Which would be a year from now.

MR. BERMAN: A complaint being filed as promptly as possible. There will be motions for sure.

And so one of the other benefits I bring is I've been dealing with these motions. I've been thinking about these motions, and so I can probably bring the most efficient complaint so we don't have to go through rounds and rounds of briefing because I know he's going to raise preemption. I've now dealt with his argument in Detroit. I've dealt with Mercedes' preemption argument. I know how to structure the complaint to get around the preemption argument.

I know the class issues that they're raising through their motions, and I think I'm uniquely structured to efficiently guide the Court through that process. And I think that's what the class would want, someone who has unique experience on these issues.

Now, with respect to -- so I think then we're going to wait -- we're going to litigate this case like we normally would because we don't know if there's going to be a fix.

We're continually testing right now parameters and simulations.

If there's a fix, you know, what that might do to fuel economy.

And then, obviously, if Mr. Giuffra has a settlement, he would likely turn to us and say, "What do you want to do?

Do you want to settle? Here is where we are."

If we don't think there's any impact, we're going to push back and either going to have a settlement, or we're going to litigate the issues that I talked about, which is you didn't get the benefit of the bargain and/or you may have a car that's not performing as well.

THE COURT: Say something about the leadership structure. Any more specifics? I mean, I know people have recommended eight to ten, six to eight steering committee along with colead counsel. Do you have any further thoughts?

MR. BERMAN: My thoughts are that you should have a colead leadership of two to four lawyers. That it should be made up of lawyers who have experience in automobile cases.

And the reason I say that is I think you want and the class wants lawyers who have thought about the very thorny issues of class certification that go around in these auto defect cases.

I think I've got an appreciation for that. Dealing with the MyFord Touch class cert. And so I think you want lawyers who are thinking about that issue and have dealt with that issue and bring experience in that issue.

In terms of the steering committee, so I think two to

four coleads. Maybe a steering committee of four to six people. So we're talking about eight to ten people who run the case.

There's going to be a need for -- there's going to be a lot of work in the case, Your Honor. For example, I'm dealing with this right now. So another thing that I bring is I'm also suing Bosch in all these other cases. So I have been studying Bosch, talking about Bosch, working on the Bosch angle probably more than any other lawyer in this courtroom.

But one of the things we're going to have to do with Bosch is there's going to be a lot of documents in German.

We're going to have them translated. We're going to have to go over there. So, you know, I see dedicating a bunch of lawyers to focusing on the Bosch picture in conjunction with the leadership.

And there's obviously going to be a very rigorous technical part of the case in terms of the testing. Because as both the EPA lawyers and Mr. Giuffra said, this is very -- this testing is immensely complicated, and you need lawyers who understand the science and are able to work with the experts.

THE COURT: Right. And, finally, cost control.

MR. BERMAN: Cost control. I think that we should, as we did in MyFord Touch, after appointment, provide you with a protocol that you sign off on, on cost control.

And some of the things that I think about that we've

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recently did in the Qualcomm case in front of Judge Ko is our protocol there says, "One lawyer here. One lawyer at a deposition unless it's a major executive or there's some technical issue, and very strict control on the number of lawyers looking at documents." I agree with you. Given the size, perhaps, of this committee, we need to make sure we have good controls. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. BERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Appreciate it. All right. Ms. Cabraser? MS. CABRASER: Thank you, Your Honor. Elizabeth Cabraser for Lieff Cabraser. Mr. Giuffra is a messenger of hope and optimism, and what he says is encouraging, but it's reflective of what he said at the same time in the case in the Volkswagen litigation. And technology is a wonderful thing. Getting it to work is something different. We saw that this morning with CourtCall. So this case is going to unfold in realtime, and it's going to take real work, and it is in a position of uncertainty. And getting to certainty under the conditions of urgency that exist in this case is going to require the plaintiff's team that brings relevant experience, that brings competence, and that brings continuity.

We didn't fail to note that both Bosch and Fiat
Chrysler chose lawyers to represent them in this case that had
the experience from the Volkswagen case. It gives plaintiffs
an advantage to do the same thing.

We're fortunate, I think, that so many members of the Volkswagen plaintiff's steering committee are here before you today ready, willing, and able to apply the expertise, the experience, what they have learned in Volkswagen to this case.

THE COURT: That steering committee had 21, as I recall. Or started off with 21, and nobody is suggesting that here, so...

MS. CABRASER: No one is suggesting that here, Your Honor, and I'm not suggesting that a plaintiff's steering committee be comprised necessarily exclusively of those from Volkswagen. Diversity is important.

But continuity and competence and the competitive advantage of having leaders for the class in this case who dealt successfully with the same defense counsel in Volkswagen cannot be understated.

With respect to the structure to make that happen, I'm a little more liberal on structure than some of the other applicants because I saw the plaintiff's steering committee, a large one of 21, work very efficiently, very expeditiously with no waste and delay in Volkswagen.

And, in fact, as the Court there observed, it was the

size of that committee that helped deliver the remedy in that case so quickly. I've seen that happen in other very large, very expeditious MDLs as well.

For example, Deepwater Horizon with a 17-member PSC and two coleads. And there, the settlement was delivered in record time for a case of that nature within about a year.

It's delivered over \$11 billion to class members so far, and the Court was able to hold a three-phase trial because hundreds of depositions were taken within a year.

THE COURT: What do you think this case warrants? I know your application left it open. Do you have any specific --

MS. CABRASER: I did leave it open, and I think, Your Honor, that a PSC of ten to twelve people would not be too many. Would be immediately deployed.

Again, it depends on who those people are. There are many things we don't have to redo in this case because we did them in Volkswagen.

Mr. Berman mentioned technical expertise and testing. Well, that's not exclusive to the Hagens Berman firm, although they've done it. Other PSC members in Volkswagen did as well and were very, very active, for example, on the Bosch team.

I'll give you one example of something we spent months of intensive work developing in Volkswagen that we can use immediately here, and that is refining. Getting all the kinks

out of the machine translation tools for German. We did that in Volkswagen so that we were able to translate accurately, idiomatically, and technically.

We can do that with respect to Italian language documents as well because my firm has both German and Italian proficient staff attorneys.

Getting that translation done very rapidly so a large number of document reviewers and analysts can get to work on documents saves months of time. We're going to have millions of documents in this case. We have a plan for expedited document requests. We want the documents, obviously, that the government has gotten.

We will also want to ask this Court for a trial date or a trial time that was used very effectively in Volkswagen. That means this PSC is going to have to multitask. We're going to have to simultaneously prepare the case for trial; prepare for settlement; test the testing; work with the government, both state and federal; and if we're talking settlement, work on settlement.

And we cannot do it in a linear fashion. We have to do it in a simultaneous fashion. That's how these cases work. So I would caution against a PSC that is too small to get that done.

Most of the firms that are asking to be on the PSC have more than one lawyer. Some of the lead firms have entire

teams that already have the expertise from Volkswagen and/or other cases.

THE COURT: What are your thoughts, then, with respect to the colead counsel question since you were sole lead counsel in the Volkswagen case? Is there a need for colead counsel, and what's the -- what are the pros and cons in your view?

I've put you in a tough situation, but --

MS. CABRASER: Let me put it this way, Your Honor. I served as lead counsel gladly in Volkswagen because that was the structure that Judge Breyer appointed. And it worked. It worked because of who was on the PSC.

A sole lead can work if that person is inclusive, collaborative, wants to spend the time and effort on administration. Wants to control the costs while ensuring maximum participation, and, basically, can keep a three- or four-ring circus going in the air at once.

I tried to do that in Volkswagen. I think the outcome speaks for itself. I've gone over the time. But I think having coleads here if they're the right people could also do that job consistently with efficiency and control.

For cost control, I would say use protocols as have been used in VW and other cases. Courts do that now. Colead counsel or lead counsel take them very seriously, and it works.

THE COURT: Great.

MS. CABRASER: Thank you.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Cabraser. 2 Mr. Casey? 3 MR. CASEY: Good morning, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. CASEY: David Casey on behalf of Casey Gerry. 5 6 going to deviate based on your comments from what I had 7 prepared, Your Honor. 8 I'd like to first off say it was an honor to serve on 9 the Volkswagen PSC, and I found Elizabeth Cabraser's leadership 10 inspiring and very disciplined, and I think one of the reasons 11 it was so successful is she made decisions quickly. She didn't 12 have to really negotiate with anybody. She just laid out a 13 game plan. 14 And for that reason, addressing the issue of the size, 15 I think in this case, it would be best with one or if you added 16 cocounsel to her, if you were considering her seriously, she 17 certainly has been through the ropes and knows this area. 18 And when you get into the cost issue, you know, we've 19 been through a lot of the data here. I was assigned early on in Bosch, and, as the Court is aware, Bosch was not prosecuted 20 21 by the U.S. Government, so we were on our own on that. We had to dig through millions of documents. We worked very closely 22 with the top experts in the United States. 23 And I think we kind of broke through the codes, Your 24

Honor. We know what happened, and we have that knowledge, and

25

that knowledge will be of benefit to this Court in this litigation.

So I think when it comes down to costs, we really do have the experts in place. We do have a lot of the knowledge. You have before you some of the most outstanding lawyers I've ever had an opportunity to serve with, and I want to say it was a very collaborative well-working machine. It was a very, very positive experience at least, certainly, for me.

I do think the knowledge that we've gained certainly can be an asset to this Court. I will say early on in the Volkswagen case, we were pushing for a trial date because, as the Court is aware, what ensures things move along is to have a trial team and to have a trial date.

And so we had a trial team. So I think any PSC will have to have a trial team. I think any PSC will have to have a good discovery team, a team to deal with law and motion matters, a team to deal with the experts, and a team to really focus on Chrysler's conduct and Bosch's conduct. And then, important in all of that, is a team devoted to settlement, to work with the special master.

So it's multifaceted. To do that under effective leadership, I think you should have twelve to fourteen PSC members so that leadership has the flexibility to give those assignments.

And based on that, I submit. I'm trying to come in

under two minutes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, you're doing very well, but you still have a couple of minutes. Let me ask you about the colead counsel. You get extra points the earlier you -- no.

With respect to the question of whether it's beneficial to have colead versus lead, how many lead counsel atop a steering committee? Any thoughts on that?

MR. CASEY: I would say no more than two. I think you want to keep it lean at the top but have an in-depth PSC.

Your Honor, one other thing I just forgot to mention.

I had the honor of serving with Lesley Weaver, and we were assigned to the California Attorney General. We spent a lot of time meeting with the attorney general. Judge Breyer wanted us to work with government entities and develop a close working relationship.

That was very critically important because CARB was very important then, and it's even more important now in this overall equation. And so I would recommend that a part of the structure of this includes lawyers assigned dealing specifically with the California Attorney General.

THE COURT: And you played that role in the -- you were active with respect to that?

MR. CASEY: Yes, I was, Your Honor. And they did not file in that case. They monitored the case. But they had a presence, and I can't overstate the importance of that

1 relationship. 2 THE COURT: All right. Any other further thoughts? 3 MR. CASEY: Thank you for your time, Your Honor. THE COURT: Great. Thank you. Mr. Heygood? 5 6 MR. HEYGOOD: Good morning, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. 8 MR. HEYGOOD: As you note from my application, I 9 simply said that I am offering my services in whatever capacity 10 the Court deems appropriate in whatever portion of the 11 plaintiff's management team that the Court may think that I can offer services. 12 13 I'll echo what's been said here today. I think that 14 the structure of the Volkswagen PSC was very efficient. I was 15 very happy to help on that, and it has been -- I think you have 16 a lot of very quality lawyers in this room to choose from. 17 What I will focus my remarks on is really singular, 18 and that is that we've heard a lot already today, and I suspect we will the rest of the morning, on class action. But we're 19 here today on an MDL. This isn't a class certification. 20 21 is a multidistrict litigation. That includes class action and 22 individual plaintiffs who have brought lawsuits seeking individual redress. 23 24 As I understand and read the pleadings that have been 25 filed to date, there are more plaintiffs that have filed

individual lawsuits than there are individual plaintiffs who have sought class action status. In fact, I believe that this hearing today as an MDL hearing has to look at both sides.

And it may very well be -- I was on the Volkswagen steering committee and was ultimately part of class counsel for the class settlement in Volkswagen, and that model is going to be helpful.

But at an early-on stage like this, I think we cannot lose sight of the fact that this is an MDL and not a class action hearing today, and we have to be inclusive, and we have to take account of all the litigants.

THE COURT: What's an example of what should be done to take into account the individual nonclass litigants?

MR. HEYGOOD: I think that's the exact question that I'm asking the Court to focus on, and my answer to that is very simple. You have to have someone in the class plaintiff's committee, the leadership of this particular litigation, that comes from — to this litigation historically, but also with this litigation, not from a class mindset, but from a representation of individual mindset. That's important for several reasons.

It's important to have that diversity, number one, because I think having that other voice in the room matters.

Having that discussion. Whatever -- what wins in a day and what the strategy might be, it will be what it is, but you need

to have that discussion.

But most importantly, it's important for the optics around the country. There are going to be hundreds of lawyers from around this country who represent individuals who have these cars and these vehicles that are not going to be on plaintiff's steering committee. It is important for them to know and believe that whatever result happens, whether it be a litigation track or a settlement track, that their voice -- people that were not looking at it solely from a class action standpoint but from a standpoint that they themselves was being heard. That's important because whatever comes out of this management has to be sold.

I know that firsthand because as a member of the state liaison committee in the Volkswagen leadership, I talked to hundreds and hundreds of lawyers who had cases around the country who were wanting to know, "Is my issue being heard in there? Is what my concern is and my client's concern, is it being discussed?"

That's important to sell it in the optics of it.

THE COURT: So what's an example of things you've heard, sort of the issues coming from individual non- -- I'm going to use some of Mr. Casey's time to give you that.

What's an example of where that voice -- you know, what specifically was the concern that otherwise would not have been heard were you not in the room?

MR. HEYGOOD: I think that the one thing that we can learn -- I think that Judge Breyer's litigation was wildly successful. One of the things I think that's grappling with now is an answer to your question, and that is that a little more effort and time could be given during the litigation in terms of timelines and scheduling that might focus on individual claims.

For example, not just a form class action complaint, but maybe a form individual complaint and things of those nature. I think what we're grappling with in the Volkswagen litigation now is we know however successful the resolution may be, there's going to be lawyers and plaintiffs who opt out of any potential settlement or opt out of any class. There's going to be ongoing litigation.

And as an MDL, I believe this MDL should be focused on that from the beginning and putting in their deadlines and things they're thinking about of whether this is successful or not, how will this look when the majority of cases are done, but there's still litigation? That's the obligation of the MDL, I believe.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Heygood. Appreciate it.

Mr. Levitt?

MR. LEVITT: We're in the size order segment of the hearing, I think. Let me put this up a little bit.

Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. LEVITT: Adam Levitt of Dicello, Levitt & Casey.

At the last hearing, Your Honor had stated that you strongly emphasize with the ongoing problems that each of the class vehicles spewing emissions into the air, that we needed to approach as aggressively and as efficiently as possible.

So in thinking about what the leadership of this case should actually look like and hearing what the defendants are saying, which, obviously, as others who went before me have said, is highly aspirational, we hope it works. We're not sure.

The way that I would -- so, first of all, to answer Your Honor's specific questions, I would propose a two-lawyer lead counsel structure.

I would also then propose a seven-firm steering committee under that, which falls into the following categories: Law and briefing; discovery involving Fiat Chrysler; discovery involving Bosch; third-party discovery; engineering and industry experts; economic experts; a trial team; and settlement. That's eight. I apologize. I miscounted.

So -- and I think that structuring it and sequencing it that way from the outset lets us have a focus from the first day. We're all working as a cohesive team.

I also think it's important that having a structure of that size rather than a larger structure lets us reach into the pool of extraordinarily talented lawyers in this room and otherwise in this case who have very specialized knowledge.

For example, perhaps, in German language translation and documents, in technical issues, in code issues. Because having been involved in many of the largest automotive cases out there, including the Ford MFT case before Your Honor with Mr. Berman and Mr. Tellis, as well as the GM 5.3L case, which we have in front of Your Honor where we're arguing the motion to dismiss three weeks from right now with Mr. Miles, it's important to have a team highly experienced in these kinds of cases.

We bring that experience to the table. One other thing that my new firm brings to the table is that looking at every case from a trial perspective from the first minute, we're the only firm, I think, with an in-house focus group and mock jury practice, which works on each of our cases from the outset. Ongoing focus grouping, ongoing enhancement of our message ongoing.

Because the goal here is what -- we hope Fiat Chrysler and Bosch and everything they're saying to the Court actually solves these problems, the goal is to set a relatively early and aggressive trial date and work toward that date. Without that out there, all the hope in the world isn't going to change

anything.

All the hope in the world isn't going to change the fact that until these cars are fixed and until the class members are properly compensated, we have a lot of work to do.

THE COURT: What's a realistic trial date given what you know of this case?

MR. LEVITT: 18 months.

THE COURT: And class cert, that would put class cert when?

MR. LEVITT: Probably ten months from appointment -it's very aggressive I know, Your Honor, but I think it's
something. In terms of a lot of the class certification
requirements, I think that a lot of them are going to be more
straightforward than we might have seen in other cases.

And I think also to Your Honor's point on the diversity issue, my partner, Amy Keller, would be working on this case extensively with me. Ms. Keller has also extensive experience in automotive and highly technical litigation as well, so she would be an asset to any team.

So unless Your Honor has any questions -- oh, the last point was on cost containment and control. The protocol that we put before Your Honor and worked with Your Honor on Ford MFT would be the sort of cost control and oversight approach that I think is entirely appropriate here.

THE COURT: Great.

1 MR. LEVITT: So thank you very much, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Appreciate it. 3 Mr. Sarko? 4 MR. SARKO: Good morning, Your Honor. Lynn Sarko from Keller Rohrback. 5 6 Your Honor, let me start at the end. You asked about 7 cost controls. I think the most efficient way is the faster 8 you move the case along, the less it's going to cost at the 9 end. I've found that through the history of these cases. 10 I will also say that it will force the plaintiffs to 11 get their act together quickly to cut through the weeds, as 12 they say, and nothing like pressure on the defendants to either 13 move it towards resolution or decide what the issues are. 14 THE COURT: What do you think is realistic with 15 respect to a trial date? 16 MR. SARKO: I actually am going to go out there, and I 17 even had a conversation with Ms. Cabraser about it. I will say 18 trial in six to seven months on some common issues. I think this is a case where it makes no sense to wait until the end on 19 20 all the issues. There are some issues we can bring along. 21 We have some science that is still developing. Have 22 to work with the Department of Justice. But I think that, 23 actually, before Judge Breyer, having the threat of early bellwether cases actually moved us all towards resolution. 24

25

I will also --

THE COURT: Do you see a bellwether process here? What are you thinking?

MR. SARKO: I do on certain common issues. I mean, obviously, we need to have the class certified. There is also two defendants, Bosch and VW, but one of the things I think that would be helpful is early on to ask both sides for their trial plan and sort of lay them out. So that's one issue.

The second issue I would say as far as structure goes, you know, I am all about we, not I. I actually think cases like this operate better with a group. We have an outstanding group of people here who work not only in VW, but other cases. People have different expertise.

You have Mr. Rice who is -- probably can settle and get more money out of my pocket than other people. We have people who, you know, Mr. Bailey who has tested lots of cars. People have had other parts of these cases.

I will say that this is a case that isn't any one person's case. People decided to file it at different times. There were -- we actually did testing also. There's a number of counsel here who have tested the cars, which I think is helpful.

I think Mr. Giuffra should not feel so good because we actually see some big problems.

THE COURT: So why -- let me ask you because your part of the contingent has suggested a four colead counsel

structure, and so I'm trying to figure out why. When you have a steering committee that can have folks with these expertise, what's the advantage of having a large colead structure?

MR. SARKO: Well, I've actually found that, you know, if you have the right personalities, one, it's fine. But the tweak that I would have on the VW case is Ms. Cabraser did a fabulous job, but she does have to sleep. In order for us to --

THE COURT: I'm not sure about that.

MR. SARKO: In order for us to pursue this case with the intensity that we need, I think it would be helpful to have more than one colead, and I think that she's acknowledged that.

As to what the right number is, whether it's two, three, four, I think that all of those accommodate. If you believe in democracy, the more people, the better. I think that, you know, somewhere in the number of three or four is the right number for this case.

I will say it also is all about ego. You know, I have managed people for quite a while. I have been managing partner for a number of times. It is very difficult to get this many alphas to row in the same direction. But we did it in the VW case, and I actually think it's a better result than we otherwise would have.

We also, if you want me to look at how this case is different.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SARKO: I actually think we have learned more about Bosch as we've gone, and, you know, Mr. Slater should not feel so good, because I actually think that as we turn over more rocks that their role may be looked at even more intensely in this case.

I will also say that we also have a foreign aspect. You know, not only do we have the same regulators here, but we also have investigations going on in Europe that have been further developed. The Bosch story and saga has gone on.

I've done lots of work in Italy and in Europe with lawyers and investigations there. I think that will be active here. My firm has German and Italian lawyers. Other firms have German and Italian lawyers. I think those will be put to use.

And as far as structure for you, what I would suggest is that you appoint the leadership, you appoint colead counsels and a PSC, and you ask us to come back to you with committee assignments.

We actually, in the VW case, had 12 committees all the way from settlement to engineering to discovery, et cetera.

People served on more than one committee, but that was very helpful.

And on cost controls, I will say that cases that the costs get out of control often are when people are not paying

attention. The lead counsel have not focused on it. And I think that we have a very good system that we utilized in other large cases.

I mean, and we are actually incentivized to keep the costs low. I mean, I will say that we don't use litigation funders. Our firm has the ability to fund this case, and the other firms do. But a dollar is a dollar, and we have no interest in spending more than we need to.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

MR. SARKO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Appreciate it.

Mr. Scarpulla?

MR. SCARPULLA: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I thought it was alphabetical.

THE COURT: Actually, it was. I made one mistake here, but I'm going to make an exception and allow you to come on up. Sorry about that, Mr. Saveri. You will get your chance.

MR. SCARPULLA: Your Honor, I will answer the questions which you suggested rather than talk about anything that is already in my submission.

As a structure, Your Honor is questioning that -- the number of people that should be coleads. I would think, and my clients respectfully suggest, Your Honor, that two maximum is sufficient for this case. We don't want it -- look. If the

government and Fiat Chrysler work something out, this case is going to settle. We know that.

So to have a huge structure that may be unnecessary and to have people spending time and money when that may be unnecessary to charge that to the class, seems to me that if you had just two coleads maximum, and you don't need -- you really don't need a plaintiff's steering committee if Your Honor doesn't want to.

Because if you're running these cases properly, lead counsel knows what lawyers can do what tasks, and they reach out to those lawyers to perform those tasks throughout the litigation, and so you reduce the amount of lodestar that's run up, and you reduce the costs to the class.

THE COURT: What if the case does not resolve? Some have indicated less optimistic about a possible resolution on the software front, and this goes into full-fledged litigation? What's your --

MR. SCARPULLA: Well, it still would be the same, Your Honor. You still reach out to the same lawyers to help you prosecute the case as a lead counsel.

You don't need this huge -- I don't think you need this huge structure. We try and avoid that in most of the class cases that I've had where I've been in the leadership.

You have one or two lead lawyers, and they reach out to other lawyers to perform services as it goes along.

One of the things that my clients would respectfully suggest, Your Honor, that you might consider also having a class settlement counsel. Because if Fiat Chrysler and the government work this out, then all you'd need is somebody that can put together a reasonable settlement for the class members. And that --

THE COURT: Is that mutually exclusive from lead counsel? I mean --

MR. SCARPULLA: Well, it's not, but that must -- that has to be -- I would respectfully suggest, Your Honor, one of the first things to consider is can this case be settled? If you have a good settlement special master, like either Judge Renfrew or Judge Weinstein or both, who wanted to work with the government if they request it, and Fiat Chrysler and the other to work with the private plaintiffs, this case is going to end.

It would be quick, and it would end soon, and you wouldn't have a huge amount of costs or lodestar for the class members.

THE COURT: Do you see a settlement master playing a role at this juncture where there is a pending software fix being evaluated by the regulators? What role -- just that threshold question, what role would a settlement master play in that since there are direct discussions and iterations going back between Fiat Chrysler --

MR. SCARPULLA: Well, it may be that they -- if there

is an issue that comes up, and it may be that a neutral might help.

I think -- I don't remember if -- if Director Mueller was involved early on in the settlement with the government entities and Volkswagen, but I understand that as the case went on, he was involved in that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCARPULLA: And as for controlling fees and costs, I just told you -- I just mentioned to Your Honor a way to do it. But also there has to be a regular reporting of time and expenses on a monthly basis pursuant to an order that Your Honor would enter that would suggest how you kept time and to whom it was reported, and then limit the number of hard costs that are recoverable from the class.

Soft costs, Your Honor, could have come out of any fees. So if somebody wants to go to a deposition in, let's say -- I don't know whether there would be, but if there's a deposition in Milano, somebody might want to go there, and if you want to fly first class, that's fine, but that's on you. That's not on the class.

So -- and then have a regular report to Your Honor on the fees and costs. Because just having a time and expense report is -- I mean, if nobody is going to look at it until the end of the case, it doesn't work very well. It has to be something that you review on a monthly basis. You get it on a

```
monthly basis, review it on a monthly basis, make a report to
 1
 2
      Your Honor quarterly on those issues.
 3
               So unless Your Honor has questions of me, I'll sit
 4
      down.
               THE COURT: No. Thank you. Appreciate your insight.
 5
               All right. Mr. Saveri?
 6
 7
               MR. SAVERI: Thank you, Your Honor.
8
               Let me just start here. I think probably my Italian
9
      is better than anybody else in the room. So if that matters --
               THE COURT: Did you want to illustrate that or give us
10
11
      a couple of lessons or something?
               MR. SAVERI: (Speaking foreign language.)
12
13
               THE COURT: Okay. You're hired.
14
               MR. SAVERI: So a few points, Your Honor. Let's talk
15
      about the structure, first. I've served as sole lead counsel;
16
      I've served as colead counsel; I've served as members of the
      plaintiff's steering committee; I've been on boards of
17
18
      directors of corporations.
               My -- all that teaches me is that we should be
19
      treating this enterprise essentially as one in which there is
20
21
      an executive who makes the decisions in this case, who is
22
      responsible to the Court, and who is surrounded or supported by
      a plaintiff's steering committee.
23
24
               And when I think of a plaintiff's steering committee,
25
      I think of it like a board of directors of a corporate entity.
```

And I think it's -- it's useful to think and realize that there's no corporation that would have four CEOs, and it's very rare that that there would be two CEOs. I think there's a reason for that because I think that even in very complicated situations, it's important to have authority located in one person who is responsive to the Court and responsive to management of a group.

And that's a time tested way of organizing it, and there are good reasons for it. I think it produces the best results. I think it's the surest way of getting -- of having efficiency, and I think it promotes the interests of justice to the highest degree.

So I do think quite clearly there should be only one or two leads.

Now let's talk about the steering committee. I think that it's also important that the steering committee should not be too large. If you have 20 members --

THE COURT: Do you want to comment on Mr. Scarpulla's comment about no steering committee?

MR. SAVERI: Well, Your Honor, I actually think that with a properly chosen executive or sole lead, I think it's perfectly possible to run a case efficiently.

I'm the sole lead counsel in the Capacitor case in front of Judge Donato. In a lot of ways, it's a much more complicated case. There are 22 defendants all over the world.

There is no executive committee, and I run that case myself.

Now, I rely on a team of lawyers, but I actually think that that system works quite well.

But what -- my recommendation in this case, Your

Honor, because it is in an MDL case, that there are reasons for

having a steering committee. I think it's important in cases

to have a steering committee supporting one or two leads that

bring different expertise and experience to bear. That's not

only in substantive areas like electronic discovery or

discovery management or class certification or experts.

But I do think it's important to say that it's also important in these cases that the plaintiff's steering committee also promotes the -- a diversity of participation by persons or firms that perhaps haven't been chosen before.

And so I think that consistent with a lot of recent thinking on this, that it's important to when one populates a steering committee think about, candidly, issues about diversity of gender, race, geography. I think those are very important because these are public cases. This is an MDL case. There are broader public concerns involved.

And I do think that's important to the system. It's also important to the profession. So it's important to me at my firm. It's something that I've tried to advocate and promote, and I recommend that to be one of the considerations that Your Honor consider.

I also know that this Court has expressed a policy of encouraging the participation of younger lawyers to develop them professionally. That's also very important, I think, to the bar, and to the promotion of justice.

So those are -- those are criteria or qualities I would recommend that the Court consider in determining who is going to serve on this steering committee.

So that's my thought about structure.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

MR. SAVERI: In terms of the -- what I see about the litigation, I do echo the other counsel who have suggested that a trial date is very important. I don't think there's anything that is as therapeutic and promotes a speedy resolution of a case as a trial date.

Now, I think a trial date in seven months, I'd say, is wildly optimistic. To me, the big things that need to be addressed are the pleadings, discovery, class certification, preparation for trial. Just based on what I know of this case, I would imagine that if it moves quickly, it's 24 months. If it moves more slowly, it's 36 months.

I think there's some negotiation around that, but that's what I would recommend as what the parties consider as a trajectory of this case towards a trial date. And, again, I do think it's really important that a trial date be set.

Let's talk about time and expenses. My experience is

that it's important for the Court to enter two types of orders.

Consistent with a practice in the court, I think there are

limitations that should be set about the type of expenses that

can be --

THE COURT: I'll give you a little bit of time.

MR. SAVERI: So those are things like how much can be -- relatively mundane things, perhaps. How much can be spent on copies, whether business travel is to be permitted, whether participation at a deposition is limited to one person or not.

But the other important part of this I think is a reporting requirement. I don't think the Court should be burdened with monthly time supports from us. My experience with -- we have a system that's working quite well based on an order from Judge Donato which says a couple things.

All counsel have to submit their time on a monthly basis. It has to be submitted by a date certain. Any time that's not included within that submission is not to be compensated.

That's submitted to me on a monthly basis. I review that. I make my own decisions as lead counsel about what's permitted and what's not permitted, and at that point, that time is basically locked down. That is set, that's the time in the case. And I think doing that on a monthly basis is consistent with best practices, and I also think it promotes

```
1
      the kind of interests of efficiency.
 2
               I've also instituted in that case, the submission of
      time electronically. Technology has advanced over the years,
 3
 4
      and I also think that's a way of making the administrative
      burden less. So --
 5
 6
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 7
               MR. SAVERI: -- thanks.
8
               THE COURT: Appreciate it.
9
              Mr. Seeger?
10
               THE DEPUTY: I don't think he's --
11
               THE COURT: Oh.
               THE DEPUTY: Can you please state your name?
12
13
               MS. SCULLION: Sure. Good morning, Your Honor.
14
      Jennifer Scullion from Seeger Weiss.
15
               Your Honor, I am here on behalf of Mr. Seeger today
16
      and -- who does respectfully seek appointment as colead counsel
17
      for the steering committee.
18
               But first, Your Honor, I did want to express
19
      Mr. Seeger's sincere apologies for not being able to be here
20
      today in person. He did want me to express to you his deep
      respects for Your Honor, for the court, and for this process.
21
22
               As explained in his letter application, Mr. Seeger
      actually was scheduled for trial for these first three weeks of
23
24
      June in Illinois. As it turned out, he actually ran into some
25
      medical issues this weekend. I'm happy to report he is fully
```

1 on the mend, but that means he could not be here today. 2 He did want me to confirm to you that he will be fully 3 ready, willing, and able from a health and otherwise 4 perspective --THE COURT: All right. 5 MS. SCULLION: -- to take on leadership in this case. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 MS. SCULLION: And I will be working closely with him, 8 9 which is why I'm appearing here today in his stead. So we do 10 appreciate your letting me appear for him today. Thank you. 11 Your Honor, we won't go back through the application. In terms of the questions Your Honor asked, we see the 12 13 structure of the steering committee and how this case is likely 14 to unfold as really tied together. And in that respect, we 15 have supported a tiered structure with four colead counsel and 16 then up to ten for an additional steering committee. 17 And in terms of why four, there are a few reasons. 18 One is that in many ways it effectively can evolve over time, that from the larger steering committee, certain leaders will, 19 in fact, evolve, especially in a case of this complexity and 20 magnitude. So it can be useful to have that really from the 21 22 get-go. And we also think it's relevant here that those who 23

have had experience in the VW case and in the VW steering

committee are supporting having a colead structure here. I

24

25

think having learned and understand the complexity of the 2 case --3 THE COURT: Was there something about --4 MS. SCULLION: There was nothing about Ms. Cabraser's leadership whatsoever, but I think there was an understanding 5 6 that it can be useful to have coleads, and I think, as others 7 have pointed out, this is a multiheaded hydra in many ways. 8 So we have supported a suggestion for coleads in part 9 because there will need to obviously be parallel tracks. 10 is the need to prepare the case for trial. This is a case that 11 we think needs leadership that has a proven track record of 12 preparing a case and taking it all the way through. 13 THE COURT: So why can't that be and isn't that 14 normally accomplished through the PSCs or, perhaps, a trial 15 subcommittee as opposed to a designated colead? 16 MS. SCULLION: Yes. 17 THE COURT: What's the thinking behind having multiple 18 leads? MS. SCULLION: And so, again, Your Honor, it's more a 19 reflection on how things often do develop and evolve over time. 20 21 Certainly, a structure of having a trial committee also does 22 work and has worked very effectively as well as a settlement committee. 23 We do think, as Your Honor has pointed out, there is 24 25 urgency in this case as well as other similar cases given the

actual impact on the public and on the environment, so the need to have everything working effectively and efficiently is possibly even greater here than in many other cases.

And then, Your Honor, in terms of the larger steering committee, we've suggested up to ten. Your Honor will obviously figure out what the right balance is between dealing with a complex and large case like this but without having to get potentially something that's not manageable.

But we think ten is probably about the right number.

It also has a benefit of allowing, obviously, for diversity of backgrounds, experience, and development of further leadership to come to the floor.

Your Honor, with respect to cost controls, I just want to focus -- we've heard a lot of discussion about process and protocols and, obviously, those are key. We obviously think character matters a lot in cost control and ultimately is what is going to determine that.

And we respectfully submit that both Mr. Seeger's reputation as well as others that we have -- are supporting for leadership is impeccable in terms of their commitment to ensuring that the case stays focused on the clients and getting the remedies that the consumers need and doing that in the most, again, efficient and effective way possible. So I do think that's ultimately what the foundation has to be for cost control.

And I did want to underscore, though, also, Mr. Seeger and our firm's commitment not only to this case, but to these device cases in general. And we have -- obviously, Mr. Seeger was involved very prominently in the VW case. He was part of the settlement committee. Worked hand in hand with many of our colleagues here very effectively in achieving a settlement there.

We have invested hundreds and hundreds of hours in this particular case, and we've also, along with some of our

We have invested hundreds and hundreds of hours in this particular case, and we've also, along with some of our colleagues, filed other cases in this area against GM, against Mercedes. So there's a commitment to seeing through this issue on its many fronts by this firm.

And again, Your Honor, we very much thank you for your indulgence for letting me appear for Mr. Seeger today.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MS. SCULLION: Thank you.

THE COURT: Appreciate it.

All right. Ms. Weaver?

MS. WEAVER: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. WEAVER: My name is Lesley Weaver. I opened and oversee the California office of the firm Bleichmar, Fonti & Auld.

As part of the VW team, as David Casey mentioned, I acted first as a liaison to the California Attorney General's

office, and also to CARB at the direction of lead counsel.

The language and cultural skills that I learned while studying and working in Germany in the early 90s, first at the University of Bonn and then later at Bayer AG, helped in numerous ways in this case, particularly as I helped lead the development of the RICO claims against Bosch.

My work involved not just analyzing complex German legal and technical documents but also coordination with German experts, NGOs, and other entities.

THE COURT: You're proficient enough to read and translate documents?

MS. WEAVER: Yes. Absolutely. And, in fact, in the review of some of the documents, in a key document against Bosch, I requested that we hire additional translators so that we could parse out exactly what some of the language meant, especially regarding indemnification, which was very complex.

Last June 2016, I arranged for meetings with, among other, a German expert to learn about his work in recreating the VW software code. Mr. Stranch and Mr. Bailey joined me in that meeting, and that trip is when we first, incidentally, learned that Fiat too might be involved in cheating on emissions because, again, Bosch creates the electronic control unit for the Fiat vehicles as well as the VW.

The information from that trip along with the key documents produced by VW formed the basis for the RICO claim

against Bosch in the VW litigation of which I was a primary author.

These same allegations were later filed word for word in a complaint filed before Your Honor. But a much better case can be made against Bosch. We now know more about the development of the cheat devices and the software that controls the physical operation of the vehicles.

This includes additional evidence of significant admissions that Fiat executives made in meetings in Germany, admissions against interest, and those are allegations that are only in the Johnson complaint that I filed with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Stranch.

Because Bosch will likely resist discovery in this case too, that evidence -- that informal evidence may play a key role in defeating jurisdictional and substantive motions.

Following that trip and in June 2016, I retained for this case, the Fiat case, the economic expert who played a key role in the VW litigation to understand damages in a potential case against Fiat. Just a few weeks ago, I convened German and U.S. experts to further discuss analyses of the Fiat defeat devices.

One element of this analysis was to consider whether the recall announced on May 9, 2017, of certain Ram trucks, which includes our class here as subclass vehicles, might affect this case.

One concern is the preservation of all software codes that might be altered as a result of that recall, and at the hearing on May 24th, Your Honor asked for and received assurances from the defendants that all preservation obligations would be met.

You've asked where this case is heading, and I think it's notable that just a few days later, following our meeting with the experts, a joint study by six scientists at UC Davis and also Germany was published. That study compares the defeat devices in the VWs and in the Fiat vehicles through a detailed look at the software codes. Significantly, that article documents a new kind of defeat device found in a Fiat 500X and compares it to the old defeat devices in the VW vehicles.

While the Fiat 500X is not sold in the U.S., the article is important because it describes the new frontier in emissions regulation and compliance. That is, time did not stand still while we were litigating the VW matter.

Cyber physical mechanisms for detecting testing even on road have progressed; thus, more than ever, this case will require significant resources.

Fiat has already reflashed the software in at least one of the eight AECDs identified in the EPA's notice of violation. Fiat apparently intends to do so again, at least with regards to the safety recall.

If, in fact, it turns out that the number of people in

EPA's testing division is cut in half as was proposed on March 21st, 2017, which may or may not affect this case. I have no idea. But a public/private partnership could play a more important role than ever.

The Court should consider appointing counsel who work well with government regulators. I possess that track record as do others here.

My firm is young, but has good fortune. And I raise this because I think I want to be clear about it. In the first two years of its existence, we settled cases worth more than \$600 million acting as lead or colead. The firm's recovery in those cases alone arms us with considerable resources.

Importantly, those resources aren't being tapped by other cases. My firm is not acting as lead or colead in any other case, and I don't need to make time for this case. It will naturally occupy it.

THE COURT: What are your thoughts on the structure?

MS. WEAVER: Yes. I think it's always an interesting question. I think it is critical that -- personality is important. I do not think the Court should appoint CEOs in collaborative cases of this nature. I have -- I'm in support of a one to three colead proposal.

Again, probably six to eight. I wholeheartedly agree with the concept of committees. I do think that should be left to the discretion of a lead or coleads.

I think there's an argument to be made in a case like this where there might be a need for flexibility because Your Honor is correctly asking is this a litigation case or a settlement case? It's a little bit hard to know now. If it ends up being a settlement case, there might be a good reason, actually, to have a tier of firms.

I would like to say a note on diversity. Not as an afterthought, but as a parting comment for the Court's consideration. I was invited to participate in the drafting committee for the Duke Law Center's MDL Best Practices with respect to selection of lead counsel, and we hope those guidelines will issue next year.

But in the meantime, from my personal perspective, I am incredibly grateful for the opportunity that I was given by Judge Breyer to participate in the VW PSC. It changed the arc of my career. I had the honor of working with some of the finest lawyers in the country, and I'm extremely grateful for the opportunities to witness the varied approaches and the skill sets each lawyer and firm brought to the table.

