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| 1 | Jones Day. |
| 2 | A. Absolutely. |
| 3 | Q. You may have or did from local counsel. |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | Q. And you can't recall whether you did from the City's |
| 6 | law department. |
| 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | Q. Are you waiving the attorney-client privilege in |
| 9 | connection with the motion to assume the forbearance |
| 10 | agreement? |
| 11 | $\quad$ MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, could call for |
| 12 | the revelation of attorney-client communication. |
| 13 | You can answer the question, but yes or no. |
| 14 | A. No. |
| 15 | BY MR. HACKNEY: |
| 16 | Q. If I ask you questions regarding the legal advice |
| 17 | rendered to you in connection with the forbearance |
| 18 | agreement's negotiation or execution, you will refuse |
| 19 | to answer those questions on the grounds of the |
| 20 | attorney-client privilege; is that correct? |
| 21 | MR. SHUMAKER: If you're asking what the |
| 22 | advice is, certainly. The communications between |
| 23 | counsel and what he was -- what he was advised on, |
| 24 | certainly. |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Right. |

Page 14
1 BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. That's correct?
A. Yes. That is correct.
Q. So if I ask you what your view is on the likelihood
that the City's Swap and validity arguments will
prevail, you will assert the attorney-client
privilege; is that correct?
A. Yes, more than likely.
Q. If I ask you your view on the likelihood that the pledge of the gaming revenues under the Michigan Gaming Act is an invalid pledge, you'll assert the attorney-client privilege, correct?
A. Yes, more than likely.
Q. If I ask you questions regarding the likelihood that the City would prevail on a claim or defense against the Swap counterparties, you'll assert the attorney-client privilege, correct?
A. Yes, more than likely.
Q. And I guess I gotta clarify. When you say more than likely, I mean are you asserting the privilege with respect to those types of questions? I'm trying to save having to --
A. Sure.

MR. SHUMAKER: Let me state for the record you can ask questions as to whether those -- those
factors were considered by Mr. Orr, but obviously if you're going to ask what he was -- what he was advised by counsel, then I'm going to instruct him not to answer.
A. When I say more than likely, that's -- that's exactly the distinction that I'm trying to make. Did I have discussions with my counsel? Yes. Did those discussions take into consideration some of those factors? Yes. Am I going to tell you what those discussions were and what, if any, conclusions were made? No.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. Fair enough.

On July 15, 2013, the City entered into
what we're going to call the forbearance agreement with the Swap counterparties and the service corporations; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When did negotiations around that agreement with the Swap counterparties begin after your appointment?
A. I think there were discussions about negotiations almost immediately after my appointment. My specific knowledge -- when you say negotiations, what do you mean?
Q. Well, let me -- let me ask it a different way, which
is isn't it true that Mr. Buckfire was the lead negotiator for the City on the business terms of what became the forbearance agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Buckfire has testified that the negotiations in earnest regarding what became the forbearance agreement were conducted between June 4th and June 11th of 2013?
A. I don't recall those specific dates, but I think that's the right time frame. Let me -- let me try to be as clear as I can so we can move on. We began talking, discussing ways with my advisors, without discussing what we discussed, to provide the City with liquidity almost immediately upon my appointment. The negotiations that you're referring to I believe did occur within that time frame.
Q. Okay. So you don't have a basis as you sit here today to contradict Mr. Buckfire's recollection of when the key negotiations over the business terms of the forbearance agreement were conducted?
A. No. It might be earlier, but that's the approximate time frame.
Q. And as he was the lead negotiator, he's probably the guy who would know, right?
A. Sure, absolutely.

1 Q. Okay. And you did not participate directly in those negotiations; isn't that correct?
A. No. No. I did participate at some point in June with -- I had no face-to-face meetings, but there were several phone calls with a principal on the other side.
Q. Do you remember when those phone calls took place?
A. I do not remember the exact date. I believe those calls took place in the first and second week of June prior to the June 14th creditor's meeting.
Q. Okay. And what was the substance of those calls?
A. The nature of the proposed settlement and the amount of the discount.
Q. And who were you talking to?
A. I don't remember. A Mr. Kuderic (phonetic)? There was one individual, and perhaps others on a conference call that Ken and I -- Ken and I had, Ken Buckfire and I had. One or two conference calls the first week of June and then perhaps another couple of conference calls the second week of June.
Q. And this was prior to an agreement in principle being struck?
A. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. And tell me what was said on these conference calls if you can divide them in your mind.
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1 A. Generally speaking, without violating confidential settlement negotiations, we were talking about the amount of the discount for the optional termination payment. At several points discussions broke down and the parties pledged to keep the lines of communication open, but felt that there may not be a settlement.

I actually, several times, came away
believing there was not going to be a settlement. I think there was a -- without running on, I think a weekend transpired, and then negotiations began anew the second week. Those negotiations broke down a time or two, and then eventually I believe an agreement in principle was reached at some point that week.
Q. If Mr. Buckfire testified there was an agreement in principle by June 11th of 2013, does that sound correct to you?
A. Yes, the second -- yes. Yes, it does.
Q. Now, you prefaced your answer without divulging confidential settlement communications, and I'll tell you that Rule 408 doesn't actually make your settlement communications privileged, and I mean from discovery it may have implications for admissibility at trial.
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to make sure that you're not leaving
anything out from these conversations.
A. No. I'm -- I'm trying to relay to you that there were -- there were some very difficult discussions the first week on a series of conference calls.
Negotiations broke down and that first week we walked away believing that the concept of the settlement wasn't going to work. I came away with a very sincere feeling that it wasn't going to work.

Those negotiations started again. It may have even started over the weekend, but they started the second week. They broke down again. There was a conference call where we -- the parties hung up without having reached an agreement. Then I believe later -- the afternoon, and it may have been the 11th -- I said it was the second week -- there were a series of calls going back and forth where the actual terms of the discount and the framework for the settlement was finally hammered out.
Q. Okay. Can you dial in with any more specificity the dates that these calls took place?
A. Like I said, the first of -- it is consistent with my memory that, yes, we started around the June 4th time frame. As I said, there was a weekend. June 10th was my public meeting, so June 11th is entirely reasonable as the date that we finally reached an agreement.
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Q. Okay. Do you maintain a calendar that would reflect any of these calls or dates?
A. No. Because they were very much off the cuff and ad hoc and they were not -- my calendar is more of a formal process where it has to go through my administrative assistant and it's put in, and then I either accept or deny it, and I don't have any of these calls basically because it was very quick and it was very dynamic and as I said, they actually broke down several times.
Q. Would you agree that, notwithstanding your involvement
in these calls with the Swap counterparties, it's still fair to characterize Mr. Buckfire --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as the lead negotiator for the City?
A. Yes.
Q. Using Mr. Buckfire's recollection of June 4th as kind of the kickoff of these negotiations which you don't have a basis to --
A. No.
Q. -- contradict --
A. Not at all.
Q. -- I'd like to kind of level set where you were at going in to June 4th. Okay?

Your assumption prior to June 4th was that
the Swap counterparties could unilaterally -unilaterally terminate the Swap, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. Well, my understanding was the City -- there were a series of events which put the City in default. The consent agreement prior to my appointment, the consent agreement, the declaration of a financial emergency, my appointment was an event of default. My understanding was that due to those multiple events of default, the counterparties had the ability to exercise their rights and deprive the City of much needed casino revenue.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. We'll get to the casino revenue in a moment which is something that's trapped under -- potentially trapped under the collateral agreement, right?
A. Right.
Q. I want to talk about the Swap agreement which can lead to a large termination payment --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that the service corporations might owe.
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand the distinction between those two documents --
A. Yes.
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Q. -- right?
A. Um-hm.
Q. And your assumptions prior to the June 4th meeting were that as a result of these events of default under the Swap that occurred, some of them, prior to your appointment --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that the Swap counterparties could unilaterally terminate the Swap and demand a sizable payment from the service corporations, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation.
A. Yeah, my assumption was, my understanding was that, yes, they could terminate and demand a sizable payment, whether from the service corporations or eventually from the City. It would hit our bottom line, yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's right because it ripples --
A. Yes.
Q. -- through the service corporations to the City by the service agreements, right?
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. If that is in fact the process, yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Now, another one of your assumptions prior to June 4 was that the Swap counterparties could also unilaterally trap cash under the collateral agreement, right?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. My understanding was that the Swap counterparties could instruct the custodian to exercise their rights to trap cash.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And that was one of the rights that they had as you were going into the negotiations with them, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. My understanding -- yes. My understanding was that they had that right.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's why you were negotiating with them, right?
A. My -- we were negotiating with them to make sure that the City had access to the revenue that it needed quite badly and that the City would not suffer the imposition of a fairly significant termination payment.
Q. Now, another one of your assumptions prior to June 4 was that no other party could stop the Swap
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counterparties from either terminating the Swaps or trapping cash, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation. A. Yeah, my assumption was -- or, rather, my understanding was that the Swap counterparties had certain rights and that they had the ability to exercise those rights and remedies. Whether another party could, quote-unquote, stop them could depend on a number of different factors.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. So was that something -- that was not something that you had considered then as of June 4th?
A. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. Yeah. We had considered whether or not there were perhaps other risks involved. What l'm saying to you is I had not, as you phrased the question, reached a conclusion as to whether or not someone would have the ability to stop them from exercising those rights.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. So you considered the question, but you hadn't answered, in your money mind, whether or not there was a party out there that could stop the Swap counterparties from acting.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.

1 A. We believe that the Swap counterparties could act. I think there's a series of letters subsequently with discussion with your client about their lack of ability to stop the Swap counterparties from acting, but I'm -- what I'm trying to relay to you is we had to assess whether they were risks to that, and my understanding was that they had the right to exercise their remedies.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Okay. Now, I want to also get a level set on your objectives going into the negotiations, and I
understand that when I say you, I mean the City,
Mr. Buckfire, there are multiple parts --
A. My -- my team --
Q. That's right.
A. -- consultants.
Q. I may be a little euphemistic, but I'll try to be precise at the right times.
A. That's fine.
Q. Okay.

MR. SHUMAKER: Steve, if I could just
object. If you could just define what you mean by level set, I would appreciate that.

MR. HACKNEY: I want to go back in time --
MR. SHUMAKER: Okay.
commencement of negotiations.
MR. SHUMAKER: Okay.
MR. HACKNEY: That's what I mean by level
set.
MR. SHUMAKER: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Now, l'd like to ask about your objectives as you go into the negotiation. Okay?
A. Um-hm.
Q. You understand that when you go into a negotiation it's important to have an understanding of both the financial realities that your party is -- is facing as well as the legal realities that your party's facing, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That informs the negotiation, right?
A. In making an informed decision, I would say you want to have an understanding of those factors.
Q. And you also want to understand what your counterparty in the negotiation needs and wants are as well as their potential legal rights, right?
A. What your counterparty negotiations perceived needs and rights are.
Q. That's right. That's right.

Now, I'm going to ask about the City's objectives in entering into the negotiations. Okay? Objective one of the City was to get the counterparties to waive their cash trap at least on an interim basis to allow the City access to casino revenues, correct?
A. I don't know if I would characterize it as objective one. It wasn't as if we were trying to prioritize one objective over the other. It was an objective to make sure that the cash did not get trapped.
Q. Okay. So that was one of the objectives.
A. Yes.
Q. A second objective was that you wanted to modify the Swap to get a discount on the termination amount, correct?
A. Yes. That was certainly an objective, yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection there to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And the third was that you wanted to obtain an option about when you could direct the termination of the Swap, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

1 A. Here again, I understand your characterization. I'm going to say that that -- that is a fair characterization without trying to quantify as one objective is more important than the others, and let me explain my answer.

The City was at risk of significant
reduction in cash flow at that period. I think at one point there were various projections that showed as us having as little as four or nine million dollars of cash on hand in mid-June. In fact, sometime around that period I heard that an employee of the City had gone to cash their paycheck and the paycheck had bounced. They came back in later that afternoon and it cashed, but we were -- we were that precarious in terms of our cash.

We knew we were at risk with regard to the Swap agreement both for trapping casino revenue as well as the termination payment. We also knew that we would need to analyze what the right were -- rights were and to have time to resolve that issue. So to the extent your characterization of three objectives encompasses those concepts, then that's a fair characterization.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And I don't mean to order them, but -- so I won't
focus on it. I just gave you them in an --
A. Sure.
Q. -- order.
A. Right.
Q. But those were three objectives of your negotiations, correct?
A. I think it's fair to say that.
Q. And you achieved those three objectives in the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. We believe so.
Q. Tell me what you and Mr. Buckfire discussed as he's going into the June 4 meeting. So what was his mission?
A. Well, I'm trying to -- generally speaking, because some of these conversations may have occurred on phone calls where my attorneys were present, but generally speaking, the characterization of what you just talked about, getting a discount of the termination payment, making sure that the casino revenue wasn't trapped, getting time to find an alternative source of funding, making sure that the City had sufficient cash to commence some immediate reinvestment and public health, safety and welfare initiatives that we were focused on, all of those concepts were caught up in these discussions.
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Q. Okay. So the way we described your objectives is a fair way to describe the marching orders that Mr. Buckfire had going in to the June 4 meeting.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, you know, marching orders -- I think that

Mr. Buckfire, myself, our attorneys, the consultants
and accountants reached a consensus.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. About what the City should do?
A. About what the City needed to do.
Q. And what -- and that consensus was to try and achieve the three objectives we talked about earlier.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Here again, l'll stay by the concept that, you know -I understand for your purposes you're trying to characterize the three objectives, but the objectives, in my opinion, were quite broader. The efforts to try to achieve the objectives, as you call them, were necessary for some of the things, priorities the City needed to do.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Did you have any conversations with anyone else in advance of June 4 about the anticipated negotiations? A. Oh, sure. We -- we -- my -- my team and I have conversations from the time my appointment became
subject of alternatives, on the subject of relieving
us from our obligations under the Swaps, we -- we --
we have conversations regularly.
Q. So going -- using the June 4th date, Mr. Buckfire goes
into a negotiation in New York with the Swap
counterparties, correct?
A. As to the best of my knowledge -- I'll stick with
June 4th, because you have told me that's what Ken
said, and so I assume that's the date -- yes.
Q. And whenever the date was, there was a first meeting that he took in person with the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. Yes. To the best of my recollection, I believe it was a meeting.
Q. What offer was he authorized to make in that meeting, if any?
A. I don't recall if there was a specific offer in that meeting. I think our discussions centered around getting the best deal we could. We may have discussed trying to even have the potential termination -optional termination payment or more, so I don't think we had it as strict as, you know, your marching orders
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are to say do this and go in.
It was to go in and have a discussion with
the representatives of the counterparty about what we needed to get so that the City could function first with cash flow, not any priority, but also to get a discount over that termination payment.
Q. So did Mr. Buckfire have authorization to make a formal proposal in the first meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And to your knowledge did he make one?
A. I believe so.
Q. What was the proposal?
A. I don't remember what the exact number was, but I believe the concepts were consistent throughout.
Q. And what were the concepts?
A. Same thing that we just said, to -- to try to get a discount over the termination payment, to try to make sure that the cash wasn't trapped, make sure we had some time to find a way to pay even the discounted amount.
Q. Did Mr. Buckfire report back to you after the June 4th meeting about what had transpired?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he tell you transpired?
A. Had a discussion. I don't have notes, but my general
recollection is had a discussion with the counterparties, discussed a range of alternatives, our first overture was rejected, but we would have further discussions.
Q. And do you remember whether they countered?
A. I don't remember specifically. I believe they may have.
Q. Okay. Do you know the terms of their counter?
A. Generally in the same concept I said. If you're looking for a number, for instance, we said 50 percent and they came back with 98. I don't recall those specifics.
Q. So you can't give me the bid and the ask --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- on what the Swap would be modified as far as the termination?
A. Yes, that's correct.
(Discussion off the record at 8:56 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 8:56 a.m.)
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Did the City enter into a nondisclosure agreement in connection with these negotiations?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. With the Swap counterparties?
A. Yes.
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 of the specific dates any of this occurred. I'm making representations to you as an officer who was here yesterday.A. Right.
Q. So subject to my representations being accurate,

Mr. Buckfire's recollection was that the next meeting in person with the Swap counterparties was June 8th.
A. That's sou -- as I said, there was a first week and there was a second week and that sounds about accurate. I believe June 8th may have been a weekend, so as I said before some of these discussions may have occurred over the weekend.
Q. Okay. So discussions had not broken down at this point, correct?
5 A. No. They may have. I think they broke down at some

## MR. HACKNEY: I think we would ask to see

 if that could be produced. I know that there's not formal written discovery, but the Court has also indicated that all documents relating to the debtors are effectively discoverable in bankruptcy, so l'd ask that you consider that and we can address it later.MR. SHUMAKER: We'll look into it.
MR. SHUMAKER. We ll look into it.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
point during the first week, but they -- they resumed. My interpretation was that they broke down, and then they recommenced a second week.
Q. Okay. So on -- if there -- to the extent

Mr. Buckfire's right that there was an in-person June 8th meeting --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- do you remember what his -- what your marching orders to him were as he went into that meeting?
A. Here again, the concept of marching orders, we were trying to get to an agreement generally, and I believe the instructions were to continue to move towards that process, whatever that was. And so the specific bid/ask that were going on throughout that time, I don't -- I don't recall, but the general concept was to continue to try to move to a point to get to a discount number or a discount process.
Q. Is it fair to say that if I ask you for the specific ebb and flow of the negotiations between the Swap counterparties in terms of the precise business deal --
A. Right.
Q. -- you would have to defer to Mr. Buckfire's recollection because he was more intimately involved? A. That's fair. Because Ken was -- Ken would have the
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direct meetings and then call me back. We'd go back and forth, and I didn't keep notes and I didn't keep a calendar, so --
Q. I asked you about nondisclosure agreements, but did the City execute any other agreements of any kind with the Swap counterparties during this period that you were negotiating the forbearance agreement?
A. No, not that I know of.
(Discussion off the record at 8:59 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 8:59 a.m.)
MR. HACKNEY: No. Problem. Let's go off the record.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is 8:59 a.m.
We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 8:59 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 9:08 a.m.)
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are back on the record at 9:08 a.m.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Mr. Orr, I want to clear something up. Maybe I've been saying it the wrong way. I've been using the term "marching orders" with the respect to the way that you and Mr. Buckfire operated.
A. Right.
Q. And is a better way to say it that you authorized

1 Mr. Buckfire to negotiate the best possible deal he could with the Swap counterparties and that's what he did?
A. That's a fair characterization, sure.
Q. And at some point did he come out of a meeting and say, Mr. Orr, this is the best deal that I'm able to get out of these Swap counterparties and it's my advice that we take it?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that on or about June 11th, 2013, which is the date he recalls the agreement in principle being reached?
A. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And what was the agreement in principle that was reached as you understood it?
A. The agreement was essentially that in exchange for a reduced optional termination payment -- we'll just call it the payment under the forbearance agreement -the Swap counterparties would agree not to trap the cash, they would agree to release their liens, and also release their claims, I believe, against your client, Syncora, and we would have access to that cash going forward provided we made the discounted payment

Page 38
at some point in the future. I believe at that point it was in the next 60,90 days.
Q. Isn't the -- wasn't the agreement in principle that you'd have an option to direct the termination of the Swap?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah. I believe the way it works is we would have an option to request the counterparties exercise their rights at a discounted level.

```
        BY MR. HACKNEY:
```

Q. And I'm not asking about the forbearance agreement.

I'm asking about the agreement in principle.
A. Yeah, I think those were the general confines of the agreement in principle.
Q. Okay. Now, you did not invite anyone else to the negotiations with the Swap counterparties; isn't that correct?
A. I did not invite anyone else. I don't know if Ken invited anyone else or anyone else on my behalf invited anyone else.
Q. And you did not direct anyone such as Mr. Buckfire or others to invite any other parties into the negotiation, correct?
A. Correct.

1 Q. And you did not invite Syncora to participate in these 2 negotiations, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you did not inform Syncora of the existence of these negotiations, correct?
A. The reason I'm hesitating is at some point clearly Syncora became aware, so I don't know how they were informed, but I did not do it, correct.
Q. You didn't do it.
A. Correct.
Q. And you did not invite FGIC to attend these negotiations, correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And you didn't direct anyone acting on your behalf to invite FGIC, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Nor did you inform FGIC of the existence of these negotiations, correct?
A. Me personally, no.
Q. You didn't invite U.S. Bank as trustee to the funding trust or as custodian or contract administrator to attend any negotiations, correct?
A. Me personally, no.
Q. And you didn't direct anyone else acting on your behalf to do so, correct?
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## A. Correct.

Q. Now, why didn't you invite Syncora into these negotiations with the Swap counterparties?
A. After consultations with my, you know, team, we didn't think Syncora had any right to be involved in the negotiations.
Q. And that's because Syncora had no rights under the relevant documents?
A. That was my understanding, yes.
Q. Now, at any time during these negotiations -- and by these negotiations, I mean through the June 11th agreement in principle.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Okay? I understand that there are legal negotiations of the scrivening of the document --
A. Sure.
Q. -- between June 11 and July 15. I going to ask you about them, but when I say these negotiations, I'm talking about the ones that we're talking about right now --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- that led to the agreement in principle.
A. Okay.
Q. At any time prior to June 11th, did the Swap

25 counterparties send a notice of a default under the

| Page 41 | Page 43 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Swap? | 1 A. Right. |
| 2 A. I don't recall, but I don't think so. | 2 Q. I'll say that. |
| 3 Q. At any time prior to June 11th, did the Swap | 3 A. Okay. |
| 4 counterparties designate an early termination date? | 4 Q. I've talked about events of default under the Swap |
| 5 A. I don't recall, but I don't think so. | 5 that could lead to the big termination payment. |
| 6 Q. Did they ever threaten to? | 6 A. Right. |
| 7 A. They didn't threaten me. | 7 Q. We talked about that earlier, right? |
| 8 Q. They never threatened you personally. | 8 A. Right. |
| 9 A. Right. | 9 Q. I'm talking specifically now about whether there were |
| 10 Q. Did they threaten other people who reported the | 10 events of default under the collateral agreement. Had |
| 11 threats to you? | 11 you breached any of the provisions of the collateral |
| 12 A. Not that I know of. | 12 agreement? |
| 13 Q. At any time during these negotiations, did the Swap | 13 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal |
| 14 counterparties designate an optional early | 14 conclusio |
| 15 termination? | 15 A. Yeah. That's why l'm being a little -- a little |
| 16 A. Not that I know of | 16 careful here. There may be conduct under the Swaps |
| 17 Q. Did they ever threaten to do that? | 17 that could be conceivably a breach under collateral |
| 18 A. Not me. | 18 agreement. I don't know what they are, so I'm being |
| 19 Q. And did they ever threaten anyone else who reported | 19 hesitant. But to get to your question, were we making |
| 20 the threat to you? | 20 the payments due under the Swaps? Yes. |
| 21 A. Not to my knowledge, no. | 21 BY MR. HACKNEY: |
| 22 Q. At any time during these negotiations, did the Swap 23 counterparties contend that the City was in breach of | 22 Q. What was -- what was the conduct under the Swap that 23 might be -- |
| 24 the collateral agreement? | 24 A. I'm not sure. |
| 25 A. Which collateral agreement are you talking about? | 25 Q. As you sit here today, are you aware of any breaches |
| Page 42 | Page 44 |
| 1 Q. The collateral agreement with respect to the casino | 1 of the collateral agreement by the City? |
| 2 revenues. | 2 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal |
| 3 A. The 2009 agreement? | 3 conclusion. |
| 4 Q. Yes. | 4 A. None from my perspective, but there might be. What I |
| 5 A. Okay. Not that I recall. | 5 don't want to do is sit here today and try to draw a |
| 6 Q. In fact, the City was endeavoring to make the monthly | 6 conclusion as to what might be a breach of the |
| 7 Swap payments into the holdback account throughout | 7 collateral agreement vis-a-vis the Swap agreement. |
| 8 this period, correct? | 8 I'm trying to answer your question that we were making |
| 9 A. Yes. They were being paid in the ordinary course. | 9 the payments that were due. |
| 10 Q. And to the best of your knowledge, the City has | 10 BY MR. HACKNEY: |
| 11 complied with all of its obligations under the | 11 Q. Yeah, I appreciate that. I mean, I guess your answer |
| 12 collateral agreement vis-à-vis the Swap | 12 is there may be breaches of the collateral agreement, |
| 13 counterparties. | 13 there may not be, you don't know. |
| 14 A. No. | 14 A. I don't know, that's right. |
| 15 Q. That's not correct? | 15 Q. Now, this June 11th agreement in principle that we |
| 16 A. No, I mean I think we were -- as I said previously | 16 were talking about earlier -- |
| 17 today, we were in default. | 17 A. Right. |
| 18 Q. Of the collateral agreement? | 18 Q. -- was there a term sheet? |
| 19 A. Right. You mean in terms of making the payments due 20 under the agreement? | 19 A. No. To the best of my recollection, I did not see a 20 term sheet at that time. |
| 21 Q. Well, the collateral agreement I know so -- the | 21 Q. And just to be clear, do you know whether there was a |
| 22 collateral agreement and the Swap are -- they are two | 22 term sheet that you just didn't see? |
| 23 different agreements -- | 23 A. Yeah. There might have been a term sheet that I |
| 24 A. Yes. | 24 didn't see. I think Ken and I and some of the other |
| 25 Q. -- that certainly relate to one another. | 25 attorneys at Jones Day, Corinne, David Heiman and |

others would have a -- I'm trying to relay to you a sense that we'd have calls, but sometimes I don't recall seeing a specific term sheet at that time.
Q. I'm going to distinguish this from when you get into
the definitive document negotiation that's going to become the forbearance agreement.
A. Right.
Q. You're familiar with the idea that sometimes parties
hash out a non-binding term sheet --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to get an understanding on the business terms, and then they progress from the term sheet to the definitive document. You're familiar with that concept.
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to put the definitive documents over here.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you remember whether there was a term sheet?
A. There eventually was a term sheet. I just don't remember whether or not it was on June 11th.
Q. That's fine. So do you think it went agreement in
principle, non-binding term sheet, and then
negotiation of definitive documents?
A. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: You're talking about in
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time?
MR. HACKNEY: Yes.
MR. SHUMAKER: Chronologically?
MR. HACKNEY: Yes.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And so at some point you did see a non-binding term
sheet that embodied the agreement in principle
Mr. Buckfire had negotiated, correct?
A. Yes. Oh, yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. HACKNEY: Is that something that the
City's willing to produce?
MR. SHUMAKER: We'll look into it. I
don't -- I don't see that one as being an issue.
MR. HACKNEY: Okay.
MR. SHUMAKER: To the extent we have it.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And the term sheet was consistent with the agreement
in principle that we discussed earlier that
Mr. Buckfire negotiated?
A. Yes. It had obviously, as terms do, have more
information, but it was consistent.
Q. So between July 11 -- I'm sorry.

Between June 11th --
A. Okay.

1 Q. -- and July 15th, which is the execution date of the forbearance agreement --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you pivot from negotiating this agreement in principle that Mr. Buckfire has struck to now documenting it, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Buckfire has testified that those -- that those negotiations proceeded without interruption from June 11th to Ju -- July 15th. Is that consistent with your recollection?
A. The negotiations continued. I think there were other events related to the agreement, some of them by your client in that time frame, but yes, we continued negotiating.
Q. Okay. And there were no serious interruptions in those negotiations, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. There was an agreement reached. I'm going to take your time frame, June 11th. Ken and I had a discussion about the amount. It was somewhere south of $\mathbf{2 5}$ percent. I believe in the same second week I said we can't do this deal for less than a 25 percent discount. I believe the negotiations broke down, then the next day they came back without changing the
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framework of the agreement, just the number changed, the discount went up, and then I believe that -- yes, I believe negotiations continued continually throughout that time.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And they -- they continued from June 11 to July 15 without serious interruption, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, here again, your characterization of serious interruption and to July 15th, I don't want to testify to your characterization. What I can say is it was my understanding that negotiations continued from that second week of June to that date, if that's the date that you're relaying to me based upon Mr. Buckfire's testimony.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Were there any serious interruptions in the
negotiations between June 11 and July 15?
MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. You keep saying serious, and to the best of my knowledge there were no material or significant interruptions. I don't want to try to characterize what serious means. I think negotiations continued unabated.

BY MR. HACKNEY:

1 Q. There were little -- there may have been points of contention between the parties, but they continued steadily from June 11 to July 15, true statement?
A. Here again, I believe June 14th was the creditor's meeting, and I don't have a document to refresh my recollection in front of me, but I believe your client sent a letter at some point during that time which I think had an impact on negotiations, so l'm being careful with the concept that they continued without serious interruption because I think there may have been interruptions.
Q. So there may have been a serious interruption in the negotiations.
A. Yeah. I just don't remember the time frame. I mean you probably recall there were a series of letters between Mr. LeBlanc and your client at first to the custodian and then to me and then I wrote back to him. I'm just not recalling the specific dates of those letters, but I believe they were during this time.
Q. And those caused a serious interruption in the negotiations, right?
A. Here again, you say -- you say serious, and I'm saying it caused an interruption. There was -- there were -I recall there were letters that I was sending back and forth, and so whether or not it was serious, I
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believe they're interruptions, if this is the time frame I'm thinking of. If they came after the June 14th date and it was July 17th, for instance, that's when that -- those events occurred.
Q. Okay.
Q. I'll represent to you, and I'm going to show it to you in a moment, but Syncora's letter was June 17th.
A. Okay. Then that -- yeah, then that -- that caused some disruption.
Q. It caused some disruption, but did it cause a serious interruption in the negotiations?
A. Yeah, because the benefit that we -- we were supposed to get which was -- actually as I recall, your client sent a letter to UBS. UBS expressed some concern. The negotiations that we were going through were impacted by those concerns and, here again, recalling off the top of my head, there were discussions then. Mr. LeBlanc sent me a letter, I sent him one, I think he sent me another one, I think we exchanged two or three letters, and those all had an impact on the negotiations, yes.
Q. Did they stall the negotiations?
A. To some degree I believe they did.

