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| 1 (COMMENCED AT 9:00 A.M.) | 1 Q. Now, and you recall that we spoke also at your |
| 2 DONALD CARCIERI | 2 last session about the June 9, 2010 meeting at |
| 3 (PREVIOUSLY SWORN) | 3 which Mr. Saul made a presentation, do you |
| 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're on the | 4 remember talking about that? |
| 5 record. | 5 A. Yes. |
| 6 EXAMINATION BY MR. HOLT (CONT.) | 6 Q. Now, and I think we also were discussing the 38 |
| 7 Q. Governor, I just wanted to remind you, and I'm | 7 Studios financial projections, do you remember our |
| 8 certain you know this, but you remain under oath | 8 talking about that the last time you were here? |
| 9 at the present time? | 9 A. Yes. |
| 10 A. Yes. | 10 Q. And actually before I forget, do you recall when |
| 11 Q. Now, between the last time that we were together | 11 the first time it was that you became aware that |
| 12 for your deposition a couple of weeks back and | 1238 Studios had prepared financial projections in |
| 13 today, did you do anything further to prepare for | 13 connection with the contemplated bond transaction? |
| 14 today's segment of your deposition? | 14 A. No, I don't recall that time, Tom. |
| 15 A. I met with Max and Marc this morning prior to | 15 Q. It would have been some time prior to July 26, I |
| 16 coming here a couple of hours | 16 take it? |
| 17 Q. You met for two hours this morning? | 17 A. I just don't recall. Yeah, there were |
| 18 A. Yes. | 18 projections that would have been certainly before |
| 19 Q. So, did either Mr. DeSisto or Mr. Wistow show you | 19 the final approval, but I don't remember exactly |
| 20 any documents this morning? | 20 when. |
| 21 A. Yes, you know, a bunch of them, to be honest | 21 Q. But you would certainly have known that prior to |
| 22 with you, I don't remember them all right now, but | 22 July 26, 2010 that 38 Studios had prepared |
| 23 yes. | 23 projections, revenue projections, cash flow |
| 24 Q. What did they show you? | 24 projections and the like, right? |
| 25 A. I think the term sheet that -- and the Wells | 25 A. Yes. |
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| 1 Fargo presentation, a couple of slides from that, | 1 Q. And they had provided those to the EDC staff, |
| 2 a couple of slides from the Strategy Anal | 2 right? |
| 3 presentation, things that we had talked about | 3 A. Yes. |
| 4 previously. I don't remember others. | 4 Q . And to the best of your knowledge, were other |
| 5 Q. Did they show you any financial projections of 38 | 5 board members aware that 38 Studios had |
| 6 Studios? | 6 provided -- had prepared projections? |
| 7 A. N | 7 A. I don't recall. I recall, you know, |
| 8 Q. Now, when we were here in our last session, | 8 presentation being made, but I don't recall |
| 9 think we were wrapping up with a discussion of the | 9 whether, you know, when the other board members |
| 10 June 14, 2010 board meeting of the EDC; do you | 10 were made aware other than the presentations |
| 11 recall that? | 11 the board meeting |
| 12 A. Yes. | 12 Q. Now, did you ever ask to see the 38 Studios |
| 13 Q. And we were talking about various presentations | 13 projections? |
| 14 that had been made at that particular board | 14 A. I don't recall that. I mean, I think th |
| 15 meeting, right? | 15 there was a series of presentations as we've |
| 16 A. Y | 16 discussed over the four different board meetings, |
| 17 Q . And that was the second of four board meetings | 17 two of which were at -- were confidential private |
| 18 that were dedicated to 38 Studios; does that | 18 non-public board meetings, and they were special |
| 19 accord with your recollection? | 19 meetings devoted specifically to the 38 Studios |
| 20 A. Yes. | 20 transaction, two hours of length, roughly, so |
| 21 Q. And there was one subsequent one for July 15, and | 21 there was a lot discussed and a lot of |
| 22 then there was the July 26th EDC board meeting | 22 presentations; I just don't recall. |
| 23 where the vote was taken to proceed with the 38 | 23 Q. Well, my question is actually more simple than |
| 24 Studios deal, right? | 24 that, did you ever say to Mr. Stokes or anyone at |
| 25 A. Yes. | 25 the EDC, I would like to see the financial |

projections that you've been discussing at the board meetings?
3 A. I don't recall that. I really don't.
4 Q. Now, while we were off the record today, you were
5 talking about the New England Merchants Bank, you
6 were working there in the '60s as a banker, right?
7 A. It was in the computer department.
8 Q. For a bank?
9 A. Yeah.
10 Q. You later went to work for Old Stone Bank right?
A. Right.
Q. You were on the credit committee of Old Stone

Bank, right?
A. Yes, and one of many.
Q. Why don't you tell me briefly and in a general way
what the function of the credit committee of Old
Stone Bank was when you were a member of that credit committee?
A. Reviewed the large loan transactions.
Q. In other words, when you say review loan
transactions, what do you mean?
A. Well, when you go to a bank for a loan and your law firm, or whatever, they would provide financial information, that would be analyzed by credit analysts in the credit department, the loan
officer would come in with a recommendation to lend the whole law firm so much money based upon the analysis being done, the credit committee had levels, certain levels that had passed through the credit committee, and they would approve those transactions to be submitted to the board.
Q. Now, to the extent that -- is that sometimes
referred to as the underwriting process?
A. Well, underwriting usually refers to
securities from my background. This would just be
the process that a bank used in those days for reviewing a loan and making a recommendation.
Q. And the objective of that, at least one objective
would be to determine whether or not the potential
borrower, customer, could actually pay the money back, right?
A. All parts of that. Security, if there was
security required, what the security would be, the
value of the security, you know, the business plan
if they were -- in anticipation of growing the
business. If it were an accounts receivable loan
for example, you know, who is controlling the
receivables and what percentage of the
receivables. So it would depend on the nature of the loan.

1 Q. So, in a business plan, as you've just used that term, would potentially include projections, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why would it be important to look at a business
plan that contained projections in determining whether or not to make a loan?
A. Ascertain the likelihood of them paying it back, obviously.
Q. Now, is it your testimony here today that you
never once prior to July 26, 2010 looked at the 38
Studios financial projections that had been mentioned at various points in your testimony?
A. No. What I'm -- I didn't say that. I said I
don't recall when the projections were reviewed, whether it was the 26th or a prior meeting, or at a prior time, but I do recall, you know, projections being reviewed that anticipated the cash flow from the bond underwriting, the loan guarantee and other sources of revenue that would be coming in and the likelihood. There was a best case, I think at our last session, we reviewed a best case, likely case, et cetera.
Q. Actually, my question is did you ever see a
complete set of financial projections prepared by
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38 Studios in anticipation of the $\$ 75$ million loan outside of those portions that would been presented at the board meetings?
A. You know, I don't recall is all I can say,

Tom. There were lots of discussion, and there
were projections and cash flow projections that were reviewed and, you know, Strategic Analytics, as well, as I recall, we hired them and Wells Fargo to advise the board and review not only the industry but review the projections of the company.
Q. My question is do you have any specific memory as
you sit here today of having asked Keith Stokes or anyone at the EDC for a complete set of the 38 Studios projections, other than what was shown at board meetings, other than what was shown at outside board meetings?
A. I don't recall outside of the board meetings, I don't recall.
Q. Don't you think it would have been important as a former banker and chairman of the EDC board to have had in your possession all of the cash flows, all of the projections before submitting this deal?
25 A. I think I said at our first session that from

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | my perspective, you know, the governor serves as the chairman ex-officio on the board, 1 of 12 at the time. What information the board had, and I had to make that decision with information that was presented to the full board. <br> Q. But my question to you is -- <br> MR. WISTOW: Why don't you let him finish, Mr. Holt. <br> MR. WISTOW: Mr. Holt -- <br> Q. Were you finished? <br> A. Go ahead. <br> Q. My question to you is, do you have any present recollection of having asked anyone at EDC for the financial projections, a complete set of financial projections other than what was shown in presentations at EDC board meetings? <br> A. No, I said no. <br> Q. No. Okay. Thank you. After, at the conclusion of the June 14, 2010 board meeting, what did you expect would be done next by the EDC staff? <br> A. Again, I don't recall the substance of each of the separate meetings. It was a process that we had undertaken. The public -- with the 14th, I forgot which ones were confidential, they were non-public sessions. Was that the non-public |

session?
Q. There was a non-public session as part of the June 14th --
A. There were two, actually.
Q. There was the June 14,2010 , it was a non-public
portion then, there was a non-public portion July
15 , there was a non-public portion July 26 ?
A. There were special meetings, all right, that
were devoted to 38 Studios, a special meeting as I
recall, of the board, devoted to 38 Studios and that alone, no other business. And they were much longer than the normal meetings. So, I think that, answer to your question, I don't remember exactly what transpired at which meeting.
Q. Well, you know that after -- at the June 14, 2010
meeting that presentations were made by Strategy
Analytics, Wells Fargo and others, correct?
A. If you say so. As I said, I don't remember exactly when, which meeting, so I'll take what you're saying as fact.
Q. After that meeting at which the presentations were
made, what did you expect the EDC staff to do next
in connection with the 38 Studios deal?
24 A. Well, there was a process. I think at one
25 point, I don't remember which meeting, there was
an inducement resolution that was -- that came before the board that basically gave EDC the authority to pursue negotiations. As the process proceeded, and there were different presentations, my general recollection being most all those positive about the transaction, understanding the risks, but the mitigating factors in that, and questions that the board had, that the process would, you know, unfold, further negotiations in terms of what the actual transaction would look like.
Q. Further due diligence, for example?
A. Yes. There was a process.
Q. Who was responsible for doing the further due diligence after June 14, 2010?
A. Well, when you say responsible, I mean, the executive director, EDC staff, you know, was responsible, in my judgment. They enlisted outside expertise, as Wells Fargo, Strategy Analytics and others, all right, to assist the presentation, assist providing data to the board. Q. Let me ask you this: You say that the EDC staff enlisted Wells Fargo. Do you have any specific evidence that the EDC had hired Wells Fargo to work on behalf of the EDC prior to July 26, 2010,

## specific evidence of that?

A. No, I don't have any specific -- I don't
recall, okay, who did what to whom. All I recall is that I had the strong impression that Wells
Fargo had been hired by EDC as an independent advisor to review the industry and review 38 Studios, and the reasonableness of their projections, and the same with Strategy Analytics. I mean, why else would they be coming before the board? I'm not interested in hearing from somebody who had a vested interest. The idea was to have independent advisors. And so my presumption was that they had been hired by EDC. Q. What's the specific factual basis to support that presumption?
A. I just said I don't know, Tom. Okay.
Q. You have no factual basis that you can recollect as you sit here today and testify that -- to support your presumption that someone Wells Fargo had been hired by the EDC prior to July $26 ?$
A. I do not have a factual basis for that. I don't have a piece of paper. I don't recall a piece of paper. All I'm saying is as a board member and EDC represented that they were going to seek outside independent counsel, if you will, in
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| 1 the sense of analyzing this industry and analyzing | 1 Q. It says, "For approval for financing for 38 |
| 238 Studios, the reasonableness of their business | 2 Studios, LLC" |
| 3 plan and their projections. That's why Wells | 3 A. Yes. |
| 4 Fargo was there. Why else would Wells Fargo be | 4 Q. And the next paragraph goes down, it says, |
| 5 there making a lengthy presentation? | 5 "Mr. Stokes explained that the EDC has been |
| 6 Q. I want to know specifically what specific facts | 6 deliberating this matter, performing its due |
| 7 support your presumption that EDC had actually | 7 diligence for the last several months." Do you |
| 8 hired Wells Fargo as opposed to Wells Fargo | 8 see that? |
| 9 working on behalf of 38 Studios? | 9 A. Yes. |
| 10 A. Well -- | 10 Q . Let's go down to the next paragraph, these notes |
| 11 Q. Specific facts. | 11 say that, "After several months of engaged due |
| 12 A. First of all, it would make no sense to have | 12 diligence by staff as well as by the board, final |
| 13 Wells Fargo working on behalf of 38 Studios making | 13 terms and conditions are to be presented at this |
| 14 a presentation to the board when it's supposed to | 14 meeting. Mr. Stokes introduced Deputy Director J. |
| 15 be an independent objective analysis. So that was | 15 Michael Saul to make a presentation to the board. |
| 16 the presumption that the board had asked EDC for | 16 Do you see that? |
| 17 outside independent appraisal, not just the EDC | 17 A. Yes. |
| 18 staff, because they didn't have expertise in this | 18 Q. And he did make a presentation that day, did he |
| 19 particular area. And so I presumed that those | 19 not? |
| 20 firms had been engaged to do that. | 20 A. Yes. |
| 21 Q. But I want to know specifically the basis for your | 21 Q. And then the next paragraph down begins with, "Mr. |
| 22 presumption that Wells Fargo had been hired by EDC | 22 Saul stated that this process," he's referring to |
| 23 as an independent objective advisor, specific | 23 the due diligence process, right? |
| 24 factual basis for that presumption? | 24 A. Yes. |
| 25 A. I just said I don't have one, I don't have a | 25 Q. That's been going on for the last five months, |
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| 1 factual basis. I'm just giving you my impression | 1 right? |
| 2 and my sense, because it would make no sense to | 2 A. Yes. |
| 3 have Wells Fargo there presenting, you know, and | 3 Q. Okay. Then the next paragraph down, can you read |
| 4 selling on behalf of 38 Studios to the board. We | 4 that aloud, please? |
| 5 don't need somebody selling us. We wanted | 5 A. It says, "The EDC hired two reputable |
| 6 independent analysis. | 6 consultant companies, Strategy Analytics and |
| 7 Q. Well, did Wells Fargo, anyone at Wells Fargo ever | 7 Perimeter Partners, to evaluate the video game |
| 8 say at that June 14 meeting, I'm Mark Lamarre from | 8 industry as well as 38 Studios and provide |
| 9 Wells Fargo, I have been hired by EDC to do an | 9 detailed information to the board." |
| 10 independent analysis? | 10 Q. Okay. Does that paragraph mention Wells Fargo |
| 11 A. I don't recall that. I don't recall that | 11 anywhere? |
| 12 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 85. I put before you | 12 A. No. |
| 13 Exhibit 85, which is the meeting minutes for the | 13 Q. In fact, it only represents -- it only indicates |
| 14 meeting of the directors of the EDC public session | 14 that two consultants had been hired by EDC, |
| 15 dated July 26, 2010. Do you have that? | 15 Strategy Analytics and Perimeter Partners, right? |
| 16 A. Yes, I do. | 16 A. No, it doesn't say only two. It says these |
| 17 Q. Now, let's go to -- let's go to Page 6 of | 17 two had been hired. |
| 18 meeting minutes of the July 26, 2010 meeting at | 18 Q. But there's no reference to Wells Fargo? |
| 19 which the EDC approved proceeding with the 38 | 19 A. It does not. It didn't. |
| 20 Studios transaction. Do you have that in front of | 20 Q. Now, let's -- now after the -- withdraw that |
| 21 you, Governor? | 21 question. Now as we were discussing earlier, the |
| 22 A. Yes, I do. | 22 next board meeting was on July 15, 2010, right? |
| 23 Q. Let's take a look at Item 6. Do you see that on | 23 A. I believe so -- you say the next, this is |
| 24 Page 6? | 24 July 26. |
| 25 A. Yes. | 25 Q. I understand. I'm not on this -- let's just leave |

