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NEW ORLEANS，LOUISIANA；THURSDAY，JANUARY 22， 2015 9：00 A．M．

THE COURT：Be seated，please．Good morning，call the 08：55AM case．

CASE MANAGER：In re： 2047 in re：Chinese 08：55AM 08：59AM

Manufactured Drywall Products Liability litigation．
THE COURT：This is our monthly status conference in this matter．I＇m hear from liaison counsel．

MR．LEVIN：Good morning，Your Honor．Arnold Levin，09：01AM substituting for Russ Herman，who is the plaintiff＇s liaison．09：01AM

MR．MILLER：Good morning，Your Honor．Kerry Miller on behalf of Knauf and the defense steering committee．

THE COURT：I met with lead and liaison counsel moment ago to discuss the agenda．

We don＇t have any motions necessarily on the agenda but I＇ll take it on the order．

Do we have anything on Pretrial Orders？
MR．LEVIN：No，sir．But BrownGreer will issue a report to the Court today that speaks to the money that＇s flowing to the clients．

THE COURT：Anything on State Court Trial Settings？09：01AM
MS．BARRIOS：Your Honor，the three cases that are listed in the joint report on page five are pending now in Virginia，and we have hopes that they＇ll be able to be resolved by Mr．Serpe．

| But I'd like to just jump head and talk about the | 09:01AM |
| :---: | :---: |
| Virginia class action settlements. Garretson Group did not come | 09:02AM |
| today. They asked me to make a very simple report. | 09:02AM |
| The other loss fund deadline is over. They are | 09:02AM |
| now reviewing all the claim forms. They are in the process of | 09:02AM |
| preparing the deficiency notices, which should go out by the end | 09:02AM |
| of the month. They've been in very close contact with Jake | 09:02AM |
| Woody at BrownGreer, particularly with regard to your last order | 09:02AM |
| on the other loss funds and the payouts. And they're talking | 09:02AM |
| about all issues with regard to it, particularly the | 09:02AM |
| Medicare-Medicaid injury with regard to the bodily injury | 09:02AM |
| payments. | 09:02AM |
| Thank you. | 09:02AM |
| MR. LEVIN: That's a segue for one thing on the | 09:02AM |
| Virginia settlements. Not necessarily the Virginia settlement, | 09:02AM |
| but Mr. Serpe is explaining to the Taishan plaintiffs on a | 09:02AM |
| one-to-one basis, answering calls and effectively steering them | 09:02AM |
| to make decisions with regard to the class certification order | 09:02AM |
| of this Court with regard to Taishan and the assessment of | 09:03AM |
| damages hearing which will take place during the February | 09:03AM |
| pretrial conference, sir. | 09:03AM |
| THE COURT: All right. That case seems to be going | 09:03AM |
| well. I appreciate the help that the judge is giving to it. | 09:03AM |
| She and I have worked closely on this matter and she's been a | 09:03AM |
| great help to us in this proceeding. | 09:03AM |
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While we are on that，Jake，give me a report on what＇s happening with regard to the money．

MR．WOODY：Good morning，Your Honor．My name is Jake Woody，from BrownGreer．I＇m here to give the monthly status report for the Chinese Drywall settlement program．

I＇ll start very briefly，just as I always do，with our total number of claims to set the stage．

Total submitted claims is 22,491 ．Of those，we reviewed 19，726．We＇re complete with all claim types other than miscellaneous claims．We＇re actively reviewing those claims and should be done with those in short order．

Our largest claim type，as you know，is our Global Banner IN／EX repair and relocation claims．Those are settlements for a pro rata share of three different settlements， the Global settlement，the Banner settlement and the IN／EX settlement．We had just under 10，000 eligible claims in this 09：04AM category，9，983．We＇ve denied 1，674 largely for insufficient 09：04AM documentation or because the claimants submitted a claim that 09：04AM they had previously assigned to another claim．

THE COURT：So the denied doesn＇t mean that they＇re not going to get some money but they＇re going to get it from another fund？

MR．WOODY：They are denied for this claim type，but they could potentially receive claim from other loss fund or for other loss claim．
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These numbers change month to month largely
because we have claimants withdrawing claims．
We＇re at the stage in this claim type where we are 09：05Am essentially reconciling duplicate claims．We＇re only authorized 09：05AM to make payment per property．The claims that haven＇t been paid are largely claims where we have that issue．As we work through them，claimants generally withdraw them．We see duplicate claims in many cases for spouses who submitted two claims out an abundance of caution and also where we have competing claims where one claimant has received an assignment and the other assigned the claim．We＇re reconciling those，and largely are able to do that on our own．

We began issuing payments on GBI claims on September 12 th of last year．So far，we＇ve issued 11，770 checks．The number of checks is larger than the number of claimants because many claimants are eligible for payment from multiple settlements．So they would receive two checks for one claim．So far，we have distributed just over $\$ 54.8$ million． That＇s an increase of 1.7 million from the last status conference．

We make payments every day．The number fluctuates as we＇re able to reconcile these duplicate claimant issues．We also require a $W$－9 and a verification of claims from claimants before we make payment．As we receive those，we put them in line for payment and issue checks．
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| Both of those forms are available on our website. | 09:06AM |
| :---: | :---: |
| I'll give the address at the end of this presentation. | 09:06AM |
| We have \$21.3 million left to distribute. As I | 09:06AM |
| mentioned, we continue to make payments every day and this | 09:06AM |
| process is largely stable and we're not seeing any problems with | 09:06AM |
| it. | 09:06AM |
| The claims that are not Global, Banner, IN-EX | 09:06AM |
| claims, we refer to as Other Loss Claims, and these fit in a | 09:06AM |
| variety of categories. Our four main Other Loss claims | 09:07AM |
| are bodily injury; foreclosure and short sale; lost rent, use | 09:07AM |
| and sales; and pre-remediation alternative living expenses, | 09:07AM |
| which we abbreviate as PRALE here. | 09:07AM |
| We have just over 4,000 claims in these four claim | 09:07AM |
| types; 428, to be exactly. Of those 2,527 are eligible. 44 are | 09:07AM |
| incomplete. As I always mention, the incompleteness number | 09:07AM |
| changes every month. Last month, it was 100. The month before, | 09:07AM |
| I think it was 200. So you can see the progress we're making in | 09:07AM |
| reconciling those and moving them from either incomplete to | 09:07AM |
| eligible if they satisfy the document requirements or denying | 09:07AM |
| them for failure to submit those documents. | 09:07AM |
| Because of the low number of incomplete claims, | 09:07AM |
| we're able to work with the parties and the court to draft and | 09:07AM |
| submit PTO-29, which allow us to begin making payments on | 09:07AM |
| eligible Other Loss claims. | 09:07AM |
| The Court entered this order on December 23 rd. | 09:07AM |
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We've received a lot of questions, and I'd like to just go through some of the high points of PTO-29.

