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P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S<br>THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2011<br>M O R N I N G S ES S I O N<br>(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Call the case, please.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 2047, In Re: Chinese Drywall.

THE COURT: Would counsel make their appearances for the record, please.

MR. LEVIN: Yes, sir. Arnold Levin for the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, sir.

THE COURT: Who is for the defendants?
MR. MILLER: I'm coming. I'm taking the long way.
Kerry Miller on behalf of the Defense Steering Committee, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We're here today for our monthly status conference. I have a number of people on the phone, so please use the microphones. I apologize for the inconvenience this morning with the security. Things have changed a bit since Arizona, and we have some increased security concerns.

I met with the parties, the liaison and lead
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Property inspections is the next item.
MR. LEVIN: I believe there is nothing, really, on property inspections, but I think Your Honor wanted to make a note of the remediation program.

THE COURT: Yes, I did. There are a couple of issues here. We've had a lot of property inspections, and that's part of the settlement program with Knauf that's gone into affect, or at least the pilot program, and the inspections have been made and certain documents have been received, but we haven't had any remediation work, and that's where we have to focus on, to get remediation work on the ground.

There is a lot happening in this litigation. Those in this room, perhaps, know what's happening -- a lot of action going back and forth -- but the public doesn't know, and the homeowners don't know because they have just seen their homes inspected, and they are waiting for the next step. Well, it's time for them to get some help with their particular homes. So I've tried to expedite that in two ways:

One is we have a number of homes in the Slidell area. They have been inspected. They are ready to go. So I've ordered mediation on Monday for those particular homes, and we will hopefully wrap up those 20 and start the program immediately.

I've also asked Knauf to pick some homes that are ready and to put those individuals at the top of the list, if
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they can move from their homes as quickly as possible, because they have a certain period of time when they can move from the home and allow the remediation to commence. Some individuals are ready to move tomorrow or the next day. In that type situation, then perhaps they should go to the head of the class and get their homes remediated immediately. So we're working on that program to at least get some things done.

The next item is plaintiff and defendant profile forms. Anything there?

MR. LEVIN: There is nothing new there, Your Honor. THE COURT: Preservation order anything? MR. LEVIN: Nothing new.

State/federal coordination Ms. Barrios will handle. THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEVIN: Most people don't know it, but she does a lot more than this in the litigation. THE COURT: I know she does.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Mr. Levin.
Good morning, Judge, Dawn Barrios for the
State/Federal Committee. I've brought today for Your Honor, and I'll give to all the parties, a CD containing all of the remands through СTO Number 20. Besides these state court cases that are listed in the joint report, I would like to bring to Your Honor's attention a couple of other matters.

I've been informed very kindly by Taishan's
national counsel of all of the cases in state court which have been served by Taishan. There is three cases: One is in CDC; the plaintiffs' attorney is Mr. Jim Gardener, and he's working with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. The other is Lenoir Homes in Miami, Dade County, and, of course, Ms. Hilarie Baas is working with the MDL as well; and the other is a case in Alabama, Alexander v. Building Materials, and Mr. Long and Mr. Serpe have been in touch with the plaintiffs' attorney there. So we have the coordination on all cases that Taishan has been served in.

The other matter --
THE COURT: In that particular matter, I've been discussing these issues with the state courts in those cases as well as other cases, and what we're trying to do is coordinate, and it's been very helpful to me to have the state courts express a willingness to work with the MDL, and, of course, I am more than willing to work with them to coordinate our schedule with their busy schedules.

What we're trying to do is to have discovery proceed at the same time, and we're looking into the possibility of having class cert motions at the same time so that either they can come over here or monitor it by either television hookup or telephonic hookup, and we can do our class cert hearings one time so that you don't have to have a class cert hearing here in federal court and then next week or next month have the same class cert hearing in state court. So we're trying to coordinate before her. There is a declaratory judgment action pending in Virginia federal court on coverage issue. There is an appeal on the homeowners coverage issue, which will be heard in March, and on December 6th of last year, Venture Supply is attempting service on Taishan through the Hague Convention.