Exhibit 85 for a moment; okay?
A. Okay.
Q. We're going to go on to some other exhibits, all right?
A. Okay.
Q. So, again, just to put us in a time line here, we
had the June 14 board meeting, and then the next board meeting was going to be on July 15; does that accord with your recollection?
A. As I said, I don't recollect these dates
exactly, Tom. I'll take your word.
Q. Now, do you recall at day one of your deposition
that we talked about an e-mail with some attachments dated April 1, 2010 that were sent to Andy Hodgkin which included a draft term sheet or letter of intent; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you recall prior to the July 15, 2010
board meeting receiving any other drafts of the
so-called letter of intent which later became
known as a term sheet?
A. I just don't recall.
Q. Governor, I'm going to ask you to take a look at

Exhibit 122, please. Now, Exhibit 122 is an
e-mail from Sharon Penta at the EDC which is
addressed to the board members at the EDC, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're shown as having received a copy of
this, third line down to the far right-hand
margin, it says Governor Donald L. Carcieri, and
then it has mgartelman@gov.state.ri.us, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's Marge Gartelman, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you told us before that basically
information that would sent electronically to you would essentially go through Marge Gartelman as your staff member, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that you did not
receive this e-mail, Exhibit 122?
A. No.
Q. And by the way --
A. I don't recall, but there is no reason to
believe one way or the other.
Q. Well, this was dated July 13, 2010, which was two
days before the July 15 board meeting to discuss
the 38 Studios deal, right?
A. Uh-huh -- yes.

25 Q. Now, it goes on to say, "Dear board members." It

5 Q. It says it's a draft term sheet and then a

## memorandum from Mike Saul attached, right?

A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to the term sheet itself, which is on the
second page of Exhibit 122, Bates stamp APS0
00442; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's go down to the third paragraph, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It begins with, "We understand"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And maybe you could read the first sentence
of Paragraph 3 aloud for us, please?
A. "We understand your capital needs to bring

Project Copernicus to completion to be
approximately $\$ 75$ million."
Q. Now can you tell us in your own words what you
understand that sentence to mean?
A. Well, I think it explains it further in the
paragraph.
Q. Well tell us in your own words what you understand
that sentence to mean?
A. That $\$ 75$ million of financing and the net
proceeds of which, along with their other cash
flow projections which they had of revenues would
be sufficient to complete Copernicus.
Q. Well, the first sentence on a stand-alone basis
just says the capital needs to bring Copernicus to
completion, you know, are approximately $\$ 75$
million, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, where do you understand that that $\$ 75$ million came from?
A. The following sentences made clear. We understand that the net proceeds -- we're willing to issue, the net proceeds will be sufficient to finance the relocation, complete Copernicus and capitalize the company's growth and expansion. Q. I think a couple of questions back you said you offered that in addition to other funds that might be available; do you remember telling me that? A. Well, they had a cash flow projection that I recall that assumed sales of the first game, which I don't remember, Mercury, whatever it was called, the first game, and there were cash flow
projections that assumed revenues in conjunction with whatever the net proceeds would be from this financing.
Q. Of course we know those projections were simply
someone best's guess as to what might happen in the future?
A. All projections are. That's what they are.
Q. So, in fact, if sales were less robust than
projected on financial projections, that would
adversely affect cash flow, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if in fact you had less cash flow than projected, you'd have to get cash from some other source to continue in business, would you not?
A. Yes. Sales could exceed projections, in
which case you'd have plenty. They're projections, that's what they are.
Q. Of course, sales did not exceed projections, did it?
A. I don't recall. I wasn't in office when the first game came out. So from what I read in the press accounts, the sales of the first game were reasonably successful.
Q. But that first sentence focuses on capital needs of $\$ 75$ million, does it not?

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. Okay. Now, let's assume for the sake of
discussion that in these projections that are inherently unknowable, that revenues were significantly less than projected, that would have an adverse impact on cash flow, would it not?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that case, 38 Studios would have to go and
source funding someone else, either through
additional debt or through an equity raise, right?
A. Well, somehow, yeah. There would be
additional -- if all that you're posulating
occurred. All I'm saying is at the time we approved this, based on the projections, projections that were given it was our understanding that this financing, the net proceeds of which would be less than 75 , how much, we at this point was not clear, but with all the other sources, would be sufficient to have them move, complete Copernicus and, in fact, I think capitalize the company's growth is what it says.
Q. When you use the term other sources, what did you
have in mind?
24 A. Well, other revenues from -- from the first
25 game, for example, that was going to be -- the

1 first game, is my recollection, the first game was
2 anticipated to be completed, you know, a year or so and into the marketplace before Copernicus. So, there would be revenues coming from, and projections of revenues coming from the sale of the first game, that's what they had anticipated. But of course, the anticipated revenues for the first game, they were simply projections, right?
9 A. Yes, all these things are projections.
10 Q. And this company had not made any money as of July 26, 2010, had it?
A. Well, they were developing the game, correct.
Q. Sure. And can we agree that the board was aware
that this company was prerevenue as of July 26, 2010?
A. The board understood that they were
developing the game -- two games, all right, the first one was well along, and that was likely to be released to the public. Now fairly soon, when I say fairly soon, within a year or so, I just don't remember the exact time frame, Copernicus, which is a much more complex game, multi-player, was going to take longer, and that's what the financing that we were providing would assist them with.

1 Q. And the board understood that the revenue
projections that were presented to the board were just what that name implies, something you couldn't really guarantee and verify, right?

MR. WISTOW: Asked and answered four times.
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Now, can we also agree that as of July 26, 2010,
that the board was aware that if in fact the revenue projections were not met, that the company would have to seek funding from some other source, either through an additional equity raise or additional borrowed funds; is that fair to say?

MR. WISTOW: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. The board approved this after, you know, input from outside consultants, et cetera, reviewing the industry, reviewing the track record, understanding the risks that this is, you know, a business where they've got to produce a game, but that they had lots of factors in their favor and deemed to be a good management team, deemed to be one of the best creative teams, deemed to be a talented group of people, backed by Entertainment Arts (sic), the largest distributor

1 in the first game who seemed to be, as I recall, enthused about a multi-player game. Based on all of that, the package that the board approved, we felt, would be sufficient to accomplish the goal of getting Copernicus completed and the company relocated to Rhode Island.
Q. Well, did the board ever consider the possibility

8 that the projections would not be met and that 38
9 Studios would not achieve projected revenue levels
10 that would require them to seek additional
infusion of capital, either equity capital or debt capital?
A. Well, I think the board understood the risk.

There was a lengthy conversation about -- I think the board, again, is my recollection was, how would I say it, was reasonably comfortable that if the game were produced, you know, we were willing to take the risk that the game would be a hit, a flop or somewhere in between. That's the nature of these things. But that the creative team and talent 38 Studios had put together understood the market well enough that they were designing a game that would have a reasonable prospect of success. The board was concerned about whether their cash flow projections anticipated were sufficient. Let
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me say it another way, that they would need more money to complete Copernicus, okay, than was indicated at the time. There was concern about that, all right, and a discussion about the first game had a completion bond, for example, as I recall. And there were discussions about that, so the board was concerned, not that the projections were necessarily, you know, how would I say, completely erroneous. You do projections. But when you get into any project, there are unknowns, and the cost could possibly be larger, it could take longer to develop the game than they had anticipated themselves.
Q. And the board was aware of all of those facts you just recited for me, correct?
A. Yeah. Well, the board understood that and was prepared to, as I said, make a decision based upon all the mitigating factors that this was a risk that we were prepared to take.
Q. So the board understood that in fact the games
could be, in your words, a flop, right?
A. Anything can be. Sure. There's no guarantees in life. But as I said, on review of the talent that had been assembled, the creative talent, I think the board came away, I'll speak
for myself, with a degree of comfort that they knew how to develop a game, and that that game had a reasonable prospect of succeeding. So I don't think there's always a risk that it would be a total flop, that wasn't the case, by the way, the game that they developed, you know, as I said, I don't know, I wasn't there, but the media accounts that I've read indicated it was a reasonable success and, in fact, the media reported they were negotiating for a sequel. I don't know that. I'm only reflecting what was in the press.
Q. But in any event, we know the board was aware that
the projected revenues could come up short, and if those projected revenues came up short, in other words, were less than projected, in order to stay in business, the company would have to get additional source of liquidity, either through additional equity investment or loans, right? Only stands to reason, can we agree on that?
A. If what you say transpired, they needed more
cash, because for whatever reason, then, yes, you know, any company is faced with that -- every company is faced with that as you're growing and expanding.
Q. And that's something that the board was aware of

## on or before July 26, 2010, right?

A. Yes. There was discussion about that.
Q. There was a discussion in fact there could be a
shortfall between the $\$ 75$ million and the actual net proceeds and whether the net proceeds would be sufficient to actually achieve the development of the RPG game Copernicus and the move; isn't that true?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. No. It was not that specific. I think that the board was assured that the net proceeds along with the other -- cash flow projections and other sources of revenue would be sufficient.
Q. Well, when you say the board was comfortable with
the notion that the net proceeds along other cash projections would be sufficient, if in fact the RPG game was delayed, and they didn't have that cash flow, and that was a possibility that was certainly -- the board was aware of, in that case, unavoidably, 38 Studios would have to seek additional liquidity, right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Well, you've postulated a lot of ifs. I
think, speaking for myself, there was a
reasonable -- you know, a reasonable degree of

proceeds of the financing would be sufficient.
Q. Along with other --
A. You know, whatever all the other sources
were, but this financing -- with this financing,
they could accomplish the move, the relocation and the completion of Copernicus.
Q. But --
A. That is what we, you know, believed.
Q. But that assumption or that belief was predicated
on the fact that the company would be making
revenues, would actually be achieving revenue
projections that were presented to the board, right?
A. That they were -- I don't remember all the
detail, which the years, et cetera, things were
going to occur, but the presumption was that the
RPG game was going to be completed before
Copernicus, and that it would generate revenues
that would be available now to help the company with its financing.
Q. Okay. And those revenues would be over and above
the net proceeds, right?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. And now if, in fact, there were no revenues
25 achieved, let's say for the sale of the RPG game,
what's the specific basis for that statement? A. If I recall, you got to go back to the slide, you had slides that indicated that their sales didn't -- seemed in line with their peers and that the market share they had to command was not outlandish, my words, okay. There was, again, I'm using the word reasonable. There was nothing in that -- I remember some bullet statements and the slide presentation, you showed them, we went over them I think the last time I was here.
Q. So, other than the slide presentations that I showed you in your previous deposition session, what other specific basis do you have for the statement you made that Wells Fargo concluded that the projections were reasonable, other than the slides?
A. No. I'm basing it on the slides.
Q. Now, you said that there was a comparison, or there was a comparison between the sales and industry peers. Were you referring to sales by 38 Studios?
A. Sales of 38 Studios games, yes.
that there had been no sales whatsoever?
how would that affect the company's liquidity position?
A. Well, they'd have a problem.
Q. And there was no guarantee as of July 26 that they would receive those, right?
A. No, there were -- these were all projections.