PTO-29 allow us to make what we call resolution offers on eligible Other Loss claims of varying amounts. For bodily injury, it's up to $\$ 1,000$. For closure short sale claims, it's up to $\$ 10,000$. For loss use or sales, it's up to \$10,000. For lost rent, it's three times the verified monthly rent for rental property. For PRALE claims, it's \$14,400. It's up to $\$ 14,400$. And miscellaneous tenant losses are up to $\$ 2,500$.

These amounts are essentially modified pro rata share of the amount available for Other Loss claims, which is $\$ 37.7$ millin. It's not a straight pro rata or distribution because each claim has a different value. But within each claim type, it is a pro rata number. That's where we got those numbers from and that's how we're proceeding.

We will issue eligibility notices and have begun issuing eligibility notices on Other Loss claims that list the resolution offer.

I should also mention, before $I$ move on, that the up to -- this is an up to number. So, if we review the claim and determine that the verified losses are less than the numbers that I mentioned, we make the lower offer.

And whatever the offer is will be in the eligibility notice. We'll issue these through our standard

```
notice process.
```

The notices contain instructions on how toto the special master who will review them independently of us and make a determination．

Claimants who do not take any action within thirty days will be deemed to have accepted the offer；and，if all

What happens when a claimant requests this is yet to be determined．There＇s a number of variables at issue．The special master，as I mentioned，will do a review independent of ours and come up with a determination．

If a claimant accepts the resolution offer，we will make payment rapidly．Generally，within seven days of the acceptance．Assuming，of course，that the $\mathrm{W}-9$ verification of 09：10AM the claims form are present．

| If you already submitted those documents in | 09:10AM |
| :---: | :---: |
| support of another claim, of a GBI claim, you do not need to | 09:10AM |
| submit them again. We only need these documents once per claim. | 09:10AM |
| If a claimant wishes to request a Special Master | 09:11AM |
| Award, you cannot submit an additional documents. The time to | 09:11AM |
| submit supporting documents has passed, along with the claims | 09:11AM |
| deadline. You can, however -- and we prefer that you submit | 09:11AM |
| something that tells us where in your claim what we should look | 09:11AM |
| at: A list of itemized expenses that you think support your | 09:11AM |
| request and you can refer to documents you've already admitted | 09:11AM |
| to us. That will help streamline the special master review and | 09:11AM |
| speed up the process. | 09:11AM |
| Finally, we have received a lot of questions about | 09:11AM |
| the timeline associated with that special master. We anticipate | 09:11AM |
| having the vast majority of all eligibility notices on Other | 09:11AM |
| Loss claims issued by the first week of February. That will | 09:11AM |
| start the thirty-day clock on all the claims. We will not be | 09:11AM |
| able to grant deadline extensions for those claims. | 09:11AM |
| So the deadline for almost all the Other Loss | 09:11AM |
| claims should expire some time in the first week of March. Once | 09:11AM |
| we have a good idea of how many people want a special master | 09:12AM |
| review and how many want to be paid, we'll be able to make a | 09:12AM |
| better evaluation of how long it will take. However, because | 09:12AM |
| all of the claim documents are already in because we've reviewed | 09:12AM |
| all the claims, it will not take as long as the claim process. | 09:12AM |
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It will be a shorter process
THE COURT: All right. We'll have some indication by 09:12AM next meeting, I would think.

MR. WOODY: I think so.
As I mentioned, have begun issuing eligible notices on these claims. So far, we've issued just over a thousand on three different claim types. We've issued all the eligibility notices for bodily injury and foreclosure and short sale claims and we've issued 200 notices on PRALE claims. And we'll continue to issue notices, as I mentioned, on all of the remaining PRALE claims as well as the lost rent, use and sales claims.

So we've issued just over 1,000. We've received responses on 176 claims. 159 offers have been accepted. Seventeen have requested the special master review, which puts our acceptance rate at ninety percent.

And we've also begun issuing payment on Other Loss claims. We began earlier this week. We've paid forty-three claims and disbursed $\$ 393,800$. We'll continue make payments on accepted claims, and should have payment out pretty quickly within the date of acceptance and resolve as many of these claims as we can.

Finally, our contact information, the best place to obtain the $W$-9 verification form I mentioned are on our website at www3.BrownGreer.com/drywall. If you need to email
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us, you can do it at CDWquestions@BrownGreer. And you can call us at 866-866-1729.

THE COURT: Thank you.
The next item is Omnibus Class Actions. Anything on that?

MR. LEVIN: Just one personal thing.
The PSC has listened to the BrownGreer report each and every month, and I just want BrownGreer to know how appreciative we have of the work they are doing and the manner in which they're doing the work.

THE COURT: Yes. They've done a good job, and I appreciate that also.

MR. LEVIN: With regard to the Class Action Complaints, 09:14AM the Omnibus, there's just one aspect of the complaints that's 09:14AM outstanding. We have a complaint against SASAC in China right 09:14AM now. And, if SASAC behaves as CMBM behaved and BMBM behaved in 09:14AM the past and doesn't enter an appearance and come in here, for 09:14AM whatever reasons, but appear in these proceedings, at that 09:14AM point, in about six weeks, we're prepared to take a default 09:14AM judgment against SASAC. And then we will pursue assessment of a 09:15AM class action as we pursued against CMBM and BMBM an assessment 09:15AM of damages against SASAC, which is the umbrella corporation that has a lot of interests in the United States.

THE COURT: How about Class Action, the last item?
MR. LEVIN: That would be it, sir.
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THE COURT：The next item is Fee Expense．
MR．LEVIN：There＇s nothing new on that．
THE COURT：In connection with that，I have received 09：15AM 09：15AM
from Danny Becnel letters showing copies to you and to Arnold．
Danny，you want to flesh that out for me，the issue here on Sean Payton．

MR．BECNEL：Judge，as you know，Sean was living across the lake in the Super Bowl year，in Mandeville，in a rather expensive home．He and his wife，the minute it was finished， had to move out．He then had to live in the Saint＇s training camp for the whole season，and his wife wound up having to get another house．So she moved．The Chinese drywall case really resulted in the dissolution of their marriage．

And he approached me．As you know，I represent many of the Saints：Mickey Loomis，the general manager，Drew Brees and many of the team members．

And so I handled that case by myself．I negotiated the settlement by myself．And I don＇t mind if all the other cases I have with the plaintiff＇s committee gets a fee．But this case was purely me．And I could have settled it probably a week after they were notified that I had Sean Payton．

In any event，I＇d like to get paid on it．And

THE COURT：All right．
09：17AM
MR．BECNEL：And I don＇t think the PSC has a claim 09：17AM against those funds．

I did the inspections myself．In fact，it was drywall case．

THE COURT：Well，you know，in this case，I guess the beauty of it is so forth，from the standpoint of the litigants themselves，is that the defendant，the settlements call for the defendant paying the attorney fees．

Let me hear from Arnold．
MR．LEVIN：I will not hold it against Danny Becnel and Sean Payton that they＇ve had their way with the Philadelphia Eagles for some time now．