I would -- I agree that Ms. Cabraser's leadership was outstanding. I deeply appreciate the mentorship by Lynn Sarko. I think Joe Rice was incredible in settlement, and I have formed deep, functional relationships with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Stranch.

I do think there are other VW -- non-VW lawyers here

who are local today like Mr. Gibbs, who could also play a great role.

In any event, I have tremendous respect for all of these lawyers, and I'd be happy to serve in any capacity you see fit. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Appreciate it. And, Ms. Wolfson?

MS. WOLFSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Tina Wolfson of Ahdoot & Wolfson. It's nice to be here again.

Let me start with a structure suggestion, and I'm going to alter that from what I put in my application letter. I think that a larger structure than I originally suggested makes sense upon further reflection. I would suggest two coleads and a PSC of eight additional members.

And that's because a lot of things need to happen quickly. It was music to my ears to hear Your Honor's view that this case is going to move forward and is going to move forward quickly because it is an important public policy case.

So whether we're on the litigation track or the settlement track, we need to get the documents that are readily available from defendants immediately. In fact, I would suggest that the Court even make that part of the appointment order. These documents that have been turned over to the government should be produced to the appointed counsel right away.

In terms of the consolidated complaints, that's going to require a lot of work and coordination. We would utilize the expertise of the different PSC members regarding potential state laws and the appropriate causes of action to be brought.

The class representatives would need to be vetted and make sure that all the subclasses are adequately represented.

Most of the firms have retained their own experts: Mechanical, economic, environmental. All of those would need to be vetted, and the appropriate experts picked to lead this MDL.

Obviously, coordination with all the government entities is another thing that needs to happen very quickly.

I would also suggest just in terms of a management idea that the Court set periodic status conferences to move the litigation along. I'm colead counsel in the Experian data breach case in front of Judge Guilford in the Central District. That something that we suggested to him. He agreed, and it works really well to move the parties to get them going.

In the event one is not necessary, we have one scheduled every 30 days there, and sometimes the parties will call and say, "You know, we don't need to talk to you this time."

But it's really good to have that to keep things going.

I really appreciate that the Court doesn't want to hear what we already put in our papers, but I do want to

summarize that I have 23 years of litigation experience as a cofounder of my firm, and 17 of those years have been virtually exclusively devoted to class action contingency work.

I have vast expertise in consumer fraud cases, product liability cases, and auto defect cases especially.

I have served as lead counsel or colead counsel in some MDLs, but, obviously, not the largest and the most publicized such as this case.

In terms of efficiency and expenses, in Experian, for example we require monthly billing statements from all counsel. One of the columns on those billing statements is who authorized you to do this work so that people are not free to take on work themselves, but there's someone in charge of making sure there's no duplication, and it works well.

We do not report to Judge Guilford in that case, but we have had calls internally where certain things that are questionable, you know, I'm the one who makes those calls and says, "Hey, you can't bill for that. You can't, you know, sign that as a cost, et cetera."

In Home Depot, on the other hand, we did report to the judge periodically, and if that's something that -- you know, that's within Your Honor's discretion.

THE COURT: That made a difference, in your view, to report to the judge as opposed to lead counsel?

MS. WOLFSON: Frankly, I don't think so. I think it's

really up to the lead to make sure that there's no duplication and the work is handled efficiently. And if we were to be appointed lead, Your Honor, we would suggest a protocol to be made part of the court order.

I did want to say about diversity, Your Honor, I was encouraged and inspired by the fact that you pointed that out as one of the issues to be considered. There are numerous studies in the corporate world that diverse teams do better. They're smarter. They make more money. And so it's not a question just for our profession at this time. It's the class will do better with a diverse team.

And, unfortunately and ironically, our business, which is the business of justice, has a long ways to go in that respect. I'm sure Your Honor read the Law 360 article that came out in March 2017 that, you know, only 16.5 percent of lead attorney roles go to women.

I think more studies need to be done with respect to other minority groups, and part of the problem in the large MDLs is that the people who typically get appointed are repeat players, including the women.

And I think, you know, the article points out that private ordering is part of the problem. That's why I think it is important to appoint a PSC on this case and not just lead counsel.

And the bench has the power to turn all of that

1 That's a tension, I think, between continuity and around. 2 diversity. So if all we focus on is continuity, we'll never 3 know, you know, who the next dream team is and the full 4 potential of what can be accomplished for the class. THE COURT: Thank you. 5 6 MS. WOLFSON: Any questions? 7 THE COURT: No. Thank you, Ms. Wolfson. Appreciate 8 it. 9 Okay. Are we okay on --10 (Discussion with the reporter.) 11 THE COURT: All right. Yes? 12 MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, I just want to raise one 13 question. You know, obviously, I just want to figure out when 14 you'd want to hear from the defendants. I know -- I think, 15 based on the alphabet, you may be at the end of the lead 16 counsel folks. 17 And a lot of things were said about structure, the 18 case, trials, the facts of this case versus VW that we 19 definitely would want to respond to. And I can just --THE COURT: Why don't we do that now? Obviously, I'm 20 21 not here to get into the merits of the case, but any comments 22 you have that will enlighten my thinking with respect to the leadership structure, why don't we do that? 23 24 And then we're going to take a break for the court 25 reporter and for staff, and then we will go on with the second half.

MR. GIUFFRA: Okay. So first, Your Honor, in terms of the structure, you know, from the standpoint of at least FCA, we have a concern about a multiheaded lead plaintiff structure. We think the best structure is one where there is one lead plaintiff who is in charge. One lead counsel.

We would be concerned about a structure with two or three or four that you would end up with disputes that would need to be resolved over whether it be settlement, the dates in a scheduling order, and the like.

And in the VW case, which we talked about, we had one lead counsel. That worked extremely well. Ms. Cabraser was in charge, and everyone on the plaintiff's side knew it. She could make the decisions with respect to the scheduling order, which, in that case, worked out extremely well. No problems. And we would presumably do one here.

Similarly, issues with respect to settlement were worked out with Ms. Cabraser was in charge. And I would have a real concern about -- particularly you have these big, you know, steering committees, of having factions on the steering committee vying for one or two or three lead plaintiffs -- and who is -- or lead counsel, excuse me, and who is in charge.

So I think having more than one person in charge of this will be contrary. Your Honor will be -- ultimately, I think, have a problem. You'll be referee among the lead

counsel. And from my standpoint, you know, I'll be having to negotiate with two or three lead counsel as opposed to one.

And whether it's -- you know, the first thing which we'll have to deal with, which will be the scheduling order, then if we have to move through -- you know, who -- I guess they can work out amongst themselves thing like motions to dismiss.

But you need to have someone in charge. That's how it is in a courtroom. That's how it is in a company. That's how it is, you know, in the government. You can't have multiple people in charge.

And I also think it's important to keep in mind here that, you know, there's a tendency for the whole sort of VW team to sort of move over to this case and say the two cases are comparable.

And let me just draw some important distinctions. It was a 21-person steering committee along with Ms. Cabraser in VW. And that was a very big steering committee, and in terms of settling the cases, we dealt with a much smaller group of people, and that case was on a settlement track from day one.

Now, let's just look at the number of vehicles. In VW, you had roughly 600,000 vehicles. And those 600,000 vehicles were made into multiple generations. So you had two-liter vehicles, and you had three-liter vehicles.

Among the two-liter vehicles, you had gen 1, gen 2,

gen 3, and different cars. Pretty complicated stuff. The solutions for the different generations of cars were different.

And that was one of the issues that came up in that case was when we tried to resolve it with respect to the two-liter cars, the company was not able to fix those cars to the certified standard, and, ultimately, the settlement was reached that allowed the company to fix the cars to a lower standard but the fixes -- some of the fixes involved hardware changes, takes a long time, very complicated stuff.

That's just the two liter. Then the three liter, that was additional, you know, generations of cars, types of cars, fixes being different. So, for example, for the gen 1, three liters, those cars were made able to be fixed to the certified standard.

With respect to the gen 2 SUVs, those cars, VW believes, can be fixed, and there's a process going on to deal with that.

But a pretty complicated, you know, number of cars, number of generations of cars, plus Porsche was separately represented in that case.

Here you're dealing with a much more simple situation. You have two types of trucks. You have Jeep Grand Cherokees, Ram 1500s. They have the same engine in them; okay? So you're not talking about a situation where, you know, you have the kind of complexity that was at issue in VW.

In addition, you know, FCA has -- and I think this is important to just put on -- you know, I think people know it in the room, but for the Court to be aware of it, FCA has applied for a software solution before the first hearing in this case. Before the very first hearing, and FCA remains optimistic that it can reach a solution that will satisfy the government, not have any emissions impact, not have a performance impact, and we can address this.

In VW, the fix was not applied for until after the settlements. After the settlements. And with respect to the three-liter vehicles, that process is still going on, and the company thinks it can fix the three-liter vehicle cars. But -- and that's what's been stated publicly. But it's a different -- it's just a different case.

And so, you know, we would be concerned both from the standpoint of management and cost controls in this case, if you have a, you know, five, ten-person steering committee. It's just not necessary when you look at the fact that you're basically dealing with one engine and two trucks.

THE COURT: Might that depend in part upon Fiat's position if there's not a fix or not a fix pending and this case moves forward that, as you indicated last time, there's not been an admission of liability as there was in the VW case, that this case, at least publicly stated, there seems to be disputes on a number of different fronts which suggests an

active litigation path if this case does not resolve?

MR. GIUFFRA: Well, I think, Your Honor, there may not be. I think the issues in terms of the litigation, the first set of issues we'll deal with will be a motion to dismiss. In VW, there was never a motion to dismiss filed.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GIUFFRA: I don't believe there was ever an answer filed in that case. And so the case was in settlement mode from day one.

Here we will have a motion to dismiss, and, you know, there's been discussion, for example, of something called on-road PEMS testing. On-road PEMS testing is easily manipulatable depending on the weight of the driver, the speed with which you're driving, the temperature outside, whether you're going up a hill or not.

And so there's a reason why regulators rely on lab testing for the most part, and so -- so, you know, we'll have to -- and we've heard a little bit about, you know, cars that aren't even in the case. These Fiat 500Xs. They're not in the case. We're talking about one engine in two trucks.

And so the position of Fiat is it has not admitted to having the defeat devices in the vehicles. It has not admitted to having emissions issues, and the company believes and is confident that it can address the regulators' concerns.

If we can do so within a limited number of months --

okay? -- then I think this case has a completely different complexion, and we'll be fighting about things like diminution of value of the trucks or not.

There also are in this case --

THE COURT: But if not, if the fix is not in the works, then we also have a different case than Volkswagen because you've already indicated rather than not answering, there's going to be a motion to dismiss. There may be several rounds of that, there will be a fair amount of motions work as we're now beginning to hear.

You will -- I don't know if you're going to get into -- I wouldn't be shocked if you opposed class revocation, and then -- I mean, so we're going down a road that is typically -- and that suggests if the litigation route is the one that's going to be taken that that's going to require a significant amount of resources.

And that's why I'm curious about your comment about we don't need a large steering committee, et cetera. I mean, I understand your comment about the lead counsel, and the -- you know, the possible issues that result, but in terms of a steering committee that's large enough to accommodate the potential litigation handle given the "contestedness" of the matters --

MR. GIUFFRA: Well, I think most large cases, Your Honor, at least on the defense side, you don't have multiple

law firms. These are pretty big and sophisticated firms on the other side. If you appointed two or three or four to the steering committee with a lead counsel, you'd have a lot of people who could work on this case. And they're economically motivated, then they will spend their time on the case.

You don't need ten law firms in the case, particularly when you're only talking about a hundred thousand vehicles.

And, ultimately, in terms of cost containment, you know, were the case to settle, you know, that would be something that would be a cost born by the company, I guess, in the end based on other cases.

But you don't need to have ten people coming to every status conference, for example. And, again, VW had a lot more vehicles, differences among the vehicles. Here you're talking essentially about one engine.

And so, you know, EPA and CARB are still investigating the matter. There have been no admissions.

And just to give you -- you know, just to make another point, which I think is important, in terms of the schedule, people start throwing out dates. You know, let me just give you a date, which is -- the EPA has agreed that the substantial completion date for the production of documents in connection with what are called EPA 208 requests -- and these are requests that are provided for under the Clean Air Act Section 208 -- is December 15, 2017.

Okay. So that's just the 208 responses, and that's in part because there's documents that have to be collected from Italy. They need to be translated. There will be data privacy issues that will have to be addressed with.

So the idea that we can sort of rush this case to a trial, I don't think, makes any sense whatsoever. You're talking about a case where there will be significant class circumstance issues.

I think people buy, you know, RAM trucks and Jeep Cherokees for different reasons. That would be an issue that would have to be addressed at class cert.

In addition, Your Honor, there will be experts in this case. There will be experts into the values of the cars.

There will be experts -- let's assume we have a software solution that we believe works and that the government believes works. The plaintiffs may have experts who want to challenge that, although the Court, I think, would have to look at the expert agency's views on that question. But that's something that, you know, that will take some time.

So you're looking at --

THE COURT: So what's your best estimate as to a reasonable trial date as you -- assuming this case does not resolve quickly because of the things that -- we go on the less optimistic --

MR. GIUFFRA: I think the way to think about the case,

Your Honor, possibly is to think about it in terms of there's two paths it could go down. If we are able, as we believe, to satisfy the government, the expert government regulators, that we have a software solution that works and that does not have impacts on performance, and it satisfies emissions standards, I think this case will -- can resolve very quickly.

And there may be some dispute about diminution of value of cars, but if you can fix the cars and address them -you know, and I'm not aware these cars, you know, going down in value like the VW vehicles did -- I think the case can be resolved relatively quickly.

If there's some issue where we -- you know, we and the government cannot see eye to eye, I think we're down a different path, and you're talking about a litigation that would go on, potentially, for years.

THE COURT: That's why I'm asking what's your forecast --

MR. GIUFFRA: I think -- look. Our view is, Your Honor, that the likelihood of going down the litigation path here where we don't have a solution is a relatively low one, and I think it would be something where throughout the entire process of the litigation, we would be trying to work on a solution that would satisfy the regulators.

So no matter what happens, if you're going down the litigation road, you're basically still going to be working to

try to satisfy the regulators that we can fix the cars.

Because, as I understand it, this is really a question of calibration of software. No one is saying that the -- the emission -- the AECDs that are in the vehicle as they exist, you know, need to be taken out.

I believe in the proposals that we've made, the same AECDs are still in the vehicles, and we're just changing the calibrations of those AECDs, and that's what we're going back and forth with the government about.

But even, let's suppose -- let's suppose the process took a period that Your Honor was not satisfied with. Well, you know, the litigation would go on. We'd still try to fix the cars.

But I think -- look, if they file a consolidated amended complaint, that's the most likely first step here. So if Your Honor were to appoint a lead counsel in two weeks, and give them -- they may want -- you know, six to eight weeks is the normal period of time folks want to file a consolidated motion, consolidated complaint.

We would want the same amount of time to move against that complaint, and then you would have -- so let's suppose it's two months. Two months.

Then the other side would want two months to put in their opposition brief. You're out six months. Then there will be a reply brief, you're into seven months already.

1 Now, even if you move it --2 THE COURT: Let me look at my local rules. I don't 3 think it provides -- I can't remember that time frame, but --4 MR. GIUFFRA: Let's just suppose if they do a consolidated -- let's even do shorter. A month for the 5 6 consolidated complaint; right? Then we would -- I would imagine they'd want to take 7 8 some time, then we'd want at least a month to file our motion 9 to dismiss. They'll want a month to do their opposition. 10 Okay. That's three months. 11 THE COURT: There's a rush to take a bidding war with 12 who --- how many can do it in two weeks? How many can go down 13 to, like, ten days? 14 MR. GIUFFRA: But I think, realistically, Your Honor, 15 there is going to be a period where there's going to be 16 briefing on a motion to dismiss. It's going to take three to 17 six months in my experience. 18 Your Honor is going to have to decide the motion. suspect the motion will be a long motion which will have lots 19 20 of legal issues in it, and so you're still talking about some period of time. 21 22 My estimate would be by that time that period is over, we would have a resolution with the Department of Justice and 23 24 the EPA. 25 Because, again, unlike in VW where the settlements

came and then the fixes were being looked at, although there was process before that, here you have a situation where they've actually made the application before the first hearing in the MDL.

THE COURT: All right. Any final comments that you want to impart?

MR. GIUFFRA: No, Your Honor, other than, you know, one other point I would make is, you know, in terms of the settlement master, there was discussion of that.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. GIUFFRA: Mr. Mueller was more involved, I would say, on the PSC side, let's say, than the DOJ side, at least initially. But then as the settlement had to go forward, obviously, he was involved on all sides because it was a multidimensional interrelated settlement.

Now, whether you need someone at this point, you know, in the next -- I would think that's something that could await -- that could await the resolution of the motions to dismiss.

THE COURT: Well, if you delay it long enough,

Director Mueller might be available again.

MR. GIUFFRA: Depends on what you read in the newspaper. He certainly did a great job in the VW case.

But I think the big thing would be -- the big thing would be -- you know, our main -- the main point I wanted to stand up here and say was a lot has been said about the

structure. I think there are a lot of benefits to having one person in charge to avoid having the problem of disputes among PSC members, and, at least from the standpoint of the defense, we know who we can deal with.

Because what happens if I'm working out a schedule with one person on as the lead counsel, and the other one is taking a harder line or not a harder line, and I'm sort of ending up with a negotiation among three people? And the one thing that worked really well in VW was you knew that Ms. Cabraser was in charge.

And so I really strongly urge the Court to follow that model, and I also don't think given the number of cars and the complexity of this case versus the other case, you need a PSC that's -- you know, that's manageable.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Giuffra. Appreciate it.

So at this point, why don't we take break? Given that the next phase, we have, I think, what? 19? 18, 19 folks?

That's going to be another hour and a half. So to be humane about this, people may want to grab something quick to eat or sustain themselves.

So why don't we come back in 30 minutes, and resume with the phase 2? Thank you.

(Lunch recess taken.)

THE COURT: Okay. Last one to sit down loses their

position. Let's see how quickly...

Okay. We're going into phase 2 now, and we've allocated four minutes to make your presentation. And those who have already spoken will not -- not be invited to speak again.

So, again, alphabetical order. Mr. Bailey? Is
Mr. Bailey -- you made it. Good.

MR. BAILEY: I just thought it was too risky to sit and try to get up and climb over everybody.

Thank you, Your Honor. I'm Ben Bailey from Bailey & Glasser in Charleston, almost heaven, West Virginia.

My letter doesn't talk about my language skills. I'm fluent in Appalachian English. I was born there. And for some of these pickup truck owners, we may need that.

THE COURT: That's a good angle. Excellent.

MR. BAILEY: I looked at my letter, Your Honor, and a couple of things I probably should have said more clearly. The team in my office consists of six lawyers. The team who works on this case is six lawyers, women and men. All of them much younger than I am. And the engineers at West Virginia University's Center for Alternative Fuels Engines and Emissions.

And that group is professors and PhDs, and they're teachers. And I probably didn't make that clear, but they've been involved in making diesel technology cleaner since the

heavy over-the-road vehicles in the 90s. They created this PEMS technology, and they do the testing of the vehicles on a dynamometer, which is like a treadmill, in a lab, and independent testing on the road.

We would very much like to serve on the PSC. When I filed my application letter, and when I filed the Fasching complaint with the seven other firms on it, what we knew about these vehicles was the testing that I had done in -- starting in late December of 2015 and through '16, and the numbers that were in the complaint filed by Mr. Berman, and the information in the NOV that the government issued that talked about the eight different AECDs.

Since then, another study that my colleagues at West Virginia University did has been made public. And everybody can see it if they want to. I brought a copy of it.

But we know now that these -- that there are tests in the private sector outside the car manufacturers and outside the government of at least seven different vehicles. Nine total iterations of them because these cars have already had one recall of hardware for about 11,000 cars in 2016.

THE COURT: Are we talking about the same models or different cars?

MR. BAILEY: Different. Both the Jeep, the --

THE COURT: The Ram.

MR. BAILEY: The Ram and the Jeep, there are about

11,000 of them that were recalled. R69 is the recall. That have different hardware, and there was a field fix mentioned in --

THE COURT: What years were these models?

MR. BAILEY: The 2014. And there's a field fix mentioned in the government's NOV that was done, I think, in 2015 on 2014 vehicles.

And what we know from those tests is that whether these cars are -- whether they are as sold or after the recall, that they emit in town, depends on the vehicle, anywhere from 2 to 15 times the certified NOx limits, and they emit on the highway anywhere from 5 to 35 times the limits. And some of those tests were done after this recall.

So while all of us hope that Mr. Giuffra and Fiat
Chrysler are right about an easy proposed fix like the -- like
the Volkswagen three-liter case, the devil is in the details.

And the details include not only whether these cars will have their performance or fuel economy altered, but whether they will be durable because a lot of people who buy big diesel trucks want them to last forever, and it begs the question of if it was so simple, why was it not done right in the first place or after the recall or after the field fix?

I bring that team to the table. We are pretty much done with Volkswagen, so I have all that to bring to the Court and to whoever you put in charge of this case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have had the privilege of working with virtually everyone who applied for leadership here, and throughout the Volkswagen case, I had the privilege of working with the government in both California and the EPA, and working with Director Mueller. Look where we got him. You know --THE COURT: Is that a positive or a negative? I don't know. MR. BAILEY: But I will tell you that my team and I, our engineers will forever be grateful for the opportunity we had to do a technical -- the first technical presentation to Director Mueller and his team about how diesel vehicles work and how defeat devices work, and I'd like to do it here. THE COURT: Do you have a technical background yourself? MR. BAILEY: I do not. Well, I'm a West Virginian, and I have a liberal arts degree. THE COURT: That sounds pretty technical. Judged by community standards; is that where we... MR. BAILEY: I've run out my four minutes. Your Honor, my firm and I have spent over 730 hours and over \$40,000 on this case as I left Monday. If you'll put us on the committee, I promise you that we will work efficiently, that we will work with grace, and that we will

work with good humor when we can because this case is just too

```
1
      important and life is too short to do otherwise.
 2
               THE COURT: Great. Thank you, Mr. Bailey. Appreciate
 3
      it.
               Mr. Bryson? Not here.
               Okay. Mr. Cecchi?
 5
 6
               MR. CECCHI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Good afternoon.
               MR. CECCHI: So I think I'll start, because there's
8
9
     been a lot of discussion about Italy, the c-c-h is pronounced
10
      "K" in the Italian language.
11
               (Speaking foreign language.)
               So I don't think Mr. Saveri has a monopoly on Italy.
12
13
               THE COURT: Well, let's have a contest here.
14
               MR. CECCHI: And, you know, Mr. Sarko mentioned that
15
      he has and -- Sarko mentioned that he has an Italian lawyer in
16
     his office. I actually am an Italian lawyer.
17
               But there is an important point that I would make
18
      substantively about that issue. Fiat, of course, is an Italian
19
      company. It's run by Sergio Marchionne. My firm is unique
     here. We've represented Italian companies in the past.
20
21
               We've represented Alitalia. We currently represent
22
      the Archdiocese of Newark. I say that because those are unique
      entities, and I think having the perspective of having
23
24
      represented them speaks well to my ability to bring something
25
      unique to this PSC, which my application is for.
```

I did want to very briefly mention some of Mr.

Giuffra's comments. I want to amend my application, Judge,
that in the interests of efficiency and getting this case done
because this is a really simple case. He should only have one
other lawyer at Sullivan & Cromwell, and this guy is from New
Jersey over here, so he can be that other lawyer.

It's a very simple case, but it's going to take them like ten years to get the motions done and the documents produced from Italy.

So -- you know, look. On the plaintiffs' side we don't buy the calibration story; right? And I think he would like to have what I'll call an understaffed PSC. He really would because that's to his advantage. And I don't begrudge him making an argument to his advantage, but this case speaks clearly to the need for, let's call it a more expanded PSC.

I agree with Ms. Cabraser that the size of this PSC, the work is there, Judge. I think Mr. Scarpulla mentioned we don't know if this is a settlement case or a trial case. I'm a former Assistant U.S. Attorney. Every case to me is the same, Judge. I get ready for trial in the case.

And one of the reasons VW was so successful, not only because of our esteemed and exalted leader, Ms. Cabraser, but we two-tracked it. We got ready for trial.

I was fortunate to work both on the Bosch team and the team that was responsible for digging up what I'll call some of

1 the less than stellar document preservation habits of Mr. 2 Giuffra's clients. I took some of those depositions myself. 3 Those issues we'll ascertain here as well. 4 I also want to echo something Mr. Berman said. 23(g) does speak to the initiative of plaintiffs' lawyers. I think 5 6 that's a really important consideration here, Judge. My firm, 7 Mr. Berman's firm, and Mr. Seeger's firm did file the first 8 case before the EPA. We did use the portable emissions system to do that testing. We did invest those resources to buy that 9 10 machine and do the testing. I think that initiative credits 11 all of us, Mr. Berman, Mr. Seeger, and myself, for service 12 here. 13 I also think that a leadership of two to four, 14 Mr. Sarko, Ms. Cabraser applied, along with Mr. Berman and 15 Mr. Seeger. Yes, VW was outstanding and it was great, but I 16 think generally having more than one colead is in the interests 17 of the class and the Court. 18 I wanted to mention to you --THE COURT: Why is that? 19 MR. CECCHI: I just think because you have more heads 20 thinking about the issues. You have --21 22 THE COURT: Why can't that be done through the PSC? 23 MR. CECCHI: It can be done through the PSC, Judge. There's no question about that. But I think having two on the 24 25 top does assist that process at the leadership level. You're

right, Judge. It has worked with one, but I think, as a general principle from my perspective, two is good.

I want to mention two other points. Bosch. I was also on the Bosch team in VW. I filed the first Bosch case in New Jersey before anyone else filed the Bosch case, and I have to say I was a bit nervous for a while because no one was piling on, and I was thinking, "Did I get it right?"

But I agree with everyone here. Bosch is a big player here, and that's a big issue.

My firm is unique because we also have patent lawyers. We do a lot of patent work. I am not a patent lawyer, but I can tell Your Honor that I often play a patent lawyer. I've learned the lingo. I know a little bit about patents, but we have actual patent lawyers who have expertise in mechanical and electrical patents, have reviewed the Bosch patents, did that in VW, and can do it here.

I think I'm done. I just wanted to mention I was an Assistant United States Attorney under Mike Chertoff. I know the Department of Justice. I look forward to working with them here. And one of the things that Mike taught us was not only to be vigorous prosecutors, but to have perspective. I think I bring that to all my cases, and it would be a real pleasure to work in this case before Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Gibbs?

MR. GIBBS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's a pleasure to be here today. I'm going to scrap most of what I had planned to say and respond to a couple of your earlier questions.

I've served as lead counsel or on a steering committee in probably 20 auto class actions at this point against just about every major manufacturer in the country or in the world.

My opinion is this case needs one or two lead counsel and a steering committee of between seven and nine firms.

Maybe I say that to my own disadvantage, but from my experience, I think that's about right.

And, of course, lead counsel can always call on a particular talent or expertise beyond what's -- who is appointed.

I also think it's important -- we're doing this in

Anthem case now, and I think in every day which I'm appointed
as a lead, a strict, strict timekeeping protocol is necessary.

Monthly reporting at a minimum. That time needs to be reviewed
in realtime, and work that wasn't approved needs to be cast
aside, can't sit there for two or three years and linger and
become a problem for the Court and the class and everyone else.

Reaching back to my application, one case I would like to highlight for Your Honor is the Hyundai MPG case, which I was appointed by Judge George Wu in the Central District to serve a fairly unique role there. At the initial MDL

conference, Judge Wu was told that the defendants and the small group of lawyers had negotiated a class settlement, and there were dozens and dozens of dozens of firms who weren't part of that.

He appointed me in a role to represent the interests of those firms and work with the Court and the settling parties to develop a discovery plan to essentially ferret out whether the settlement was fair and reasonable and adequate.

We did that over the course of many hearings with the Court, and discovery in Korea and in the United States, and, ultimately, through that process, 42 firms who had opposed the initial settlement either changed their views affirmatively and supported it or withdrew their objections.

Ultimately, Judge Wu approved a revised settlement that is worth about \$360 million, and I raise that because I think it reflects my firm's ability to manage and navigate complex litigation with a lot of thorny issues.

The last thing I'd like to do is in my written application, I mentioned one of my more senior partners, Amy Zeman, who is here with me today. I'm familiar with the Court's standing order which encourages active participation by more junior lawyers. That's something that my firm regularly strives to do. That's personally rewarding to me to see lawyers develop that way.

The tension, though, for us, in cases like this, large

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MDL cases, is when you're competing with the type of talent that's in this room today, it's very difficult to take a lawyer and have her or him be the main applicant when she doesn't or he doesn't have the track record of formal court appointments. Ms. Zeman, I think is perfect for a role here. She's fluent in German. She lived in Germany. She studied in Germany. She's worked with me in a number of auto cases. She's currently effectively playing my role in a large mass tort and is regularly receiving compliments from the Court and from lead counsel in that case. Together we've worked well with Ms. Cabraser in the past in an MDL before Judge Chesney that settled for a hundred million dollars. So I would respectfully ask the Court to consider her as an appointment if you're so inclined to appoint our firm. THE COURT: All right. MR. GIBBS: Thank you very much. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Gilbert? MR. GILBERT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. May it please the Court, my name is Robert Gilbert, although most everyone here knows me as Bobby, and I come from Miami, Florida. It's a pleasure to be here before you. I'm part of

Your Honor, I became an attorney 31 years ago and

the group of plaintiffs' counsel in the Kitchel complaint.

joined the law firm my grandfather set up in Miami, Florida because I wanted to help people pursue justice. And I've devoted my entire legal career, indeed, my entire life to trying to help people in need.

I believe based on the experience and qualifications that I described in my application, which is at docket entry 95, that I am able -- capable, able, willing to assist the leadership appointed in this case in the pursuit of justice and would be very proud to accept the honor of an appointment here.

Your Honor, according to some figures that I've looked at published by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Florida is number three in the country in the number of pickup trucks with 11 percent of the total pickup trucks in this country, and Georgia is number four with 7 and a half percent of the total pickup trucks in the country.

Now, that's not specifically EcoDiesel, but that's pickup trucks in general, and we know that these are pickup trucks, Dodge Ram EcoDiesels.

In other words, Florida and Georgia count for nearly 20 percent of all the pickup trucks in the United States today.

My original named plaintiffs that were part of the Kitchel complaint hailed from Florida and Georgia. Our Florida plaintiff purchased five Dodge Ram diesel 1500 EcoDiesels, and our Georgia client purchased one.

And like virtually all of the 103,000 affected owners

and lessees of these vehicles, those two plaintiffs made a conscious decision to purchase environmentally friendly pickup trucks, but unbeknownst to them, that's not what they got.

Based on the data reported by the DOT regarding
Florida and Georgia plaintiffs and as one of only two Florida
lawyers who has made an application for leadership here, I
would suggest to the Court that it would be healthy and good
for the process overall as we proceed forward to include at
least one lawyer from Florida as a member of the PSC. And
whether it's Mr. Leopold, who is an outstanding lawyer in his
own stead, or me, I believe that that would do right for the
class and be a very good addition.

I'd like to address quickly an elephant that I think is in the room. Other than Mr. Gibbs, who just presented, I'm first person, I think, today to make a presentation who wasn't named by Judge Breyer to be part of the PSC in Volkswagen. And I had hoped to be a member but I wasn't appointed.

And I think it would be perhaps topically appealing to the Court to take all or most of the PSC appointments and leadership appointments from Volkswagen and replicate it here, because, after all, they did an amazing job.

But I think for the MDL process, for the class action process, for this class, it would be healthy to broaden the group, to bring in some new faces from different parts of the country, gender diversity, et cetera, and I believe that I can

make a very big contribution to the team if appointed. 1 In particular, as I'm sure you've already seen from my 2 3 letter, I am one of a smaller set of people in the room today 4 who have actually tried class action cases to judges and I've tried in the last decade alone ten certified 5 6 class action cases to judgment for judges and 12-person juries 7 in Florida. 8 Mr. Giuffra says that they're going to fight to the 9 death or at least that's what we're hearing today. Ms. 10 Cabraser indicated early this morning that the case needs to be 11 prepared and prepared quickly on both a settlement track and a trial track. 12 13 I'm available, able to do that. Kids are no longer in 14 the house, so I can spend as much time as needed here to 15 prepare this case for trial. 16 THE COURT: Are you sure they're not coming back? 17 MR. GILBERT: They always come back, don't they? 18 But I can spend as much time as needed on the road, here or elsewhere, helping to prepare this case for trial, and 19 I would be honored if the Court appointed me to be a member of 20 the PSC. Thank you. 21 22 THE COURT: Great. Thank you. Appreciate it.

MR. HAGSTROM: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's a pleasure to be here. Richard Hagstrom of Helmuth & Johnson

Mr. Hagstrom?

23

24

25

from Minneapolis, Minnesota. I am requesting an appointment to the PSC.

The economic loss, environmental circumstances here require a speedy resolution either through settlement or final judgment. Consequently, I suggest that for purposes of the PSC, the qualifications of the members have immediate capacity to work on the case, drawing negotiating skills, technical knowledge, and litigation and trial skills.

I'm personally willing to commit my time immediately to this case to carry it to conclusion. I strategize a case from the beginning expecting that it will go to trial. And based upon Mr. Giuffra's comments earlier, I think we ought to plan that this case will, in fact, go to trial. I firmly believe that that approach is necessary to get the best result for clients.

Now, there are obviously many talented lawyers in this room who are very capable and have had outstanding results over the years.

THE COURT: How is your Italian?

MR. HAGSTROM: Pardon?

THE COURT: How is your Italian?

MR. HAGSTROM: I know none, Your Honor.

Unfortunately, I've thought about learning the language, but I never have. I have friends in Italy, however, that do speak very well.

So there are a great deal of many talented attorneys here. I too have obtained great results in cases over the years. I've had many cases involving hundreds of millions of dollars and some in excess of a billion dollars.

I've represented the little guy against corporate giants, and I've represented corporate giants like 3M, Wells Fargo, U.S. Bank, and Bridgestone, Firestone to name a few. My firm and I are representing plaintiffs in the Volkswagen MDL and have assisted the lead counsel.

In short, I've been involved in many hard fought, major litigations over the years. I've worked with many of the firms in attendance here today, and I've litigated against and negotiated with Sullivan & Cromwell in a series of state class actions involving Microsoft over the years.

One of these cases settled only after three months of trial. The settlement returned the highest per capita recovery for plaintiffs of any of the cases against Microsoft. And although we were outstaffed literally three to one by the Microsoft team, the result that we obtained was a result of our tenacity, skilled trial team, and commitment to the clients, and I believe those skills are necessary here.

THE COURT: You were on the trial team?

MR. HAGSTROM: Yes, sir.

I've taken and defended hundreds of depositions, including internationally renowned experts. I've worked with

experts on extensive damage modeling over the years.

And, perhaps, unique to me among counsel here, but I don't know for sure, I helped pay my way through college as a mechanic. I've always been a motor head who loved automobiles, loved taking them apart. I love knowing how they work. I've rebuilt engines.

In addition, I've litigated cases involving software.

THE COURT: Have you rebuilt a Ram 1500 by chance?

MR. HAGSTROM: I have not rebuilt a diesel engine.

Just gas engines. My brother has rebuilt a diesel engine, but not me. Perhaps we can bring him here.

So I plan to put this knowledge to use in a case like this.

And somebody mentioned patent lawyers. Our firm has several patent lawyers present and they are certainly well skilled to look at the patents at issue here.

In summary, the pursuit of the class claims requires good old-fashioned hard work, creative thinking, and diplomacy. I know a formidable team will be appointed by Your Honor, and I would be honored to be a part of that team. Thank you.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Herrera?

MR. HERRERA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Nicomedes Herrera. I'm with the Joseph Saveri Law Firm, and I think I should begin by saying that I'm pleased, and I think

Mr. Saveri would be gratified to know, that I fully support his application to be --

THE COURT: I'm shocked.

MR. HERRERA: -- lead counsel.

But to focus my words on why should I be granted the privilege of serving with some of my distinguished colleagues on the steering committee. I think I'd like to emphasize something that may not be apparent on my papers, but that has to do with the distinctive background that I have.

As Your Honor knows, I've worked on very large class actions at the Saveri Law Firm including a leadership role in the Capacitors antitrust litigation that involved over 30 million pages of documents produced by 22 corporate defendant families, most of them in foreign languages such as Japanese and Chinese and Korean and others.

We have handled that case as lead counsel efficiently. We have done, I think, a good job for our clients as well as for the public good in prosecuting that case, and I think I bring that type of sensitivity to --

THE COURT: Maybe you can describe your specific role in the Capacitor antitrust case.

MR. HERRERA: Sure. As one of the most senior attorneys at the firm, I've been involved with the cartel allegations with respect to two of the most important defendants in the case that comprise the vast majority of the

commerce, at least in the United States.

THE COURT: What did you -- maybe you can tell me, when you say you're involved, what did you do? What's been your specific tasks?

MR. HERRERA: Not only in terms of formulating top level strategy in terms of how to develop the allegations and -- but also down to the discovery level overseeing the discovery by our document reviewers, by writing substantive pleadings and motions, and, I think, being involved in overseeing some of the counsel that we work with, particularly in the sense of preparation for important depositions including executives in foreign countries.

I've taken a lead role in making sure that the work that our counsel that we work with are doing their job properly and efficiently.

And so I would say, to answer your question, from both the top level in terms of formulating strategy down to the bottom level of making sure the discovery is done efficiently and that the case is analyzed not only factually but legally in the highest manner possible.

I think that type of experience would inform my work on the steering committee in this case.

THE COURT: How large is the legal team in that case?

MR. HERRERA: Within the Saveri Law Firm, there are
six attorneys that are mostly involved, and we work with many

different firms with respect to each of the defendants, corporate defendants. So we've broken up the work not only in terms of the type of defendants, but the geography and the type of responsibility in the work.

So I think it's a large and important case, and I think that in many case ways it perhaps maybe more complex than in this case, and I think that our commitment to quality and efficiency would allow me to be a valuable member of the steering committee.

But I would also like to add that I've been a general counsel. I began my career in Manhattan on some very large defense firms representing Fortune 100 companies, manufacturing, financial services, a broad range of industries.

And I was asked by my client to join their in-house department where I rose to general counsel position, and I think that having served both on the plaintiff side, the defense side, and in house will allow me to be a good member of the steering committee for two reasons.

Number one, this hasn't been something that has been mentioned by others, but in this case -- if I just may finish.

In this case, we're not talking about a mistake. We're talking -- the code didn't write itself to defeat the testing. This is a decision that was made by a large and particularly well-respected corporation.

And it is important in this case that we just don't

redress this particular example of corporate wrongdoing, but we change the culture. The culture not just at Fiat Chrysler, the culture not just at Bosch, but the entire industry, and, perhaps, lead by example.

And having served as general counsel where I know that the culture of a corporation is set at the top level and how it can be changed for good and bad, that I would be a valuable in the steering committee to not only create a just result in this case but to have a sensitivity that this case is beyond the particular trucks in this case. It's beyond just the environmental harm that has been caused in this case.

It is about the culture of an industry that thinks that they can cheat, and I think that I would bring my broad experience to bear to create justice not just for society but for our clients and for these corporations as well.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HERRERA: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Appreciate it.

Ms. Jensen?

MS. JENSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Rachel Jensen, and I am a partner in the San Diego office of Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd.

First, I'd like to echo a couple of comments that were made earlier about whether we're going on a litigation track or settlement track. I think the best way to get a quick

resolution, as others have said, is to prepare for trial, get a trial date, and work on parallel tracks.

I can tell Your Honor from my experience as one of the lead counsel in the Trump University class actions, that the trial date, the looming trial date was really why we were able to reach such an excellent resolution for the class.

Now, I recognize that Your Honor has no shortage of excellent applicants here today. I offer three reasons why I should be among those selected for the plaintiffs' steering committee.

First, I'm honored to have the support of virtually all the attorneys who are seeking lead counsel appointments, among those, Ms. Cabraser, Mr. Berman, Mr. Sarko, Mr. Seeger, and Ms. Weaver. Each of these attorneys knows the caliber of my work and that of my firm.