You do, in life, in business, you make the best estimates you can, you test those. Are they reasonable in the market, you know, Wells Fargo concluded that the sales that they were requiring looked reasonable, you know, in the marketplace, they weren't going to have to command an overly large share of the market. These are the kinds of things you assess, and in that overall assessment, you know, the board concluded that this was a risk worth taking, that we were aiming to develop a new industry in the state. These were high-paying jobs, all right, and jobs for which we were producing talent at our higher education institutions here that this, you know, had the potential to be a very good economic impetus to the state, not just this deal but, you know, as an industry.
Q. Now, I think you just testified that Wells Fargo
concluded that the projections were reasonable,
Rhode Island Economic Development Corp
Wells Fargo Securities, LLC

1 | 1 | A. We're talking about the projections that the |
| ---: | :--- |
| 2 | company made that you referred to earlier. So |
| 3 | that Wells Fargo, my assumption, had looked at |
| 4 | those projections and was testing, from their |
| 5 | expertise, the reasonableness of achieving those |
| 6 | projections in the marketplace, and that the |
| 7 | bullets that I recall in the slides, you know, |
| 8 | seemed to indicate that these projections were, my |
| 9 | words, reasonable. They weren't outlandish, they |
| 10 | weren't crazy in the context of the marketplace, |
| 11 | that's all I'm saying. |
| 12 | Q. Specifically, what is your assumption that Wells |
| 13 | Fargo tested the reasonableness of 38 Studios' |
| 14 | projections based upon, the slides? |
| 15 | A. There was a lengthy analysis done by Wells |
| 16 | Fargo, as I recall, and you showed me the |
| 17 | presentation the last time, I don't remember it, |
| 18 | but it talked about the industry, an overview of |
| 19 | the industry, and then 38 Studios and 38 Studios' |
| 20 | projections of game sales, you know, in the |
| 21 | context of that industry. I don't know what Wells |
| 22 | Fargo's methodology is, I assume they just said, |
| 23 | well, these, you know -- are these crazy in what |
| 24 | they're projecting, are they going to have to own |
| 25 | the whole market in order to achieve these |

projections? Do they need 10 percent of the market, 5 percent of the market? I don't know what your protocol is at Wells Fargo. I assume they had a protocol when they said these seemed to be in line with peers is what I remember, and that the market share was not extraordinarily large. Q. So, we can agree then, basically, your statement that Wells Fargo concluded the projections were reasonable, that statement you made is based upon the slides that were presented at the June 14 meeting, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you see any other reports or any other written documentation of any sort that you understood it to have been prepared by Wells Fargo in connection with the 38 Studios deal, other than the slide projection presented at the June 14 meeting?
A. No. I don't recall any other, you know.

That's the one I recall.
Q. Okay. So, other than the slide projections that we had discussed at some length in our last session, you have no specific factual basis to support the notion that Wells Fargo concluded that the projects were reasonable, correct?

1 A. Yes.
Q. And that gov.state.ri.us, that's the URL that's
indicative of the governor's office, right?
A. I have no idea. You're quickly getting over my head, so...
Q. Now as of July 12, 2010, Andrew Hodgkin was your
chief of staff, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Jamia McDonald was your deputy chief of staff, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had hired Ms. McDonald to be your deputy
chief of staff, had you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And you interviewed her for that position, right?
A. Well, she had other positions that she held
within the governor's office and she was, you know, well regarded.
Q. And did you consider her to be qualified to serve
as your deputy chief of staff?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at D-6,

Exhibit D-6 that we talked about before. Do you
have that in front of you?
5 A. Yes, I do.

1 A. Yes.
Q. And that's --
A. -- gov.state.ri.us.
Q. That's identical to McDonald's URL,
gov.state.ri.us, right?
A. yes.
Q. This e-mail from Mr. Saul at the EDC is being
shown as having been sent to Ms. McDonald on July
12, 2010 with attachments, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that this
was not sent to Ms. McDonald on July 12, 2010?
A. No. I have no idea.
Q. You have no reason to believe it was not sent?
A. She's listed on here, so I'm presuming it was.
Q. Along with the attachments?
A. I don't know how -- again, I've got no basis
for making that.
Q. But you assume this e-mail went to Ms. McDonald? MR. WISTOW: Objection. MR. HOLT: Answer.
A. She is listed on here. Whether all of this
went to her, I have no way of knowing that.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe it didn't go to

## her?

A. No. But I have no way of knowing that.
Q. As of July 12 , she was your deputy chief of staff,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let's --

MR. WISTOW: Are you through with this exhibit?

MR. HOLT: Yes. We're going to move
on to another exhibit.
MR. WISTOW: Let the record reflect
that at his last deposition the Governor testified that he could, quote, "Guarantee" --

MR. HOLT: Don't testify, Max. That is way out of bonds. Wait, please -- no, no.

MR. WISTOW: You said you were
finished with the exhibit.
MR. HOLT: No testimony. None, nada.
MR. WISTOW: Just stop, okay. You
indicated you didn't want me to say --
MR. HOLT: Don't say something.
MR. WISTOW: Wait. I'm going to say something.

MR. HOLT: It's speaking -- I'm going
to ask the witness to leave the room, please. I'm

that the 38 Studios would be receiving something less than $\$ 75$ million --
A. Yes.
Q. -- right.
A. Yes.
Q. And can we agree that if 38 Studios had based
their projections that are referenced here on actually having a disbursement of $\$ 75$ million and not something less than that, that would adversely affect cash available for operations for 38
Studios, would it not?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. I don't know how to answer the question. You
know, every borrower has a number in mind that
they deem that they would like to receive, and they've got that factored into their cash flows. Whether they were anticipating 75 million or some amount less, I don't know. I believe they understood, but I could be wrong, that there were going to be reserves and set asides, and there were fees that came out of the net, and so that 75 million was not the amount that they were going to actually receive. How much they anticipated, I don't know.
Q. Okay. So you have no way of knowing as to what
the projections assumed relative to the net amount they would receive?
A. No. All we're saying here is that whatever
the net was, that they understood there was a net amount, what they understood that to be, I don't
know. That, along with the other revenues, et cetera, would be sufficient to accomplish the move and completion of Copernicus.
Q. As of July 13, 2010, what was the dollar amount of
the net proceeds that are referenced in this

## Exhibit 122 ?

A. I don't recall. I don't know as that was
discussed. I think that was still being developed.
Q. So, do you know what the net proceeds were going
to be as of the July 26 board meeting? Was the
the board aware what the net proceeds were going
to be with any degree of precision?
A. I don't remember when the final amount that was resolved, it was 48,49 million, whatever it was after these reserves were set up. I don't know whether it was the 26th or -- my recollection is the board understood that the amount was going to be, you know, where it ended up being, close to that.
Q. My question is a little more simple. Let's
confine our attention to July 26 , the day of the vote. To the best of your recollection, the board didn't know as of July 26 what the exact net proceeds were going to be, did they?
A. I just don't recall. I don't recall, Tom.
Q. Well, in fact, there were deductions that were yet
to be determined as they progressed toward the bond issuance, right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yeah, there were going to be deductions and fees and all the set asides, I indicated.
Q. So, to the extent that the EDC and 38 Studios as
of July 26, 2010 did not know the exact amount of the net proceeds, no one could say with certainty that the net proceeds would provide the necessary financing to relocate 38 Studios to Rhode Island, complete production of Copernicus and capitalize the company's growth and expansion in Rhode Island because they simply didn't know that amount, right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
MR. DeSISTO: Objection.
A. Well, they didn't. But I'm presuming they, you know, they had an idea of a ballpark range in
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these things. It's never exact until it's completed.
Q. So, in fact, as of July 26 , nobody really knew
what the exact net proceeds were going to be, right?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. No, I don't know that. That's what I'm
saying, I don't recall. It could have been
specified at that point. I just don't recall.
Q. Where do you think it might have been specified? MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. It could have been in a discussion at the board meeting, I just don't recall.
Q. Do you recall any specific discussions at the board meeting, let's say regarding Mr. Wadensten asking the question that what happens if in fact 38 Studios doesn't meet their revenue projections, and where they're going to get the money, and you responded, well, they can always go out and get more equity or borrow more money; do you recall that discussion?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yes. But that was in the context of a
concern the board had of their ability to get the -- Copernicus completed as they had forecast
it at the cost and the time frame that they forecast. And all you can do is make your best judgments based on what are projections. What Karl had indicated, well, what if they're wrong, what if they overrun their cost? And I think, well, any business person that's in that position, my response was if that happens, then they're going to have to, you know, raise additional capital in some form. That happens to every business all the time.
Q. Fair enough. And that's something that the board would have been aware of as of July 26, 2010?
A. Yeah, I think the board felt at that point
that based upon the, you know, the analysis of the independent review we had, that it looked like this could be and would be completed, all right. There was discussion, as I indicated, I don't remember all the details about -- because there was concern about, how do I say it -- their over running, taking longer to get the game completed, so that led into a discussion about, you know, performance bond or guarantee and failing that what other options there might be.
Q. Well, so the board, as of July 26, 2010, was aware of the fact that if there were cost overruns or
delays, that 38 Studios would have to go out and get additional funding, correct?
A. Yeah. Well, I think you have to separate two different issues. One is the reasonableness of 38 Studios' projection that they could complete the game with the financing that had been approved, okay, or was going to be approved by the board. With those own projections, you know, reasonable, and that's what led to the discussion about, you know, a performance bond or somebody that could -that ultimately I ended up I guess being IBM, but somebody that could make a judgment on that. That's separate, because one piece is, as you indicated earlier, are these projections, they're projections. They could be high, they could be low, they could be wrong. There's no guarantee on the projections, but are they reasonable. That's all you can ask, are they reasonable.

Now, you can agree they're reasonable and go forward, and they can still be unknowns that occur in the future that you just didn't anticipate.
That I think, you'll have to ask Karl, but I think that was a separate sort of, you know, we were first of all trying to deal with the first part, that was the part. You always have the
possibility, you know, that there's something that crops up that you weren't aware of, didn't expect, and it overruns the cost.
Q. Well, let's confine our discussion to the
situation where in fact there were delays that were not anticipated and there were costs that could --
A. But that wasn't known at the time.
Q. Of course.
A. At the time the board made the decision, it was a decision that these looked reasonable, it looked like, because they were pretty much on track to develop the first game and get it launched, that these people had the expertise to produce the game. And that looked reasonable. And that was the basis on which the board approved the financing. You know, what happens after that, you know, anybody -- nobody knows, you know, it's the uncertainties of the business world.
Q. But the board was aware, at least as of July 26, that there was a possibility that the revenue projections would not come to fruition and that there would be a need for additional financing?

MR. WISTOW: Asked and answered probably 25 times.

1 A. All these things, all these things were
projections and the board understood that. I mean, these are executives of large companies in our state that run big businesses. They understand what projections are. They deal with them every day.
Q. So, they would have understood then that there was
the possibility that projections were not met and
38 Studios would have to get additional funding beyond the net proceeds, right?

MR. WISTOW: At some point I'm going to instruct him not to answer.

MR. HOLT: You can answer. Read the question back.
(QUESTION READ)
A. Did they understand intuitively that that's
possible, of course, these are intelligent business people running big businesses. They understood that. But they were making a decision based upon the facts before them presented and the reasonablessness of those, you know, those facts. Q. But these sophisticated business people on the board would certainly have been aware of the fact that 38 Studios might have to get additional funding beyond the net proceeds?

3 Q. If some projections weren't met?
MR. WISTOW: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. I think there was not -- that I recall a
lengthy conversation about that, all right, but any business person knows that, you know, there are things that occur that may cause you to need additional capital. Yeah, that's a given.
Q. Let's take a look at the July 26 meeting minutes again. We were talking about them before Exhibit 85 , please. Is now a good time to take a quick break, Linda?

THE REPORTER: That would be good. Thank you.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, this is the end of Disk Number 1.
(RECESS)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record. This is the beginning of Disk Number 2 Q. Governor, returning to Exhibit 122, and again, the term sheet which is attached to 122 , do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
to me about certain risks that Mr. Saul had brought to the board's attention; do you remember that?
A. Yeah. Well, he pointed out in his presentation that, you know, as most people did, that there are risks. This was an industry that, you know, there could be a risk that the game is a flop, maybe a risk that, you know, as we indicated earlier, it takes longer to develop than it did. You know, there were a host of risks here, but there were also a lot of mitigating factors that were positives on the side of 38 Studios that mitigated those risks.
Q. And you recall that he indicated that the company
was prerevenue, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was not branded?
A. Yes. I don't know what branded -- I mean,
they didn't have a product in the marketplace yet.
Q. And he cited that as a possible risk, right?
A. Yes.

22 Q. And indicated that it was a dynamic industry, right?
A. Yes.

25 Q. And that it was a hit-driven business?
Q. And now after you received this, did you request
any further documentation or any further information on any of the topics addressed in the term sheet?
A. I don't recall. I don't recall asking for any further information.
Q. But had you asked for additional information on
any of the items addressed in the Exhibit 122,
term sheet letter, had you asked anyone at EDC for
additional information, they would have provided
it to you, wouldn't they have?
MR. DeSISTO: Objection.
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yeah. If I asked them a question, they would answer. They would get an answer for me.
Q. So you have no reason to believe that if in fact
you had requested more information regarding
financial projections, that they would have
refused to provide it?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Now, let's turn to -- you have 122 in front of you, Governor?
23 A. Yes, I do.
24 Q. Before I actually delve into that further, I think
25 you recall the last time we were here you talked

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. Now let's take a look at, going in on Exhibit 122,
after the term sheet on Bates stamp page APS 448; do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is a memorandum that was sent to you as
part of the package and to all the other board members on July 13 , right?
A. Yes. That's what it indicates.

10 Q. Now, this says that, "This memorandum," quote,
"Summarized below are some key risk mitigation business terms relating to the 38 Studios transaction term letter." Quote. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And again, it references net proceeds, but we've agreed that at this point in time no one knew for sure what the amount of the proceeds -- the amount of the net proceeds, right?
A. Yes.