Getting to the merits of Mr ．Becnel＇s request． The fee committee has conducted extensive interviews with every plaintiff＇s counsel that is seeking a common benefit fee，and the fee committee has taken all of that under advisement．And I can assure Mr．Becnel that those issues are being discussed by the fee committee．

There will be a report，and he will be able to review that report and take whatever action．

I might add that，at the interview，the situation
fee committee is available－－is aware of his representation of the lead plaintiff in the omnibus complaint，and we will treat him the way we treat everybody as to when a common benefit fee， how it advanced the litigation．And also there＇s a segment of the fee for the individual attorneys on their retainer agreements．And that is being actively pursued and is a very prolix and complex process，and Mr．Becnel will be treated as everybody else is．And he will have－－there will be a report， the Court will see the report．Danny Becnel could object to the report，he could deal with it afterwards if he doesn＇t like what the fee committee has done with regard to his particular claim．

But I can assure Danny that：We know who he is，09：19AM we know who Sean Payton is，we know what this litigation is and we will afford him due process．

THE COURT：Okay．
MR．BECNEL：Your Honor，let me just reply to that．
As you know，I got Sean Payton and the Saints to counsel with the bar association，and it had all kinds of

The case was－－he and my first client，
09：20AM Dr．Parent，the dentist，that＇s the first two cases．She＇s a

And，you know，I just don＇t think I should have to
wait，especially with my health situation periodically．I don＇t want to be here with my estate having to deal with something that I should have been paid on and could have been paid on directly，right off the bat．

THE COURT：The interesting thing in this particular case is that usually，as everybody knows，the fee comes from the litigants．The litigants work out some arrangement with their attorney．They hire the attorney，they agree to pay the attorney a fee．Then the case comes to MDL．The MDL sets an amount for common benefit fee．That common benefit generally comes from the attorney＇s fee portion，not in addition to the claimant．

But，in this particular case，the interesting thing was that the concept of the settlement was that the claimants got their homes fixed， 100 percent of their homes fixed；and，in addition to that，the defendants paid a fee．So the claimants didn＇t have to pay anything．They got everything done for them and plus their attorney fees．So it＇s a little different in this situation．

But I hear your comments，and nobody＇s going to 09：22AM get any fee until I approve the fees．So I＇m going to give 09：22AM everybody an opportunity express themselves，and I certainly will take all of that into consideration．Including a fast－track type situation．There are some people who may have some issues，health and otherwise，that need to be dealt with，
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```
and I'm conscious of that. Thanks for bringing it to my
    attention.
            How about the Remediation Program, anything,
Kerry?
    MR. MILLER: Good morning, again, Your Honor. Kerry
Miller.
                    Nothing really new to report, Your Honor. The
remediation program is into I think the last inning of the game.
Moss is complete with ninety-plus percent of the homes. They're
trying to do their last shift, including the last group of pro
se homes we talked about last time, get those started this
spring, so that everything's done this year, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Yes.
            As everyone knows, with the Remediation Program,
        as I mentioned several times, in this particular case, rather
        than wait for the case to get over the defendants have
        undertaken the remediation program which even predated the
        settlement of the case. And, so far, they've been able to
        remediate several thousand homes, which has worked out well.
            How about the IN\EX, Banner, Knauf settlement?
        MR. LEVIN: Nothing with regard to that.
        THE COURT: Anything on Shared Costs?
        MR. LEVIN: Nothing, sir.
        THE COURT: What about Taishan defendants?
        MR. LEVIN: Well, if we're in the ninth inning with
```
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#### Abstract

regard to the Knauf remediation program，we＇re in the first


 inning or perhaps just batting practice with regard to Taishan．We are pursuing assets．We are pursuing affiliates have brought suit in Portland，Oregon and have utilized our court system，our federal court system，to pursue 09：24AM their commercial needs，where they have ignored us in the their commercial needs，where they have ignored us in the Eastern District of Louisiana and created another great wall between us and China．

THE COURT：Is there any money in that？
MR．LEVIN：There＇s $\$ 50,000$ for attorneys fees in the case that was settled．We＇re not interested in hurting the attorneys that have handled the case there for the $\$ 50,000$ ．

But what we are interested in is finding out what their ongoing business is．It seems that they are purchasing from China drywall．

We have not seen the settlement agreement．We＇ve been precluded so far from seeing the settlement agreement．But we think the settlement agreement contains clauses with ongoing activities between the parties to the settlement．That＇s just one aspect of it．

Once we perfect service on SASAC，and either they
from

We have not seen the settlement agreement．We ve come in and defend or we get a default judgment against SASAC，
that umbrella corporation has petroleum，banking and other interests around the world，including in the United States．

And we just want to assure those poor unfortunates that didn＇t have Knauf board，so that their homes could be remediated，and had Taishan board，that eventually we are going to make them whole．But，unfortunately，in the process，many of 09：26am them have had foreclosures and gone bankrupt．

THE COURT：As we know，the board that we＇re talking about was manufactured by basically two entities，one Knauf and the other Taishan entities．

After discovery in trial，the Knauf entities settled the case．The Taishan entities did not．They resisted service，and then they resisted appearance．And，eventually， they showed up in court participating in an appeal．They lost the appeal，and then they decided that they were going to walk away from the court because they didn＇t get their way．They＇re going to take their ball and go home，so to speak． explain why they did that．They refused to participate in the proceedings，so $I$ found them in content of court．And，in addition to fining them，I provided that a percentage of any

So I would direct counsel to determine whether or
order wherever they happen to be in the United States．Because I do sit，as an MDL judge，I sit as a district judge in every district in the United States．So let me know if there＇s any assets，and I will seize them．

MR．BECNEL：May it please the Court，I want to give the Court some additional information on Chinese assets．

About five weeks ago，six weeks，Cargill and then ADM filed suit in St．John Parish in our court system for money against Syngenta，which produced genetically engineered corn． There is a separate MDL which we had a hearing on yesterday in Kansas．

But they，Chinese，refused to accept it． Although，they already paid those companies．And so the corn is all coming back，which has been paid for by China．

And I think we would have the ability－－－as the Court knows，the major grain exports come from Reserve， Louisiana，with all of the grain elevators there．And we may be able to seize those grain．You know，it could be sold here in the US for cattle feed and other things．But it＇s something else that the Chinese sent back，that we may have an ability to get those assets．

THE COURT：Okay．Well，if there＇s some assets，any kind of assets from those companies or the affiliates of those companies，I will act on it．Because I do owe the system the duty to effect my orders，and I ordered them to do that．They
violated it. I held them in contempt. So I'll stand behind that.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, we'll prepare the appropriate papers for the Court.

But we'll ask Mr. Becnel or anyone else that has 09:29AM information, if they could get it to us and they could provide us the links to CMDM or BMDM or whoever it is so that we can make those links.

THE COURT: Let's make sure it's an affiliate or the company itself. Because I don't want to wrongfully seize anything. But $I$ will seize matters or material.

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, we would request that madam court reporter give us on an expedited basis, which we'll pay for obviously, the transcript of these proceedings. Because I think this becomes very relevant for the judiciary in Portland, Oregon to see.

MR. BECNEL: In addition to that, Judge, there's an MDL judge on that very case. And, yesterday, at the hearing, both ADM and Cargill says they didn't want to be in the MDL; they want it to come back. Because almost all of the grain that goes to China is shipped through Reserve.

MR. DAVIS: If you'll got us that link, Danny, so we can make the connection, that that will be helpful. Thank you.

THE COURT: Venture Supply, anything on Venture Supply? 09:30AM MR. LEVIN: No, sir. Just that the Virginia settlement