25 Q. And did you inform Mr. Buckfire that these important
negotiations had been stalled by Syncora?
A. Well, I think there were discussions about Syncora's behavior that was reflected in my letters.
Q. That wasn't my question. My question was did you tell

Mr. Buckfire that there had been -- that the
negotiations had been stalled as a result -- as a resort of Syncora's conduct?
A. Sir, that's your phrase, "stalled." What I said was I think they did have an impact on the negotiations because there were communications going back and forth, I think we discussed them, and I think I sent a series of letters back and forth to your client as a consequence of that behavior.
Q. You wouldn't use the -- you wouldn't use the word stalled to describe the negotiations impact --
Syncora's impact on the negotiations, correct?
A. Yeah, l'm not going to use any adjectives -specifically what I said is they had an impact.
Q. But you can't say that they stalled?
A. I don't know if they did or they didn't. I said they had an impact.
Q. Okay. And did you inform Mr. Buckfire that there had been a serious interruption in the negotiations with the Swap counterparties?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and

Page 52
answered.
A. Yeah, here again, I don't think I had to inform him. We were all of the opinion that after announcing, I believe -- after reaching, rather, we thought was agreement in principle, I believe that following Monday, if it's the 17th, your client sent a letter and interjected itself into this process and -BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. So Mr. --
A. -- that had an impact.
Q. Sorry to interrupt you.
A. You're okay.
Q. Mr. Buckfire was well aware of the serious
interruption in the negotiation process, correct?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation, form.
A. Here again, you keep saying serious interruption. I said it had an impact. Whether or not that stopped us from having discussions with the Swap counterparties and going forward, it certainly had an impact on the process.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It didn't stop the process, though, did it?
A. It had an impact on it. We were -- we were trying to continue going forward in figuring out what your client's intent was and whether or not it should have
an impact on the Swap counterparties or the custodian.
Q. But did you inform Mr. Buckfire that Syncora's
letter -- Mr. Buckfire, the lead negotiator of the business terms of the deal, that Syncora's letter had disrupted the negotiations of this important agreement?
A. I don't know if I --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. I don't know if I had to inform Mr. Buckfire. He saw the letters that were going back and forth and I'm sure he was aware that they had an impact on what we were trying to achieve.

MR. HACKNEY: Let me hand you a document
l've marked for purposes of identification as Orr
Exhibit 1.
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 1
9:24 a.m.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Is this a copy of Syncora's June 17th, 2013 letter?
A. Um-hm.

Okay. I've read the letter.
Q. Have you had a chance to read it?
A. Yes.
Q. First question, are there any statements you consider
to be false in this letter?
A. I think there was a discussion that some of the statements regarding the cross-default provision -this is -- this is what I understood of this letter after -- without going into specific discussions with my attorneys, that I had with my attorneys, that my understanding was Syncora was attempting to tell U.S. Bank, as custodian, that the default on the COP payment on June 14 constituted some form of a cross-default and therefore it impacted the settlement we were teaching -- attempting to reach under the Swap agreement.

We did not believe that those two events had a relationship in that position it appeared Syncora was taking, trying to tell U.S. Bank not to release any of the casino revenue to us, was appropriate.
Q. Other than the letter characterizing the missed payment as a cross-default, other than the sentence, are there any other sentences in this letter that you think are false?
A. Well, the first paragraph is an introductory paragraph, so I don't think that's relevant. The second paragraph -- the last paragraph is someone reserving their rights, and that's fine. Generally
the tenor, without parsing through the entire letter, we believed that the tenor of the letter was inappropriate.
Q. But there were -- are there any other statements that were false in this letter other than the sentence you identified on the cross-default?

MR. SHUMAKER: I want you to go through it sentence by sentence.
A. We write in reference to the General Receipts

Subaccount under the cap --
COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.
A. Okay. The first sentence of the first paragraph is a reference in it, so I don't believe that would fall into whether or not it's true or false. It's what they purport to be writing to. I suppose someone could take an interpretation that to the extent they're trying to reference the cross collateralization is false, but I'm not trying to be insincere, so I'm just going to go through the letter.

The second sentence of the first paragraph is a general business nomenclature, so that's a throw away. June 14th service corporations failed to -- the first sentence of the second paragraph I believe we did fail to make the June 14th payment.

BY MR. HACKNEY:

1 Q. The second sentence we've discussed.
A. Which is the substantive sentence I believe is -- is the one that we had issues with, we felt was inappropriate.

The third paragraph, first sentence, I
don't know whether that was false or not because I wasn't privileged to -- privy to that conversation. The second sentence is a request of the third paragraph. That consent is required for any release, I think that was another -- the last sentence of the third paragraph I think we had a problem with that, and as I said before, the final paragraph sentence I don't think is germane to discussion that we're having. It's a standard business sentence.
Q. And the last sentence of the third paragraph you had a problem with because you don't think Syncora has consent rights, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct, yeah.
Q. Now, how did this letter disrupt negotiations with the Swap counterparties?
A. Well, my -- my understanding is it raised concerns as far as what Syncora thought their rights were and what they were going to do. I think people have to understand this was a very sensitive and urgent situation. As I said before, the week before we had

1 checks bounce, we were running about four or nine million dollars, we needed urgent access to the -- to the revenue, and I think it caused all parties to take a step back.
Q. And how long did they step back?
A. I don't -- to be perfectly honest with you, I don't -I don't really recall. I remember, as I said before, after this letter there were a series of letters that went back and forth, and I recall that there was some concern by the counterparties as to their potential exposure based upon Syncora's behavior and whether or not they would be free to give us access to the casino revenue.
Q. They were concerned that Syncora might be right, correct?
A. No. That's your characterization. I think my general understanding was that everyone felt Syncora was quite wrong.
Q. Didn't you just say that they were worried about their exposure?
A. Well, their exposure in terms of -- not that they were right, their exposure in terms of potential litigation and having to parse through a position which they thought was unfounded.
Q. So they were worried about having to engage in a
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## litigation with Syncora over a frivolous legal position that Syncora was taking?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's your understanding?
A. Well, no. You're characterizing it as frivolous. I
think any prudent business people when they receive letters like this, if they don't believe they are well founded are certainly justified in being concerned about potential litigation.
Q. Were there any out-of-the-ordinary emergencies in the City of Detroit on July 5th that demanded your attention?
A. There are always out-of-the-ordinary emergencies in the City of Detroit.
Q. What were the ones on July 5th?
A. I don't -- I don't remember the ones on July 5th, but I'm sure you can check. We can -- you know, you can check the press reports as far as -- so there are shootings daily, there are fires, there are unfunded mandates within the City.
Q. Anything that stands out in your mind?
A. There are always -- there are always emergencies. Nothing that stands out in my mind, but on any given weekend, we get 30 shootings a weekend.
Q. Was there anything that you can recall today that happened on July 5th that was so urgent it couldn't wait six hours?
A. Every -- every day -- let me be clear about this, so we can just get by it. Every day that the City does not make reinvestment in the City that has tens of thousands of abandoned structures, that has four of the most dangerous neighborhoods in the country, that has police cars with over $\mathbf{2 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ miles on them, that has police officers I believe during this time, one of whom got shot in the head by a perpetrator that nine cars had surrounded and remains in the hospital today, every day that this City does not make reinvestment is a dangerous day.
Q. Were there any negotiations scheduled for July 5th, 2013, the day after July 4?
A. I don't -- I don't recall. If there's something you can refresh my recollection. I believe there was -there was something on July 5th. I'm just not recalling what it was.
Q. Did this letter cause the negotiations to cease between June 17th and when you're able to obtain the TRO on July 5th?
A. I wouldn't say whether it caused them to cease. As I said before, it had an impact and it was disruptive.
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Q. Okay. So it had an impact, but it didn't cause them to stop, correct?
A. To some degree the parties -- you know, to some degree my recollection is -- here again, understanding that I'm the client and I'm relying on my team, my understanding was it had an impact and it was disruptive.
Q. Did negotiations stop between June 17th and July 5th?
A. I don't know if they completely stopped because your characterization of negotiations could include discussions about what to do with Syncora's interruption.
Q. So the answer to my question is no, they did not stop?
A. No. The answer to your question is just what I said. The characterization of the interruption could include this letter.
Q. Okay. But it's a simple question, and you were the person that was involved for the City in making the ultimate decision. Did the negotiations of the forbearance agreement's final terms stop between June 17th and July 5th when you're able to get a TRO?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. Sir, I'm going to stick with my answer. It was disruptive and it was -- had an impact.

1 BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Can you answer the question as to whether they stopped?
A. Your characterization --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. On any given day they may have. I'm going to stick with my answer. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Were there any negotiations with the Swap
counterparties between June 17th and July 5th?
A. There probably were.
Q. After Syncora -- let me -- let me stop.

So after you obtained the TRO, did that
facilitate the resumption of the negotiations?
A. When did we obtain the TRO?
Q. July 5th.
A. That was the event I was talking about. I think it certainly facilitated the parties continuing to discuss, yes.
Q. It didn't resolve any of Syncora's rights, correct?
A. Well, we didn't -- we didn't --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
A. We didn't think Syncora had rights in this regard, but
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my understanding of the TRO was to cause Syncora to cease and desist from its behavior.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. But you understand that whatever Syncora's rights were before the TRO, they were after the TRO. The TRO doesn't resolve Syncora's rights. It's just an interim measure. You understand that as a lawyer, right?
A. Well --

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection, form.
A. And let's get by this, sir. Yes, I am an attorney, but I do not have a license in the state of Michigan and I'm not practicing law now nor do I have malpractice insurance, so I think it's fair for me to act as a -- act as a client, a business person, and not draw a legal conclusion as far as what your client's rights are. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And the TRO was very important because it stopped Syncora from doing what it was doing, correct?
A. Yes. My understanding is it did, sure.
Q. And that was critical, right?
A. I thought it was appropriate, yes.
Q. And then you were willing to dissolve the TRO one week later, correct?

1 A. I don't recall if it was one week later or not. I believe it was dissolved a week or so ago. I don't recall whether or not we were willing to resolve it one week later -- dissolve it one week later.
Q. If I told you that your counsel represented to me on July 12th, one week after the TRO was entered, that you were willing to dissolve the TRO, do you have a basis to contradict that?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation.
A. Yeah, if my counsel was telling you that in the context of potential settlement negotiations, I'm -I'm a little hesitant to characterize what he said, but I have no basis -- if my counsel represented that to you, I have no basis to object to that.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. And if they represented it in pleadings to the Court, you don't have a basis to dispute that either?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So this critical TRO that you had obtained, your counsel was willing to dissolve ten days after it was entered, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection. Counsel, this is discovery about the assumption motion, correct? I mean this is not discovery for the City's lawsuit against Syncora.

MR. HACKNEY: Syncora -- Syncora's alleged conduct is included in Mr. Orr's affidavit. It's described in the assumption motion. I mean, come on, this is right up Main Street.
A. Well, sir, I understand you're trying to get me to characterize what we were doing for purposes in the litigation. If you want to stick to the facts as far as what happened, I'm happy to talk to you about those, but you asked me a question before as to whether or not I would have any reason to object on what my counsel represented to you and I said no.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. If Syncora's letter represented such a threat to the City, why were you willing to dissolve the TRO that stopped the impact of Syncora's letter?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation.
A. Here again, there. There -- part of your question is calling for a little bit of speculation. Clearly, you were having discussions with my counsel potentially about what could be done to resolve this issue. Your question may not include the context of all of those discussions.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. I'm referring to statements you made in pleadings.

5 A. Well, I'm trying to respond to your question. There
may be other reasons why they made those representations. What I will say to you is what I said before. If my counsel represented to you that we were willing to dissolve it, I have no reason to contradict that.
Q. And they would have done that at your behest, right? MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation.
A. They -- we would have the -- they would have had the authority to do that, yeah.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. During the course of your negotiations back to the agreement in principle of what became the forbearance agreement, did you ever solicit the views of any of the other monoline insurers, such as Ambac or Assured or National about what they thought the City should do?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Did you ever solicit the views of any COP holders about what they thought the City should do with respect to the --
A. I didn't solicit their views, no.
Q. Did you direct anyone acting on your behalf to solicit
the views of any of those parties?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Isn't it true that getting the forbearance agreement
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was a life or death issue for the City of Detroit?
A. Yes, getting the forbearance agreement was very important to the City of Detroit.
Q. Is it a life or death issue?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to form.
A. When you say life or death, you know, here again I'm trying to be responsive, but I want (sic) to characterize it. The City needs the casino revenue badly. It was cash poor at that time. It would have facilitated without access, and it continues to be relatively cash poor without access. It could have facilitated a cash crisis. Life or death suggests to me it was critical and it might have been life or death, but what it does mean is that we could not have made the investment and cannot make the investment that is so crucial for the City.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. In fact, isn't it your position that without access to the casino revenues that people in the City of Detroit may die?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. People -- you know, you may think of that as hyperbole, but this is a City where between car jackings, crime -- just last week, there was a woman

1 A. I told you, lives are at stake in the City every day.
2 Q. Are they at stake with respect to access to the --
A. Every day --
Q. -- casino revenues?
A. I will say again, every day that we don't have access to casino revenue, we cannot make the necessary reinvestment in this City to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens, and that's a true statement.
Q. If I said that lives are at stake with respect to the casino revenues, can you agree with that statement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. I've answered your question.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Can you -- can you agree with my statement?
A. I've answered your question.
Q. I disagree that you've answered my question. We'll take the objection up at the -- with the Court, but are lives at stake with respect to access to the casino revenues?
A. I've answered your question.
(Whereupon Rick Frimmer left the
deposition at 9:41 a.m.)
MR. HACKNEY: Well, we're going to have to
take a motion to compel then on this one, Greg. I've not gotten an answer to that question.

MR. SHUMAKER: I disagree.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. We can agree that access to the casino revenues was an
issue of extreme importance to the City, right?
A. Yes.
Q. There was no guarantee going into the negotiations
with the Swap counterparties that they were going to grant you that access, correct?
A. That is true.
Q. Given the importance of this issue, what was your backup plan?
A. We had discussed a number of alternatives, but quite frankly, there were none that made any sense.
Q. So what -- so you had no backup plan?
A. No. Sir, this City had reduced FTEs by over

20 percent before I got here. The police department had lost hundreds, I believe, before I got here under the point -- this year, from January 1, we've lost in excess of 300 employees.

Even if you did an analysis of the City of $\$ 40,000$, the salary per FTE, and the City benefits account for 108 percent of FTE, so let's say 80,000 times 300 lost employees. That's only 24 million
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dollars. So even if we reduced the City -- tried to reduce it by more employees beyond the roughly 9,700 that we have, you wouldn't have a way to stem the loss of almost 132 to 180 million dollars in casino revenue. So when you say what other alternatives we had, this was a crucial component of any plan that we would have.
Q. Do you have any --
A. This is the third largest source of income for the City.
Q. And I -- I have a limited time with you today,

Mr. Orr, and l'd appreciate it if you answered my
questions directly to the extent you're able.
Did you have a backup plan if you couldn't
get the Swap counterparties to waive their cash trapping rights?
A. We discussed alternatives. When you say plan, that suggests to me that we were going to say we were going to do this if we can't do that. We had discussed alternatives.
Q. But you can't say that you had a plan?
A. No. This was crucial.
Q. And if Mr. Buckfire testified that you'd just started developing your backup plan recently, do you have a basis to contradict that?

1 A. No. That's what I was just saying. We had discussed alternatives, but this was crucial.
Q. Given the importance of this issue, I assume that you had made requests from the State of Michigan to provide the City with liquidity prior to June 4th; isn't that correct?
A. Sir, you can assume whatever you want. The reality is under my contract I have an obligation to report and coordinate with the State. We had had discussions, I believe, with the State about potential liquidity, and we were told that that would be unavailable.
Q. And you conveyed to the State the seriousness of the City's situation, correct?
A. I don't think I had to convey to the State the seriousness of the City's situation. I think the State's well aware.
Q. So the State understood that getting liquidity was a
life or death issue for the City of Detroit, correct?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation, calls for speculation.
A. Whatever the State understood, what I'm trying to tell you is I conveyed to them what our needs are.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You conveyed the extreme seriousness of the situation to the State, correct?
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A. As I said, I don't think I had to convey it to the State. The State had just been through almost two years of determining a financial emergency existed.
Q. And the State did not provide the City with any liquidity prior to June 4th, correct?
A. No.
Q. I am correct that they didn't?
(Whereupon Jerome Goldberg entered the deposition at 9:44 a.m.)
A. You are correct, they did not.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Now, given that seriousness of the liquidity crisis and the life or death issues that were facing the City, I assume you also evaluated the value of the City's non-core assets for possible sale, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form,
mischaracterizes his testimony.
A. Is that a compound question?

I think in our June 14 proposal and the run up to the June 14 proposal, we had listed in our proposal for creditors a number of assets of the City, and we had also said that we were in the process of evaluating what to do.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And the City owns a fine art collection; isn't that
correct?
A. The City owns the Detroit Institute of Arts in its collection.
Q. And did you attempt to value the art collection with an eye towards selling pieces of the art collection to relieve the City's life or death liquidity crisis?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.
A. Prior to June 14th? BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Prior to June 11th, which is the date of the agreement in principle.
A. No. We've entered into an agreement with Sotheby's to begin that process now, not related to relieving the liquidity crisis, just as a matter of prudence to determine the value of assets.
Q. Your expectation is that the -- that the City's art collection is very valuable; isn't that correct?
A. I've been told that, yes.
Q. Isn't it possible it may be worth billions of dollars?
A. That would be speculation. I've been told it is valuable.
Q. Could it be worth hundreds of millions of dollars?
A. That would be speculation. I've been told that it's valuable.
Q. Okay. So as of June 4th, you didn't know whether or
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not the City might have billions of dollars of art sitting in its art institute; is that your testimony?
A. No. My testimony is that I understand it as valuable.

The exact value of it is to be determined.
Q. And you made no effort to sell any of that art prior to engaging in the negotiations with the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. No. That's true.
Q. What about federal aid? Did you attempt -- did you attempt to obtain federal aid prior to the June 4 commencement of negotiations with the Swap counterparties?
A. I don't know if it was prior to or around that time. It may have been. We may have sought federal aid prior to that.
Q. And you conveyed the seriousness of the situation to whomever you spoke to at the federal government?
A. Yes, I believe the federal government was aware of the seriousness of the situation.
Q. And the federal government was also unwilling to provide aid to the City of Detroit; is that your testimony?
A. Yes, direct aid.
Q. Let me ask you some questions about the service corporations. The service corporations are two
A. Police and Fire General Services.
9 Q. There you go. So you already know them and you said
the names. So the two service corporations are
parties to the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Buckfire testified yesterday, l'll represent
to you, that his understanding is that you directed
the service corporations to execute the forbearance
agreement and they did so; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Were there arms' length negotiations with the
service corporations?
A. To the best of my knowledge, there was.
Q. And who led those?
A. I'm not quite sure. I know that -- in response to
your question, I did not direct a service corporation.
They were organized by the City. And they are managed
by City employees, but I had no direct -- I gave no
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direct instruction to either of the service corporations.
Q. Okay. So my question was about negotiations with the service corporations.
A. Right.
Q. Who conducted the arms' length negotiations with the service corporations on behalf of the City?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Well, you know it wasn't you?
A. Yes, it wasn't me.
Q. And did you ever direct Mr. Buckfire to engage in direct negotiations with the service corporations?
A. No. I directed Mr. Buckfire to do whatever needed to get done to get the agreement in principle resolved and signed. That's what I did, but I did -- said nothing specific. Just to be responsive to your question, said oh, go talk to the service corporations, there was nothing that specific.
Q. So to the extent there was a negotiation that needed to be had, it was his job to go have it?
A. It was his or someone else on my -- on my reorganization team's job, yeah, sure.
Q. Well, did you direct anyone else on your team to go negotiate with the service corporations?
A. No. Once we reached an agreement in principle, I
directed my team to more or less go forth and get it documented and get it done.
Q. And the service corporations are legally separate from the City, correct?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Your powers as emergency financial manager do not extend to the service corporations, correct?
A. I haven't examined that question, so I can't answer you yes or no.
Q. Can you direct their actions under PA 436 ?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Do you have any firsthand knowledge that the service corporations engaged in arms' length negotiations with the Swap counterparties?
A. No.
Q. If they had, do you think that's something you would have likely heard about?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. I may have. As emergency manager, there are a number of things that occur, as you might imagine, on a daily basis that I may or may not hear of. I might have. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. As you sit here today, though, can you recall hearing that there were ongoing negotiations between the
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service corporations and the Swap counterparties?
A. No.
Q. Isn't it true that the City's obligation to the
service corporations under the service contracts with
respect to the hedge-related payments were secured by the collateral agreement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion, foundation.

If you understand it, you can answer it.
A. I'm trying not to draw a legal conclusion. Repeat your question; let me see if I can answer it.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. I was just asking whether -- you understand that the service corporations have service contracts with the City?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand that the City has hedge-related payments that it has to make to the service corporations --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that they then can use to make to the Swap counterparties under the Swap?
A. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Do you understand that the collateral agreement secures the City's obligation to the service corporations and the service corporations' obligation to the Swap counterparties?
A. That's the legal conclusion. It might. That's -- I'm going to stay away from relaying my understanding because, frankly, I haven't -- l'm going to be careful, frankly. It might.
Q. Okay. You don't know as you sit here today?
A. I have an impression of something along those lines, yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. That it does -- it may well secure it. It's just that it's a legal conclusion that I don't want to make.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. Isn't it fair to say, though, that the collateral agreement's existence meant that the service corporations could rely on the City to make its quarterly Swap-related interest payments?
A. Yeah, my understanding is that the casino revenue comes in daily. It's put into an account. Monthly there are payments that are put into the custodial account and those payments are disbursed orally.
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1 Q. Now, if the City's able to perform under the forbearance agreement and exercises the option, the effect of this is that the hedge will be terminated, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. I believe there will no longer be a need for the hedge, yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And the collateral agreement will also be terminated
in that event, correct?
A. If we -- if the City performs?
Q. Right.
A. Yes.
Q. And that will free up the casino revenues to be used by the City, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How does that benefit the service corporations?
A. I don't know if it does or doesn't. I know it benefits the City.
Q. Can you think of a way that it benefits the service corporations as you sit here today?
A. No. That would be speculation.
Q. And you understand that the service corporations depend on the City to make the payments of their
various obligations both under the COPs and the Swap?
A. I believe that's true.
Q. They don't have any independent sources of income?
A. To the best of my knowledge, they do not.
Q. And your view today is that the City of Detroit is insolvent, correct?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And fair to assume that by extension the service
corporations are also insolvent, too?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. I don't know if that's true or not. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Now, isn't it true that the composition of the service corporations' boards of directors includes three City officers and at least one City Council member?
A. Yes. I think I said before there are City employees and City representatives on the boards.
Q. And in fact the person who signed the forbearance agreement on behalf of the service corporations was the president of both service corporations, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And her name is Cheryl Johnson, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she is also the City's finance director, correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Portia Roberson --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- is the City's corporation counsel, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she's also on the board of both service corporations, correct?
A. To the best of my knowledge, that's true.
Q. Do you know who made the decision at the service corporations to enter into the forbearance agreement?
A. I do not.
Q. Did you have any conversations with either Ms. Johnson
or Ms. Roberson about the service corporations
entering into the forbearance agreement?
A. No.
Q. Isn't it true that the policy of the City is to
indemnify the service corporation directors for
actions they take in their capacity as City employees?
A. I don't know that.
Q. You don't know if that's the policy of the City?
A. I do not. I know the City has an indemnification policy. I don't know if it applies to the service corporations.
Q. Okay, but does it apply to the City employees?
A. It applies to City employees acting within their

Q. I will -- I'm sorry.
A. Okay.
Q. As emergency financial manager, you control the salary of all City employees; isn't that correct?
A. As emergency manager.
Q. As emergency manager, right.
A. Right.
Q. Sorry. Is that the proper --
A. It changed with Public Act 436. Public Act 72 was EFM and now I'm an EM.
Q. Okay. Got to get my lingo.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you do, as emergency manager, control the salary of all City employees, correct?
A. I have the authority to control the salary of all City
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employees. I have not exercised that authority for all City employees.
Q. Okay. And you have the power to reduce those City employee salaries to zero if you choose, correct?
A. I think I do, yes.
Q. And you have done that on at least one prior occasion, I believe, correct?
A. Yes, I did do that.
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware that the insurers, the Swap insurers, like Syncora and FGIC, contend that the hedges cannot be terminated without their consent where there are termination events or events of default?
A. I have heard that. I m -- I have no independent awareness of that.
Q. So when did you first hear that?
A. I think it was all caught up in this time frame of the -- of the discussion after the agreement in principle, before the forbearance agreement was reached.
Q. Your best recollection is that you heard that prior to the execution of the forbearance agreement?
A. I believe it may have been prior to execution.

24 Q. But you have taken -- you have taken no steps to 25 evaluate whether the City concurs with the insurers'
construction on this point?
A. No. I don't think that's exactly true. I think there
were -- as I said before, there were a series of letters and discussions that went on from the second week of June throughout some point in July where I believe there may have been discussions in that regard, validity of that point.
Q. Okay. But if I ask you to express the City's view on
the legal merits of the insurers' contention that they have the right to consent, you'll decline to answer those questions because it tends to reveal the attorney-client privilege.

MR. SHUMAKER: That's right and also calls for a legal conclusion, yes.

MR. HACKNEY: But you'll -- I want to save a big string of questions, so if I want to ask him what are the pros and cons of the argument, who's likely to win, how will it all come out --

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You won't answer those questions on the grounds of the -- because it would tend to reveal attorney-client advice, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Well, I don't want to prevent you from asking any questions and I don't -but if he has an understanding independent of advice
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he's given -- but clearly to the extent it's going to reveal attorney-client communication, I will tell him not to answer.

MR. HACKNEY: Okay. I'll ask him that.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Does the City concur in the insurers' view?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion and could ask for attorney-client communications.

MR. HACKNEY: Are you instructing him not to answer?

MR. SHUMAKER: To the extent that the question goes to that, yes.
A. Maybe I can help out in this line of questioning.

Any -- I have not acted as an attorney on this job for the aforementioned reasons, so any opinion that I would express on behalf of the City in this regard would be solely as a result of communications with counsel and discussions.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. That was my expectation. So if I ask you if the City concurred, that's going to get into what your lawyer thinks.
A. That's exactly right.
Q. So you -- you will assert the privilege.
A. I will assert the privilege.
Q. And if I ask you what are the arguments for and against this point, you'll assert the privilege.
A. I will assert the privilege, but I am aware there are a number of objections that have been filed in the case that have addressed those issues and none of them have caused me any surprise.
Q. If I said that the City -- if I asked you what the City's view is on -- well, let me take a step back.

Do you agree that the insurers can block an early termination of the Swap, that this would be important to assessing whether the City was in danger of owing a termination payment?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yes, same thing. l'd only have a response to that based upon discussions l've had with counsel. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Do you agree that the insurers can block a termination, that it would make sense to negotiate with the insurers to determine whether you can secure their agreement not to consent to any termination?

MR. JURGENS: Objection, form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. Same response. It would only be based upon
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discussions I've had with counsel. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Are you aware that the insurers contend that they have the right to control all actions that may be taken by the Swap counterparties in connection with the -- with the Swaps?
A. I am aware of that, yes.
Q. When did you first develop that awareness?

9 A. During some course of the correspondence that occurred during this time frame that we previously discussed today.
Q. And have you taken steps to evaluate whether the City concurs with the insurers' construction of the operative documents on this point?
A. Have we taken steps? Yes.
Q. Yeah. And what is the City's position?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for the
provision of attorney-client communications, and I
will instruct him not to answer.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Yeah, I'm just going -- I'm making a record here.

Okay? I don't want to have -- I tried to --
A. I'm with you. I'm with you.
Q. And if I ask you what the arguments are on both sides

25 of this point, you'll also refuse to answer on the
grounds of the privilege.
A. Here again, there are objections in the case that make
some of those arguments, but I will not specifically answer.
Q. Because of the privilege.
A. Because of the attorney-client privilege and it calls for a legal conclusion.
Q. And if I ask you who had the better side of the argument, you would say the same thing?
A. Same thing.

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection, same instruction.
A. I would say the same thing. I would say the same thing.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Do you agree that the insurers can control all actions
of the Swap counterparties in connection with the
Swaps, that this would be important in terms of
assessing whether the City should negotiate with the insurers?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation, calls
for a legal conclusion.
You can answer to the extent you have an understanding.
A. It's also a little speculative because it's a
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hypothetical. If then is usually a hypothetical, so I would -- for the same reasons as we discussed before, I would say that to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, l'll refuse to answer.