21 Q. Let's go to Paragraph Number 2, it says, "To mitigate risk, bond proceeds will be delivered to the company according to a job creation performance schedule, with $\$ 15$ million being disbursed at closing, $\$ 10$ million being disbursed
when the company announces its relocation date, $\$ 20$ million being disbursed when the company relocates to RI and increments thereafter based on job growth." Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when he's talking about mitigating risk here,
how did a schedule of progress payments mitigate made the risk of making a loan to a prerevenue company?
A. I think -- well, my interpretation, as I recall, this was the issue of disbursing the money, and then not relocating, in other words, the whole point of this, not the whole point, but a significant part was that they were going to relocate 38 Studios, headquarter in Providence and that on their own projections, the employment was going to grow from what it was then somewhere around 150,180 , I don't remember, but up to 350, 400 jobs. So, I think this was indicative of making sure that, you know, they actually transition and relocate. That's the way I interpreted this to mean.
Q. But this Item 2 on Exhibit 122, that contemplates essentially conditions on disbursement of funds from the bond proceeds, right?

1 A. Yes.
Q. And that set of restrictions would restrict the
amount of cash available to 38 Studios as a prerevenue company, right?
A. Well, again, 38 Studios signed this.
Q. You're saying the term sheet?
A. They signed the term sheet, so they understood what was going on. The disbursement schedule, as I recall, had been reviewed with them. So there's nothing in here in terms of the disbursement schedule that should have been a surprise to them.
Q. But whether it was a surprise or not, to call this
mitigation or mitigating the risk, it really
didn't mitigate the risk that 38 Studios would, you know, produce a flop, it simply -- you know, held back on cash disbursements over a period of time, right?
A. To ensure that they relocated. The risk you're referring to is a risk that the company not complete the game. The reason, one of the reasons for doing this was to have the company relocate all of their headquarters (sic) and all their employees to Rhode Island and those people, the income levels they were high-paying jobs, all the
things I said earlier were the positives of that. We wanted to make sure if we gave them all the money up front, what's the assurance that they're actually going to, you know, move the company. So the risk mitigation, I believe, or I interpreted it to mean the risk that, you know, they wouldn't fulfill that side of it and relocate the company. Q. So number 2 was mitigating a relocation risk as opposed to a performance risk?
A. Yes. Because there's nothing that speaks to this disbursement about performance or cash flows or anything in the company. It only speaks to the relocation of the company. So, these cash flows were not tied to what you might think of as milestones of achievement in terms of the game itself being produced. These were milestones of relocating the company.
Q. Do you recall seeing a complete set of cash flows
as opposed to simply revenue projections at any time prior to July 26, 2010?
A. I just don't -- I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Well, is that something you think you might have wanted to see, a complete set of cash flows before you continued your support of 38 Studios?

MR. WISTOW: Asked and answered four
times.
A. The board's role, you know, on any board, you
serve on boards, particularly these are unpaid people that serve on the board, you are dependent upon the staff to prepare the information and provide those, do those analyses. In this case as we talked about, we even enlisted the -- EDC enlisted outside independent expertise. So, the board would not necessarily get enmeshed into the details of these things. You're relying on the staff. If there's a problem and a cash flow, you're relying on the staff to tell you, hey, wait a minute, this thing doesn't synch, and there's a big problem here.

These are all people, including me, that have lots of other things that they are doing and they were serving in this as a public service.
Q. How many other $\$ 75$ million loan transactions were
you involved in as of July 2010 as Governor and chairman of the EDC?
A. No, this was the first.
Q. Now, did you take any independent steps at any time to validate any of the information that was being provided to you by the EDC staff regarding the 38 Studios bond transaction?
A. We hired, EDC hired, they indicated, the two they indicated, my belief and representation that,
I can't recall exactly, but from either Mike Saul
or Keith Stokes, is that Wells Fargo had been
hired to do the same. So the notion was that
these were outside experts that were assisting the
board's deliberations as well as the EDC due diligence.
Q. But did you take any independent steps to validate
any information that was provided to you by the
EDC board or by the two companies that were hired
by EDC as independent advisors, did you as
chairman of the board take any independent steps
to validate any of that information?
MR. WISTOW: He said there were three companies, not two.

MR. HOLT: He didn't say that.
A. Yeah, I said there was Strategy Analytics,

Perimeter, whatever it was called, and Wells
Fargo.
Q. But you told me earlier you have no specific
evidence showing that Wells Fargo was actually
hired; yes or no?

1 A. I said I don't have detailed evidence of a
document, but clearly the board was led to believe that -- and from either Mike Saul or Keith Stokes, I don't remember whom, but that Wells Fargo had also been engaged.
6 Q. And that representation would have been made by,
7 according to your testimony, Mike Saul or Keith
Stokes?
9 A. One of them, yes.
Q. But not anybody at Wells Fargo?
A. No.
Q. Now, let's go back to the question that I think is
a very narrow one. Can you tell the court and jury what steps you took to validate any information that was provided to you concerning the 38 Studios deal by any outside advisors or EDC staff?

MR. WISTOW: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. No. I said, you know, the board -- my goal
from the beginning of this was not for me to do independent analysis, all right, that the board should have before it all the same information as I had available, and that should be presented by EDC staff along with the consultants and advisors
that they had hired, and on that basis, the decision would be made. I did not, to my knowledge, I don't remember, undertake any independent second-guessing in terms of what the, quote, independent advisors were giving us; they're the industry experts.
Q. So you relied upon information provided by EDC
staff and outside advisors exclusively in supporting the 38 Studios bond transaction, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. HOLT: Let's take a look at Item 3 on 122 Bates stamp APS 448, the Stokes memorandum. Do you have that? I think it's on the very last page, if you turn that over -reverse it. I think it's right there, Governor.

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. This, okay, sorry.
Q. Let's go down to Item Number 3. It says, "To
further mitigate performance risk, the bond documents will include various cash distribution limitations on the company, including limits on dividends, distributions, salaries and bonuses." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. How did that restriction on cash flow mitigate the
risk that 38 Studios would not achieve a -- let me back up. Do you see Number 3, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now how did Number 3 mitigate the risk that was articulated by Mr. Saul that 38 Studios was prerevenue?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Well, again, my interpretation of this, and
it's not uncommon, all right, and this would be fairly common in lending documents, that you want to make certain that the cash you were disbursing is going into the company to be used for the intended purpose. So, hence, limitations on dividends, distributions to the owners or salaries and bonuses is fairly consistent with that. It's only -- it is only an assurance that -- or trying to ensure that the distributions coming from the bond proceeds in this case are in fact going to employ the people to complete the game and the company's growth and not being siphoned off in any way, because if that money went to dividends, distributions or whatever, it wouldn't be available to the company.
25 Q. But specifically, how did Item Number 3 mitigate

1 the risk that, for example, 38 Studios would not achieve --
A. If all the cash was going in the company and staying in the company, you know, when you're going to need cash, you want to make sure the cash is staying in the company, you know, I think that's pretty straightforward.
Q. But that would mean that that cash -- to the
extent that's a restriction, that cash would not
have been available to the company to develop, let's say, Copernicus, right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection. What? What?
A. I don't follow you at all.
Q. Let's take a look at Number 4.
A. I don't follow you. That to me is assuring
that cash is not leaving the company in the form of dividends and distributions, unusually large salaries or bonuses. The cash is staying in the company that should enhance the prospects of the game being completed.
Q. But how did Number 3 mitigate the risk that 38

Studios was in a hit-driven business?
A. No. That didn't deal with that issue.
Q. Okay. And it didn't deal with the issue that 38

25 Studios was in a so-called dynamic industry, a
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risk that had previously been identified, did it?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. No. No. I'll say it again, all I interpret
this is to make sure that all of the cash being
disbursed through the loan proceeds, any of the revenues coming in from the sales of the RPG game, that that cash would stay in the company to fund the company and not be siphoned out, you know, either to the shareholders or owners. That's what that's designed to do.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. But so that would not have
addressed the issues that were raised regarding
the fact that the company wasn't branded, it was
in a dynamic industry, and it was a hit-driven business, right; that's not what that was intended to address, right?
A. No. The things that addressed that, as I said, on the other hand, were the quality of the creative team, the quality of the technical team, the quality of the distribution outlet, et cetera, and all of those were deemed in this case by independent analysis to be strong.
23 Q. Let's take a look at Number 4; do you see that?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. This says that, "The RIEDC will receive a base
guarantee fee, 1.5 percent of balance due on bonds, deferred fee to be paid based on earnings, but which will, in any event, yield between $15,250,000$ and $18,800,000$. . Do you see that? A. Yes.
Q. Now, how would that risk mitigation item mitigate
the fact that 38 Studios was in a hit-driven business?
A. No. This particular item would not. This again, as I recall, in reading it was designed so that there would be -- the company were as successful as we had all hoped and continued to grow and expand and create jobs here, that this would allow EDC to receive some further compensation for having assisted in the growth of this. But it was out in the future, future earnings of the company, so it did not address the issue you're referring to.
Q. And same with Item 5, that didn't address the prerevenue risk, the non-branded risk, non-dynamic industry risk or hit-driven business risk that Mr. Saul identified in his June 9 presentation, does it?
A. No. This was just, again, I take this to be
a bit of a control on the cash flow. If the -- if
the sales of these games in the first one in particular were to exceed expectations, et cetera, that that money would be set aside, you know, in a reserve fund, as they call it, so that it's the same sort of thing, the money would stay in the company, either to pay back the bonds or fund the growth.
Q. Now, let's turn our attention to the July 15, 2010
board meeting, did you attend that meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was discussed at that meeting? MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. I don't recall. Again, I just don't recall,

Tom, what the subject of each meeting was. I'd
have to review the minutes and refresh my memory.
Q. Do you have any recollection of Mr. Saul's
memorandum being discussed at that meeting?
A. I don't. Sorry.
Q. Do you recall if any board members asked for any
further information as a follow-up to the term sheet that was distributed on July 13 ?
A. No, I don't. There was a lot of meetings, a
lot of different topics. I just don't have a
recollection of specific ones.
25 Q. If I could direct your attention to Exhibit 67.

1 Handing you a copy of Exhibit 67 previously
marked. Now, this document, Exhibit 67, is
comprised of a number of pages that begin with
Bates stamp APS0 00328; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this has attached to it a confidential memo
regarding 38 Studios from Keith; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was from Sharon Penta at the EDC
addressed to board members, including yourself,
via Marge Gartelman, your assistant, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And a copy was also sent to Clare Sedlock, who was
also on your staff, right, third line down on the cc list after Costantino?
A. I'm just curious why it would have been sent
to Clare. She's a scheduler. Maybe to make sure --
Q. Consistent with our earlier conversation, to the
extent Ms. Gartelman would have gotten it, it was
the intention that she would provide this document
to you, Exhibit 67, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe you didn't
receive it at the time?

1 A. No.
2 Q. Now let's take a look at the confidential
memorandum that is attached, next page, APS 329;
do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a memo from Mr. Stokes, the executive
director of the EDC to the board dated July 22,
2010, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you tell me to what extent that you relied
on this July 22nd, 2010 memorandum from Mr. Stokes
in deciding to continue your support for the 38
Studios transaction?
MR. WISTOW: Would you allow him to read the memo?

MR. HOLT: Why don't you read the memo. THE WITNESS: I've got to.
Q. Do you want to take a moment and read Keith

Stokes' memorandum dated July 22, 2010?
A. If I could, please, thank you.

MR. WISTOW: That's what he's doing,
I think.
(WITNESS READING DOCUMENT)
25 A. I didn't take the time, but there is a lot of

1
2 would be a hit or not, the market risk, let me put it that way. The board understood that when you produce these kinds of games, it's like producing a movie, you know, it can be a big hit, it can be a flop, or most likely usually is somewhere in between. And that was a risk the board understood and was willing, based upon the quality, the creative staff, technical team, et cetera, were willing to take. The concern was that their own projections could be met and that the game could be produced within the confines of the financing that had been outlined, and that they agreed to.
Q. When you say --

MR. WISTOW: Are you finished,
was contingent upon there being something in place, an assessment having been done and a monitoring agreement or a performance bond. So this is in response to that, Tom.
Q. Well, let's take that a step at a time. Again, looking at the July 22, 2010 memo that you just described. You said that the board was willing to take the risk, but was concerned that the actual Copernicus game get completed; do you recall
existed on the first game, or failing that, some third-party independent analysis that would give comfort that the assessment would indicate that their projections were reasonable, again, and a mechanism for monitoring it after the fact. So that you could see -- because all these things, you have milestones, benchmarks, there is a process. And you set up, you know, any good company, you set up mechanisms that keep track of that. So that you get sort of an early warning system if your costs are running ahead or you're delaying -- the development is taking longer, you've got to take some action. It's either raise additional capital or reduce your costs. There's two sides to that equation. But you've got to manage that process.

So, the board was concerned that there be a mechanism in place that would give more comfort that that process was being overseen.
20 Q. You indicated that I think, quote, "They had given
cash flow projections." You're referring to 38 Studios?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. And you said that those cash flow projected cash
25 flow revenues, do you remember just saying that to

## Governor?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. WISTOW: Okay.
Q. I'm sorry, Governor. If I interrupt, just hold your hand up and I'll stop. I don't mean to be rude.
A. No, that's good.
Q. Let's go back to their concern. You said that there was a concern on the part of the board that 38 Studios' projections would not be met; do you recall just telling me that?
A. Well, as we talked before, projections are projections, all right. They had given us a projection and the cash flow projection that with the -- end of the term sheet that had been agreed and the financing that we were prepared to give them, and the cash flow that they then projected from sales of the other games, et cetera, and the ramp up of costs that people in the staff, that they had indicated to the board that they could complete Copernicus within that financing and within that cash flow. And so I think the board, you know, some additional caution, was just looking for a way to mitigate that, if you will, by either, A, getting a performance bond as it

## Page 419

1 me?
A. Yes.
Q. And also that they had shown some projections
regarding the ramp up distribution of costs; do you remember telling me that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, did you ever see any set of projections that
showed costs, not simply projected revenues for,
let's say a three- or four-year period, did you ever see a set of cash flows that showed not only revenue, but also anticipated cost disbursements?
A. You know, again, I don't recall, Tom -you're talking about a detailed cash flow that showed the elements of cost, et cetera, and I don't recall, you know.
Q. Did you ever ask for a detailed cash flow
projection?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. And, of course, had you asked for that, you have
no reason to believe that anyone would have
intentionally withheld that from you at EDC?
A. No.