```
is just between Your Honor, Judge Wall, Mr. Serpe and Dewan and
others that have been working with them, is being run very
effectively.
    THE COURT: Okay. *
    Plaintiff and Defendant Profile, Fact Forms
    anything?
    MR. LEVIN: Nothing, sir.
    THE COURT: Nothing on Frequently Asked Questions.
            No pro se claimants?
            MR. LEVIN: Mr. Johnston has informed me that he
        needn't come here --
    THE COURT: He is here.
        MR. JOHNSTON: It's been so interesting that I decided
        to stay.
            Let me make a brief comment for the Court.
            Since the November 25th status conference, I have
        worked certainly very, very well with counsel for Knauf and
        staff. My office has provided every document, every piece of
        paper for every one of the group that I've called the late Knauf
        claimants, which we're all aware of, that we ended up being
        informed by Kerry Miller at the last status that remediation was
        going to be accomplished. And I think it is going very, very
        well. And I just want to notify the Court that we've had
        back-and-forth, but there's never been a negative moment since
        the last status conference. And we'll continue try to help
```
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these last group of people to get what they want, which is of course to have the remediation of their properties.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate your work on it
As you all know, we had a number of pro se claimants. They haven't hired attorneys. They don't wish to hire an attorney. And so I appointed Bob Johnston to help them navigate through this system. He's been talking to them. As a result of his efforts and efforts of Knauf, these individuals have been taken care of. So I appreciate your work.

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, I apologize to Bob. Because he had told me before this hearing that he couldn't be here for the complete hearing; he had a personal situation. And I didn't think he was in the courtroom when I started off.

THE COURT: All right.
Anything on --
MR. JOHNSTON: Did you hear what I said? It was so interesting that $I$ just had to stay.

THE COURT: Okay.
Physical Evidence.
MR. LEVIN: Mr. Davis will respond to that.
MR. DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor.
In light of your comments earlier, prior status conferences, we've met --

THE COURT: This is the issue in the Physical Evidence. In this some type situation, the exposure to the board has
created physical problems with a lot of appliances, particularly with the copper-fit appliances. It has some negative effect object those appliances. Well, those appliances and a lot of $09: 33 \mathrm{Am}$ other board had to be stored. And you can imagine, there may be hundreds or thousands of refrigerators and things of that sort. The issue now is what do we do with it? It's not really fair for the defendants to be required to continue to pay rent for these warehouses that I required them to keep the material in.

So we have to recognize, however, the case is not over and some proof may be needed.

So it seems to me that it's legitimate and appropriate for the defendants or liaison counsel and defendants to file a motion with the Court to find some other way. And what we would do is take pictures of it, take samples of it, take video of it and have individuals look at it so that they can be able to testify.

The reason $I$ suggest the motion is that so there's no spoliation issue that's raised by a defendant later on saying that you intentionally and maliciously destroyed this material so that evidence should be used against you. I don't see it that way. It's a practicality.

So file the motion and I'll authorize another way of preserving that evidence.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
And, in light of that, we've also had discussions

09:33AM 09:33AM 09:33AM 09:34AM
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doing this.

And, because of the numbers that they've worked on, they're able to have not only the quality but also some break for the numbers of cases that they're handling, and they're able to do it and do it efficiently. While this has sometimes things don't work out. And so Moss has been able to be at these meetings; and, any problems that people have had, they've been able to bring them up at these meetings and they've been able to get attention immediately for it.

So I think the program has worked very well, and I appreciate the cooperation of the parties in doing it.

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, lead and liaison counsel have monitored what's going on with the remediation. There's emails every day confirming various problems and the resolution of various problems. And we can say that, with the undertaking that Knauf has made through Kerry and what Moss has done, that we only wish that the Taishan defendants behaved in the manner clients that we represent.

Any other items on the agenda?
The Louisiana Attorney General, anything from the
The Louisiana Attorney General, anything from the attorney general?

The representative says no
09:38AM
The next meeting is February the 12th; and, following that, it's March the 26th. March 26th.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, one thing before we break.
On the issue of Already Remediated Homes, that was right before the Louisiana Attorney General.

Your Honor, Sean Payton was the actually first ARA that settled this part of that component of the class action settlement. That was a protocol I had worked out with Mr. Davis in terms of documentation and putting books together and so on and so forth.

On that, Your Honor, we've settled about 260 of those. We have about 150 left. The 260 we've settled were the cases that had the best documentation, such as Mr. Payton's home and others like that, where the attorneys kept and the clients kept very good records of what went on.