Judge Breyer appointed my partner, Paul Geller, to the PSC in VW, and I worked very closely with him as well as lead counsel and the other PSC members. Because of my background in civil RICO cases, I helped craft the RICO theory of liability, and my firm assisted on all the 23 related matters, and we built out a robust Bosch trial plan.

Now, Ms. Cabraser can attest to the fact that my firm worked very closely with hers. For every complaint, brief, argument, settlement papers and presentation, we had a hand in it. There was no night we wouldn't work. No weekend we

wouldn't sacrifice.

I would go so far as to say we weren't just part of VW, we were a major part of it. And it's due to my firm's hard work and our excellent work product that I have Ms. Cabraser's full support.

Now, second, I have proven ability to achieve excellent results in other high profile cases. As I said, I'm one of the lead counsel for the class in the Trump University class actions, and I'm the only attorney who survived all the litigation battles from the start to the end. All 150 motions of it.

And just for some perspective, I took Mr. Trump's deposition in 2012. He was a reality TV star, and now he's Commander in Chief.

So as surreal as all --

THE COURT: You take responsibility for that?

MS. JENSEN: As surreal as the case became, we were able to persevere and secure an excellent recovery for the class, and we did it just ten days after the election and ten days before trial was set to begin. Our settlement is expected to yield \$0.90 on the dollar, and our firm did it all pro bono.

The twists and turns of that unprecedented case, I think I can say, prepared me for just about anything, and I'd be honored to apply the agility that I honed in that case to this MDL.

I also bring a breadth of different types of legal experiences. I've worked on the plaintiff's side, the defense side. I worked for the Office of the Prosecutor at the UN Tribunal for Rwanda, former Yugoslavia. I worked for the ACLU on Capitol Hill, and I had the great honor of working for the great late Judge Ferguson on the Ninth Circuit.

And then finally, I provide a fresh face to represent a diverse class of consumers. I fully recognize that there are lawyers in this courtroom who have many more years of experience than I do. For instance, Paul Geller could have applied instead of me, but we decided together that it was important to practice what we preach about giving women and attorneys of color opportunities for MDL leadership.

Of course, this doesn't mean sacrificing quality.

With my appointment to the PSC, the class will receive the benefits of my years of MDL and class action experience and expertise, and, in particular, RICO expertise, as well as the benefits of my firm's substantial financial and human resources.

I'd be honored to assist the Court, the class, and the public interests in this matter. Thank you so much.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you, Ms. Jensen.

Mr. Leopold?

MR. LEOPOLD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ted Leopold with the law firm Cohen, Milstein, Sellers, and Toll.

First, Your Honor, I'd like to certainly concur with my esteemed colleague that the Court should appoint a Florida attorney, I being one of them, and I appreciate the opportunity to appear before Your Honor here today.

One of the issues that the Court certainly needs to consider is the breadth and scope of the experience of counsel when they appear before the Court. A little bit in terms of what I have done over the last 30 years is two-fold as it relates to the importance of what this case is about.

Number one is for 30 years I've specialized in the area of automotive defect litigation. I have litigated some of the most important, I feel, and largest jury verdicts in the country in automotive safety related issues, crashworthiness litigation, and defect matters.

In addition, we've carried that over not only into individual litigation throughout the country where we've had these cases but also personally involved in class action work as it relates to automotive engine defect issues.

Of most recent vintage is the Caterpillar case, which some of the counsel I was colead counsel with, in front of Judge Simandle, which dealt with the issues of -- specifically similar to, if you will, emission standards and defects in Caterpillar truck and engines. We're involved in the same type of litigation right now against PACCAR and also against Cummins.

But also of importance is not that Mr. Berman doesn't have experience in it, but it's not a unilateral nor a monopoly in that regard.

We handled, actually, through -- in fact, Mr. Cecchi, and Mr. Shah, and myself, and a few others, the issue of preemption on the Clean Air Act. We prevailed in that issue in front of Judge Simandle, and we're dealing with those issues also in the PACCAR and the Cummins cases.

So I am personally very familiar with those cases with those legal issues, which are going to be paramount in this case in some shape or form.

THE COURT: So how does that kind of specific experience, can you imagine, help in this particular case?

MR. LEOPOLD: Well, in this case, I think it's going to certainly raise its head in terms of a legal issue that the Court is going to have to deal with. I think it brings a team together, one of which I hope is myself and my firm, that has litigated those issues, have briefed those issues, researched those issues, and have the ability to develop discovery along those issues to help box out the defenses that we believe that the defendants are going to raise in this case.

So I think it would be very important from a litigation standpoint, and I think that's also something of an added advantage that I believe that I bring to this particular litigation is not only my years of experience in individual

auto defect related matters, but also on the class action consumer side where I've been appointed lead counsel and colead counsel in several cases.

Also, it's interesting that Your Honor also raised in its order about some of the backgrounds on mass tort litigation experience, and I've had that. In fact, I've had the most recent experience in front of Judge Huvelle, which was a wonderful experience in the DynCorp matter, where we represented over 2,000 Ecuadorian individuals as a result of the Department of State spraying of crops and things of that sort. So I think I bring a lot of experience as it relates to those matters for the litigation.

Specifically, in terms of the scope and the type of team that this Court is looking for to prosecute this case, I think what Mr. Berman and Ms. Cabraser and others have said is appropriate. I think, generally, a two-person firm -- lead counsel could be one, but, certainly, there is precedent for that here in this court.

But, generally, I find in my experience as being a colead that two is good because of the ability to cross-pollinate, educate each other, be able to brainstorm issues, I think, is very, very important, especially in litigation like this when you're dealing with multiple issues, multiple factors of issues.

Secondly, as it relates to the plaintiffs' steering

1 committee, I do think that, perhaps, 14, 15 that has been 2 proposed by some in here today or in their papers is too much, 3 but I do think there are a significant number of issues all 4 around that relates to the issues of having different teams. And on a final aspect of that, in terms of my 5 6 experience over the many years I've been litigating automotive 7 defect cases, many against Fiat, many against Bosch, many 8 against Chrysler, but they have dealt with international issues 9 where I have taken and -- gone to Europe, Germany, whether --10 or Japan, whatever it may be. 11 So dealing with the international issues of discovery, 12 depositions, and all that transpire in that aspect, I think 13 that I and my firm can bring a lot both in the resources and 14 ability to litigate that matter. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 16 MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Appreciate it. 18 Mr. Michaud? MR. SHAH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jamie Shah 19 with the law firm Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah. Your 20 21 Honor, I have been litigating --22 THE COURT: Oh, I was calling Marc Michaud, but that's 23 all right. That's okay. MR. SHAH: I thought there was a big jump between 24 25 Mr. Leopold and myself.

THE COURT: Everybody up the middle was wondering what -- but go ahead. No, now that you're up, let's just --

MR. SHAH: Thank you, Your Honor. I have been, for the past 17 years, litigating automotive defect class actions around the country. And for the past four-plus years, I have spent considerable time litigating diesel engine emission defect cases.

I've had the good fortune, as Mr. Leopold just mentioned, of working with Mr. Leopold and Mr. Cecchi on the Caterpillar and Cummins and PACCAR cases.

In addition, I've also litigated and recently settled another emissions defect case against Mitsubishi regarding 10,000 of the company's Fuso trucks that were alleged to have faulty emissions systems.

I was not nor was my firm part of the VW case. I think that, nevertheless, the benefit that we have gained from litigating these four pieces of litigation with other counsel is that we were required to be involved in every aspect of the litigation from motion practice to class certification briefing to expert discovery on both the liability and damages side through settlement.

And so I think what we're able to bring as a result of that experience as Ms. Cabraser and Mr. Levitt mentioned in talking about leadership in general and how the case is going to be run, the steering committee is going to be called upon to

handle a number of different tasks.

And I think a benefit that we can bring is that we have, in very similar cases, dealt with all aspects of the litigation, and, therefore, can contribute across the board in terms of whatever the leadership decides needs to be done.

We also do, and I personally handle, a number of qui tam actions, so we're accustomed to working with the DOJ to move cases forward and to ultimate resolution.

I think another thing that we can bring from a unique perspective and skill set is that in addition to our class practice, we also have a significant hourly commercial practice, much of which focuses on representing European and Indian clients including in their stateside litigation.

We have an attorney that's based in Milan, which is obviously potentially relevant to discovery here. My firm is a member of a group called Integrated Advisory Group, which is a consortium of 75 independent law firms, fiduciary, and accounting firms worldwide that collaborate to assist with their clients.

And just by way of example, our newest associate just spent three weeks interning with a firm that we have a relationship with in Germany.

So we are familiar with litigation involving European companies, European industries, and I think can bring our experience to bear in that respect. And I think when that's

```
1
      coupled with the significant four-plus years of experience we
 2
      have litigating diesel emission cases, that we would be a
 3
      veritable asset to the team here in the prosecution of this
      case.
               And, finally, Your Honor, I would just say that I've
 5
      had the good fortune of working in leadership positions with
 6
7
      many of the fine attorneys in this room and have always strived
      reputationally to have good relationships within the
8
      plaintiffs' bar and also with defense counsel and would be
9
10
      honored to have the opportunity to serve in this matter.
11
               THE COURT: But you have served -- let me just ask you
      in your exhibit, you list a number of -- quite a few cases
12
13
      where you were colead counsel in various cases.
14
               MR. SHAH: That's correct, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: And was that a lead counsel team of two or
16
      three?
             What typically --
17
               MR. SHAH: The Caterpillar case was four individuals.
18
      Michelin PAX, I believe, was two attorneys. It's ranged
      anywhere from two to four firms.
19
               THE COURT: And in terms of prior MDL appointment,
20
21
      lead positions in any MDL cases, have you had any?
22
               MR. SHAH: I have. As I indicated in my -- on my CV,
      I've had a number of leadership positions in MDL cases,
23
24
      including --
25
               THE COURT: Oh, I see. Right.
```

1 MR. SHAH: From automotive cases to other consumer 2 cases. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 4 MR. SHAH: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Appreciate it. 5 MR. SHAH: And thank you for letting me skip turns. 6 7 THE COURT: That's okay. 8 Now, let's see. Where was I? Marc, is it Michaud? 9 And maybe I didn't pronounce it properly. MR. MICHAUD: Good afternoon. It's Marc Michaud, 10 11 Patrick Miller, New Orleans. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Michaud. 12 13 MR. MICHAUD: Your Honor, if this is a contest about 14 who has the most relevant direct experience, I lose. However, 15 I think that I come here most organically, Your Honor 16 notwithstanding. 17 On the morning of January 12th, 2017, I was waiting to 18 be called for a court hearing in Covington, Louisiana, which is about an hour from New Orleans. And I was reading about the 19 20 EPA announcement in this case just on my phone. 21 And between then and the time that I came on my way 22 home, I received a telephone call from a friend who referred me to a gentleman by the name of Jamie Varnado. Jamie Varnado 23 works at a place called Rainbow Chrysler Jeep in Covington, 24 25 Louisiana, which I had to pass right by on the way home.

And I stopped to see Mr. Jamie. Jamie has a 2014 Ram 1500 EcoDiesel. And so we started talking about it. He actually works there. He's a service manager there. So we started speaking about it, and I recognize that that could be a potential thing, obviously.

And on my way home between then -- and Mr. Varnado is from Mississippi. So on my way home, took about an hour to get home, I was processing this in my head and talking to my partners on the telephone, and I was preparing to file a lawsuit in Mississippi.

In that time, a friend of Mr. Varnado's, Mr. Bret Rivero out of Northern Louisiana, called me and, again, organically, he also has a 2014 EcoDiesel Ram. So in processing this, we decided to get this in the form of a class action complaint.

I do have class action complaint -- excuse me, class action experience, but this is my first attempt and my first application for appointment to any PSA.

But nevertheless, that day, I returned to my office at about 11:00 a.m., and we were on file by about 3:00 o'clock that afternoon. And so as far as the post-EPA announcement, we were the first case to file in this matter.

And, moreover, typically speaking, Your Honor, I represent people. I represent -- the vast majority of my practice is in representing individual consumers in consumer

fraud cases against some of the biggest companies in the country and in the world, frankly.

The majority of which I do is in consumer finance, and I have represented both sides of that issue. In my first seven years of practice, I was, you know, an associate in a large defense firm representing banks and mortgage companies and whatnot.

Since then, when I opened up my own practice, I did my own thing. I had no staff, I had no secretaries, nothing. And I managed these cases all on my own successfully litigating against and preparing settlements against some of the biggest banks, Bank of America, et cetera.

Since then, I have lots of experience litigating against lemon law cases, for example. So I have a large case against Mercedes Benz.

How much of this is going to relate to what we're doing here? Remains to be seen, Your Honor.

I think that what I've heard several times in, you know, this morning and the last couple few weeks ago is that diversity matters. Geographic diversity. I believe I am the only applicant from the Fifth Circuit.

I represent clients in both Mississippi and Louisiana.

And I know somebody spoke about there being a lot of pickup

trucks in Florida and West Virginia and whatnot, but I can

promise you if there is any contest, I don't think I'm far

behind in that regard.

Nevertheless, I think that the reality is that I'm a consumer lawyer. If you look up -- if you called the Louisiana State Bar Association and said you have a consumer fraud matter, you would be referred to me. And whether or not that perspective plays into a plaintiffs' steering committee remains to be seen.

And so I humbly ask to be added to provide a different perspective. A more plaintiffs oriented and individual consumer oriented perspective. And that's why I've applied, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. All right. Well, thank you.

Mr. Miles?

MR. MILES: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. MILES: D. Miles with the Beasley Allen firm in Montgomery.

May it please the Court, I come to you this morning offering a position -- or asking for a position on the PSC. I served in the Volkswagen PSC and was one of the 22 lawyers that were on that case. Ms. Cabraser had me on so many committees, I can't recount them all.

But my main -- I think my main duty on there was to herd all of the reseller dealers throughout the country. So if you can imagine used car dealers dealing with a trial lawyer,

imagine the challenge it was.

THE COURT: What a combination.

MR. MILES: Yes, it was. Thank you.

My firm represents the Stephens and Turner plaintiffs in this case and, also along with Mr. Levitt and also with Mr. Bailey, I represent the Johnson and the Webster plaintiffs, and we filed that together.

I don't just bring to you the Volkswagen experience.

I also served on the Toyota case with Ms. Cabraser and Mr.

Berman, among others.

I was also involved with the Ducati case down in Miami in the discovery committee. I'm not in a leadership role in that case.

And, also, we're involved in the General Motors case.

In the Toyota case, my firm was the first one to have a verdict in the Booker case, which sort of set the pace for the settlement. And in that case, I was involved in the settlement with both Mr. Berman in the early stages and then also with Ms. Cabraser in the later stages of which she and I were the architects of the intensive settlement process, which is still ongoing today. In fact, we had a call with Judge Selna yesterday. So it's a successful program that we came up with, so I'll offer you a resolution skill as well.

Your Honor, I also have worked with attorney generals all over the country, and I think that's a relevant piece of

information that may be helpful in the selection because I've represented up to twelve attorney generals, currently representing four now. So if there is a -
THE COURT: In what capacity? How have you

represented --

MR. MILES: Representing Mississippi in a drug pharmaceutical litigation, representing Kentucky also in a Fresenius case, and representing the State of Louisiana in four

And if there's going to be a contest for Italians,

Mr. Bailey and I should have a contest among the "Bubba"

language, because I am from Montgomery, Alabama, and there are
a lot of trucks there, so I don't want to leave that out.

separate cases. So I do offer you that as well.

And, finally, Your Honor, I heard you ask the question about the structure. And I proposed a structure in my papers, and I believe I had proposed a structure of a colead.

But having said that, I do want to -- unprompted and certainly not asked to do this, I want to commend Ms. Cabraser on the VW case. It was undeniable her leadership in that case, and we were able to reach a remarkable result because of her leadership, and I was proud to be part of that, and it would be an honor for me to serve in this case as well, whatever structure you decide.

Unless you have any questions, Your Honor, I'll sit down.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me just ask you, the attorney general that -- you say you're now currently representing four attorney generals. Which states are you --MR. MILES: Three. One I can't announce yet because it hasn't been publicly announced. THE COURT: All right. MR. MILES: Jim Hood for the State of Mississippi. I'm representing the State of Kentucky, and also representing the State of Louisiana. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. MR. MILES: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Miller? MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. MILLER: My name is Ed Powell Miller. I'm the founder of the Miller Law Firm in Rochester, Michigan. I believe that my firm is the only Michigan applicant. Michigan consumers certainly have an interest in this case as Michigan is centrally relevant as the location of both defendants FCA and Bosch. I'd like to focus on cost control. I can help in several areas. First, my firm provides boots on the ground in Michigan. My office is located in the heart of Automotive Alley right next to Auburn Hills. I drive by FCA's world headquarters every day.

Second, I know efficiency. I had to. I gave up a partnership after six years with the Honigman firm because my heart was not into corporate litigation. I decided to start the first pro-consumer class action firm in Michigan.

I sold my house, I sold my car, I raised \$35,000, and 25 years later, I built a 30-lawyer firm with a focus on diversity, have more than 3 billion in settlements from one office in Michigan, and four times got 100 percent net cash recoveries for class members.

I know the automobile industry. To fund this class action practice, I devoted half my resources to building commercial litigation focused on the automotive industry. We have done hundreds of automotive commercial tier one supplier cases involving recalls, warranties, and product defects.

I've done many consumer class actions in the automotive industry including as lead and -- as lead counsel and as colead counsel for many others.

I don't believe there's a firm in the United States that has more automotive experience than my firm because it's been many hundreds of cases.

I know FCA, Your Honor. We've litigated against FCA many times. I'm currently sole lead counsel on the MDL Monostable Gearshift case in the Eastern District of Michigan, involving more than 800,000 defective vehicles, and I am lead or colead on two other cases against FCA.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know Bosch. We've litigated against Bosch many times. In fact, on the plane over here from Detroit, I ran into the in-house counsel for Bosch, and we were very cordial. THE COURT: And did you settle the case? MR. MILES: I'm sorry? No, we didn't settle the case. In fact, we joked about the fact that we didn't settle the case. Your Honor, I believe in building bridges. I am well known in Michigan. Ranked 3 in the state by Super Lawyers. Everyone knows I'm a pro-environment pro-consumer lawyer; yet, Republican Congresspeople put me on the judicial selection committee for the Eastern District of Michigan. And yesterday I was advised that the judges in the Eastern District of Michigan awarded me with the Judge Friedman and Cook Civility Award, which is just given to one lawyer every year. I'm proud of that. And I work well with other lawyers. I've worked with Elizabeth Cabraser in Michigan, who is great. Lynn Sarko, who is fantastic. Steve Berman, who is an outstanding lawyer. And I think a lot of weight should be given to the fact that Mr. Berman really discovered this problem. He drafted a great complaint, and he's worked very well with me on the Monostable Gearshift case.

I also believe in diversity. The head of my class

action department is Sharon Almonrode, and she's been fabulous.

1 I hope you give me favorable consideration. 2 you. 3 THE COURT: Great. Thank you. 4 Okay. Mr. Rice? MR. RICE: Thank you, Your Honor. Joe Rice from 5 6 Charleston, South Carolina, of Motley Rice. Your Honor, you're creating a law firm today. And 7 8 when you create a law firm, you're going to be creating a law 9 firm that's going to go against some of the best defense 10 lawyers in the country, that the defendants have chosen with 11 Sullivan & Cromwell and with Cleary Gottlieb. 12 And the consumers deserve that you -- for you to 13 create the best law firm you can from the applicants that you 14 have. 15 THE COURT: Do I get to determine the profit structure 16 on that? 17 MR. RICE: I'm not sure that's within the ethical 18 bounds. You need a law firm that has expertise in a lot of 19 different areas: Motion practice; discovery; finding experts; 20 21 preparing experts; electronic document discovery; digging for 22 little nuggets of discovery; coordination; and resolutions. 23 One that can work as a cohesive group. 24 My focus is resolution. That is what I have been 25 doing for the last 20 years or so. But resolution does not

happen without trial prep. It does not happen without a stable of good experts that are prepared to go forward. It does not happen without discovery in the document world, and it does not happen without understanding the science.

So this cohesive law firm has to be able to do all of those things in order to give the consumers what they deserve, which is a good result.

Someone said that if the government and FCA work out something that this case is going to settle. I don't think that's necessarily true, and I'm fairly confident that my friends from Bosch are going to be a little more difficult to deal with here than they were in VW in light of what's come out, and Ms. Weaver spoke about Bosch's involvement. There's a lot of smoke there, and I'm afraid we are going to be in for a little litigation.

Mr. Giuffra is using the lessons he learned in Volkswagen here. He had his client file an early application. He is talking about delay. We're talking about environmental damage that's occurring every day that needs to be addressed. There's got to be a balance there.

I'm sure that whoever is doing the discussions with FCA and Bosch want resolution. We'll hear a lot of the arguments that I listened to from Mr. Giuffra and Mr. Slater for the last couple years -- or the last year or so.

And we'll have the same experts in most likelihood.

Motley Rice has offices in South Carolina, New York,

Connecticut, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Louisiana, DC, and

Missouri. That's 93 lawyers, 109 support staff, and multiple

years of MDL experience.

Class action experience. I was class counsel in

Amchem and Ortiz. Both of them saw their way to the supreme
court. I learned a lot from those cases.

And I've used that over the years as I've laid the negotiations in the Tobacco cases, and, most recently, in the Deepwater Horizon with Judge Barbier, the TVM cases with Judge Goodwin, and Volkswagen under Elizabeth Cabraser's leadership.

I also have probably the best associate in the country to deal with Mr. Giuffra's experts on the technical information here as we've been working with his experts for the last couple years, and that staff is available to work on this case.

I think my experience has shown my ability to work well with my colleagues. I support the leadership positions that have been sought. I think the key in whether you appoint one, two, three, or four is what Your Honor is comfortable with because you're appointing the person or the persons that you're going to be looking to direct it with.

And if you can get comfort with one, you should appoint one. If you think it needs to be two or three, you should appoint two or three. I think it's what Your Honor is comfortable with.

I think the lessons learned from Volkswagen will be very valuable lessons here, and I think that we will save a lot of time and efficiency to the extent we can use the education that we have and the cohesiveness that we had within the Volkswagen group.

Over the last two years or year and a half, I've spoken to a lot of consumers in the Volkswagen world. I understood what their problems were, what they thought the solutions should be. I spent a lot of time looking at the records, and we were able to craft a settlement that had a remarkably low number of opt-outs.

I think we will take that experience, and I look forward to working with the group if Your Honor selects me. I don't speak German, I don't speak Italian, but I count pretty good.

THE COURT: And you're from West Virginia, so...

All right. Thank you, appreciate it.

Mr. Seaver?

MR. SEAVER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thanks for hearing from all of us, including the applicants for the plaintiffs' steering committee of which I am one.

My name is Todd Seaver. I am a partner in the Berman DeValerio firm here in San Francisco. I and my firm are ready, willing, and able to commit to this case right away, hit the ground running.

With regard to the structure of the plaintiffs' steering committee, I think in my papers I had suggested to Your Honor four to six lawyers would be appropriate, but as a demonstration of my own flexibility, I think I'd revise that to -- 8 to 12, I think, would be the number for the reason that -- well, I think it's apparent that there are fact disputes here, Your Honor, that are going to have to be fleshed out in the adversarial process.

And that's true even if, ultimately, the result is settlement. It doesn't seem that an informed settlement can be reached here without litigation.

And so there's a lot of language flying around the room, so there is an old Latin or Roman adage. I won't say the Latin, but it's, "If you want peace" --

THE COURT: You could give it in Italian. That would be --

MR. SEAVER: (Speaking foreign language.)

I did live in Germany for a year. I am proficient in German, but that's -- I think, has worn off, so I don't want to overstate that.

But the Roman adage is, "Hope for peace, but prepare for war," and that is why I think the lead counsel here, whoever it is, should have a deep bench of talented lawyers to draw upon, and that's why I think 8 to 12 lawyers is about right here.

I do think there is a -- well, with regard to timing and the urgency here, I mean, we have -- there are equitable claims, and there are legal claims, and chances are they're going to need to be tried together. And so I'd suggest a trial date 14 to 20 months out from today for reasons that others have stated.

But I would -- I recognize the temptation to keep the Volkswagen band together so to speak. I and my firm were not involved in Volkswagen litigation, but I would say that there is a benefit to some new blood being involved in this case.

And that is, invariably, in my experience, in leadership of various class actions from time to time, I and others here have been in forced marriages where you work with a firm that's relatively new to you. Maybe you haven't worked with them before.

And I'm always pleasantly surprised at the depth of talent and abilities which I never would have considered and would never have had the opportunity to work with those firms had I otherwise not been forced together.

So, finally, here with regard to the question of the lead counsel, as I stated in my papers, I support Elizabeth Cabraser. I think if there's going to be a sole lead counsel, and I'm not recommending it, I think it should be Ms. Cabraser.

But I think in this case, a colead structure of three, maximum four is appropriate. Really, it's just -- it comes

down to practical considerations of scheduling phone calls, getting people physically in a room together. Once you get beyond three or four, I think that becomes difficult and can be a hindrance, especially in the urgency -- with the urgency that this case presents.

Nothing else, Your Honor, unless you have questions.

THE COURT: I just have one question. I'm looking at your letter, and you've indicated where your firm is playing lead counsel. It wouldn't occur to me whether you have played lead counsel role. I know you indicated you were on a steering committee in the online DVD case. Have you served as lead counsel or colead in -- you yourself in any of these cases?

MR. SEAVER: Yes. Classical lawyer answer, it depends. But there was a case, In Re New Motor Vehicles case involving the auto industry but not auto defect. It was a cartel conspiracy case involving the export -- a conspiracy to prevent the export of motor vehicles from Canada and the United States.

That case -- actually, I started that case as a young associate, and then as the case went on, and I'm sorry to report on and on and on, I did assume the lead counsel role and continued today in that role.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

MR. SEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Slaughter?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is Stacey Slaughter. I'm from the Robins Kaplan law firm out of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

I represent Chatom Motor Company on behalf of car dealers who bought and then sold preowned vehicles. I applied for a position on the steering committee to represent the interest of those dealers in this case.

Dealers may have distinct consideration from consumers that will need to be considered in looking at any damage analysis. For example, dealers -- a primary reason that a dealer will purchase a preowned vehicle is a business reason. It's to turn around and sell it for a profit.

So resale value is a key factor in that purchase decision. Dealers will buy preowned vehicles at auction or from other dealers or consumers, perhaps. They may pay a transport fee to move that car onto their lot.

Lot size is often limited, so space is limited. In choosing to purchase that particular vehicle to put in that slot, they're making an economic decision to not purchase some other vehicle to put in that space.

So, again, resale value for these cars is key.

Dealers will often enhance the car's value before reselling them. So it could be as simple as detailing the car or reconditioning the car before resale. So they put money into the value of the car before selling it as well.

And they typically do not engage in any kind of activity that would depreciate the value of the cars that maybe a consumer would engage in like driving it every day or driving it in traffic and risking getting into an accident that could decrease the car's value.

In short, everything that a dealer does in purchasing a preowned vehicle they do so and it's designed to increase the resale value for a profit.

THE COURT: Do you have any idea what the size of the -- how many dealers would be represented by that class or subclass?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes. We've done some preliminary market research and analysis, and I did come here today initially planning to talk about that. I was a little concerned that doing that might get into some of the expert area, but at least the preliminary analysis is roughly in the range of 10 percent of the impacted cars.

So these would be just some of the considerations -the different considerations for this particular group of car
owners.

I wanted to mention a few points about my law firm,

Robins Kaplan. We are a trial firm. When we take a case, we

prepare the case for trial. I've been involved in trials with

some of the most well-known and high profile trial lawyers from

my firm, and we have eight offices and 220 lawyers throughout

the country.

I have with me here in the courtroom today two of my partners in the Silicon Valley office, Susan Brown and Michael Ram. Mr. Ram has actually certified a number of car class cases in the Northern District of California and he's also very familiar with this venue.

I think the most important thing -- I like the reference to "you're putting together a new law firm" because I think the most important thing about the lead counsel group and any plaintiffs' steering committee is that the lawyers have the ability to work together well as a team and be team players to truly put the interests of the clients ahead of themselves and ahead of their law firms to get the best outcome possible.

I do think my skill set will lend toward being a team player. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Slaughter. Appreciate it.

Ms. Smith?

MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. SMITH: I am Catherine Sung-Yun Smith. I'm an equity partner at Gustafson Gluek in Minneapolis, Minnesota. While it is true that I probably don't have as long or decorated résumé as my fellow applicants here today, I'd like to highlight what I would bring to this case.

First of all, it would be -- I would bring diversity to this case in the leadership. Geographic diversity, of course, is a factor that should not be overlooked when we are trying to represent plaintiffs that are all over, all across the country.

But more importantly, I bring diversity in terms of race and gender as well. It is true that leadership positions are dominated by local Caucasian male attorneys, and just in this application too, it is true that there is not that many female attorneys here, and, certainly, not that many female attorneys of color. I believe increasing diversity is an important cause, and it will benefit the class that would be comprised of a diverse group of people.

Also, in addition to diversity, I represent the new generation of lawyers that will be leading these cases in the coming years. While it would be probably a tried and true course to go with more experienced attorneys who have served in leadership roles in many other cases, if that is the case, it will be nearly impossible for new attorneys to gain that experience to be even considered for leadership.

But my shorter years of experience doesn't really mean that I do not bring anything substantive to the case. In 11-plus years, I have worked primarily on antitrust class action litigations, MDL cases, and consumer protection cases.

And my background as a foreign born and raised

```
1
      attorney, I was able to work on many cases involving foreign
 2
      corporations as defendants in the cases, which often pose
 3
      additional hurdles in prosecuting the case.
 4
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, you represented defendants did
 5
      you say?
 6
               MS. SMITH: I worked on cases with many foreign
 7
      corporations.
8
               THE COURT: Oh, where the defendant is a foreign
9
      corporation.
10
               MS. SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: So what -- tell me a little bit about what
      you've done in these cases in terms of --
12
13
               MR. SMITH: So I've worked on these tech cases LCD,
14
      CRT, ODD, all these cases that involved Korean, Japanese,
15
      Chinese corporations.
16
               I mostly focused on the discovery effort: Going
17
      through documents; preparing for depositions; doing document
18
      requests; meet and confers; interrogatories; things of that
19
      nature.
               THE COURT: What about trial work? Have you --
20
21
               MS. SMITH: We had prepped for trial. I was on the
22
      LCD trial team, but -- I was very excited that we were getting
      close, but the case settled days before the trial. So I never
23
24
      really got to actually see it in action.
25
               But I do believe that prepping for trial from the
```

get-go is the best way to get a great outcome either in terms of settlement or, you know, if it does go to trial, you know, it would be wise to prepare for that from the get-go.

So in this case, I believe that should be the same. The complexity of this case requires, I believe, about eight to ten leadership committee members, and I believe as long as the leadership is -- the lead counsel, one or two lead counsel leads the team of plaintiffs' steering committee, a good diverse mixture of attorneys in the committee in terms of geographic background, race and gender, and experience level will bring different skill sets, different attributes to best represent the class.

THE COURT: And what would you -- what would you contribute, do you think? What's your strongest asset that you would bring to the table?

MS. SMITH: I worked very hard on the -- I will be contributing in terms of discovery efforts. I have -- when there is foreign defendants involved, there is certain, I guess, steps that seem to work best in terms of document review, production, and even depositions. Translation protocols, how exhibits are prepared, how it's presented.

And all those things, I have -- over the last decade, I've found certain ways work better than others. So that's sort of the skill set that I would bring to this case.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

Appreciate it.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Stranch?

MR. STRANCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

There's been a lot of discussion about whether there's more trucks in Mississippi or Louisiana or West Virginia, and I just want to point out that in Tennessee, we're a more gentile state, and we have both kinds of trucks. We have farm trucks and we have what we refer to as gentleman farmer trucks, which are all truck and no farm.

So the one thing that stands out to me that I think would help guide the Court some here is what is the goal of this litigation? The goal of this litigation is to get these cars fixed or off the road as quickly as possible.

And we see that this is probably not going to be a very quick thing because we have Mr. Giuffra out of one side of his mouth saying, "We're working as hard as we can to get this resolved with the government as quickly as possible," but at the other time -- other side of his mouth, saying, "But we didn't do anything wrong, and there's nothing here for us to be talking to the government about."

And so when you're dealing with a defendant that is doing that , what you have to do is prepare for trial as expeditiously as possible, and there's two ways that I believe that I am uniquely qualified to help do that.

First of all, Your Honor, I am a fluent German speaker. I lived in Germany when I was 15 and have maintained that fluency since then.

Second thing, Your Honor, is I was on the Bosch discovery team. I was appointed to the PSC in Volkswagen. I actually served on other discovery and trial teams as well, but the Bosch was one of the ones that I was originally appointed to, and I spent a large portion of my time working in.

That included everything from reviewing documents that were in German before we would meet to make sure that we could understand what was going on, to actually drafting memos, to going to Germany and meeting with witnesses, with governmental entities, with elected officials, with formers, or any one of —— experts in Germany that had done work.

To do that, dig into the facts so that we could determine what actually happened and what Bosch's role was.

It probably comes as no surprise to the Court that Mr. Slater's position was we did nothing wrong, and he would feed us information, and then we would have to go confirm or deny that information.

And as a result of doing that in Germany and learning as much as we could about how they operated, how the software worked, who was involved, we could start to pick apart what happened and how it worked. And that's a real benefit here because Bosch is again at the center with Fiat.

During that process of doing that, I worked very closely with other members of the PSC. I worked with Ms. Weaver, who you've already heard from, who's also a German speaker. And we traded and we divided up responsibilities within Germany and also used our independent network and contacts within the country to get as much done as possible. And I think looking at the results in Volkswagen, you can say that we had some serious successes.

I also worked with Mr. Bailey extensively throughout. While I personally grew up on a cattle farm, and unlike some of the other gearheads you heard from, I actually have rebuilt a diesel engine, Your Honor.

But most of the diesel engines that we had on our farm did not have heavy software in them. And so I worked with Mr. Bailey whenever I had questions about the software or the engineering to learn as much as I could about it. And that was to help guide our investigation in Germany and also in review of the documents.

What that actually leads to and the benefit that it gives, Your Honor, is I've already started working on the Bosch claim in Fiat. I've been to Germany and have met with people over there specifically about Fiat and Bosch and what they do. And we have a very good understanding now of what the Bosch defeat devices are in the Fiat engines.

We've also met with experts from Germany who have done

incredible amounts of testing that they've been sharing with the government that's leading the German government's investigation into Fiat.

And the benefit of that is we can move quickly to start implementing that, and it won't be a delay in getting me or some -- getting me up to speed on how Bosch operates, how the EDC17 operates, and we'll also know exactly where to look for documents and what to do, and that brings a real benefit here.

The last thing, Your Honor, is there is an injunction here that might be at issue before even a trial in this matter if the cars are not fixed or off the road. I have litigated numerous injunction cases, both in the election and voting context. Also in the pharmaceutical context and in other matters. Class context and non-class context. I have also defended them. It's been a substantial portion of my practice since the beginning.

Unless the Court has any questions --

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. STRANCH: Thank you.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Tellis?

MR. TELLIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This may be the one time the phrase "saving the best for last" really works. Yeah. I had this other one about Elizabeth Taylor's fifth husband, but I decided not to go there.

Your Honor, good afternoon. I am Roland Tellis. I manage the Los Angeles office of Baron & Budd, and I head up the firm's class action practice group.

My letter details my 20-plus years' experience in complex cases including the MyFord Touch case pending before Your Honor for which I'm colead. I'd like to spend a minute talking about the size and structure of the PSC.

As Your Honor embarks on making a decision about how big and who should be on it, I think we have to build a team that is prepared for where this case is likely to go. Mr. Giuffra's comments suggest that we couldn't have two more different views about this case.

The notion that a software reflash will bring these cars into compliance without any impact on their performance or fuel economy begs the question, why, then, was it necessary for a company to surreptitiously put eight auxiliary emissions control devices in these vehicles and take the risk that they're facing today?

I think suffice it to say we ought to have a team that's prepared for hotly contested litigation from day one, and you should build the team that's prepared to do that.

I suggested in my letter that we have a PSC of six to eight members. We readily place ourselves and avoid redundancy and efficiency by having committees, and we stay in our lanes.

We can have a committee dedicated to creating

operative complaints, motion practice, fact discovery, experts, settlements, trials, and that sort of thing.

And I think through a responsible leadership and a well-crafted pretrial order or a case management order, we will address cost overruns and that sort of thing.

There's been some suggestion today that we either have no PSC or a very lean PSC, and firms in leadership reach out to friends they know, I think is how it was put. Or their own law firms.

And I think that's problematic for two reasons. One, this is a high profile case, Your Honor, and the selection process should be transparent as it should be in every class action. Your Honor should make the decision based on the record that is put before you and on the criteria that you placed in your pretrial order.

And the second thing is, as we all sometimes forget, law firms are not appointed to MDL positions. Lawyers are.

And you should make the decision based on the individual qualifications of lawyers in this case.

I come from a big law firm. I would love to be able to have my stable of lawyers help me, but I don't think that's how the process works.

I -- what I can offer the Court, Your Honor, is a proven track record of delivering on whatever role I'm asked to play on a PCS. I was honored to be selected by Judge Breyer to

serve on the Volkswagen diesel MDL. I played a variety of roles.

Working with teams, preparing the amended complaint, working with experts to drill down on the Bosch EDC unit, working with experts to figure out how to come up with a baseline to determine the performance of these vehicles so we could test it against a fix.

I worked on a team that was preparing the amended -- or the preliminary approval papers and dealing with objectors.

I was also honored to serve on the plaintiffs' steering committee in the Takata airbag litigation that's pending in South Florida. I have been involved in almost every aspect of that case.

The strategic decisions, taking and defending depositions, motion practice, and, most recently, I worked with a small group of lawyers, some of which are in the courtroom here today, negotiating a settlement -- a half a billion dollar settlement which received preliminary approval this past Friday against four of the seven automakers in that case.

If you select me, Your Honor, I'll make two commitments to you. One, I'll work collaboratively with any group of lawyers Your Honor selects to lead the case, and I'll personally devote my time to make this case reach a conclusion as quickly and justly as possible.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Tellis.

1 MR. TELLIS: Thank you.

THE COURT: That -- I think that -- is there anybody else that I missed? I think I've heard from everyone that's here.

So this has been very helpful, and, obviously, there's a tremendous amount of talent in this room, so that makes this process easy and hard. It seems like no matter what I do, I'm going to have a great law firm here.

But I do have to make a decision, and I intend to make a decision very quickly. I do want to move this on.

When I do announce a decision, it will be in the form of an order with a scheduling order.

For the next step, I know we have to address the issue of settlement master and -- as well as -- the first order will be to get the consolidated complaint on file and start the pleading work.

And that's what's forthcoming, and I know that can't be done until I complete this selection process, so I'm going to be working on that immediately.

So with that, let me thank everybody for making the trip, and I'm sorry we couldn't conclude in time for all of you to join the Warriors parade, but you can watch the reruns, I quess.