23 Q. Now, but specifically, maybe you could just tell
24 me how did you actually rely upon this July 22,
252010 Stokes memorandum in actually finally saying
yes, I favor the 38 Studios loan? Specifically, what facts in here did you rely upon?
A. Well, not just here, but the discussion that I recall at the board was -- can we get a performance bond to ensure that the money would be available. EDC or whomever went out and the answer came back that, no, that -- what's the company here -- IFG, International Film Guarantors that guaranteed the completion of the first one, which is an RPG, indicated that MMOGs were too new, and they didn't have the protocols in place and all the things, and they were not prepared to do that.

They indicated, as I guess what Keith is reporting here, they might be able to help us in developing those protocols, doing an assessment to tell us that the assumptions that the company had made to the time it takes and the cost to complete this game looked reasonable, and then a mechanism and a process for keeping track -- monitoring on a monthly basis going forward. Because that's what a guarantor will do, they want to make sure, you know, if there's some kind of early warning system in place, if they're getting off track, they being the company is getting off track from their
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projections.
So, the answer to your question is that the
board and I were concerned about that. I think
what came out of this was, you know, a discussion,
I don't remember the details or any -- but IBM wound up as the source, other than IFG, that would do the assessment and would develop the monitoring protocol, and that was important. That was important. I'm not saying it was the whole basis for the decision but, you know, it was an important concern on my part and the board's.
Q. So, you've told me everything you can now recall
about the July 22, 2010 memorandum that you relied upon, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's go back to IFG. You mentioned -- who
is IFG, International Film Guarantors, who did you understand IFG to be?
A. I understood them to be the firm that were
the performance guarantors, the bonding company, if you will, on the first game, Mercury, RPG game.
Q. Okay. And was it your understanding that they
were a specialty line carrier?
A. I don't know enough about them to recall, but

25 they were the people that had done this for the
first game.
Q. Okay. So, IFG -- can we agree IFG was a bonding
company that had issued a bond, performance bond with respect to the RPG game, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And IFG refused, however, to issue a performance
bond with respect to the Copernicus, the MMOG game, right?
A. Yes. They said that's not a business line
that they were in because this was -- the MMOG was an entirely new game and a new product, and there wasn't enough track record in their mind.
Q. Now, I take it the board had directed Mr. Stokes
and Mr. Saul to seek out a company that would provide a performance bond on the MMOG game, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did the board do that?
A. As I said, the board's concern was that the company be able to produce the game and complete the game within the projections and cash flows and the financing we were providing. In other words, if it looked like this was going to be, you know, totally impossible to do, that is, complete the Copernicus game with the financing that we were
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offering and the other elements of the cash flow, then you know, that's something the board would want to know because, obviously, they would need to raise additional capital and, therefore, we would be having a discussion and say, wait a minute, you're going to need another 50 million, 25 million, whatever it is, so where is that going to come from? So it would have been, you know, a more extended process.
Q. And that was a concern that the board had as of July 22nd, 2010, which had caused --
A. I think it came up at the prior meeting which was a response to that.
Q. So the board was concerned that in fact the game
might not be completed and the cash flows achieved within the parameters of the projections, and as a result, wanted to get a performance bond, right? A. Well, the board was -- how would I say it -they were all sort of seeking -- it's like anything else, if you would be mitigating another risk, if you could have a performance bond, something that made sure that the money was going to be available to complete the game, and so that would enhance the transaction, clearly.
25 Q. So, the board then was attempting to mitigate
against a risk that they were concerned about, namely, that the company would need more money to complete the game beyond the -- beyond the net proceeds?
A. They may need more money. In other words, again, you said earlier, I said these are projections, these are people's good faith best estimates of what's going to happen in the future going forward. So, if there were a way, the board felt if there were a way to, you know, lessen that uncertainty with a performance guarantee by a third party, then that would be a positive.
Q. So the board was aware that there was this possibility, at least as of July 15 , that 38 Studios would need funding beyond the net proceeds, and that's one of the reasons why they sought out a performance bond; is that fair to say?
A. I wouldn't say a certain date. I would say
the board generally recognized that in a transaction like this the risk is the company can't complete the project, if you will, with the financing, and although we had, you know, cash flow projections from the company that had been, you know, verified and tested, if you will, by proceeds?
A. All of these things are projections. Okay.

There was a belief that as presented, as reviewed
by independent outside experts, that this project would work, and that this company would be successful. If we didn't believe that, we wouldn't have voted for it. All right.

But like anything else, if there's some insurance you can buy in case something goes wrong, that's all I'm trying to make the distinction. The board didn't just automatically assume they're going to need more money. If we assumed that, we would have been sitting down having a discussion about what, how much more are you going to need and how are you going to get it.
Q. But the board was aware that that possibility
we buy, you know, casualty insurance for, you know
it's not that you expect it's going to happen, but it's possible.
Q. Okay. So the board was aware as of July 26, 2010
that there was a possibility, at least, that that --
A. The board was aware from the beginning that there was a possibility --
Q. That they would need funding beyond the net
some, quote, industry experts, you know, if it were possible to have a performance bond, that would be a good thing and would help in the board's mind to make -- in the eventuality something went wrong would, you know, would mitigate that.
Q. And the board was aware of the risk that, I think
in your words, that 38 Studios would need funding
to complete the project beyond the loan proceeds
and that would have been something they would have been aware of in July --
A. No, I wouldn't say that. The board was not aware, the board was concerned that the possibility could exist and, therefore, is there some way we could protect against that possibility, hence, the performance -- but the board didn't -- we were assuming, based upon all of the input that we got, that this transaction would work as it had been designed, and that they would complete Copernicus, they would complete Mercury, it would be in the market, it would generate revenues.

We accepted that, but there's always a
possibility, you know, something can go wrong and so, you know, it's what we buy life insurance for,

1 existed, they would need more than the net proceeds, right?

MR. WISTOW: Asked and answered.
A. Yes.
Q. And that was one of the motivating factors going
out and seeking the performance bond, right?
A. It was to ensure against the risk that that would occur.
Q. Now, IFG didn't issue a performance bond, right;
you told me that a few questions back?
MR. WISTOW: For Copernicus.
MR. HOLT: For Copernicus, right.
A. Correct.
Q. Did that raise any red flags for the board when that happened?
A. Well, I think it was explained in the context of this is a different game, it's a more complex game and, therefore, I don't think it was necessarily a surprise, there wasn't a lot of expertise or, you know, a lot of experience, let me put it that way, in watching the development of MMOGs, and hence a history that anybody that's going to ensure it could rely on it.

So, I don't think the board was shocked. I
wasn't, that they were not prepared to issue a
performance bond for Copernicus.
Q. Are you familiar with the term uninsurable risk?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you understand that term to mean?
A. The risk is too great for anyone to insure.
Q. And that's what happened in this case with IFG,
right?
A. Well, you will have to ask them. What I said
is they were apparently unwilling to issue a
performance bond on this. They just didn't feel comfortable doing it.
Q. Hence, they were not willing to insure against a
risk of non-completion of Copernicus, according to
the projected schedules, right?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, Mr. Subramaniam was on the board, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you appointed Mr. Subramaniam?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was the CEO of FM Global, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what's the business of FM Global?
A. Casualty insurance.
Q. Is it sometimes his work called specialty line carrier?
lower right-hand corner?
A. Yes.
Q. And that, just so you're aware, the convention
being used here in terms of labeling documents to identify the source of the documents typically is the letters in front of the number, and this stands for Office of the Governor, okay. Do you understand that?
A. Uh-huh -- yes. I'm sorry.
Q. Now, this document is an e-mail from --
(OFF THE RECORD)
MR. WISTOW: Just so it's not a
mystery, what happened is during the discovery requests made to the Office of the Governor for certain documents, and this document was produced by the Office of the Governor. That's what that means.
Q. Now, Governor, this is, on its face an e-mail from

Clare Sedlock; she was your scheduler, right?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. And it's dated Friday, July 23, 2010, right?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And that would have been two days before or three
24 days before the July 26 meeting that was held to
25 have the vote approving the 38 Studios loan,

1 A. I don't know enough about their business.
They started out insuring against fires and casualties, that's what they did for businesses.
Q. Now, as among all of the EDC board members that
you appointed, who do you believe, at least as of July 26, 2010, had the most expertise in the area of insurance matters?
A. Well, you know, Shivan was very experienced
in casualty insurance of, you know, companies.
That's what their business is, so he understands insurance risk.
(MR. CONNOLLY ENTERED AT THIS POINT)
Q. That's Shivan Subramaniam we're talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Now let's take a look at -- I'll withdraw that question.

MR. WISTOW: Let's take a five-minute
break.
MR. HOLT: Okay.
(BRIEF RECESS)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the
record.
Q. Governor, I'm going to have you take a look at

Exhibit 515, please. Exhibit 515, which has the
Bates stamp OOG 03987; do you see that in the

1 right?
A. Yes.

3 Q. This is from Ms. Sedlock addressed to Andrew
4 Hodgkin, your chief of staff, right?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Amy Kempe, who was your communications director,
7 right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Jamia McDonald, right?
A. Yes.

1 Q. Also copied are two other staff members, Chris
DiFilippo in your office, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Donna Dell'Aquila, right?
A. Yes.
Q. This appears to have attached to it the same
information, it was attached to Exhibit 122 that was the e-mail from Sharon Penta at EDC attaching the Stokes memorandum of July 22, the term sheet as well as some other documents, right?
A. Well, 122 that I have, Tom, only has the
draft term sheet and then the back sheet --
MR. HOLT: Memorandum, okay.
24 A. But it does not have the confidential
25 memorandum here that you're referring to. That's

| Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation Wells Fargo Securities, LLC | vs $\begin{array}{r}\text { Donald Carcieri - Vol. III } \\ \text { August 22, } 2014\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Page 434 | Page 436 |
| 167. | 1 A. Yes. |
| 2 Q. I'm sorry, forgive me. I misspoke here. Exhibit | 2 Q. Let's go to Exhibit D-6, if we can return to that |
| 3 67. - | 3 for a moment. |
| 4 A. Okay. | 4 A. D-6, okay. |
| 5 Q. -- Exhibit 67 you will recall was the Sharon Penta | 5 Q . And this is an e-mail that was sent a little less |
| 6 e-mail of July 22, we've been discussing a few | 6 than two weeks before the e-mail from Ms. Sedlock |
| 7 questions back, right? | 7 to Ms. McDonald, right? |
| 8 A. Yes. | 8 A. Yeah, this is an e-mail from Mike Saul. |
| 9 Q. And the -- point of clarification, Exhibit 67 was | 9 Q. Correct? |
| 10 an e-mail sent by Sharon Penta on Thursday, July | 10 A. To Maureen Gurghigian and Rosemary Gallogly. |
| 11 22, 2010 at 10:59 P.M.; do you see that? | 11 Q. A copy of which went to Jamia McDonald? |
| 12 A. Yes. | 12 A. Yes. I assume -- this is the one we went |
| 13 Q. So that would have been after business hours, | 13 through before that was in response to Rosemary |
| 14 right? | 14 questions, okay. |
| 15 A. Yes. | 15 Q. Yes. Now Mr. Saul would have been sending this to |
| 16 Q. Now let's take a look at Exhibit 515; do you see | 16 Ms. McDonald as your deputy chief of staff, right? |
| 17 that? | 17 A. Yes. |
| 18 A. Yes. | 18 Q. Now let's go back to -- |
| 19 Q. And that is from Ms. Sedlock to Mr. Hodgkin, Ms. | 19 A. But this is something I did not see, I don't |
| 20 Kempe and Ms. McDonald, and that is the following | 20 recall seeing this. |
| 21 morning at 10:52, after Exhibit 67 was e-mailed to | 21 MR. WISTOW: That's Exhibit D-6? |
| 22 the board, right? | 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 23 A. I'm trying to follow you here, Tom. The | 23 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that -- let me |
| 24 one -- I'm sorry, I'm on the wrong page. Yes, the | 24 go back. We're on Exhibit 515 -- I'll withdraw |
| 25 next morning. | 25 that question. We're going to move on, here, I |
| Page 435 | Page 437 |
| 1 Q. Okay. Now, this contains, the memorandum that | 1 think. I'm going to direct your attention to |
| 2 Mr. Stokes, and I'm saying this, Exhibit 515, had | 2 Exhibit 85, which it should be two more down, |
| 3 the Stokes memorandum as well as the draft term | 3 Governor, the very bottom one, I believe |
| 4 sheet? | 4 A. The minutes of July 26, yes |
| 5 THE WITNESS: This is all the same | 5 Q . These are the meeting minutes of both the public |
| 6 information? | 6 and private session of the July 26 board meeting |
| 7 MR. HOLT: Yes. | 7 where the board voted to proceed with the 38 |
| 8 Q. So this would have been sent by Ms. Sedlock, your | 8 Studios loan, right |
| 9 scheduler, and it would have been sent to | 9 A. Yes, I see the public -- |
| 10 Mr. Hodgkin, Ms. Kempe and McDonald on that | 10 Q. Now, either the public session or the private |
| 11 Friday, again, the following morning after the | 11 session of the July 26th, 2010 board meeting, did |
| 12 previous evening's e-mail from EDC, right? | 12 the board see any additional reports or |
| 13 A. I'm trying to figure out how she got it. | 13 presentations other than those that were presented |
| 14 Q. Well -- | 14 at the July -- the June 14 -- actually, let m |
| 15 A. Oh, she's cc'd on the first one -- | 15 withdraw that question. I'm going to ask you a |
| 16 Q. She was cc'd on the first one - | 16 new question. Let's go -- again, we're on Exhibit |
| 17 A. -- because they had a date she had to crank | 17 85, let's go to the public session. Do you see |
| 18 into the schedule. | 18 that -- and those public session meeting minutes |
| 19 Q. And I take it Ms. Sedlock would have been sending | 19 are on the first page here? |
| 20 this e-mail with the attachments to Mr. Hodgkin in | 20 A. Yes. |
| 21 his capacity as your chief of staff, right? | 21 Q. And it goes on to, then, to the second page of |
| 22 A. Yes. | 22 Exhibit 85? |
| 23 Q. And she would have been sending it to Ms. McDonald | 23 A. Yes. |
| 24 in her capacity as your deputy chief of staff, | 24 Q. Now, do the meeting minutes of the public session |
| 25 right? | 25 indicate whether or not any additional |

presentations or reports were presented to the EDC
board concerning the 38 Studios loan transaction?
You can take a minute to look through that.
A. I'm just looking, trying to see because there
was a number of matters taken up beforehand.
Q. I'm confining your attention now to the public session.
A. Yup -- yes.
Q. I guess this is all public session, I'm sorry.
A. I was just going to say I don't think I recall --
Q. Forgive me, I'm confusing this unnecessarily.