For the 150 that are left, maybe some fall in that 09:39AM category. But the others, at least to us, appear to have some evidentiary issues and so are more difficult to resolve.

What we want to do, Your Honor is perhaps set up mediations, perhaps set up face-to-face meetings with counsel and their clients on these issues to try and wrap these up this year while we wrap up the other aspects of the program.

THE COURT: That's a good idea.
What's the total number? Some thousands?

MR. MILLER: No. Already remediated homes? About 410. So we've gotten about 260 done with about 150 left to go.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MILLER: Your Honor, on that score, I've recently switched firms. I know that they were looking for some contact information in terms of getting additional information in on these already remediated homes that are unsettled or setting mediation, things of that nature. I provided Duncan, your law clerk, with my new email address. That will be available on the Court's website. And certainly me and the staff that I have at my new firm will be very attentive to this issue moving forward at this point.

THE COURT: Good luck to you at the new firm. I know 09:40AM you'll do a good job for them.

Court will stand in recess. Thank you.
(9:38 a.m., proceedings recessed.)
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| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 428[1]-8: 14 \\ & 44[1]-8: 14 \end{aligned}$ | act $[1]-21: 24$ <br> Action [2]-13:13, 13:24 | APPEARANCES [1] - <br> 2:1 <br> appliances [4]-25:1, $25: 2,25: 3$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$1,000 ${ }_{[1]}-9: 5$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0}[2]-9: 6,9: 7$ |  |  |  | B406 [1]-1:18 back-and-forth [1] - |
| \$10,000[2] - 9:6, 9:7 | 5 | action [6]-5:2, |  |  |
| \$14,400 [2] - 9:8, 9:9 | 500 [2]-1:18, 2:6 | 10:13, 13:21, 15:23, | applied [1] - 27 : 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 24 \\ & \text { ball }[1]-20: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| \$2,500 [1] - 9:10 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:8 } \\ & \text { Actions }[1]-13: 4 \\ & \text { actively }[2]-6: 10, \\ & \text { 16:6 } \\ & \text { activities }[1]-19: 22 \\ & \text { Adams }[2]-26: 13, \end{aligned}$ | appointed [1] - 24: |  |
| \$393,800 [1] - 12:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 504.589.7781[1] - } \\ & 1: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Actions [1]-13:4 <br> actively [2]-6:10, <br> 16:6 <br> activities [1] - 19:22 <br> Adams [2]-26:13, | appreciate [6]-5:23, | ball [1] - 20:17 <br> banking [1] - 20:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 0 0 0}[2]-19: 11, \\ & 19: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 13:12, 24:3, 24:9, | bankrupt ${ }_{[1]}$-20:7 <br> Banner [4]-6:13, <br> 6:15, 8:7, 18:20 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 504.593.0849 } \\ & 2: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | 26:4, 27:13 <br> appreciative [1] - 13:9 <br> approached [1] - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 510[1]-2: 6 \\ & 54.8[1]-7: 18 \\ & 546[1]-2: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | bar ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ - 16:19 |
| /S [1] - 29:24 |  | 26:20 <br> add [1] - 15:24 <br> addition [4]-17:11, <br> 17:16, 20:21, 22:17 | 14:14 <br> appropriate [2]-22:3, $25: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BARRIOS }_{[3]}-2: 10, \\ & 2: 11,4: 22 \\ & \text { basis }[2]-5: 17,22: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $17: 16,20: 21,22: 17$ |  |  |
| 1 [1]-14:23 |  | additional [3]-11:5,21:6, 29:6 | $\text { ARA }_{[1]}-28: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bass }[1]-26: 1 \\ & \text { bat }[1]-17: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 70086[1]-2:9 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Arnold }[3]-4: 9,14: 4, \\ & 15: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1,000 [1] - 12:13 | 701 [1]-2:11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { address }[3]-8: 2, \\ 26: 21,29: 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | bat [1] - 17:4 batting [1] - 19:2 |
| 1,674[1]-6:17 | $70113{ }_{[1]}-2: 4$ |  | ARNOLD [1]-2:5 arrangement [1] - | beauty [1] - 15:9 <br> Becnel [7] - 14:4, <br> 15:13, 15:20, 15:25, |
| $1.7{ }^{11]}$ - $7: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70130[3]-1: 19,2: 15, \\ & 2: 21 \end{aligned}$ | ADM [2] - 21:8, 22:19 <br> admitted [1] - 11:10 <br> advanced [1] - 16:4 |  |  |
| $100[2]-8: 16,17: 15$ |  |  | 17:7 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 70139[1]-2: 12 \\ & 70163_{[1]}-2: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | aspect [2]-13:14, | 16:7, 16:9, $22: 5$BECNEL $[6]-2.7$ |
| 11,770 [1] - 7:14 |  | advertising [1] - 16:18 advisement [1] -$15: 19$ | 19:23 <br> aspects [1] - 28:23 <br> assessment $[3]-5: 19$, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1100 }_{[1]}-2: 18 \\ & \text { 12th }[2]-7: 14,28: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BECNEL [6] - 2:7, } \\ & \text { 14:7, 15:2, 16:16, } \\ & 21: 5,22: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 150[3]-28: 13,28: 17, \\ & 29: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | affiliate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 22:9 <br> affiliates [3]-19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13:20, 13:21 } \\ \text { assets }[7]-19: 3, \end{gathered}$ | Becnel's [1] - 15:16 becomes [1]-22:15 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 820[1]-2: 3 \\ & 866-866-1729[1]- \\ & 13: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 159 $176{ }_{[1]}-12: 14$ [1] |  | $20: 23,21: 23$ <br> afford [1] - 16:14 afterwards [1] - 16:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 25,21: 4,21: 6, \\ & 21: 21,21: 22,21: 23 \end{aligned}$ | BEFORE [1]-1:14 |
| $176{ }_{[1]}-12: 14$ |  |  |  |  |