We also found out through some media coverage that there are some Colorado cases, so I reached out and discovered that both of the Colorado cases pending in state court are just coverage issues between the insurer.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much.
We have motions in the MDL. I'll take those after our hearing.

Any discovery issues?
MR. LEVIN: Just that with regard to the motions, Your Honor, you'll take our Motion to Compel as against Taishan
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at the close of the hearing?
THE COURT: Right. Yes.
MR. LEVIN: The report --
THE COURT: Discovery issues.
MR. LEVIN: -- is that we have taken the deposition of Isabel Knauf in Hong Kong and the deposition of Grunke, Mr. Grunke, in Frankfurt, and we're discussing additional depositions but they have not been scheduled. We can take one thing out of order. We took the deposition of Mark Norris from the Knauf entities in Hong Kong. It did not finish on time. It's not important as to why. We're beyond that. We're going to probably finish the deposition by telephonic hookup. Speaking for the plaintiffs, I have no more than a half hour of questions there.

THE COURT: If something pops up, get me on the line. Let's not terminate the deposition. Get me on the line, or I'll monitor the deposition, and if any issues come up, I'll rule immediately either telephonically, or we can set up television depositions, if that's of interest to you also.

MR. LEVIN: Additionally, Your Honor, if I may interject here, we're in the process of scheduling jurisdictional depositions as to Taishan entities in Hong Kong, and they've offered them in the first week of April. We feel that this train is leaving the station, and we want them to catch up with -- we don't want them to be the caboose. We would like to take those
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depositions earlier than that, but that will be part of the Motion to Compel.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything on Freedom of Information Act?

MR. LEVIN: Nothing new, sir.
THE COURT: Trial settings in federal court. I've talked to the parties from Interior Exterior. I've set the weeks of May 23rd, June 20th, July 18th, for trials either in one or more of the cases involving Interior Exterior. I'm meeting with them in the near future, as well as with the plaintiffs, to talk about the scheduling orders and the cases that will be set for trial on those particular dates.

One issue that I do want to address is that in some of these matters there are insurance issues, which is also on our list here, and the issue that the insurance company is facing is both substantive as well as procedural. They are taking the position that they are not formally or shouldn't be formally before the Court because the Court has no personal jurisdiction or jurisdiction over them. There are also some substantive matters.

I really would like to get to some of the substantive before we deal with jurisdictional issues. What I'm trying to do and what I'm willing to do is to reserve their rights. I need their input for some of the substantive matters, I need their input to make some decisions that I think are
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significant in the case, and they need to participate in that, but I don't want them to waive or give up any of their rights to take the position that the Court has no jurisdiction over them.

So I want to give them and make sure that they have some comfort in the fact that by giving me some of their comments about the substantive issues, they are not waiving their procedural rights. They are just giving me the benefit of their views on some substantive matters, and I'll preserve any of their rights to take the position that the Court has no jurisdiction over them. So I want to make sure that they understand that. I'll have the parties stipulate to that effect, if that's necessary.

MR. LEVIN: We certainly will stipulate to that on behalf of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

THE COURT: Filings in the MDL.
MR. LEVIN: Nothing new, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Default judgments, anything?
MR. LEVIN: Well, we have that one default judgment that we're going to argue after the conference.

THE COURT: Right. I talked about insurance issues. Is there anything more on that?

MR. LEVIN: Yes. Your Honor had a ruling in the homeowners litigation. Despite our strenuous disagreement with Your Honor's ruling, we've decided to withdraw the cases, and we're in the process of getting permission from the individual
plaintiff's counsel, we've set up a procedure where, if they want to object to the dismissal of their case with prejudice, they notify us so that we can notify the Court. I believe they will be dismissed, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine. There is also, FCCI has indicated that they intend to file a request for an interlocutory appeal when I issue the judgment. I duly note that, and when I do issue the judgment I'll let them make their position known and I'll hear from them. I don't need any oral argument on it, but I'll hear from the plaintiffs and then I'll make that decision. Service of pleadings electronically.