Confining your attention to Exhibit 85, they are the meeting minutes of the public session of the July 26, 2010 board meeting, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is there any reference in Exhibit 85, the

July 26, 2010 meeting minutes, regarding any presentations or reports that were presented to the board at that time on July 26 concerning the 38 Studios loan transaction?
A. Well, I'd have to read them, Tom, here, I
just don't know.
MR. HOLT: Why don't you take a
minute and read it.

MR. HOLT: It is.
THE WITNESS: A whole bunch of -Mr. HOLT: It is -- let's go towards the end.

THE WITNESS: I see some RIEDC so maybe I'm honing in on it here, Max.

MR. WISTOW: Why don't I just hand you --
THE WITNESS: Ta-da. I got it.
Q. Other than Exhibit D, which on its face purports
to be and, again, I'm referring to Exhibit D as a sub exhibit of Exhibit 887?

MR. WISTOW: 85.
Q. 85. This is a slide dec. of a presentation that
was made at that board meeting, right?
A. I assume. As I said earlier, I just don't
recollect what was given at what board meeting, but if this is attached as an exhibit, I'm assuming that it was.
Q. Okay. Now, other than this presentation, sub

Exhibit D to Exhibit 85, that was the only presentation that was made at the July 26th, 2010 public meeting, correct?
24 A. I just -- I don't recall, but if these are
25 the minutes and this is what it's reflecting, I

1 A. I see Mike Saul referring to Exhibit D but --

## comment on.

Q. If I were to suggest to you that Exhibit D refers
to a version of the Wells Fargo slide dec. that was -- I'm sorry, Exhibit D refers to the RIEDC board meeting July 26, 2010 presentation, that's attached to Exhibit 85; do you see that?
A. No, I'm lost there.
Q. Okay. Let's go in, again, confining our attention
to exhibit --
MR. WISTOW: Can I show him what
you're talking about. Exhibit D on its face says
July 26, 2010.
THE WITNESS: Where is it, it's deep
in here?
accept that.
Q. Let's go back into the minutes, go to the first
page of Exhibit 85.
A. Yes.

5 Q. If we take a look at the page numbered Page 7 of
6 Exhibit 85.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see on the fourth paragraph down?

THE WITNESS: On the risk analysis
side?
MR. HOLT: Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And there Mr. Saul is pointing out again risks associated with the 38 Studios loan, namely, that it's an investment in the prerevenue company, a binary revenue stream, the fact the company is focused on a hit-driven product and concentration of 60 percent of the state's Job Creation Program to one company, right?
A. That's what it says, yes.

21 Q. Again, we know the board was well aware of those
risks on July 26, 2010 when it voted in favor of the loan, right?
24 A. Yes, because the next paragraph describes all
25 the positives.
Q. Well, let's take a look at that -- you say
positives, it talks about experienced management, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it goes on and talks about an ROI, that means return on investment, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says as a positive there would be a total

ROI to the state of 47 percent, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How was that calculated?
A. I don't recall. You know, frankly, from my perspective, I can't speak for the other board members, this was not a significant item. We entered into this or went into this transaction with a goal to -- have a company relocate here, employ lots of people here, hopefully grow and expand and be a real beacon for new industry in our state that's, and then understanding all the risks in that. What the state's return on investment, to me personally, was not a significant factor. I don't remember how they calculated it. It was all based on a bunch of assumptions, I'm sure.
Q. Is there anything that you know now that you wish
you had known on July 26, 2010 before that vote was taken?
A. I wouldn't -- you know, when you look back with 20/20 hindsight, you know, there is a number of different questions. I think the issue, from my perspective, I felt the board did its work, did a lot of due diligence, required outside input into that process, understood the risks, understood the benefits and made a decision balancing all those that they thought would be good for our state and, you know, good in terms of all the things I said, in creating new jobs, new industry, et cetera. I wouldn't say there's anything necessarily that I can't look back and answer that question from where I am here today.
Q. Nothing comes to mind other than what you've just
told us?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at exhibit -- stay on
that page, let's go to the next page, Page Number
8. If we go down to the bottom paragraph.
A. Yes.

23 Q. And basically the sixth line down which begins
24 with, "In this field," do you see that?
25 A. Last paragraph.

1 Q. That begins with Governor Carcieri?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And these meeting minute notes purport to
essentially provide notes of a statement that you
made at that July 26, 2010 meeting, right?
A. Yes.
Q. It says on the sixth line down, quote, "He,"
referring to you, "Agrees that there is risk, but
that it is a risk worth taking." Do you recall making that statement or using words to that effect at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did you have in mind when you used those
words, or words to that effect?
A. Just what it says here. Just what I said a moment ago, this was an -- we all felt -- by the way, I'm not reflecting my own view. I think the vast majority, with one exception, and that exception was not excited about the company, it was just concerned with the amount, but we were very hopeful, very excited and hopeful that this could be something very positive for the state with lots of high-paying jobs as the presentation here indicated, dovetailed with expertise that were producing at our hired institutions.

Understood there was risk. There's always risk in these things, but there were mitigating factors in that, and that it was a risk worth our taking and that I was supportive of that.
Q. Let's go on to the next page, Page 9, the top paragraph. It says, "Mr. Wadensten asked where the money would come from if it turns out the company needs more? To which Governor Carcieri explained, 'The company could get more investors, if nothing else.'" Do you recall that conversation with Mr. Wadensten?
A. Yes, there was a back-and-forth with Karl, yes.
Q. And Karl -- when you say Karl, you're referring to

Mr. Wadensten, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your understanding Mr. Wadensten was
concerned that if in fact projections weren't met, where would the company get additional money? A. Yes.
Q. And you responded -- explained that the company could get more investors, if nothing else. So, at least as of July 26, 2010, you believed that in the event that the projections were not met, that 38 Studios would go out and get additional capital
to provide whatever shortfall there might be?
A. I believe that they would have options, like
any good business. If they needed additional capital as their business was unfolding -- in fact, I believed that the transaction the state was doing in the loan guarantee would in fact strengthen the likelihood and possibilities for raising capital if they needed to, but that was -this was sort of just a side, what happens if they need more money than we're providing here, and the answer was, well, they're going to have to -that's a possibility, the projections were, and they signed the term sheet, that said they believed that they could live with and could produce Copernicus with the financing that we were providing, and it's on that basis that the board approved it.
Q. With the expectation if there was a shortfall,
that 38 Studios would go out and raise additional capital, right?
A. Always the possibility, yes, that they might possibly need more, and they would have to raise that capital, yeah.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that Wells Fargo at any time made any statements or representations
that were in any way false and misleading to the EDC board?
A. No. I would say nothing that was false and
misleading that I can recall.
MR. HOLT: Thank you. I'm going to
take a break here.
MR. DOLAN: Is this lunch?
(OFF THE RECORD)
(BRIEF RECESS)
(DEFENDANTS' EXHIBITS 912 AND 914
MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record.
Q. Governor, I'm going to show you Exhibit 912 for
identification, please, and before we specifically
get into that, you executed two affidavits in
connection with this case, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And who asked you to execute these affidavits?
A. Max Wistow's office.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Max Wistow.

23 Q. And was that a telephone call to you or --
24 A. Initially it was a telephone call to me and
25 then, you know, I engaged Bob Flanders from
you signed that affidavit, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's look at the bottom left-hand corner, it
has a number on it, 50934297; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what that number signifies?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Now, before executing this on October 3rd, how
many conversations did you have with Mr. Wistow?
A. No, I didn't have any beyond the first one.
The conversations I had were with Bob Flanders.
Q. From that point forward Mr. Flanders had the
communication with Mr. Wistow?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, this actual physical document, Exhibit
912, the one-page affidavit which has two
attachments, one is the inducement resolution and
the second one is the July 22, 2010 executive
session -- executive directors of the EDC's memo
to you and the board, right?
A. Well, I see -- I have got to go through this.
There's a resolution authorizing the issuance and
sale. That's the inducement resolution. The next
one I have looks like the term sheet which was
signed by 38 Studios, and then the letter from
Keith about the -- you know, having an insurance
bond on there. And then this looks like a term
sheet that was changed. This was the
presentation, apparently.
Q. And as you sit here today, do you have any
specific memory of having reviewed those
attachments to your Exhibit 912 before you
executed your affidavit?
A. It was about at the same time. I think these
were forwarded, you know, to me from Bob Flanders,
and that was the first that I had seen them.
Q. And was it your understanding that Mr. Flanders
had gotten them from Mr. Wistow's office?
A. Again, I don't know.
Q. Now, focusing on 912, the affidavit, which bears
the date October 3, 2012. Did you write this out
in longhand or type this before it was put into
its final -- you, yourself?

1 A. I don't remember. I'm not good at that, Tom, so I don't -- I think, if I recall, this was something that Bob had drafted and sent it to me and, you know, I don't have a printer at home, I must have printed it off somewhere, probably my daughter's, and then signed this.
Q. Without asking you the substance of the
conversation you had with Mr. Flanders, are you
telling me that you would have had a conversation
with Mr. Flanders, Mr. Flanders would have reduced
that conversation to writing in the form of an
affidavit, sent it to you for your review, and you would have signed it?
A. Yes.

MR. DeSISTO: Hold on. You've
answered, but you're getting close to
attorney/client.
MR. HOLT: I'm not asking -- I'm
trying to get the process here.
A. The process is correct.
Q. And are these all your words that you would have actually drafted in the first instance?

MR. DeSISTO: Objection. Hold on.
Let me think about that.
MR. DOLAN: What was the question?

1 (QUESTION READ)

5 Q. Let's go on to the next -- did there come a time
when you executed a second affidavit with some changes?
A. I don't recall. I think I only executed one, you know, one affidavit. There were discussions
10 about different, you know, feedback from Bob in
11 terms of different iterations and something that I
12 was comfortable with.
13 Q. Well, let's take a look at Paragraph 1, it states
14 here in your sworn affidavit you say, "In my
15 capacity as Governor of Rhode Island during 2010,
16 I served as chairman of the board of directors of
17 the Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation,
18 EDC." Did I read that correctly?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. And in fact, it was in your capacity as Governor
21 was the reason you were actually serving on that
22 board?
23 A. Yeah. It's statutory, right.
24 Q. Statutory. So let's go down to Paragraph 3, it
25 says that -- can you read the first sentence of

1 Paragraph 3 aloud, please?
2 A. It says, "I understood based on Exhibit A to the resolution and the presentation and representations by the staff of the EDC that the proceeds of the EDC loan authorized by the resolution, together with other cash available or to become available to 38 Studios as set forth in the 38 Studios' financial projections would be sufficient to fund the so-called MMOG game, Project Copernicus, to completion."
Q. What did you mean when you used the words,
"Together with other cash available or to become available to 38 Studios as set forth in the 38 Studios' financial projections"?
A. Just what we've been talking about, as I recall, 38 Studios' projections projected revenues coming in from the RPG, since it was going to come out first before Copernicus. So there was -- all I was saying here or trying to reiterate is that I, as most of the board members, were relying on the presentation made and the representation signed by 38 Studios. They signed that term sheet and that letter, that the proceeds, net proceeds of our financing would be sufficient.
Q. But you say, "Together with other cash available
or to become available"?
A. As set forth -- well, I think the projection
just said there was other cash flow than our funding, that's all.
Q. As we've agreed on numerous occasions, in all
fairness in your deposition, those projections
were just what the name applies, there was no certainty to that, right?
A. We said that many times. These are
projections that were done, reviewed by independent people to give us the sense of reasonableness.
Q. And to the extent that those -- that other cash available or which might become available in fact did not become available because the assumptions and the projections were not met, 38 Studios would have to seek some additional funding from some other source, right?
A. We said that earlier. If they did not have enough money, then they would have to, you know, find some other sources of financing, but the presumption was there was a reasonable expectation that this financing would provide them what they needed to get the job done.
25 Q. Now, this affidavit does not mention Wells Fargo,
does it, specifically?
A. No.
Q. Governor, I'm going to have you take a look at
what's been marked for identification purposes as
5 Exhibit 914.
MR. DOLAN: Were there additional copies?