| 19,726 [1] - 6:9 | 9 |  | ```assigned [2] - 6:19, 7:11 assignment [1] - 7:10``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { began }[2]-7: 13, \\ & 12: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 9,983_{[1]}-6: 17 \\ & 9: 00[2]-1: 7,4: 2 \\ & 9: 38[1]-29: 16 \end{aligned}$ | ago [2] - 4:14, 21:7 <br> agree [1] - 17:8 <br> agreement [3] - 19:19, | associated [1] - 11:14 | 12:17 |
| 2,527 [1] - 8:14 |  |  |  | behaved $[4]-13: 16$, |
| $200[2]-8: 17,12: 9$ $2015[2]-1: 6,4: 1$ | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agreement }[3]-19: 19, \\ & \text { 19:20, 19:21 } \\ & \text { agreements }[1]-16: 6 \\ & \text { AIDED }_{[1]}-1: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { assuming [1] }-10: 24$ $\text { assure }[3]-15: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:19, } 27: 20 \\ & \text { behaves [1] - 13:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2047[2] - 1:5, 4:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A.M }{ }_{[2]}-1: 7,4: 2 \\ & \text { a.m }_{[1]}-29: 16 \\ & \text { abbreviate }[1]-8: 12 \\ & \text { ability }[2]-21: 15 \text {, } \\ & 21: 20 \\ & \text { able }[15]-4: 24,7: 12, \\ & 7: 22,8: 22,11: 18 \text {, } \\ & 11: 22,15: 22,18: 18, \\ & 21: 18,25: 16,27: 3, \\ & 27: 5,27: 8,27: 10, \\ & 27: 11 \\ & \text { abundance }[1]-7: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | 16:12, 20:3 | behaves [1]-13:16 behind ${ }^{11]}$ - 22:1 |
| $21.3[1]-8: 3$ |  | AIRLINE [1] - 2:8 <br> ALL ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:8 | attention [2]-18:2, 27:11 | benefit [4]-15:18, 16:3, 17:10 |
| 22[2]-1.6, 4.1 |  | allow [2] - 8:23, 9:3 | attentive ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:1 | BERMAN ${ }^{11]}-2: 5$ |
| 23rd [1] - 8:25 |  | almost [2]-11:19, | Attorney [2]-27:24, | best [2] - 12:23, 28:14 |
| 2450 [1] - 2:15 |  | 22:20 | 28:6 | better ${ }_{[1]}$ - 11:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25th }[1]-23: 16 \\ & \text { 260 [3] - 28:12, 28:13, } \\ & 29: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | alternative ${ }_{[1]}-8: 11$ | attorney [7] - 15:11, | between [3]-19:9, |
|  |  | amount [2] - 9:12, | 17:8, 17:9, 17:18 $24: 6,27: 25$ | 19:22, 23:1 |
| 26th [2]-28:3 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amounts [2]-9:4, } \\ & 9: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:6, 27:25 } \\ & \text { attorney's [1] - 17:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BMBM }_{[2]}-13: 16, \\ & 13: 21 \\ & \text { BMDM }_{[1]}-22: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 |  |  | attorneys [5] - 16:5, 19:11, 19:13, 24:5, | BMDM [1] - 22:7 <br> board [5] - 20:4, 20:5, |
| 3600[1]-2:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accept }[2]-10: 4, \\ & 21: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 16:21 | 28:15 | board [5] - 20:4, 20:5, $20: 8,24: 25,25: 4$ |
| 37.7 [1]-9:13 | acceptance [3] -10:24, 12:16, 12:21 | answering $[1]-5: 17$ <br> anticipate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 11:14 | authorize [1] - 25:22 <br> authorized [1] - 7:4 | Bob [2]-24:6, 24:10 <br> bodily $[4]-5: 11,8: 10$, |
| 3700[1]-2:18 |  | apologize [1] - 24:10 <br> appeal [2] - 20:14, | available [5] - 8:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:5, 12:8 } \\ & \text { books [1] - 28:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { accepted }[3]-10: 11, \\ 12: 14,12: 20 \end{gathered}$ |  | 9:12, 16:1, 26:21, 29:9 | books [1] - 28:10 <br> Bowl [1]-14:8 |
| 4,000 ${ }_{[1]}-8: 13$ | pts [1] - 10:22 |  | AVENUE ${ }_{[1]}-2: 3$ award [1] - 10:6 | break [2]-27:4, 28:4 |
| $400{ }_{[1]}-2: 14$ | cess [1]-26:2 | 28:18 | award [1] - 10:6 <br> Award [4]-10:7, | Brees $[1]$ - 14:16 |
| $410{ }_{[1]}$ - 29:1 | accomplished [1] - | appearance [2] - 13:17, 20:13 | $10: 14,10: 15,11: 5$ | brief [1]-23:15 |
| 425 [1] - 2:8 |  |  | aware [2]-16:1, 23:20 | briefly [1] - 6:6 |
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|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { corporation }[2]- \\ & \text { 13:22, 20:1 } \\ & \text { correct }[1]-29: 22 \\ & \text { Costs }[1]-18: 22 \\ & \text { counsel }[10]-4: 8, \\ & 4: 13,15: 18,16: 19, \\ & 20: 24,23: 17,25: 12, \\ & 27: 14,27: 20,28: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 23:13 <br> decisions [1]-5:18 <br> deemed [1]-10:11 <br> default [2]-13:19, 19:25 <br> defend [1]-19:25 <br> defendant [3]-15:10, 15:11, 25:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | China [6] - 13:15, 19:9, 19:17, 19:18, 21:14, 22:21 <br> Chinese [8] - 4:5, 6:5, 14:12, 15:6, 16:21, 21:6, 21:12, 21:20 CHINESE [1]-1:4 | ```24:22 commercial [2] - 16:18, 19:7 committee [8] - 4:12, 14:19, 15:17, 15:19, 15:21, 16:1, 16:11, 26:1``` |  |  |
| brought ${ }_{[1]}-19: 5$ |  |  |  |  |
| BrownGreer [5] |  |  |  |  |
| :4, |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| builder [1]-26:6 |  |  |  |  |
| BUILDERS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:20 |  |  |  |  |
| Build | CHINESEMANUFACTURED[1] - 1:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMMITTEE }_{[2]}-2: 2 \text {, } \\ & 2: 10 \end{aligned}$ | country [1]-20:22 <br> course [2]-10:24, | DEFENDANT ${ }_{[1]}$ -2:16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { common [4] - 15:18, } \\ & 16: 3,17: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { court }[8]-19: 6,20: 14, \\ & 20: 16,20: 20,21: 8, \\ & 22: 13,29: 15 \end{aligned}$ | ```Defendant [1]-23:5 defendants [7] - 17:16, 18:16, 18:24, 25:7, 25:12, 27:19``` |
|  | City ${ }_{[1]}-14: 25$ <br> claim [24]-5:5, 6:9, <br> 6:12, 6:18, 6:19, | commotion [1] - 16:20 |  |  |