MR. LEVIN: There's nothing new on that, Your Honor. One thing that is new is we have been able to serve the Knauf entities by serving Mr. Miller, which expedites things, and it's working. They got a lot of paper in the last month. We would like to have that agreement with Taishan.

THE COURT: Yes. I think that, frankly, would be helpful, because one problem that we had to get over initially in this particular case is the census of the case. When we started out, neither side, neither the plaintiffs nor the defendants, just looking at it from a two-sided issue and all of the people associated with both of those sides, really didn't have a feeling for the census. How many cases are we dealing with? How many board feet are we dealing with, and where are they? How many claims are there? Things of that sort.

| $09: 39 \mathrm{AM}$ | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $09: 40 \mathrm{AM}$ | 2 |
| $09: 40 \mathrm{AM}$ | 3 |
| $09: 40 \mathrm{AM}$ | 4 |
| $09: 40 \mathrm{AM}$ | 5 |
| $09: 40 \mathrm{AM}$ | 6 |

09:40AM

09:40AM

09:40AM

09:40AM

09:40AM 11

09:40AM 12

09:40AM 13

09:40AM 14
09:40AM 15

09:40AM 16

09:40AM

09:40AM

09:41AM

09:41AM

09:41AM

09:41AM 22

09:41AM 23

09:41AM 24

09:41AM 25

So it wasn't an easy thing to work through, but in this process, with Knauf's agreement, I think we were, we were able to expedite the matter, and they were better able to get a census of their litigation, and I think it moved the case faster than it would have otherwise.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor, that's right, and I would recommend the process. A compromise that my client reached with the PSC was to accept service so that they don't have to go through the time and the expense of doing that, in exchange for the appointment of BrownGreer as a Special Master to confirm product ID.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MILLER. So that we could further refine the census. And I think there is a mutuality of interest there.

THE COURT: Yes, I think that that's a key thing. I don't think it's fair for a defendant to come into the litigation when they don't even know their total exposure, and so I have to recognize that. This is a way of dealing with it, and I think that in a case of this sort it's helpful to all sides if we get our hands around it and find out what the total census is. It worked with Knauf, and hopefully it will work with Taishan.

MR. LEVIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Master complaints, anything?
MR. LEVIN: Well, we're still filing omnibus complaints. The master complaint is not ready until all the interventions are
in place.
THE COURT: Yes, this case has posed a challenge for pleadings, and they have to invent things that you don't find in the Federal Rules, like the omnibus complaint. We had to figure out a way of having claims grouped. The parties had to figure out a way of dealing with that, and both sides, all of the interested parties suggested that we deal with it in the form of an omnibus complaint so that all of the claims that are of the same type we can put into an omnibus complaint. That helps us also with the census.

Once we get everybody into the litigation, then perhaps a master complaint may or may not be in order to group the issues so that we're dealing with issues one time as opposed to a number of times.

All of these things are procedural, they are not substantive, but the procedure makes it more efficient and effective, and that's what we have been doing.

Special Master.
MR. LEVIN: I think I've addressed the master, unless you have any other questions.

THE COURT: No, I think that that was very helpful to us in this particular case. BrownGreer is very efficient, and they will be able to be of great assistance in that regard.

MR. LEVIN: With regard to the class action complaint on the indeterminate defendants, we have a motion for preliminary
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the default judgments, too -- are Taishan entities, and we've moved those plaintiffs from the indeterminate defendant complaint, Omni 3, to Omni 7, along with additional Taishan plaintiffs, which there are substantial.

The PSC is now in the process of formulating an Omni 8 complaint, which is against the Knauf entities and some builders with them. The plaintiffs are predominantly Texas residents; although, there are residents in Louisiana and Florida, but that will be predominantly Texas residents.