MR. VALENTE: I handed them out.
Q. Now, Exhibit 914 is a second affidavit that was on
its face executed by you on October 14
approximately 11 days after your October 3
affidavit, Exhibit 913, we've just been talking
about, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go down to Paragraph 4. You say that, "I
also reviewed and relied upon a July 22, 2010 memorandum that I received from the EDC's Executive Director Keith Stokes, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 2." In what respect specifically did you rely upon the July 22, 2010 memorandum that you've just referenced here?
A. I can't remember what it was here, so let me see what it was. This was just the discussion, you know, the possibility of having a guarantee
a protocol for monitoring it to go forward. So this was important to the board, I think, if I recall, I've got to look back, I may be getting confused here, the board made it clear -- Keith's memo here says that I will not proceed to closing without -- "If such a mechanism is not achieved to our reasonable satisfaction." So there was concern, and it proceeded, we assumed the assessment was going to be done and then the monitoring protocol put in place.
Q. But that July 22nd, 2010 memorandum from

Mr. Stokes to the board doesn't mention Wells Fargo having any responsibility of that?
A. No.
Q. No. Okay. Let's go to Paragraph 5 of Exhibit 914, that is an additional paragraph to the four numbered paragraphs in your October 3, 2012 affidavit, Exhibit 912, right?
have been a suggestion on his part, but I just don't recall.
insurance for completion.
Q. But Paragraph 4 says you relied upon that, but we
know the insurance wasn't issued because IFG
refused to insure against the risk of non-completion of Copernicus, right?
A. Yes. We said that in the memo. All I'm
trying to get at is that this memo and these other
things were part of the information flow that was
presented to me and the other board members in the
course of making the decision we made.
Q. How specifically did you rely upon the July 22,

2010 memorandum from Mr. Stokes?
A. Well, as I said, I think there was a lengthy
conversation, to repeat myself, about the
possibility of securing insurance for the completion, because that was a concern of mine, a concern of the board's. Keith and the team, I don't know who, but the team at EDC, you know, pursued that. But there were no commercially available products out there. In the alternative they came up with another option, which was IBM who was commissioned, my understanding, to do an assessment of the plan, if you will, the cash flows in the plan, the timing, et cetera, that 38
Studios had done. And in addition to that, set up

[^0]1 Chambers have prepared this e-mail and the attachments thereto?

MR. WISTOW: If you know.
A. I don't know why she prepared it. I'm just presuming that in her job she's responding, so she wanted a set of bullet points that would summarize or -- yes.
Q. Summarize the transaction?
A. Yeah. Be able to answer inquiries from the media.
Q. Essentially provide talking points to the board, right?
A. Not to the board. I think it was more -- as

I recall -- it does say -- prefer that, you know, comments or inquiries be channeled to the communications department not -- if you can avoid everybody talking, it's a better thing.
Q. Now, the next to the last paragraph says, "Over
the next few weeks we anticipate more coverage regarding the transaction and urge you to reach out to Keith or meet with questions and comments." Lastly, it says, "Attached is an updated terms and conditions fact sheet." Do you see that?
A. Yes.

25 Q. Let's go to the terms and conditions fact sheet
that's attached to the e-mail you received, Exhibit 756. The third item down it says, " 38
Studios receives approximately $\$ 50$ million of the $\$ 75$ million bond"?

MR. WISTOW: It actually says 51.
That's material. I guess a million bucks is material to some people; not to you, Mr. Holt.
Q. Governor, do you have this exhibit --
A. Yes, I do.

10 Q. Go down to the third bullet which says, " 38
11 Studios receives approximately $\$ 51$ million of the
12 \$75 million bond proceeds." Do you see that?
A. Right.
Q. And so was it your understanding that at least as
of September 8 that 38 Studios was going to receive approximately $\$ 24$ million less than the face amount of the bond offering?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And to the extent that 38 Studios had indicated on various occasions it was going to require $\$ 75$ million to essentially complete the project, where were they going to get that $\$ 24$ million shortfall?
24 A. Well, the term sheet said that the net
25 proceeds that they signed, you know, would be
something less, not for sure, but that and other cash flows, revenues from the first game and other cash flows would be providing the funding they required.
Q. So that all assumed that the $\$ 24$ million shortfall
would have been provided by 38 Studios having met
all of its revenue projections, correct?
MR. WISTOW: Object to the form, shortfall.
A. Well, met its projections. All right. They understood this, they had projections, and if they felt this was going to put them in a deep hole and a big problem, I would have thought before they signed it they would flag that up. So the presumption was they understood in the cash flow here that there were other funding -- proceeds from the sale of the first game, et cetera, that would provide the cash they needed.
Q. So the other funding that you're referring to
would have been coming from revenues generated by the sale of product by 38 Studios, right?
A. That's what they had in their cash flow.
Q. And do you know if anything that was in any projections that were presented by 38 Studios to anyone at the EDC was somehow in error? Do you
have any reason to believe that's the cases?
A. No. They were given and we had staff review
them. So if the staff, you know, found an error,
reviewed them and thought they were in error, they
would have flagged that up to the board or to the company.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that any of the
projections that were provided by 38 Studios to
the EDC were in any way false or misleading?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that Keith

Stokes intentionally withheld any material information regarding the financial circumstance of 38 Studios from the EDC board prior to July 26, 2010?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that anyone intentionally withheld any material financial information regarding the 38 Studios from the board prior to July 26 ?
A. No, I would hope not. By the way, she must have drafted these because the first one actually is not correct. " 75 million loan guarantee will assist 38 Studios in obtaining private financing," that's not -- that may have been her
understanding; that's not the transaction. So, unfortunately, I think this was a draft by the communications people.
Q. This would have been reviewed by anyone on your
staff before it went out?
A. Not my staff. This came from EDC, so...
Q. But again, going back to I think a principle we've
established in this deposition, the revenue
projections as a means of providing the difference
between the $\$ 75$ million in face proceeds and net proceeds was simply something based on a projection with no guarantee that that could happen, right?
A. Yes. There's no guarantees. We were trying to see if we could get a guarantee in the form of insurance, but that was not doable.
Q. The insurance company refused to issue that type of guarantee, right?
A. Well, there was not a product in the market
for -- this is a new game, an MMOG, and it had just not anything commercially available, I think is what they said.
Q. So the short answer is you were unable to obtain a commercially available product in the marketplace to insure against that risk, right?

1 A. Right. That's why we undertook the second
step, which was to engage IBM to do an assessment that would have given some reasonableness, judgments about, you know, the plan that they had for completing the game and then set in place a whole protocol for monitoring against those benchmarks.

MR. HOLT: I have no further questions. Tender the witness.

MR. WISTOW: Let's take a lunch break.

MR. HOLT: Are you going to ask any questions, Max?

MR. WISTOW: I don't know. I'm going
to think about it.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
record, this is the end of Disk Number 2.
(LUNCH RECESS 12:34 TO 1:20 P.M.)
(MESSRS. EDWARDS AND GLADSTONE
PRESENT AFTER LUNCH RECESS)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, this is the beginning of Disk Number 3.

EXAMINATION BY MR. DOLAN
Q. Good afternoon, Governor.

25 A. Good after, Bill.

1 Q. As you know, I represent Robert Stolzman and
2 Adler, Pollock \& Sheehan in this case. I have some questions that will follow up to Mr. Holt's inquiries. I'll try not to duplicate things, but there's some topical areas we may have to go over again just to satisfy my clients' inquiries. Let me just say this, I have tremendous respect for you, and I know we've interacted a lot over years, and I don't want you to take away from any of my questions that I mean any disrespect whatsoever. I have to inquire because of the nature of the allegations --
A. You got a job to do, I understand that.
Q. -- that have been asserted against my client.

I'll do so as respectfully as I can and, please, don't take anything I say or ask as anything indicating otherwise. Okay. So this 38 Studios transaction was a very important transaction for the RIEDC, was it not?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. In fact, during the course of your administration, this was one of the biggest, if not the biggest transaction that RIEDC undertook, correct?
A. Yes. Of this nature, a loan guarantee.

25 Q. Right. At the time that the transaction was

1 considered by the RIEDC board in 2010, the Rhode
2 Island economy was suffering significantly, right?
3 A. Yeah. We got hit hard by the recession.
4 Q. There was substantial unemployment, correct, in
5 the state?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, at one point the highest unemployment
rate in the entire country, correct?
A. I don't know if we got that honor, but we
were pretty high.
Q. But up in one or two, right?
A. It was very high, but we got hurt very hard with the housing bust.
Q. As a consequence of that, the RIEDC board had undertaken a process in early 2010 to try to recast the organization itself, right?
A. Yeah. There was a very lengthy, you know, process where the board, the whole organization was restructured with, you know, new statutes, et cetera. The board reconstituted, like I said earlier, one of the sessions that we used to have an economic policy council that was separate from this. It was a lengthy process that we went through, and also as part of that process, once it had been restructured, undertook a nationwide
search for a new executive director. So, yeah, a lot of focus on economic development.
Q. And part of the objective of that reorganization was to try to identify companies in sort of the knowledge and information sector, correct?
A. Well, one -- we had identified, if memory serves me, Bill, you know, six or seven different areas. We already had a large marine trade industry here, defense is very important, large here in the state, and so we were looking at, you know, segments of the economy and where there was growth potential and the whole -- well, digital media was an area that had some interest because, as you're aware, and I think I said earlier, Hasbro has built a studio here. RISD and a number of institutions were producing people with those backgrounds, and it seemed to be -- gaming, you know, a big new area, but we had had conversations years before about a studio, a movie studio that did digital animation that was on the West Coast about relocating here. So this had been an area that we had talked about and focused on.
Q. So when the opportunity first presented itself, it was attractive to you as a member of the RIEDC board, correct?

1 Q. And you would say, would you not, that the board
did carefully consider all the material that was presented to it by way of written material or presentations that were presented by either the EDC staff and/or the outside consultants?
A. Yeah, that would be my judgment. They were
all conscientious people, and they did that.
Q. You mentioned something about the nature of the
people on the board, these were people from
various businesses in the state, correct?
A. Yes, some of the largest, you know, big
businesses in our state.
Q. And these were people that you trusted enough to appoint yourself to the board, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And among the persons that you appointed were
people who were very experienced and savvy business people, correct?
A. Yeah. I would, you know, consider we had
some labor leadership there, we had -- I don't
mean that negatively.
Q. I don't mean to overstate the cast.
A. I don't mean that, but I mean, we had a good
representation. Lynn Singleton, running an entertainment with PPAC and Veterans and, you

1 A. Yes.
Q. And it was in an area that the RIEDC in fact had a
charge to grow in, right?
A. Well, it was an area we had identified as
having good potential, we felt, for the state.
Q. I take it you would agree with me, would you not,
that given the importance of this opportunity, the
38 Studios opportunity, it was important for the
board to deliberate carefully over whether to do
the transaction or not, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd also agree with me, would you not, that
it was important for the board to carefully consider any materials that were provided to it by the EDC staff and/or the outside consultants that had been engaged, correct?
A. Yes. Of all my years on the board, the board spent more time on this transaction than anything we had ever done. As I think I said earlier, we had two meetings that were special meetings just devoted to this transaction, and these were people on the board that had very important roles in the community, and so the time that they put into this and listening to the presentations that were made, there was a lot of effort that went into it.
know, so we had a really good board. Tim Babineau running Rhode Island Hospital as well as industrial, insurance. So we had, in my judgment, we had some really outstanding people.
Q. People who were capable of understanding and analyzing financial information, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you yourself, for instance, having extensive
credit background, correct?
A. Yeah, but keep in mind, too, these are people
that are serving without pay as a public service and that are concerned about the state. So, you know, when you sit on a board like that, particularly people like that, and my role, you got lots of other responsibilities. You are relying heavily, heavily on the staff.
Q. I understand --
A. And the consultants, et cetera, and advisors you bring in. That's the nature of what you do. Q. To the extent you were relying on the staff and consultants, you would, as a director, necessarily have to read and consider what it was that those persons were presenting to you, correct?
24 A. Yes. But keep in mind, too, some of these,
25 they're lengthy and were going to be
presentations. So, you know, speaking for myself, it might be -- all these things generally have executive summaries. You generally go through in detail, then a lot of backup. From my standpoint you kind of go through the backup, get a sense, and then you wait for the presentation, because that's where you get the opportunity and ask questions.
Q. Okay. Now I think you've said that the
transaction, that 38 Studios transaction was first presented to the full EDC board in or about June of 2010 , right?
A. I believe that's the case. I don't remember
the exact dates, but you know the first meeting and presentation to the board of this possibility was about that time frame.
Q. Now, yourself had learned about the prospect of a transaction involving RIEDC and 38 Studios before that, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you had some very early involvement in
the possibility of a transaction involving 38
Studios, correct?
A. Well, I don't know what you mean by early
involvement. As I've indicated previously, my
heard of the prospect, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And at the time, to your knowledge, no other
member of the board was aware of that at that time?
A. To my knowledge, I was the first.
Q. Okay. And there were some other directors that
learned of the possibility of the transaction before it was considered by the full board in June of 2010 ; isn't that right?
A. I don't know that. I don't -- it's very possible. I don't know that, Bill.
Q. All right. For instance, are you aware that Mr. Steve Lane, a member of the board, had some knowledge about the prospect of the transaction before it actually was considered by the full board in June of 2010?
A. Timing, I won't recollect. I do remember
that I think it was Keith or Mike Saul or whatever, reached out to Steve. He had some background and experience in start-ups and new companies and digital, and he had offered apparently to, you know, take a look at it. When that occurred in relation to the board meetings, it's very possible it was before the actual board
wife and I had gone to a family -- actually, to a fund-raiser at Curt Schilling's house for PBS, and in the course of that, which I do often, is just, what-are-you-doing kind of thing. And out of that he said he had a gaming studio he started, bought a company down in, I think it was Philadelphia, and they were excited about the growth prospects.