I'm going to schedule the next date when I get out this order because I may want to -- I mean, it will be soon.

```
1
      It may be on fairly short notice.
 2
               But I -- we can't do anything until I get the
 3
      structure in place; all right? Great.
 4
               Thank you, everyone. Appreciate it.
 5
                    (The proceedings were concluded at 1:43 p.m.)
 6
                                  ---000---
7
8
9
                           CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
10
               I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
      from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
11
12
13
      DATE:
               Wednesday, June 21st, 2017
14
15
16
17
                                s/b Angela Pourtabib
18
                         Angela Pourtabib, CSR No. 13714, RPR
                                    U.S. Court Reporter
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

#	106:1, 133:2	2331 [1] - 5:3	6	115:20, 120:5,
π	150 [1] - 101:10	24 [1] - 49:19	O .	122:10, 122:24,
#13714 [1] - 1:23	1500 [3] - 90:23, 95:8,	2440 [1] - 5:9	600,000 [2] - 67:22	130:1, 137:20
	111:2	24th [2] - 10:9, 58:3	601 [2] - 4:18, 5:7	above-entitled [1] -
\$	1500s [2] - 9:24, 68:23	25 [1] - 117:6	60602 [1] - 6:11	140:11
Ψ	15910 [1] - 3:23	250 [1] - 3:6	655 [1] - 4:4	absolutely [2] - 15:14,
\$0.90 [1] - 101:21	16.5 [1] - 64:15	2500 [1] - 19:16	670 [1] - 3:14	56:12
\$11 [1] - 25:7	1600 [1] - 3:23	25301 [1] - 3:12	0.0[.] 0	accept [1] - 90:9
\$35,000 [1] - 117:5	17 [2] - 63:2, 107:4	2600 [1] - 5:22	7	accident [1] - 127:4
\$360 [1] - 88:15	17-MD-02777-EMC [1]	272 [1] - 6:13		accommodate [2] -
\$40,000 [1] - 82:22	- 1:5	275 [1] - 3:4	7 [1] - 90:14	40:14, 71:21
\$600 [1] - 59:11	17-member [1] - 25:4	28 [1] - 3:19	70130 [1] - 6:4	accomplished [2] -
· · · · ·	17th [1] - 4:10	2800 [1] - 4:7	730 [1] - 82:21	53:14, 65:4
1	18 [2] - 37:7, 78:18	2925 [1] - 2:4	75 [1] - 108:17	according [1] - 90:10
	19 [2] - 78:18	29464 [1] - 3:19	75220 [1] - 5:4	According [1] - 7:2
'16 [2] - 11:21, 80:9	1900 [1] - 4:4	29th [1] - 3:4	7611 [1] - 2:14	account [3] - 10:10,
	19063 [1] - 6:7	2nd [1] - 5:3	77 [1] - 2:9	32:11, 32:13
0	1918 [1] - 1:16	211 u [1] - 3.3	78th [1] - 5:17	accounting [1] -
	1916 [1] - 1.10 1999 [1] - 3:14	3		108:18
07068 [1] - 1:19	1999 [1] - 3.14 19th [1] - 9:22	3	8	accurately [1] - 26:2
	19th [1] - 9:22 1:43 [1] - 140:5	3 [3] - 68:1, 117:7,	<u> </u>	accustomed [1] -
1	1.43 [1] - 140.3	118:9	8 [2] - 123:5, 123:24	108:7
-	2	30 [5] - 62:19, 78:22,	800,000 [1] - 117:24	achieve [1] - 101:6
1 [3] - 1:1, 67:25,	2	96:12, 103:8, 103:10	8050 [1] - 5:17	achieving [1] - 55:6
68:12	2 [5] - 67:25, 68:15,	30-lawyer [1] - 117:6	8th [1] - 3:6	acknowledged [1] -
10 [1] - 127:17	78:23, 79:2, 81:10	300 [1] - 2:6	our [1] o.o	40:12
10,000 [1] - 107:13	2,000 [1] - 105:9	30 [1] - 2.0 31 [1] - 89:25	9	ACLU [1] - 102:4
100 [3] - 5:9, 98:12,	20 [5] - 47:17, 87:6,	3200 [1] - 3:16	9	Act [2] - 72:24, 104:6
117:8	90:20, 119:25, 124:5	• •	9 [1] - 57:23	act [1] - 38:11
10004 [1] - 6:17	20-plus [1] - 136:4	3300 [1] - 1:16	900 [1] - 5:20	acted [1] - 55:25
10005 [1] - 2:10	200 [2] - 2:4, 3:9	33134 [1] - 4:7	90069 [1] - 2:18	
10013 [1] - 3:7	• • •	33410 [1] - 2:4	90s [2] - 56:3, 80:1	acting [2] - 59:11, 59:14
10022 [1] - 5:7	2000 [1] - 6:21	3400 [1] - 5:7	91436 [1] - 3:23	
1016 [1] - 2:18	20006 [1] - 6:21	35 [2] - 6:7, 81:12	92101 [2] - 4:4, 5:14	action [25] - 31:19, 31:21, 32:2, 32:10,
103,000 [1] - 90:25	20044 [1] - 2:14	3500 [1] - 19:16	93 [1] - 121:3	33:9, 34:8, 62:4,
109 [1] - 121:3	2012 [1] - 101:13	36 [1] - 49:20	94040 [1] - 5:10	63:3, 91:22, 92:4,
10:02 [1] - 8:1	2014 [7] - 11:17,	360 [1] - 64:14	94104 [1] - 4:11	92:6, 102:16,
11 [3] - 8:18, 9:2,	11:19, 13:9, 81:5,	36103 [1] - 6:14	94108 [1] - 4:18	103:17, 105:1,
90:13	81:7, 111:1, 111:13	37203 [1] - 3:9	94111 [3] - 3:4, 4:14,	111:15, 111:16,
11,000 [2] - 80:20,	2015 [2] - 80:9, 81:7	3:00 [1] - 111:20	5:20	
81:1	2016 [5] - 11:20, 13:9,	3M [1] - 94:6		111:17, 117:4, 117:11, 118:25
11-plus [1] - 129:23	56:17, 57:16, 80:20		94612 [1] - 3:14	117:11, 118:25, 121:5, 129:24,
110 [1] - 5:14	2017 [13] - 1:10, 8:1,	4	95 [1] - 90:7	130:24, 136:3,
1100 [1] - 4:7	9:23, 11:15, 11:17,	400 0.0	950 [1] - 2:6	137:13
11:00 [1] - 111:20	11:24, 13:8, 57:23,	400 [1] - 6:3	98101 [2] - 1:16, 3:17	actions [9] - 87:6,
11th [1] - 6:10	59:2, 64:15, 72:25,	42 [1] - 88:11	Λ	94:14, 96:11, 100:4,
12 [4] - 20:3, 41:20,	110:17, 140:13	456 [1] - 4:10	Α	101:9, 107:4, 108:7,
123:5, 123:24	208 [3] - 72:23, 72:24,	48307 [1] - 2:7	a.m [2] - 8:1, 111:20	117:15, 124:12
12-person [1] - 92:6	73:1	_		
120 [1] - 5:22	209 [1] - 3:11	5	abilities [1] - 124:17 ability [9] - 42:6,	active [5] - 25:22, 30:22, 41:12, 70:1,
1201 [1] - 3:16	21 [3] - 24:9, 24:10,	F 4:40 04 40	83:24, 88:16, 101:6,	88:21
1210 [1] - 4:14	24:23	5 [2] - 1:19, 81:12	104:19, 105:20,	activity [1] - 127:2
125 [1] - 6:17	21-person [1] - 67:17	5.3L [1] - 36:9	104.19, 105.20,	actual [2] - 54:1, 86:14
125 [1] - 0.17 12th [1] - 110:17	21st [2] - 59:2, 140:13	500X [2] - 58:12, 58:14	128:11	adage [2] - 123:13,
13714 [1] - 140:18	22 [3] - 47:25, 96:13,	500Xs [1] - 70:19	able [22] - 22:20, 24:7,	123:21
13 /14 [1] - 140.18 14 [4] - 1:10, 8:1,	113:20	55402 [1] - 5:23	25:8, 26:2, 51:19,	
14 [4] - 1.10, 6.1, 106:1, 124:5	220 [1] - 127:25	55439 [1] - 5:18	52:3, 68:5, 68:13,	Adam [1] - 35:3 ADAM [1] - 6:11
140 [1] - 1:1	223 [1] - 3:9	555 [1] - 4:14	74:2, 90:7, 92:13,	add [1] - 98:10
140 [1] - 1.1 14th [1] - 4:18	23 [2] - 63:1, 100:20		100:5, 101:18,	
15 [4] - 72:25, 81:11,	23(g [3] - 17:24, 18:3,		105:21, 107:22,	added [3] - 28:15,
13 [4] - 12.23, 01.11,	85:4		100.21, 101.22,	104:24, 113:8

addition [9] - 15:12, 69:1, 73:12, 91:12, 95:7, 103:15, 107:11, 108:10, 129:14 additional [10] - 10:14, 10:25, 11:4, 11:9, 52:16, 56:14, 57:8, 61:14, 68:11, 130:3 address [12] - 9:18, 10:4, 12:10, 13:10, 17:22, 17:23, 69:8, 70:24, 74:8, 91:13, 137:5, 139:13 addressed [4] - 49:17, 73:4, 73:11, 120:19 addressing [1] - 28:14 adequate [1] - 88:8 adequately [1] - 62:6 administration [1] -27:14 administrative [1] -51:4 admission [1] - 69:23 admissions [3] - 57:9, 57:10, 72:17 admitted [2] - 70:21, 70:22 advanced [1] - 51:3 advantage [6] - 24:4, 24:17, 40:3, 84:13, 84:14, 104:24 adversarial [1] - 123:8 advised [1] - 118:13 Advisory [1] - 108:16 advocate [1] - 48:23 **AECDs** [5] - 58:22, 75:4, 75:7, 75:8, 80:12 affect [2] - 57:25, 59:2 affected [1] - 90:25 affecting [1] - 12:11 affirmatively [1] -88:12 afraid [1] - 120:14 afternoon [21] - 83:6, 83:7, 87:1, 89:20, 92:24, 95:23, 99:20, 102:24, 106:19, 110:10, 111:21, 113:14, 113:15, 116:13, 116:14, 122:19, 128:19, 128:20, 132:4, 135:22, 136:1 afterthought [1] - 60:8 AG [1] - 56:4 Agency [1] - 2:11 agency's [1] - 73:18 aggressive [2] -

36:24, 37:11 aggressively [1] -35:7 agility [1] - 101:24 **AGNELLO** [1] - 1:18 **ago** [3] - 57:19, 89:25, 112:19 agree [5] - 23:6, 59:23, 60:20, 84:16, 86.88 agreed [2] - 62:16, 72:21 agreement [2] - 14:25, 15:7 **AHDOOT** [1] - 2:17 Ahdoot [1] - 61:9 ahead [3] - 107:2, 128:12, 128:13 **Air** [2] - 72:24, 104:6 air [2] - 27:16, 35:6 airbag [1] - 138:11 **AL** [1] - 6:14 **Alabama** [1] - 115:12 Albert [1] - 5:12 Alitalia [1] - 83:21 allegations [4] - 57:3, 57:10, 96:24, 97:6 alleged [1] - 107:13 Allen [1] - 113:16 **ALLEN** [1] - 6:12 Alley [1] - 116:24 allocated [2] - 8:24, 79:3 allot [1] - 8:20 allow [3] - 42:16, 98:8, 98:17 allowed [2] - 8:25, 68.7 allowing [1] - 54:10 **ALMONRODE** [1] - 2:8 Almonrode [1] -118:25 almost [2] - 79:11, 138:12 alone [2] - 59:12, 92:5 alphabet [1] - 65:15 alphabetical [4] - 9:7, 17:19, 42:14, 79:6 alphas [1] - 40:21 alter [1] - 61:11 altered [2] - 58:2, 81:18 Alternative [1] - 79:21 amazing [1] - 91:21 Amchem [1] - 121:6 amend [1] - 84:2 amended [3] - 75:15,

138:3, 138:8

America [1] - 112:12

128:24

amount [6] - 43:12, 44:17, 71:9, 71:16, 75:20, 139:6 amounts [1] - 135:1 Amy [2] - 37:16, 88:19 **AMY** [1] - 4:19 analyses [1] - 57:20 analysis [5] - 16:25, 57:22, 126:10, 127:13, 127:16 analysts [1] - 26:8 analyzed [1] - 97:19 analyzing [1] - 56:7 AND [1] - 1:6 Angela [3] - 1:23, 140:17, 140:18 **Angeles** [1] - 136:2 angle [2] - 22:8, 79:15 Ann [1] - 10:21 announce [2] - 116:4, 139:11 announced [2] -57:23, 116:5 announcement [2] -110:20, 111:21 answer [8] - 8:21, 32:15, 34:4, 35:13, 42:19, 70:7, 97:16, 125:13 answering [1] - 71:7 Anthem [1] - 87:16 Anthony [1] - 5:2 antitrust [3] - 96:12, 96:21, 129:23 apart [2] - 95:5, 133:23 apologies [1] - 51:19 apologize [1] - 35:21 Appalachian [1] -79:13 apparent [2] - 96:8, 123:6 appealing [1] - 91:18 appear [4] - 52:10, 55:14, 103:4, 103:7 Appearance [1] - 7:2 appearance [2] - 8:11, 8:15 Appearances [2] -1:22, 7:2 APPEARANCES [7] -1:13, 2:1, 3:1, 4:1, 5:1, 6:1, 7:1 appearing [1] - 52:9 applicant [3] - 89:3, 112:21, 116:17 applicants [6] - 8:18, 24:22, 100:8, 119:13, 122:20,

application [17] -25:11, 31:8, 51:22, 52:11, 61:11, 77:3, 80:6, 83:25, 84:2, 87:22, 88:19, 90:6, 91:6. 96:2. 111:18. 120:17, 129:9 applied [10] - 8:22, 9:2, 16:21, 69:3, 69:9, 82:2, 85:14, 102:11, 113:10, 126:5 apply [3] - 11:16, 24:7, 101:24 appoint [10] - 41:17, 59:20, 64:23, 75:16, 89:14, 103:2, 121:18, 121:23, 121:24 appointed [19] -27:10, 61:24, 64:3, 64:19, 72:2, 87:14, 87:16, 87:24, 88:5, 90:8, 91:17, 92:1, 92:20, 95:19, 100:16, 105:2, 133:5, 133:7, 137:17 appointing [2] - 59:5, 121:20 appointment [10] -22:23, 37:10, 51:16, 61:22, 89:14, 90:9, 93:1. 102:15. 109:20, 111:18 appointments [4] -89:4, 91:19, 91:20, 100:12 appreciate [24] -13:25, 23:10, 34:22, 38:2, 42:11, 46:5, 51:8, 52:10, 55:17, 60:21, 61:6, 62:24, 65:7, 78:16, 83:2, 92:22, 99:18, 103:3, 106:17, 110:5, 122:17, 128:17, 132:1, 140:4 appreciated [1] -17:17 appreciation [1] -21:21 approach [3] - 35:7, 37:23, 93:14 approaches [1] -60:18 appropriate [7] -31:10, 37:24, 62:4, 62:9, 105:16, 123:3, 124:25 approval [11] - 11:16,

11:24, 13:7, 13:8, 13:10, 13:13, 13:14, 14:20, 14:21, 138:9, approved [3] - 11:15, 87:19.88:14 Arbor [1] - 10:21 arc [1] - 60:15 Archdiocese [1] -83:22 architects [1] - 114:20 area [4] - 28:17, 55:10, 103:11, 127:16 areas [3] - 48:9, 116:22, 119:20 arguing [1] - 36:10 argument [6] - 20:14, 20:15, 20:16, 60:1, 84:14, 100:24 arguments [2] - 19:23, 120:23 arms [1] - 59:12 arranged [1] - 56:17 article [4] - 58:11, 58:15, 64:14, 64:21 arts [1] - 82:17 ascertain [1] - 85:3 aside [1] - 87:20 aspect [5] - 41:7, 106:5, 106:12, 107:18, 138:13 aspects [1] - 108:3 aspirational [1] -35:11 asset [4] - 29:10, 37:19, 109:3, 131:14 assigned [3] - 28:19, 30:12, 30:19 assignments [2] -29:24, 41:19 assist [4] - 85:25, 90:7, 102:20, 108:18 Assistant [2] - 84:19, 86.18 assisted [2] - 94:9, 100:20 associate [4] - 108:20, 112:5, 121:12, 125:20 Association [1] -113:4 assume [2] - 73:14, 125:21 assuming [3] - 13:20, 19:25, 73:22 assurances [1] - 58:4 atop [1] - 30:7 attempt [1] - 111:17 attendance [1] - 94:12 attention [1] - 42:1

attest [1] - 100:22 attorney [12] - 19:19, 30:13, 64:16, 89:25, 101:9, 103:3, 108:14, 114:24, 115:2, 116:1, 116:2, 130:1 Attorney [6] - 15:18, 30:12, 30:20, 55:25, 84:19, 86:18 attorneys [15] - 26:6, 94:1, 96:23, 97:25, 100:12, 100:14, 102:13, 109:7, 109:18, 129:8, 129:10, 129:11, 129:17, 129:19, 131:9 attributes [1] - 131:11 Auburn [1] - 116:24 auction [1] - 126:14 audience [1] - 16:17 **AULD** [1] - 3:13 Auld [1] - 55:23 author [1] - 57:2 authority [1] - 47:5 authorized [1] - 63:12 auto [7] - 21:19, 63:5, 87:6, 89:7, 105:1, 125:15 automakers [1] -138:19 automobile [2] -21:16, 117:10 automobiles [1] - 95:4 automotive [12] -36:7, 37:18, 103:11, 103:13, 103:18, 106:6, 107:4, 110:1, 117:12, 117:13, 117:16, 117:19 Automotive [1] -116:23 auxiliary [1] - 136:16 available [4] - 61:21, 77:20, 92:13, 121:15 Avenue [6] - 1:16, 2:18, 3:9, 3:16, 5:7, 6.21 avoid [3] - 43:22, 78:2, 136:23 await [2] - 77:17, 77:18 Award [1] - 118:15 awarded [1] - 118:14 aware [7] - 16:24, 17:16, 18:7, 28:20, 29:12, 69:3, 74:9

В background [6] -18:17, 82:14, 96:9, 100:18, 129:25, 131:10 backgrounds [2] -54:11, 105:5 bad [1] - 99:7 bailey [2] - 56:19, 60:23 BAILEY [10] - 3:11, 3:12, 79:8, 79:16, 80:23, 80:25, 81:5, 82:9, 82:16, 82:20 Bailey [11] - 39:15, 57:11, 79:6, 79:7, 79:10, 83:2, 114:6, 115:11, 134:9, 134:15 balance [2] - 54:6, 120:20 band [1] - 124:8 Bank [2] - 94:7, 112:12 banks [2] - 112:6, 112:12 bar [2] - 49:4, 109:9 Bar [1] - 113:4 Barbier [1] - 121:10 bargain [2] - 19:6, 21:8 Baron [1] - 136:2 **BARON** [1] - 3:22 based [13] - 12:12, 28:6, 29:25, 49:18, 50:14, 65:15, 72:10, 90:5, 91:4, 93:12, 108:14, 137:13, 137:18 baseline [1] - 138:6 basis [8] - 45:11, 45:25, 46:1, 50:17, 50:20, 50:24, 56:25 Battery [1] - 3:4 battles [1] - 101:10 Bayer [1] - 56:4 Beach [1] - 2:4 bear [3] - 48:8, 99:14, 108:25 Beasley [1] - 113:16 **BEASLEY** [1] - 6:12 became [2] - 89:25, 101:17 Becker [1] - 1:19 become [2] - 12:6, 87.21 becomes [2] - 11:22,

125:3

BEFORE [1] - 1:4

14:3

began [1] - 98:11 begin [2] - 95:25, 101:20 111:6 beginning [4] - 34:16, 71:10, 93:11, 135:17 begrudge [1] - 84:13 begs [2] - 81:20, 136:15 behalf [8] - 1:14, 2:2, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 28:5, 51:15, 126:4 behind [3] - 18:3, 53:17, 113:1 believes [3] - 68:16, 70:23, 73:15 112:11 bellwether [2] - 38:24, **Bill** [1] - 6:9 39:1 Ben [1] - 79:10 bench [2] - 64:25, 63:11 123:23 beneficial [1] - 30:6 benefit [12] - 19:6, 21:8, 29:1, 54:10, 107:16, 108:2, 124:10, 129:12, 133:24, 134:19, 135:4, 135:8 130:11 benefits [4] - 20:9, 78:1, 102:16, 102:18 **BENJAMIN** [1] - 3:12 Benz [1] - 112:15 **BERMAN** [10] - 1:15, 1:17, 5:19, 17:20, 17:22, 20:5, 20:7, 108:4 21:14, 22:22, 23:9 Berman [16] - 17:19, 25:19, 25:20, 36:9, 80:10, 85:4, 85:11, 85:14, 100:13, 104:1, 105:15, 114:10, 114:18, 118:19, 118:21, 122:22 Berman's [1] - 85:7 **BERNSTEIN** [2] - 3:3, best [15] - 28:15, 47:9, 50:25, 66:5, 73:21, 93:14, 99:25, 119:9, 119:13, 121:12, 128:13. 131:1. 131:11, 131:19, 135:23 Best [1] - 60:10 better [8] - 39:10, 40:15, 40:22, 46:9, 57:4, 64:8, 64:11, 131:23 **Betty** [3] - 4:9, 8:12,

between [7] - 44:24, 120:13, 133:16 bottom [1] - 97:18 54:6, 65:1, 87:9, 106:24, 110:21, bought [4] - 18:17, 19:4, 19:7, 126:5 beyond [4] - 87:13, Boulevard [3] - 2:4, 99:9, 99:10, 125:3 3:19, 3:23 **bidding** [1] - 76:11 **bounds** [1] - 119:18 bifurcate [1] - 8:17 box [1] - 104:20 big [17] - 10:11, 11:2, Box [1] - 2:14 19:24, 39:23, 49:16, brainstorm [1] -66:19, 67:18, 72:1, 105:21 77:23, 81:20, 86:8, BRANSTETTER [1] -86:9, 92:1, 106:24, 3:8 136:9, 137:20 breach [1] - 62:15 biggest [2] - 112:1, breadth [2] - 102:1, 103:6 break [2] - 65:24, bill [1] - 63:18 78:17 billing [2] - 63:10, Bret [2] - 6:2, 111:11 Breyer [8] - 8:25, billion [4] - 25:7, 94:4, 27:10, 30:13, 38:23, 117:7, 138:17 60:15, 91:16, binder [1] - 9:7 100:16, 137:25 bit [9] - 15:6, 34:25, Breyer's [1] - 34:2 50:5, 60:4, 70:18, bridges [1] - 118:8 86:6, 86:13, 103:7, **Bridgeside** [1] - 3:19 Bridgestone [1] - 94:7 **BLATT** [1] - 5:13 brief [3] - 75:24, Bleichmar [1] - 55:22 75:25, 100:23 **BLEICHMAR** [1] - 3:13 briefed [1] - 104:18 blood [1] - 124:10 briefing [4] - 20:13, Blvd [1] - 4:7 35:18, 76:16, 107:19 board [2] - 46:25, briefly [2] - 9:11, 84:1 bring [35] - 13:16, boards [1] - 46:17 18:5, 19:13, 20:9, Bobby [1] - 89:22 20:11, 21:24, 22:6, Boggs [1] - 7:3 36:14, 38:20, 48:8, Bonn [1] - 56:4 81:23, 81:24, 83:24, bono [1] - 101:21 86:22, 91:24, 95:11, Booker [1] - 114:16 96:19, 99:13, 102:1, 104:24, 105:11, boots [1] - 116:22 106:13, 107:22, born [3] - 72:10, 108:2, 108:9, 79:13, 129:25 108:24, 114:8, Bosch [46] - 6:19, 128:25, 129:1, 22:7, 22:8, 22:11, 129:6, 129:22, 22:14, 24:1, 25:22, 131:11, 131:15, 28:20, 35:19, 36:22, 131:24, 136:13 39:5, 41:3, 41:10, brings [6] - 23:24, 56:6, 56:14, 56:22, 23:25, 36:15, 57:1, 57:5, 57:13, 84:24, 86:3, 86:4, 104:16, 135:8 broad [2] - 98:13, 86:5, 86:8, 86:15, 99:13 99:3, 100:21, 106:7, Broad [1] - 6:17 116:20, 118:1, broaden [1] - 91:23 118:3, 120:11, 120:22, 133:4, broader [1] - 48:20 133:7, 133:25, Broadway [1] - 4:4 134:20, 134:22, **BRODY** [1] - 1:18 134:23, 135:6, 138:4 broke [1] - 28:24 Bosch's [3] - 29:18, broken [1] - 98:2

brother [1] - 95:10 brought [4] - 31:22, 60:19, 62:4, 80:15 **BROWN** [1] - 5:11 Brown [1] - 128:3 Bruce [1] - 4:16 Bryson [1] - 83:4 Bubba [1] - 115:11 Budd [1] - 136:2 **BUDD** [1] - 3:22 build [2] - 136:9, 136:21 building [2] - 117:11, 118:8 built [2] - 100:21, 117:6 bunch [1] - 22:13 **burden** [1] - 51:5 burdened [1] - 50:13 business [4] - 50:8, 64:12, 64:13, 126:11 buy [5] - 73:9, 81:19, 84:11, 85:9, 126:14 **BY** [33] - 1:17, 1:20, 2:5, 2:7, 2:10, 2:15, 2:19, 3:5, 3:7, 3:10, 3:12, 3:15, 3:17, 3:20, 3:24, 4:5, 4:8, 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:4, 5:8, 5:10, 5:15, 5:18, 5:21, 5:23, 6:4, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 6:18, 6.22 **BYRNE** [1] - 1:18

C

C-17-2777 [1] - 8:7 CA[11] - 2:18, 3:4, 3:14, 3:23, 4:4, 4:11, 4:14, 4:18, 5:10, 5:14, 5:20 Caballero [1] - 7:4 **CABRASER** [8] - 3:3, 3:5, 3:6, 23:12, 24:12, 25:13, 27:8, 27:25 Cabraser [26] - 23:11, 23:13, 28:1, 38:17, 40:6, 66:12, 66:18, 67:17. 78:10. 84:16. 84:22, 85:14, 89:11, 92:10, 100:13, 100:22, 105:15, 107:23, 113:21, 114:9, 114:19, 115:18, 118:18, 124:22, 124:23 Cabraser's [5] - 28:9, 53:4, 60:20, 101:4,

121:11 CAFASSO [1] - 6:18 caliber [1] - 100:14 calibration [14] - 10:4, 11:5, 11:7, 11:8, 11:9, 11:12, 11:15, 11:16, 11:25, 12:6, 13:2, 13:14, 75:3, 84:11 calibrations [3] -10:13, 11:1, 75:8 **CALIFORNIA** [1] - 1:3 California [13] - 1:10, 4:18, 5:20, 10:19, 15:3, 15:18, 15:23, 30:12, 30:20, 55:22, 55:25, 82:4, 128:5 Camino [1] - 5:9 Canada [1] - 125:17 candidates [1] - 16:11 candidly [1] - 48:17 cannot [4] - 24:19, 26:20, 32:8, 74:13 capable [3] - 16:11, 90:7, 93:17 Capacitor [2] - 47:23, 96:21 Capacitors [1] - 96:12 capacity [4] - 31:9, 61:4, 93:6, 115:4 capita [1] - 94:16 Capitol [2] - 3:11, 102.5 car [13] - 12:20, 18:25, 21:8, 80:17, 113:25, 117:5, 126:4, 126:16, 126:23, 126:24, 126:25, 127:19, 128:4 car's [2] - 126:22, 127:5 CARB [13] - 9:22, 10:5, 10:10, 10:18, 10:20, 11:1, 11:4, 12:16, 14:10, 20:1, 30:16, 56:1, 72:16 CARB's [2] - 9:18, 15:15 cards [1] - 8:12 career [3] - 60:16, 90:3, 98:11 CARELLA [1] - 1:18 Carolina [2] - 119:6, 121:1 carried [1] - 103:15 carry [1] - 93:10

cars [41] - 12:5, 18:1,

18:16, 18:20, 19:4,

19:16, 33:5, 37:3,

39:15, 39:20, 68:1,

68:2, 68:5, 68:7, 81:25, 82:3, 82:22, 68:11, 68:13, 68:15, 82:25, 84:3, 84:4, 68:18, 68:19, 69:12, 70:18, 73:13, 74:8, 74:9, 75:1, 75:13, 86:4, 86:5, 86:23, 78:12, 80:19, 80:20, 80:22, 81:9, 81:17, 126:21. 127:2. 127:17, 132:14, 135:12, 136:14 cartel [2] - 96:23, 125:16 98:6, 98:7, 98:20, carve [1] - 9:13 case [269] - 8:6, 8:7, 99:10, 99:11, 12:1, 17:8, 18:10, 101:17, 101:22, 18:14, 19:5, 19:6, 101:24, 103:9, 19:8, 19:10, 19:20, 103:19, 104:11, 20:4, 20:23, 22:3, 104:13, 104:14, 22:5, 22:17, 23:1, 104:21, 105:14, 23:16, 23:20, 23:23, 107:12, 107:15, 24:2, 24:3, 24:8, 107:24, 109:4, 24:17, 25:2, 25:6, 109:17, 110:20, 25:10, 25:17, 26:10, 111:22, 112:14, 26:16, 27:5, 28:15, 113:21, 114:5, 29:11, 30:24, 35:8, 114:9, 114:11, 36:4, 36:8, 36:9, 114:13, 114:14, 36:16, 37:6, 37:17, 114:15, 114:16, 38:8, 38:19, 39:17, 114:17, 115:8, 39:18, 40:6, 40:10, 115:19, 115:22, 40:17, 40:22, 40:24, 116:18, 117:23, 41:6, 41:20, 42:6, 42:25, 43:1, 43:14, 118:23, 120:9, 43:20, 44:11, 44:15, 45:5, 45:24, 46:21, 121:15, 122:24, 47:22, 47:23, 47:25, 124:10, 124:24, 125:5, 125:11, 48:1, 48:4, 48:5, 125:14, 125:16, 48:19, 49:14, 49:18, 125:19, 125:20, 49:23, 50:24, 51:2, 126:7, 127:22, 52:6, 52:13, 52:20, 52:24, 53:2, 53:10, 127:23, 128:25, 129:2, 129:18, 53:12, 53:25, 54:7, 129:22, 130:3, 54:21, 55:2, 55:4, 130:23, 131:4, 55:9, 56:5, 57:4, 57:14, 57:17, 57:19, 131:5, 131:24, 136:5, 136:10, 57:25, 58:6, 58:19, 59:2, 59:15, 60:1, 136:12, 137:4, 60:3, 60:4, 60:5, 137:11, 137:19, 61:17, 61:18, 62:15, 138:13, 138:19, 138:22, 138:23 63:8, 63:15, 64:23, cases [95] - 18:5, 65:18, 65:21, 66:11, 66:15, 67:14, 67:20, 68:4. 68:20. 69:4. 69:14, 69:16, 69:22, 69:23, 69:24, 70:1, 70:8, 70:19, 70:20, 71:1, 71:4, 71:6, 72:4, 72:5, 72:6, 72:9, 73:5, 73:7, 43:9, 43:23, 48:6, 73:13, 73:22, 73:25, 54:3, 55:3, 55:10, 74:6, 74:10, 77:22, 78:13, 79:19, 81:16,

84:7, 84:14, 84:18, 84:19, 84:20, 85:8, 87:8, 87:16, 87:22, 87:23, 89:10, 90:8, 92:10. 92:15. 92:19. 93:7, 93:10, 93:13, 95:12, 96:16, 96:18, 96:21, 96:25, 97:19, 97:22, 97:23, 98:5, 98:21, 98:25, 99:9, 118:4, 118:5, 118:7, 19:14, 19:19, 21:16, 21:20, 22:7, 26:21, 27:2, 27:22, 33:15, 34:18, 36:7, 36:13, 36:18, 37:14, 38:9, 38:24, 39:9, 39:11, 39:16, 41:24, 42:3, 48:12, 48:19, 53:25, 59:10, 59:12, 59:14,

59:21, 63:4, 63:5, 67:14, 67:19, 71:24, 72:11, 86:22, 88:25, 89:1, 89:7, 92:4, 92:6, 94:2, 94:3, 94:15, 94:17, 95:7, 100:19, 101:7, 103:17. 104:8. 104:9, 105:3, 106:7, 107:7, 107:10, 108:3, 108:8, 109:2, 109:12, 109:13, 109:21, 109:23, 110:1, 110:2, 112:1, 112:10, 112:14, 115:9, 117:14, 117:20, 117:25, 121:7, 121:9, 121:10, 125:12, 128:5, 129:15, 129:18, 129:24, 130:1, 130:2, 130:6, 130:12, 130:13, 130:14, 135:13, 136:5 Casey [5] - 28:2, 28:5, 35:3, 55:24 CASEY [8] - 5:13, 5:15, 6:10, 28:3, 28:5, 30:8, 30:23, 31:3 Casey's [1] - 33:22 cash [1] - 117:8 cast [1] - 87:19 categories [1] - 35:18 Caterpillar [4] -103:19, 103:23, 107:10, 109:17 Catherine [1] - 128:21 **CATHY** [1] - 5:23 cattle [1] - 134:10 **Caucasian** [1] - 129:8 caused [2] - 13:23, 99:11 causes [1] - 62:4 caution [1] - 26:22 CCH [1] - 83:9 **CECCHI**[7] - 1:18, 1:20, 83:6, 83:8, 83:14, 85:20, 85:23 Cecchi [3] - 83:5, 104:4, 107:9 Center [1] - 79:21 center [1] - 133:25 Center's [1] - 60:10 Central [2] - 62:15, 87:24 centrally [1] - 116:19 CEOs [3] - 47:2, 47:3, 59:20

cert [4] - 21:22, 37:8, 73:11 certain [7] - 39:3, 50:17, 52:19, 57:23, 63:16, 131:18, 131:23 Certainly [1] - 55:15 certainly [13] - 28:17, 29:8, 29:9, 53:21, 77:22, 95:15, 103:1, 103:5, 104:15, 105:17, 115:18, 116:18, 129:10 certainty [1] - 23:22 CERTIFICATE [1] -140:9 certification [10] -9:23, 10:3, 12:19, 12:21, 21:19, 31:20, 37:12, 48:10, 49:17, 107:19 certified [6] - 39:4, 68:6, 68:13, 81:11, 92:5, 128:4 certify [1] - 140:10 cetera [9] - 16:6, 17:3, 17:4, 41:21, 63:19, 71:18, 91:25, 112:12 challenge [2] - 73:16, 114:1 chance [4] - 8:14, 9:3, 42:18, 95:8 chances [1] - 124:3 change [5] - 11:11, 12:1, 36:25, 37:2, changed [3] - 60:15, 88:12, 99:7 changes [2] - 11:10, 68.9 changing [1] - 75:7 character [1] - 54:16 charge [12] - 43:5, 63:13, 66:6, 66:13, 66:18, 66:22, 66:23, 67:8, 67:11, 78:2, 78:10, 81:25 Charles [1] - 4:16 Charleston [3] - 3:12, 79:11, 119:6 Charonko [1] - 7:4 Chatom [2] - 5:5, 126.4 Chavez [2] - 1:14, 2:2 cheat [4] - 18:24, 19:1, 57:6, 99:13 cheating [1] - 56:21 checked [1] - 8:12 CHEN [1] - 1:4 Chen [1] - 14:8

Cherokees [3] - 9:23, 68:22, 73:10 Chertoff [1] - 86:18 Chesney [1] - 89:12 Chicago [1] - 6:11 Chief [1] - 101:14 Chinese [2] - 96:15, 130.15 choose [1] - 31:16 choosing [1] - 126:18 chose [1] - 24:2 chosen [3] - 47:21, 48:14, 119:10 Christopher [1] - 4:9 Chrysler [12] - 8:8, 24:2, 35:19, 36:21, 43:1, 44:3, 44:14, 44:24, 81:15, 99:2, 106:8, 110:24 **CHRYSLER** [1] - 1:5 Chrysler's [1] - 29:18 Chrysler-Dodge-**Jeep** [1] - 8:8 CHRYSLER-DODGE-**JEEP** [1] - 1:5 Circuit [2] - 102:6, 112:21 circumstance [1] -73:8 circumstances [1] -93:3 circus [1] - 27:16 civil [1] - 100:19 Civility [1] - 118:15 claim [2] - 56:25, 134:21 claims [5] - 34:7, 56:6, 95:17, 124:3 clarifications [1] -14.19 class [90] - 20:17, 20:20, 21:18, 21:19, 21:22, 24:17, 25:7, 31:19, 31:20, 31:21, 32:2, 32:5, 32:6, 32:9, 32:16, 32:19, 33:9, 34:8, 34:13, 35:6, 37:3, 37:8, 37:12, 39:4, 43:5, 43:13, 43:23, 44:3, 44:5, 44:17, 45:14, 45:19, 45:20, 48:10, 49:17, 57:24, 62:5, 63:3, 64:10, 65:4, 71:12, 73:7, 73:11, 85:17, 87:6, 87:21, 88:2, 91:12, 91:22, 91:23, 92:4, 92:6, 94:13, 95:17, 96:10, 100:4, 100:6, 101:8,

101:9, 101:19, 102:8, 102:15, 102:16, 102:20, 103:17, 105:1, 107:4, 107:19, 108:10, 111:14, 111:16, 117:4, 117:9. 117:10. 117:15, 118:24, 121:5, 124:12, 127:10, 128:4, 129:12, 129:23, 131:12, 135:15, 136:3, 137:12 classical [1] - 125:13 Clean [2] - 72:24, 104:6 cleaner [1] - 79:25 clear [5] - 9:3, 13:7, 14:20, 59:9, 79:24 clearly [3] - 47:13, 79:17, 84:15 **CLEARY** [1] - 6:20 Cleary [1] - 119:11 client [3] - 90:24, 98:14, 120:17 client's [1] - 33:17 clients [12] - 42:24, 44:1, 54:21, 85:2, 93:15, 94:20, 96:17, 99:15, 108:13, 108:19, 112:22, 128:12 climb [1] - 79:9 clock [1] - 16:20 close [2] - 30:14, 130:23 closely [6] - 15:23, 28:22, 52:8, 100:17, 100:23, 134:2 cocounsel [1] - 28:16 code [3] - 36:6, 56:19, 98:22 codes [3] - 28:24, 58:1, 58:11 cofounder [1] - 63:2 **COHEN** [1] - 2:3 Cohen [1] - 102:25 cohesive [3] - 35:25, 119:23, 120:5 cohesiveness [1] -122:4 colead [34] - 8:18, 18:8, 21:13, 21:15, 27:4, 27:5, 27:22, 30:4, 30:6, 39:25, 40:3, 40:12, 41:17, 46:16, 51:16, 52:15, 52:25, 53:15, 59:11, 59:14, 59:22, 62:14,

63:6, 85:16, 103:20, 105:2, 105:20, 109:13, 115:16, 117:17, 117:25, 124:24, 125:12, 136:6 coleads [9] - 22:1, 25:5. 27:19. 42:23. 43:6, 53:6, 53:8, 59:25, 61:14 collaborate [1] -108:18 collaborative [3] -27:13, 29:7, 59:21 collaboratively [1] -138:21 colleague [1] - 103:2 colleagues [5] - 55:6, 55:10, 80:13, 96:6, 121:17 collected [1] - 73:2 college [1] - 95:3 color [2] - 102:13, 129:11 columns [1] - 63:11 combination [1] -114:2 comfort [1] - 121:22 comfortable [2] -121:19, 121:25 coming [4] - 33:21, 72:12, 92:16, 129:16 Commander [1] -101:14 commend [1] - 115:18 comment [6] - 9:11, 47:18, 47:19, 60:8, 71:17, 71:19 comments [10] -10:22, 14:13, 16:3, 28:6, 65:21, 77:5, 84:2, 93:12, 99:23, 136:11 commerce [1] - 97:1 Commerce [1] - 6:13 commercial [3] -108:11, 117:12, 117:13 commit [2] - 93:9, 122:24 commitment [5] -54:20, 55:2, 55:11, 94:20.98:7 commitments [1] -138:21 committee [76] - 8:23, 16:6, 16:9, 21:12, 21:25, 22:1, 23:7,

24:6, 24:9, 24:14,

24:22, 25:1, 30:7,

32:5, 32:17, 33:6, 33:14, 35:17, 40:2, 41:18, 41:22, 43:7, 46:17, 46:23, 46:24, 47:15, 47:16, 47:19, 48:1, 48:6, 48:7, 48:13, 48:17, 49:7, 51:17. 52:13. 52:16. 52:19, 52:25, 53:21, 53:23, 54:5, 55:5, 60:10, 66:21, 67:17, 67:18, 69:17, 71:18, 71:21, 72:3, 82:23, 87:5, 87:9, 96:7, 97:22, 98:9, 98:18, 99:8, 100:10, 106:1, 107:25, 113:6, 114:12, 118:12, 122:21, 123:2, 125:11, 126:6, 128:10, 131:6, 131:8, 131:9, 136:25, 138:11 committees [5] -41:20, 59:24, 66:20, 113:21, 136:24 common [2] - 38:18, 39:3 communication [1] -10.6 communications [1] -14:10 community [1] - 82:19 companies [5] -83:20. 98:12. 108:24, 112:1, 112:6 Company [2] - 5:5, 126:4 company [9] - 13:13, 67:9, 68:5, 68:7, 69:12, 70:23, 72:10, 83:19, 136:16 company's [1] -107:13 comparable [1] -67:15 compares [2] - 58:9, 58:13 compensated [2] -37:4, 50:19 competence [2] -23:25, 24:16 competing [1] - 89:1 competitive [1] -24:16 complaint [21] - 20:7, 20:12, 20:16, 34:8, 34:9, 57:4, 57:11, 75:15, 75:19, 75:21, 76:6, 80:7, 80:10,

89:24, 90:22, 100:23, 111:15, 111:16, 118:22, 138:3, 139:15 complaints [2] - 62:1, 137:1 complete [1] - 139:18 completely [1] - 71:1 **completion** [1] - 72:22 complex [6] - 54:7, 56:7, 56:16, 88:17, 98:6, 136:5 complexion [1] - 71:2 complexity [5] -52:20, 53:1, 68:25, 78:13, 131:5 compliance [2] -58:16, 136:14 complicated [8] -12:3, 12:7, 22:19, 47:4, 47:25, 68:1, 68:9, 68:18 compliments [1] -89:9 comprise [1] - 96:25 comprised [2] - 24:14, 129:13 computers [1] - 12:6 concept [1] - 59:24 concern [7] - 17:12, 33:17, 33:24, 58:1, 66:4.66:19 concerned [3] - 66:7, 69:15, 127:15 concerns [4] - 9:18, 10:4, 48:20, 70:24 conclude [1] - 139:21 concluded [1] - 140:5 conclusion [2] -93:10, 138:23 concur [1] - 103:1 conditions [1] - 23:22 conduct [2] - 29:18 conducted [2] - 10:19, 10:20 **conference** [4] - 9:12, 10:11, 72:13, 88:1 conferences [1] -62:13 confers [1] - 130:18 confident [2] - 70:24, 120:10 confirm [2] - 52:2, 133:19 Confirmed [1] - 7:2 Congresspeople [1] -118:11 conjunction [1] -22:14 Connecticut [1] -

121:2 connection [1] - 72:22 cons [1] - 27:6 conscious [1] - 91:2 consequently [1] -93.5 consider [9] - 44:2, 44:11, 48:25, 49:6, 49:22, 57:22, 59:5, 89:14, 103:6 considerable [3] -18:11, 59:12, 107:6 consideration [4] -60:9, 85:6, 119:1, 126:8 considerations [4] -48:24, 125:1, 127:18, 127:19 considered [4] - 64:7, 124:17, 126:9, 129:20 considering [2] -16:12, 28:16 consistent [4] - 10:24, 48:15, 50:2, 50:25 consistently [1] -27:20 consists [1] - 79:18 consolidated [7] -62:1, 75:14, 75:18, 75:19, 76:5, 76:6, 139:15 consortium [1] -108:17 conspiracy [2] -125:16 consumer [13] - 63:4, 105:2, 110:1, 111:25, 112:3, 113:3, 113:4, 113:10, 117:4, 117:15, 118:10, 127:3, 129:24 consumers [9] -54:22, 102:8, 111:25, 116:18, 119:12, 120:6, 122:7, 126:8, 126:15 contacts [1] - 134:6 containment [2] -37:21, 72:8 contest [5] - 83:13, 110:13, 112:25, 115:10, 115:11 contested [1] - 136:20 contestedness [1] -71:22 context [7] - 12:20,

13:10, 135:14,

135:15

contingency [1] - 63:3 contingent [1] - 39:25 continually [1] - 20:25 continued [3] - 1:22, 10:16, 125:22 **CONTINUED** [6] - 2:1, 3:1, 4:1, 5:1, 6:1, 7:1 continuity [4] - 23:25, 24:16, 65:1, 65:2 contrary [1] - 66:24 **contrast** [1] - 17:6 contribute [2] - 108:4, 131:14 contributing [1] -131:17 contribution [1] - 92:1 control [17] - 12:9, 15:10, 22:21, 22:22, 22:24, 23:4, 27:14, 27:20, 27:21, 37:21, 37:23, 41:25, 54:16, 54:25, 56:22, 116:21, 136:17 controlling [2] -17:11, 45:8 controls [6] - 23:7, 38:7, 41:24, 54:13, 57:6, 69:16 convened [1] - 57:19 conversation [1] -38:17 Cook [1] - 118:15 coordination [4] -56:8, 62:2, 62:10, 119:22 copies [1] - 50:8 copy [1] - 80:15 Coral [1] - 4:7 cordial [1] - 118:3 corporate [8] - 46:25, 64:8, 94:5, 94:6, 96:13, 98:2, 99:1, 117:3 corporation [4] - 47:2, 98:24, 99:6, 130:9 corporations [5] -46:18, 99:15, 130:2, 130:7, 130:15 correct [4] - 16:2, 109:14, 130:10, 140:10 correctly [1] - 60:3 cost [19] - 22:21, 22:22, 22:24, 27:21, 28:18, 37:21, 37:23, 38:7, 38:8, 41:24, 54:13, 54:16, 54:24, 63:19, 69:16, 72:8, 72:10, 116:21, 137:5 costs [11] - 17:11,

27:14, 29:3, 41:25, 42:5, 43:13, 44:17, 45:8, 45:13, 45:15, 45.22 counsel [95] - 8:19, 16:9. 16:22. 18:8. 21:13. 24:18. 27:4. 27:5. 27:9. 27:23. 30:4, 30:6, 32:5, 35:15, 39:20, 39:25, 42:1, 43:10, 43:20, 44:3, 44:8, 46:15, 46:16, 47:23, 49:11, 50:16, 50:21, 51:16, 52:15, 56:1, 59:5, 60:11, 61:24, 62:14, 63:6, 63:10, 63:24, 64:24, 65:16, 66:6, 66:12, 66:22, 67:1, 67:2, 71:19, 72:3, 75:16, 78:6, 87:5, 87:8, 87:12, 89:10, 89:24, 94:9, 95:2, 96:4, 96:16, 97:10, 97:14, 98:11, 98:15, 99:5, 100:4, 100:12, 100:18, 101:8, 103:6, 103:20, 105:2, 105:3, 105:17, 107:17, 109:9, 109:13, 109:15, 117:16, 117:17, 117:22, 118:3, 121:5, 123:22, 124:21, 124:22, 125:9, 125:10, 125:12, 125:21, 128:9, 131:7 counsels [1] - 41:17 count [2] - 90:19, 122:14 countries [1] - 97:12 country [21] - 18:18, 33:3, 33:4, 33:16, 60:17, 87:7, 90:12, 90:13, 90:15, 91:25, 103:13, 103:16, 107:5, 112:2, 113:24, 114:25, 119:10, 121:12, 128:1, 129:5, 134:6 couple [10] - 14:19, 30:3, 46:11, 50:15, 79:17, 87:3, 99:23, 112:19, 120:24, 121:14 coupled [1] - 109:1 course [9] - 8:15, 8:25, 17:12, 83:18, 87:12, 88:9, 102:14,

129:3, 129:17 court [8] - 50:2, 51:21, 64:4, 65:24, 89:4, 105:18, 110:18, 121:7 Court [52] - 1:24, 9:16, 16:12, 20:19, 24:25, 25:8, 26:13, 28:20, 29:1, 29:10, 29:12, 31:10, 31:11, 32:15, 36:22, 46:22, 47:6, 49:1, 49:6, 50:1, 50:12, 59:5, 59:20, 61:22, 62:13, 62:24, 69:3, 73:17, 78:11, 81:24, 85:17, 87:21, 88:6, 88:10, 89:9, 89:13, 89:21, 91:7, 91:19, 92:20, 102:20, 103:2, 103:5, 103:7, 104:16, 105:14, 113:18, 132:12, 133:17, 135:18, 137:23, 140:18 COURT [170] - 1:2, 8:4, 8:10, 10:1, 10:6, 11:19, 11:21, 12:12, 13:25, 14:3, 14:7, 14:16, 14:22, 15:5, 15:8, 15:12, 15:15, 15:25, 16:3, 16:13, 16:15, 17:21, 19:25, 20:6, 21:10, 22:21, 23:8, 23:10, 24:9, 25:10, 27:3, 27:24, 28:1, 28:4, 30:2, 30:21, 31:2, 31:4, 31:7, 32:12, 33:20, 34:21, 35:2, 37:5, 37:8, 37:25, 38:2, 38:14, 39:1, 39:24, 40:9, 41:1, 42:9, 42:11, 42:15, 43:14, 44:7, 44:19, 45:7, 46:5, 46:10, 46:13, 47:18, 49:9, 50:5, 51:6, 51:8, 51:11, 52:5, 52:7, 53:3, 53:13, 53:17, 55:15, 55:17, 55:20, 56:10, 59:17. 61:6. 63:23. 65:5, 65:7, 65:11, 65:20, 69:20, 70:6, 71:5, 73:21, 74:16, 76:2, 76:11, 77:5, 77:10, 77:19, 78:15, 78:25, 79:15, 80:21, 80:24, 81:4, 82:7, 82:14, 82:18, 83:2, 83:7, 83:13, 85:19,

126:10, 126:14,

85:22, 86:24, 89:16, 89:18, 92:16, 92:22, 93:19, 93:21, 94:22, 95:8, 95:21, 96:3, 96:20, 97:2, 97:23, 99:16, 99:18, 101:16, 102:22, 104:12. 106:15. 106:17, 106:22, 107:1, 109:11, 109:15, 109:20, 109:25, 110:3, 110:5, 110:7, 110:12, 113:12, 113:15, 114:2, 115:4, 116:1, 116:6, 116:10, 116:12, 116:14, 118:4, 119:3, 119:15, 122:16, 123:15, 125:7, 125:23, 125:25, 127:9, 128:16, 128:20, 130:4, 130:8, 130:11, 130:20, 131:13, 131:25, 132:3, 135:19, 135:21, 138:25, 139:2 Court's [2] - 60:8, 88:21 CourtCall [1] - 23:19 courtroom [5] - 22:9, 67:9, 102:9, 128:2, 138:16 courts [1] - 27:22 cover [1] - 17:13 Covington [2] -110:18, 110:24 craft [2] - 100:19, 122:10 crafted [1] - 137:4 crashworthiness [1] -103:13 create [4] - 99:8, 99:14, 119:8, 119:13 created [1] - 80:1 creates [1] - 56:22 creating [3] - 119:7, 119:8, 136:25 creative [1] - 95:18 credits [1] - 85:10 criteria [2] - 49:5, 137:14 critical [1] - 59:19 critically [1] - 30:16 Cromwell [4] - 9:15, 84:5, 94:13, 119:11 CROMWELL [1] - 6:16 crops [1] - 105:10

cross [1] - 105:21 cross-pollinate [1] -105:21 CROW [1] - 6:12 CRT [1] - 130:14 CSR [2] - 1:23, 140:18 cultural [1] - 56:2 culture [5] - 99:2, 99:3, 99:6, 99:12 Cummins [3] - 103:25, 104:8, 107:10 curious [1] - 71:17 customers [1] - 13:16 cut [2] - 38:11, 59:1 CV [1] - 109:22 cyber [1] - 58:18

D

Dallas [1] - 5:4

damage [3] - 95:1,

120:19, 126:9

damages [2] - 57:18, 107:20 **DANIEL** [1] - 6:14 **DARRELL** [1] - 6:18 data [4] - 28:19, 62:14, 73:3, 91:4 **DATE** [1] - 140:13 date [22] - 26:13, 29:11, 29:13, 31:25, 36:24, 37:5, 38:15, 49:12, 49:14, 49:15, 49:23, 49:24, 50:17, 72:21, 72:22, 73:22, 100:2, 100:5, 124:5, 139:24 dates [2] - 66:9, 72:20 David [2] - 28:5, 55:24 **DAVID** [2] - 3:7, 5:15 Davis [1] - 58:8 days [7] - 11:11, 58:7, 62:19, 76:13, 101:19, 101:20, 130:23 **DC** [3] - 2:14, 6:21, 121:2 **De** [1] - 4:7 deadlines [1] - 34:16 deal [10] - 29:16, 29:17, 67:4, 68:16, 70:4, 78:4, 94:1, 104:16, 120:12, 121:13 dealer [2] - 126:11, 127:6 Dealers [1] - 126:22 dealers [9] - 113:24, 113:25, 126:5, 126:7, 126:8,

126:15, 127:10 dealership [1] - 13:17 dealing [13] - 20:10, 21:21, 22:6, 30:19, 54:6, 68:21, 69:19, 104:7, 105:23, 106:11, 113:25, 132:22, 138:9 dealt [8] - 20:14, 21:23, 24:18, 67:19, 103:21, 106:8, 108:3 **Dearborn** [1] - 6:10 death [1] - 92:9 decade [2] - 92:5, 131:22 December [2] - 72:25, 80.9 decide [3] - 38:13, 76:18, 115:23 decided [5] - 39:18, 102:11, 111:14, 117:3, 135:25 decides [1] - 108:5 decision [11] - 15:11, 91:2, 98:23, 126:14, 126:19, 136:8, 137:13, 137:18, 139:9, 139:10, 139:11 decisions [5] - 28:11, 46:21, 50:21, 66:14, 138:14 decorated [1] - 128:24 decrease [1] - 127:5 dedicated [1] - 136:25 dedicating [1] - 22:13 deems [1] - 31:10 deep [3] - 51:20, 60:23, 123:23 deeply [1] - 60:21 Deepwater [2] - 25:4, 121:10 defeat [8] - 57:20, 58:9, 58:12, 58:13, 70:22, 82:13, 98:22, 134:24 defeating [1] - 57:15 defect [11] - 21:20, 63:5, 103:11, 103:14, 103:18, 105:1, 106:7, 107:4, 107:7, 107:12, 125:15 defective [1] - 117:24 defects [2] - 103:22, 117:14 defendant [3] - 96:13, 130:8, 132:22