THE COURT: Yes, we're getting some cases from Texas, and also, I understand there are a few cases in Colorado now and in other states. We have about 15 or 20 states that are involved in this litigation so far.

As you can see, the scope of the litigation is rather daunting. I have in this particular case nearly a thousand defendants. A thousand defendants. We may have about 20,000 or so plaintiffs. The case presents challenges because I have 1,200 lawyers in this particular case. We have a thousand defendants, 20,000 or so plaintiffs, and 1,200 lawyers. So you can see the challenge that that poses from a logistical standpoint, an organizational standpoint.

The cases of this magnitude could not be handled without talented lawyers on each side, and it's been very helpful to me in this particular case to have quality lawyers presenting this particular case. It's been able to be managed because of

their efforts.
Matters set for hearing. Litigation expense fund.
MR. LEVIN: That's just staying there, Your Honor.
We're not pushing it at this point.
THE COURT: I did the appointment of the plaintiffs' committee.

Mediation. What is the status of the Banner matter? Anything there?

MR. LEVIN: Well, somebody will stand up, if I'm speaking out of -- that I shouldn't be.

In a public conference with Your Honor we went through, two weeks ago, a term sheet that we proposed. We reduced it to writing. We sent it to Banner. We received a response from Banner last night. I've got to take it up with my plaintiffs' committee. We're moving the ball very close. Within field goal range.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LEVIN: Probably, we could, even on the fourth down, go for a touchdown, but there is a few things that we have to do, that we have to clear up, and until we do that, I don't think Banner wants me to go any further.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine, just get it to me by Monday or Tuesday --

MR. LEVIN: Absolutely, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- so that I can hear from you as to that.


Hopefully that will resolve.
Class certification motions?
MR. LEVIN: The Germano motion, which is a Taishan motion, we're deferring because we believe we should deal with the jurisdictional issues, the depositions, the documents, the motions to compel, and put that on the back table.

The three other motions for class certification, INEX, Knauf, Banner, Your Honor has scheduled them for hearings June 1, 2, and 3. We have a schedule for discovery. We're meeting next week on the scope of discovery. I don't think we'll have a problem there. Most of -- we all know what class discovery is, and there will be a substitution of class representative because one of the class representatives qualified for the pilot program. We lost him, but we'll put somebody else in.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. If any issues come up there, get to me on the phone, and I'll hear from both sides and resolve the issues, as sometimes problems crop up with class certification discovery. Let's not bog down in that.

Pretrial order 1H, anything on that?
MR. LEVIN: Nothing sir.
THE COURT: How about the pilot program, any status on the pilot program?

MR. LEVIN: Greg?
MR. WALLANCE: Good morning, Your Honor,
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Gregory Wallance, Kaye Scholer, for the Knauf entities.
Your Honor, I think we've made very good progress, off to a good start. We have qualified about 175 homes for the program. That means that they -- those homes have now been given over to our contractor, Moss and Associates. Approximately 80 of those homes have been inspected and bid out by subcontractors. We're assembling, for those 80 homes, work authorizations, and in some cases the work authorizations have gone out for review by the homeowners, their counsel, and by Knauf. Once those authorizations are signed, then it's just a matter of scheduling the work, giving the owner -- if the owner is still occupying the house -- move-out notice and then commencing construction work. We are hopeful that between the efforts we're making on the Slidell homes and some very, very positive discussions that we had yesterday with Your Honor and with the PSC regarding moving forward on at least those that are closest to starting work, particularly where the homeowner may no longer be occupying, then I'm hopeful that within a very short time you're going to see some shovels flying and some hammers, and I think there is going to be some visible results of the very, very substantial effort that we've all made over the last six or seven months.

THE COURT: I appreciate your work on it. It's been very helpful to have you coordinate the matter. I would suggest that, as we go along, oftentimes you're dealing with a number of
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plaintiff lawyers and a number of plaintiff counsel, and we really need from the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee the designation of one person who can handle that, and we need that person to be the expeditor so that you can go to that person and say, this is a problem I have in this home in Florida or this home in Virginia or the home in Louisiana or Mississippi, and then that expeditor can handle the matter, as opposed to your trying to flesh out who is the lawyer in charge of that particular case.