I would say as a rational person, if you
were put in a corner, then you might want to consider
your alternatives, including negotiations.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. With the insurers?
A. With whoever, yes, whoever's --
Q. I mean it's just a simple point. We have five minutes left. I'm going to milk them.
A. Okay.
Q. But it's a simple point, which is if the insurers can potentially direct, like a marionette, the actions of the Swap counterparties, and I understand --
A. Right.
Q. -- that you're not agreeing with that --
A. Right.
Q. -- okay, but if they can --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- they're a potential party that you can go negotiate with to play off against the Swap counterparties, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for

1 speculation.
A. Yeah, here again, I mean if that happened, possibly, but that's a speculative question, so I'm going stay away from it.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It is speculation, but it's logical --
A. As I said in my answer, a rational person would make that --
Q. Yeah.
A. If you were put in a corner, you'd have to find some way out, and negotiation might be one of those sources, but to the extent your question is also speculation, I'm going to defer from answering.
Q. Do you agree that the insurers are entitled to control all of the actions of the Swap counterparties; it raises the risk that the deal negotiated in the forbearance agreement may be for naught?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah, here again, maybe not.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Those are things you haven't -- you haven't considered prior to today, fair statement?
A. That's a fair statement.
Q. Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase "play both ends
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against the middle"?
A. Oh, have I ever heard the phrase?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You're a bankruptcy lawyer, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were, I should say.
A. I was.
Q. And that's one of the time-honored tricks of bankruptcy negotiation, right, is to play parties off against one another to try and get the best deal?
A. I'm not going to call it a trick.
Q. Tools.
A. Tools, tactics. You know, there -- lawyer, as a negotiator, getting a yes, discussing a number of different alternatives.
Q. And one of them is playing off both ends against the middle?
A. Could be. People do that all -- outside of legal issues, they do that in negotiation.
Q. Isn't it true that prior to July 17 the City never engaged in substantive negotiations with Syncora?
A. I don't know if that's true. You said July 17th?
Q. Yeah. That's the date of the execution of the forbearance agreement.
A. Right. I don't know if that's true. I believe there were discussions that may have been, but you characterize it as substantive negotiations, so I don't know if that's true.
Q. You certainly didn't participate in any substantive negotiations with Syncora, correct?
A. Well, I -- you know, you say negotiations. I know there were a series of letters going back and forth and I know that there was a letter -- I just don't recall when I sent it -- to Mr. LeBlanc that said if you want to have serious negotiations, then let's have a discussion, but let's stop sending these letters back and forth.
Q. But isn't it your position that there were no serious negotiations with Syncora because Syncora would not make a proposal?
A. I believe in one of those letters I expressed that concern, yes.
Q. And to your knowledge Syncora never made a proposal to the City of Detroit prior to July 17th, correct?
A. Yeah, I believe there was a discussion -- well, there was discussion about an exchange of NDAs, and Syncora said they wanted to make a proposal, but they first wanted to see the proposal from the Swap counterparties, and I believe in one of my letters to
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Mr. LeBlanc, I said well, the parties need to sign a NDA, and my understanding was Syncora declined to do that.

MR. HACKNEY: Let's actually take a break right now in light of the videotape and maybe we can use it as a chance to stretch our legs and use the restroom.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is 10:04 a.m. This marks the end of tape number 1 . We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 10:04 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 10:14 a.m.)
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are back on the
record at 10:14 a.m. This marks the beginning of tape number 2.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Mr. Orr, I kind of want to cut through this with

Syncora. I understand that there were letters back and forth between you and Syncora.
A. Yes.
Q. But I just want to make clear for the record that
there were not substantive negotiations of the type that you engaged in with the Swap counterparties with Syncora about an alternative proposal to the
forbearance agreement prior to its execution on

July 17th, correct?
A. I believe -- July 17th?
Q. (Nods head).
A. I believe that's true. As I said, I think there was some discussion about a potential offer from Syncora, but I believe that got caught up in the NDA issue and that went away, so yes, I believe that's true.
Q. And your recollection in the NDA issue is that the City wanted an NDA, but Syncora wouldn't sign it?
A. My recollection -- no. My recollection was the City needed an NDA because we were asking all parties -nondisclosure agreement, we were asking all parties to sign them. There was some discussion -- I put in a letter, I seem to recall, that Syncora sign one, but I don't want to speculate or mischaracterize. There were some discussion about a NDA before Syncora would show us their proposal and something about they wanted to see the Swap counterparties' proposal before signing an NDA first or something along those lines. Q. You're not aware of any situation where the City refused to sign an NDA with Syncora, correct?
A. No, not that I'm aware of.
Q. In fact, it was the City that wanted an NDA with Syncora?
A. Yes. I believe that's true.

1 Q. And it's also true that you did not engage in substantive negotiations with FGIC about an alternative to the forbearance agreement prior to July 17th, correct?
A. Yeah, with regard to the issue of substantive, l'll -I'll, you know, caution that I'm not -- I'm not necessarily characterizing, but to the best of my knowledge, that's a fair characterization.
Q. You didn't make a proposal about an alternative to FIGC and FIGC didn't make one to you.
A. Yes, to the best of my knowledge, that's true.
Q. And that's also true with respect to Syncora, correct?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. Now, I think you've testified previously that no proposal was forthcoming from Syncora in connection with the TRO proceedings.
A. Okay.
Q. I'll just represent that to you --
A. Okay.
Q. -- as a way of --
A. Yeah. In one of my affidavits --
Q. That's right.
A. -- or something, yeah.
Q. Were you aware that Mr. Buckfire had had a
conversation with Todd Snyder of Syncora?

1 A. As I said, there were -- you know, during this -there were many conversations that were going back and forth and I wasn't necessarily aware of all of them. I knew they were -- they were going back and forth, but it is -- if that's true, it wouldn't surprise me.
Q. So you don't remember it as you sit here today?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Okay. Because this was in the -- this was in the period of where the cash was being trapped.
A. Right. But, sir, here again, there were so many -- so many discussions going back and forth about so many things. I mean in this period we were dealing with the June 10th meeting, the June 14th creditor's presentation, trying to do the Swap settlement, the run up to my quarterly report. There were just -there were a lot of conversations about a lot of things. I simply don't remember.
Q. Okay. And I take it you don't recall that Mr. -whether Mr. Buckfire told you that Syncora had described to him the general structure of a proposal it wanted to make?
A. He may have. I just don't recall it.
Q. Okay. It's true, isn't it, that as of the date of the execution of the forbearance agreement, your office had received multiple calls from Claude LeBlanc at
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Syncora, correct?
A. I'm not aware of that. There may have been multiple calls, but I'm not aware -- I received no calls.
Q. Okay. So you don't -- I take it your secretary --
A. My office may have. Yeah, my secretary may have, but I didn't.
Q. So you don't know whether he called you or not?
A. If you're representing to me that he did, I have no reason to believe that that's untrue.
Q. Okay. And I take it you have never called personally Mr. LeBlanc --
A. No.
Q. -- isn't that correct?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. So you didn't return those calls if they were made?
A. No.
Q. I just want -- I guess I -- the City has entered into numerous nondisclosure agreements --
A. Right.
Q. -- in these cases, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I mean has it entered into hundreds?
A. I don't know. I don't -- I don't operate the data room or any others, but I suspect there's certainly many.

1 Q. We can say that there are lots.
A. There are lots.
Q. Okay.

4 A. Okay.
5 Q. And there's no reason you can think of today that the City wouldn't enter into one with Syncora.
A. No.

8 Q. Were you aware that Syncora wanted a nondisclosure
agreement so that it could make a proposal that would be an alternative to the Swap counterparties?
A. As I said, I believe I have a letter that discusses the NDA issue, but it was caught up in something related to Syncora -- as I understood it, Syncora wanting to see the Swap counterparty proposal first prior to entering an NDA.
Q. Did you ever hear that Syncora had gotten over that issue and was now willing to just make a proposal to the City?
A. No.
Q. So no one ever told you that?
A. No, I don't recall ever hearing that.
Q. Okay. Would that have been significant to you if you heard that?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.

1 A. Yeah. Here again, it depends upon what point in time, if we were already bound by the definitive term sheet and then -- or the agreement, I believe the forbearance agreement has an obligation we cooperate with Swap counterparties, so it wouldn't have mat -no, it would not have mattered at that time, so it depends on when that would have occurred. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. But if it was prior to July 17th, if there were any parties that were out there that thought they had a good deal for the City, that would have been something you wanted to know?
A. We are always willing to listen to parties that think they have a good deal for the City.
Q. Isn't it true that the City's decision to enter into the forbearance agreement was made by you, in your role as emergency manager?
A. Yes, after consultation with my -- with my employees,
staff and consultants, yes.
Q. And when did you make that decision?
A. To enter into the actual agreement?
Q. Yes.
A. The day I signed it.
Q. July 15th, 2013?
A. I believe so, yes.

1 Q. And what advisors did you rely upon in making this decision?
A. My attorneys, Mill -- my investment banker, Miller Buckfire; our accountants, Ernst \& Young; virtually -virtually -- Conway McKenzie, our operational advisor, virtually all of them.
Q. All of your third party advisors?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And anyone else that you relied upon in making the decision?
A. Oh, probably members of my immediate staff such as my senior advisor, chief of staff, but less so. More of my outside third party advisors.
Q. What documents did you rely upon in making the decision, if any?
A. We looked at a number of -- the term sheet, the actual draft of the forbearance agreement. There may have been some e-mails. I just recall a lot of telephone calls. There may have been some forecast, cash forecast, and actuals, and some of the public reports I had issued regarding our cash position.
Q. Any other documents you can remember considering as part of this decision to enter into the forbearance agreement?
A. There may have been correspondence. As I said, there
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were letters that were exchanged between Mr. LeBlanc and myself, and others, the letter you showed me today. I'm just trying to capture the universe of what would have been included, but any -- any and all documents related to this that I would have seen would probably fall under that characterization.
Q. Any legal memoranda from Jones Day that you considered in making this decision?
A. Yes, probably.
Q. Okay. Written legal memoranda that you reviewed?
A. Yeah, including e-mails. Yeah.
Q. Now, did you take time to familiarize -- to
familiarize yourself with any of the legal documents
relating to the COPs Swap structure in connection with your decision to execute the forbearance agreement?
A. I relied -- I may have seen them, but I relied upon consultation with my counsel and investment bankers. Q. The documents I'm referring to are -- can we agree they're relatively complicated legal documents?
A. Yeah, l'd say they're not simple documents. It's not a -- you know, an auto purchase contract, yeah. Q. Right. So can I fairly characterize that -- that you may have looked at the documents, but you didn't attempt to master -- master them in terms of their legal ins and outs?
A. Yeah. That's a --

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to form.
A. That's a fair characterization. As I said, I'm trying to stay away from acting as an attorney in this job. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay.
A. For a number of reasons.
Q. So you relied on your advisors to explain to you how the COP Swap agreements worked?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also relied on them to explain to you how the COP Swap agreements worked in conjunction with the forbearance agreement that you were about to execute?

MR. JURGENS: Object to form.
A. Yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. So what is the relationship between the forbearance agreement and the COPs Swap structure?
A. Well, my understanding is that the forbearance agreement is related to the Swaps structure, but that the COPs structure is unrelated.
Q. Okay. So the forbearance agreement is part of the same subject matter as the collateral agreement and the Swaps agreement, but not the COPs part of the structure?
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A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. In your legal career, have you come across the concept of the idea that two different contracts can be part of one integrated transaction?
A. Sure. Yes.
Q. You're familiar with that as an idea?
A. Oh, yeah, sure.
Q. Okay. What do you understand that to mean?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. There are a number of ways that two different
documents were -- may refer to the other, as simple as attachments, exhibits, the master -- the master service agreement on a loan, for instance. There are a number of ways that one document can relate to another as explicitly expressed and intended.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Yeah, and I know this is a -- you know, we're not talking about was the stoplight red or green here, but you are also a lawyer with a relatively --
A. I was.
Q. -- sophisticated clientele and experience?
A. Well --
Q. You understand the idea that two different contracts can form part of one larger agreement?
A. Oh, sure. Yeah.
$1 Q$. Is the forbearance agreement part of an integrated transaction with the amended Swap agreements?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah, I'm going to stay away from characterizing it as
an integrated transaction. That may have legal consequence. I know they are related.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. They are related, but you can't answer today whether they're part of an integrated transaction as the person who executed it on behalf of the City?
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. Yeah, because -- because of legal implications of
using that nomenclature.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. So it may be, it may not be, you just don't know?
A. Precisely. I'll rely on the attorneys to characterize that.
Q. Is the forbearance agreement part of an integrated transaction with the collateral agreement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. Same answer. I'll rely on the attorneys to characterize it as integrated. I know I signed the
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forbearance agreement. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You did?
A. Yes.
Q. So it may be, it may not be, you don't know?
A. Correct.
Q. And did you consider any of those questions when you entered into the forbearance agreement?
A. We may have had some discussions. The question such as whether they're integrated or supersede or are related may have been discussed.
Q. But as you sit here today, you can't answer my question about whether it is integrated into other agreements or not?
A. True. I'm going to re -- because of the possible legal implications of anything I say, I'm going to rely on our counsel.
Q. Okay. Well, I guess there are legal implications of all of the testimony that you give today --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- both good and bad.
A. Right.
Q. So I guess are you saying that you can't reveal
attorney-client communications or are you saying that
you just don't know the answer to this particular
legal question?
A. I'm saying I can't reveal attorney-client communications, and based upon the characterization, I have formed no independent decision outside of discussions with my attorney as to whether or not they're integrated.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you the reverse question, which is,
is the forbearance agreement a separate agreement from the collateral agreement?
A. Is it a separate agreement?
Q. Yeah.
A. I believe it's related to it, but yeah, it was a separate agreement, sure. It wasn't entered into contemporaneously.
Q. Meaning one that does not form part of a common agreement with the collateral agreement?
A. Here again, you're using a characterization as common agreement or integrated. I'm going to stay away because those may have legal connotations. What I know is the forbearance agreement was entered into in 2009, and the collateral agreement attempts to resolve issues of default that are raised by the forbearance agreement and also including obligations of the City. Q. Isn't it -- l'd like to shift and ask you a question about the service agreements between the City and the
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service corporations.
A. Okay.
Q. Isn't it true that the City is in default of its obligations under the service agreements because it missed the --
A. June 14th payment?
Q. That's right.
A. We're in default.
Q. Okay. And isn't it also true that the City is not proposing to cure those defaults in connection with the assumption of the forbearance agreement?
A. I believe that's true.
Q. And you would agree that the City is not going to provide assurances that it will perform with the service agreements in the future, correct, as part of the assumption motion?
A. I'm going to be careful here because we're -- we're trying to have discussions about what we're going to do with regard to the proposal, so I don't want to say now something that may or may not occur in the future, but there is no present intent -- in response to your question, no present intent to do that.
Q. You certainly haven't represented that you will as part of the assumption motion?
A. Yes.

1 Q. We talked about this earlier. I don't want to reask the question, but I want to tie it up in connection with the assumption motion, which is, there are also events of default existing under the Swaps.
A. Yes.
Q. Those are the cause of all the problems, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The City is not proposing to cure those defaults in
connection with the assumption agreement, correct?
A. I'm going to be careful with the characterization of a cure because, as you know, and -- I have formed no independent decision as to whether or not that nomenclature's true. What I will say is that pursuant to the forbearance agreement we are attempting to resolve any and all defaults that may have occurred under the collateral agreement.
Q. Under -- and I was asking about the Swaps.
A. And the Swaps.
Q. And the Swaps.

So the forbearance agreement is an effort
to resolve any defaults that exist under the
collateral agreement and amended Swaps?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in your view it does that?
A. Yes.
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## Q. Okay.

A. Yes.
Q. So l'll say it this way. In your assumption motion, isn't it true the City doesn't promise to cure any defaults under the collateral agreement or the Swap agreement; isn't it that correct?
A. Here again, and I'm not trying to be evasive. I just -- you know, there are concepts of cure in the bankruptcy code, for instance, with regard to the assumptions of contracts so on and so forth, and I want to make sure that I don't testify as to a legal conclusion. So what I will say is we are trying -- by the assumption agreement and forbearance agreement, we are trying to resolve all defaults under those documents, both the collateral agreement and the Swaps.
Q. Okay. And how does it achieve that resolution?
A. Well, the documents speaks for itself, but generally speaking, it imposes obligations upon us to perform a certain ways within certain time frames with regard to the potential termination payment. It therefore gives us a discount for that payment. It releases the casino revenue and imposes obligations, and this is my language, upon the Swap counterparties not to trap that revenue upon performance of certain obligations,

1 Q. But the benefits of the forbearance agreement are access to the casino revenues during the option period, a workable unwind of the Swaps, and a discounted termination payment?
A. And a release of liens and potential claims against the insured, yes.
Q. Correct. Those are kind of some of the key elements of the forbearance agreement.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to start with the casino gaming revenues.
A. Um-hm.
Q. How does the forbearance agreement provide the City with better access to gaming revenues than it has right now?
A. Well, as -- I think as we discussed earlier today, there's always the risk that because there are events of default under the Swaps, that those revenues could -- that default could be declared and those revenues could be trapped, so it removes that level of uncertainty, which is crucial for the City. Cash is critical for the City.

So once you remove that level of
uncertainty and the City has certainty, as we've seen in some of our proposals that we made for creditors, the City can then reasonably count on having access to
that cash in terms of going forward.
Q. Now, if the collateral agreement operates the trapped cash automatically upon an event of default under the Swap --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- is there anything in the forbearance agreement that alters that mechanism?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for legal conclusion.
A. Yeah, here again, your conclusion if it acts to trap automatically, I don't know if I would characterize it that way. I know that the agreements work that money comes in on a daily basis. That money is put into I think one account. At the end of each month, some portion of that money is sent out to another account, and every quarter that money is disbursed. I'm not going to characterize as to whether or not it would -it would change that mechanism automatically. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. You can't say if it does or it doesn't?
A. Correct.
Q. And can you say here today whether the collateral agreement operates automatically or does not?
A. The collateral agreement, it's my understanding, using your words automatically, operates to trap cash, but
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maybe not in the way that is detrimental to the City. It has two accounts, a subrecipient holding account --

COURT REPORTER: Subrecipient?
THE WITNESS: Subrecipient.
A. -- two accounts, an initial general account and then a subrecipient account. We'll just call them that.

Those monies come in -- so when you use automatic, those monies come in daily, but they're disbursed according to the terms, and have been disbursed according to their terms.
Q. I'm not talking about interim trapping that --
A. Right.
Q. -- happens in the first part of the month until the whole bank account builds up.
A. Right.
Q. I'm talking about what l'll call big time cash
trapping upon an event of default --
A. Right.
Q. -- or termination event.
A. Right.
Q. So let me go back. I guess my question is, like, do you have a view on whether that big time cash trapping is supposed to happen automatically under the collateral agreement?
A. My understanding is that it does not happen
automatically.
Q. Okay. And is that based on conversations you've had with counsel?
A. Yes.
Q. And if I ask you for the pros and cons of that argument as to who's likely to win and how the City came to its view, you would refuse to answer those questions on the basis of the attorney-client privilege, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, you also mentioned that the forbearance
agreement -- or we talked about the idea that the forbearance agreement provides for a workable unwind of the Swap, correct?
A. Right.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. How does it do that?
A. Well, my understanding, as I said before, in the forbearance agreement, the parties agree to certain -certain events that we will pay -- meaning the City -will pay a discount, an optional termination payment or cause that payment to be made; that in consideration for that payment, the parties to the agreement will release any claims they have to
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trapping the casino revenue; and, here again, the parties will release their liens and any potential claims they have against the insured.
Q. The discount that you obtained through the negotiations that Mr. Buckfire led --
A. Right.
Q. -- is a discount to the so-called early termination of the Swap.
A. Yes.
Q. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you just read the Swap agreement, it would -- it implies a termination value, correct?

MR. JURGENS: Objection, form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, Calls for --
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It implies an early termination value?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. We'll use a nomenclature. It implies a value for termination fee that I understand represents the loss expectation of the counterparties.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's exactly right.

And the discount you negotiated in the
forbearance agreement is a discount to that amount in

## the Swap?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. It is a discount to that, yes. It is a discount to
that expected amount.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Yeah. It is a discount to what would otherwise be owing under the Swap in the absence of the forbearance agreement if the Swap counterparties designated an early termination.
A. I believe that's correct. MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. Now, you know that there's a different concept which is an optional early termination under the Swap, correct?
A. Um-hm.
Q. Is that correct?
A. Well, the way the agreement is worded, forbearance and optional termination --
Q. I'm not talking about the forbearance agreement.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm sorry if that wasn't clear --
A. Oh.
Q. -- and I don't mean to interrupt you.
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A. Okay.
Q. Under the Swap --
A. Right.
Q. -- there is a different type of termination that's
called an optional early termination. Are you aware of that?
A. I am aware of that.
Q. Okay. That's one where the insured -- the Swap counterparties contend that they can terminate the
Swap and walk away with no payment.
A. Any understanding I would have about what the Swap counterparties can do would be based upon consultations with counsel, but suffice it to say I have heard of that concept.
Q. Okay. So if I ask you about the pros and cons of that argument and who would likely to win, you would assert the attorney-client privilege; is that correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: We would.
A. Yes. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. But I do want to say that you understand that the Swap counterparties are substantially in the money under prevailing interest rates, correct?
A. There is a lot of money that the City's going to owe, 25 yes.
Q. Okay. I want to make an obvious point, which is the Swap counterparties have never come to the City and said hey, we're going to exercise that optional early termination rights that has us walking away and being paid nothing, correct?

MR. JURGENS: Form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection form, too.
A. To the best of my knowledge, l've never heard that. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Obviously if they had, you would have been --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Let me -- if you had heard them threaten that, it would have made Mr. Buckfire's negotiation a lot easier.
A. I think it would have made the entire situation a lot easier, but l've never heard that.
Q. They've never offered to walk away without any payment.
A. I've never heard them offer to walk away without a payment.
Q. Okay. Too bad.
A. I'm more than willing to accept that offer.
Q. I was going to say we're all open, right?
A. Right.
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| Q. I want to go back to the forbearance agreement. We were talking about the things that it does in terms of providing access to casino revenues, allowing for an unwind of the Swap. These were my descriptions of it -- <br> A. Right. <br> Q. -- candidly, from your motion -- <br> A. Right. <br> Q. -- but we were talking generally about these things. <br> The valuable consideration that the City gets under the forbearance agreement are all things that it can exercise without any consent from any other party, correct? <br> MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal <br> conclusion. <br> You can answer. <br> A. That's my understanding of the way it works, yeah. BY MR. HACKNEY: <br> Q. Do you agree that the effect of the forbearance agreement, if the option is exercised, is to modify the amount of the termination payment owed under the Swaps down to whatever percentage is applicable as of that date? <br> MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. <br> MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, calls for a | MR. HACKNEY: I understand you want to <br> preserve objections. This is the individual who <br> signed the agreement -- <br> A. Yeah, the -- <br> MR. HACKNEY: -- so I'm asking him for his <br> understanding. <br> MR. SHUMAKER: Okay. That's fine. <br> A. Yeah, the mechanism is such that it's not our termination, that it's the parties -- it's the counterparties' termination. <br> BY MR. HACKNEY: <br> Q. That's right. It's their termination right, but the City gets to direct them to exercise it. <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. Okay. Is that a right that the City currently possesses under any of the other agreements to the best of your knowledge? <br> A. To the best of my knowledge, no. <br> Q. That's a right it obtained as a result of the forbearance agreement, correct? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. And the City's able to exercise that right to direct the actions of the Swap counterparties without the consent of any third party, correct? <br> A. To the best of my knowledge, that's true. |
| legal conclusion. <br> A. If you're talking about the forbearance agreement and the formula that's involved for the percentage change depending upon -- as linked to time, as well as the requirement that we get approval of the agreement at a certain time period, yes, that's true. <br> BY MR. HACKNEY: <br> Q. Okay. I mean the effect of the forbearance agreement is that instead of owing what the City would owe under the Swap, which is the hundred percent of the termination value, it now owes -- only owes the discounted amount? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. So the effect is that it modifies that provision in the Swap in a way that's favorable for the City? <br> MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. <br> A. That's a fair characterization. <br> THE WITNESS: Sorry. <br> BY MR. HACKNEY: <br> Q. Now, the forbearance agreement, another part of it, that it allows the City to direct the Swap counterparties to terminate the Swap, correct? <br> MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion. <br> MR. JURGENS: Objection. | Q. Now, if Syncora has the right to control all actions of the Swap counterparties under the contract administration agreement, your position is that the forbearance agreement overrides that provision in the contract administration agreement; is that correct? <br> MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation. <br> A. I think it calls for speculation and it also essentially implies a legal analysis. I will defer to my counsel as to what our position would be. What I do know is that forbearance agreement gives us certain rights. <br> BY MR. HACKNEY: <br> Q. Okay. What if I said that when it comes to the interaction between Syncora's alleged control rights under the contract administration agreement and the City's alleged control right under the forbearance and optional termination agreement, you would refuse to answer those questions on the grounds that it would get into attorney-client advice that you've received from your counsel, correct? <br> A. That is correct. <br> MR. SHUMAKER: It most likely would, depending upon how you phrased the question. MR. HACKNEY: I'm asking. |

1 A. Yeah, no. These issues I have discussed with my counsel. We have discussed pros and cons as I said earlier today, and as you notice, although I'm not an attorney here, I've practiced before, none of this surprises me. Some of these issues are expressed in the objections. It's just that I want to be very careful about relaying to you any of my perceptions about these issues based upon discussions l've had with counsel.

Suffice it to say we think that I have the right -- the City has the right under forbearance agreement to exercise its rights under that agreement.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Okay. So -- but you -- you can't give me your understanding of how Syncora's alleged rights under the contract administration agreement interact with the City's alleged rights under the forbearance agreement.
A. I can't do that without implicating conversations I've had with my counsel.
Q. And just for the record, you won't?
A. And I won't.
Q. That's right.
A. And I won't, yes.
Q. What are the downsides of the forbearance agreement to

Page 126
the City?
A. From my perspective?
Q. Yeah.
A. None.
Q. So this agreement that Mr. Buckfire negotiated is one of those happy agreements. It's all upside and no downside.
A. It's not happy. I mean, I'm not going to characterize it as happy. There's a significant sum of money that the City has got to pay, but it does remove a certain amount of uncertainty and allows the City to be able to plan to make the reinvestment that's crucial for it to go forward. So I wouldn't characterize it as happy by any means, but it's an obligation that the City entered into a long time ago -- several years ago -that we have to resolve so we can have unfettered access to the casino revenue.
Q. I want to go back to the subject of cash trapping really quick because we had just moments ago talked about whether it worked automatically --
A. Right.
Q. -- or whether it worked upon notice.
A. Right.
Q. But prior to the forbearance agreement, it was your view that the Swap counterparties had the right to

3 A. I think if there were events of default, and here they are, yes.
Q. Yeah. That was a driver of the negotiation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- correct?
A. Certainly is, yes.
Q. And your understanding is that as part of the forbearance agreement during the -- during the -during the forbearance period, the Swap counterparties have temporarily relinquished that right to direct cash trapping so long as the optional termination period is pending.
A. Yes, they are forebearing from exercising their right.
Q. Okay. Now, you understand that cash passes through the general receipts subaccount on a monthly basis. We talked about that earlier.

## A. Right.

Q. It's trapped until a certain point and then the City makes the holdback account, and when they get -become equal, there's a discharge of payment to the City from the general receipts subaccount, and then for the remainder of the month, the City gets access to the casino revenues, correct?
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A. Yes. My understanding is about $\$ 500,000$ a day are paid into those accounts and the mechanism is very similar to what you said --
Q. Okay.
A. -- how it operates.
Q. Can we agree that the way the forbearance agreement works is that certainly between July 17th and now and from now to whenever the forbearance, the option is either exercised or expires, there's going to be cash that passes through this account, already passed through the account, that goes to the City?
A. Yes. There should be.
Q. If the option expires without the City's exercise of the option, isn't it true that under the forbearance agreement, the City has no obligation to put that cash back into the -- into the general receipts subaccount?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. I --

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Just asking for your understanding of how the agreement works.
A. Sure. And my understanding of how the agreement works, without having it in front of me and consulting counsel, is the parties revert back to the status quo

1 ante as where they were, and I do not recall that there's an obligation for remittor (sic) --
Q. Yeah.
A. -- of monies that were paid during the forbearance period.
Q. And the agreement does speak for itself. I'm just
asking for your understanding of the agreement.
A. That's my understanding.
Q. I have read the agreement, and my reading of

Section 1.2(c) of the agreement is that when the
option expires without being exercised, that it's just
as you said, everyone is restored to the status quo
ante, but the City doesn't have to put the money it received back in the -- in the interim back into the account.
A. Right, which is status quo because we would have received that money in any event.
Q. Okay. But what I just said is also your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we agree that -- we talked about waiver and forbearance and they are two different concepts, but can we agree that the Swap counterparties have certainly waived their right to obtain the cash that passes through the account during the option period?
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1 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I'm going to stay away from characterizing what consequences are if we don't exercise the option under the agreement.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Let me hand you this forbearance agreement.
A. Okay.
Q. I've marked it as Orr Exhibit 2.
A. Okay.

MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 2
10:48 a.m.
A. Okay.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Do you have it in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that, to the best of your knowledge, a true and accurate copy of the forbearance agreement?
A. Yes, it appears to be.
Q. Now, if you look at the -- on page 2 of the second
full recital?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. You'll see that it says, "Whereas, pursuant to the
terms of each Swap agreement, it is the view of the Swap counterparties that one or more events of default and/or additional termination events has occurred, with the service corporations" -- "with the service corporation as the defaulting party or sole affected party, and therefore each of SBS and UBS has the right to designate an early termination date for the related Swap agreements."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, Ido.
Q. I have a long set of questions here that I would like to collapse if I could, which is, this just says it's the view of the Swap counterparties. The fact of the matter is it's also the City's view that there are termination events and events of default existing under the Swap.
A. Yes, I think that's fair.
Q. And that as a result of those termination and events of default in the absence of this agreement, the Swap counterparties would have the right to designate an early termination date.
A. Yes.
Q. If I asked you to catalog all of the termination events and events of default under the Swap, would you be able to do that?
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1 A. No, I wouldn't, not without a consulting client and a long compendium of events that occurred before I was appointed.
Q. You do know some of them offhand.
A. Sure, like the consent agreement, the declaration of financial emergency, the appointment of the financial advisory board, the failure to make some of the -there are a bunch of them, but I couldn't catalog them all.
Q. Yeah. Your appointment?
A. My appointment. I'm an event of default.
Q. You are -- you are an embodiment of default.
A. I'm an embodiment of default.
Q. So at some point we will have to cure you.
A. You will have to talk to my wife about that.
Q. Okay. The -- okay. So that is helpful. I was going to go through some of these things, but it doesn't sound like there's an actual dispute between the City and the Swap counterparties on this point, correct?
A. No.
Q. Now, I want to ask you a different question, though.
A. Sure.
Q. This is different from what I was just asking, so --
A. Okay.

25 Q. As of July 17th, had you evaluated where there were
any termination events where the Swap counterparty was the sole affected party?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. I'm not asking for the advice. I'm asking had you evaluated that.
A. We had evaluated a number of issues and suffice it to say that was probably one of them.
Q. You can't remember whether it was or it wasn't?
A. I can't remember if --
Q. Pretty technical question?
A. Yeah. As I said before, I'm not trying to be evasive.

It's just that the conversations I have with my counsel, investment banker, you know, on a daily basis, are -- there are days when there are dozens.
Q. Now, if I asked you whether you had evaluated whether there were any events of default under the Swap where the Swap counterparties were the defaulting party --
A. Sure.
Q. -- can you answer that question?
A. Whether I personally or whether it had been done on the payoff of the team?
Q. Either.
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1 A. I personally don't recall doing that. I do recall that members of the team and I may have had those discussions, yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that if I ask you to describe to me what potential events of default or termination events where the Swap counterparties were the sole affected party or the defaulting party --
A. Right.
Q. -- you would decline to answer those questions on the basis of the attorney-client privilege?

MR. SHUMAKER: To the extent they would reveal those communications, of course.

MR. HACKNEY: Well, I mean --
A. Yes, I would.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. Even if I ask you about your understanding of
the position, your position is that you don't have one independent of your legal advisors.
A. I-- on this question, I don't have one independent of my legal advisors.
Q. So I can't ask you what your understanding is --
A. Right.
Q. -- because it will necessarily reveal the legal advice you got.
25 A. I'm trying to see if there's a way I can answer your

1 there were other claims that the Swap counterparties have against the City, you would decline to answer those questions on the grounds of attorney-client privilege?
A. I think I would have to. I do recall discussions, but I think I'd have to decline on the basis of attorney-client privilege.
Q. Have the Swap counterparties threatened to bring any claims against the City?
A. Well, here again, being careful with the word claims, you mean unrelated to the defaults such as tort claims?
Q. I guess I would say the Swap agreement is one you understand that's between the Swap counterparties and the service corporations.
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So I'm trying to put that in a box for now.
A. Right.
Q. And we've talked about that extensively.
A. Right.
Q. So other than any claims they may have against the service corporations --
A. Right.
Q. -- that could absolutely have implications for the City, but other than that, have the Swap
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1 A. No. I don't recall doing that.
Q. So you haven't assessed that?
A. Not me independently, no.

4Q. Okay. And it's not something you took into account as part of this agreement?
A. No. We -- there was a discussion about the interest of all the parties. I, independently, did not handicap whether the service corporations might bring a claim against the City. I think there were discussions about it. Many of those discussions would have been caught up in the general discussions that I was having with counsel and my other advisors.
Q. And you wouldn't be able to discuss them?
A. No.
Q. But the service corporations' claims against the City, those are not resolved by the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. If they have any. I don't think they are.
Q. Let me cut to it. Is it fair to say you haven't given this any real consideration?
A. Yeah. We -- it is fair to say that it was -- there was no real deep consideration of it. We did consider it.
Q. Now, as the City evaluated whether it has claims against the Swap counterparties --
counterparties threatened to bring any other claims directly against the City?
A. None that I'm aware of.
Q. I may have asked you this earlier, but I just -- I
want to make sure that I didn't miss it and so if it's
asked and answered I apologize, but did the City
evaluate whether it is in breach of the collateral
agreement?
A. Did we evaluate it?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes, I and my consultants evaluated it.
Q. Is this one where if I asked you the results of those evaluations you'd decline to answer?
A. Yes.
Q. It is true that prior to the forbearance agreement, the only direct contractual agreement under which both the City and the Swap counterparties had signed was the collateral agreement, correct?
A. To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.
Q. Now, have the service corporations threatened to bring any claims against the City?
A. None that I'm aware of.
Q. And have you undertaken an assessment of the likelihood of the service corporations to the extent they were to assert claims against the City?
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A. Um-hm.
Q. -- okay?
A. Um-hm.
Q. And if I ask you to tell me what claims you have, will you tell me them or will you assert the privilege?

MR. SHUMAKER: I would instruct the witness
that may implicate attorney-client communications.
A. I would have no independent knowledge of what claims may have other than discussions l've had with counsel so I wouldn't answer.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. If I ask you what's the likelihood that you'll
win on the claims?
A. Same answer.
Q. You would follow the advice --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and assert the privilege?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. In my prior life, as an attorney, likely would be a hundred percent.
Q. Okay.
A. But I can't say that.
Q. Well, let me ask you -- let me ask you just a -- sort of this is your understanding of the forbearance
agreement.
A. Right.
Q. What claims are you asking the Court to approve the settlement of?
A. In claims that might be had by the parties vis-à-vis each other.
Q. So any and all claims that they have under the Swaps or the collateral agreement or the service contracts or any other contracts --
A. Yes.
Q. -- those claims are being resolved by the forbearance agreement?
A. To the best of my knowledge, that is true.
Q. Okay. And the result of the forbearance agreement is that the City will be able to perform under the forbearance agreement without being subject to any liability to any third party?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. And so will the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. It will give you what l'll call a clean closing?
A. As I said earlier this week, it will bring us to closure and certainty, yes. Earlier today.
Q. That is also one of the values of this agreement to both and you the Swap counterparties, you the City?
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## A. Right.

Q. Which is that it absolves you for any liability in
connection with the relevant agreements?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. As a result of performance under the forbearance
agreement, correct?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection calls for
speculation.
A. My understanding is that it provides us with closure and finality regarding any claims and relationships that the parties have.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Okay. And there's no trailing liability?
A. That is correct.
Q. And just for the record, if I asked to you assess the likelihood of success of all of the different claims that are being resolved by the forbearance agreement, you would assert the attorney-client privilege and refuse to answer?
A. That is correct. I have made no independent assessment outside of any conversation I would have had with counsel and my advisors.
Q. Now, Mr. Orr, I'm going to speculate you may have negotiated a settlement or two in your life as a
lawyer.
A. That's a fair statement.
Q. And isn't it also fair -- I will tell you I have as well, but --
A. Right.
Q. Isn't it common that settlement agreements typically
involve releases of liability by the parties against one another?
A. It is not uncommon for there to be releases in settlement agreements.
Q. And I will tell you I actually was racking my brain to
see whether I ever entered into a settlement agreement that didn't have a release. I couldn't think of one.
Have you ever entered into a settlement agreement that didn't have a release?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You have?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. Do you know whether the forbearance agreement contains a release of claims by the parties against one another?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for legal conclusion.

You can answer.
A. Okay. I'd have to read through it and consult with my
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counsel to make sure. I know the agreement speaks for itself.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It does, but as you sit here today, I take it you reviewed the forbearance agreement in connection with the preparation for your deposition?
A. Maybe not as in depth as you might think.

8 Q. Okay. I know you have a lot on your plate.
A. I have a lot on my plate.
Q. But I guess I'm saying are you seriously unaware as to whether there's a release in the forbearance agreement?
A. Seriously or not, I think the forbearance agreement resolved all claims between the parties. Sitting here today without examining it, I'm not aware as to whether or not it specifically has a release.
Q. Okay. So the -- whether it's in the forbearance agreement or in the effect of its approval, it operates as a release for everyone involved?
A. Yeah. The reality is -- when you asked me the question before as to whether or not it has a release, the reality is that to the extent you asked -- I believe in the motion you asked for assumptions and 9019 settlement that the order might well contain a release so -- I wasn't trying to be truculent with
you. I'm just saying that, yes, the effect of the approval of the agreement should have that impact. Q. I'm not going to try to go claim by claim because your understanding is it releases all claims of the Swap counterparties, the service corporations, and the City against one another?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the Swap insurers, as part of the forbearance agreement, they get a release of their insurance obligations under the Swap in the event the City directs an optional termination, correct?
A. Yes, I believe that's true.
Q. And this was one of the things that the City has
touted, which is to say, hey, Swap insurers, pipe down this is good for you, right?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, without characterizing, you know, the colloquial characterization, yes, we think that's a benefit. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's a concept that you've argued in your papers --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as to why the Swap insurers should be happy?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you understand you -- you have argued that this is a benefit to the Swap insurers under the

Page 146
forbearance agreement, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Are the swap insurers third party beneficiaries as you understand it as the signatories to the agreement -of the agreement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Here, I'm not acting as a lawyer as I understand it. I'll have to decline from answering whether or not they're third party beneficiaries. As you know, they're intended beneficiaries, incidental beneficiaries. A lot of these questions are questions of fact, so that would draw me into a legal analysis and I'll stay away from that.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Let me -- let me -- let me -- what I'll do then is

I'll ask you your understanding as a layperson --
A. Okay.
Q. -- because you are -- you can say that you're acting
as a layperson --
A. I am.
Q. -- so to speak.
A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. As a layperson person, do you have a view one
25 way as to whether Syncora is a third party beneficiary

1 under the agreement?
A. As a layperson, I really haven't examined it.
Q. So don't know one way or the other?
A. Don't know one way or the other.
Q. Do you have a view as to whether Syncora or FGIC, for that matter, can sue to enforce the agreement?
A. I don't have one way or the other.
Q. They may have, they may not have?
A. Yeah. I'd probably weigh on the side of they don't, but I -- I don't have a view one way or the other.
Q. And have you considered the possibility that if they don't have the right to sue to enforce the agreement, that they also would not have the right to sue to enforce the release that's in the agreement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection --
A. They might or they might --

MR. SHUMAKER: -- calls for a legal conclusion.
A. They might or they might not.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And let's be frank. That's not your concern, right?
A. Well, to be honest with you, you know, without getting into whether or not there may be equitable rights, estoppel, third party intended, unintended beneficiary rights, things along those lines, what I do know --
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incidental benefits -- what I do know is the agreement, and what we've said is it provides a benefit to the insured.
Q. That's right, but you obviously don't represent the insured, you represent the City?
A. I am employed by the governor on behalf of the City, that is correct.
Q. And so if the insurer can't enforce the agreement to take advantage of the release, that's the insurer's problem, correct?
A. Well, without characterizing whether or not it's their problem or so, my fiduciary duty runs to the City in its interest; it does not necessarily run to Syncora.
Q. Yeah. Can we agree that you certainly didn't negotiate into the agreement any specific provision granting the insurers the right to sue to enforce that provision?
A. I made no instruction to my team to negotiate such a provision.
Q. In entering into the forbearance agreement, did you consider whether or not the automatic stay would apply to cash trapping if the City filed for bankruptcy?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Without getting -- here again, there were discussions
because, quite frankly, at the time we were in negotiating this agreement in June, we were hoping that this agreement and its announcement was for other creditors to -- and other stakeholders, including the labor side, to come in and negotiate additional agreements. So we may have had discussion about what the impact, if we filed bankruptcy, would have been, but, frankly, at this time we were hoping we were going to get a round of agreements in place.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. You knew that as of July 15th, when you executed the forbearance agreement, that bankruptcy was possible?
A. Oh, sure. We knew it was possible, yeah.
Q. Fair to say that by July 15th, given all the work that was going on, you were of the view that it was likely?
A. No, not really. We had been sued -- the governor and the treasurer had been sued a few weeks before that. The following week I believe one union had joined in that suit and the Monday of the week after that, the governor and I were sued, and I believe July -- I don't have a calendar. I believe July 15th was that Monday.
Q. It was.
A. Yes. So we signed this agreement and, frankly, even at that time, because there was a whole lot of things
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going on, there was litigation, there were stays in place, there were appeals to the state court, it certainly was possible and we were with doing contingency planning given the paper, but we have not made any determination at that point as to whether or not, excuse me, we were going to file.
Q. It was certainly possible enough that it behooved you to analyze whether the automatic stay might be a way to get access to the casino revenues, correct?
A. Yeah, I don't recall whether or not we did it then or before or just during that week, but -- but we -there was some discussion about the impact of the automatic stay, yes.
Q. So is it possible that you did not evaluate the applicability of the automatic stay in the event of a bankruptcy prior to executing the forbearance agreement?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection --
A. No.

MR. SHUMAKER: -- asked and answered.
A. No. What I said is at some point during that time or even prior we had to have those discussions.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You may have had them in advance of July 15th, you may not have, you just can't remember?

1 A. No. I -- let's be clear. I think we had them before. I think we had them around that time because in that week, when I was sued that Monday, there were discussions about what they may be and we were signing this agreement at the time.
Q. If I ask you about the specifics of the conversations you had about whether the automatic stay applied and the likelihood that it would or wouldn't, you'll decline to answer those questions on the basis of the attorney-client privilege, correct?
A. Yes, again, today I would have to do that.
Q. The one thing I will say that we can agree on, though, is that if the automatic stay did bar cash trapping, that would be valuable to the City because at least during the pendency of the bankruptcy it would then have access to the casino revenues, correct?
A. Well, it's -- here again, it's a hypothetical and contingent question, but I take your meaning, and what I would say is I think certainly one of the benefits of the automatic stay is that you maintain the status quo and access to cash. There are also provisions however in the bankruptcy code -- I'm not acting as an attorney, but I am aware -- of Safe Harbor provisions related to certain financial instruments and you have to factor that in as well.
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Q. And those are?

COURT REPORTER: Can you please slow down? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Those are risk factors that might make the automatic stay not applicable?
A. That's correct.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. I was informed without telling specific -BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Right.
A. -- conversations that those are issues you have to take into consideration.
Q. And so let me try and collapse this if I can. If I ask you about whether the casino revenues are special revenues being applied to indebtedness, you will refuse to answer?

MR. SHUMAKER: You can ask him whether he considered them, but in terms of likelihood of success or communication between --

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. I'll do it that way.

Did you consider whether there were special revenues that were accepted from the automatic stay
under 922(d)?
A. We considered all of these issues including the interaction 922(d) with 362 and I considered them in the context with my counsel.
Q. Okay. You considered whether 362(b)(17) exception for

Swap collateral applied?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you consider whether the collateral account -rather, the gaming revenues were even property of the estate at all?
A. Yes.
Q. So you considered all those questions.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Your counsel rendered advice to you about the
likelihood, the pros and cons of the arguments, and you're not at liberty to provide that advice to us because it would invade the attorney-client privilege?
A. Yes, I believe that's correct.
Q. But I do want to get -- I do want to just get your agreement that the question is important to at least one of the benefits of the forbearance agreement which was the interim access to cash during the optional termination period.
A. I think the question is relevant.
Q. Yeah.
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1 A. Yes.
Q. In fact the optional termination period, it could end
as soon as on September 16th; at the latest it goes to June 30, 2014, right?
A. Correct.

6 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, document speaks for itself.
A. Yeah, the document -BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Whatever it says --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- that's your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. So that -- the forbearance agreement -- let's put it
this way, Mr. Orr. The forbearance agreement gets you access to cash during the optional termination period.
A. Yes, I believe that's true.
Q. If the automatic stay applied, it might get access to the casino revenue during the whole bankruptcy, correct?
A. It might.
Q. Yeah. We're talking about different things that you consider as you're analyzing your options, right?
A. Yeah, correct.
Q. And this is -- this is a potentially important one
familiar with those statements?
A. I am.
Q. Did the Swap counterparties give their consent to the City to make those arguments in court?
A. I don't know.
Q. And -- so you don't know whether they did or they didn't?
A. That is correct.
Q. You understand that as originally designed the Swaps were designed to hedge against interest rate risk on the floating COPs?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form as well.
A. That is my understanding.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And I can unpack it if you want. I know we get into the --
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Yeah, okay. Let's just do basics of interest rate risk, which is if the interest rates go above the hedge rate, then now the Swap counterparties have to pay the difference to the service corporations so that they can pay the difference to the floating rate COPs, correct?

1 MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. That is my understanding. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's how the hedge works.

Now, interest rates do not favor the City
in the Swaps -- we asked that earlier.
A. Right.
Q. I will strike that.

But more basics of interest rate hedging, so as the interest rates go up and start to approach the hedge, the amount the City owes under the Swap via service corporations goes down?
A. That -- that is my understanding.
Q. And as it crosses over the hedge line, the service corporation could actually be in the money?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, here again, we had the discussion about in the money or not, but to the extent your point is saying that they would benefit more from the hedge than the counterparties would, that is my understanding.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. When the interest rates get above the hedge line?
A. (Nods head).
Q. That's right.

Okay. Now, when you were entering into the
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forbearance agreement on July 17th, what steps did you take personally to evaluate future -- I'm sorry. I misspoke, didn't I?
A. Yeah.
Q. When you entered into the forbearance agreement on July 15th --
A. Right.
Q. -- what steps did you take prior to that time to evaluate future interest rate moves?
A. Any discussions in those -- that regard would have been with our investment bankers and generally with our attorneys. What I'm trying to think of is were there any discussions that I had with Miller Buckfire which would not have been confidential in that regard. I don't think that there were. What I can say is that we evaluated the potentiality of the -- of the interest rate fluctuation as indexed to LIBOR going up or down, but I think most of those, if not all of them, were in communications with one or more of my attorneys.
Q. And when you say we evaluated the interest rate
fluctuations, that would have been tasked to Miller Buckfire to do?
A. Yes, Miller Buckfire in conjunction with folks from Jones Day. Yeah, sure.

1 Q. Okay. No disrespect to the fine lawyers at Jones Day. I don't know if I can calculate future interest rates as a lawyer.

It was in Miller Buckfire's province to do
it. They may have done it in conjunction with Jones Day?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. And any review of forward curves or different
interest rate implications currently existing in the
market would have been done by Miller Buckfire?
A. Yes.
Q. And your recollection is that it was done and it was something that you considered as part of the decision entering into this agreement?
A. I believe so.
Q. You're aware, for example, that the Federal Reserve has indicated intent to scale back its monthly bond purchases?
A. I heard that.
Q. And --
A. Quantitative reasoning --
Q. Yeah.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you're aware that many people believe that that may lead interest rates to rise; isn't that right?
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1 A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you analyze the likelihood that the interest rates would rise or was that also tasked to Miller Buckfire?
A. I didn't do it independently. That would have been tasked to Miller Buckfire.
Q. And if I asked what that analysis showed, I would have to ask Mr. Buckfire that?
A. Yes, you would.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes, you would.
Q. Let me ask you about -- in the motion to assume the forbearance agreement, the City states that it has examined whether there are viable actions to challenge the Swap contracts. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Under what theory could the City challenge the validity of the Swap contracts?
A. Any theories that we discussed -- I'll give you two answers. One, many of the theories, my understanding is and somebody -- I haven't read all of the objections, but l've read some of them. Some of the objections in this case have discussed some of those theories.

Two, any theories which we would have

1 examined, either independently or in the context of 2 reviewing and handicapping the probability of success 3 of some of the objections, would have been done with 4 attributes to an action seeking to declare the Swaps invalid, you'll decline to answer that on the attorney-client privilege?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we agree that if the Swaps are not valid, it wouldn't make sense for you to enter into the forbearance agreement?
A. No, not necessarily. There may be other prudential reasons that the City might want to be bring closure and certainty is access to its cash flow irrespective of the probability that the Swaps are valid or not valid.
Q. In your proposal for creditors on June 14, 2013, you said that the City has identified certain issues related to the validity and/or enforceability of the COPs --
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1 A. Yes.
Q. -- that may warrant further investigation.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm saving us from having to go through that --
A. Yeah, yeah. No. I remember.
Q. What issues has the City identified?

MR. SHUMAKER: Again, I'm going to caution the witness --
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: -- if this is going to reveal attorney-client communications to not answer.

Subject to that, you can answer.
A. Here again, there would be no issues that -- and I
hate to keep saying this. There'd be no issues that I independently would have identified because I'm trying very hard not to act as a lawyer. I would have only identified those issues and had discussions of them in consultations with my attorneys. So whether there are issues such as void ab initio, fraud, any of the other issues that typically go to contracts, I would only have had those discussions with counsel, so consequently I can't speak to this. BY MR. HACKNEY:

1 Q. Okay. And you'll assert the attorney-client privilege as a protection against describing the invalidity of the COPs analysis?
A. Yes, because I did no independent analysis.
Q. Has the City completed its investigation into this issue?
A. No. The City's investigation into a number of things are ongoing.
Q. Okay. And this is one of them?
A. This is one of them, yeah.
Q. Okay. So the City hasn't reached a conclusion on this subject because it hasn't concluded its investigation into the subject, correct?
A. It -- I think that's fair, yes.
Q. And has the City considered whether the service agreements between the service corporations and the City are lawful?
A. I don't recall if we looked into that.
Q. So that's one that you --
A. I just don't recall if that was one.
Q. You may have investigated, you may have not?
A. Correct. I don't recall that one.
Q. If you have investigated, do you know if the
investigation has concluded or do you not know?
A. No. If we had investigated or are investigating it,
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my understanding it would not have been concluded. Q. Okay. So much like with the COPs, generally the validity of the service contracts with the City is a subject of ongoing investigation that has not yet concluded.
A. It may be the subject of ongoing investigation which has not yet concluded.
Q. Okay. If I asked you how either of those two investigations, the one into the COPs validity or the one into the service contracts validity, impacted your decision to enter into the forbearance agreement, you will decline to answer because it would tend to reveal attorney-client communications?
A. For all the reasons we discussed today, the -- yes, I would have to.
Q. Mr. Orr, let me ask you about under section 803 of the service contracts --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- I'm going to save us both from having to go through them --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- so l'll represent to you what it relates to and see if you've heard of it.
A. Okay.

25 Q. Okay?
A. Um-hm.
Q. Have you heard of this waterfall?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you evaluate whether there were any claims that any parties to the structure might have against one another if the forbearance agreement leads to the payment of monies outside of the waterfall?
A. I assume you're alluding to prioritization or subordination in claims along those regards, and the answer: I think there probably was, but, here again, I would -- I did not do it independently. It would have been done by my counsel.
Q. Okay. So you can't tell me the fruits of the analysis or the City's position on the likelihood of success on the issue because it's protected by the attorney-client --
A. That is --
Q. -- privilege?
A. -- correct.
Q. If I ask you how it impacted your decision to enter into the forbearance agreement, you'd also not be able to answer that on the basis of the attorney-client
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privilege?
A. That is correct. In addition, that's part of the deliberative process.
Q. Have you analyzed whether or not COP holders might have claims against the Swap counterparties if the City exercises the optional termination right?
A. There -- have we analyzed it? The answer is yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. What's the result of that analysis?
A. Here again, any discussion would have been caught up in discussions I would have had with my counsel in that regard, so I decline to answer the question.
Q. Okay. Have you analyzed whether those potential claims may have an impact on whether the Swap counterparties go forward with the optional termination amount -- optional termination?
A. I don't recall if we did that specific analysis. I -I think that was probably caught up in the whole universe of analyses of potential claims, pros and cons analyses, but I don't recall that one specifically.
Q. We've just been talking now about the COPs. We've talked about the Swaps a lot. I'm going to for a moment reference the 2006 COPs Swap transaction documents.

1 A. Okay.
Q. Do you know generally what I mean when I say that?
A. Yes. The original documents by which the City borrowed money, 1.4 billion, for the unfunded actuarial liability --

COURT REPORTER: For the --
A. For the unfunded actuarial liability involve -- the organic documents.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. That is exactly correct. And, to name a few, there are the service contracts, the contract administration agreement, the trust agreement, and the master and -and amended Swap agreements, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You've heard of all of those?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are multiple versions of them?
A. There are multiple versions of them.
Q. For example, there are two service contracts --
A. That's right.
Q. -- because there are two service corporations.
A. That's right.
Q. Now, your understanding is that some of these documents were amended in 2009 in connection with the addition of the collateral agreement to the package,
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correct?
A. Yes. I'm going to take your meaning -- the amendment to mean that's the -- yes, the net effect of what happened in 2009.
Q. Okay. Did you know, for example, that the service contracts were also literally amended --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as part of that?
A. Yes. We're talking generally about all the documents without specifically going into each one.
Q. Although I did -- I did in that last one.
A. Yeah, you did, and so I'm following your lead on what we're talking about.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. The Swaps were also themselves amended in addition to the collateral agreement being created?
A. I believe so.
Q. Now, you're aware that these contracts that form the 2006 COPs Swap transaction documents were contracts that were entered into the same day back in 2006? I know you weren't there.
A. Yeah, I wasn't there, and I have seen them. I just don't recall sitting here today if they're the same day. If you're representing to me that is a fact, I
have no reason to believe otherwise.
Q. I believe the City ordinance describes this as all one transaction.
A. Right.
Q. Do you have a basis to dispute it?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for
speculation --
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: -- foundation.
A. Yeah, I have no basis to dispute it. Yeah. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You also know -- I know that you haven't familiarized yourself with the documents.
A. Right.
Q. We talked about that earlier.
A. Right.
Q. You took a look at them. You know that they all refer
to one other and relate to one another.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. JURGENS: Object to form.
A. Yeah, if -- without drawing any legal meaning to the concept that they all refer to one another, I believe that they do.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Now, the forbearance agreement that you just signed on July 15th, that also references the 2006 transaction documents, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. In fact, doesn't it borrow certain terms from some of those documents?
A. Without -- yeah, without reviewing the 2005 and 2006 documents or spending time here today reading through this agreement, I believe that's accurate.
Q. Okay. I will represent to you that I have reviewed it and that it does --
A. Right.
Q. -- but I take your answer.
A. Right.
Q. The -- do you know that one of the things that the

City agreed to do under the forbearance agreement is that during the optional termination period --
A. Right.
Q. -- the City won't try to seek to invalidate any of the 2006 transaction documents?
A. I believe that's true.
Q. Okay. That's one piece that's big enough that you're familiar with?
A. Yeah, I believe that's true.
Q. So is it fair to say that the 2006 transaction
documents, the collateral agreement from 2009, and the forbearance agreement are all documents that relate to the same subject matter?
A. Without drawing a legal conclusion, I believe in a broad sense it's fair to say that they relate to the same subject matter, meaning the Swaps.
Q. Does the forbearance agreement amend any of the provisions in the 2006 COPs or Swap transaction documents?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, document speaks for itself.
A. Yeah. I want to be very careful here. In addition to the document speaks for itself, I don't want to draw a relationship between the COPs document, which is separate, to the Swaps document.

When I said they relate broadly to the
subject, to the extent COPs were money borrowed to try to fund a pension obligation, and the Swaps were in place as a hedge against the interest rate fluctuations in those documents, and the collateral agreement 2009 was a document that was meant to address defaults that had occurred in relation to the Swaps document, and this document was meant to address the Swaps, they relate to that same subject area, but I don't want to have my testimony suggest that there's

Page 172
a legal relationship between the COPs and the Swaps document as relates to this agreement, forbearance and optional termination agreement.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. So as you sit here today, is your answer that you don't know if the forbearance agreement amends any of the 2006 COPs Swap transaction documents? It may, it may not, you don't know?
A. That is -- that is correct. I'm not going to draw a legal conclusion.
Q. Yeah, and I'm not going to try to drive you to one.
A. Okay.
Q. I am asking questions as in your role as a layperson who did execute the document.
A. Right.
Q. I understand the lawyers are going to do what they do, okay, but there is as a aspect of this where it's -your understanding as the guy who signs on it --
A. Right.
Q. -- can also be relevant?
A. That's right. My understanding is what this agreement does -- it's a forbearance agreement, and to the extent it has a provision in it that reverts back to the status quo ante if -- if the deal's not done, I don't want to draw any legal conclusion if there's an
amendment that exists after that process.
Q. Okay.
A. That's why I'm being hesitant.
Q. So you just don't know one way or the other as you sit
here today the impact the forbearance agreement has on the other agreements?
A. With regard to an amendment, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that the 2006 COPs

Swap transaction documents retain their vitality as
legal agreements to the -- of the parties thereto?
A. It's my understanding that they have whatever vitality they have according to their terms.
Q. Okay. So all the rights that all the parties to the COPs Swap transaction documents had before the forbearance agreement, they still have today?
A. No. Here again, you're -- I just want to be careful.