|  | 6:12, 6:18, 6:19, $6: 23,6: 24,6: 25,7: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { companies [3] - } \\ & 21: 13,21: 23,21: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | 11, 7:18, 8:13 | company [2]-20:25, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Court }[16]-4: 19,4: 21, \\ 5: 19,8: 22,8: 25, \end{gathered}$ | defense [1] - 4:12 <br> deficiency ${ }_{[1]}$ - 5:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{camp}_{[1]}-14: 11 \\ & \text { cannot }_{[1]}-11: 5 \\ & \text { care }_{[1]}-24: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:3, 11:8, 11:24, } \\ & 11: 25,12: 7,15: 2, \\ & 16: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 10 \\ & \text { competing } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:9, 20:23, 21:5, } \\ & 21: 6,21: 16,22: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { denied }[3]-6: 17, \\ 6: 20,6: 23 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 6.20,6:23 |
|  |  |  | 26.3, 29.21 | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cargill }[2]-21: 7, \\ & 22: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:11 } \\ & \text { claimant }[7]-7: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Complaints [1]- } \\ & \text { 13:13 } \\ & \text { complaints [1] - 13:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COURT }_{[39]}-1: 1, \\ & \text { 1:17, 4:3, 4:7, 4:13, } \end{aligned}$ | destroyed [1]-25:19 determination [2]- |
| 22: | 7:22, 10:15, 10:18, 10:22, 11:4, 17:12 |  | 1:17, 4:3, 4:7, 4:13, 4:21, 5:22, 6:20, | determination [2] - $10: 9,10: 21$ |
| case [22]-4:4, 5:22, | $\begin{gathered} \text { claimants [13] - } 6: 18, \\ 7: 2,7: 7,7: 16,7: 23, \end{gathered}$ | complaints [1]-13:14 <br> complete [3] - 6:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 2,13: 3,13: 11, \\ & 13: 24,14: 1,14: 3, \end{aligned}$ | determine [2]-9:22, 20:24 |
| $12,14: 17,14: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 2,7: 7,7: 16,7: 23, \\ & \text { 10:3, 10:10, 17:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 18:9, 24:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 24,14: 1,14: 3, \\ & 15: 1,15: 8,16: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $0: 24$ <br> termined [2] - |
| ,6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:3, 10:10, 17:15, } \\ & 17: 17,23: 9,23: 20, \end{aligned}$ | component [1] - $28: 8$ | 15:1, 15:8, 16:15, 17:5, 18:13, 18:22, | 10:19, 19:4 |
| 13, 18:15, $18:$ | Claims [1] - 8:8 <br> claims [45]-6:7, 6 | COMPUTER ${ }_{[1]}-1: 23$ <br> concept ${ }^{11]}$ - 17:14 | 18:24, 19:10, 20:8, | Dewan [1]-23:1 <br> different [5]-6:14, |
| 18:18, 19:12, 19:13 |  |  | 23:4, 23:8, 23:12, |  |
| 12, 22:18, 25:9, |  | concept [1] - 17:14 conducted ${ }^{[1]}$ - 15:17 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 14,12: 7,15: 5, \\ & 17: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6:10, 6:13, 6:16, | CONFERENCE ${ }_{[1]}$ | :3, 24:14, 24:18, |  |
| CASE [1] - 4:5 | 7 |  | :24, 26:5, 26:23, | difficult ${ }_{[1]}-28: 19$ |
| CASES [1] - 1:8 | 3, 7:23, $8: 7$ | conference [5] - 4:7, <br> 5:21, 7:20, 23:16, | $8: 24,29:$ | direct ${ }_{[1]}$ - 20:24 <br> directly [2]-17:4, |
|  | 8:24, 9:4, 9:6, 9:8, | 5:21, 7:20, 23:16, 23:25 | Court's [1] - 29:10 courtroom [1] - 24:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:10 } \\ & \text { disbursed [1] - 12:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| , |  | conferences [2] -$24: 23,26: 14$ |  |  |
| CASTEIX [1] - 2:10 | 10:7, 10:25, 11:6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { created }[2]-19: 8 \text {, } \\ & 25: 1 \\ & \text { CURATOR }[1]-2: 13 \end{aligned}$ | discovery [1] - 20:11 <br> discuss [1] - 4:14 <br> discussed [1] - 15:20 <br> discussion [1] - 26:16 <br> discussions [1] - <br> 25:25 |
| categories [1]-8.9 | 11:16, 11:17, 11:18 |  |  |  |
| category [2]-6:17 | 11:20, 11:25, 12:6 | connection [2]-14:3 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| cattle [1]-21:19 | 19 | co |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { consideration [1] } \\ & \text { 17:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { damages }[2]-5: 20, \\ & 13: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | ssolution [1] - 14:13 |
|  | Class [3]-13 | contact [3] - 5:7 | DANIEL [1] - 2:7 <br> Danny [6] - 14:4, 14:5, | distribute [1] - 8:3 <br> distributed [1] - 7:18 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13:13, 13:24 } \\ \text { clauses }[1]-19: 2 \end{gathered}$ | contain [1]-10:2 |  | distributed $[1]-7: 18$ distribution $[1]-9: 13$ |
|  |  | contains [1]-19:21 | Danny [6] - 14:4, 14:5, | District $[1]$ - 19:8 DISTRICT [4]-1:1, |
| 23:17, 26:18, 26:21 | clerk [1] - 29:9 |  | 15:13, 16:9, 16:12, 22:22 |  |
| 10 | client ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:22 | content ${ }^{[1]}$-20:20 | date [1] - 12:21 <br> DAVIS [5] - 2:3, 22:3, | $1: 2,1: 15,1: 18$ |
| CERTIFICATE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clients }[4]-4: 20, \\ & 27: 21,28: 15,28: 22 \end{aligned}$ | continue [5] - $8: 4$, | $22: 22,24: 21,25: 24$ | district [2]-21:2, 21:3 <br> document [2] - 8:19, |
| certification [1]-5:18 | clock [1] - 11:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:10, 12:19, 23:25, } \\ & 25: 7 \end{aligned}$ | Davis [2]-24:20, $28: 9$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cooperation }[1] \text { - } \\ & 27: 13 \end{aligned}$ <br> COORDINATION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | DAWN [1] - 2:11 <br> days $[2]-10: 11,10: 23$ | DOCUMENT [1]-1:7 <br> documentation [3] - |
| chance [1] - 10.13 |  |  |  |  |
| change [2]-7:1 | $\text { CMBM }[2]-13: 16,$ |  | deadline [4]-5:4,11:7, 11:18, 11:19 | $6: 18,28: 10,28: 14$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { documented [1]- } \\ & \text { 26:25 } \\ & \text { documents [8]-8:20, } \\ & \text { 10:12, 11:1, 11:3, } \\ & \text { 11:5, 11:6, 11:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| changes [1] - 8:16 | CMDM [1] - 22:7 <br> coming [1] - 21:14 <br> comment [1] - 23:15 | copper [1] - 25:2 <br> copper-fit [1] - 25:2 <br> corn [2]-21:9, 21:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dealt }[1]-17: 25 \\ & \text { December }[1]-8: 25 \\ & \text { decided }[2]-20: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ch |  |  |  |  |
| ch |  |  |  |  |