Also from your standpoint, you're going to have some people that need to answer some homeowners who have complaints or some suggestions or whatever it is, and they need to talk to somebody, and it's not going to be enough that they can call "the company." They need some name that they can call, e.g., call John or call Paul or something of that sort, so that that person is responsible for handling that complaint.

MR. WALLANCE: Your Honor, we're going to put that in place, and I am speaking to Moss this afternoon, and we will be providing a name tomorrow to the PSC to furnish to the attorneys representing the homeowners.

And, Your Honor, if I may, I don't want to leave the impression that we are content with 175 homes or that we're content ultimately with the 300 homes that are the intended target of the pilot program. We're in the process of laying the groundwork to expand the pilot program well beyond several
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hundred homes.
There are a number of mediations, negotiations, discussions alluded to earlier that, while there are a lot of moving parts, if they all come together, I think over the course of the next 6 to 12 months you're going to see a very rapid expansion of the pilot program.

In that regard, I would urge all of the attorneys who are listening in on this who represent homeowners who haven't furnished through the PSC documentation that would qualify their homes for this program to do so, and we will act on it. We have engaged with every attorney who has furnished us that kind of documentation. There is a process to go through, but we're committed to that engagement.

MR. LEVIN: We basically agree with everything Mr. Wallance has said, but 6 to 12 months is not going to do it. We've got to move a lot faster than that. We've got people that are out of their homes, can't get into their homes, and they've waited already 18 months, and 12 months just doesn't do it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I agree with that. We do have to move faster, and I think that Greg sees that. I think what he was saying, that hopefully the whole matter can be resolved in a very short time.

MR. WALLANCE: Your Honor, I'm talking about -- I'm talking about more than a few hundred homes when I use that time
period. I'm talking about --
THE COURT: Yes, right. You're talking about the whole thing.

MR. WALLANCE: -- about the substantial critical mass that will break, if you will allow me to use the expression, break the back on the case, at least as against the Knauf entities.

THE COURT: Yes, I see in the future that there is an indication that we may be coming into a closing aspect, or end game at least from Knauf, and that's important for the other defendants to kind of take a look at because they have now a concrete program that they can look at, they should know their census, and the insurance companies that are behind them should be able to evaluate their situation, and hopefully we can move this entire litigation to completion.

MR. WALLANCE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much.
MR. LEVIN: Regarding the new items, sir.
THE COURT: Yes, the new items, stipulation of service. We've talked about that.

MR. MILLER: On that point, I'm sorry, Your Honor, I forgot to mention earlier, the deadline to get the indicia in to BrownGreer is February the 4th. It's in the order, but I just want to highlight it while we're here.

THE COURT: Right, okay.
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MR. LEVIN: Along those lines, what has to go to BrownGreer is as follows: Much of the indicia has been sent to our office. It was sent pursuant to a court order. We are in the process of getting that in order to deliver to BrownGreer. So the plaintiffs' counsel do not have to duplicate what they've given us. That does not mean that it's been determined to be adequate. They should supplement, if they have to supplement, and I encourage them to supplement with BrownGreer.

Knauf accumulated a lot of indicia with regard to the pilot program, lawyers that attempted to schedule mediations, and gave them to Knauf and Knauf's counsel. That information is not being turned over by Knauf because there was no court order involved in that. And as to that particular indicia, they must -- the plaintiff's attorney must send that to BrownGreer.

If there are clients who are not on an Omni complaint as yet, they can send it to BrownGreer after the Omni complaint is filed, or they can expedite it by sending it to BrownGreer and noting that the plaintiff is not on an Omni complaint as yet, but it's very important that all plaintiff's counsel know that date and get this information in because this -- getting this information in is going to advance the wall to the ultimate resolution of this case.