It seems that you're trying to conflate COPs with Swaps, and I want to be careful.
Q. Well, I want to say all of them, but if you say no, it's different on these, some rights have changed, but on these everyone's rights are preserved, that's okay.
A. Yeah, I want to be careful as far as saying what their rights are because I do believe those are legal questions, and in fact some of them are being litigated in the various piece of litigation that are
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going on.
Q. Hence this deposition?
A. Hence this deposition. So I want to be very careful
that I not give any testimony that would implicate a legal conclusion with regard to those documents. Q. And I'm not asking for a legal conclusion. I'm just asking for your understanding as the signatory -A. Right.
Q. -- as to whether the COPs Swap transaction documents, whether all the parties preserved their rights under those documents, not withstanding the forbearance agreement, or whether the forbearance agreement changes the parties' rights under those documents.
A. And that's why I'm being careful because my understanding of the forbearance agreement is that it imposed upon the City, service corporations and the counterparties certain obligations to forebear. I'm not going to draw a legal conclusion as to whether or not that amended any rights or changed any rights under the original documents.
Q. It may have, it may not have?
A. It may. It may have not. I'll leave that to the attorneys.
Q. It may constitute a waiver, it may not constitute a waiver, you'll leave that to the attorneys?
A. I'll leave that to the attorneys.
Q. At the time that you entered into the forbearance agreement, were you aware that the Swap insurers had the right to consent to waivers, modifications or amendments of the Swap agreement and the collateral agreement?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I was aware that some of the Swap insurers had asserted they had those rights. I had drawn no independent legal conclusion as to whether or not they did.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. So you didn't know whether they were right or they were wrong --
A. Correct.
Q. -- at the time you executed the agreement?
A. I had had discussions with my attorneys about whether they were right or they were wrong, but I had no independent conclusions.
Q. And you won't disclose the subject of your counsel's communications?
A. I cannot disclose that subject because that's an attorney-client communication.
Q. Did you evaluate when you entered into the forbearance agreement, whether the act of entering into it would
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multiply the amount of litigation that the City might face?
A. I think it's fair to say that we considered whether it might. Any time you're in a transaction I think you consider whether it might suborn litigation, yes.
Q. And what were your conclusions on this subject?
A. Here again, any conclusions we would have had would have been in this whole air of discussions with my counsel. What I can say, without saying what my conclusions specifically were of the probability that it might create additional litigation, is I thought that overall it was in the best interest of the City to enter into agreement.
Q. But you won't disclose to me your communications with your counsel about whether this might multiply the amount of litigation?
A. That is correct. Multiply, increase, whatever.
Q. And have you -- did you evaluate whether performing under the forbearance agreement, performing -- and by that I mean exercising the option.
A. Right.
Q. Whether -- let me say it again.

Have you evaluated whether exercising the option under the forbearance agreement might subject the City to additional liability?
A. Here again, all of these issues regarding potential of contingent claims, additional litigation, the advisability of entering into the agreement, considering that we were in litigation, and as I said before there may have been litigation threats made additionally, were taken into consideration in consultation with my counsel.
Q. But you can't disclose those communications?
A. They are attorney-client communications.
Q. All right. Let me ask you some questions about the proposed order which l've marked.
A. Okay.

MR. HACKNEY: You know what? We've got a
five-minute tape coming up and maybe since we're about to move to a new section, I'll propose a restroom break.

THE WITNESS: Okay. That's fine.
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is 11:35 a.m.
This marks the end of tape number 2. We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 11:35 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 11:51 a.m.)
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are back on the
record at 11:51 a.m. This marks the beginning of tape number 3.
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```
1 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
2 DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 4
3 11:51 a.m.
4 BY MR. HACKNEY:
```

Q. Let me hand you what I've marked as Orr Exhibit 4.
MR. SHUMAKER: Are we going out of order?
MR. HACKNEY: Yes. These were pre-marked
and I must have dropped an exhibit here or there.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Do you have Orr Exhibit 4 in front of you, sir?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. So, Mr. Orr, I'll represent to you that this is the
proposed order that your counsel submitted along with
the motion.
MR. HACKNEY: Oh, sorry.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Do you understand that?
A. Yes. Yes, I do.
Q. Did you review this order prior to its being submitted
along with the motion?
A. I don't think I did.
Q. Okay. Let me tell you that this order is actually of
some importance to the forbearance agreement.
A. Um-hm.
Q. And that's because if you don't get an order that is

1 in a form that's satisfactory --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to the Swap counterparties --
A. I understand.
Q. Yeah.
A. I need to be clear. Obviously l've reviewed and read and signed the forbearance agreement. I reviewed the motion. I just don't recall whether or not I reviewed the order.
Q. Okay.
A. I may have because it was probably attached to the motion. I just don't have an independent recollection of it.
Q. Let's try and make sure we understand the potential significance of the order --
A. Sure.
Q. -- and then we're going to go through it --
A. Sure.
Q. -- even though you haven't read it.

Do you understand the Swap counterparties and the City and the service corporations -- there's a provision in the forbearance agreement that talks about the fact that you need to get an order entered --
A. Sixty days.
Q. -- that's mutually agreeable.
A. Yes.
Q. And that was the 60-day time period.
A. Yes.
Q. And we can find the specific provision, but --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you know what I'm talking about.
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. So the form of the order is important.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Is that a yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's important because if the order changes
materially, it might arguably give the Swap
counterparties the right to declare an end to the termination period.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the form, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Here again, without making a legal assessment, I understand your meaning that we -- we have an obligation in the City to make sure the order is in a form that is mutually agreeable to the parties.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And this is it, right?

25 A. That is the proposed order.

1 Q. And this one, you know, is mutually agreeable to the parties.
A. I believe that it is, yes.
Q. I mean, you may not have negotiated it --
A. Correct.
Q. -- personally, but it's your expectation that people
acting on your behalf then went to make sure that the proposed order was mutually agreeable to the Swap counterparties?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Now, if the Court -- you understand that in bankruptcy sometimes the Court enters an order that's different from the one that was proposed.
A. Yes. I think the judge has done that on many occasions in this case.
Q. Yes. And so you understand the judge is the one who ultimately decides what the order says.
A. The judge wears the robe.
Q. That's right. Now, the judge, it's possible he may
materially change some of the provisions of this order. Do you understand that?
A. Yes. It is possible that the judge may change the order.
Q. And I'm not going to ask you to commit to a position as to whether you would lose your rights, but it at
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least raises the risk that if there's a material change to the proposed order, the Swap counterparties might be able to say that's not the order that we mutually negotiated in advance of the motion so in my view you haven't obtained the mutually negotiated order.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form, foundation. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. That's a risk?

MR. SHUMAKER: Sorry. Objection to form, foundation, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah. It is somewhat speculative, and I'd have to say that risk has to be mitigated by the fact that I would hope and anticipate that any proposed revisions to the order would be discussed with the Court under the guise of the obligations that the parties have to reach a mutually agreeable order.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Okay. But if the Court enters an order that is not mutually agreeable to the City and the Swap counterparties, that could give the Swap counterparties the right to terminate the optional forbearance period?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yes. Here again, it's speculative, in my -- but I don't anticipate that experience. In my experience most judges are -- my experience is that many judges are very careful not to undermine the underlying agreement by the order that's entered.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. So we can agree, though, that this order is an
important part of the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. Yes. I think the order is relevant to the forbearance agreement.

MR. JURGENS: Objection, form.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And it's important to it?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. I think it's a -- yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Let me ask you about some of the specific provisions in the order.
A. Okay.
Q. Let me just say real quick, do you know who negotiated this order with the Swap counterparties?

MR. JURGENS: Objection, form.
A. I assume it was my counsel. I don't know who in particular.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Did you -- but did -- did you approve the form of this order before it was submitted for the City?
A. As I said, I looked at the motion and the order was probably attached to the motion. I just don't remember looking at the order specifically. What I remember is, after we reached the agreement in principle and signed the forbearance agreement, having discussions without speaking to them, my counsel, okay, was -- let's document the agreement and get the motion filed.
Q. Do you know who -- do you know whether anyone approached the service corporations to get their views on the order?
A. I do not.
Q. You certainly didn't?
A. No.
Q. And let me just tie this up for a record because I was asking it colloquially, but it's under section 1.3(j) of the forbearance agreement. The City needs to obtain a final and non-appealable order on its motion before September 16th, 2013 or else the Swap counterparties have the right to terminate the forbearance agreement; isn't that correct?
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the summary.

1 A. Yeah. The agreement speaks for itself and there are other provisions in there, but the net effect is that you have to do -- obtain the order within 60 days and --

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Yeah.
A. -- I believe that's -- if you represent that's the correct date, then I have no reason to disagree.
Q. And there are actually two elements to this here. One of them is that, whatever the order says, it has to be final and unappealable by September 16, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, document speaks for itself.
A. I'll have to rely on the documents speaking to itself because without going through the whole -- I do recall that there was an obligation that the order be a final order. I don't recall specifically the -- the unappealable aspect of it. I do -- I do see in $J$ that there's a 60-day provision going forward.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. And do you see it says final and unappealable in J ?
A. I'm sorry, I'm looking through it.
Q. No, that's okay. You what, the court order definition?
A. Yeah. It doesn't say it in $J$ as defined in 2.1(d),
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and that's what I was looking. Unfortunately I -- I remembered it was in 2. It's $D$. It's 2.1(d).
Q. And you --
A. It says obtain entry of a final and unappealable order, yeah.
Q. Are you aware that that's actually not possible as we stand here today under the rules of the bankruptcy code?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation and a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah, here again, since I'm not acting as an attorney,

I'm going to defer from asking (sic) that question. I do understand that there are time frames involved under the bankruptcy code and under the rules as to whether or not they can occur.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. So you don't know whether or not it's -- it's
potentially impossible for the City to comply with
this --
A. Yeah, I would --

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. I would not opine as to whether or not it's possible. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Have you or your representatives had any
communications with the Swap counterparties regarding
whether they will extend that 60-day deadline we were just discussing?
A. I have not had any discussions. I am unaware as to whether or not any of my representatives have.
Q. You haven't directed them to have any, correct?
A. No, not directly.
Q. It's correct that you have not directed them?
A. It is correct -- it is correct that I have not directed them, but generally, just so we have an understanding here, once the forbearance agreement was reached, my counsel and representatives have all the authority necessary to do what's required to get the order entered.
Q. Okay. Well, let me ask it this way, which is, there are a number of provisions that are in this order that I -- I guess I'm maybe having the sense that you're not intimately familiar with as you sit here today; is that correct?
A. Yes, I know generally what the provisions of the order are. I know that the motion speaks to both the assumption and the 9019 agreement and their different principles, but the specific inner workings of the order, I will defer to my counsel on those.
Q. Let me ask you about some of them then. Look on the page 3 at E which is entitled Consent to Use of Casino
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## Revenues.

A. Um-hm. Um-hm.
Q. And it contains a finding that says, "Pursuant to
section 1.2 of the forbearance agreement, UBS AG and MLCS consent to the City's use of the casino revenue as set forth in the forbearance agreement."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then it says, "The consent of the UBS AG and MLCS will allow the City immediate access to its casino revenue as set forth in forbearance agreement and no other or further consents are required."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Is this an important part of the proposed order?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Well, first, the document speaks for itself. Two -BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It doesn't speak for itself in terms of whether it's important.
A. Well, let me respond. Two, to the extent this is an order into a motion, it -- as we had discussed earlier today, it's important that we have unfettered access to the casino revenue; and, three, I do think this is
a central aspect of the forbearance agreement.
Q. Okay. If the Court refuses to grant the relief specified here, will the Swap counterparties have the right to terminate the forbearance agreement in your view?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

You can answer.
A. Yeah, they'll have whatever rights they have under the forbearance agreement which might include termination. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Take a look at paragraph G , arms' length agreement. The forbearance agreement was negotiated at arms' length and in good faith by all parties, and it goes on to say, "UBS AG and MLCS are not insiders of the City as that term is defined in bankruptcy code section 10131?
A. Um-hm.
Q. And this is the important part I want to you focus on, "The parties entry into and performance under the forbearance agreement does not violate any law, including the bankruptcy code, and does not give rise to any claim or remedy against the parties thereto except as may be expressly set forth in this order or in such agreement."
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$1 \quad$ Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember earlier we talked about whether if the City performed under the forbearance agreement it would be able to do so without the fear of liability to other parties?
A. Yes.
Q. And your understanding was it could do so, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that so could the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't this provision one part of the basis for your -- for that view?
A. Well, you know, as I said, this provision draws a legal conclusion and I have not independently or as an attorney done an analysis of what this provision will provide, but that's my understanding, yes.
Q. Are you just reading this provision for the first time?
A. No. I think I -- as I said, I think I saw the order attached to the motion. I just didn't recall it immediately or as terms by itself. I was more familiar with the motion because I read that in conjunction with my affidavit that was attached to the motion, but I think that's the effect of what this

## provision does.

Q. Is this an important part of the order --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. -- from the City's perspective?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. Yes, without giving rise to the nomenclature important. As I said before, it's important that we have certainty and -- regarding the use of the casino revenue, and this term certainly looks like it would provide that.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. And not only does it provide you the certainty about the casino revenue, it provides you with the certainty that you will not be -- the City will not be subject to any liability as a result of performing under the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And it does the same thing for the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Take a look at paragraph 4 on the bottom of page 4.
A. Um-hm.
Q. It says, "The forbearance agreement is approved in its entirety. The City is authorized to perform its
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obligations that arise from the forbearance agreement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019, and any actions taken heretofore in furtherance of these obligations are hereby ratified."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, Ido.
Q. You understand that to be a provision by which the Court provides a judicial authorization to the City and the Swap counterparties to perform under the forbearance agreement, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. HACKNEY: I'm just asking for his assumption.
A. My understanding --

MR. SHUMAKER: Just to make that clear.
A. My understanding is that is the practical effect of this provision.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. Is this an important part of this order?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. I think approval of the forbearance agreement is an important part of this order, yes.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. But also the judicial authorization to perform.

1 A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Let me -- let me cut through some of these provisions, which is, what the parties really want the Court to do here, both the City and Swap counterparties, is to tell them you are allowed to perform this forbearance agreement without fear of reprisal from any third party, correct?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, and I also think it calls for a legal conclusion, but let me see if I can answer the question. The motion sets forth what I believe are the conditions necessary for approval of the forbearance agreement. This order seeks to approve that motion, so to the extent it does that, yes, I believe it authorizes the parties to perform and gives them the authority to go forward to a motion according to its terms which incorporates by definition the forbearance agreement, so yeah.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. And they can do so without fear of liability to third parties.
A. You know, that -- that impacts upon -- I believe that may impact upon the question is not atypical in some orders as far as -- as we discussed earlier today,
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releases, third party liability, exculpation, those are legal conclusions. My understanding is that the way the order is -- is worded that, yes, it allows the parties to go forward.

COURT REPORTER: To --
THE WITNESS: To go forward.
MR. HACKNEY: Without liability to third parties.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. I think we're going over ground we've gone over before.
A. Yeah. I believe that's the intent of the order, yes.
Q. Okay. So one of the benefits of the order to the City and the Swap counterparties is that to the extent there are third party claims -- and I know you're not conceding that there are any --
A. Right.
Q. -- it clears them away.
A. I believe that's accurate, which is one of the -- yes. I believe that's accurate.
Q. And I take it the City is not willing to agree to an order which ensures the protection of third party claims?

MR. SHUMAKER: Calls for speculation, objection.

1 A. Yeah, that's -- you know, there are so many -- there are -- there's a possibility there may be conditions under which the City could agree, so I don't want to be misleading in saying that there are no circumstances when -- but generally speaking, this order, the motion and forbearance agreement, are the expectations of the parties.
Q. Are you aware of the possibility that if third party
claims are preserved, that that could be a
sufficiently material change in this order for the
Swap counterparties to be able to terminate?
A. It might be.
Q. Have you had any conversations with them about that subject?
A. I have not personally had any conversations with them about that subject.
Q. Have you directed folks that report to you to do so, either advisors or personal --
A. As I've said earlier, I've given the authority to my counsel and team to have all discussions that are necessary to address any contingencies that could arise, and they may well have had those discussions. I'm just not aware of any with specificity.
Q. Okay. But you gave a general direction.
A. Right.
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1 Q. You didn't give someone a specific direction to hey, go find out what the Swap counterparties think if third party rights are preserved, what are they going to do, do we have a problem? You never gave that specific direction.
A. No, I didn't, and let's -- you know, let's make sure we're clear on this. As I said, once we reached the agreement, you know, my direction was okay, let's get it done and let's document and do whatever's necessary to do that, so I did not give a specific direction in that regard.
Q. Let me ask you real quickly. One of the other benefits of the forbearance agreement to the City is that it resolves litigation that the City's currently in with Syncora, correct?
A. I would like to think so. To the extent it draws a legal conclusion, l'd have to defer to my counsel, but I like to think it does that, yes.
Q. So you think that the Court's order that we're looking at here will actually moot pending litigations involving the City and Syncora?
A. Perhaps not. For instance, and I haven't -- you know, I haven't drawn a legal conclusion on this, but there may be claims by the City against Syncora that survive this order. I just don't know.
Q. Okay. As the City's litigation against Syncora stands currently, will the Court's order moot out that litigation?
A. I don't know.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah, I was going to say I don't know. That -- that
calls for a legal conclusion and $I$ have not
independently done that analysis.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. So it may, it may not, you don't know?
A. It may, it may not. I don't know.
Q. The -- I want to talk about the source of proceeds for any potential termination payment down the road. This is a subject I discussed with Mr. Buckfire yesterday.
A. Um-hm.
Q. The optional termination amount fluctuates over time and is ultimately pegged on the day that you exercise the option; isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I believe that's correct.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. So when we talk about these amounts, Mr. Orr, it's a little bit difficult because we don't -- I can't tell you you're going to have X amount of money to exercise
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it, but you understand that there is a distinct possibility that the amount of the optional termination payment will be a very sizable sum.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I think that it's fair to say that although the interest rates may fluctuate, they are not going to fluctuate so greatly that it will reduce the probability that that will be a sizable sum. You're not going to go from zero points or two points to 36 percent at the Fed discount window.
Q. Hopefully not or something's horrible happened.
A. Yeah, or we're all in trouble, yeah. So you may fluctuate, but the range of fluctuation is generally within a fairly finite bandwidth, we hope.
Q. And I'm going to give you some notional amounts that are based on comments your counsel has made in court, just to try and get general agreement.
A. Sure.
Q. But it's very possible that the amount of the termination payment could be between 180 and 220 million dollars?
MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I think that's fair. We certainly hope it's on the lower end or lower of that scale, but that depends what the rates are at any given day.

## BY MR. HACKNEY:

Q. Okay. Now, let's link up the potential sizeable termination payment that the City may have to marshall if it wants to exercise the option with the City's current financial capabilities.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Isn't it true that the City does not currently have enough cash on hand to be able to fund a termination payment that was in the range of 200 million dollars?
A. That is true.
Q. Okay. That's part of the problem that you're working on as emergency manager, right?
A. That is certainly true.
Q. Do you know how much cash the City has today?
A. On any given day, we fluctuate approximately in the neighborhood of I want to say 30 to 40 million dollars. Right now that number may be a little bit higher because we just went through one of our tax collection periods in August.
Q. I'm going to guess and ask you do you stay in almost daily contact with your -- with your cash flow forecast?
A. Almost daily, yeah.
Q. Yeah. That's probably an important aspect of running
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the City.
A. It's an important aspect of the City.
Q. Do you still project that you're going to run out of cash by the end of the year?
A. If we don't have this agreement, there's a very real chance, yes, in a steady state, we will run out of cash.
Q. And by -- what do you mean by a steady state?
A. If we don't do anything such as secure this casino revenue, if we don't go to the capital markets and borrow additional funds, which appears unlikely which the City has done every other year since 2008 to make up the difference, yes, the projections show that by December of this year, we will run out of cash.
Q. Are those the pre-bankruptcy projections?
A. Yes. I believe so.
Q. Those are the projections that we'll get into in a moment that -- but that assumes that the City's paying its legacy expenditures on a current basis, right?
A. Yes. As we have -- as we have represented, we intend to continue doing that throughout the year.
Q. The legacy expenditures?
A. Well, certainly with regard to healthcare and other employees, if we get this agreement, that may change our risk for the termination payment.

1 Q. Your view of those legacy expenditures in the bankruptcy is that they are unsecured claims, correct?
A. Yes. Many of them are, yes. There are some expenditures that are secured with regard to the water department and parking and some miscellaneous, but the roughly 11 and a half, 12 billion dollars that we put out there we view as unsecured.
Q. So let's go back to sourcing this termination payment.
A. Yes.
Q. It was my understanding of his testimony that

Mr. Buckfire who, by the way, is the individual tasked with obtaining the City's post petition financing, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And is presumably the individual that's most knowledgeable about that effort?
A. Yes.
Q. It was -- I'll represent to you that his testimony was
that the proceeds for the optional termination payment would likely come from the post -- the proceeds of the post petition financing?
A. Yes.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Is that also your understanding?

Page 202
1 A. Yes.
2 Q. Okay. Now, isn't it also true that the City hopes to pledge the casino revenues as part of the collateral package for the post petition financing?

MR. SHUMAKER: I'm going to object here. We're getting into an area where it is incredibly commercially sensitive as to what sort of post petition financing that the City is seeking.

MR. HACKNEY: Let me not be rude. I will tell you I'm just going to ask him questions that Buckfire asked yesterday -- answered. So I'm not going to try and play the whole thing, but there were absolutely areas where Buckfire answered. I think there were a lot of other people in the room that were there. I think any of your colleagues --

MR. SHUMAKER: Okay, that's fine.
MR. HACKNEY: Any of your colleagues.
MR. SHUMAKER: I just want to caution you.
MR. HACKNEY: I understand. I understand the sensitivity. There were absolutely areas, though, that Buckfire talked about. This was one of them. I mean can I get an Amen or --
(Consensus Amen.)
A. Okay.

BY MR. HACKNEY:

1 Q. Okay. So I think there -- if I'm not mistaken, your father was an amen minister.
A. Great grandfather, grandfather and father.
Q. So maybe --
A. Yeah, took me back to -- over in the corner with the deacons, yeah, took me back.
Q. Okay. I won't compare myself to your father, grandfather and great grandfather, but I can aspire.
A. Yeah.
Q. So I do want to talk about -- this is important.

Okay. This is -- isn't it true that one aspect of the
DIP -- I'm not going to get into the others -- is that the casino revenues will be pledged or anticipated to be pledged as collateral for the post petition financing?
A. Let me say this. That is certainly under consideration.
Q. Okay. Now, isn't it also true, though, that the casino revenues have not currently been freed up on a permanent basis because the City has not currently exercised the option, correct?
A. The certainty that we hope to get out of the forbearance agreement has not been approved yet, correct.
Q. Well, even if it is approved by the Court, you still
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won't have exercised the option.
A. That is true with regard to the optional termination payment.
Q. Right.
A. Yes.
Q. And you need to exercise the option to terminate the hedge, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You need to terminate the hedge to terminate the collateral agreement.
A. I think that's --

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to form, to the extent calls for a legal conclusion.
A. Yeah, without getting into legal conclusions -COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. This is -BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. You think it's a fair characterization that you need
to get the hedge terminated to get the collateral agreement terminated?
A. Yes.
Q. And the good part for the City, if those things happen, is that now you have unchanneled access to the casino revenues going into the future?
A. Yes, as we've said today, that certainty is one of the motivations to enter into the agreement.
Q. But do you also understand that you can't currently pledge the casino revenues to a post petition lender in a -- prior to having exercised the option under the forbearance agreement?
A. Well, let's be careful without drawing legal conclusions. You can always enter into agreements that have contingencies attached to them and the parties will wait for those contingencies to occur. That certainly has happened with a number of different negotiations, not just in this case, but happens all the time.