Defendant [1] - 6:19

defendants [22] -9:10, 9:15, 14:9, 14:25, 35:9, 38:12, 39:5, 47:25, 58:4, 61:21, 65:14, 88:1, 96:25, 98:1, 98:2, 98:3. 104:21. 116:19. 119:10. 130:2, 130:4, 131:18 **Defendants** [1] - 6:15 defended [2] - 94:24, 135:16 defending [1] - 138:14 defense [9] - 24:18, 71:25, 78:3, 98:12, 98:17, 102:2, 109:9, 112:6, 119:9 defenses [1] - 104:20 definitely [1] - 65:19 degree [2] - 47:12, 82:17 delay [4] - 24:24, 77:19, 120:18, 135:5 deliver [1] - 25:1 delivered [2] - 25:5, 25:7 delivering [1] - 137:24 delta [1] - 19:9 democracy [1] - 40:15 demonstration [1] -123:4 deny [1] - 133:20 Department [6] -14:11, 38:22, 76:23, 86:19, 90:11, 105:10 department [2] -98:15, 118:25 **DEPARTMENT**[1] -2:12 deployed [1] - 25:15 deposition [5] - 23:3, 45:16, 45:18, 50:9, 101:13 depositions [8] - 25:9, 85:2, 94:24, 97:11, 106:12, 130:17, 131:20, 138:15 Depot [1] - 63:20 depreciate [1] - 127:2 depth [2] - 30:9, 124:16 **DEPUTY** [3] - 8:7, 51:10, 51:12 describe [1] - 96:20 described [1] - 90:6 describes [1] - 58:15 deserve [3] - 18:7, 119:12, 120:6 deserving [1] - 18:11

designated [1] - 53:15

designed [1] - 127:7 detailed [1] - 58:10 detailing [1] - 126:23 details [4] - 16:25, 81:16, 81:17, 136:4 **detecting** [1] - 58:18 determine [4] - 54:17, 119:15, 133:16, 138:6 determining [1] - 49:6 Detroit [3] - 19:15, 20:14, 118:2 **DEVALERIO** [1] - 5:19 **DeValerio** [1] - 122:23 develop [7] - 30:14, 49:2, 53:20, 88:7, 88:24, 97:6, 104:19 developed [2] - 9:12, 41:10 developing [2] -25:24, 38:21 development [3] -54:11, 56:6, 57:6 developments [1] -10:7 develops [1] - 18:10 deviate [1] - 28:6 device [2] - 55:3, 58:12 devices [10] - 18:24, 19:1, 57:6, 57:21, 58:10, 58:13, 70:22, 82:13, 134:24, 136:17 devil [1] - 81:16 devote [1] - 138:23 devoted [4] - 29:19, 63:3, 90:3, 117:11 dial [1] - 14:5 Dicello [2] - 6:10, 35:3 **Diego** [3] - 4:4, 5:14, 99:21 diesel [11] - 79:25, 81:20, 82:12, 90:23, 95:9, 95:10, 107:6, 109:2, 134:12, 134:13, 138:1 difference [1] - 63:23 differences [1] - 72:14 different [33] - 18:24, 23:18, 39:12, 39:18, 40:25, 48:8, 62:3, 68:1, 68:2, 68:12, 69:14, 69:25, 71:1, 71:6, 73:10, 74:14, 80:12, 80:18, 80:22, 81:2, 91:24, 98:1, 102:1, 106:4, 108:1, 113:8, 119:20, 127:19, 131:11,

136:12 Different [1] - 80:23 difficult [4] - 40:20, 89:2, 120:11, 125:3 dig [2] - 28:22, 133:15 digging [2] - 84:25, 119:21 diminution [3] - 13:22, 71:2, 74:7 diplomacy [1] - 95:18 direct [3] - 44:23, 110:14, 121:21 direction [2] - 40:21, 56:1 Director [4] - 45:3, 77:20, 82:5, 82:12 directors [2] - 46:18, 46:25 disadvantage [1] -87:10 disappointed [1] -16:16 disciplined [1] - 28:10 discovered [1] -118:21 discovery [28] - 29:16, 35:18, 35:19, 41:21, 48:9, 48:10, 49:17, 57:13, 88:7, 88:10, 97:7, 97:8, 97:18, 104:19. 106:11. 107:20. 108:15. 114:12. 119:20. 119:21, 119:22, 120:3, 130:16, 131:17, 133:5, 133:6, 137:1 discretion [2] - 59:25, 63:22 discuss [3] - 10:12, 10:13, 57:20 discussed [3] - 10:25, 19:5, 33:18 discussing [1] - 13:24 discussion [7] -32:24, 33:1, 54:14, 70:11, 77:9, 83:9, 132.5 **Discussion** [1] - 65:10 discussions [3] -15:2, 44:23, 120:21 dismiss [9] - 36:11, 67:7, 70:4, 70:5, 70:10, 71:8, 76:9, 76:16, 77:18 dispute [1] - 74:7 disputes [4] - 66:8, 69:25, 78:2, 123:6 distinct [1] - 126:8 distinctions [1] -

distinctive [1] - 96:9 distinguished [1] -96.6 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:2, 1:3 District [6] - 62:15, 87:24, 117:23, 118:12, 118:14, 128:5 diverse [5] - 64:8, 64:11, 102:8, 129:13, 131:9 diversity [19] - 24:15, 32:22, 37:16, 48:13, 48:18, 54:10, 60:7, 64:5, 65:2, 91:25, 112:20, 117:7, 118:24, 129:1, 129:2, 129:6, 129:11, 129:14 divided [1] - 134:4 division [2] - 17:3, 59:1 Division [1] - 2:13 docket [1] - 90:6 document [9] - 26:8, 26:11, 56:13, 85:1, 97:8, 119:21, 120:3, 130:17, 131:19 documents [23] -22:11, 23:5, 26:5, 26:9, 26:10, 26:11, 28:22, 36:6, 56:8, 56:11, 56:13, 56:25, 58:12, 61:20, 61:23, 72:22, 73:2, 84:8, 96:13, 130:17, 133:9, 134:18, 135:8 Dodge [3] - 8:8, 90:18, 90:23 **DODGE** [1] - 1:5 dog [2] - 16:16, 16:17 **DOJ** [2] - 77:12, 108:7 dollar [4] - 42:7, 101:21, 138:17 dollars [4] - 18:19, 89:13, 94:4 dominated [1] - 129:8 Donato [2] - 47:24, 50:15 done [29] - 25:21, 26:7, 26:23, 32:12, 34:18, 41:11, 64:17, 80:8, 81:6, 81:13, 81:21, 81:24, 84:3, 84:8, 85:22, 85:23, 86:17, 96:17, 97:18, 103:8, 108:5, 117:13, 117:15,

67:16

127:12, 130:12, 133:14, 134:6, 134:25, 139:18 **DOT** [1] - 91:4 double [1] - 8:25 dovetails [1] - 18:13 Dowd [1] - 99:22 **DOWD** [1] - 4:3 down [18] - 17:6, 29:3, 46:4, 50:23, 71:13, 74:2, 74:9, 74:13, 74:19, 74:24, 76:12, 78:25, 97:7, 97:17, 114:11, 115:25, 125:1, 138:4 dozens [3] - 88:3 drafted [1] - 118:21 drafting [2] - 60:9, 133:11 draw [2] - 67:16, 123:24 drawing [1] - 93:7 dream [1] - 65:3 drill [1] - 138:4 **Drive** [1] - 2:6 drive [1] - 116:24 driver [1] - 70:13 driving [3] - 70:14, 127:3 drug [1] - 115:6 Ducati [1] - 114:11 due [1] - 101:3 **Duke** [1] - 60:10 duplication [2] -63:14, 64:1 durable [2] - 13:3, 81:19 **During** [1] - 134:1 **during** [1] - 34:5 duty [1] - 113:23 **DVD**[1] - 125:11 dynamometer [1] -80:3 **DynCorp** [1] - 105:8

Ε

early [11] - 28:19,
29:10, 32:8, 36:23,
38:23, 39:6, 45:4,
56:3, 92:10, 114:18,
120:17
early-on [1] - 32:8
ears [1] - 61:16
easier [1] - 9:8
easily [1] - 70:12
East [1] - 6:7
Eastern [3] - 117:23,
118:12, 118:14
easy [2] - 81:15, 139:7

eat [1] - 78:20 echo [4] - 31:13, 49:11, 85:4, 99:23 ECODIESEL [1] - 1:6 EcoDiesel [4] - 8:8, 90:16, 111:2, 111:13 EcoDiesels [2] -90:18, 90:23 economic [5] - 35:20, 57:17, 62:8, 93:3, 126:19 economically [1] -72:4 economy [6] - 9:20, 19:1, 19:2, 21:1, 81:18, 136:15 Ecuadorian [1] -105:9 Ed [1] - 116:15 EDC [1] - 138:4 EDC17 [1] - 135:7 Edina [1] - 5:18 educate [1] - 105:21 education [1] - 122:3 EDWARD [1] - 1:4 effective [3] - 14:24, 29:21, 54:23 effectively [6] - 26:14, 52:18, 53:22, 54:2, 55:6, 89:8 efficiency [9] - 27:20, 47:11, 51:1, 63:9, 84:3, 98:8, 117:1, 122:3, 136:24 efficient [4] - 20:11, 31:14, 38:7, 54:23 efficiently [10] - 20:19, 24:23, 35:7, 47:22, 54:2, 64:2, 82:24, 96:16, 97:15, 97:18 effort [3] - 27:13, 34:5, 130:16 efforts [1] - 131:17 ego [1] - 40:18 eight [14] - 18:24, 21:12, 22:2, 35:21, 58:22, 59:23, 61:14, 75:17, 80:12, 127:25, 131:5, 136:16, 136:23 **Eighth** [1] - 1:16 either [8] - 10:11, 21:6, 38:12, 44:12, 88:12, 93:4, 131:1, 137:6 **EI** [2] - 5:9, 10:19 elected [1] - 133:13

election [2] - 101:19,

electrical [1] - 86:15

135:13

electronic [3] - 48:9, 56:22, 119:21 electronically [1] -51:3 element [1] - 57:22 elephant [1] - 91:13 **ELIZABETH** [1] - 3:5 Elizabeth [6] - 23:12, 28:9, 118:18, 121:11, 124:21, 135:24 elsewhere [1] - 92:19 embark [1] - 16:4 embarks [1] - 136:8 **EMILY** [1] - 2:15 emission [4] - 75:4, 103:22, 107:6, 109:2 **Emissions** [1] - 79:22 emissions [15] - 10:3, 11:13, 12:9, 19:14, 19:19, 35:6, 56:22, 58:16, 69:7, 70:23, 74:5, 85:8, 107:12, 107:14, 136:16 emit [2] - 81:10, 81:11 emphasize [2] - 35:5, 96.7 Encino [1] - 3:23 encourage [1] - 18:4 encouraged [1] - 64:6 encourages [1] -88:21 encouraging [2] -23:15, 49:2 end [10] - 38:6, 38:9, 38:19, 44:15, 44:16, 45:24, 65:15, 66:8, 72:10, 101:10 ending [1] - 78:8 ends [1] - 60:5 engage [2] - 127:1, 127:3 engine [9] - 68:23, 69:19, 70:20, 72:15, 95:9, 95:10, 103:18, 107:6, 134:12 engineering [3] -35:20, 41:21, 134:16 engineers [2] - 79:20, 82:10 engines [5] - 95:6, 95:10, 103:23, 134:13, 134:24 Engines [1] - 79:21 English [1] - 79:13 enhance [1] - 126:22 enhancement [1] -36:19 enlighten [1] - 65:22 ensures [1] - 29:12

expenses [4] - 45:11,

49:25, 50:3, 63:9

ensuring [2] - 27:14, 54:21 enter [2] - 45:12, 50:1 entered [1] - 15:16 enterprise [1] - 46:20 entire [5] - 26:25, 74:21, 90:3, 99:3 entirely [1] - 37:24 entities [6] - 30:14, 45:5, 56:9, 62:11, 83:23, 133:13 entitled [2] - 19:9, 140:11 entity [1] - 46:25 entry [1] - 90:6 environment [2] -54:1, 118:10 Environment [1] -2:13 environmental [4] -62:8, 93:3, 99:11, 120:18 Environmental [1] -2:11 environmentally [1] -91:2 **EPA** [22] - 9:18, 9:22, 10:5, 10:10, 10:21, 11:1, 11:4, 12:16, 14:10, 14:17, 15:3, 18:2, 20:1, 22:18, 72:16, 72:21, 72:23, 76:24, 82:4, 85:8, 110:20, 111:21 EPA's [2] - 58:22, 59:1 equation [1] - 30:18 **equitable** [1] - 124:2 equity [1] - 128:22 ERIC [1] - 4:19 especially [5] - 52:20, 56:16, 63:5, 105:22, 125:4 **ESQUIRE** [39] - 1:17, 1:20, 2:5, 2:7, 2:8, 2:10, 2:15, 2:15, 2:19, 3:5, 3:7, 3:10, 3:12, 3:15, 3:17, 3:20, 3:24, 4:5, 4:8, 4:11, 4:15, 4:15, 4:19, 4:19, 5:4, 5:8, 5:10, 5:11, 5:15, 5:18, 5:21, 5:23, 6:4, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 6:18, 6:18, 6:22 essentially [3] - 46:20, 72:15, 88:7 esteemed [2] - 84:22, 103:2 estimate [2] - 73:21, 76:22

et [9] - 16:6, 17:3, 41:21, 63:19, 71:18, 91:25, 112:12 ethical [1] - 119:17 Europe [3] - 41:9, 41:11, 106:9 European [3] -108:12, 108:23, 108:24 evaluate [1] - 11:6 evaluated [1] - 44:21 event [3] - 16:19, 61:3, 62:18 evidence [3] - 57:8, 57:14 evolve [3] - 52:18, 52:20, 53:20 exact [1] - 32:14 exactly [2] - 56:15, 135:7 exalted [1] - 84:22 example [18] - 22:5, 25:4, 25:22, 25:23, 32:12, 33:20, 33:23, 34:8, 36:5, 63:10, 68:12, 70:11, 72:13, 99:1, 99:4, 108:20, 112:14, 126:10 excellent [6] - 79:15, 100:6, 100:8, 101:4, 101:7, 101:18 exception [1] - 42:16 excess [1] - 94:4 excited [1] - 130:22 exclusive [2] - 25:20, 44:7 exclusively [2] -24:14, 63:3 excuse [2] - 66:22, 111:16 executive [4] - 23:3, 46:21, 47:21, 48:1 executives [2] - 57:9, 97:12 exhibit [1] - 109:12 exhibits [1] - 131:21 exist [2] - 23:23, 75:4 existence [1] - 59:10 expanded [1] - 84:15 expect [1] - 11:11 expected [1] - 101:20 expecting [1] - 93:11 expedited [1] - 26:10 expeditious [1] - 25:3 expeditiously [2] -24:23, 132:24 expenditures [1] -17:11

expense [3] - 18:5,

18:11, 45:22

expensive [2] - 12:2, 13:19 Experian [2] - 62:14, 63.9 experience [53] -12:18, 16:23, 18:12, 20:21, 21:16, 21:24, 23:24, 24:3, 24:8, 29:8, 36:14, 37:18, 48:8, 49:25, 50:13, 52:24, 54:11, 63:1, 76:17, 87:11, 90:5, 97:21, 99:14, 100:3, 102:10, 102:16, 103:6, 104:2, 104:13, 104:25, 105:6, 105:7, 105:8, 105:11, 105:19, 106:6, 107:23, 108:25, 109:1, 110:14, 111:17, 112:13, 114:8, 117:19, 121:4, 121:5, 121:16, 122:12, 124:11, 129:20, 129:21, 131:10, 136:4 experienced [3] -17:15, 36:12, 129:17 experiences [1] -102:2 expert [6] - 56:18, 57:17, 73:18, 74:3, 107:20, 127:15 expertise [13] - 24:7, 25:19, 27:1, 39:12, 40:2, 48:8, 62:3, 63:4, 86:14, 87:13, 102:17, 119:19 experts [32] - 18:23, 19:12, 19:18, 22:20, 28:23, 29:4, 29:17, 35:20, 48:10, 56:9, 57:20, 58:8, 62:7, 62:9, 73:12, 73:13, 73:14, 73:16, 94:25, 95:1, 119:20, 119:21, 120:2, 120:25, 121:13, 121:14, 133:14, 134:25, 137:1, 138:4, 138:5 explained [1] - 51:22 export [2] - 125:16, 125:17 express [2] - 51:18, 51:20 expressed [2] - 10:4,

49:1
extensive [2] - 37:17,
95:1
extensively [2] 37:17, 134:9
extent [1] - 122:3
extra [1] - 30:4
extraordinarily [1] 36:3
extremely [4] - 12:25,
60:17, 66:12, 66:15
eye [2] - 74:13

F fabulous [2] - 40:7, 118:25 face [1] - 102:7 faces [1] - 91:24 facilities [1] - 10:17 facility [2] - 10:18, 10:21 facing [1] - 136:18 fact [21] - 24:25, 32:2, 32:9, 37:3, 52:20, 56:12, 58:25, 61:21, 64:6, 69:18, 93:13, 100:22, 104:4, 105:6, 114:21, 118:2, 118:6, 118:20, 123:6, 137:1 factions [1] - 66:20 factor [3] - 18:4, 126:13, 129:3 factors [1] - 105:24 facts [2] - 65:18, 133:15 factually [1] - 97:19 fail [1] - 24:1 fair [4] - 9:6, 12:22, 71:9, 88:8 fairly [3] - 87:25, 120:10, 140:1 faith [1] - 12:23 falls [1] - 35:17 familiar [4] - 88:20, 104:9, 108:23, 128:6 families [1] - 96:14 fantastic [1] - 118:19 far [6] - 25:7, 39:8, 41:16, 101:2, 111:21, 112:25 Fargo [1] - 94:7 Farm [1] - 1:19 farm [4] - 132:8, 132:10, 134:10, 134:13 farmer [1] - 132:9 Fasching [2] - 3:2,

80:6

fashion [2] - 26:20, 26:21 fashioned [1] - 95:18 faster [1] - 38:7 faulty [1] - 107:14 favorable [1] - 119:1 **FCA**[17] - 6:15, 9:15, 9:17, 10:9, 10:16, 10:17, 12:24, 66:3, 69:1, 69:3, 69:5, 116:19, 117:21, 117:25, 120:8, 120:22 FCA's [1] - 116:24 FCS [1] - 6:15 federal [1] - 26:18 fee [1] - 126:16 feed [1] - 133:19 fees [4] - 17:11, 45:8, 45:16, 45:22 fellow [1] - 128:24 female [2] - 129:10 Ferguson [1] - 102:6 **FERGUSON** [1] - 4:6 ferret [1] - 88:7 few [9] - 46:14, 52:17, 57:19, 58:7, 94:7, 104:5, 109:12, 112:19, 127:21 Fiat [30] - 19:16, 24:1, 35:18, 36:21, 43:1, 44:3, 44:14, 44:24, 56:21, 56:23, 57:9, 57:17, 57:19, 57:20, 58:10, 58:12, 58:14, 58:21, 58:23, 70:19, 70:21, 81:14, 83:18, 99:2, 106:7, 133:25, 134:21, 134:22, 134:24, 135:3 Fiat's [1] - 69:20 fiduciary [1] - 108:17 field [5] - 13:15, 19:21, 81:2, 81:5, 81:22 Fifth [1] - 112:21 fifth [1] - 135:25 fight [1] - 92:8 fighting [1] - 71:2 figure [4] - 40:1, 54:6, 65:13, 138:5 figures [1] - 90:10 file [11] - 30:24, 39:18, 75:14, 75:18, 76:8, 85:7, 111:9, 111:20, 111:22, 120:17, 139:15 filed [16] - 18:1, 20:7,

31:25, 55:10, 57:3,

57:4, 57:11, 70:5,

70:8, 80:6, 80:10,

86:4, 86:5, 114:7 final [3] - 77:5, 93:4, 106:5 finally [6] - 17:10. 22:21, 102:7, 109:5, 115:14, 124:20 finance [1] - 112:3 financial [2] - 98:13, 102:18 fine [3] - 40:5, 45:19, 109:7 finest [1] - 60:17 finish [1] - 98:20 Finkelman [1] -106:20 **FINKELMAN** [1] - 6:6 Firestone [1] - 94:7 FIRM [2] - 2:6, 4:13 Firm [4] - 95:24, 96:11, 97:24, 116:16 firm [68] - 17:25, 25:20, 26:5, 35:16, 36:15, 36:17, 41:13, 42:6, 48:23, 55:12, 55:22, 59:8, 59:14, 60:19, 63:2, 82:21, 83:19, 85:6, 85:7, 86:10, 88:22, 89:15, 90:1, 94:8, 95:14, 96:23, 100:15, 100:20, 100:22, 101:21, 102:25, 104:17, 105:16, 106:13, 106:20, 107:15, 108:15, 108:21, 112:6, 113:16, 114:4, 114:15, 116:17, 116:22, 117:2, 117:4, 117:6, 117:18, 117:19, 119:7, 119:8, 119:9, 119:13, 119:19, 120:5, 122:23, 124:8. 124:14. 125:8, 126:2, 127:21, 127:22, 127:25, 128:8, 137:20, 139:8 firm's [6] - 55:2, 59:11, 88:16, 101:3, 102:18, 136:3 firmly [1] - 93:13 firms [26] - 26:24, 26:25, 41:13, 42:7, 48:14, 60:6, 62:7, 72:1, 72:6, 80:7, 87:9, 88:3, 88:6, 88:11, 94:12, 98:1, 98:12, 108:17,

51:23, 55:25, 56:3, 56:20, 59:9, 66:2, 67:3, 69:4, 69:5, 70:3, 75:15, 77:3, 81:22, 82:11, 85:7, 86:4, 91:15, 99:23, 100:11, 103:1, 111:17, 111:22, 112:4, 114:15, 116:22, 117:4, 129:1, 133:1, 139:14 firsthand [1] - 33:13 fit [1] - 61:5 five [2] - 69:17, 90:23 **fix** [21] - 14:24, 19:11, 19:13, 20:24, 21:1, 44:20, 68:5, 68:7, 69:9, 69:12, 69:21, 71:5, 74:8, 75:1, 75:12, 81:2, 81:5, 81:15, 81:22, 138:7 fixed [6] - 18:21, 37:3, 68:13, 68:16, 132:14, 135:12 fixes [4] - 68:8, 68:12, 77:1 FL [2] - 2:4, 4:7 fledged [1] - 43:16 fleshed [1] - 123:7 flexibility [3] - 29:23, 60:2, 123:4 floor [1] - 54:12 Floor [6] - 3:4, 3:6, 4:10, 4:18, 5:3, 6:10 Florida [13] - 89:23, 90:1, 90:11, 90:19, 90:22, 91:5, 91:9, 92:7, 103:2, 112:24, 138:12 Flowers [1] - 7:5 fluency [1] - 133:3 fluent [3] - 79:13, 89:6, 133:1 fly [1] - 45:19 flying [1] - 123:12 focus [13] - 29:18, 31:17, 32:15, 34:6, 35:24, 36:17, 36:19, 54:14, 65:2, 96:5, 116:21, 117:6, 119:24 focused [5] - 34:15, 42:1, 54:21, 117:12,

108:18, 109:19,

124:18, 128:13,

137:7, 137:9, 137:17

first [41] - 9:10, 16:15,

18:13, 28:8, 35:13,

35:24. 36:16. 44:11.

45:19. 46:15. 51:18.

130:16 focuses [1] - 108:12 focusing [1] - 22:14 fold [1] - 103:8 folks [4] - 40:2, 65:16, 75:18, 78:18 follow [1] - 78:11 following [4] - 1:22, 35:17, 57:16, 58:7 **FONTI** [1] - 3:13 Fonti [1] - 55:22 force [1] - 38:10 forced [2] - 124:13, 124:19 Ford [2] - 36:8, 37:22 forecast [1] - 74:17 foregoing [1] - 140:10 foreign [11] - 41:7, 46:12, 83:11, 96:14, 97:12, 123:17, 129:25, 130:1, 130:6, 130:8, 131:18 foresee [1] - 17:2 forever [2] - 81:20, 82:10 forget [1] - 137:16 forgot [1] - 30:10 form [5] - 34:8, 34:9, 104:11, 111:14, 139:11 formal [2] - 17:3, 89:4 formally [2] - 15:16, 15:22 formed [2] - 56:25, 60:23 former [2] - 84:19, 102:4 formers [1] - 133:13 formidable [1] - 95:19 formulating [2] - 97:5, 97:17 forth [2] - 19:8, 75:9 forthcoming [1] -139:17 fortunate [2] - 24:5, 84:24 Fortune [1] - 98:12 fortune [3] - 59:8, 107:8, 109:6 forward [10] - 11:7, 61:17, 61:18, 69:22, 77:13, 86:19, 91:8, 108:8, 120:2, 122:13 fought [1] - 94:10 **foundation** [1] - 54:24 founder [1] - 116:16 four [32] - 8:24, 9:4, 21:15, 22:1, 27:16, 39:25, 40:14, 40:16, 47:2, 52:15, 52:17,

66:8, 72:2, 79:3, 82:20, 85:13, 90:14, 107:5, 107:17, 109:1, 109:17, 109:19, 115:3, 115:8, 116:2, 117:8, 121:19, 123:3, 124:25. 125:3. 138:19 four-plus [2] - 107:5, 109:1 four-ring [1] - 27:16 fourteen [1] - 29:22 frame [1] - 76:3 FRANCAVILLA[1] -5:13 FRANCIS [2] - 4:10, 4:11 Francisco [7] - 1:10, 3:4, 4:11, 4:14, 4:18, 5:20, 122:23 frankly [2] - 63:25, 112.2 fraud [3] - 63:4, 112:1, 113:4 free [1] - 63:12 Fresenius [1] - 115:8 fresh [1] - 102:7 Friday [1] - 138:18 Friedenfels [1] - 5:16 Friedman [1] - 118:14 friend [2] - 110:22, 111:11 friendly [1] - 91:2 friends [3] - 93:24, 120:11, 137:8 front [8] - 23:1, 36:10, 43:16, 47:24, 62:15, 103:20, 104:7, 105:7 frontier [1] - 58:15 fronts [2] - 55:12, 69:25 fuel [6] - 9:20, 18:25, 19:2, 21:1, 81:18, 136:15 Fuels [1] - 79:21 full [3] - 43:16, 65:3, 101:5 full-fledged [1] - 43:16 fully [4] - 51:25, 52:2, 96:1, 102:8 functional [1] - 60:23 fund [2] - 42:6, 117:10 funders [1] - 42:6 Fuso [1] - 107:13

G

Gables [1] - 4:7 gain [1] - 129:19 gained [2] - 29:9, 107:16 Gaines [1] - 4:12 game [1] - 28:13 Gardens [1] - 2:4 gas [1] - 95:10 gearheads [1] -134:11 Gearshift [2] - 117:23, 118:23 Geller [3] - 99:22, 100:16, 102:10 **GELLER** [1] - 4:3 gen [5] - 67:25, 68:1, 68:12, 68:15 gender [4] - 48:18, 91:25, 129:7, 131:10 General [4] - 19:15, 30:12, 30:20, 114:14 general [9] - 30:13, 55:3, 86:2, 90:17, 98:10, 98:15, 99:5, 107:24, 116:1 General's [2] - 15:19, 55:25 generally [3] - 85:16, 105:16, 105:19 generals [4] - 19:19, 114:24, 115:2, 116:3 generation [1] -129:15 generations [4] -67:23, 68:2, 68:11, 68:19 generous [1] - 9:1 gentile [1] - 132:7 gentleman [2] -110:23, 132:9 geographic [3] -112:20, 129:2, 131:10 geography [2] - 48:18, 98:3 George [1] - 87:24 Georgia [5] - 90:14, 90:19, 90:22, 90:24, 91:5 GERARD [1] - 3:10 German [17] - 22:11, 26:1, 26:5, 36:5, 41:13, 41:14, 56:7, 56:8, 56:18, 57:19, 89:6, 122:14, 123:19, 133:1, 133:10, 134:3, 135:2 Germany [16] - 56:3, 57:9, 58:9, 89:6, 89:7, 106:9, 108:22,

123:18, 133:2,

133:12, 133:14,

133:21, 134:5,
134:17, 134:21,
134:25
Gerry [1] - 28:5
GERRY [1] - 5:13
get-go [3] - 52:22,
131:1, 131:3
giants [2] - 94:6
GIBBS [4] - 4:17, 4:19,
87:1, 89:17
Gibbs [3] - 61:1,
86:25, 91:14
Gilbert [2] - 89:19,
89:21
GILBERT [4] - 4:6,
4:8, 89:20, 92:17
GIRARD [1] - 4:17
GIUFFRA [20] - 6:18,
9:14, 10:2, 10:8,
11:20, 11:22, 12:14,
14:2, 65:12, 66:2,
70:2, 70:7, 71:24,
73:25, 74:18, 76:4,
76:14, 77:7, 77:11,
77:21
Giuffra [16] - 9:15,
14:9, 14:19, 14:25,
18:20, 19:15, 21:2,
22:18, 23:14, 39:22,
78:15, 81:14, 92:8,
120:16, 120:23,
132:16
Giuffra's [7] - 18:15,
19:23, 84:2, 85:2,
93:12, 121:13,
136:11
given [12] - 14:20,
14:21, 23:6, 34:5,
37:5, 53:25, 60:14,
71:22, 78:12, 78:17,
118:15, 118:20
gladly [2] - 16:11, 27:9
Glasser [1] - 79:11
GLASSER [1] - 3:11
Gluek [1] - 128:22
GLUEK [1] - 5:22
GM [2] - 36:9, 55:10
goal [4] - 36:21, 36:23,
132:12, 132:13
Goodwin [1] - 121:11
GOTTLIEB [1] - 6:20
Gottlieb [1] - 119:11
Government [1] -
28:21
government [27] -
13:3, 13:9, 13:11,
26:12, 26:17, 30:14,
43:1, 44:4, 44:14,
45:4, 59:6, 61:24,
62:10, 67:10, 69:6,
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

73:15, 74:3, 74:13, 75:9, 80:11, 80:18, 82:4, 120:8, 132:18, 132:21, 135:2 government's [3] -12:24. 81:6. 135:2 governmental [1] -133:12 **grab** [1] - 78:20 grace [1] - 82:24 Grand [2] - 9:23, 68:22 grandfather [1] - 90:1 granted [1] - 96:5 grappling [2] - 34:3, 34:10 grateful [3] - 60:14, 60:17, 82:10 gratified [1] - 96:1 great [25] - 16:13, 27:24, 31:4, 37:25, 42:9, 49:9, 61:1, 77:22, 83:2, 85:15, 86:24, 92:22, 94:1, 94:2, 95:21, 102:5, 102:6, 102:22, 113:12, 118:18, 118:21, 119:3, 131:1, 139:8, 140:3 Great [1] - 125:23 greater [1] - 54:3 grew [1] - 134:10 around [4] - 8:5. 8:6. 116:22, 122:25 Group [1] - 108:16 group [20] - 8:22, 36:17, 39:10, 39:11, 47:7, 67:19, 79:23, 88:2, 89:24, 91:24, 108:16, 119:23, 122:5, 122:13, 127:19, 128:9, 129:13, 136:3, 138:16, 138:22 grouping [1] - 36:19 groups [1] - 64:18 guess [6] - 12:12, 15:8, 67:5, 72:10, 131:19, 139:23 quide [3] - 20:19, 132:12. 134:17 guidelines [1] - 60:12 Guilford [2] - 62:15, 63:15 Gustafson [1] -128:22 GUSTAFSON [1] -5:22 guy [2] - 84:5, 94:5

Н habits [1] - 85:1 **HAGENS** [1] - 1:15 Hagens [1] - 25:20 hagstrom [1] - 92:23 HAGSTROM [6] -5:18, 92:24, 93:20, 93:22, 94:23, 95:9 Hagstrom [1] - 92:25 hailed [1] - 90:22 half [8] - 13:18, 59:1, 66:1, 78:19, 90:14, 117:11, 122:6, 138:17 **HAMILTON** [1] - 6:20 hand [4] - 55:5, 63:20, 100:24 handle [3] - 71:22,

108:1, 108:6

96:16, 104:4

hands [1] - 15:11

51:25, 61:4

hard [9] - 12:25,

95:18, 101:3,

harder [2] - 78:7

harm [1] - 99:11

Harrison [1] - 3:14

139:7

81.2

handled [3] - 64:2, happy [3] - 31:15, 45:13, 60:4, 94:10, 131:16, 132:17, hardware [5] - 11:23, 12:1, 68:8, 80:20,

hazard [1] - 15:8 head [5] - 95:4, 104:15, 111:8, 118:24, 136:2 heading [1] - 58:6 headquarters [1] -116:25 heads [1] - 85:20 health [1] - 52:3 healthy [2] - 91:7, 91:23 hear [6] - 16:23,

61:16, 62:25, 65:14, 71:10, 120:22 heard [13] - 18:20,

31:18, 33:11, 33:16, 33:21, 33:25, 54:14, 70:18, 112:18, 115:14, 134:3, 134:11, 139:3

hearing [15] - 9:21, 10:9, 32:3, 32:10, 34:25, 35:4, 35:9, 58:3, 69:4, 69:5,

77:3, 92:9, 110:18, 122:20

hearings [1] - 88:9 heart [2] - 116:23, 117:3

heaven [1] - 79:11 heavy [2] - 80:1, 134:14

HEIMANN [2] - 3:3, 3.6

Helmuth [1] - 92:25 **HELMUTH** [1] - 5:17 help [13] - 19:22, 31:15. 43:19. 45:2. 90:2, 90:4, 104:13, 104:20, 116:21,

132:12, 132:25, 134:17, 137:21

helped [5] - 25:1, 56:4, 56:5, 95:3, 100:19

helpful [7] - 32:7, 39:6, 39:21, 40:11, 41:23, 115:1, 139:5 helping [1] - 92:19

herd [1] - 113:24 HERRERA [7] - 4:15, 95:23, 96:4, 96:22, 97:5, 97:24, 99:17

Herrera [2] - 95:22, 95:24

Heygood [2] - 31:5, 34:21 **HEYGOOD** [6] - 5:3,

5:4, 31:6, 31:8, 32:14, 34:1 high [3] - 101:7,

127:24, 137:11 highest [3] - 47:12, 94:16, 97:20

highlight [2] - 87:23, 128:25

highly [3] - 35:11, 36:12, 37:18

highway [1] - 81:12 hill [1] - 70:15 Hill [1] - 102:5

Hills [1] - 116:24 hindrance [1] - 125:4

hire [1] - 56:14 hired [1] - 46:13 historically [1] - 32:18 history [1] - 38:9

hit [1] - 122:24 hmm [1] - 15:5 hold [1] - 25:8

Hollywood [1] - 2:18 home [5] - 110:22, 110:25, 111:6,

111:7, 111:8

Home [1] - 63:20 honed [1] - 101:24 Honigman [1] - 117:2 Honor [158] - 9:14, 10:8, 12:4, 12:22, 14:2, 14:14, 17:20, 22:5, 23:9, 23:12, 24:13, 25:14, 27:8, 28:3, 28:7, 28:25, 30:1, 30:10, 30:23, 31:3, 31:6, 35:1, 35:4, 36:8, 36:10, 37:11, 37:20, 37:22, 38:1, 38:4, 38:6, 42:13, 42:19, 42:22, 42:24, 43:8, 43:19, 44:2, 44:10, 45:6, 45:9, 45:12, 45:15, 45:21, 46:2, 46:3, 46:7, 46:14, 47:20, 48:5, 48:25, 51:13, 51:15, 51:18, 51:21, 52:11, 52:12, 53:19, 53:24, 54:4, 54:5, 54:13, 55:13, 55:19, 57:4, 58:3, 60:3, 61:8, 64:3, 64:5, 64:14, 65:12, 66:2, 66:24, 70:2, 71:25, 73:12, 74:1, 74:19, 75:11, 75:16, 76:14, 76:18, 77:7, 79:10, 79:16, 82:21, 83:6, 86:12, 86:23, 87:1, 87:23, 89:20, 89:25, 90:10, 92:24, 93:22, 95:19, 95:23, 96:10, 99:17, 99:20, 100:3, 100:7, 102:24, 103:1, 103:4, 105:4, 106:16, 106:19, 106:21, 107:3, 109:5, 109:14, 110:4, 110:13, 110:15, 111:23, 112:17, 113:11, 113:14, 114:24, 115:14, 115:24,

116:11, 116:13,

117:21, 118:8,

121:19, 121:24,

122:13, 122:19,

125:24, 126:1,

128:19, 130:10,

133:4, 134:12,

134:20, 135:10,

135:22, 136:1,

136:6, 136:8,

123:3, 123:7, 125:6,

132:2, 132:4, 133:1,

119:5, 119:7,

137:11, 137:13, 137:23, 138:20, 138:22 honor [6] - 28:8, 30:11, 60:16, 90:9, 102:5, 115:22 Honor's [4] - 35:14, 37:15, 61:16, 63:22 **HONORABLE** [1] - 1:4 honored [8] - 92:20, 95:20, 100:11, 101:24, 102:20, 109:10, 137:25, 138:10 Hood [1] - 116:7 Hope [1] - 123:21 hope [10] - 11:10, 23:14, 35:11, 36:21, 36:25, 37:2, 60:11, 81:14, 104:17, 119:1 hoped [1] - 91:17 hopeful [1] - 12:15 Horizon [2] - 25:4, 121.10 hotly [1] - 136:20 hour [4] - 13:18, 78:19, 110:19, 111:7 hourly [1] - 108:11 hours [2] - 55:8, 82:21 house [6] - 36:17, 92:14. 98:14. 98:17. 117:5. 118:3 **Hudson** [1] - 3:6 huge [4] - 43:3, 43:21, 43:22, 44:17 human [1] - 102:18 humane [1] - 78:19 humbly [1] - 113:8 humor [1] - 82:25 hundred [2] - 72:7, 89:12 hundreds [11] - 18:19, 25:8, 33:3, 33:15, 55:8, 94:3, 94:24, 117:13, 117:20 hurdles [1] - 130:3 husband [1] - 135:25 Huvelle [1] - 105:7 **Hwy** [1] - 5:3 hydra [1] - 53:7 Hyundai [1] - 87:23

ı

idea [4] - 59:3, 62:13, 73:5, 127:9 identified [1] - 58:22 idiomatically [1] -26:3 III_[1] - 6:14

IL [1] - 6:11 Illinois [1] - 51:24 illustrate [1] - 46:10 imagine [5] - 49:19, 76:7, 104:13, 113:25, 114:1 immediate [1] - 93:6 immediately [6] -13:8, 25:15, 25:25, 61:21, 93:9, 139:19 immensely [1] - 22:19 impact [6] - 11:12, 21:5, 54:1, 69:7, 136:14 impacted [1] - 127:17 impacting [1] - 9:19 impacts [1] - 74:5 impart [1] - 77:6 impeccable [1] -54:20 implementing [1] -135:5 importance [3] -30:25, 103:9, 104:1 important [55] - 11:14, 11:23, 13:2, 24:15, 29:19, 30:16, 30:17, 32:20, 32:22, 33:2, 33:6, 33:11, 33:19, 36:1, 36:12, 47:5, 47:16, 48:6, 48:11, 48:12, 48:16, 48:19, 48:21, 48:22, 49:3, 49:12, 49:24, 50:1, 50:11, 58:15, 59:4, 59:20, 61:18, 64:23, 67:12, 67:16, 69:2, 72:19, 83:1, 83:17, 85:6, 87:15, 96:24, 97:11, 98:5, 98:25, 102:12, 103:12, 104:22, 105:22, 128:7, 128:9, 129:12 importantly [3] - 33:2, 59:13, 129:6 impossible [1] -129:19 improve [1] - 18:25 **IN** [1] - 1:5 in-depth [1] - 30:9 in-house [3] - 36:17, 98:14, 118:3 incentivized [1] - 42:4 incidentally [1] -56:20 inclined [1] - 89:14 include [2] - 81:17, 91:8

included [2] - 50:18,

133:9

includes [4] - 30:19, 31:21, 57:8, 57:24 including [11] - 13:21, 36:8, 64:20, 94:25, 96:11, 97:11, 108:13, 109:24, 117:16, 122:20, 136:5 inclusive [2] - 27:12, 32:10 increase [1] - 127:7 increasing [1] -129:11 incredible [2] - 60:22, 135:1 incredibly [1] - 60:14 indeed [1] - 90:3 indemnification [1] -56:16 independent [3] -80:4, 108:17, 134:5 Indian [1] - 108:13 indicated [8] - 8:19, 43:15, 69:22, 71:7, 92:10, 109:22, 125:8, 125:10 individual [14] - 31:22, 31:23, 32:1, 32:13, 32:20, 33:21, 34:7, 34:9, 103:16, 104:25, 111:25, 113:9, 137:18 individually [5] - 1:14, 2:2, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2 individuals [3] - 33:4, 105:9, 109:17 indulgence [1] - 55:14 industries [2] - 98:13, 108:24 industry [7] - 35:20, 99:3, 99:12, 117:10, 117:12, 117:16, 125:15 **inform** [1] - 97:21 informal [1] - 57:14 information [7] - 8:12, 56:24, 80:10, 115:1, 121:13, 133:19, 133:20 informed [1] - 123:10 initial [3] - 9:12, 87:25, 88.12 initiative [2] - 85:5, 85:10 injunction [2] -135:10, 135:13 insight [1] - 46:5 inspired [1] - 64:6 inspiring [1] - 28:10

instance [1] - 102:10

instead [1] - 102:11 instituted [1] - 51:2 Integrated [1] - 108:16 intend [1] - 139:9 intends [1] - 58:23 intensely [1] - 41:5 intensity [1] - 40:11 intensive [2] - 25:24, 114:20 interest [4] - 42:8, 57:10, 116:18, 126:7 interested [3] - 16:22, 17:14 interesting [2] - 59:18, 105:4 interests [7] - 47:11, 51:1, 84:3, 85:16, 88:5, 102:21, 128:12 interim [1] - 11:6 internally [1] - 63:16 international [2] -106:8, 106:11 internationally [1] -94:25 interning [1] - 108:21 interrelated [1] -77:15 interrogatories [1] -130:18 interruption [1] - 14:6 invariably [1] - 124:11 invest [1] - 85:9 invested [1] - 55:8 investigating [1] -72:16 investigation [3] -17:24, 134:17, 135:3 investigations [2] -41:9, 41:12 invite [1] - 8:18 invited [2] - 60:9, 79:4 involved [31] - 13:15, 36:7, 45:4, 45:6, 48:20, 55:4, 56:7, 56:21, 68:8, 77:11, 77:14, 79:25, 94:10, 96:12, 96:23, 97:3, 97:9, 97:25, 103:17, 103:23, 107:18, 114:11, 114:14, 114:17, 124:9, 124:10, 127:23, 130:14, 131:18, 133:23, 138:12 involvement [1] -

120:13

involving [11] - 35:18,

35:19, 94:3, 94:14.

95:7, 108:23,

117:14, 117:24,

125:15, 125:16, 130.1 ironically [1] - 64:12 Island [1] - 121:2 issue [29] - 9:24, 11:18, 11:24, 19:13, 21:23, 21:24, 23:4, 28:14, 28:18, 33:16, 37:16, 39:7, 39:8, 45:1, 55:11, 60:12, 68:25, 73:10, 74:12, 83:18, 86:9, 95:16, 104:5, 104:6, 104:15, 112:4, 135:11, 139:13 issued [2] - 18:2, 80:11 issues [49] - 12:10, 13:21, 13:23, 20:17, 20:21, 21:7, 21:19, 33:21, 36:6, 38:13, 38:18, 38:20, 39:3, 46:2, 48:17, 51:25, 64:7, 66:17, 68:3, 70:3, 70:4, 70:23, 71:20, 73:4, 73:8, 76:20, 85:3, 85:21, 88:17, 103:5, 103:13, 103:18, 103:21, 104:7, 104:10, 104:18, 104:19, 104:20, 105:22, 105:23, 105:24, 106:3, 106:4, 106:8, 106:11 Italian [14] - 26:4, 26:5, 41:13, 41:14, 46:8, 83:10, 83:15, 83:16, 83:18, 83:20, 93:19, 93:21, 122:14, 123:15 Italians [1] - 115:10 Italy [6] - 41:11, 73:3, 83:9, 83:12, 84:9, 93:24 iterations [2] - 44:23, 80:19 iterative [1] - 10:25 itself [2] - 27:18, 98:22 IV [1] - 3:10 J

JAMES [2] - 1:20, 6:8 Jamie [6] - 6:2, 106:19, 110:23, 111:1 January [1] - 110:17 Japan [1] - 106:10 Japanese [2] - 96:14,

130:14 Jason [1] - 4:12 **JEEP** [1] - 1:5 Jeep [7] - 8:8, 9:23, 68:22, 73:9, 80:23, 80:25, 110:24 Jennifer [1] - 51:14 **JENNIFER** [1] - 2:10 **JENNINGS** [1] - 3:8 JENSEN [3] - 4:5, 99:20, 101:17 Jensen [3] - 99:19, 99:21, 102:22 **Jersey** [2] - 84:6, 86:5 Jim [1] - 116:7 job [6] - 27:20, 40:7, 77:22, 91:21, 96:17, 97:14 Jodi [1] - 7:5 Joe [2] - 60:22, 119:5 John [2] - 2:16, 6:9 **JOHNSON** [1] - 5:17 Johnson [3] - 57:11, 92:25, 114:6 join [2] - 98:14, 139:22 joined [3] - 15:22, 56:19, 90:1 joint [1] - 58:8 joked [1] - 118:6 Jon [2] - 7:6, 15:19 Jonathan [1] - 7:3 Jose [2] - 1:14, 2:2 JOSEPH [3] - 3:20, 4.13 4.15 Joseph [1] - 95:24 journey [1] - 16:4 **JR** [2] - 5:15, 6:18 Judge [34] - 8:25, 14:8, 23:1, 27:10, 30:13, 34:2, 38:23, 44:12, 44:13, 47:24, 50:15, 60:15, 62:15, 63:15, 84:2, 84:17, 84:20, 85:6, 85:23, 86:1, 87:24, 88:1, 88:14, 89:12, 91:16, 102:6, 103:21, 104:7, 105:7, 114:21, 118:14, 121:10, 137:25 JUDGE [1] - 1:4 judge [3] - 63:21, 63:24, 100:16 judged [1] - 82:18 judges [3] - 92:4, 92:6, 118:13 judgment [2] - 92:6, 93:5 judicial [1] - 118:11 jump [1] - 106:24

juncture [1] - 44:20 June [6] - 1:10, 8:1, 51:24, 56:17, 57:16, 140:13 junior [1] - 88:22 juries [2] - 92:5, 92:6 jurisdictional [1] -57:15 jury [2] - 36:18, 103:12 JUSTICE [1] - 2:12 justice [6] - 47:11, 49:4, 64:13, 90:2, 90:8.99:14 Justice [4] - 14:11, 38:22, 76:23, 86:19 justly [1] - 138:24

K Kaplan [2] - 126:2, 127:22 **KAPLAN** [2] - 5:6, 5:9 Katherine [1] - 7:4 Kathryn [1] - 7:4 Katy [1] - 7:6 Kayla [1] - 2:16 keep [6] - 27:15, 30:9, 42:4, 62:22, 67:12, 124.7 Keller [3] - 37:16, 37:17. 38:5 **KELLER** [1] - 3:16 Kelley [1] - 2:16 Kentucky [2] - 115:7, 116:8 kept [1] - 45:12 key [9] - 12:8, 54:15, 56:13, 56:24, 57:15, 57:17, 121:18, 126:13, 126:21 kids [1] - 92:13 kind [8] - 18:9, 19:6, 28:24, 51:1, 58:12, 68:25, 104:12, 127:1 kinds [2] - 36:12, 132:8 kinks [1] - 25:25 Kitchel [4] - 3:21, 4:2, 89:24, 90:22 knowing [1] - 95:5 knowledge [7] -28:25, 29:1, 29:4, 29:9, 36:4, 93:8, 95:12 known [2] - 118:9, 127:24

knows [6] - 28:17,

100:14, 118:10

43:10, 89:22, 96:10,

Ko [1] - 23:1 KOPELOWITZ [1] -4.6 Korea [1] - 88:10 Korean [2] - 96:15, 130:14

L

lab [2] - 70:16, 80:3

laid [2] - 28:12, 121:8

LA[1] - 6:4

lanes [1] - 136:24 language [12] - 26:4, 36:5, 46:12, 56:2, 56:15, 79:12, 83:10, 83:11, 93:23, 115:12, 123:12, 123:17 languages [1] - 96:14 large [21] - 24:23, 25:2, 26:7, 40:3, 42:3, 47:17, 54:7, 64:18, 71:18, 71:21, 71:24, 88:25, 89:8, 96:10, 97:23, 98:5, 98:11, 98:23, 112:5, 112:14, 133:8 larger [4] - 36:2, 52:19, 54:4, 61:12 largest [3] - 36:7, 63:7, 103:12 last [24] - 8:19, 9:21, 10:9, 10:17, 12:5, 15:4, 35:4, 37:20, 56:17, 69:22, 78:25, 81:20, 88:18, 92:5, 103:8, 112:19, 119:25, 120:24, 121:14, 122:6, 131:22, 135:10, 135:23 late [2] - 80:9, 102:6 Latin [2] - 123:13, 123:14 **Laurel** [1] - 5:14 **Law** [6] - 60:10, 64:14, 95:24, 96:11, 97:24, 116.16 law [24] - 19:8, 29:16, 35:18, 72:1, 72:6, 90:1, 102:25, 106:20, 108:17, 112:14, 119:7, 119:8, 119:13, 119:19, 120:5, 126:2, 127:21, 128:8, 128:13, 137:8, 137:17,

137:20, 139:8

LAW [3] - 2:6, 4:10, 4:13 laws [1] - 62:4 lawsuit [4] - 9:19, 13:11, 18:2, 111:10 lawsuits [4] - 9:25, 12:11, 31:22, 32:1 lawyer [23] - 18:6, 18:18, 22:9, 23:2, 26:25, 35:14, 60:19, 83:15, 83:16, 84:5, 84:6, 86:11, 86:12, 89:2, 91:9, 91:10, 113:3, 113:25, 118:10, 118:15, 118:19, 125:13 lawyer's [1] - 15:11 Lawyers [1] - 118:9 lawyers [60] - 18:4, 19:14, 21:15, 21:16, 21:18, 21:23, 22:13, 22:18, 22:19, 23:5, 24:2, 29:5, 30:19, 31:16, 33:3, 33:15, 34:12, 36:3, 41:12, 41:13, 41:14, 43:10, 43:11, 43:19, 43:24, 43:25, 48:2, 49:2, 60:17, 60:25, 61:4, 79:18, 79:19, 85:5, 86:10, 86:14, 88:2, 88:22, 88:24, 91:6, 93:16, 95:14, 95:15, 102:9, 113:20, 118:17, 119:10, 121:3, 123:3, 123:23, 123:24, 127:24, 127:25, 128:10, 129:15, 137:17, 137:19, 137:21, 138:16, 138:22 lay [2] - 8:5, 39:7 LCD [2] - 130:13, 130:22 lead [81] - 8:18, 15:9, 16:9, 16:21, 18:8, 26:25, 27:4, 27:9, 27:12, 27:23, 30:6, 35:15, 42:1, 43:9, 43:20, 43:24, 44:7, 46:15, 47:21, 47:23, 50:21, 56:1, 56:5, 59:11, 59:14, 59:25, 60:11, 62:9, 63:6, 63:24, 64:1, 64:3, 64:16, 64:23, 65:15, 66:4. 66:5. 66:6. 66:12, 66:21, 66:22, 66:25, 67:2, 71:19,

72:3, 75:16, 78:6, 87:5, 87:8, 87:12, 87:17, 89:10, 94:9, 96:4, 96:16, 97:13, 99:4, 100:4, 100:12, 100:17, 101:8, 105:2, 105:16, 109:15. 109:21. 117:16, 117:22, 117:24, 123:22, 124:21, 124:22, 125:9, 125:10, 125:11, 125:21, 128:9, 131:7, 138:22 leader [1] - 84:22 leaders [2] - 24:17, 52.19 leadership [47] - 9:2, 17:1, 18:11, 21:10, 21:15, 22:15, 28:9, 29:22, 29:23, 32:17, 33:14, 35:8, 41:17, 43:23, 52:6, 53:5, 53:11, 54:11, 54:20, 60:20, 65:23, 82:2, 85:13, 85:25, 90:8, 91:6, 91:20, 96:11, 102:13, 107:24, 108:5, 109:6, 109:23, 114:12, 115:19, 115:21, 121:11, 121:17, 124:12, 129:2, 129:7, 129:18, 129:20, 131:6, 131:7, 137:3, 137:7 leading [2] - 129:15, 135:2 leads [5] - 47:14, 48:7, 53:18, 131:8, 134:19 lean [2] - 30:9, 137:7 learn [3] - 34:2, 56:18, 134:16 learned [10] - 12:5, 24:8, 41:2, 53:1, 56:2, 56:21, 86:13, 120:16, 121:7, 122:1 learning [2] - 93:23, 133:21 least [14] - 29:8, 58:21, 58:23, 66:3, 69:24, 71:25, 76:8, 77:12, 78:3, 80:18, 91:9, 92:9, 97:1, 127:16 leave [2] - 25:13, 115:13 left [3] - 25:11, 59:24, 82:22 legal [9] - 15:24, 56:8,

76:20, 90:3, 97:23,
102:1, 104:10, 104:15, 124:3
legally [1] - 97:19
Leigh [1] - 14:14
LEIGH [1] - 2:15 lemon [1] - 112:14
lend [1] - 128:14
Leocadio [1] - 5:2
Leon [1] - 4:7
LEOPOLD [4] - 2:5, 102:24, 104:14,
106:16
Leopold [6] - 91:10, 102:23, 102:24,
106:25, 107:8, 107:9
LESLEY [1] - 3:15
Lesley [2] - 30:11, 55:21
less [5] - 38:8, 43:15,
51:5, 73:23, 85:1
lessees [1] - 91:1
lessons [4] - 46:11, 120:16, 122:1, 122:2
letter [9] - 51:22,
61:11, 79:12, 79:16,
80:6, 92:3, 125:8, 136:4, 136:22
letting [3] - 52:10,
55:14, 110:6
level [8] - 15:23, 85:25, 97:6, 97:7,
97:17, 97:18, 99:6,
131:10
LEVITT [7] - 6:10, 6:11, 34:24, 35:3,
37:7, 37:10, 38:1
Levitt [5] - 34:23, 35:3,
107:23, 114:5 Lexington [1] - 5:7
LIABILITY [1] - 1:6
Liability [1] - 8:9
liability [4] - 63:5, 69:23, 100:19,
107:20
liaison [2] - 33:14,
55:25 liaisons [1] - 17:3
liberal [2] - 24:21,
82:17
LIEFF [2] - 3:3, 3:6 Lieff [1] - 23:13
Lieπ [1] - 23:13 life [2] - 83:1, 90:3
light [3] - 18:5, 18:15,
120:12
likelihood [2] - 74:19, 120:25
likely [5] - 21:3, 52:13,
57:13, 75:15, 136:10
limit [1] - 45:13