THE COURT: All right. So if anybody and any plaintiff counsel needs some clarification on that, get the liaison or lead counsel, and they will be able to meet with you and consult
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further with you on that.
Our next status conference is February 23rd, and I'll meet with the liaison and lead counsel early on and then have the open matter at 9 o'clock.

I'll take a quick break here and return for motions. Anything from anybody that I haven't talked about? I've had these matters in open court for that reason.

I've also, as I mentioned, made some reappointments and new appointments to the committee. Those new individuals who are newly on the Plaintiff's Steering Committee, I welcome you to the litigation. I look forward to working with you on this matter and urge that you be conscious of team effort. I think that that makes it work.

With class action individuals, the Court is responsible under Rule 23 to pick a qualified person. That individual generally carries the ball in a class action. An MDL is little different. There are both class actions and multiple cases involved. You need talented people, just as you do in class actions, but in addition, the MDL needs individuals who pull the wagon together in teams, and that is very critical, and I know that this group is aware of that and will continue to do so.

MR. LEVIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'll be back in 10 minutes. Court will
stand in recess.
(WHEREUPON, at 10:00 a.m. the status conference was concluded.)
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|  |  | SEDRAN [1] - 1:16 | stand [2]-21:9, 28:25 | suggested [1] - 18:7 |
| QUESTIONS | representing ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{gathered} \text { see }[6]-8: 22,20: 14, \\ 20: 20,23: 19,25: 5, \end{gathered}$ | standpoint [3]-20:21, | suggestions $[1]$ - |
| quick [1] - $28: 5$ <br> quickly $[1]$ - 10:1 | ```request [1] - 16:6 requests [1]-8:12 requirements [1] - 8:25``` | 26: | $\begin{gathered} 24: 10 \\ \text { start [2] - 9:22, } 23: \end{gathered}$ | $\text { SUITE }_{[14]}-1: 17$ |
|  |  | SEEGER [1] - 2:2 | started [1] - 16:19 | 1:23, 2:4, 2:8, 2:1 |
| R |  | $\text { sees }[1]-25: 2$ | starting [1] - 23:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 18,2: 21,3: 12, \\ & 3: 18,3: 21,3: 22,4: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { range }_{[1]}-21: 16 \\ & \text { rapid }_{[1]}-25: 5 \\ & \text { rather }_{[1]}-20: 15 \\ & \mathbf{R E}_{[1]}-1: 4 \end{aligned}$ | ```reserve [1] - 14:23 residents [3] - 20:8, 20:9 resolution[1]-27:22 resolve [2] - 22:1,``` | SEGURA [1] - 3:21 <br> send [2]-27:14, 27:16 <br> sending [1] - 27:17 <br> sent $[3]-21: 13,27: 2$, 27:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state }[7]-10: 22,11: 1, \\ & 11: 12,11: 14,11: 25, \\ & 12: 5,12: 17 \end{aligned}$ <br> STATE/FEDERAL [2] - $4: 13,5: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:15, 4:19 } \\ & \text { SUNTRUST }[1]-4: 8 \\ & \text { supplement }[3]-27: 7, \\ & 27: 8 \\ & \text { Supply }[1]-12: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\operatorname{Re}_{[1]}-7: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:18 } \\ & \text { resolved }[1]-25: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Serpe [2] - 11:7, 12:8 <br> serve [1] - 16:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state/federal }[1] \text { - } \\ & 10: 13 \end{aligned}$ | T |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:7 } \\ & \text { ready }[4]-9: 20,9: 25, \\ & 10: 4,17: 25 \end{aligned}$ | response [1]-21:14 <br> responsible [2] - 24:16, 28:15 <br> responsive [1] - 12:6 | 16:11 17:8, $26 \cdot 19$ <br> SERVICE [1] - 5:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 20 \\ & \text { STATES }[2]-1: 1,1: 12 \end{aligned}$ | table [1] - 22:6 <br> Taishan [11]-11:2, |