Q. That's fair that you absolutely -- you make a pledge that's contingent on something else. But isn't it true that, as a general matter, post petition lenders typically like to make sure that they have clean collateral before they make a loan that's secured by that collateral?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. I think that's generally a fair characterization; however, there have been cases that l've been involved with outside of this one where post petition lenders have been willing to make pledges or commitments subject to certain contingencies.

BY MR. HACKNEY:

## Page 206

Q. Isn't it your expectation today, though -- is it -- is
it your expectation today that any post petition lender will want clear -- a clear lien on the casino revenues before it's willing to lend? Is that your current expectation?
A. Well, my current expectation is it might well want clear lien before it's willing to fund. I would think in many of the bankruptcy cases that l've been involved in, post petition lenders, for instance, are willing to make commitments subject to the Court approving their super priority liens, and then once that approval is granted, they fund the loan, so that's fairly common.
Q. I'm going to confirm for the record that conversations with the State of Michigan about providing DIP financing or with the federal government about providing DIP financing are still questions that you will refuse to answer on the grounds of commercial sensitivity?

MR. SHUMAKER: I think you can ask Mr. Orr those questions. I don't want to -- I don't want to categorically exclude you from doing that.

BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Are they commercially sensitive?

5 A. They are commercially sensitive, but I don't want to
Q. Yeah. In fact, that -- it's interesting because the
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DIP proceeds you're seeking are up to 350 ; is that correct?
A. Here again, those are commercially sensitive, but I think that's fair. Yes, I think that's fair.
Q. Okay. And that's the equivalent of two years' worth of casino revenues, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that's something that you think you may be able to get without having to pledge a clear lien on the casino revenues, right?
A. No. What I'm trying to say is you can certainly enter into commitments. I'm drawing commitments different from funding. You can certainly have a lender which is quite common in bankruptcy cases to make a commitment subject to approval of its security interest or priorities to actually fund.
Q. Okay.
A. So that can occur.
Q. So the fact that that can occur means that there can be uncertainty in connection with the casino revenues and it won't hamstring your DIP process, correct?
A. Yeah, it's not so much -- well, to a degree what you're saying is correct. It's not so much uncertainty with casino revenues because that's math. It may be some uncertainty with regard to the ability

1 of the City to pledge those revenues to pay off any 2 post petition lending, and, here again, a lender might 3 well be willing to enter into an agreement subject to having that insecurity removed to fund that --
Q. The fact of the matter is the DIP process is just
getting off the ground, correct?
A. I think that's fair to say.
Q. I think it's literally in the last couple days, right?
A. I think that's fair.
Q. So you don't know as you sit here today, and you probably wouldn't tell me if you did --
A. Right.
Q. -- what the current appetite of the lenders is for uncertainty around the casino revenues, correct?
A. That -- that I think is part of the process. Yeah.
Q. Now, have you attempted to borrow money -- has the

City attempted to borrow money and secure those borrowings with a lien on something other than the casino revenues?
A. No.
Q. Is the -- is the City considering pledging art as collateral?

MR. SHUMAKER: Again, I'm going to get into now the -- this is a very commercially sensitive subject.

Page 210 questions. You guys got to decide --

MR. SHUMAKER: I'm just stating my objection, and the fact of the matter is, as was stated yesterday with -- with Mr. Buckfire, is that when we get into the -- as you said, the RFP, the DIP RFP process is just started. We're not going to go into strategy or what the terms are or what the specifics are, because we do not believe that this is something that would be down to the City's benefit. If it's negotiated, gets public, and bidders' --

MR. HACKNEY: Sure.
MR. SHUMAKER: -- identities are revealed and all these things --

MR. HACKNEY: I don't mean to be rude, and I totally respect the speech. I'm just interested in time, and for me the upshot is are you going to let him answer or not?

MR. SHUMAKER: Well, if will you repeat the question, I'll tell you.

MR. HACKNEY: I can't remember the question anymore.
A. Have you considered --

MR. HACKNEY: Are you going to pledge the art --
A. Yeah.

MR. SHUMAKER: I'm going to say that's --
we're drawing a line. We're getting into specifics,
and I'm going to instruct him not to answer.
MR. HACKNEY: I -- okay. That's just all I
need to know for the record.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. Okay. Now, I want to talk about revenue streams other than casino revenues.
A. Right.
Q. The City does have other revenue streams; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, on an annual basis, the City's revenues are in the neighborhood of a billion to a billion 1, correct?
A. Yes, I think that's fair.
Q. And on an annual basis, the casino revenues are in the range of 170 to 180 million?
A. Yes.
Q. Roughly a little less than 20 percent of the City's annual revenues.
A. 17 and a half, 18 percent.
Q. Now, there's somebody who studied. Okay.

So have you engaged the possibility of
pledging other revenue streams as security for the DIP?
A. This is a commercially sensitive area. In addition, there are potentially legal issues that must be resolved. Suffice it to say we have examined a number of different possibilities, looking at what options we might have given the City's various ordinary revenue streams.
Q. And are there other revenue streams that could be pledged? I'm not going to ask you whether you are going to pledge them, whether you will, whether you plan to, but are there other revenue streams that could be pledged?
A. There might be. There might be, but there's -- here again, there's certain legal issues regarding any revenue streams that have to be resolved.
Q. Let me ask you about the -- the use of the casino revenues if you're able to obtain them.
A. Right.
Q. So just in terms of level setting --
A. Right.
Q. -- the casino revenues are approximately 15 million a month.
A. Yes, I think that's fair.

25 Q. Net of the Swap payment which is still made on a
monthly basis under the forbearance agreement --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you net about 11 million?
A. I think that's correct.
Q. Okay. Your claim is that these revenues are necessary
to the operation of the City. I think we discussed
that earlier.
A. Yes.
Q. And in fact it's your expectation that you will use these revenues to fund the reinvestment program that you have planned with respect to the 1.25 billion dollars of reinvestment in the City over the next ten years?
A. Yes, that's correct. An average of 125 million a year which a big component of it is this revenue.
Q. Okay. So fair statement, you're going to take the
casino revenues and you're going to plow them into the City, correct?
A. More -- I mean, money goes into a bathtub, but yes. The casino -- we don't have the casino revenue. We have no other source to make reinvestment in the City.
Q. And that's what you want to do?
A. Yes.
Q. And so as a creditor, I'm going to make the obvious point that you don't plan to take the casino revenues
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and give them to the unsecured creditors, correct?
A. I think that's generally a fair characterization.
Q. So isn't it fair that other than perhaps certainly benefitting the people of Detroit if you reinvested in the City, the creditors themselves will not see their recoveries enhanced by the fact that the City has gained access to these casino revenues, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah, I'm going to be careful here because one of the things we've offered in our proposal, June 14th proposal, is a 2 billion dollar note that has some capacity to fluctuate. Generally speaking, your statement is true, but there's another concept that without this reinvestment there's a very real chance that the City will have no chance to stabilize and grow and the creditors will see no opportunity for any benefit because the City would have an inability of -continue to decline, quality of life will continue to decline, revenue from other streams will continue to decline, and the City's ability to satisfy its obligations to the creditors will continue to decline. Q. Now, I understand that distinction, and we're talking now about the proposal you've made to creditors that you would give all of the unsecureds --

1 A. Yes.
Q. -- effectively a pot of 2 billion dollars of bonds.
A. Correct.
Q. And I want to distinguish between two concepts and
make sure that we're on the same page because I think that we are.
A. Right.
Q. The first point is that you do agree that you're not going to take the casino revenues and put it on top of the 2 billion pot to make a larger recovery for creditors.
A. Yes, that's fair.
Q. But you are saying that there could be some value to the creditors of a revitalized Detroit because that Detroit will be more able to perform under the 2 billion dollars in bonds that you're going to give them as part of your proposal?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Did I summarize accurately the distinction you were trying to draw there?
A. Yes. Yes. There's a broader concept about the need to revitalize the City and grow beyond just the interest of the creditors. It's also for the citizens and residents and future of the City.
Q. Oh, absolutely. I understand that.
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1 A. But, yes, that's generally -- no direct benefit from the casino revenue.
Q. Consistent with what we've just discussed then, you haven't undertaken an analysis to show how much creditor -- unsecured creditor recoveries will be enhanced if the forbearance agreement is approved, because you intend to use the money to reinvest in the City.
A. No. I'm not sure that's true. I mean, that's why I was saying before, part of it is enhancing the stability of the City and its ability to meet or actually to provide for that 2 billion dollar note. It depends on large part on the ability to stabilize the City.
Q. I understand that as a general concept, but I meant have you undertaken actually any actual analysis of the potential Delta 2 creditor recovery?
A. Oh, from the 120 -- from the casino revenue?
Q. Right.
A. Yes, I believe we have.
Q. And what does it show?
A. Here again, that's -- it's sensitive and, in addition, I believe those discussions were caught up in discussions I had with counsel, so I'm going to have to decline.

1 Q. Those are privileged communications?
A. I believe so.
Q. So the analysis of how my client Syncora, as an unsecured creditor, would do if the assumption motion is denied versus how it will do if its granted, that's something that you cannot speak to?
A. Right, because it goes into the analysis, as we said earlier today, what would happen if it were denied, what the options would be to the City, what litigation risk would happen, what would be caught up in the existing litigation, all those issues.
Q. Let me hand you Orr Exhibit Number 3.

MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 3
12:30 p.m.
BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. It's even in color. One large view for you. I don't mean that di --
A. Okay.
Q. Sorry.
A. I know you didn't. Okay.
Q. Yeah, okay. Cringeworthy, awkward. I apologize.

THE WITNESS: Can we go off the record for
a second?
MR. HACKNEY: Yeah.

7 Q. Mr. Orr, I am going to play it by the book --
A. Okay.
Q. -- from here on out, just to be safe.
A. Sure.
Q. And to the extent any of that was on the record, I do want to offer a fulsome apology. That was an inadvertent reference.
A. No apology necessary. To the extent anybody thinks there was an apology necessary, it's not.
Q. Okay. Well, I appreciate that. Very gracious of you. So in the motion to assume the forbearance agreement, the City makes the claim that the City is currently in a liquidity crisis; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's something that you obviously agree with, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you prepared this proposal for creditors that I've marked as Orr Exhibit 3 in anticipation of your
A. Yes, I and my team put this together.

3 Q. And the best of your knowledge, this is a --
A. True and correct copy.
Q. -- true and correct copy?
A. Yes. I have no reason to believe this is not a true and correct copy, in color.
Q. Great. Please don't --
A. Okay. This is --
Q. And obviously -- we haven't talked about this, but Ernst \& Young was retained to -- by the City to undertake efforts to understand the City's cash flow forecast, among other things, correct?
A. Yes, in addition -- yes.
Q. And I know that you're involved in all aspects of the City's operation as emergency manager, but isn't it true that Ernst \& Young is the entity responsible for preparing the City's cash flow forecasts?
A. Yes. I am not an account; they are. Yes.
Q. Okay. So while I'm certain that you have reviewed their work product --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when it comes to actually compiling the forecast itself, if I wanted to ask about how was this number arrived at or this projection, I would have to ask
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## Ernst \& Young.

A. You would -- yes, they'd be the best evidence of how that was done.
Q. Okay. You might have knowledge about one number here one number there because someone specifically discussed it with you, but you don't have comprehensive knowledge of how all the numbers in the cash flow forecast were arrived at.
A. No. Usually the process is the financial advisor and the -- Ernst \& Young, for instance, would do the deep dive and then present me with a report and analyses, but they would have the in-depth knowledge.
Q. Fair enough. Fair enough.

You see their work product and you go over with it with them. You're not the one that compiles their work product.
A. That is correct.
Q. Obviously, in compiling this report, you, Ernst \& Young, your other advisors endeavored to be as accurate as you could in assembling the information contained in this report?
A. Yes.
Q. And that also would apply to forecasts that you were making. You tried to be as accurate as possible about making forecasts.

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. So let me draw your attention, if I could, to page 38 of this report.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is -- this is titled A Look At the Future in the Absence of Restructuring Initiatives. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So what this table is doing is it's saying here is where the City of Detroit is headed without any increases in expenditures necessary to restore City services to adequate levels; without additional investments by the City and services assets or infrastructure; and, last, without any changes to legacy liabilities, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Now, we're going to talk about each of these three things in a moment, but the fact of the matter is each of those three things have changed during the bankruptcy process in terms of what legacy liabilities are getting paid or what reinvestments are being made, correct?
A. To some degree they have and to some degree they haven't. We are still in a steady state with, for instance, salary, overtime, fringe, health benefits,
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## operating expenses, with regard to secure debt service, pension contributions which remain underfunded, health benefits are still in a steady state. We are hopefully in a steady state on a revenue side as well.

Q. I was just making --
A. But, yes.
Q. I was making a simpler point, which is, for example -we'll go into this, but like you're not paying the service payments related to the COPs during the bankruptcy?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. And I think you're deferring pension contributions.
A. A portion of the pension contributions. For instance, this year I think we had an obligation of approximately 131 million dollars. I think we paid 31 million of it.
Q. Okay. So a portion.
A. But that is the steady state. The City regularly defers pension contributions.
Q. True, true. We'll get into this in a moment here, but --
A. Right.
Q. -- now, the fiscal year of the City runs from June 30
to June 30, right?
A. Yeah, July 1 to June 30.
Q. Right. Yeah. Okay.

And the years that are listed here, it's
your understanding these are the fiscal years, correct?
A. 2008 to 2012 are fiscal year actuals. 2013 were preliminary forecasts, at this time forward.
Q. That's right. This was back in June, so you had a
little -- there was a stub period on June 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. When I talked to Mr. Buckfire yesterday, he indicated that it was his understanding that these years are July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- 2014 here?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, the forecast that the City indicates when it comes to total revenues for the fiscal year that we're currently in is about 1,082,800,000 in total revenue, correct?
A. That is correct. That's down about 30 -some-odd million dollars from the prior year.
Q. Right. And if you look at the operating expenditures, that shows that you anticipate 685.7 million in
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operating expenditures during that -- this fiscal year that we're currently in, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, if you just viewed these things in isolation, you are representing here a net operating surplus of just under $\$ 400,000,000$, correct?
A. That's roughly, correct, yes.
Q. Now, the -- and the operating expenditures are the amount of money that you forecast needing to operate the City as you found it with its current level of services when you were appointed, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So that's the point of the caveat at the top, which is you have the aim of improving services in the City, but when you compiled this expenditures analysis, this was based on here is how we currently do things in the City of Detroit, providing the level of services we currently provide, and here is how much it costs?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, isn't it true that -- we've talked about the fact that while the casino revenues fluctuate between 170 and 180 million, even if you took them out of this forecast, you would still have a net operating surplus of $\$ 227,000,000$, correct?
A. Well --
Q. Put aside --
A. Yeah, put aside --
Q. I understand.
A. -- debt service and pension contributions, healthcare, but just looking at operating expenses, that would be correct.
Q. And -- that's right. I'm emphatically doing that.

I'm referring to --
A. Right.
Q. -- this line. Okay?
A. Right.

MR. SHUMAKER: Which line, Steve?
MR. HACKNEY: The line that says net operating surplus.
A. It's in bold. It's the 1, 2, 3, 4th line down. BY MR. HACKNEY:
Q. And, I mean, can we agree it wasn't an accident that whoever compiled this broke the legacy expenditures down below the operating expenditures, correct?
A. Yes. I'm sure that was intentional.
Q. Right. And that's because, for example, while
payments to the COPs are likely very important to the COP holders --
A. Right.
Q. -- they're not something that you actually use to run the City.
A. Well, yes, it's not an operating expense.
Q. Right.
A. It's a debt service.
Q. Right.

A payment to a police officer for their time or for their benefits, that is an operating expense?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that's all covered in the operating expenditures.
A. Yeah. Salary over time and fringe benefits, yes.
Q. Okay. So if you follow along in my hypothetical and we took out what we'll call a hundred -- we'll split the difference. We'll say it's $175,000,000$.
A. Sure.
Q. I'll tell you in here it's projected to be $170--$ why don't we use the number here. If we took the 170 out, you'll still have 227.2 million dollars to work with from the standpoint of a net operating surplus, correct?
A. Yes, roughly $\$ 230,000,000$.
Q. Okay. Your reinvestment plan I believe calls for a billion and a quarter over ten years and it's commonly described as being about $\$ 125,000,000$ a year.
Q. It was $500,000,000$ over the first --
A. Over the first six years.
Q. Oh, so that's less than 125 a year.
A. No, it's more. It's $500,000,000$ over the first six
years -- I believe it's on page 47 -- maybe on page 47
or 48. If you look on page 47, not to go out of
sign -- but if you look at the second to the last bold
line, it says reinvestment in the City. Starting in
2014 you'll see, for instance, the total reinvestment
in the City will be $\$ 188.5$ million dollars.
Q. I'm sorry, I blanked on you. What page are you on?
A. Oh, l'm sorry. Page 47, the second to the last bold
line, you will see that in the first year of the
preliminary forecast -- this is in a steady state, so
we're comparing steady state to steady state --
without any adjustments that that reinvestment
expense, total reinvestment in the City will be 188.5
million dollars and --
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1 Q. Oh, I see it. Okay.
A. Third line up from the bottom.

But if you wanted to average it, it would be 125 over ten years.
Q. Oh, I see. And it drops off quite a bit in --
A. Right. After the six years, it drops off to $\$ 32.8$ million.
Q. And if I recall, what I had said to you earlier is
that even if we take out the casino revenues, you will have $\$ 227,000,000$ in net operating surplus to work with. That's where we were before we broke.
A. Right. Operating, but that still does not adjust for other expenditures, legacy expenditures we call them. Q. That's true. All of which -- the large majority of which are unsecured claims in the bankruptcy, correct?
A. Well, if you look on page -- go back to page 38 where it says net operating surplus, you'll see the first line below net operating surplus is debt service and a portion of that one -- portion of that 141.4 for year 2013 or 135.9 for year 2014 is secured debt service. Q. Some portion of the gold bonds is secure?
A. Some portion is secured, roughly -- roughly 30,000,000.
Q. That's a very appropriate caveat. I will say with that caveat and with the caveat of the Swaps, the
remainder of the claims under legacy expenditures are ones that you consider unsecure.
A. Yes. That's how we treated them in our proposal.
Q. And by the way, even with respect to the Swaps, I've been giving you full credit for the 170 of the casino revenues, but you actually have to not -- you have to net the swap payments out against it, at least until you exercise the --
A. Yes. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So with respect to the 188 , we can agree that the 227 net operating surplus you have, as a matter of math and subject to your qualifications about certain secured legacy obligations, is larger than $188 ?$
A. Yes. The surplus is assuming that we make no pension contributions, we do not service -- you have to back out of that -- you call it 227. I call it 230. You have to back out of there approximately $\$ 30,000,000$ in debt service under the LTGO and UTGO -COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, under the? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
A. Under the LTGO and UTGO cat -- the bonds category debt service, so that would leave you with a net of roughly 200,000,000, and then if you look on the 2014 column, you would see that if -- if some portion of pension contributions were made and some portion of healthcare
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benefits were made, that would essentially wipe out the 200,000,000, and that's not dealing with the COPs or the Swaps payment.
Q. It is however your expectation that substantial
portions of retiree health and benefits will be deferred at a minimum?
A. They essentially have to be because we won't have the money.
Q. That's right. And also pension contributions, substantial parts of those are being deferred at a minimum?
A. This year we deferred some and we are anticipating deferring more, and again -- but that creates a deferred pension obligation. There are two things that's missing from this analysis. One is we have a general operating deficit going forth this year, about $\$ 387,000,000$, for which there's no provision made in the cash flow analysis, and we have an aggregate deferred pension contribution number close to 200,000,000.
So while I under -- take your point that if you were to take out from 1.1 billion, deduct the roughly $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ million in operating expenses, would leave you with a net of 400 million, if you were to back out the 170 million or so in wagering expenditures, you
A. I don't recall, but it may been.
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1 Q. Now, it's been reported in the press that during that meeting one of the things that you said to these community leaders was that the first thing to be done to help the City with the City's bankruptcy was to, "Deal with these Huns on Wall Street."

Did you say that, Mr. Orr?
A. I may have said that.
Q. Okay.
A. Some people make misstatements, as witnessed today.

So I may well have said that.
Q. I will -- I will suggest to you, earlier, and I want
to reiterate that was truly unintentional.
A. Steve, as I said, some people may make misstatements, and as I said today it happens.

I may have said that.
Q. When you said that about the Huns of Wall Street, I take it wasn't like a slip of the tongue. Did you mean to say hey, the first thing I mean to do is deal with the Huns of Wall Street?
A. No. Let me explain that. What I meant to say by that is look, we've got to deal with adjusting our debt to the creditors as well as our obligations to the laborers, and I used -- I used I think the nomenclature Huns. It was probably too colloquial, too slip of the tongue.

I wasn't meaning to impugn anyone's character. That was an allusion to a statement that I've seen used before, you've got to keep the Huns out of the portals, and that's all I meant.
Q. When you talk about the Huns of Wall Street, you mean banks, bond holders, bond insurers, Swap insurers, Swap counterparties, etcetera, correct?
A. Whatever's on Wall Street, yes.
Q. Yeah.
A. Largely speaking.
Q. You mean the clients of the folks in this room, in the main?
A. Well, some of whom were my ex-clients, who probably will no longer be, but yeah.
Q. I understand. But wouldn't you agree, Mr. Orr, that while the last, you know -- going back to 2006, when they had that COPs transaction, I know that it's been a challenging time in Detroit, but the Huns of Wall Street were some of the people that kept the City's lights on by providing credit to the City?
A. Let me say this, and I'm not going to use the word Hun anymore.
Q. Okay.
A. I've since learned to be very careful with my words. The capital markets have assisted the City in many,
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many ways over the years, and as I said before earlier today, in addition to providing funding in 2008, 2010, 2012 when the City was in very dire straits, so I do not mean to impugn in any way the help that the capital markets have provided to the Cities -- to the City.

What I do mean to say is given the dire straights that the City is in, and the fact that under any set of circumstances, it can no longer afford to pay this debt, there has to be adjustment of this debt, particularly the unsecured debt portion, and that's both for the capital market community, including banks, private equity, as well as for the obligations we owe to our labor counterparts, including health and pension funds.
Q. In fact, bond holders, the so-called COP holders, as part of the 2006 transaction, they contributed a billion four that ultimately went into the pension funds, correct?
A. I believe that was the number, yes.
Q. And if that hadn't happened back then, all things
being equal you'd have an even larger unfunded pension liability than you currently do, right?
A. Well, I'm going to be careful about what would have happened because it may have -- you know, it's
speculative as far as what happened. In fact, before I took this job, I read several articles that advised the City to file bankruptcy in 2005. So I'm going to be careful about what would have happened if the City had not received that 1.4, because at that time, my understanding -- I wasn't here, but from what I read that was to supposed to secure the unfunded portion of the pension liability at that time, and it didn't work out so well, but there was provision of credit to the City.
Q. In your mind, when you made the statement, were you trying to convey to people that you view the pensioners' claims or the retirees' claims or the current employees' claims for pension benefits or -or health benefits as more important than the claims of unsecured creditors like Wall Street participants such as my client?
A. No. I was not trying to make any value judgments about the claims. What we had done -- here again, as I said, it was a colloquialism that I made in a closed door meeting, but I was not trying to convey to anyone that we were treating any class of creditors -unsecured creditors differently than the others. As provided for in our proposal, we were treating them all equally.

## Page 236

1 Q. We're coming up on the one o'clock hour, which is almost the end of my time, and I think I'm going to just ask you a couple questions to tie up and then -A. Sure.
Q. -- I'll allow you to go get a well-deserved lunch.
A. Thank you.
Q. I've asked you earlier about selling the art and I asked you about it as considering it as a potential backup plan to the negotiations with the Swap counterparties.
A. Right.
Q. Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. We went back and forth.
A. Yes.
Q. I'd like to bring it forward to the future, to the present.
A. Yes.
Q. Which is, are you under active consideration now of using the art to alleviate the liquidity crisis and to do all of the things that you say you want to do in this proposal?
A. No. There are no plans to use the art or any other asset in particular to liquidate it to relieve liquidity issues in the City. What I have

1 said when I first took this job, and continue to say, all options are on the table. We are currently beginning the process of appraising approximately 3,500 pieces of art in the City of the 66,000 that are there at the DIA, and once we go through that process, we will have to decide what, if anything, we need to do, but I have no plans to use art to relieve the liquidity crisis that the City is in now.
Q. So let me offer an observation for you to react to, which is, earlier on when I was asking you questions, you were telling me about the terrible things happening in the City, people dying, being shot, the seriousness of the problems with which you're grappling.
A. Yes.
Q. You've also identified the assumption motion as something that needs to be moved along quickly because of its importance to the issues that we discussed, right?
A. Right.
Q. Why isn't the art equally important to allowing you to fix Detroit?
A. I haven't said that it's not important. What l've said is there are no plans to liquidate it to address those concerns. I think it is fair to say that there
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has been much debate as to the value of art versus alleviating a number of other concerns, and I've heard that debate and l've listened to it, but our first order of business is to assess what we're talking about and then we'll decide what, if anything, we need to do.
Q. Isn't it fair to say that you certainly haven't put the art time line, in terms of your decision-making process, you haven't given it the same sort of speed you've given to the forbearance agreement time line?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.
A. Yeah. I think it's fair to say that in our proposal I think we included roughly 15 buckets of assets, and none of them have been given the same priority that we deem the forbearance agreement principally because we're not in default with regard to art. We're in default with regard to the Swap agreement.
Q. Well, that was actually going to be my point, which is, you own the art.
A. Yes.
Q. So you don't have to negotiate with anybody in order to sell it, right?
A. No, but a prudent thing to do, and we've said this before, is to find out what we're talking about first, and that's why we're going through an appraisal knowledge, that's true.

MR. HACKNEY: Mr. Orr, I'd like to thank you for your time. We have -- as I mentioned, we have divided up our examination. There are a number of different objectors here. I have attempted to coordinate some of the common subjects so that we could have --

THE WITNESS: Sure.
MR. HACKNEY: -- one 4-hour period that we have come nearly to the end of, and I'm going to pass the baton to my other objectors. I may review my notes to see if I have follow-up.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
MR. HACKNEY: And so I'll reserve my time technically, but I want to get out of the way of the other folks so they can start asking questions. And consistent with what we discussed earlier, I thought we might take a short lunch break.

## THE WITNESS: Sure.

MR. HACKNEY: Off the record.
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: The time is $12: 57$ p.m.
this marks the end of tape Number 3. We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 12:57 p.m.)
(Back on the record at 1:48 p.m.)
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are back on the
record at 1:49 p.m. This marks the beginning of tape number 4.

## EXAMINATION