```
limitations [1] - 50:3
limited [4] - 50:9,
 70:25, 126:17
limits [2] - 81:11,
 81:12
line [2] - 78:7
linear [1] - 26:20
linger [1] - 87:20
lingo [1] - 86:13
                             6:19
list [2] - 17:19, 109:12
listen [1] - 14:4
listened [1] - 120:23
listening [2] - 14:17,
                             6:20
 15:19
liter [9] - 67:24, 67:25,
 68:5, 68:10, 69:11,
 69:12, 81:16
literally [2] - 13:15,
 94:18
liters [1] - 68:13
litigants [2] - 32:11,
                             44:17
 32:13
litigate [3] - 20:23,
 21:7, 106:14
litigated [8] - 94:12,
 95:7, 103:11,
 104:18, 107:11,
 117:21, 118:1,
 135:12
litigating [9] - 58:17,
 106:6, 106:21,
 107:4, 107:6,
 107:17, 109:2,
 112:10, 112:13
LITIGATION [1] - 1:7
Litigation [1] - 8:9
                             134:7
litigation [67] - 11:18,
 13:21, 15:16, 17:6,
 18:21, 19:11, 23:16,
 29:2, 31:21, 32:17,
 32:18, 32:19, 33:8,
 34:2, 34:5, 34:11,
 34:14, 34:19, 37:18,
 42:5, 43:12, 43:16,
 49:11, 57:1, 57:18,
 60:3, 61:19, 62:14,
 63:1, 70:1, 70:3,
 71:14, 71:22, 74:14,
 74:19, 74:22, 74:25,
 75:12, 88:17, 93:8,
 96:12. 99:24.
 101:10, 103:11,
 103:14, 103:16,
 103:24, 104:23,
 104:25, 105:5,
 105:12, 105:23,
 107:17, 107:19,
 108:4, 108:13,
 108:23, 115:7,
 117:3, 117:12,
```