| 7:17, 7:25 |  |  |  |  |




| ```1:18, 2:13 offer [9]-9:19, 9:23, 9:24, 10:4, 10:5, 10:11, 10:14, 10:16, 10:22 offers [2]-9:4, 12:14 office [1] - 23:18 OFFICES \({ }_{[1]}-2: 13\) Official [1] - 29:21 OFFICIAL [1] - 1:17 Omnibus [2]-13:4, 13:14 omnibus [1] - 16:2 once [3] - 11:3, 11:20, 19:24 one \([11]-5: 14,5: 17\), 7:10, 7:17, 13:6, 13:14, 19:23, 20:9, 23:19, 28:4 one-to-one [1]-5:17 ongoing [2]-19:15, 19:21 opportunity \({ }_{[2]}\) - 17:22, 20:18 options [1] - 10:3 order [6] - 4:16, 5:8, 5:18, 6:11, 8:25, 21:1 ordered [1] - 21:25 Orders [1] - 4:17 orders [1]-21:25 Oregon [3]-19:4, 19:5, 22:16 ORLEANS \([7]-1: 6\), 1:19, 2:4, 2:12, 2:15, 2:19, 4:1 \\ Orleans [2]-2:21,None```$\mathbf{P}$ <br> PA $_{[1]}-2: 6$ <br> page $_{[1]}-4: 23$ <br> paid $_{[11]}-7: 5,11: 22$, <br> 12:18, 14:22, 14:25, <br> 16:18, 17:3, 17:16, <br> 21:13, 21:14 <br> paper $[1]-23: 19$ <br> papers $^{[1]}-22: 4$ <br> parent $[1]-16: 23$ <br> Parish $_{[1]}-21: 8$ <br> part $[1]-28: 8$ <br> participate $[1]-20: 19$ <br> participating $[1]-$ <br> 20:14 |  | ```29:12 points [1]-9:2 poor [1]-20:3 portion [1] - 17:11 Portland [3]-19:4, 19:5, 22:15 poster [1] - 15:6 potentially \({ }_{[1]}\) - 6:24 POYDRAS [4]-1:18, 2:11, 2:14, 2:18 practicality \([1]-25: 21\) practice [1]-19:2 PRALE [4]-8:12, 9:8, 12:9, 12:11 pre [1]-8:11 pre-remediation [1] - 8:11 precluded [1] - 19:20 predated \({ }^{[1]}\) - 18:17 prefer \({ }_{[1]}\) - 11:7 prepare [1]-22:3 prepared \({ }^{11]}\) - 13:19 preparing [1] - 5:6 present [3]-10:12, 10:25, 26:2 presentation [1]-8:2 presents [1] - 26:15 preserving [1]-25:23 pretrial [1]-5:21 Pretrial [1]-4:17 pretty [1]-12:20 previously [1] - 6:19 PRO [1] - 2:13 pro [7]-6:14, 9:11, 9:13, 9:15, 18:10, 23:9, 24:4 problems [6] - 8:5, 25:1, 26:7, 27:9, 27:16, 27:17 proceed [1] - 10:3 proceeding [2]-5:25, 9:16 proceedings [4] - 13:18, 20:20, 22:14, 29:16 PROCEEDINGS [2] - 1:13, 1:23 process [9]-5:5, 8:5, 10:1, 11:12, 11:25, 12:1, 16:7, 16:14, 20:6 produced [1]-21:9 PRODUCED [1] - 1:23 Products [1] - 4:6 PRODUCTS \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:4 professional [1] - 26:24 Profile [1] - 23:5 profits [1]-20:22``` | ```program [9]-6:5, 18:8, 18:17, 19:1, 26:10, 26:18, 27:6, 27:12, 28:23 Program [2]-18:3, 18:14 programs [1]-27:7 progress [1]-8:17 prolix [1] - 16:7 proof [1]-25:10 properties [1] - 24:2 property \(\left.{ }_{[2]}\right]-7: 5,9: 8\) proposal [1]-26:2 protocol \({ }_{[1]}\) - 28:9 provide [1]-22:6 provided [3]-20:21, 23:18, 29:8 PSC [2] - 13:7, 15:2 PTO-29 [3]-8:23, 9:2, 9:3 public [1]-16:21 purchased [1] - 19:17 purchasing [1] - 19:15 purely \({ }^{[1]}\) - 14:20 pursue [2]-13:20, 19:6 pursued [2]-13:21, 16:6 pursuing [2]-19:3 put [1]-7:24 puts [1] - 12:15 putting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 28:10 quality \([1]\) - 27:3 Questions [1]-23:8 questions [2]-9:1, 11:13 quickly [1]-12:20 \\ R \\ raised \([1]-25: 18\) \\ rapidly [1] - 10:23 \\ rata [4]-6:14, 9:11, \\ 9:13, 9:15 \\ rate [1] - 12:16 \\ rather \([2]-14: 8,18: 15\) \\ re [2]-4:5 \\ RE [1] - 1:4 \\ reach [1]-26:2 \\ really \([3]-14: 12,18: 7\), 25:6 \\ reason [1]-25:17 \\ reasons [1]-13:18 \\ receive [5]-6:24, \\ 7:17, 7:24, 10:4, \\ 10:14 \\ received [5] - 7:10,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:1, 11:13, 12:13, } \\ & \text { 14:3 } \\ & \text { receiving }[1]-10: 3 \\ & \text { recently }[1]-29: 4 \\ & \text { recess }[1]-29: 15 \\ & \text { recessed }[1]-29: 16 \\ & \text { recognize }[1]-25: 9 \\ & \text { reconcile }[1]-7: 22 \\ & \text { reconciling }[3]-7: 4, \\ & 7: 11,8: 18 \\ & \text { RECORDED }{ }_{[1]}-1: 23 \\ & \text { records }[1]-28: 16 \\ & \text { refer }[2]-8: 8,11: 10 \\ & \text { refrigerators }[1]-25: 5 \\ & \text { refused }[2]-20: 19, \\ & 21: 12 \\ & \text { regard }[11]-5: 8,5: 10, \\ & 5: 11,5: 18,5: 19,6: 2, \\ & 13: 13,16: 11,18: 21, \\ & 19: 1,19: 2 \end{aligned}$ <br> RELATES [1] - 1:7 <br> relevant ${ }_{[1]}$ - 22:15 <br> relocation [1] -6:13 <br> remaining ${ }_{[1]}-12: 11$ <br> remediate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 18:19 <br> Remediated [1] - 28:5 <br> remediated [3]-20:5, 29:1, 29:7 <br> remediating ${ }_{[1]}$ - 26:24 <br> Remediation [2] 18:3, 18:14 <br> remediation [10] - <br> 8:11, 18:8, 18:17, <br> 19:1, 23:21, 24:2, <br> 26:10, 26:18, 27:7, <br> 27:15 <br> remember [1]-26:15 <br> rent [5]-8:10, 9:7, <br> 9:8, 12:11, 25:7 <br> rental [1] -9:8 <br> repair [1]-6:13 <br> reply $[1]-16: 16$ <br> report [12]-4:19, <br> 4:23, 5:3, 6:1, 6:5, <br> 13:7, 15:22, 15:23, <br> 16:8, 16:9, 16:10, <br> 18:7 <br> REPORTER [1] - 1:17 <br> reporter [1]-22:13 <br> Reporter ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:21 <br> represent [2]-14:14, 27:21 <br> representation [1] 16:1 <br> representative [2] 26:8, 28:1 <br> request $[7]-10: 5$, 10:7, 10:13, 11:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| vast $[1]-11: 15$ <br> Venture［2］－22：24 verification［3］－7：23， 10：24，12：24 verified［2］－9：7，9：22 video［1］－25：15 violated［1］－22：1 Virginia［5］－4：24，5：2， 5：15，22：25 |
| :---: |
| W |
| ```W-9 [3] - 7:23, 10:24, 12:24 wait [2]-17:1, 18:16 walk \([1]-20: 15\) wall [1] - 19:8 Wall [1] - 23:1 WALNUT [1] - 2:6 warehouses [1]-25:8 website [3]-8:1, 12:25, 29:10 week [4] - 11:16, 11:20, 12:18, 14:21 weeks [3] - 13:19, 21:7 well-thought-of \({ }_{[1]}\) - 26:25 whole [2] - 14:11, 20:6 wife [2] - 14:9, 14:11 Wimberly [1]-26:1 WIMBERLY [1]-2:20 wish [2]-24:5, 27:19 wishes [1] - 11:4 withdraw [1] - 7:7 withdrawing [1] - 7:2 Woody [2] - 5:8, 6:4 WOODY [3]-6:3, 6:23, 12:4 world [1] - 20:2 wound [1] - 14:11 wrap [2] - 28:22, 28:23 wrongfully [1] - 22:10 www3.BrownGreer. com/drywall [1] - 12:25``` |
| Y |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { year }[4]-7: 14,14: 8, \\ & 18: 12,28: 23 \\ & \text { yesterday }[2]-21: 10, \\ & 22: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| Z |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zielie }[2]-29: 21, \\ & 29: 25 \\ & \text { ZIELIE } 22]-1: 17, \\ & 29: 24 \end{aligned}$ |