```
BY MS. DiBLASI:
```

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Orr. My name is Kelly DiBlasi.

I'm an attorney at Weil, Gotshal \& Manges. We represent Financial Guaranty Insurance Company, which people generally refer to as FGIC.
A. FGIC.
Q. As I go through my questions with you this afternoon,
if you could please assume that the same ground rules that Mr. Hackney discussed with you earlier today still apply.
A. Yes.
Q. You spoke to Mr. Hackney earlier today about the Swap contract and the fact that they hedge against the interest rate risks that's associated with the series 2006-B COPs, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your understanding of how this hedge is
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## accomplished?

A. As we discussed earlier today, depending upon the
interest rate fluctuations, they're supposed to convert the fix rate that was in the original documents -- variable rates some people say -- to a fixed rate based upon whether interest rates go up or down. And since the parties have essentially bet against each other, depending upon which way the rates go, one party may owe an obligation to the other. Q. So based on that understanding that you just articulated, is it fair to say that from the City's perspective, it's as if the series 2006-B COPs have a fixed rate of interest?
A. That was the intent. That's my understanding.
Q. Have you ever heard of a structure like this being referred to as creating a synthetic fixed rate of interest?
A. Yes. I may have heard that. There are other phrase -- I think I've read that somewhere.
Q. Prior to executing the forbearance agreement, did you do anything to inform yourself about the structure of the COPs and the Swap contracts and in particular why they were structured the way that they were?
A. If I can address your question in two ways, yes, I did something to inform myself about the structure, and
yes, I did some -- I had some discussions and analyses about why they were structured the way they are. Depending upon how far back your question is asking about that analyses, it may or may not be true.
Q. So -- so let's in particular go back to 2005 --
A. Right.
Q. -- which is really when the structure initially was put in place, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And what is your understanding as to why in 2005 the transaction was structured so that the COPs -- the series 2005-B COPs had a variable interest rate hedged with the Swap contracts?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form, foundation.
A. Yeah. Let me say I only know what l've read, and it seemed to say that that was the nature of the transaction based upon the certificates of participation to lend the City ultimately the 1.4 billion dollars, and that I don't know the intent of why they did not at that point provide for a fixed rate, but I know that the Swap contract was entered into the hedge against the variable rate that was in the original document.

BY MS. DiBLASI:
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1 Q. Would you answer the same if I asked you as to why it was structured that way in 2006 ?
A. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection.
A. Yes. I don't know the intent behind the parties at that time.

BY MS. DiBLASI:
Q. Do you know who designed the structure either in 2005 or 2006?
A. Other than the parties that appear on the documents, no, I do not know who designed the structure. I don't know if it was their counsel or the principals. No, I don't know.
Q. Is there any benefit to the City from having the 2000 -- series 2006-B COPs have a floating rate of interest hedged by the Swap contract as opposed to just issuing them with a fixed rate of interest?
A. I don't -- as I just said, I don't know what the parties were thinking back in 2005 and 2006, as opposed to -- as to why they wanted that structure, and so any statement I would have would either be a derivative based on what I read or speculative on what I think was going on in the capital markets at that time.
Q. Understood. Today can you -- are you aware of any
benefit from that structure that I described?
A. Well, the -- yes.
Q. What benefits are you aware of?
A. The benefit currently is, given the debt that was
taken out and the Swap contract, the interest rates could actually make the optional termination payment decrease.
Q. Are there any other benefits that you're aware of?
A. Not principally, no.
Q. Would the City have had to pay higher interest rates
if the COPs were issued with fixed rates?
A. I don't know.
Q. Would the City have agreed to a structure where the 2006-B COPs were issued with a floating interest rate without having a Swap contract in place?
A. I don't know.
Q. And you're aware of the fact that FGIC and Syncora each insured portions of the payment of principal and interest to the series 2006-B COPs, correct?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Are you aware of any benefit to FGIC and Syncora as insurers of these variable rate certificates to having the interest rate hedge in place?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. None, other than the fact that they might be able to
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benefit based upon interest rate fluctuations, but not aware of any other benefit or what the intent of the parties were.

## BY MS. DiBLASI:

Q. Are you aware of any harm or risk that FGIC or Syncora might insure if the Swap contracts are terminated?
A. I think there are some risks that they insured as a basis of an insurer, yes.
Q. What risk might that be?
A. There -- in terms of the Swaps? There may be some risk that a claim could be made to the extent payments weren't made.
Q. And would there be any risk to FGIC and Syncora with respect to the insurance policies on the COPs themselves if the Swap contracts are terminated?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah. I mean, you say there may be, but I'm -- I'm not aware of any specific certain risks, no. BY MS. DiBLASI:
Q. Are you aware of the fact that FGIC and Syncora -- and I think you alluded to this just a minute ago -- that FGIC and Syncora also insured the obligations to the Swap counterparties under the Swap contracts, correct? A. Yes.

3 A. Yes. I believe I testified I did not instruct anybody to invite them.
Q. To your knowledge, did anyone else suggest inviting either FGIC or Syncora to the negotiations?
A. As I testified earlier today, there were a series of letters that were exchanged, and at some point there was some discussion about Syncora submitting a proposal. That discussion was wrapped up into whether or not it would sign a reciprocal nondisclosure agreement. To the best of my knowledge, that never happened.
Q. But I think we established that the letter exchanged with Syncora occurred at some point after June 11th, when there had been an agreement in principle on the economic terms of the forbearance agreement; is that correct?
A. Yes. I believe we -- we testified that June 11th we reached agreement and principally documented, June 14th we had the presentation for creditors, and the letter I saw earlier today I think was dated June 17th.
Q. That's right. So prior to June 11th, did anyone else to your knowledge suggest inviting either FGIC or
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## Syncora to the negotiations?

A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. And you mentioned just a minute ago that there had been some discussion with Syncora or representatives of Syncora about an alternative proposal to the forbearance agreement, and I think you said to Mr. Hackney that there had been no negotiations with FGIC about an alternative proposal; is that correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, it's a compound question, but I think the way I would answer it, yes, we would talk about whether or not someone had been invited. And I think what I said is to the best of my knowledge I did not invite FGIC and I did not know if anybody else did.

## BY MS. DiBLASI:

Q. To your knowledge, was there any negotiations by the City with FGIC about the forbearance agreement prior to the City executing the forbearance agreement?
A. There may have been. I seem to recall one of our attorneys -- you used the word negotiation and, here again, as I said earlier today, without getting caught up in the nomenclature, I don't want to characterize what was going on, but I think there was -- I remember hearing something about some discussions with FGIC, but I don't recall who. Whether or not there were
Q. Okay.
A. There were no conference calls. There were letters with Syncora, not conference calls with Syncora.
Q. Just so I'm clear in my understanding, did you
participate in conference calls with the Swap
counterparties negotiating the terms of the
forbearance agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. Was FGIC or a representative of FGIC on any of those conference calls?
A. No. To the best of my knowledge, no.

MS. DiBLASI: Thank you for your time,
Mr. Orr. That's all I have.
THE WITNESS: Sure. Thank you very much, Mrs. DiBlasi.

MR. HACKNEY: I was worried that I missed a pretty significant area of inquiry there.

THE WITNESS: I was looking at this letter and Syncora popped into my head, so that's -- long day.

EXAMINATION
BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Orr.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'm Vince Marriott. I'm with Ballard Spahr, and I
represent a holder of 152 million dollars in the 2006
COPs. We refer to it by agreement as EEPK, and I hope
we can stipulate that I will have to pronounce the
entire name for you.
MR. SHUMAKER: Stipulated.
A. Mr. Marriott, we will stipulate as such.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. Ironically enough it's German.
A. We wouldn't try.
Q. Mr. Hackney was very comprehensive and I don't have a lot.
A. Okay. Yes, he was.
Q. One of the things you -- one of the things Mr. Hackney asked you about was if in the course of the negotiation of the forbearance agreement, you had what he referred to as a plan B. Do --
A. Right.
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Q. -- you recall him asking that question?
A. Yes, I recall that discussion. Yes.
Q. And you responded by saying, without specifically having a plan $B$, you had considered alternative to the forbearance agreement structure, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you tell me what alternatives to the forbearance agreement you considered at the time?
A. Without getting into the discussions with my counsel or with commercially sensitive information with the investment banker and/or both, the alternatives generally centered on the need for reinvestment in the City and what we would do if we could not secure the funds to have that reinvestment and what kind of reinvestment proposal, if any, we could put together. Q. And are you able to articulate more specifically whether you consider -- or what specifically you considered as alternative source of the funding for reinvestment?
A. I think as I said with Mr. Hackney just before the break, I have said fairly consistently since l've been here that everything's on the table, but we had not specifically looked at liquidation of any particular bucket of assets in relation to this. All we had considered was if we could not secure the critical
need for the casino revenue, which was urgent and critical and would not in our opinion at that point be able to make a reinvestment of the City, what would the City look like going forward.
Q. Let me ask you the question this way. Did you consider what l'll describe -- and if you want me to be more specific I can try to be.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Did you consider capital market alternatives to the forbearance agreement?
A. We did, but to be perfectly honest with you, the City had borrowed so much money from the capital markets without the probability of being able to pay it back on any reasonable or rational time frame that that wasn't a serious consideration was taking on more debt.
Q. Okay. So you didn't really believe that had you a what we -- what I just described as a capital market alternative to the forbearance agreement?
A. The City has no -- what l've said at the June 10th -public meeting on June 14th we were addicted to debt and we had no ability to take on additional debt.
Q. Okay. All right. And this may re-plow some ground and I apologize to the extent it does, but in the context of your negotiation of the forbearance
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agreement, and by yours I mean the City's --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it was with the understanding that the Swap
counterparties asserted a lien in the casino revenues, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would the City have entered into the forbearance agreement with the Swap counterparties if they did not assert a lien in the casino revenues?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah. I was going to say that's a hypothetical, and it would depend on a number of different issues, so I'm not quite sure I can answer you. All I can say is that our need for that cash was so significant that we might well have considered anything.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. All right. Let me ask the question this way then. Is
it fair to say that the optional termination amount of pay will be paid by the City to obtain clear title to the casino revenues?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form and calls for legal conclusion.
A. Without getting into the concept of title, what I will
say, and what l've said today, is the forbearance agreement is designed to remove uncertainty with regard to the City's access to the casino revenue which is essential.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. All right. Let me ask the question this way. Is it your understanding that the Swap counterparties will no longer assert a lien in the casino revenues if paid the optional termination amount?

MR. JURGENS: Objection --
A. Yes.

MR. JURGENS: -- to form.
A. It's my understanding that it's going to resolve all
those issues, and as I said earlier today, including a release of liens to the extent they have any.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. Okay. Now, I understand your description of the

City's current operational needs --
A. Right.
Q. -- for access to the casino revenues.
A. Yes.
Q. If those casino revenues were otherwise available to the City, for current operation's purposes, would removal of the lien be necessary -- or removal of the asserted lien be necessary?
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speculation.
A. Yeah, this again is a hypothetical question, but I believe you may be alluding to the discussion I had with Mr. Hackney regarding whether the stay would provide us unfettered access, and I think what I said there is that's something we'd have to examine, but the whole concept of the forbearance agreement was to deal with removing any uncertainty regarding our access to the casino revenues so that we could put in place a reinvestment plan.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. Okay. I wasn't clear, I don't think --
A. Okay.
Q. -- in what I'm trying to get at.
A. Sure.
Q. I'm not asking you whether or not there was an alternative to releasing -- I'm just asking whether you believe there was a legitimate alternative to release of the lien to get access to those funds.

What I'm asking you is that assuming you
had access to those funds on some basis, without the need to release the lien --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- is a release of the lien today --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- necessary for the City to currently operate?
A. To currently operate?
Q. Yes.

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the hypothetical. Go ahead.
A. If you're drawing a distinction between currently operating and the reinvestment plan that we have, what I would say is we are currently operating in the status quo. So the answer to your question would be to the extent the Swap counterparties have a lien interest in the casino revenue, it would not be necessary because that's where we are now.

BY MR. MARRIOTT:
Q. Okay. And so what do you view release of the lien as necessary to?
A. The release of the lien is essential so that the City has certainty in terms of going forward so that we can plan, as is required both under Chapter 9, but more importantly, in my perspective, under Chapter -- under Public Act 436.

436 imposes an obligation on me within 18 months to come up with a plan to put the City on a sustainable footing going forward before the expiration of my term, and even if you could come up
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with a plan without release of those liens, that would leave some uncertainty and would be, in my opinion, a violation of my duty as emergency manager to provide that certainty for the City to move forward in a sustainable fashion.
Q. Okay. So and if I'm paraphrasing your answer incorrectly --
A. Right.
Q. -- tell me.

Release of the lien is necessary to a viable exit strategy from the Chapter 9 proceeding?
A. That's part of it. Not just the Chapter 9 proceeding. As I said, I think what's missing in some of the discussion is the fact that I have an independent duty under Public Act 436 to put the City on a sustainable footing. That is my obligation. And leaving liens in place in a City that has defaulted, as we discussed earlier today, under multiple different factors would be irresponsible.
Q. One of the other things that Mr. Hackney and you discussed was whether or not the Swaps and the COPs and the insurance associated with the Swaps and the cops --
A. Right.
Q. -- were what Mr. Hackney described as an integrated
transaction.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Do you recall that discussion?
A. Yes, I do recall that discussion.
Q. Your counsel in a hearing on August 21st -- and I'll
represent this to you --
A. Okay.
Q. -- whether you're aware of it or not. It described
the 2009 transaction with respect to the COPs and the Swaps as severing the tie --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- Between the COPs and the Swaps. Do you have an understanding of what that means?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. I have not consulted with my counsel regarding what was meant by that statement, so I'm going to qualify my answer by saying to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion or an analysis, that this is my understanding in a layman's sense.

But what I think -- and your question began with the concept of the insurance for the COPs and Swaps, so I also want to say my understanding there may be different insurance obligations related to the COPs that in our view are unrelated to the obligations under the Swaps. I don't want to conflate the two.
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1 And further, anything I can say in that
regard, because I have not talked to my counsel, would be speculative as far as what they meant. Okay? But what my understanding is, is that that would relieve us under the agreement, forbearance agreement, of any of the obligations that are necessary under the Swaps. I sincerely don't know what that statement means with regard to the COPs.

BY MR. MARRIOTT: That's all I have. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

## EXAMINATION

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. Hi , there.
A. Hi. How are you?
Q. Good. How are you?
A. I am well. Thank you.
Q. I'm Caroline English.
A. Hi , Caroline.
Q. We met before in the Chrysler case and I don't know if you recall.
A. Oh, you know --
Q. We can talk later. It's all right.
A. Yeah. We will talk later. I was going to say I recognized you over there.

1 Q. Yeah. So I'm from Arent Fox?
A. Okay.
Q. And this time I reco -- I represent Ambac.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. I'm going to apologize in advance in advance if I jump
around a little bit or seem to jump around because I'm going to try to plug some holes from your earlier four and a half hours of testimony that you've given already.
A. Thank you.
Q. Okay. Same rules apply, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. This is a small question. Earlier in response
to Mr. Hackney, his questioning, he asked you a question about the collateral agreement and your response was which collateral agreement.
A. Um-hm.
Q. I want to make sure. Is there any other collateral agreement other than the 2009 collateral agreement we've spoken about?
A. No. I just think that was earlier on in my deposition by Mr. Hackney, and I just wanted to make sure we were being specific about the terms. I wasn't meaning to
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allude to another collateral agreement.
Q. That's fine. I just wanted to make sure I --
A. Sure.
${ }^{4}$ Q. -- didn't miss a large transactional document here.
Okay?
A. Sure.
Q. Mr. Hackney also asked you some questions about the service corporations and about whether there were any negotiations on behalf of the City with the service. Corporations?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I believe you answered that negotiating with service corporations would not have been your job. It would have been Ken Buckfire's or someone else's job to do that.
A. Yes. I believe that's right.
Q. Okay. If it wasn't Ken Buckfire's job, who else's job would it have been?
A. It might have been someone else on his team or at Miller Buckfire or someone else on behalf of the other counsel for the emergency manager or the City.
Q. Someone else in your office you mean?
A. No. No. Other consultants and attorneys on behalf of the City.
Q. Okay. But am I correct that no one has reported to
> you that they had negotiations with the service corporations; is that correct?
A. Yeah, reported. I'm going to be careful. My understanding was we had an agreement, I signed it, and it was sent to the service corporations. personally had no negotiations with them, but my understanding, based upon the fact it was executed, that whoever needed to procure and secure those signatures did so.
Q. You don't know who got those signatures from the service corporations?
A. No. Sitting here today I do not.
Q. You also testified earlier -- Mr. Hackney's helping me out here.

Do you -- are you assuming then that there were some negotiations between the City and the service corporations?
A. Yeah. Here again, I'm going to say whenever you -- as I said to Mr. Hackney, whenever you talk about negotiations, you know, so we don't get bogged down in nomenclature, I'm assuming that something happened that had the service corporations aware of the agreement, that they agreed to and they signed off on it. So if those constitute negotiations, that's what I'm assuming, but I'm saying to you that I had no
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independent negotiations and I don't know who did that.
Q. And you don't have any idea sitting here today about what those negotiations would have involved, how they happened, when they happened, how long they took, anything like that; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. You testified earlier about state aid and federal aid, the possibilities of getting aid from other government sources.
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to state aid, when did the City make a request of any kind to the State for aid?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation.
A. Assuming the predicate that some request was made, which I don't think is true, what became clear from various discussions with the State was that this was a hole that the City had dug for itself and it needed to find its way out of it on its own.

I think at some point we were also informed that there are State prohibitions against the State lending money to the City, either state ordinances -State statutes or constitutional prohibitions, so that would not have been a possibility in any event. BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. All right. I have the same questions about federal aid, and let me start again with the predicate. Was a request ever made of any kind for federal government aid?
A. Not by me. Not for -- well, let me correct that. Not for direct federal government aid in the terms of either a loan or a grant, meaning money. I did have a meeting with Senator Levin where he informed me and actually gave me a list of a number of different grant programs, ordinary grant programs, that are available to the City, as well as other cities, by which we could apply for additional grants and we're reviewing those now.

So I want to be clear when people say federal aid, it became clear to us that no one was going to give us, for lack of a better word -- people use the word bailout, which I don't like -- but a direct grant of money, but there are other programs that the City can apply for to get federal assistance.
Q. Okay. With respect to the federal grant programs you just mentioned, at this point in time, have any applications been submitted for any of these grant programs?
A. At this point in time, there may -- there may be. We 25 received that a couple weeks ago and I know two things

1 as has been reported. We're currently doing an analysis of our grants administration and application process to make it better, and I think we're also reviewing it for making specific grant requests, I think some specifically related to public safety.

So I don't know if -- sitting here today if actual documents have been submitted, but I know we are mining the federal programs with an eye toward making applications and some have been made or some are near to being made.
Q. Are there specific grants you're targeting in this application process?
A. That's handled by the folks in the City bureaucracy and consultants, so I -- as I said, health, safety and welfare, meaning police, fire, EMT, City grants meaning blight, HUD grants and others, yes, but sitting here today, I don't know which specific ones have been submitted.
Q. And who was handling that process?
A. Ultimately, in my office, it would be a combination of the existing -- hopefully in the City as well -existing grant procurers, you know, whether they're at different departments in planning and development, police and fire. It would be at that level, at a line level, would be applying for grants.
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1 Q. Is that going to happen under your supervision?
A. I certainly hope so, yes.
Q. Do you have any idea of how much money in grant programs might be available to the City?
A. Well, the City has already applied of somewhere in the neighborhood of $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ million in 71 programs. We have been told that none of those 71 programs are in compliance. Some of those programs we're receiving technical assistance from HUD --

COURT REPORTER: I need you to slow down.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
A. Some of those programs we're receiving technical assistance, for instance, from HUD, and our intent is to get our grants administration and application process more up to date and streamlined so we can apply for as many grants as we can possibly get our hands on.

BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Okay. You confused me there for a minute because you've said you've got a bunch of grant applications already in with respect to programs that are noncompliant, but I thought you said earlier you don't have any grant applications in.
A. No, no, no.
Q. Okay.

1 A. You asked me if there were any new ones going in.
Q. Okay.

3 A. We -- the City has received, in past years and currently, almost 300 million dollars in federal grants.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. We hoped -- and they're being administered through 71 different programs in the City. I think that's been publicly discussed before. We hope to apply for even more grants. So I can be clear, what we are trying to do is to get some assistance so that we can get better at this process, this administration application process, so we would be eligible for more federal assistance that's already existing.
Q. And how much do you estimate that more federal assistance to be?
A. I have no idea. Whatever -- whatever we can get. If it's several millions more, if it's several hundreds millions more, we're going to apply for it.
Q. Do you think it's a possibility it could be hundreds of millions more?
A. Possibility it could be.
Q. Earlier in your testimony you were asked a lot of questions about legal analyses or legal claims that might have been made, and on those questions you
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claimed attorney-client privilege --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and said that you didn't have an independent view that didn't come from attorney-client communications.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to ask, without divulging what the advice was of your counsel, can you just list for me what the topics were on which you got advice, or would you claim the privilege as to just the topics as well?
A. Maybe I can do it this way. I think I've said before that in this case, for instance, your client has filed an objection.
Q. Yes, it has.
A. And in this case many objections have been filed and many of the topics listed in those objections, and I think I said with Mr. Hackney, whether it was subordination, prioritization, equitable estoppel, tort, invalidation of liens ab initio, whatever they were, none of those analyses or claims came as a surprise to me and that in some fashion -- without divulging what I had spoken with to my counsel, in some fashion issues such as those had been discussed and analyzed with my counsel, attorneys and advisors.
Q. So, for example, if -- as you know, Ambac filed an objection, and --

1 A. Yes.
Q. -- one of the arguments raised was whether the Swap obligations themselves were void ab initio because they did not comply with Act 34 .
A. Yes.
Q. You're familiar with that argument that we raised?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you -- and again without asking -- I'm not asking you to divulge what the advice was or what the analysis was you got from your counsel, but can you tell me what issues, just by naming the topics, you sought advice on with respect to that argument?
MR. SHUMAKER: Well, the seeking of advice somewhat implicates communications. If you were to look at topics perhaps as to whether he regarding your objection whether he -- they were raised, without going into the communications, I think he could respond to that.

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. That's exactly what I'm asking.
A. Okay. Well, for instance, whether or not arguments such as that would erase the obligation in toto or subordinate it to a lower level, whether or not an obligation like that would raise defenses on behalf of the obligor of equitable estoppel to the City, whether
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or not there are facts surrounding those documents and liens that would equitably raise issues as far as their validity beyond void ab initio, whether or not the law in the district and the circuit supported a clean remedy that could be easily obtained, and whether or not it would be expensive and extensive litigation and appeals over a period of time, things such as those were discussed and examined.
Q. When you say whether there were equitable issues, what do you mean by that?
A. Here again, without going into discussion, any of the concern -- equity is -- implicates action such as clean hands. Whether there were issues surrounding the City's conduct and issues along those lines, that would be factually intensive and lead to, for instance, increased litigation costs which I think is mentioned in our motion or some of the papers we filed, things along those lines, general equitable concerns.
Q. When you just listed for me the types of concerns and topics you were exploring with counsel, you didn't mention Act 34.
A. Well, as I said, I said for instance. I didn't mean for it to be an exhaustive list, and that's why without sitting here today, counsel, memos that were
prepared, analyses, I can't give you a compendium or an exhaustive list of things that were considered, so I don't want to leave you with the misimpression that somehow the analysis wasn't complete or we didn't consider more issues than the one I did. We did. Those are just the ones that came, sitting here today -- you asked me a question -- off the top of my head that I remembered for instance.
Q. Did you have legal analysis done on whether the Swaps transactions complied with Act 34?
A. As I said, without getting into discussions with my counsel, a whole panoply of issues, some of which are contained in the objections filed, including those filed by your client, were examined.
Q. Okay. Now can you answer my question? Did you have legal analysis done on whether the Swap transactions complied with Act 34?
A. As I said --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. As I said --

MR. SHUMAKER: If you want to share with him the argument, that might help.
A. There are a whole panoply of issues, some of them contained in the objections such as the one filed by
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your client which were examined and reviewed. BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Was Act 34 one of them?
A. More than likely, yes.
Q. More than likely? You don't know?
A. No. Sitting here today, I just said to you, for instance, that many of the issues, without being a compendium or being exhaustive, were examined. Act 34 was probably one of them. I did not mean for my testimony to be exhaustive because I don't have the analyses or the benefit of discussing them with my client prior to your question today.
Q. I do understand the answers that you're giving me. They're just not quite answers to the questions I'm asking.
A. Okay.
Q. So let me -- in your answer right now when I was trying to hone in on was Act 34 --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- examined, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You said probably.
A. Yes.
Q. So you're not sure?
A. No. I said --

## answered.

A. I'll say it again. Probably means that it was, but I don't want my answer to represent to you that it was a compendium. If you want to keep asking me about Act 34, that's fine, but I said more likely than not it was examined. I -- just sitting here right now, I don't have an independent recollection of all the things we examined. Act 34 was more than likely one of them.

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. Okay. But sitting here today you don't have an independent recollection for sure that Act 34 was looked at; is that correct?
A. I just said --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. I just said it's more likely than not. BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Sitting here today do you have a recollection as to
whether there was legal analysis done as to the validity of the pledge of casino revenues under the gaming act?
A. I thought you just asked -- well, suffice it to say I believe so.
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Q. You believe so?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you sure?
A. I believe so.
Q. Are you sure?
A. I believe so.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. Do you recall seeing a legal analysis or memo that was
prepared with respect to the validity of the pledge of casino revenues under the gaming act?
A. Ms. English, I see -- I see a lot of memos. As I said before this line of questioning, it's more likely than not that I did, but sitting here today, in an effort to be accurate, I don't specifically recall all of the issues we examined. More likely than not, it included Act 34, it included validity of liens.

COURT REPORTER: It included validity --
THE WITNESS: Validity of liens.
COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Did you make an independent assessment apart from advice of counsel as to the strengths -- strengths or weaknesses of the City's claims against the Swap

## counterparties?

A. Not without the advice of counsel, no.
Q. Why didn't the City just sue the Swap counterparties and then negotiate from there?
A. You know, one of the things that we have, both in bankruptcy and in Public Act 436, is that in the deliberative process the emergency manager has discretion to make decisions, business judgment decisions, within that discretion, irrespective of third parties, the decisions as to how that should have occurred.

We made a decision in consultation with counsel that this was the best way to proceed. Commencing litigation might well have created a cascade of other events such as the very event we are trying to avoid which is trapping the casino revenue for time and a number of months and/or years which would have made the probability of me completing my mission within the time frame of the statute difficult.
Q. If the City couldn't get a deal such as the
forbearance agreement, was the City prepared to sue the Swap counterparties then?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to the extent that question is asking for attorney-client privileged
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communication. I'll object.
If you have some independent understanding, you can answer.
A. Mrs. English, I'll say this. Without getting into communications with my counsel, we examined all alternatives, and as I said earlier with Mr. Hackney, including potential litigation.

BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. If you hadn't gotten a deal, were you prepared to sue them then?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Yeah, I was going to say. I don't know. We'd have to examine the situation on the ground at that time.

BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Okay. Let me ask you this. If the forbearance agreement is not approved by the bankruptcy court, will the City then sue the Swap counterparties?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, calls for speculation.
A. Here again, it's a different version of the prior question which it calls me to speculate as to what we would do if the Court does not approve the agreement.

BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. If there were to be litigation with the Swap

1 counterparties, do you have some sense as to what claims might be asserted against the Swap counterparties?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, asked and answered.
A. Yeah, as we said before, those are discussions that I've had with my counsel. I would consult with them as to our possible -- I can't tell you in direct response to your question and this line of questioning what we would do. What I can tell you is that we would engage in a process of examining what our alternatives were and try to make an informed and reasonable decision based upon the information we had at that time.

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. Okay. So sitting here today you are not able to tell me even a single claim that the City might assert against the Swap counterparties?
A. There are a number of claims that the City might assert. As I said earlier today, some of them might be framed in some of the objections. Whether or not we would ultimately assert those, depends upon a number of different factors that we would have to examine at that point.
Q. Well, in the forbearance agreement, the City is giving
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up the right to assert claims against the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. If the forbearance agreement is approved and we ultimately execute on the agreement, then yes, the parties would forebear and would not sue each other. Q. Right. So all I'm asking is give me one example of one claim you're giving up in the forbearance agreement.
A. I suppose any of the claims that have been implicated in some of the objections that have been filed and, as I said earlier today, some of those claims which is the ones we discussed a few minutes ago, such as estoppel, ab initio and those others.
Q. Did any of your legal counsel ever prepare a memo or a written analysis for the City that outlined a litigation strategy against the Swap counterparties? I'm not asking what would have been in it, if there was one. I just want to know if there was any written analysis ever prepared that outlined a litigation strategy.
A. Well, without, here again, drawing into the nomenclature of a litigation strategy, because that can mean a number of different things, including up -up to and through attaching a proposed complaint, for instance, without getting into the nomenclature, I
would say that, as I said before this afternoon, there was analysis of the potential claims, strengths and weaknesses and options available to the City.
Those -- some of those were prepared in writing, yes.
Q. You just mentioned a draft complaint. Was there ever a draft complaint prepared?

MR. SHUMAKER: I think you mischaracterized what he said. That's my objection.
A. Yeah, as I said, some of those types of things could include a draft complaint. I don't recall seeing a draft complaint.

## BY MS. ENGLISH:

Q. Do you recall seeing a memo that outlined strengths and weaknesses of claims that could be asserted in a complaint?
A. As I said before, I think there were memorandum and advice that was given regarding the various claims, defenses and alternatives available to the City which could have included a memorandum of the nature you're talking about.
Q. It could have included it --
A. It could.
Q. -- but you're not sure whether it did or not?
A. Sitting here today I don't specifically remember all the memos that would fit the description that you're
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making. There were memos discussing the various strengths and weaknesses of the positions.
Q. Did you have any analysis done as to the cost of a litigation with the Swap counterparties?
A. No. I don't recall if any of the documents included costs. We -- there were discussions about the potential costs and the timing, but I don't recall if any of the documents did.
Q. Okay. What was your best estimate as to how much a litigation with Swap counterparties would cost the City?
A. I don't -- I don't remember what the best estimates were. They -- they ranged from --

MR. SHUMAKER: Object. I just want to make sure you're not going to be revealing any
attorney-client communications with your answer.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. SHUMAKER: I'll interject that. I'll
let you answer the question as to whether that was
addressed. I don't want you to go --
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. SHUMAKER: -- into anything --
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. SHUMAKER: -- beyond that.
A. It was addressed, and suffice it to say I think it's
say that there were discussions regarding the time for
litigation and/or appeals and the costs that were
involved if that tack was taken.
BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. How long did you estimate it would take to litigate
with Swap counterparties?
A. I'm not sure the predicate is there that I estimated
the length of time.
Q. Okay. If you didn't estimate the length of time,
that's an okay answer to give.
A. Yeah. I'm trying to be as clear as I can for you and
say that there were discussions, but there's nothing
as specific as the lodestar method of analysis which
you understand is time times hours billed, so on and
so forth. There were discussions and there were
analyses about what it could be.
Q. Now, I have to unpack that a little bit because you
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mentioned the lodestar analysis, one of my favorite
friends. Did you have a lodestar analysis done for
litigation with the Swap counterparties?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, this is getting into the -- the specific communications between Mr. Orr and his counsel when you start to go through what -- what are the particulars of the advice that was being given. I allowed you to go forward with whether he considered the length of litigation in his answer, but I don't want him to go into the specifics of any sort of analysis that was done by counsel.

With that admonition, you can answer.
A. Again, without going to the specifics of discussion I've had with counsel, there were discussions about potential length of litigation and appeals and the potential cost. Those discussions included time that may have impaired my ability to complete my obligation within the time frame provided by Public Act 436, as well as significant costs, litigation cost being incurred by the City.

BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Okay. Here is my question again, because in your answer you mentioned lodestar analysis, so I'm just asking -- it's a yes or no question.
A. Um-hm.
obligations, do you know?
A. You mean initially?
Q. Yeah.
A. I don't know. Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute.

I recall seeing a letter some time ago on
official Michigan State letterhead -- well, I recall seeing a letter. It may have been some form related to the COPs. I just don't remember specifically, but I do recall seeing a letter on Michigan letterhead related to the transaction.
Q. Okay. So I'm going to put in a request to your counsel.

MS. ENGLISH: If there is an approval or a letter from the Michigan Department of Treasury with respect to the COPs or the Swaps, we'd like to request a copy of that.

MR. SHUMAKER: We'll look into it.
MS. ENGLISH: Thanks.
BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Here's another one I don't know if you know the answer to this.
A. Right.
Q. Do you know if the City approved the offering circular that went out with respect to the COPs?
A. I do not.
Q. You mentioned earlier that you were on conference
calls with Ken Buckfire and the principals of the Swap
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counterparties?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you -- on any of those calls, did you ever take the position that the Swaps were invalid or void?
A. I don't recall if we had any discussions of that nature on any of those calls.
Q. Do you recall whether you ever took the position that the liens were invalid or not secured?
A. Likewise, I don't recall if we had discussions of that nature on those calls.
Q. Do you recall whether you ever discussed with any of
the Swap counterparties the City's potential legal
arguments as against the Swap counterparties?
A. Did I?
Q. Yeah.
(Whereupon Robert Hertzberg left the deposition at 2:49 p.m.)
A. No, I don't think I had though those discussions. No. BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Did you ever debate the validity of the Swap
counterparties secured position with anyone from the
Swap counterparties?
A. Did I personally?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. I want to show you a document you're very familiar with.
A. Um-hm.
Q. So what exhibit are we up to now? Exhibit 6?
A. Yeah.
Q. Orr 6?
A. Yes.

MS. ENGLISH: Lally, can you pass me my
binder?
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 6
2:50 p.m.
BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Okay. You recognize this document, don't you,

Mr. Orr?
A. Yes. I assume it's an accurate representation of my

June 14th proposal to creditors.
Q. Okay. And this is a document that you put together
largely, with help I'm sure, but you were responsible
for putting this together, right?
A. This is a document that $I$ and my team put together.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to turn to pages 97 and 98 of the document.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. These are -- there's two forecast tables here

1 which is really just one table on two pages, right?
A. Right.
Q. And --
A. Well, let me make sure. Yes.
Q. You know what, so there's ECF numbers at the bottom --
A. Yes.
Q. -- but there's also numbers in the -- that were part of the original document and it's the original numbers that I'm looking for, page 97 and 98.
A. Okay.
Q. On the top it says restructuring scenario.
A. Okay. I'm sorry, I was looking at the electronic case number. -
Q. Yeah, my bad.
A. 97 and 98. Here we go. Okay.
Q. Okay. Now, if I understand this table that spans pages 97 and 98 correctly, this is the City's restructuring proposal, if you will; is that correct?
A. Yes.
(Whereupon Robert Hertzberg entered the deposition at 2:51 p.m.) BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. Okay. And if we just look down say the column for 2014, we've got total revenues, net operating surplus, readjustment expenses. And then if you go to page 98,
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we get down to a list of secured claims of the City.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
(Whereupon Kelly DiBlasi left the
deposition at 2:52 p.m.)
BY MS. ENGLISH:
Q. And there's a line item there for POC Swaps. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that line item is actually the Swaps we're talking about today that you proposed to settle through the forbearance agreement, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that line item, if you go right straight across, shows roughly 50 million dollars a year being paid; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So this restructuring proposal, if I'm reading this correctly, is assuming that the City is going to continue to pay its monthly Swap payments; is that correct?
A. Yes. I think there's a footnote there at the top that says -- at the bottom, it says, "Assumes continued payments as scheduled. Treatment to be determined." Q. Okay. So this restructuring proposal then -- well,
let me stay with this for just one more minute.
A. Um-hm.
Q. Then fur -- further down you've got an estimate of total unsecured claims of the City, about 11 and a half billion dollars, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, flip to page 106. I'm sorry, 105.

There again, we've got secured -- a section on secured payments, and we're showing the City's still making the Swap payments, correct?
A. Um-hm.
Q. All right. And then we flip to 107. We've got your proposal for the 2 billion dollar note that's going to go to pay unsecured.
A. Yes.
Q. Have I read all that correctly?
A. Yes. I think --
Q. Okay.
A. -- the document speaks for itself.
Q. So if l've understood this correctly, then your -- the

City's restructuring proposal is based on the notion
that the Swaps payments will continue, correct?
A. Yes, for some period of time.
Q. And in fact, this proposal does not show the -- any effect of the forbearance agreement or indicate the
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forbearance agreement coming into play here at all, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right. So if I were to tell you that Mr. Buckfire yesterday testified that the City's restructuring plan was based on an assumption that the forbearance agreement was approved, that would be incorrect, correct?
A. No, not necessarily. I think the footnote at 1 , "assumes payments as scheduled. Treatment to be determined," suggests that we're going to assume it. I think what you're trying to say is based upon these numbers, that at some point they should be taking (sic) out because we would assume that the payments would cease to the Swap counterparties, is what I think you're saying.

I think what Mr. Buckfire was saying is
that at some point, based upon these notes, whether it's this data or others -- I don't know what he was saying, but my interpretation would be based upon estimated unsecured claims that they would be -- and I don't -- I don't want to mischaracterize his testimony and I don't know the context in which it was taken, so I don't want to misstate my understanding of what his testimony was.

But when you look at the note on page 107, that -- the 2 billion dollar note -- that assumes that the Swaps are -- the forbearance agreement is going to include that all this unsecured debt is somehow paid out of this note. Now, I understand what you're trying to say is that the cash flow forecast here doesn't take into account the Swap payment. I don't know what he was saying in that regard.
Q. Well, I guess all I'm trying to figure out is --
the -- the 2 billion dollar note that's in your plan --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as evidenced in this document, seems to me to be based on continuing to pay the Swap payments because that's what's listed here, both on page 105 and on page 98.
A. Right.
Q. Are you telling me that that's not correct, that the 2 billion dollars was formulated based on the assumption that you'd get the forbearance agreement?
A. What I'm telling you is that at the time this report went out -- well, I'm telling you two things. One, at the time this report went out, we did not have the forbearance agreement, but we were having discussions about it; and, two, what I'm telling you it's probably
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the best thing to do is ask Mr. Buckfire what he meant by his testimony 'cause -- rather than trying to use me to somehow contradict his testimony regarding the Swap payment cash flow that's shown at page 98, you should ask him what he meant.
Q. Well, let me ask you this. Has -- based on this
document, the City's plan is to allocate a 2 billion
dollar note to the unsecureds, and this plan is -- it
has a line item for continuing to pay the Swaps?
A. Yes.
Q. Does the 2 billion dollar number change if the Swap payments change?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no. I don't assume that.

MS. ENGLISH: I don't think I have anything else.
A. Okay.

MS. ENGLISH: Thank you for your patience.
THE WITNESS: No, thank you. Sure.
MR. SHUMAKER: Take a quick five-minute
break and then we'll switch.
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: Okay. The time is
2:57 p.m. This marks the end of tape number 4. We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 2:57 p.m.)
(Back on the record at 3:06 p.m.)

1 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are back on the record at 3:06 p.m. This marks the beginning of tape number 5.

## EXAMINATION

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Orr.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'm Jennifer Green.
A. Hi, Jennifer.
Q. I'm from Clark Hill and I represent the Police and

Fire Retirement System and the General Retirement System.
A. Um-hm.
Q. If I refer to the 2009 collateral agreement -- we've
been doing it all day, but it has not yet been marked
as an exhibit -- you know what I'm referring to,
though, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It's attached as Exhibit B to your assumption motion?
A. Yes.
Q. You know, are you familiar with the attachments to the collateral agreement?
A. Yes. I'm somewhat familiar with them, yes.
Q. I have an extra copy here.
A. Okay.
Q. I will give them to you if you want to follow along.
A. Okay.
Q. If you can flip to page 186. At the bottom it's
listed. It's the first yellow tab.
(Sneezing.)
THE WITNESS: Bless you. Gesundheit. BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Do you recognize that letter?
A. I've seen it before, but obviously I have no contemporaneous recollection when it was written.
Q. And that's the letter from the City to the Motor City

Casino, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It's dated June 23rd, 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. It's attached to the collateral agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. If I can direct your attention to paragraphs 4 and 5 --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- that letter appears to instruct the casino, the

Motor City Casino, to direct certain payments to U.S. Bank?
4 A. Yes. Paragraph 4 seems to mention payment
25 instructions and paragraph 5 seems to discuss who they
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. And so that's another instructional letter, correct, kind of doing the same thing, just laying out that certain payments are supposed to be made?

MR. SHUMAKER: Just for clarification, when you say that, are you talking about the irrevocable instructions on page 191 through 193?

MS. GREEN: Yes, exactly what he's looking at right now.
A. Okay. So I -- in order to expedite this, I assume you will represent to me the letters are essentially similar and the first one was to Motor City and the second was to Greektown Casino.

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Exactly.
A. Is that correct?

Yes.
Q. And if you keep going there's another one I believe to MGM.
A. I would assume there's a similar letter from Norma White, following up with a receipt, following up with a similar -- what appears to have been -- maybe have been a cover letter, and then there's a June 23rd, 2009 letter to MGM Grand.

1 Q. So you'd agree with me, there's a series of instructional letters from the City to the casinos, and then each of those are followed by a letter from the casino back to the City acknowledging receipt. I'm just summarizing what you just said.
A. Yes. I don't -- I don't mean to be difficult. I don't know if this receipt regarding irrevocable instructions was a letter or was attached to the document, but there appear to be those that are comparable to the three letters you discussed from each of the hotels back to Norma White.
Q. Okay. Earlier when you were being examined by

Ms. English, you referenced that you relied on a formal approval letter from the Michigan Gaming Control Board?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, mischaracterizes his testimony.
A. Yeah, my testimony was I thought I had seen a letter from the -- from the State on State letterhead which might have qualified for the question of Ms. English as to whether or not I'd seen anything approving the agreement.

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. From the State of Michigan or from the Michigan Gaming Control Board?
A. I thought from the -- I think I said on State
letterhead. I don't recall if I said Michigan Gaming Control Board, but I said State I believe.
Q. Okay. What was your understanding of this approval letter?
A. Well, you call it an approval letter.
Q. I was using your language, I thought.
A. Yeah, I said -- what I said was -- the question was had you seen an approval letter, and what I said I don't know. I said at first, no. I said wait a minute. I seem to have recalled seeing a letter on State letterhead related to this issue, and I couldn't recall whether or not it was a formal, quote, unquote, approval.
Q. Do you recall if you relied upon this letter in evaluating the validity of the lien on the casino revenue?
A. I recall having seen this letter, and this I think is the letter that I recall having seen. Your question is did I rely on it -- in evaluating potential claims, did I personally rely on it. My response to you is I made no independent analysis, as I said to Ms. English, outside of discussions that I had with
counsel.
There were a number of analyses and memoranda that were prepared regarding potential strengths and weaknesses and a proposal for the deal, and -- and the reason I recall this letter is because, yes, I believe that this was one of the documents that I may have reviewed in that process.
Q. Do you know if anyone else on your team at the City would have reviewed and analyzed this letter in connection with evaluating the validity of the lien?
A. I believe my -- my team, including my counsel -- I don't know if they're at the City. It may have been my restructuring and outside counsel.
Q. And just for the record, we're referring to a letter dated June 18th, 2009. The letterhead is from the Michigan Gaming Control Board and it does say State of Michigan.
A. Yes, page 200 of 247.
Q. If you read the first paragraph of the letter --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and if you need to reacquaint yourself with it now, that's fine.
A. I did. Here again, these documents are legacy documents that occurred in 2009, well before I was here, so I've only seen them. I have no
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contemporaneous recollection.
Q. I understand.
A. The document speak for themselves, but l'd be certainly happy to read it and give you my understanding.

Okay. I've read the letter.
Q. This letter acknowledges that the three Detroit-based casinos have been directed to, quote, electronically transfer a portion of the City's money that would be due under the gaming act to U.S. Bank, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And after that it acknowledges that there was a letter, quote, advising the board that the City Council of the City of Detroit has enacted an ordinance and taken all related action necessary to direct the three licensed Detroit casinos to make the transfer to the account.

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, the document speaks for itself.
A. Yes.

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Did I -- did I correctly relate the letter on the record?
A. Well, the document speaks for itself, but romanette II says that, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So this letter at the bottom, page -- of
the same page --
A. Right.
Q. -- paragraph 2 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- there is some sort of analysis as to this
electronic transfer, correct?
MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.
A. Yeah, I don't know if I'd call it an analysis, but -BY MS. GREEN:
Q. A reference?
A. Yeah, the paragraph speaks for itself. The single sentence paragraph speaks for itself.
Q. And it's referring to the transfer of the funds
that -- mentioned in paragraph 1, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So fair to say this letter is really just
confirming that the Michigan Gaming Board received a letter directing it to transfer those funds, and this letter is relating to the mere transfer of those funds, correct?

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form, document speaks for itself.
A. Yeah, the document speaks for itself, and I'm -- your
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question seems to suggest that the prior letters we looked at were to the gaming control board directing them to transfer funds. As I read this letter, it says that the gaming control board has seen the letters, that they're giving -- advising the board of certain irrevocable instructions, not instructing them to do it, for certain the three licensed Detroit casinos, and it goes on to speak for itself.

And then it says at the end, upon review of this matter, I do not find --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You're going to have to slow down.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry.
COURT REPORTER: Speaks for itself and it goes on.
A. Speaks for itself, and goes on to say, "Upon review of this matter, I do not find any compliance issues at this time, and since no goods or service are being provided to the casino, no licensing is required." BY MS. GREEN:
Q. That's a fair point. As we said before, the letter was reflecting on the fact that certain instructional letters had been sent --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to the casinos and signing off on that process
transaction is approved under section 12 of the Michigan Gaming Act, right?
A. That is not -- that is not in the letter.
Q. Okay. And speaking of the lien on the casino revenue,
what is your understanding of how the lien on casino revenue arose? It arose from the agreement that we just looked at, correct?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. My understanding is that the 2009 collateral agreement was entered into to address a default under the 2005 and 2006 Swaps, and that as a consequence of that, there were allegedly liens based upon the casino revenue.

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Okay. But was there a lien prior to the collateral
agreement that was entered into in 2009?
MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to foundation.
A. Without getting into legal conclusion as to whether or not there was a lien, to the best of my knowledge, the answer is no.

BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Okay. So suffice it to say that the lien would not

25 exist but for the 2009 collateral agreement that was
entered into, correct?
MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
A. Here again, as I've said a couple of times today, I'm going to stay away from legal conclusions as to whether or not a lien would or would not have existed. There are equitable liens that arise ex contractu outside of law. There are other issues, but suffice it to say this agreement seemed to impose a lien as a matter of the agreement on the casino revenue. BY MS. GREEN:
Q. Okay. You're not claiming any equitable lien? MR. JURGENS: Objection.
A. We're not claiming a lien. We've done an analysis, and there have been several memos that have gone back and forth from counsel analyzing a number of different issues at law and at equity. We -- there's -- me, personally, under our agreement, there's no -- been no assertion of an equitable lien.

MS. GREEN: I have nothing further then.
THE WITNESS: Sure.
Do you need -- you need this, don't you?
Is this -- did you -- excuse me. Did you mark this?
MS. GREEN: We can mark it as an exhibit.
I don't know that anyone has marked it yet. We can
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mark it as Exhibit 7.
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 7
3:20 p.m.
(Discussion off the record at 3:20 p.m.)
(Back on the record at 3:20 p.m.)
MS. GREEN: I thought maybe it was earlier and I just didn't know.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't think it was.
MS. GREEN: It's hard to hear down there.
THE WITNESS: We talked about the collateral agreement.

MS. GREEN: We did. Okay.
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: Do we need to go off the record for the second or are we staying on? Are you asking questions?

MS. GREEN: Oh, were we on?
THE WITNESS: We can shut up.
MR. SHUMAKER: Why don't we go off for one minute to get ourselves together.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: All right. Thank you.
The time is $3: 20$ p.m. We are off the record.
(Recess taken at 3:20 p.m.)
(Whereupon Lally Gartel and Stephen Hackney David Sole, who's an interested party, he's a retiree, along with his wife, who's also a retiree.

MR. GOLDBERG: First of all, I want to just go on the record and thank Kirkland \& Ellis and the other attorneys for their patience and their working with other attorneys in this case, and especially someone like me who represents a very different point of view and that they were objective and fair their -in accommodating all the objectives here.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Let me begin by asking just a few questions just so we can put some of this into perspective. I want to call your attention to Exhibit 3.
A. Yes. Okay.
Q. On page 34 of Exhibit 3, there's a chart here that references expenditures from the years 2008 to 2012?
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A. Yes.
Q. And it indicates -- first of all, I just had a
question. Under the POCs, it has POC Swap GF, I assume that means general fund?

MR. SHUMAKER: Counsel, I think you may be pointing to a different page than the witness has in front of him.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. It's page 34 in mine. Which one did I give you? I'm talking about the June 14th, 2013.

MR. SHUMAKER: Yeah, there's an executive summary and then there's a bigger one. Are you looking at the bigger one?

MR. GOLDBERG: I have copies of what I'm looking at.
A. These are the executive summaries.

MR. GOLDBERG: Why don't I mark these and that will make it easier.

THE WITNESS: And the larger one is this one.

MR. SHUMAKER: The larger one is Orr
Number 6. Take a look at that.
MR. GOLDBERG: Sure. Yeah, this is the one I'm looking at.

THE WITNESS: That's the one, the larger
one.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Okay. So Exhibit Number 6.
A. Okay. Mr. Goldberg, which page were you at?
Q. Page 34 .
A. Of the original document?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. Here we go, that chart, 34. And it's a chart that says study that -- lists for fiscal years ended actual expenditures for 2008 to 2012; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to be clear. It has under POC Swaps GF. That means general fund?
A. Yes.
Q. EF, is that enterprise fund?
A. Enterprise fund excluding department of transportation.
Q. And I'm trying to understand, does that mean that part
of the POC Swaps are paid -- a small part is paid from the enterprise fund?
A. Yes. You'll see the corresponding numbers show for those categories.
Q. Okay. And I totaled up the years from 2008, 2012. It appears that $\$ 247.5$ million was paid on for the POC
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Swaps during those years.
A. I don't have that total in front of me, but I'm going
to take it that that's the accurate number.
Q. It appears that it's usually about between 45 to 50
million a year.
A. Right, if you average $5,10,15,20$.
Q. Just so we're clear, I mean, that 247 million, none of that went to turn on any lights in the City of
Detroit, did it?
MR. SHUMAKER: Object to the form.
A. It was legacy expenditures, debt service. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. It basically went to UBS and to Bank of America. It was their reward for betting correctly on a hedge bet, right?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, I'm going to stay away from characterizing it as a reward. There were payments made pursuant to existing certificates of participation at that time. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. And it was based on, as we talked about before, that the difference between the interest rate on the floating rate Swaps -- on the floating rate COPs and the fixed rate that the -- that the City was obligated
to pay the Swap counterparties, correct?
A. Yes --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. -- as we discussed earlier today. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Just so I'm clear, the -- what we're talking about with the optional termination event. The exhibit -the same exhibit you're referencing -- let's just get this -- I want to call your attention to page 28.
A. Of the same exhibit?
Q. Same exhibit.
A. Okay.
Q. Am I correct in the -- that that reflects that as of May 31, 2013, according to your proposal for creditors, the negative fair value of the Swaps was $\$ 343.6$ million?
A. That's what it says. Recent valuations established the negative fair value --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You're reading way too fast.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
A. Recent valuations established. The negative fair value of the Swaps at approximately 343.6 million as of May 31st.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

1 Q. So in the optional termination policy that's part of the forbearance agreement, if the City was to pay the initial payment, the City would still owe 264 -- we'd be paying 264 million approximately on the Swaps?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. We'd be paying 75 percent of whatever the termination amount is at that point?
A. Well, it's 75 percent of termination amount at that point, which I believe has since declined from May 31st.
Q. Why do you say it's declined?
A. Because interest rates have shifted, and so at any given time we'd have to value the interest rate formula at the time you choose to exercise the optional termination provision of the forbearance agreement.
Q. The interest rate that we're talking about on the Swap is linked to the LIBOR; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The three-month LIBOR?
A. Yes. I believe so.
Q. I pulled the three-month LIBOR historical index. It indicated that as of -- might as well as mark this as an exhibit.

1 MR. GOLDBERG: Can you mark this as an exhibit?

MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 8
3:29 p.m.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. It appears that as of August of 2013, the three-month

LIBOR rate was .2655 percent?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation.
A. Is there -- if you're talking about -BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Under 2013.
A. 2013, a specific category in August which reads 0.26550.
Q. Right. So it's actually gone down since July of 2013 according to this chart.
A. Yes. Did I say up before?
Q. You had indicated that the interest rates -- right,
that the -- I mean, if it goes down, the City owes more; isn't that correct?
A. Right.
Q. Just so we're clear again, that 200 -- whatever --
whether the figure is 247 million or 200 million, the optional termination payment is not going to be -- the City gets no direct benefit from that payment?
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| 1 | MR. JURGENS: Objection. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. |
| 3 | A. Well -- |
| 4 | BY MR. HACKNEY: |
| 5 | Q. Let me be -- strike that question. |
| 6 | No lights get turned on from that money. |
| 7 | That's money that comes out of the City budget. |
| 8 | MR. SHUMAKER: Same objection. |
| 9 | A. Well, it's money -- yeah, I would say that it's money |
| 10 | that the City is obligated to pay in some fashion, but |
| 11 | to the extent we get a discount, the City benefits. |
| 12 | $\quad$ BY MR. GOLDBERG: |
| 13 | Q. I heard before the testimony, and I think it's pretty |
| 14 | obvious, that the City does not have the money on hand |
| 15 | to pay that termination amount, correct? |
| 16 | $\quad$ MR. JURGENS: Objection to form. |
| 17 | A. Yes, I'm told that is correct. |
| 18 | $\quad$ BY MR. GOLDBERG: |
| 19 | Q. And to do so it's going to have to float another bond |
| 20 | or some kind of loan? |
| 21 | A. Well, it would have to in some fashion derive some |
| 22 | funding from the capital markets, yes. |
| 23 | Q. Okay. I read something, and I heard the same figures |
| 24 | floated here. I read an article in the Detroit News |
| 25 | and I heard the same -- I wasn't able to come |

1 yesterday due to an illness of my wife, but --
A. Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. -- they were talking about a $\$ 350$ million bond of some kind that is being looked into being floated, correct?
A. Here again, I want to be careful. It's unclear whether or not it is a bond.
Q. Okay.
A. What is clear is there's some post petition financing proposal which are quite sensitive, but that number is not an unreasonable number and it has been mentioned about in the press.
Q. And is it reasonable to say that that $2-350$ million
is not going to come free to the City?
A. No. The City will have to finance it in some fashion.
Q. I mean, I did a little research myself and looked up a bond in Ann Arbor that was recently financed for 340 million at 4 percent which is, I would think we both agree, was a good interest rate --
A. Um-hm.
Q. -- and the -- Ann Arbor would be paying 230 million in interest on that bond over a 25-year period.
A. Here again, Mr. Goldberg, I want to be very careful. Without representing or agreeing that the post petition financing that's being discussed will take the characteristic of a bond.
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Q. No problem. But either way, we are in agreement that that financing -- we don't have -- the City does not have a source for -- it doesn't have a relationship with the Fed that the banks have where it gets a zero qualitative easing and zero percent loans, does it? A. The City does not -- is not a qualified financial institution to go to the Fed discount window nor does it have an extra several hundred million dollars in its funds.
Q. Let me ask another question. I want to call your attention to the forbearance agreement.
A. Yes.
Q. Which exhibit is that?
A. That's Exhibit 2.
Q. Let me call your attention to page 14.
A. Yes.
Q. And it indicates under mid-market amount --
A. Yes.
Q. -- am I reading it correctly to say that the -- when the optional termination goes into effect, assuming it goes into effect, that the calculation on what's owed on the Swap that's the basis for the termination is based on the ISDA fix 3 ?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. The document speaks for itself.

1 BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah, here again, the document speaks to itself and it says methodology that is agreed to by the City and based upon the present value as it speaks to the rest of the document, yes.
Q. Have you looked into the fact that there's a lot of literature out now that's exposing a pretty large
scandal with reg -- regard to the ISDA fix that
involves and implicates both Bank of America and UBS?
MR. JURGENS: Object to form.
A. Without characterizing the nature of the literature, I think it's safe to say that I am aware of some issues that have been discussed regarding ISDA, fixed. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Are you aware also of issues that have come out with regard to the LIBOR, specifically with regard to UBS and Bank of America in the setting of using the LIBOR as a standard?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I am aware that in the past years there have been some questions raised regarding the LIBOR for certain financial institutions, yes.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Has that affected your analysis of how to deal with
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the Swap counterparties in terms of the -- the forbearance agreement?
A. No.
Q. The fact that it's potential fraud was involved in the
setting of these --
MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. Mr. Goldberg, I'm going to defer from accepting the characterization of potential fraud. It is -- it is as reported.

## BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. Okay. That's fine.

Are you also aware that the -- that UBS
was -- let me find that.
Are you aware that UBS has been sued by the Securities and Exchange Commission for rigging in regard to municipal bonds?
A. In past years?
Q. That there was a final judgment -- yes, in past years.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of the final judgment that was -- there was a final judgment on a case that was filed on -it's 112539 -- that -- and that one of the bonds that actually was involved in that case was the Detroit water and sewage bond case?

1 A. I had heard that. I have not read the final judgment.
Q. Well, l'd be glad to pass you down a copy.

MR. GOLDBERG: Why don't we mark this.
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 9
3:36 p.m.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Are you also aware that Bank of America has been investigated for potential rigging with regard to the municipal bond market?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. I am aware that Bank of America has been investigated.

The exact specifics of the investigation I am not aware of.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. In light of these investigations that deal with rigging of the municipal bond market, was that taken into consideration by the City in how to approach the question of this forbearance agreement and potential action on these Swaps?
A. Perhaps you could be more specific in what way you're asking whether that was taken into consideration.
Q. I mean, if there, in fact, was fraud -- based on the fact there's at least an indication of fraudulent activity by both Bank of America and UBS within the
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municipal bond market, has there been any investigation as to whether or not that was the case with -- with regard to the Swaps associated with the POCs?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form, foundation.
A. Yeah, first, it's not clear that there was fraud with respect to POCs. I think your prior question concerning Bank of America concerned bonds at DWSD that as my understanding are not implicated by this process, meaning the forbearance agreement, but have we calculated and analyzed the possibility that there may be issues surrounding potential concerns in connection with the Swap agreement, the answer is yes.

## BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. And who was -- who were those discussions with in terms of whether or not to pursue that?
A. I would have had discussions with my counsel.
Q. When you say your counsel, who do you mean?
A. My attorneys.
Q. Jones Day, is that --
A. Well, Jones Day. We also have local counsel that's involved that's sitting here, Pepper Hamilton, and others.

1 Q. I mean, isn't Jones Day -- doesn't Jones Day represent this Bank of America as one of its clients on its Web site?
A. Yes, Jones Day does represent Bank of America.
Q. How could Jones Day investigate one of its own clients for potential fraud?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, form.
MR. JURGENS: Objection, form.
A. I am today, Mr. Goldberg, a client of Jones Day. The specific practices of Jones Day regarding its investigations, I would suggest that you refer to them.

## BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. Okay. I'm just saying you utilize them --
A. Yes, I do.
Q. -- for their -- for their advice on whether or not to
conduct such an investigation. I'm trying to ask you as your -- in your independent position as emergency manager, wouldn't you think that a law firm that represents the precise person you're asking to investigate for fraud could not give you an objective appraisal?
A. No.

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.

1 A. No. In my experience, having worked now at three different law firms, I have seen situations where law firms are fully capable of investigating clients, yes. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Are you aware that three executives of UBS were in -recently jailed that -- who were involved in municipal bond division were recently jailed?
A. I'm aware that there were prosecutions related to UBS. I wasn't aware of the exact number or who they are. Q. Okay. I do have -- now, I'm not privy to much on that either, but I do have articles that do cite that.
A. Okay.
Q. And they cited three people who were just convicted in July of this year.
A. Okay.
Q. Are you aware that Bank of -- an executive of Bank of America in its municipal bond division was indicted in 2012?
A. I don't recall if I was aware of that.
Q. Okay. Let me just ask under -- pursuant to the Public Act 436 section 13 -- section 16, aren't you mandated to conduct a criminal investigation, or at least to refer potential suspicion of criminal investigation to the Attorney General in connection with -- if there's any kind of criminal activity associated with the
A. If there appears to be a basis for making a criminal referral of any kind related to anything that falls under my purview of 436 , I will do that.
Q. But at this point nothing -- there hasn't even been a request for such an investigation?
A. I would be careful about -- I -- I have asked -- there are matters that are under investigation that may or may not implicate the subject matters you're talking about. I'm going to defer to speak about them further.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the circumstances that led to the 2005 Swap?
A. I'm familiar with what I've read. I wasn't here in the City at the time.
Q. Do you know why Moody's -- not Moody's -- Fitch and Standard \& Poor's would have been at the table along with UBS when this -- when this was discussed?
A. First, I don't know that they were at the table and, secondly, if they were, I do not know why they would have been.
Q. Well, I do have a photograph of them at the table which l'd be glad to share with you --
A. Okay.

25 Q. -- from the Michigan Citizen. It was taken at that
time. Let me see if I can find that.
MR. GOLDBERG: Here, I can mark this.
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION:
DEPOSITION EXHIBIT 10
3:43 p.m.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. This is a photograph taken by the -- it was in the

Michigan Citizen July 31st, 2005, it reflects a picture of Sha -- Sean Werdlow, Stephen Murphy of Standard \& Poor -- Poor's, Joe Keefe -- Joe O'Keefe of Fitch, the Deputy Mayor, Anthony Adams, and the -- and the -- and -- and the representative of SBS at the table.

MR. SHUMAKER: Is there a question? BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Sure. I was asking why would Moody -- why would

Standard \& Poor and Fitch be at the table?
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation, form, document speaks for itself.
A. Yeah, Mr. Goldberg, this purports to be a document showing some of these members at counsel table. I have no idea -- I wasn't here, and I have no idea what the discussions were and whether or not it's accurately represented to be something related to this. This document speaks for itself.
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## 1 BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. So you haven't done really any substantive
investigation on what the circumstances were that -that why -- that put the City into the pension
obligations with certificates and Swap --
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. -- when they first were initiated in 2005?
A. Yeah, all I can say is this -- this picture appears to be what it purports to be and speaks for itself. I don't know if it's accurate or not.
Q. Let me just ask one quick -- that I was kind of curious about, personally. It appears that there was -- the first COP and Swap was in 2005. Then they were terminated and a new one -- new COPs and Swaps were placed in 2006. Is that your understanding?
A. I don't know if that's my understanding. I know there were -- there were two series that went on. I'm going to be careful with the question of replacing them, but let's go with your question.
Q. Okay. I guess my curiosity is why the banks would pay a termination fee of 2.7 million, according to those documents, to the City to then have them renegotiate -- replaced?
A. Mr. Goldberg --

MR. SHUMAKER: Object to form, foundation.
A. I wasn't here in the City at the time. I have no idea.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Okay. That's fine.

Have you approached the Securities and
Exchange Commission to conduct any kind of investigation of the Swaps in light of their extensive investigations of UBS and Bank of America?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. Yeah, here again, any -- your question is have I? I think I can answer your question. I think the answer is no.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Okay. And you haven't approached them to intervene in the bankruptcy which they have a right to do as we both know under the bankruptcy code?
A. I would hazard a guess that the Security and Exchange Commission is aware of Detroit's bankruptcy.
Q. But you have not approached them to aid you in doing a proper investigation of the Swaps?
A. No. I -- I think they're fully capable of determining what they should do within their mission.
Q. Have you looked into the mortgage practices of Bank of America that -- in light of the financial crisis of
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## Detroit?

MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
MR. ESSAD: Objection to relevance.
A. I don't think my duties under 436 would specify to look into the mortgage crisis, so the answer is no. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. But you would agree with me that the mortgage crisis and the subprime lending crisis is a major contributor to Detroit's financial crisis, would you not?

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form,
foundation.
A. Mr. Goldberg, I don't know if it was or wasn't. BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. You don't know if it was or it wasn't?
A. No. I've -- l've heard reports that there was disproportionate mortgage foreclosures and so on and so forth, but l've made no conclusion as to whether or not that was a major contributor to Detroit's financial crisis.
Q. I've got you. Well, let me -- let me run this -(Whereupon Vincent Marriott and Matthew Summers left the Deposition at 3:47 p.m.)
MS. ENGLISH: Can we go off the record for one second, please?

1 VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are off the record.
The time is $3: 47$.
(Recess taken at $3: 47$ p.m.)
(Back on the record at $3: 48$ p.m.)
VIDEO TECHNICIAN: Back on the record at 3:48 p.m.
BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't bring that report with me.

So your public -- your statement to me is you're not clear whether the subprime mortgage crisis in Detroit was a factor in Detroit's financial crisis?
A. No. My statement --

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection to form.
A. My statement to you -- I believe your question was, was it a major factor, and I said I understand there have been reports, allegations, and stories that there was disproportionate mortgage foreclosure in the City of Detroit. I don't know if that was a major factor in its financial crisis.

## BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. And you haven't looked into that issue independently?
A. No, I've not looked into it independently.
Q. Even though the banks -- the same banks that are claiming all these Swaps were directly involved in the subprime mortgage crisis?
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1 MR. JURGENS: Objection to form.
A. Here again, your characterization was directly involved. My mission in this forbearance agreement is look at whether or not this is in the best interest of the City at the time.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:
Q. Sure.
A. It seems to be as you and I have discussed before,
several times now, that you have expressed concerns about a broader issue regarding banks involvement with the mortgage foreclosure crisis in the City of Detroit. In my opinion, that's not directly related to the issue that we have at hand in the forbearance agreement.
Q. Let me just ask you one other question. We've been talking about alternative sources of financing.
You're familiar with the last CAFR?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with the -- what the 82 million in chargebacks means in this CAFR that the City is paying?
A. Yes, I think I have some understanding.
Q. What is your understanding of it, sir?
A. That there's a certain obligation on the City to pay some money out based upon an analysis of either

MR. SHUMAKER: Objection, foundation.
appropriately used for that purpose.

## BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q. It's not?
A. It's -- it's not clear. That's --
Q. Well, l'll send you some literature on that so you can clarify that.
A. Okay.

MR. GOLDBERG: Okay. Okay. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: All set?
THE WITNESS: All done? Okay. Thank you very much.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: This concludes today's deposition. The time is 3:52 p.m. We are off the record.
(The deposition was concluded at $3: 52 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. Signature of the witness was not requested by counsel for the respective parties hereto.)
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