```
120:15, 123:11,
 124:9, 132:13,
 136:20, 138:11
                           machine [3] - 26:1,
litigations [2] - 94:11,
                             29:7, 85:10
 129:24
live [1] - 123:18
lived [2] - 89:6, 133:2
LLC [3] - 6:3, 6:10,
                             113:23
LLP [14] - 1:15, 2:9,
 3:11, 3:13, 3:16,
 3:18, 4:3, 4:17, 5:6,
 5:9, 5:13, 6:6, 6:16,
local [3] - 61:1, 76:2,
 129:8
                             136:2
located [2] - 47:5,
 116:23
location [1] - 116:19
locked [1] - 50:23
                             112:10
lodestar [2] - 43:12,
look [23] - 11:7, 17:1,
 18:3, 32:3, 34:18,
                             137:4
 35:9, 40:24, 42:25,
 45:23, 58:11, 67:21,
 69:18, 73:17, 74:18,
 75:14, 76:2, 82:5,
 84:10, 86:19, 95:16,
                            70.13
 113:3, 122:12, 135:7
looked [4] - 41:5,
 77:1, 79:16, 90:10
looking [10] - 23:5,
 33:9, 36:15, 73:20,
                             80.17
 105:14, 121:21,
 122:9, 125:7, 126:9,
                             98:13
looming [1] - 100:5
                             110:10
Los [1] - 136:2
lose [3] - 19:2, 32:9,
 110:14
                           March [2] - 59:1,
loses [1] - 78:25
                             64:15
loss [1] - 93:3
Lou [1] - 4:9
                             83:19
Louisiana [9] -
                           market [1] - 127:13
 110:18, 110:25,
 111:12, 112:22,
 113:3, 115:8, 116:9,
 121:2, 132:6
love [2] - 95:5, 137:20
loved [2] - 95:4, 95:5
low [3] - 42:5, 74:20,
 122:11
lower [1] - 68:7
                           Mathue [1] - 3:2
Luke [2] - 3:21, 4:2
Lunch [1] - 78:24
Lynn [3] - 38:4, 60:21,
 118:18
LYNN [1] - 3:17
```

М

machines [1] - 18:17 magnitude [1] - 52:21 main [5] - 77:24, 89:3, maintained [1] - 133:2

major [4] - 23:3, 87:7, 94:11, 101:3 majority [4] - 34:18, 96:25, 111:24, 112:3 male [1] - 129:8 manage [2] - 88:16,

manageable [2] -54:8, 78:14 managed [2] - 40:19,

management [7] -31:11, 33:12, 47:7, 48:10, 62:12, 69:16,

manager [1] - 111:3 managing [1] - 40:19 Manhattan [1] - 98:11 manipulatable [1] -

manner [1] - 97:20 manufacturer [2] -18:25, 87:7 manufacturers [1] -

manufacturing [1] -Marc [2] - 106:22,

MARC [1] - 6:4 marc [1] - 110:8

Marchionne [1] -

MARKETING [1] - 1:6 Marketing [1] - 8:8 Marlatt [1] - 4:16 marriages [1] - 124:13 mass [2] - 89:8, 105:5 master [7] - 16:10, 29:20, 44:12, 44:19, 44:22, 77:9, 139:14

matter [13] - 13:15, 58:17, 72:17, 74:24, 102:21, 105:8, 106:14, 109:10, 111:22, 113:5, 135:11, 139:7,

140:11 matters [11] - 29:17, 32:23, 46:9, 54:16, 71:23, 100:20, 103:14, 105:1, 105:12. 112:20. 135:15

MATTHEW [1] - 6:22 maximum [4] - 27:15, 42:24, 43:6, 124:25 Maya [1] - 6:5 MDL [27] - 31:20, 32:3, 32:9, 34:15, 34:20,

48:5, 48:19, 60:10, 62:9, 77:4, 87:25, 89:1, 89:12, 91:22, 94:8, 101:25, 102:13, 102:16, 109:20, 109:21,

109:23, 117:22, 121:4, 129:24, 137:17, 138:1

MDLs [3] - 25:3, 63:7, 64:19

mean [12] - 21:11, 39:3. 42:4. 42:5. 44:8. 45:23. 71:13. 71:18, 102:14, 124:2, 129:21, 139:25

means [2] - 26:15, 52:1

meant [1] - 56:15 meantime [1] - 60:13 mechanic [1] - 95:4 mechanical [2] - 62:7, 86:14

mechanisms [1] -58:18

Media [1] - 6:7 medical [1] - 51:25 meet [2] - 130:18, 133:10

meeting [4] - 30:13, 56:20, 58:7, 133:12 meetings [4] - 10:10,

10:11, 56:17, 57:9 member [8] - 16:8, 33:13, 91:9, 91:17,

92:20, 98:8, 98:17, 108:16

members [18] - 24:5, 25:7, 25:21, 29:23, 37:4, 44:5, 44:18, 46:16, 47:17, 61:14, 62:3, 78:3, 93:6, 100:18, 117:9, 131:6, 134:2, 136:23 memo [1] - 16:18

memos [1] - 133:11

men [1] - 79:19 mend [1] - 52:1 mention [6] - 30:10, 84:1, 85:18, 86:3, 86:17, 127:21 mentioned [14] - 9:21, 25:19, 45:9, 55:24, 81:2, 81:6, 83:14, 83:15, 84:17, 88:19, 95:14, 98:20, 107:9, 107:23 mentorship [1] -60:21 Mercedes [3] - 19:15, 55:11, 112:15 Mercedes' [1] - 20:15 merits [1] - 65:21 mess [1] - 19:1 message [1] - 36:20 messenger [1] - 23:14 met [3] - 58:5, 134:21, 134:25 **METHVIN** [1] - 6:12 MFT [2] - 36:8, 37:22 MI [1] - 2:7 Miami [3] - 89:22, 90:1, 114:11 Michael [1] - 128:3 MICHAEL [2] - 5:4, 5:10 MICHAUD [3] - 6:4, 110:10, 110:13 Michaud [5] - 106:18, 106:22, 110:8, 110:10, 110:12 Michelin [1] - 109:18 Michigan [12] -116:16, 116:17, 116:18, 116:23, 117:4, 117:8, 117:23, 118:9, 118:12, 118:14, 118:18 Microsoft [3] - 94:14, 94:17, 94:19 middle [1] - 107:1 might [24] - 8:21, 9:1, 9:5, 13:9, 13:12, 16:3, 16:5, 17:4, 21:1, 32:25, 34:6, 37:14, 44:2, 45:1, 45:18, 56:21, 57:24, 58:2, 60:2, 60:5, 69:20, 77:20, 127:15, 135:11 Mike [2] - 86:18, 86:20 Milan [1] - 108:14 Milano [1] - 45:18 MILES [10] - 6:13, 6:14, 113:14,

113:16, 114:3, Monday [1] - 82:22 115:6, 116:4, 116:7, money [4] - 39:14, 116:11, 118:5 43:4, 64:9, 126:24 Miles [1] - 113:16 monitored [1] - 30:24 miles [2] - 36:11, monopoly [2] - 83:12, 113:13 104:2 MILLER [6] - 2:6, 2:7, Monostable [2] -6:3, 6:6, 116:13, 117:23, 118:22 116:15 Monte [1] - 10:19 Miller [4] - 106:20, Montgomery [5] -110:11, 116:15, 4:10, 4:14, 6:14, 116:16 113:17, 115:12 miller [1] - 116:12 month [3] - 76:5, 76:8, Milligan [1] - 2:16 76:9 million [4] - 59:11, monthly [10] - 45:11, 88:15, 89:13, 96:13 45:25, 46:1, 50:13, millions [3] - 26:9, 50:16, 50:20, 50:24, 28:22, 94:3 63:10, 87:18 Milstein [1] - 102:25 months [22] - 12:16, MILSTEIN [1] - 2:3 14:24, 20:1, 20:3, mind [1] - 67:12 25:23, 26:9, 37:7, 37:10, 38:18, 49:15, mindset [2] - 32:19, 49:19, 49:20, 70:25, 32:20 75:22, 75:23, 75:24, minimum [1] - 87:18 75:25, 76:10, 76:17, Minneapolis [4] -94:15, 124:5 5:23, 93:1, 126:3, moreover [1] - 111:23 128:22 Minnesota [3] - 93:1, morning [24] - 8:4, 126:3, 128:22 8:7, 9:14, 14:14, 15:21, 17:20, 17:21, minority [1] - 64:18 23:18, 28:3, 28:4, minute [2] - 36:16, 31:6, 31:7, 31:19, 136:6 35:1, 35:2, 38:4, minutes [8] - 8:20, 51:13, 55:19, 55:20, 8:24, 17:13, 30:1, 61:8, 92:10, 110:17, 30:3, 78:22, 79:3, 112:19, 113:18 82:20 mortgage [1] - 112:6 miscounted [1] most [30] - 20:11, 35:22 26:24, 29:5, 33:2, missed [1] - 139:3 38:7, 43:22, 54:23, mission [1] - 9:22 62:7, 63:7, 70:17, Mississippi [6] -71:24, 75:15, 87:2, 111:7, 111:10, 89:21, 91:19, 96:14, 112:22, 115:6, 96:22, 96:24, 116:7, 132:6 103:12, 103:19, Missouri [1] - 121:3 105:6, 110:14, mistake [2] - 42:15, 110:15, 120:25, 98:21 121:9, 127:24, Mitsubishi [1] -128:7, 128:9, 107:12 134:13, 138:15 mixture [1] - 131:9 mostly [2] - 97:25, MN [2] - 5:18, 5:23 130:16 mock [1] - 36:18 motion [16] - 29:16, mode [1] - 70:8 36:10, 70:4, 70:5, model [4] - 9:23, 70:10, 71:8, 75:19, 11:17, 32:6, 78:12 76:8, 76:16, 76:18, modeling [1] - 95:1 76:19, 107:19, models [2] - 80:21,

81:4

modified [1] - 10:3

Monahan [1] - 7:5

119:20, 137:1,

motions [11] - 20:8,

138:15

20:10, 20:11, 20:18, 57:15, 67:6, 71:9, 77:18, 84:8, 97:9, 101:10 motivated [1] - 72:5 **MOTLEY** [1] - 3:18 Motley [1] - 119:6 motley [1] - 121:1 motor [2] - 95:4, 125.17 Motor [3] - 5:5, 125:14, 126:4 Motors [2] - 19:15, 114:14 Mountain [1] - 5:10 mouth [2] - 132:17, 132:19 move [16] - 8:16, 29:12, 38:8, 38:13, 61:17, 62:13, 62:17, 67:5, 67:14, 75:20, 76:1, 108:8, 126:16, 135:4, 139:10 moved [1] - 38:24 moves [3] - 49:19, 49:20, 69:22 MPG [1] - 87:23 MR [123] - 9:14, 10:2, 10:8, 11:20, 11:22, 12:14, 14:2, 17:20, 17:22, 20:5, 20:7, 21:14, 22:22, 23:9, 28:3, 28:5, 30:8, 30:23, 31:3, 31:6, 31:8, 32:14, 34:1, 34:24, 35:3, 37:7, 37:10, 38:1, 38:4, 38:16, 39:3, 40:4, 40:10, 41:2, 42:10, 42:13, 42:19, 43:18, 44:9. 44:25. 45:8. 46:7, 46:12, 46:14, 47:20, 49:10, 50:6, 51:7, 65:12, 66:2, 70:2, 70:7, 71:24, 73:25, 74:18, 76:4, 76:14, 77:7, 77:11, 77:21, 79:8, 79:16, 80:23, 80:25, 81:5, 82:9, 82:16, 82:20, 83:6, 83:8, 83:14, 85:20, 85:23, 87:1, 89:17, 89:20, 92:17, 92:24, 93:20, 93:22, 94:23, 95:9, 95:23, 96:4, 96:22, 97:5, 97:24, 99:17, 102:24, 104:14, 106:16, 106:19, 106:24, 107:3,

109:14, 109:17, 109:22, 110:1, 110:4, 110:6, 110:10, 110:13, 113:14, 113:16, 114:3, 115:6, 116:4, 116:7, 116:11, 116:13. 116:15. 118:5, 119:5, 119:17, 122:19, 123:17, 125:13, 125:24, 130:13, 132:4, 135:20, 135:22, 139:1 **MS** [40] - 14:14, 14:17, 14:23, 15:6, 15:10, 15:14, 15:18, 16:2, 16:7, 16:14, 23:12, 24:12, 25:13, 27:8, 27:25, 51:13, 52:6, 52:8, 53:4, 53:16, 53:19, 55:16, 55:19, 55:21, 56:12, 59:18, 61:8, 63:25, 65:6, 99:20, 101:17, 126:1, 127:12, 128:19, 128:21, 130:6, 130:10, 130:21, 131:16, 132:2 Mueller [5] - 45:3, 77:11, 77:20, 82:5, 82.12 multidimensional [1] - 77:15 multidistrict [1] -31:21 multifaceted [1] -29:21 multiheaded [2] -53:7, 66:4 multiple [8] - 10:9, 53:17, 67:10, 67:23, 71:25, 105:23, 105:24, 121:3 multitask [1] - 26:15 mundane [1] - 50:7 music [1] - 61:16 must [1] - 44:9 mutually [1] - 44:7 MyFord [5] - 19:5, 19:9, 21:22, 22:23, 136:5

Ν

N.V_[1] - 6:15 N.W_[1] - 6:21 name_[10] - 51:12, 55:21, 89:21, 94:7, 26:8, 32:22, 39:19,

40:13, 40:16, 40:17,

40:20, 42:23, 45:13,

54:9, 58:25, 67:21,

68:18, 68:19, 69:25,

70:25, 78:12, 89:7,

90:12, 90:14, 98:19,

122:11, 123:5, 128:4

103:10, 106:3,

109:12, 109:23,

108:1, 108:6,

64:7, 135:13

110:16

95:23, 99:20, 110:23, 116:15, 122:22, 126:1 named [2] - 90:21, 91:16 Nashville [1] - 3:9 Nathan [1] - 5:16 Natural [1] - 2:13 naturally [1] - 59:16 nature [4] - 25:6, 34:10, 59:21, 130:19 navigate [1] - 88:16 nearly [2] - 90:19, 129:19 necessarily [2] -24:14, 120:10 necessary [6] - 62:18, 69:18, 87:17, 93:14, 94:21, 136:15 need [44] - 12:17, 14:3, 16:22, 22:4, 22:19, 23:7, 27:5, 32:25, 39:4, 40:11, 42:8, 43:6, 43:7, 43:21, 44:4, 49:16, 53:9, 53:10, 54:1, 54:22, 59:15, 60:2, 61:15, 61:20, 62:5, 62:8, 62:20, 64:17, 66:9, 67:8, 71:18, 72:6, 72:12, 73:3, 75:5, 77:16, 78:13, 79:14, 84:15, 90:4, 119:19, 124:4, 126:9 needed [3] - 35:6, 92:14, 92:18 needs [10] - 53:11, 62:11, 87:8, 87:18, 87:19, 92:10, 103:5, 108:5, 120:19, 121:23 negative [2] - 11:12, 82.7 negotiate [2] - 28:12, 67:2 negotiated [2] - 88:2, 94:13 negotiating [2] - 93:7, 138:17 negotiation [2] -49:21, 78:8 negotiations [1] -121:9 nervous [1] - 86:6 net [1] - 117:8 **network** [1] - 134:5 neutral [2] - 9:8, 45:1 never [6] - 65:2, 70:5, 93:24, 124:17, 124:18, 130:23

nevertheless [3] notwithstanding [1] -107:16, 111:19, 113:2 **NOV** [2] - 80:11, 81:6 New [11] - 2:10, 3:7, **NOVs** [2] - 9:19, 9:25 5:7, 6:4, 6:17, 84:5, NOx [1] - 81:11 86:5, 110:11, nuggets [1] - 119:22 110:19, 121:1, number [32] - 23:4, 125:14 new [12] - 12:20, 13:14, 18:5, 36:15, 58:12, 58:15, 91:24, 124:10, 124:14, 128:8, 129:14, 129:19 Newark [1] - 83:22 newest [1] - 108:20 newspaper [1] - 77:22 next [11] - 8:22, 11:11, 16:4, 20:3, 60:12, numbers [1] - 80:9 65:3, 77:17, 78:18, numerous [3] - 56:5, 116:24, 139:13, 139:24 **NY** [4] - 2:10, 3:7, 5:7, NGOs [1] - 56:9 6:17 nice [1] - 61:9

NICOMEDES [1] -

night [2] - 15:4,

Ninth [1] - 102:6

NJ [1] - 1:19

NO[1] - 1:5

45:23

135:15

53:14

128:5

100:25

Nicomedes [1] - 95:24

nine [2] - 80:18, 87:9

nobody [2] - 24:10,

non [3] - 33:21, 60:25,

non-class [1] - 135:15

non-VW [1] - 60:25

none [1] - 93:22

North [1] - 6:10

normal [1] - 75:18

normally [2] - 20:23,

NORTHERN [1] - 1:3

Northern [2] - 111:12,

Northwest [1] - 5:3

note [5] - 9:1, 11:15,

24:1, 31:8, 60:7

nothing [6] - 38:12,

132:20, 133:18

notice [2] - 58:22,

notices [1] - 18:2

notion [1] - 136:13

140:1

53:4, 112:9, 125:6,

noted [1] - 8:15

notable [1] - 58:7

nonclass [1] - 32:13

4:15

0 o'clock [1] - 111:20 Oakland [1] - 3:14 objections [1] - 88:13 **objectors** [1] - 138:9 **obligation** [1] - 34:19 obligations [1] - 58:5 observe [1] - 16:15 observed [1] - 24:25 obtained [2] - 94:2, 94:19

obviously [30] - 10:24, 12:2, 12:16, 13:2, 13:11, 16:10, 16:22, 17:8, 17:15, 20:2, 21:2, 22:16, 26:11, 35:10, 39:4, 53:9, 54:6, 54:10, 54:15, 55:3, 62:10, 63:7, 65:13, 65:20, 77:14, 93:16, 108:15, 111:5, 139:5 occupy [1] - 59:16 occur [1] - 125:9 occurring [1] - 120:19 **ODD** [1] - 130:14 OF [5] - 1:3, 1:12, 2:12, 4:10, 140:9 offer [5] - 31:12, 100:8, 114:23, 115:9, 137:23

offering [2] - 31:9,

Office [2] - 15:19,

113:19

102:3

office [10] - 55:22, 56:1, 79:18, 83:16, 99:21, 111:19, 116:23, 117:8, 128:3, 136:2 offices [2] - 121:1, 127:25 **OFFICES** [1] - 4:10 officials [1] - 133:13 often [6] - 41:25, 53:20, 86:12, 126:17, 126:22, 130:2 old [3] - 58:13, 95:18, 123:13 old-fashioned [1] -95:18 **OLSTEIN** [1] - 1:18 on-road [2] - 70:12 once [5] - 11:15, 13:7, 13:13, 27:16, 125:2 One [2] - 5:20, 23:2 one [123] - 8:6, 9:11, 11:25, 13:1, 13:3, 17:23, 18:8, 18:13, 18:17, 19:24, 20:9, 22:10, 23:2, 24:12, 24:23, 25:23, 26:25, 28:10, 28:15, 30:10, 32:22, 34:1, 34:3, 36:14, 39:5, 39:7, 39:17, 40:5, 40:12, 41:22, 42:15, 43:24, 44:1, 44:10, 46:20, 47:5, 47:13, 48:7, 48:16, 48:24, 50:9, 52:18, 57:22, 58:1, 58:22, 59:22, 62:18, 63:11, 63:17, 64:7, 65:12, 66:5, 66:6, 66:11, 66:16, 66:21, 66:23, 67:2, 67:20, 68:3, 69:19, 70:9, 70:20, 71:15, 72:15, 74:20, 75:3, 77:8, 78:1, 78:6, 78:8, 78:25, 80:20, 84:4, 84:21, 85:16, 86:1, 86:6, 86:20, 87:8, 87:22, 88:19, 90:24, 91:5, 91:9, 92:3, 94:15, 94:18, 96:22, 98:19, 100:3, 101:8, 103:3, 103:5, 103:10, 104:17, 105:17, 113:20, 114:15, 116:4. 117:7, 117:13, 118:15, 119:23, 121:19, 121:22,

121:23, 122:21, 125:7, 131:7, 132:11, 132:16, 133:7, 133:13, 135:23, 135:24, 136:20, 137:10, 138:21 ones [1] - 133:7 ongoing [7] - 15:2, 34:14, 35:5, 36:19, 36:20, 114:21 online [1] - 125:11 **oOo** [2] - 8:3, 140:6 open [3] - 13:12, 25:11, 25:13 opened [2] - 55:21, 112:8 operate [1] - 39:10 operated [1] - 133:22 operates [2] - 135:6, 135.7 operating [1] - 12:23 **operation** [1] - 57:7 operative [1] - 137:1 opinion [1] - 87:8 opportunities [2] -60:18, 102:13 opportunity [6] - 29:6, 60:14, 82:10, 103:3, 109:10, 124:18 opposed [5] - 53:15, 63:24, 67:2, 71:12, 88:11 opposition [2] - 75:24, 76:9 **opt** [3] - 34:12, 34:13, 122:11 opt-outs [1] - 122:11 optics [2] - 33:2, 33:19 optimism [1] - 23:14 optimistic [7] - 9:18, 13:5, 20:2, 43:15, 49:16, 69:5, 73:24 order [23] - 8:19, 9:7, 34:24, 40:7, 40:10, 45:11, 50:15, 61:23, 64:4, 66:10, 66:14, 67:4, 79:6, 88:21, 105:5, 120:6, 137:4, 137:15, 139:12, 139:14, 139:25 ordering [1] - 64:22 orders [1] - 50:1 organically [2] -110:15, 111:13 organized [1] - 9:8 organizing [1] - 47:8 oriented [2] - 113:9, 113:10

original [1] - 90:21 originally [2] - 61:12, 133:7 Orleans [3] - 6:4, 110:11, 110:19 ORR [1] - 5:3 Ortiz [1] - 121:6 OSTROW [1] - 4:6 otherwise [6] - 33:24, 36:4, 40:23, 52:3, 83:1, 124:19 ought [2] - 93:12, 136:19 ourselves [1] - 136:23 outcome [3] - 27:17, 128:13, 131:1 outs [1] - 122:11 outset [2] - 35:24, 36:19 outside [3] - 70:14, 80:17 outstaffed [1] - 94:18 outstanding [7] -29:5, 39:10, 60:21, 85:15, 91:10, 93:17, 118:19 over-the-road [1] -80.1 overall [2] - 30:18, 91.8 overlooked [1] - 129:3 overruns [1] - 137:5 oversee [1] - 55:22 overseeing [2] - 97:7, 97:10 oversight [1] - 37:23 overstate [2] - 30:25. 123:20 own [14] - 10:16, 18:10, 18:17, 28:21, 50:21, 62:7, 87:10, 91:11, 112:8, 112:9, 112:10, 123:4, 137:8 owners [3] - 79:14, 90:25, 127:20

Ρ

P.C [3] - 1:18, 3:22, 6:13 p.m [1] - 140:5 P.O [1] - 2:14 PA [2] - 6:7, 9:13 PACCAR [3] - 103:24, 104:8, 107:10 pace [1] - 114:16 Pages [1] - 1:1 pages [2] - 1:22, 96:13 Palm [2] - 2:4, 2:18 Pape [1] - 7:6

papers [9] - 16:23, 62:25, 96:8, 100:24, 106:2, 115:15, 123:2, 124:21, 138:9 parade [1] - 139:22 parallel [3] - 17:6, 53:9, 100:2 parameters [1] - 20:25 paramount [1] -104:10 pardon [1] - 93:20 Parks [1] - 3:9 parse [1] - 56:15 part [26] - 16:8, 18:9. 22:17, 30:18, 32:5, 39:24, 50:11, 53:8, 55:4, 55:24, 61:22, 64:4, 64:18, 64:22, 69:20, 70:17, 73:2, 88:3, 89:23, 90:21, 91:16, 95:20, 101:2, 101:3, 107:15, 115:21 participate [2] - 60:9, 60:15 participation [5] -27:15, 48:13, 49:2, 50:9, 88:21 particular [11] - 32:17, 55:9, 87:13, 92:2, 99:1, 99:10, 102:17, 104:13, 104:24, 126:18, 127:19 particularly [6] - 9:13, 56:5, 66:19, 72:6, 97:10, 98:23 parties [4] - 49:22, 62:17, 62:19, 88:6 parting [1] - 60:8 partly [1] - 9:7 partner [6] - 37:16, 40:19, 99:21, 100:16, 122:22, 128:22 partners [3] - 88:19, 111:9, 128:3 partnership [2] - 59:3, 117:2 parts [2] - 39:16, 91:24

party [1] - 35:19

pass [1] - 110:25

patent [7] - 86:10,

95:14, 95:15

86:15, 95:16

patents [4] - 86:13,

138:18

past [6] - 16:23, 83:20,

89:12, 107:4, 107:5,

86:11, 86:12, 86:14,

path [4] - 17:5, 70:1, 74:14, 74:19 paths [1] - 74:2 Patrick [1] - 110:11 **PATRICK** [1] - 6:3 Paul [2] - 100:16, 102:10 **PAX** [1] - 109:18 pay [2] - 95:3, 126:15 paying [1] - 41:25 PC [1] - 2:17 **PCS**[1] - 137:25 peace [2] - 123:14, 123:21 **PEARSON** [1] - 5:3 **PEMS** [4] - 18:17, 70:12, 80:2 pending [4] - 44:20, 69:21, 136:5, 138:12 **PENFIELD** [1] - 5:13 Pennsylvania [1] -6:21 people [43] - 12:24, 14:4, 19:2, 19:9, 21:11, 22:2, 25:14, 25:16, 27:19, 33:9, 39:11, 39:12, 39:14, 39:15, 39:16, 39:18, 40:15, 40:19, 41:22, 41:25, 42:23, 43:4, 58:25, 63:12, 64:19, 67:11, 67:20, 69:2, 72:4, 72:12, 72:20, 73:9, 78:8, 78:20, 81:19, 90:2, 90:4, 92:3, 111:24, 125:2, 129:13, 134:21 per [2] - 13:18, 94:16 percent [6] - 64:15, 90:13, 90:14, 90:20, 117:8, 127:17 perfect [1] - 89:5 perfectly [1] - 47:22 perform [2] - 43:11, 43:25 performance [8] -9:20, 11:13, 12:11, 69:7, 74:5, 81:18, 136:14, 138:6 performing [1] - 21:9 perhaps [12] - 23:6, 36:5, 48:14, 50:7, 53:14, 91:18, 95:2, 95:11, 98:6, 99:4, 106:1, 126:15 period [5] - 75:11, 75:18, 76:15, 76:21, 76:22 periodic [1] - 62:13

periodically [1] -

63:21 permitted [3] - 50:8, 50:22 persevere [1] - 101:18 person [11] - 27:12, 47:6, 50:9, 51:20, 66:23, 69:17, 78:2, 78:6, 91:15, 105:16, 121:20 person's [1] - 39:18 personal [1] - 60:13 personalities [1] -40:5 personality [1] - 59:19 personally [7] - 88:23, 93:9, 103:17, 104:9, 108:6, 134:10, 138:23 persons [2] - 48:14, 121:20 perspective [11] -36:16, 52:4, 60:13, 83:23, 86:2, 86:21, 101:12, 108:10, 113:6, 113:9, 113:10 PGA[1] - 2:4 pharmaceutical [2] -115:7, 135:14 phase [4] - 25:8, 78:18, 78:23, 79:2 PhDs [1] - 79:23 phone 151 - 14:18. 15:20. 19:18. 110:20, 125:1 phoning [1] - 14:4 phrase [1] - 135:23 physical [2] - 57:7, 58:18 physically [1] - 125:2 pick [1] - 133:23 picked [1] - 62:9 pickup [9] - 79:14, 90:12, 90:13, 90:15, 90:17, 90:20, 91:2, 112:23 picture [1] - 22:14 piece [1] - 114:25 pieces [1] - 107:17 piling [1] - 86:7 pitch [1] - 9:4 place [5] - 29:4, 81:22, 110:24, 136:23, 140.3 placed [1] - 137:15 plaintiff [4] - 66:4, 66:6, 90:23, 98:16 Plaintiff [13] - 1:14, 2:2, 2:11, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 4:12, 4:16, 5:2, 5:5, 5:12, 5:16, 6:5

plaintiff's [19] - 8:23, 16:5, 16:9, 18:9, 18:18, 23:24, 24:6, 24:13, 24:22, 31:11, 32:16, 33:6, 43:7, 46:17, 46:23, 46:24, 48:12, 66:13, 102:2 Plaintiffs [4] - 2:16, 4:9, 6:2, 6:9 plaintiffs [18] - 24:3, 31:22, 31:25, 32:1, 34:12, 38:10, 44:15, 66:21, 73:16, 90:21, 91:1, 91:5, 94:8, 94:17, 113:9, 114:4, 114:6, 129:4 plaintiffs' [12] - 84:10, 85:5, 89:24, 100:9, 105:25, 109:9, 113:6, 122:21, 123:1, 128:10, 131:8, 138:10 plan [10] - 10:2, 11:14, 15:4, 26:10, 28:13, 39:7, 88:7, 93:13, 95:12, 100:21 plane [1] - 118:2 planned [1] - 87:3 planning [1] - 127:14 play [6] - 44:22, 57:14, 59:3, 61:1, 86:12, 137:25 played [4] - 30:21, 57:17, 125:9, 138:1 player [2] - 86:8, 128:15 players [2] - 64:20, 128:11 playing [3] - 44:19, 89:8, 125:8 plays [1] - 113:6 pleading [1] - 139:16 pleadings [3] - 31:24, 49:17, 97:9 Pleasant [1] - 3:19 pleasantly [1] -124:16 pleased [1] - 95:25 pleasure [4] - 86:22, 87:2, 89:23, 92:25 PLLC [3] - 3:8, 5:17, 5:22 plus [3] - 68:19, 107:5, 109:1 pocket [1] - 39:14 point [15] - 12:4, 12:8, 14:13, 15:9, 37:15, 37:21, 50:22, 72:19, 77:8, 77:16, 77:24, 78:17, 83:17, 87:6,

132:7 pointed [3] - 53:7, 53:24, 64:6 points [5] - 30:4, 46:14, 64:21, 86:3, 127:21 policy [3] - 18:3, 49:1, 61:18 pollinate [1] - 105:21 Ponce [1] - 4:7 pony [2] - 16:16, 16:17 pool [1] - 36:3 populates [1] - 48:16 Porsche [1] - 68:19 portable [1] - 85:8 portion [3] - 31:10, 133:8, 135:16 **PORTIS** [1] - 6:13 pose [1] - 130:2 position [11] - 8:24, 15:15, 23:21, 69:21, 70:21, 79:1, 98:15, 113:19, 126:6, 133:18 positions [8] - 8:19, 9:3, 109:6, 109:21, 109:23, 121:17, 129:7, 137:17 positive [2] - 29:8, 82.7 possess [1] - 59:6 possible [14] - 13:9, 20:8, 35:7, 43:15, 47:22, 54:23, 71:20, 97:20, 128:13, 132:14, 132:18, 132:24, 134:6, 138:24 possibly [2] - 54:3, 74:1 post [1] - 111:21 post-EPA[1] - 111:21 potential [6] - 34:13, 57:18, 62:3, 65:4, 71:22, 111:5 potentially [3] - 54:8, 74:15, 108:15 Pourtabib [3] - 1:23, 140:17, 140:18 Powell [1] - 116:15 **POWELL** [1] - 2:7 power [3] - 19:1, 19:2, 64:25 powers [1] - 14:12 POWERS [1] - 2:15 Poydras [1] - 6:3 practical [1] - 125:1 practice [15] - 36:18, 50:2, 102:12,

107:19, 108:11, 108:12, 111:25, 112:5, 112:8, 117:11, 119:20, 135:16, 136:3, 137:1, 138:15 practices [1] - 50:25 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:6 Practices [2] - 8:8, 60:10 preach [1] - 102:12 precedent [1] - 105:17 precise [1] - 17:8 predict [1] - 17:8 preemption [4] -20:13, 20:15, 20:16, 104.6 preliminary [4] -127:12, 127:16, 138:9, 138:18 preowned [4] - 126:5, 126:11, 126:14, 127:7 prep [1] - 120:1 preparation [2] -49:18, 97:11 prepare [10] - 26:16, 53:10, 92:15, 92:19, 100:1, 123:21, 127:23, 131:3, 132:23 prepared [9] - 28:7, 92:11, 101:23, 120:2, 131:21, 136:10, 136:20, 136:21 preparing [7] - 53:12, 111:9, 112:11, 119:21, 130:17, 138:3, 138:8 prepped [1] - 130:21 prepping [1] - 130:25 presence [1] - 30:25 present [2] - 10:18, 95:15 presentation [6] -8:21, 79:3, 82:11, 91:15, 95:21, 100:24 presented [2] - 91:14, 131:21 presents [1] - 125:5 preservation [3] -58:1, 58:4, 85:1 pressure [1] - 38:12 presumably [1] -66:16 pretrial [2] - 137:4, 137:15 pretty [6] - 68:1,

68:18, 72:1, 81:23,

82:18, 122:14 prevailed [1] - 104:6 prevent [1] - 125:17 primarily [1] - 129:23 primary [2] - 57:1, 126:10 principle [1] - 86:2 privacy [1] - 73:3 private [3] - 44:15, 64:22, 80:17 privilege [3] - 82:1, 82:3, 96:6 Pro [1] - 1:24 pro [4] - 101:21, 117:4, 118:10 pro-consumer [2] -117:4, 118:10 pro-environment [1] -118:10 problem [6] - 64:18, 64:22, 66:25, 78:2, 87:21, 118:21 problematic [1] -137:10 problems [5] - 35:5, 36:23, 39:23, 66:15, 122.8 proceed [1] - 91:8 proceeding [2] - 9:9, 14.8 proceedings [2] -140:5, 140:11 PROCEEDINGS [1] -1.12 process [31] - 9:17, 10:24, 10:25, 12:3, 12:7, 12:15, 12:19, 13:1, 13:18, 16:19, 20:19, 39:1, 51:21, 54:14, 68:16, 69:11, 74:22, 75:10, 77:2, 85:25, 88:11, 91:8, 91:22, 91:23, 114:20, 123:8, 134:1, 137:12, 137:22, 139:7, 139:18 processing [2] -111:8, 111:14 produced [4] - 56:25, 61:24, 84:9, 96:13 produces [1] - 47:9 product [3] - 63:4, 101:4, 117:14 production [2] -72:22, 131:20 Products [1] - 8:9 **PRODUCTS** [1] - 1:6 profession [2] - 48:22, 64:10

professionally [1] -49.3 professors [1] - 79:23 proficient [3] - 26:6, 56:10, 123:18 profile [3] - 101:7, 127:24, 137:11 profit [3] - 119:15, 126:12, 127:8 program [1] - 114:22 progress [1] - 9:17 progressed [1] -58:19 prominently [1] - 55:4 promise [2] - 82:23, 112:25 promote [1] - 48:24 promotes [4] - 47:11, 48:13, 49:13, 50:25 **promotion** [1] - 49:4 promptly [1] - 20:7 pronounce [1] - 110:9 pronounced [1] - 83:9 proof [1] - 13:4 properly [5] - 37:4, 43:9, 47:21, 97:14, 110:9 proposal [1] - 59:22 proposals [1] - 75:6 propose [2] - 35:14, 35:16 proposed [7] - 10:13, 11:4, 59:1, 81:15, 106:2, 115:15, 115:16 pros [1] - 27:6 prosecute [2] - 43:20, 105:14 prosecuted [1] - 28:20 prosecuting [2] -96:18, 130:3 prosecution [1] -109:3 **Prosecutor** [1] - 102:3 prosecutors [1] -86:21 Protection [1] - 2:11 protection [1] -129:24 protocol [5] - 22:24, 23:2, 37:21, 64:3, 87:17 protocols [3] - 27:21, 54:15, 131:21 proud [3] - 90:9, 115:21, 118:16 proven [3] - 53:11, 101:6, 137:24 provide [3] - 22:23,

102:7, 113:8

provided [2] - 15:4, 72:24 provides [2] - 76:3, 116:22 PSA[1] - 111:18 **PSC** [45] - 25:4, 25:14, 25:21, 26:15, 26:22, 26:24, 27:11, 28:9, 29:14, 29:15, 29:22, 30:9, 31:14, 41:18, 60:15, 61:14, 62:3, 64:23, 77:12, 78:3, 78:13, 80:5, 83:25, 84:12, 84:15, 84:16, 85:22, 85:23, 91:9, 91:16, 91:19, 92:21, 93:2, 93:6, 100:17, 100:18, 102:15, 113:19, 113:20, 133:5, 134:2, 136:7, 136:22, 137:7 PSCs [1] - 53:14 public [7] - 48:19, 48:20, 54:1, 61:18, 80:14, 96:18, 102:21 public/private [1] -59:3 **publicized** [1] - 63:8 publicly [3] - 69:13, 69:24, 116:5 published [2] - 58:9, 90:11 **pull** [1] - 13:6 purchase [5] - 91:2, 126:11, 126:13, 126:18, 126:19 purchased [2] - 90:23, 90:24 purchasing [1] - 127:6 purposes [1] - 93:5 pursuant [1] - 45:11 pursue [2] - 40:10, 90.2 pursuit [2] - 90:8, 95:17 push [1] - 21:6 pushing [1] - 29:11 put [25] - 13:4, 13:14, 27:7, 27:8, 34:25, 37:8, 37:22, 41:14, 44:5. 61:11. 62:25. 69:2, 75:23, 81:25, 82:22, 95:12, 118:11, 126:18, 126:20, 126:24, 128:12, 136:16, 137:8, 137:14 putting [3] - 11:7, 34:16, 128:8

Q

Ramirez [1] - 6:5

127:17

ran [2] - 51:24, 118:2 range [2] - 98:13,

ranged [1] - 109:18

ranked [1] - 118:9

rapidly [1] - 26:7

rather [3] - 36:2,

Re [2] - 8:8, 125:14

rare [1] - 47:3

42:20, 71:7

Qualcomm [1] - 23:1 qualifications [4] -19:12, 90:5, 93:6, 137:19 qualified [2] - 17:16, 132:25 qualities [1] - 49:5 quality [3] - 31:16, 98:7, 102:14 quarterly [1] - 46:2 questionable [1] -63:17 questioning [1] -42:22 questions [17] - 8:21, 10:23, 11:3, 17:22, 18:13, 18:14, 35:14, 37:20, 42:20, 46:3, 52:12, 65:6, 87:4, 115:24, 125:6, 134:15, 135:18 qui [1] - 108:6 quick [4] - 44:16, 78:20, 99:25, 132:16 quickly [17] - 25:2, 28:11, 38:11, 49:19, 61:16, 61:18, 62:11, 73:23, 74:6, 74:11, 91:13, 92:11, 132:14. 132:18. 135:4. 138:24. 139:10 quickly.. [1] - 79:1 quite [5] - 40:19, 47:13, 48:3, 50:14, 109:12

R

R69 [1] - 81:1 race [3] - 48:18, 129:7, 131.10 **RACHEL** [1] - 4:5 Rachel [1] - 99:21 Rainbow [1] - 110:24 raise [6] - 20:13, 59:8, 65:12, 88:15, 104:15, 104:21 raised [5] - 10:23, 12:10, 105:4, 117:5, 129:25 raising [1] - 20:17 ram [1] - 128:4 **RAM** [2] - 5:10, 73:9 Ram [11] - 9:24, 57:23, 68:23, 80:24, 80:25, 90:18, 90:23, 95:8, 111:1, 111:13, 128:4

RE [1] - 1:5 reach [9] - 36:2, 43:10, 43:19, 43:24, 69:6, 100:6, 115:20, 137:7, 138:23 reached [2] - 68:7, 123:11 reaching [1] - 87:22 read [4] - 31:24, 56:10, 64:14, 77:21 readily [2] - 61:20, 136:23 reading [1] - 110:19 ready [5] - 24:7, 52:3, 84:20, 84:23, 122:23 Real [1] - 5:9 real [5] - 23:21, 66:19, 86:22, 133:24, 135:8 realistic [2] - 37:5, 38:14 realistically [1] -76:14 reality [2] - 101:13, 113:2 realize [1] - 47:1 really [27] - 12:6, 15:11, 16:25, 28:12, 29:3, 29:17, 31:17, 43:7, 49:24, 52:14, 52:21, 62:17, 62:22, 62:24, 64:1, 75:2, 78:9, 78:11, 84:4, 84:12, 85:6, 100:5, 118:21, 124:25, 129:21, 130:24, 135:23 realtime [2] - 23:20, 87.19 reason [11] - 11:22, 18:24, 18:25, 21:17, 28:14, 47:4, 60:5, 70:16, 123:5, 126:10, 126:11 reasonable [3] - 44:5, 73:22, 88:8 reasons [11] - 28:10, 32:21, 47:9, 48:5, 52:17, 73:10, 84:21, 98:18, 100:8, 124:5,

137:10 rebuilt [5] - 95:6, 95:8, 95:9, 95:10, 134:11 recalibrate [1] - 12:9 recalled [1] - 81:1 receive [1] - 102:15 received [4] - 19:8, 58:3, 110:22, 138:18 receiving [2] - 11:4, 89:9 recent [3] - 48:15, 103:19, 105:7 recently [4] - 23:1, 107:11. 121:9. 138:15 recess [1] - 78:24 recognize [5] - 19:20, 100:7, 102:8, 111:4, 124:7 recommend [4] -30:18, 48:24, 49:6, 49:22 recommendation [1] -48:4 recommended [1] -21:12 recommending [1] -124:23 reconditioning [1] -126:24 record [9] - 8:13, 8:16, 25:6, 53:11, 59:6, 89:4, 137:14, 137:24, 140:11 records [1] - 122:10 recount [1] - 113:22 recoverable [1] -45:14 recoveries [1] - 117:9 recovery [3] - 59:11, 94:16, 101:18 recreating [1] - 56:18 redo [1] - 25:17 redress [2] - 31:23, 99:1 reduce [2] - 43:12, 43:13 redundancy [1] -136:23 refer [1] - 132:9 referee [1] - 66:25 reference [1] - 128:8 referencing [1] -14:20 referred [2] - 110:22, 113:5 refining [1] - 25:25 reflash [2] - 13:16, 136:13 reflashed [2] - 13:17,

58:21 reflected [1] - 9:19 reflection [2] - 53:20, 61:13 reflective [1] - 23:15 reflects [1] - 88:16 regard [8] - 17:4, 17:17, 19:12, 104:3, 113:1, 123:1, 124:1, 124.20 regarding [5] - 14:23, 56:16, 62:3, 91:4, 107:12 regards [1] - 58:24 regular [2] - 45:10, 45:21 regularly [2] - 88:22, 89:9 regulation [1] - 58:16 regulators [12] -10:23, 11:5, 13:24, 15:3, 19:20, 41:8, 44:21, 59:6, 70:16, 74:3, 74:23, 75:1 regulators' [1] - 70:24 relate [1] - 112:16 related [3] - 100:20, 103:13, 105:1 relates [5] - 103:9, 103:18, 105:11, 105:25. 106:4 relationship [3] -30:15, 31:1, 108:22 relationships [2] -60:23, 109:8 relatively [5] - 36:23, 50:7, 74:11, 74:20, 124:14 relevant [6] - 23:24, 52:23, 108:15, 110:14, 114:25, 116:19 rely [2] - 48:2, 70:16 remain [1] - 13:5 remains [5] - 9:17, 15:25, 69:5, 112:17, 113:6 remarkable [1] -115:20 remarkably [1] -122:11 remarks [2] - 18:15, 31:17 **remedies** [1] - 54:22 remedy [1] - 25:1 remember [2] - 45:3, 76:3 **RENDE** [11] - 2:15.

14:14, 14:17, 14:23,

15:6, 15:10, 15:14,

15:18, 16:2, 16:7, 16:14 Rende [3] - 14:12, 14:14, 14:16 **Renfrew** [1] - 44:13 renowned [1] - 94:25 repeat [1] - 64:19 replicate [1] - 91:20 reply [1] - 75:25 report [9] - 9:16, 45:21, 45:23, 46:1, 51:25, 63:15, 63:20, 63:24, 125:21 Reported [1] - 1:23 reported [2] - 45:13, 91:4 REPORTER [1] -140:9 reporter [2] - 65:10, 65:25 Reporter [2] - 1:24, 140:18 reporting [3] - 45:10, 50:12, 87:18 represent [14] - 24:2, 33:4, 83:21, 88:5, 102:7, 111:24, 112:22, 114:6, 126:4, 126:6, 129:4, 129:14, 131:12 representation [1] -32:20 representatives [2] -10:17, 62:5 represented [13] -62:6, 68:20, 83:20, 83:21, 83:24, 94:5, 94:6, 105:9, 112:4, 115:2, 115:5, 127:10, 130:4 representing [12] -94:8, 98:12, 108:12, 111:25, 112:6, 115:3, 115:6, 115:7, 115:8, 116:2, 116:8 represents [1] - 114:4 Republican [1] -118.11 reputation [1] - 54:19 reputationally [1] -109:8 request [2] - 10:2, 44:14 requested [1] - 56:14 requesting [1] - 93:1 requests [4] - 26:11, 72:23, 130:18 require [6] - 23:23, 58:20, 62:2, 63:10, 71:15, 93:4

required [1] - 107:18 requirement [1] -50:12 requirements [1] -37:13 requires [3] - 13:1, 95:17, 131:5 reruns [1] - 139:22 resale [4] - 126:13, 126:21, 126:24, 127:8 research [1] - 127:13 researched [1] -104:18 reseller [1] - 113:24 reselling [1] - 126:22 resist [1] - 57:13 resolution [18] -13:11, 20:1, 20:3, 34:11, 38:13, 38:24, 43:15, 49:13, 76:23, 77:18, 93:4, 100:1, 100:6, 108:8, 114:23, 119:24, 119:25, 120:22 resolutions [1] -119:22 resolve [6] - 13:20, 43:14, 68:4, 70:1, 73:23, 74:6 resolved [3] - 66:9, 74:11, 132:18 **Resources** [1] - 2:13 resources [8] - 58:20, 59:12, 59:13, 71:16, 85:9, 102:19, 106:13, 117:11 respect [23] - 16:5, 20:22, 24:20, 26:4, 27:3, 30:5, 30:22, 38:15, 52:14, 54:13, 60:11, 61:3, 64:14, 64:17, 65:22, 66:14, 66:17, 68:4, 68:15, 69:10, 96:24, 98:1, 108:25 respected [1] - 98:24 respectfully [6] -42:24, 44:1, 44:10, 51:16, 54:18, 89:13 respects [1] - 51:21 respond [3] - 19:22, 65:19, 87:3 response [1] - 11:3 responses [1] - 73:1 responsibilities [1] -134:4 responsibility [2] -98:4, 101:16 responsible [3] -

46:22, 84:25, 137:3 responsive [2] - 47:6 rest [1] - 31:19 result [14] - 33:7, 40:22, 58:2, 71:20, 93:14, 94:19, 99:8, 105:9, 107:22, 115:20, 120:7, 123:9, 133:21 results [6] - 10:14, 47:10, 93:17, 94:2, 101:7, 134:7 resume [1] - 78:22 retained [2] - 57:16, 62:7 returned [2] - 94:16, 111:19 review [6] - 45:25, 46:1, 50:20, 56:13, 131:20, 134:17 reviewed [2] - 86:15, 87.18 reviewers [2] - 26:8, 97.8 reviewing [2] - 15:3, 133:9 revise [1] - 123:4 revised [1] - 88:14 revocation [1] - 71:12 rewarding [1] - 88:23 Rhode [1] - 121:2 RICE [4] - 3:18, 3:20, 119:5, 119:17 Rice [4] - 60:22, 119:5, 119:6, 121:1 rice [2] - 39:13, 119:4 Richard [1] - 92:25 RICHARD [1] - 5:18 RICO [5] - 56:6, 56:25, 100:19, 102:17 rigid [1] - 16:20 rigor [1] - 18:1 rigorous [1] - 22:16 **ring** [1] - 27:16 risk [1] - 136:17 risking [1] - 127:4 risky [1] - 79:8 Rivero [2] - 6:2, 111:12 road [10] - 58:19, 70:12, 71:13, 74:25, 80:1, 80:4, 92:18, 132:14, 135:12 Road [1] - 1:19 **ROBBINS** [1] - 4:3 Robbins [1] - 99:22 Robert [3] - 6:19, 9:14, 89:21

ROBERT [2] - 4:8,

6.18

Robins [2] - 126:2, 127:22 **ROBINS** [2] - 5:6, 5:9 robust [1] - 100:21 Rochester [2] - 2:7, 116:16 rocks [1] - 41:5 Rohrback [1] - 38:5 **ROHRBACK** [1] - 3:16 Roland [1] - 136:1 **ROLAND** [1] - 3:24 role [22] - 30:21, 41:5, 44:20, 44:21, 44:22, 57:15, 57:18, 59:4, 61:2, 87:25, 88:5, 89:5, 89:8, 96:11, 96:20, 97:13, 114:12, 125:10, 125:21, 125:22, 133:16, 137:24 roles [3] - 64:16, 129:18, 138:2 Roman [2] - 123:13, 123:21 room [15] - 18:7, 31:16, 32:23, 33:25, 36:3, 46:9, 69:3, 89:2, 91:14, 92:3, 93:17, 109:7, 123:13, 125:2, 139:6 ropes [1] - 28:17 Rosa [1] - 3:9 rose [1] - 98:15 Roseland [1] - 1:19 roughly [2] - 67:22, 127:16 rounds [3] - 20:12, 71:9 route [1] - 71:14 row [1] - 40:21 **RPR** [2] - 1:23, 140:18 **RUDMAN** [1] - 4:3 Rudman [1] - 99:22 **Rugg** [1] - 4:9 **Rule** [2] - 17:24, 18:3 rule [1] - 18:9 rules [3] - 8:5, 8:6, 76:2 run [7] - 22:2, 43:12, 47:22, 48:1, 82:20, 83:19, 107:25 running [2] - 43:9, 122:25 rush [2] - 73:5, 76:11 Rwanda [1] - 102:4 résumé [1] - 128:24

S

s/b [1] - 140:17

sacrifice [1] - 101:1 sacrificing [1] -102:14 safety [2] - 58:24, 103:13 saga [1] - 41:10 **SALES** [1] - 1:6 Sales [1] - 8:8 San [10] - 1:10, 3:4, 4:4, 4:11, 4:14, 4:18, 5:14, 5:20, 99:21, 122:23 **SARKO** [8] - 3:17, 38:4. 38:16. 39:3. 40:4. 40:10. 41:2. 42:10 Sarko [8] - 38:3, 38:4, 60:21, 83:14, 83:15, 85:14, 100:13, 118:18 satisfied [2] - 12:17, 75:11 **satisfies** [1] - 74:5 satisfy [4] - 69:6, 74:3, 74:23, 75:1 save [1] - 122:2 Saveri [7] - 42:17, 46:6, 83:12, 95:24, 96:1, 96:11, 97:24 **SAVERI** [9] - 4:13, 4:15. 46:7. 46:12. 46:14, 47:20, 49:10, 50:6. 51:7 saves [1] - 26:9 saving [1] - 135:23 saw [3] - 23:18, 24:22, 121:6 SC [1] - 3:19 SCARPULLA[8] -4:10, 4:11, 42:13, 42:19, 43:18, 44:9, 44:25, 45:8 Scarpulla [2] - 42:12, 84:17 Scarpulla's [1] - 47:18 schedule [3] - 72:19, 78:5, 139:24 Schedule [1] - 7:2 scheduled [2] - 51:23, 62:19 scheduling [6] - 34:6, 66:10, 66:14, 67:4, 125:1, 139:12 **SCHENK** [1] - 5:13 science [3] - 22:20, 38:21, 120:4 scientists [1] - 58:8 scope [2] - 103:6, 105:13 scrap [1] - 87:2

SCULLION [8] - 2:10, 51:13, 52:6, 52:8, 53:4, 53:16, 53:19, 55:16 Scullion [1] - 51:14 Seattle [2] - 1:16, 3:17 Seaver [2] - 122:18, 122:22 **SEAVER** [5] - 5:21, 122:19, 123:17, 125:13, 125:24 **Sebastian** [1] - 5:12 second [7] - 19:5, 39:8, 65:25, 101:6, 117:1, 133:4, 137:16 secondly [1] - 105:25 secretaries [1] - 112:9 Section [1] - 72:24 sector[1] - 80:17 secure [1] - 101:18 **see** [28] - 9:10, 16:17, 16:20, 17:2, 17:5, 17:7, 18:14, 19:10, 19:23, 20:3, 20:5, 22:13, 39:1, 39:23, 44:19, 49:10, 52:12, 61:5, 74:13, 79:1, 80:15, 88:23, 109:25, 110:8, 111:1, 130:24, 132:15 Seeger [10] - 51:9, 51:14, 51:15, 51:22, 55:1, 55:3, 55:14, 85:11, 85:15, 100:13 **SEEGER** [1] - 2:9 Seeger's [3] - 51:19, 54:18, 85:7 seeing [1] - 55:11 seek [2] - 11:16, 51:16 seeking [2] - 31:22, 100:12 seem [2] - 123:10, 131:19 segment [1] - 34:24 select [2] - 16:8, 138:20 selected [2] - 100:9, 137:25 selection [5] - 60:11, 115:1, 118:11. 137:11, 139:18 selects [2] - 122:13, 138:22 sell [2] - 33:19, 126:12 **SELLERS**[1] - 2:3 Sellers [1] - 102:25 selling [1] - 126:25 **Selna** [1] - 114:22 senior [2] - 88:19,

96:22 sense [5] - 13:12, 38:19, 61:13, 73:6, 97:11 sensitivity [2] - 96:19, 99.9 separate [1] - 115:9 **separately** [1] - 68:19 sequencing [1] -35:23 Sergio [1] - 83:19 series [1] - 94:13 serious [1] - 134:8 seriously [2] - 27:23, 28:16 serve [10] - 28:8, 29:6, 49:7, 61:4, 80:5, 87:25, 109:10, 115:22, 138:1, 138:10 served [15] - 27:9, 41:22, 46:15, 46:16, 63:6, 87:5, 98:16, 99:5, 109:11, 113:20, 114:9, 125:11, 129:17, 133:6 service [2] - 85:11, 111:3 services [4] - 31:9, 31:12, 43:25, 98:13 serving [2] - 30:11, set [14] - 36:23, 49:24, 50:3, 50:23, 62:13, 70:4, 90:1, 92:3, 99:6, 101:20, 108:10, 114:16, 128:14, 131:24 sets [2] - 60:19, 131:11 settle [8] - 21:4, 39:13, 43:2, 72:9, 118:4, 118:5, 118:6, 120:9 settled [6] - 44:11, 59:10, 89:12, 94:15, 107:11, 130:23 settlement [56] -16:10, 21:2, 21:6, 25:5, 26:17, 26:18, 26:19, 29:19, 32:6, 33:8, 34:13, 35:21, 41:21, 44:3, 44:5, 44:12, 44:19, 44:22, 45:4, 53:22, 55:5, 55:6, 60:4, 60:5, 60:22, 61:20, 66:9, 66:17, 67:20, 68:6, 70:8, 77:9, 77:13, 77:15, 84:18, 88:2,

88:8, 88:12, 88:14, 92:11, 93:4, 94:16, 99:25, 100:24, 101:20, 107:21, 114:17, 114:18, 114:20, 122:10, 123:10, 131:2, 138:17. 138:18. 139:14 settlements [6] -69:10, 76:25, 112:11, 117:7, 137:2 settling [2] - 67:19, 88:6 seven [9] - 35:16, 38:18, 49:15, 75:25, 80:7, 80:18, 87:9, 112:4, 138:19 seven-firm [1] - 35:16 several [8] - 11:11, 12:5, 32:21, 71:8, 95:15, 105:3, 112:18, 116:22 Shah [3] - 104:5, 106:19, 106:20 **SHAH** [11] - 6:6. 6:8. 106:19. 106:24. 107:3, 109:14, 109:17, 109:22, 110:1, 110:4, 110:6 shape [1] - 104:11 **SHAPIRO** [1] - 1:15 sharing [1] - 135:1 Sharon [1] - 118:25 **SHARON** [1] - 2:8 Shepherd [1] - 106:20 **SHEPHERD** [1] - 6:6 shocked [2] - 71:12, 96:3 **short** [4] - 83:1, 94:10, 127:6, 140:1 shortage [1] - 100:7 shorter [2] - 76:5, 129:21 show [1] - 16:17 shown [1] - 121:16 side [18] - 12:24, 15:24, 66:13, 71:25, 72:2, 75:23, 77:12, 84:10, 98:16, 98:17, 102:2. 102:3. 105:2. 107:20, 132:16, 132:19 sides [5] - 12:23, 32:3, 39:6, 77:14, 112:4 sight [1] - 32:9 sign [2] - 22:24, 63:18 significant [7] - 57:8, 58:20, 71:16, 73:7, 106:3, 108:11, 109:1

significantly [1] -58:11 Silicon [1] - 128:3 Simandle [2] - 103:21, 104.7 similar [4] - 17:7, 53:25, 103:22, 108:3 similarly [6] - 1:14, 2:2, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 66:17 simple [6] - 32:16, 68:21, 81:21, 84:4, 84:7, 126:23 simply [1] - 31:9 simulations [1] -20:25 simultaneous [1] -26:21 simultaneously [1] -26:16 sincere [1] - 51:19 singular [1] - 31:17 sit [7] - 16:6, 16:7, 46:3, 78:25, 79:8, 87:20, 115:24 situated [6] - 1:14, 2:2, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 17:24 situation [4] - 27:7, 68:21, 68:24, 77:2 **situations** [1] - 47:5 six [18] - 8:20, 9:4, 10:10, 17:13, 21:12, 22:1. 38:18. 58:8. 59:23, 75:17, 75:24. 76:17, 79:18, 79:19, 97:25, 117:2, 123:3, 136:22 Sixth [1] - 5:22 size [10] - 17:2, 23:6, 25:1, 28:14, 34:24, 36:2, 84:16, 126:17, 127:9, 136:7 skill [6] - 60:19, 108:10, 114:23, 128:14, 131:11, 131:24 skilled [2] - 94:20, 95:16 **skills** [5] - 56:2, 79:12, 93:7, 93:8, 94:21 **skip** [1] - 110:6 Slater [2] - 41:3, 120:23 **SLATER** [1] - 6:22 Slater's [1] - 133:18 **SLAUGHTER** [3] - 5:8, 126:1, 127:12 slaughter [2] - 125:25, 128:16

Slaughter [1] - 126:2 sleep [1] - 40:7 slot [1] - 126:19 slowly [1] - 49:20 small [3] - 26:22, 88:1, 138:16 smaller [2] - 67:19, 92:3 smarter [1] - 64:9 **SMITH** [9] - 5:23, 128:19, 128:21, 130:6, 130:10, 130:13, 130:21, 131:16. 132:2 Smith [2] - 128:18, 128:21 **smoke** [1] - 120:14 **so.**. [2] - 24:11, 122:16 **SOBOL** [1] - 1:15 society [1] - 99:14 soft [1] - 45:15 software [26] - 9:13, 10:3, 10:25, 11:5, 11:25, 12:7, 12:9, 13:2, 13:16, 13:23, 43:16, 44:20, 56:19, 57:6, 58:1, 58:11, 58:21, 69:4, 73:14, 74:4, 75:3, 95:7, 133:22, 134:14, 134:15. 136:13 **sold** [6] - 33:12, 58:14, 81:9, 117:5, 126:5 sole [7] - 27:4, 27:12. 46:15, 47:21, 47:23, 117:22, 124:22 solely [1] - 33:9 solution [6] - 69:4, 69:6, 73:15, 74:4, 74:20, 74:23 solutions [2] - 68:2, 122:9 solves [1] - 36:23 someone [7] - 18:10, 20:20, 32:16, 63:13, 67:8, 77:16, 120:8 sometimes [2] -62:19, 137:16 somewhere [1] -40.16 soon [2] - 44:16, 139:25 sophisticated [1] -72:1 sorry [6] - 42:13, 42:17, 118:5, 125:20, 130:4, 139:21 sort [18] - 8:17, 12:18,

16:25, 17:5, 17:7,

17:9, 33:21, 37:23, 39:7, 67:13, 67:14, 73:5, 78:7, 105:11, 114:16, 131:24, 137:2, 137:5 sought [2] - 32:2, 121:18 sounds [1] - 82:18 South [4] - 5:22, 119:6, 121:1, 138:12 space [2] - 126:17, 126:20 speaker [2] - 133:2, 134:4 Speaking [2] - 46:12, 83:11 speaking [3] - 111:4, 111:23, 123:17 speaks [3] - 27:18, 83:24, 84:14 special [2] - 29:20, 44:12 specialized [2] - 36:4, 103:10 specific [5] - 25:12, 35:14, 96:20, 97:4, 104:12 specifically [6] -30:20, 33:24, 90:16, 103:21, 105:13, 134:22 specifics [1] - 21:11 speed [2] - 70:13, 135:6 speedy [2] - 49:13, 93:4 spend [5] - 27:13, 72:5, 92:14, 92:18, 136:6 spending [2] - 42:8, 43:4 spent [8] - 25:23, 30:12, 50:8, 82:21, 107:6, 108:21, 122:9, 133:8 spewing [1] - 35:6 spoken [2] - 79:4, 122:7 spraying [1] - 105:10 stable [2] - 120:1, 137:21 STACEY [1] - 5:8 Stacey [1] - 126:2 staff [5] - 26:6, 65:25, 112:9, 121:3, 121:15 stage [1] - 32:8 stages [2] - 114:18, 114:19 stand [3] - 17:23, 58:17, 77:25

standard [3] - 68:6, 68:8, 68:14 standards [3] - 74:5, 82:19, 103:22 standing [1] - 88:21 standpoint [7] - 33:10, 66:3, 67:1, 69:16, 78:3, 104:23 stands [1] - 132:11 Stanley [1] - 4:16 star [1] - 101:13 start [13] - 8:11, 16:19, 17:18, 38:6, 46:8, 61:10. 72:20. 83:8. 101:10, 117:3, 133:23, 135:5, 139:15 started [6] - 14:8, 24:10, 111:2, 111:4, 125:19, 134:20 starting [1] - 80:8 State [7] - 6:7, 105:10, 113:4, 115:8, 116:7, 116:8, 116:9 state [7] - 26:18, 33:13, 51:12, 62:4, 94:13, 118:9, 132:8 statements [2] -63:10, 63:11 states [1] - 116:3 **STATES** [1] - 1:2 States [9] - 14:15, 16:7, 28:23, 86:18, 88:10, 90:20, 97:1, 117:18, 125:18 **stateside** [1] - 108:13 status [3] - 32:2, 62:13, 72:13 stay [1] - 136:24 stays [1] - 54:21 stead [2] - 52:9, 91:11 STEEN [1] - 6:20 steering [60] - 8:23, 16:6, 16:9, 21:12, 21:25, 22:1, 24:6, 24:9, 24:13, 24:22, 30:7, 32:5, 33:6, 35:16, 40:2, 43:7, 46:17, 46:23, 46:24, 47:15, 47:16, 47:19, 48:6, 48:7, 48:12, 48:17, 49:7, 51:17, 52:13, 52:16, 52:19, 52:24, 54:4, 66:20, 67:17, 67:18, 69:17, 71:18, 71:21, 72:3, 87:5, 87:9, 96:7, 97:22, 98:9, 98:18, 99:8, 100:9, 105:25, 107:25, 113:6,

122:21, 123:2, 125:10, 126:6, 128:10, 131:8, 138:11 stellar [1] - 85:1 **STELLINGS** [1] - 3:7 step [2] - 75:15, 139:13 Stephens [2] - 6:9, 114:4 steps [1] - 131:19 Steve [1] - 118:19 **STEVE** [1] - 1:17 still [14] - 15:2, 30:3, 34:19, 38:21, 43:18, 43:19, 58:17, 69:11, 72:16, 74:25, 75:7, 75:12, 76:20, 114:21 stopped [1] - 111:1 story [2] - 41:10, 84:11 straightforward [1] -37:14 Stranch [4] - 56:19, 57:12, 60:24, 132:3 STRANCH [4] - 3:8, 3:10, 132:4, 135:20 strategic [1] - 138:14 **strategize** [1] - 93:10 strategy [3] - 32:25, 97:6. 97:17 Street [17] - 2:9, 3:4, 3:6, 3:11, 3:14, 4:10, 4:14, 4:18, 5:14, 5:17, 5:20, 5:22, 6:3, 6:7, 6:10, 6:13, 6:17 strict [3] - 23:4, 87:17 strived [1] - 109:7 strives [1] - 88:23 strongest [1] - 131:14 strongly [2] - 35:5, 78:11 structure [44] - 16:5, 17:1, 20:15, 21:11, 24:20, 24:21, 27:10, 30:19, 31:14, 35:15, 36:1, 36:2, 39:8, 40:1, 40:3, 41:16, 42:22, 43:3, 43:22, 46:15, 49:8, 52:13, 52:15, 52:25, 53:21, 59:17, 61:10, 61:12, 65:17, 65:23, 66:3, 66:4, 66:5, 66:7, 78:1, 115:15, 115:16, 115:23, 119:15, 123:1, 124:24, 136:7, 140:3 structured [1] - 20:18 **structuring** [1] - 35:23

studied [1] - 89:6 studies [2] - 64:8, 64:17 **study** [3] - 58:8, 58:9, 80:13 studying [2] - 22:8, 56:3 stuff [2] - 68:1, 68:9 subclass [2] - 57:24, 127:11 subclasses [1] - 62:6 subcommittee [1] -53:15 subcommittees [1] -17:3 **submission** [4] - 9:13, 42:21, 50:18, 51:2 submit [3] - 29:25, 50:16, 54:18 submitted [2] - 50:17, 50:20 substantial [3] -72:21, 102:18, 135:16 substantive [4] - 48:9, 57:15, 97:8, 129:22 substantively [1] -83:18 successes [1] - 134:8 successful [6] -28:11, 34:3, 34:11, 34:17, 84:21, 114:22 successfully [2] -24:18, 112:10 **suffice** [1] - 136:19 sufficiency [1] - 18:1 sufficient [1] - 42:25 suggest [13] - 41:16, 42:24, 44:2, 44:10, 45:12, 61:13, 61:22, 62:12, 64:3, 91:7, 93:5, 124:4, 136:11 suggested [8] - 39:25, 42:20, 49:11, 54:5, 61:12, 62:16, 123:2, 136:22 suggesting [3] -24:10, 24:12, 24:13 suggestion [3] - 53:8, 61:10, 137:6 suggests [2] - 69:25, 71:14 suing [1] - 22:7 Suite [14] - 1:16, 2:4, 2:6, 3:9, 3:14, 3:16, 3:23, 4:4, 4:7, 4:14, 5:7, 5:9, 5:20, 5:22 Sullivan [4] - 9:15.

84:5, 94:13, 119:11

SULLIVAN [1] - 6:16

summarize [1] - 63:1 summary [1] - 95:17 Sung [1] - 128:21 Sung-Yun [1] - 128:21 Super [1] - 118:9 **supplier** [1] - 117:13 support [7] - 59:21, 96:1, 100:11, 101:5, 121:3, 121:17, 124:21 supported [4] - 46:22, 52:15, 53:8, 88:13 supporting [3] - 48:7, 52:25. 54:19 supports [1] - 50:13 suppose [4] - 75:10, 75:21, 76:4 **supreme** [1] - 121:6 surest [1] - 47:10 surprise [1] - 133:17 surprised [1] - 124:16 surreal [2] - 101:15, 101:17 surreptitiously [1] -136:16 surrounded [1] -46:22 survived [1] - 101:9 Susan [1] - 128:3 **SUSAN** [1] - 5:11 suspect [2] - 31:18, 76:19 sustain [1] - 78:21 **SUVs** [1] - 68:15 system [5] - 42:2, 48:3, 48:21, 50:14, 85.8 systems [1] - 107:14

Т

table [5] - 36:14, 36:15, 60:19, 81:23, 131:15 Takata [1] - 138:11 talent [4] - 87:13, 89:1, 124:17, 139:6 talented [4] - 36:3, 93:16, 94:1, 123:23 tam [1] - 108:7 tapped [1] - 59:13 tasks [4] - 43:10, 43:11, 97:4, 108:1 taught [1] - 86:20 Taylor's [1] - 135:24 teachers [1] - 79:24 teaches [1] - 46:19 team [49] - 23:24, 25:22, 29:13, 29:14, 29:15, 29:16, 29:17,

29:19, 31:11, 35:21, 35:25, 36:12, 37:19, 48:2, 55:24, 64:11, 65:3, 67:14, 79:18, 81:23, 82:9, 82:12, 84:24, 84:25, 86:4, 92:1, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22. 95:19. 95:20. 97:23, 104:16, 105:14, 109:3, 109:15, 128:11, 128:14, 130:22, 131:8, 133:5, 136:9, 136:19, 136:21, 138:8 teams [5] - 27:1, 64:8, 106:4, 133:6, 138:3 tech [1] - 130:13 technical [17] - 12:23, 15:11, 15:23, 19:23, 19:24, 22:17, 23:4, 25:19, 36:6, 37:18, 56:8, 82:11, 82:14, 82:18, 93:7, 121:13 technically [1] - 26:3 technology [4] -23:17, 51:3, 79:25, Ted [1] - 102:24 telephone [3] - 11:2, 110:22, 111:9 **Telephonic** [2] - 7:2, 14:6 **TELLIS** [3] - 3:24, 135:22, 139:1 Tellis [4] - 36:9, 135:21, 136:1, 138:25 Tem [1] - 1:24 temperature [1] -70.14 temptation [1] - 124:7 ten [16] - 21:12, 22:2, 25:14, 37:10, 52:16, 54:5, 54:9, 69:17, 72:6, 72:12, 76:13, 84:8, 92:5, 101:19, 131:6 **Ten** [1] - 6:10 ten-person [1] - 69:17 tenacity [1] - 94:20 tendency [1] - 67:13 Tennessee [1] - 132:7 tension [2] - 65:1, 88:25 terms [38] - 17:8, 17:10, 21:25, 22:17,

34:6, 37:12, 49:10,

52:12, 52:17, 54:4,

54:20, 62:1, 62:12,

63:9, 66:2, 67:18, 70:3, 71:20, 72:8, 72:19, 74:1, 77:8, 97:5, 97:6, 97:17, 98:3, 103:7, 104:15, 105:13, 106:5, 108:5, 109:20, 129:6, 130:12, 131:1, 131:9, 131:17, 131:19 test [4] - 10:13, 10:17, 26:17, 138:7 tested [3] - 39:15, 39:20, 47:8 testing [28] - 10:14, 10:16, 10:18, 10:19, 10:20, 11:9, 15:2, 15:4, 17:25, 18:16, 20:25, 22:17, 22:19, 25:19, 26:17, 39:19, 58:18, 59:1, 70:12, 70:17, 80:2, 80:4, 80:8, 85:9, 85:10, 98:22, 135:1 tests [4] - 13:1, 80:16, 81:8, 81:13 THE [174] - 1:4, 2:6, 8:4, 8:7, 8:10, 10:1, 10:6, 11:19, 11:21, 12:12, 13:25, 14:3, 14:7, 14:16, 14:22, 15:5, 15:8, 15:12, 15:15, 15:25, 16:3, 16:13, 16:15, 17:21, 19:25, 20:6, 21:10, 22:21, 23:8, 23:10, 24:9, 25:10, 27:3, 27:24, 28:1, 28:4, 30:2. 30:21. 31:2. 31:4, 31:7, 32:12, 33:20, 34:21, 35:2, 37:5, 37:8, 37:25, 38:2, 38:14, 39:1, 39:24, 40:9, 41:1, 42:9, 42:11, 42:15, 43:14, 44:7, 44:19, 45:7, 46:5, 46:10, 46:13, 47:18, 49:9, 50:5, 51:6, 51:8, 51:10, 51:11, 51:12, 52:5, 52:7, 53:3, 53:13, 53:17, 55:15, 55:17, 55:20, 56:10, 59:17, 61:6, 63:23, 65:5, 65:7, 65:11, 65:20, 69:20, 70:6, 71:5, 73:21, 74:16, 76:2, 76:11, 77:5, 77:10, 77:19, 78:15, 78:25, 79:15, 80:21,

80:24, 81:4, 82:7, 82:14, 82:18, 83:2, 83:7, 83:13, 85:19, 85:22, 86:24, 89:16, 89:18, 92:16, 92:22, 93:19, 93:21, 94:22, 95:8, 95:21, 96:3, 96:20. 97:2. 97:23. 99:16, 99:18, 101:16, 102:22, 104:12, 106:15, 106:17, 106:22, 107:1, 109:11, 109:15, 109:20, 109:25, 110:3, 110:5, 110:7, 110:12, 113:12, 113:15, 114:2, 115:4, 116:1, 116:6, 116:10, 116:12, 116:14, 118:4, 119:3, 119:15, 122:16, 123:15, 125:7, 125:23, 125:25, 127:9, 128:16, 128:20, 130:4, 130:8, 130:11, 130:20, 131:13, 131:25, 132:3, 135:19, 135:21, 138:25, 139:2 themselves [5] -33:10, 63:13, 67:6, 78:21, 128:12 **THEODORE** [1] - 2:5 theory [1] - 100:19 therapeutic [1] - 49:13 therefore [1] - 108:4 they've [4] - 25:21, 77:3, 79:24, 135:1 thinking [12] - 19:17, 20:10, 21:23, 34:17, 35:8, 39:2, 48:16, 53:17, 65:22, 85:21, 86:7, 95:18 thinks [3] - 13:13, 69:12, 99:12 third [1] - 35:19 Third [1] - 3:16 third-party [1] - 35:19 thorny [2] - 21:18, 88:17 thoughts [7] - 16:4, 21:13, 21:14, 27:3, 30:7, 31:2, 59:17 thousand [1] - 72:7 thousands [1] - 18:19

threat [1] - 38:23

three [33] - 25:8,

27:15, 36:11, 40:14, 40:16, 51:23, 59:22, 66:8, 66:21, 67:2, 67:24, 68:10, 68:12, 69:11, 69:12, 72:2, 76:10, 76:16, 78:8, 81:16, 87:20, 90:12, 94:15. 94:18. 100:8. 108:21, 109:16, 116:4, 121:19, 121:23, 121:24, 124:24, 125:3 three-liter [4] - 67:24, 69:11, 69:12, 81:16 three-phase [1] - 25:8 threshold [1] - 44:22 throughout [7] -43:11, 74:21, 82:2, 103:16, 113:24, 127:25, 134:9 throwing [1] - 72:20 tied [1] - 52:14 tier [2] - 60:6, 117:13 tiered [1] - 52:15 timekeeping [1] -87:17 timeline [1] - 12:12 timelines [1] - 34:6 timing [3] - 15:10, 15:12, 124:1 TINA[1] - 2:19 Tina [1] - 61:8 TN [1] - 3:9 Tobacco [1] - 121:9 today [34] - 24:7, 31:13, 31:18, 31:20, 32:3, 32:10, 51:15, 51:20, 52:1, 52:9, 52:10, 55:14, 61:1, 87:2, 88:20, 89:2, 90:20, 91:15, 92:3, 92:9, 94:12, 100:8, 103:4, 106:2, 114:21, 119:7, 124:5, 125:22, 127:13, 128:2, 128:24, 136:18, 137:6, 138:17 Todd [1] - 122:22 **TODD** [1] - 5:21 together [13] - 38:11, 44:5, 52:14, 89:11, 102:11, 104:17, 114:7, 124:4, 124:8, 124:19, 125:2, 128:8, 128:11 **TOLL** [1] - 2:3 Toll [1] - 102:25 took [4] - 75:11, 85:2, 101:12, 111:7

tools [1] - 26:1 top [7] - 17:18, 28:23, 30:9, 85:25, 97:5, 97:17, 99:6 topically [1] - 91:18 tort [2] - 89:9, 105:5 total [3] - 80:19, 90:13, 90:14 Touch [5] - 19:5, 19:9, 21:22, 22:23, 136:5 tough [1] - 27:7 toward [2] - 36:24, 128:14 towards [3] - 38:13, 38:24, 49:23 town [1] - 81:10 Toyota [2] - 114:9, 114:15 track [13] - 33:8, 53:11, 59:6, 61:19, 61:20, 67:20, 89:4, 92:11, 92:12, 99:24, 99:25, 137:24 tracked [1] - 84:23 tracks [2] - 53:9, 100.2 traded [1] - 134:4 traffic [1] - 127:4 trajectory [1] - 49:23 TRANSCRIPT [1] -1:12 transcript [1] - 140:10 translate [2] - 26:2, 56:11 translated [2] - 22:12, 73:3 translation [4] - 26:1, 26:7, 36:5, 131:20 translators [1] - 56:14 transparent [1] -137:12 transpire [1] - 106:12 transport [1] - 126:16 Transportation [1] -90:11 travel [1] - 50:8 treadmill [1] - 80:3 treating [1] - 46:20 tremendous [2] -61:3, 139:6 trial [61] - 25:8, 26:13, 26:14, 26:16, 29:11, 29:13, 29:14, 29:15, 35:20, 36:16, 36:24, 37:5, 38:15, 38:18, 39:7, 49:12, 49:14, 49:15, 49:18, 49:23, 49:24, 51:23, 53:10, 53:14, 53:21, 73:6,

73:22, 84:18, 84:20,

84:23, 92:12, 92:15, 92:19, 93:8, 93:11, 93:13, 94:16, 94:20, 94:22, 100:1, 100:2, 100:5, 100:21, 101:20, 113:25, 120:1, 124:4, 127:22. 127:23. 127:24, 130:20, 130:21, 130:22, 130:23, 130:25, 131:2, 132:23, 133:6, 135:11 trials [3] - 65:18, 127:23, 137:2 Tribunal [1] - 102:4 tried [7] - 27:17, 48:23, 68:4, 92:4, 92:5, 124:4, 129:16 trip [4] - 56:20, 56:24, 57:16, 139:21 truck [3] - 79:14, 103:23, 132:10 trucks [23] - 13:16, 57:23, 68:22, 69:19, 70:20, 71:3, 73:9, 81:20, 90:12, 90:13, 90:15, 90:17, 90:18, 90:20, 91:3, 99:10, 107:13, 112:24, 115:13, 132:6, 132:8, 132:9 true [6] - 120:10, 123:9, 128:23, 129:7, 129:9, 129:16 truly [1] - 128:12 Trump [2] - 100:4, 101:8 **trump's** [1] - 101:12 try [5] - 13:8, 43:22, 75:1, 75:12, 79:9 trying [6] - 14:4, 29:25, 40:1, 74:22, 90:4, 129:4 turn [4] - 21:3, 41:4, 64:25, 126:12 turned [2] - 51:24, 61:23 Turner [2] - 6:9, 114:4 turns [3] - 58:25, 101:22, 110:6 **TV** [1] - 101:13 TVM [1] - 121:10 tweak [1] - 40:6 twelve [3] - 25:14, 29:22, 115:2 twice [1] - 9:1 twists [1] - 101:22 two [63] - 21:15, 21:25, 25:5, 30:1,

30:8, 35:14, 39:5, 40:13, 42:24, 43:6, 43:24, 47:3, 47:14, 48:7, 50:1, 59:10, 61:13, 66:7, 66:21, 67:2, 67:14, 67:24, 67:25, 68:5, 68:10, 68:22. 69:19. 70:20. 72:2, 74:2, 75:16, 75:22, 75:23, 76:12, 84:23, 85:13, 85:24, 86:2, 86:3, 87:8, 87:20, 91:1, 91:5, 96:24, 98:18, 103:8, 105:16, 105:20, 109:15, 109:18, 109:19, 117:25, 121:19, 121:23, 121:24, 122:6, 128:2, 131:7, 132:24, 136:11, 137:10, 138:20 two-fold [1] - 103:8 two-lawyer [1] - 35:14 two-liter [3] - 67:24, 67:25, 68:5 two-person [1] -105:16 two-tracked [1] -84:23 TX [1] - 5:4 type [8] - 50:3, 89:1, 96:19, 97:21, 98:3, 103:23, 105:13 types [4] - 50:1, 68:11, 68:22, 102:1 typically [5] - 64:19, 71:14, 109:16, 111:23, 127:1

U

U.S [9] - 2:12, 6:15, 28:21, 57:20, 58:14, 84:19, 90:11, 94:7, 140:18 **UC** [1] - 58:8 ultimate [1] - 108:8 ultimately [9] - 32:5, 54:16, 54:24, 66:24, 68:6, 72:8, 88:11, 88:14, 123:9 **UN**[1] - 102:3 unbeknownst [1] -91:3 uncertainty [2] -14:23, 23:22 undeniable [1] -115:19 under [9] - 13:18,

understood [1] -122:8 undertake [1] - 18:4 unfold [2] - 23:20, 52:14 unfolding [1] - 17:7 unfortunately [2] -64:12, 93:23 unilateral [1] - 104:2 unique [8] - 20:20, 83:19, 83:22, 83:25, 86:10, 87:25, 95:2, 108:9 uniquely [3] - 17:23, 20:18, 132:25 unit [2] - 56:23, 138:4 **UNITED** [1] - 1:2 United [9] - 14:15, 16:7, 28:23, 86:18, 88:10, 90:20, 97:1, 117:18, 125:17 units [1] - 12:9 University [5] - 2:6, 56:4, 80:14, 100:4, 101:8 University's [1] -79:21 unless [6] - 23:3, 37:20, 46:3, 115:24, 125:6, 135:18 unlike [2] - 76:25, 134:10 unnecessary [2] -43:3, 43:5 unprecedented [1] -101:22 unprompted [1] -115:17 unwritten [1] - 18:9 **up** [30] - 21:16, 34:25, 42:17, 43:13, 45:1, 52:16, 54:5, 60:5, 64:1, 66:8, 68:3, 70:15, 77:25, 78:8, 79:9, 84:25, 90:1, 98:2, 107:1, 107:2, 112:8, 113:3, 114:22, 115:2, 117:1, 134:4, 134:10, 135:6, 136:2, 138:5

update [3] - 9:11,

19:8, 23:22, 29:21,

30:1, 35:17, 72:24,

underscore [1] - 55:1

86:18, 121:11

understaffed [1] -

understated [1] -

84:12

24:19

13:25, 14:9
updates [1] - 14:13
urge [1] - 78:11
urgency [5] - 23:23,
53:25, 124:2, 125:4
useful [3] - 47:1,
52:21, 53:6
utilize [1] - 62:2
utilized [1] - 42:2

V

Valley [1] - 128:3 valuable [3] - 98:8, 99:7, 122:2 value [11] - 13:22, 71:3, 74:8, 74:10, 126:13, 126:21, 126:22, 126:25, 127:2, 127:5, 127:8 values [1] - 73:13 varied [1] - 60:18 variety [1] - 138:1 various [3] - 10:12, 109:13, 124:12 Varnado [4] - 6:2, 110:23, 111:6 **Varnado's** [1] - 111:11 vast [3] - 63:4, 96:25, 111:24 vehicle [8] - 13:18, 69:12, 75:4, 81:10, 126:11, 126:18, 126:20, 127:7 Vehicles [1] - 125:14 vehicles [43] - 9:20, 9:24, 11:13, 11:16, 11:17, 11:18, 11:23, 12:2, 12:10, 13:22, 33:5, 35:6, 56:23, 57:7, 57:24, 58:10, 58:13, 67:21, 67:22, 67:23, 67:24, 67:25, 69:11, 70:22, 72:7, 72:14, 74:10, 75:7, 80:1, 80:2, 80:8, 80:18, 81:7, 82:12, 91:1, 117:24, 125:17, 126:5, 126:14, 136:17, 138:6 Ventura [1] - 3:23 venue [1] - 128:6 verdict [1] - 114:16 verdicts [1] - 103:12 veritable [1] - 109:3 versus [3] - 30:6, 65:18, 78:13 vetted [2] - 62:5, 62:8

view [4] - 27:6, 61:16,

63:23, 74:18 View [1] - 5:10 views [3] - 73:18, 88:12, 136:12 vigorous [1] - 86:21 vintage [1] - 103:19 violation [2] - 18:2, 58:23 Virginia [7] - 79:11, 79:20, 80:14, 112:24, 121:2, 122:16, 132:6 Virginian [1] - 82:16 virtually [4] - 63:2, 82:1. 90:25. 100:11 vision [1] - 17:9 voice [3] - 32:23, 33:8, 33:23 Volkswagen [43] -23:16, 24:3, 24:6, 24:8, 24:15, 24:18, 24:24, 25:18, 25:21, 25:24, 26:2, 26:14, 27:1, 27:5, 27:9, 27:17, 28:9, 29:11, 31:14, 32:4, 32:6, 33:14, 34:10, 45:5, 71:6, 81:16, 81:24, 82:3, 91:16, 91:20, 94:8, 113:20, 114:8, 120:17, 121:11, 122:1, 122:5, 122:7, 124:8, 124:9, 133:5, 134:7, 138:1 voting [1] - 135:13 **VW** [46] - 12:20, 17:7, 27:22, 39:5, 39:11, 40:6, 40:21, 41:20, 52:24, 55:4, 55:24, 56:19, 56:23, 56:25, 57:1, 57:18, 58:13, 58:17, 60:15, 60:25, 65:18, 66:11, 67:13, 67:18, 67:22, 68:15, 68:25. 69:9. 69:23. 70:5, 72:13, 74:10, 76:25, 77:22, 78:9, 84:21, 85:15, 86:4, 86:16, 100:17, 101:3, 107:15, 115:19, 120:12 **VWs** [1] - 58:10

W

vying [1] - 66:21

WA [2] - 1:16, 3:17 wait [2] - 20:23, 38:19 waiting [1] - 110:17 Walker [1] - 4:9

wants [5] - 13:4, 21:18, 27:13, 27:14, 45:16 war [2] - 76:11, 123:22 warranties [1] -117:14 warrants [1] - 25:10 **Warriors** [1] - 139:22 Washington [2] -2:14, 6:21 waste [1] - 24:24 watch [1] - 139:22 Water [1] - 2:9 ways [8] - 47:24, 52:18, 53:7, 56:5, 64:13, 98:6, 131:23, 132:24 we.. [1] - 82:19 Weaver [2] - 30:11, 55:21 weaver [4] - 55:18, 100:14, 120:13, 134:3 **WEAVER** [5] - 3:15, 55:19, 55:21, 56:12, 59.18 Webster [1] - 114:6 Wednesday [3] - 1:10, 8:1. 140:13 weeds [1] - 38:11 week [1] - 10:17 weekend [2] - 51:25, 100:25 weeks [10] - 13:15, 14:24, 36:11, 51:23, 57:19, 75:16, 75:17, 76:12, 108:21, 112:19 weight [2] - 70:13, 118:20 Weinstein [1] - 44:13 WEISERLBERG [1] -4:6 Weiss [1] - 51:14 **WEISS** [1] - 2:9 welcome [1] - 14:7 well-crafted [1] -137:4 well-known [1] -127:24 well-respected [1] -98:24 well-working [1] -29:7 Wells [1] - 94:6 West [13] - 2:6, 2:18, 4:4, 5:9, 5:17, 79:11,

79:20, 80:13, 82:16,

112:24, 121:2,

122:16, 132:6

whatnot [2] - 112:7, 112:24 whatsoever [2] - 53:5, 73:6 whereby [1] - 13:16 whole [1] - 67:13 wholeheartedly [1] -59:23 wildly [2] - 34:2, 49:16 **William** [1] - 7:5 willing [5] - 24:7, 52:3, 90:7, 93:9, 122:24 wins [1] - 32:24 wise [1] - 131:3 withdrew [1] - 88:13 witness [1] - 60:18 witnesses [1] - 133:12 Wolfson [4] - 61:7, 61:8, 61:9, 65:7 **WOLFSON** [5] - 2:17, 2:19, 61:8, 63:25, 65:6 women [4] - 64:16, 64:20, 79:19, 102:12 wonderful [2] - 23:17, 105:8 wondering [1] - 107:1 word [2] - 57:3 words [2] - 90:19, 96:5 works [17] - 10:24, 19:11, 27:23, 35:11, 36:18, 48:3, 62:17, 63:14, 71:6, 73:15, 73:16, 74:4, 79:18, 110:24, 111:3, 135:24, 137:22 world [9] - 36:25, 37:2, 47:25, 64:8, 87:7, 112:2, 116:24, 120:3, 122:7 worldwide [1] -108:18 Worm [2] - 7:6, 15:19 worn [1] - 123:19 worth [2] - 59:10,

120:24, 122:6, 123:18 years [36] - 12:5, 51:3, 59:10, 63:1, 63:2, 74:15, 81:4, 84:8, 87:20, 89:25, 93:18, 94:3, 94:11, 94:14, 95:1, 102:9, 102:16, 103:8, 103:10, 104:25, 106:6, 107:4, 107:5, 109:1, 112:5, 117:2, 117:6, 119:25, 120:24, 121:4, 121:8, 121:15, 122:6, 129:16, 129:21, 129:23 years' [1] - 136:4 yesterday [3] - 11:2, 114:22, 118:13 yield [1] - 101:21 York [5] - 2:10, 3:7, 5:7, 6:17, 121:1 young [2] - 59:8, 125:19 younger [2] - 49:2, 79:20 yourself [2] - 82:15, 125:12 Yugoslavia [1] - 102:4 Yun [1] - 128:21

Ζ

Zeman [2] - 88:20, 89:5 **ZEMAN** [1] - 4:19

Υ

88:15 write [1] - 98:22 writing [1] - 97:8 written [1] - 88:18 wrongdoing [1] - 99:1 Wu [3] - 87:24, 88:1,

88:14 **WV** [1] - 3:12

year [10] - 9:23, 11:17, 20:6, 25:6, 25:9, 60:12, 118:16,