So, you know, I relayed that to Keith at EDC as a possible lead on something, not knowing anything about the company, nothing whatsoever. And then it just, you know, went from there.

The conversations I would have had outside the board meeting, I think Keith had said, you know, I don't remember when, but my recollection would be, you know, there could be something here.
They really are interested, they have a need, they're growing and, you know, there were those kind of conversations, but nothing definitive or in great detail. We didn't even have a loan program, at that point, a guarantee program, so -Q. Right -- but that information -- I'm sorry, had you finished?
23 A. No. No go ahead.
24 Q. That information you learned as a consequence of
25 going to that fund-raiser, that was the first you
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presentation, but I don't --
Q. I understand. Who was it that involved Mr. Lane
in that exercise?
4 A. I don't know.
5 Q. Did you learn of that from Mr. Stokes?
6 A. Again, I can't say with certainty. I know at
some point that it was -- I think it might have
even been reported to the board that Steve but --
Steve Lane was helping a little bit, giving, you know, his viewpoint on this company or the industry.
Q. Did you have any involvement in having Mr. Lane do that?
A. Not to my knowledge. I don't remember any
conversation. It's possible Keith said, you know, would it be okay if I asked Steve. That's possible, I don't remember.
Q. If Mr. Stokes testifies that you asked Mr. Lane to get involved with that, would you dispute that?
A. You know, not necessarily. I just don't
recall. I just don't recall. I like Steve a lot. He represented a whole aspect of the economy in the state that this sort of -- it had some similarities, wasn't exactly what he was doing.
He was a guy who was pretty familiar with that; so
it's very possible.
Q. If Mr. Stokes said that, you wouldn't dispute that?
A. Yeah. I would not dispute that.
Q. How about Mr. Verrecchia, was Mr. Verrecchia
apprised of the 38 Studios transaction before the
full board considered it in June of 2010?
A. Again, I don't recall. It's very possible.

Al is vice chairman. He was also, you know,
10 heavily involved in the restructuring of the whole process we went through. So it's possible, Bill, I might have asked him, or Keith or somebody suggested that Al might, because, again, Hasbro had evolved and built a studio here and digital media was something they had some familiarity with, that's very possible.
Q. If other people involved in the case testified that Mr. Verrecchia learned about the possibility of the transaction before the full board in June of 2010, you really would have no basis to dispute that?
A. No. No.
Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about your role in this early stage before the June, I think it's the June 9, 2010 meeting of the board where this is
first outlined. Tell me what, as best you can recall, what your role was in that early period before the proposed transaction was first presented to the full board in June of 2010? A. I'm trying to think back, Bill, you know, because from the time, which was I think in March or something, when I was at Schilling's house, and thought I was giving a lead to EDC, subsequently I find out there's lots of conversations going on unbeknownst to me before that, so I wasn't the first, but I didn't know that at the time. Then, you know, it was periodically after an EDC meeting or if I would see Keith, is anything happening? He might verbally say, you know, we're having discussions, it looks interesting.

I don't remember, I might have met, you know, Schilling at EDC before the first board, I don't think so, but it's possible he could have been there in discussions, and Keith asked before a board meeting to come in and sit down and say hello. But I was not involved in any negotiation, any structuring any of that. It was just sort of being apprised of whether this thing was progressed to something that the board should consider or not.

1 Q. What, if any, direction did you give Mr. Stokes
about what he should do to look at the transaction?
A. None that recall. I think I just said here's what I thought was a lead on a business opportunity, a possibility, and after that left, it was up to Keith and the team there. Now it may have been conversations, as I said, to keep me abreast of what was happening, but I don't recall giving any direction because I didn't know anything about it. So you know, I was sort of in the position of let's -- I hadn't made up any decision, but thought that this was something that we needed to do homework on and participate in that with the board members.
Q. At some point you became favorably disposed towards the transaction, correct?
A. Yeah. And I think that was generally true of the board. In other words, at each step it was sort of get a sense of how felt people about it, even after the first meeting, and the general sense, as I remember, not that there were votes, per se, anything to vote on, but just the general, okay, what do you think, does this sound like something we should encourage the staff and the
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team to pursue. And I think my recollection is that, you know, each of those points, it was not just me, you know, people felt that this was something worth pursuing.
Q. So you expressed to other members of the board your belief that it was something that could be -should be looked at, correct?
A. Well, in the course of -- that's not my
style. I didn't have a lot of conversations that I recall with any of the individual board members, that's not what I would do. I had them -- I had huge respect for them individually and their abilities. So -- you assemble a board like that to advise you.

MR. DOLAN: Sure.
A. I'm not even a voting member of the board.

So, it was more, you know, a general conversation, what do you think; is that consistent with what we're trying to do? There's risk elements to this, for sure, but does this have the makings of, you know, something we should look at in more detail and each step along the way. So when I -I wouldn't say I became a believer, I was like everybody else, let's get the facts, let's get more information, because I didn't know anything
about the industry and, you know, I have a lot of business background, but none of it in this particular area.
Q. And that's why the board engaged outside
consultants, correct?
A. Yeah. Exactly.
Q. At some point, Governor, you must have indicated
to other members of the board you were favorably
disposed towards the transaction; is that fair?
A. In the board meeting, you know, we would go around and get different reactions, and I'm sure at some point, you know, I said, you know, I think is something that I would be reasonable to continue to pursue this and could possibly support if all of the facts and due diligence comes out.
Q. Ultimately, you did support it, right?
A. Yes. I didn't have a vote, but I supported
it.
Q. How did you demonstrate that support to other
members of the board?
A. No, just as we went around the table, we went around the table.
Q. Articulating views about the transaction?
A. Yes.
Q. And you spoke favorably towards it at some point
in time?
A. Yeah. I said there's risks and there's
rewards, and I felt this is something that could
be a good thing for the state.
Q. Now, in your experience, the Office of Governor,
your position as His Excellency has some sway with it, does it not?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. No, I wouldn't -- these are people I know and respect and people that I would expect that if they thought this was a crazy thing to do, would say that. I mean, you surround yourself with people that, you know, whose judgments you have some confidence and you don't want them -- the last thing I want somebody to say is because I want to do it. No, I mean this was -- this was a complex transaction with lots of elements to it. So I don't think -- well, you'll have to ask the other members, but I'd be surprised if anybody said they felt that I pressured them in any way.
21 Q. I wasn't suggesting that --
22 A. Or whatever.
23 Q. -- I wasn't suggesting that at all. You didn't
24 speak against the transaction, correct?
25 A. No. I spoke, as many did, the risks and I
was one that flagged up the risk that I felt of it possibly overrunning, the cost overrunning what the company anticipated as a bigger risk, but you know, we talked about the pluses and the minuses as you do, and I think as I recall many of them directors did.
Q. If you had spoken against the transaction, do you think it likely that the board would have, nevertheless, have approved it?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
MR. DeSISTO: Objection.
A. I don't know. I don't know.
Q. You don't have a view on that at all?
A. No.

MR. WISTOW: Object.
A. You know, chances are, if I were saying, you
know, I've got no interest in it, that, yeah, most of them would, you know, have, you know, take that into consideration. But again, I don't know they could have said, hey, you lost your mind, this is a wonderful thing, let's do it.
Q. You would agree with me that your view as chairman of the board and Governor would have some impact on the way in which others would perceive the transaction, correct?

1 A. Well, it's funny, you learn in this life, in this job that it often isn't what you think, okay. There's lots of other -- lots of other people that have interests in things and have agendas, et cetera. So, I may think as Governor you've got, you know, some sway, but I learned in many cases not what you think.
Q. I didn't mean by my question to suggest that you
held sway. I'm saying your view as articulated would have some impact, we don't know the magnitudes of it on the views of others; would you agree with that?
A. I would not dispute -- you're saying if I said, look, you know, I don't want to do this, and I think this is a bad deal, you know, I think they would have respected that. The reverse isn't necessarily, because I said that I think this is something worth pursuing, that they would all just jump on board. I know that group well enough that that's not the case. There's several outspoken enough, you know, that would have said, you know, if not publicly, would have gotten me aside and said, Governor, I don't know what you're thinking about here, I've known you a long time, I respect you, this is I think really way over the edge.

1 That's what I would have expected from this group.
Q. No one ever had any such -- none of the board
members ever made any such statement like that to you?
A. No.
Q. So you would agree with me, wouldn't you, that
your view as expressed had some impact on --
A. You have to ask them, Bill.
Q. Let me just finish. -- had some impact on the
views of other members of the board?
A. You know, you'll have to ask them. You
really do, okay. You'll have to ask them. Did
they support this because they felt I wanted to do
it? You know --
Q. Governor --
A. -- I would be surprised.
Q. Governor is a political office, correct?

MR. WISTOW: A what?
MR. DOLAN: Political office?
MR. WISTOW: I think we can agree to
that.
A. I'll agree to that one.
Q. There is a certain cachet that comes with the
office of Governor?
A. That's how you get all the grief there is,

Bill. I learned that a long time ago.
Q. And the governor sits as the chairman ex-officio
of the EDC board?
A. Yes.
Q. The governor presides over the board meetings of EDC, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The governor establishes, in part, the agenda for
some of the meetings, correct?
A. Yeah, generally, I might see the agenda
beforehand, I relied on Keith and the staff there
to flag up what needed to come before the board.
Q. Right. Let's talk about that a little bit. So
what was Mr. Stokes' general role as it pertains
to the 38 Studios transaction?
A. Well, from my perspective, he would have been
the point person, since he's head of Economic
Development. This is the largest transaction that
they had -- we had undertaken. So he was the point person.
Q. What about Michael Saul, what was his -- what was
your understanding of his role in connection with the 38 Studios?
A. Supportive. He was the deputy. Mike had a

25 background in banking and finance, et cetera. He
had actually done a stint as acting director
and -- how soon you forget. He's a good guy. He
left -- but, anyway, Mike was in there for a period of time. He was the acting while we actually did the search.
Q. But relative to 38 Studios, was Mr. Saul the person within the agency that had principal responsibility for the underwriting of the analysis?
A. That I don't know. You'd have to ask --

Keith would have assembled the team and then how they were allocating it, obviously Mike made the presentations. He made a couple of presentations to the board after Keith had introduced it. So my presumption would be he was, you know, from Keith's standpoint, you know, the lead person within the agency.
Q. When Mr. Stokes or Mr. Saul or others from RIEDC
wanted to communicate with you in your capacity as chairman ex-officio of the board, how did they go about doing that?
A. Well, I'm not sure I follow your question Bill. I mean, Keith and I had a relationship where he might call and apprise me of something.
He sometimes was in the building, might stop in,
if I were available to go over, it could be anything, not just 38 , it could be anything. You know, but generally, with the exception of 38 Studios, which as I said, we spent an incredible amount of time on it in terms of -- the board, I mean, the board.

Normally, most of my interaction would have been, you know, just prior to the board meeting, go there a few minutes early to go over what the agenda and are there any hot-button issues I should be aware of and, you know, it was that limited.
Q. Was it customary for Mr. Saul and Mr. Stokes to communicate with your office through your chief of staff or your deputy chief of staff in connection with 38 Studios?
A. You know, I wouldn't say customary. I just don't know. I mean, they're trying to keep the office apprised and, often, I might be away, I may be traveling or whatever, and they want to get a message to me, it might have gone through my chief of staff or somebody else in the office.
Q. And that was a way in which the EDC could communicate with the office of the Governor in his capacity as chairman ex-officio of the board?
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A. Yes.
Q. You've seen some things over the course of these
several days that suggest there were such
communications, right?
A. Yes.
Q. There is nothing unusual about that, right?
A. No. No. You know, I mean, this was
obviously -- this was, as I said, a big
transaction, a lot of focus, a lot of energy and a lot of resources went into it, but it would not be unusual, you know, for a communication from Keith to go to Andy Hodgkin about something that he wants me to be aware of, I'm out of town, I'm traveling, I'm at meetings, whatever.
Q. And that's true in respect to 38 Studios, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What role did you understand my client,

Robert Stolzman, had in connection with the 38
Studios transaction?
A. Well, Rob was legal counsel, and he was, from
all my years on the EDC board, you know, heavily
involved in these things. He was somebody that, you know, the director, executive director relied immersed.

1 His job is to make sure the board is, you know, were following legally what the board is supposed to do, keep the board organized, if you will, in the resolutions and all those kind of things, but he is somebody that, my sense is, that Keith, in particular, relied a lot on.
Q. And he had been the outside general counsel for
the RIEDC for the entire time that you were
Governor, right?
A. I believe that's true. I believe that's
true. So we had -- you know, we had a lot of changes in members, but I think Rob was there from the beginning.
Q. You had occasion to observe him in his function,
his role as outside general counsel, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You observed him as a person of ability, did you not?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yeah -- no, I'm -- I respected the job he
did. He seemed to do a good job in what he did
for the board in preparing resolutions and all of
that kind of thing. But I did not, it would be
unfair of me to make a judgment about his
activities within EDC and working with the team
there. I just would not be able to judge that.
Most of my interaction with Rob would have been at the board meetings, because he was charged with keeping us straight.
5 Q . In that regard, you observed him to be a person of ability, correct?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you observed him to be a person of integrity, correct?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. I like Rob, okay, I liked him personally. I
have no problem saying that, you know, and I had no reason to think, you know, his abilities would be inadequate.
Q. As far as you could tell, he was fulfilling his responsibilities, correct?
A. Everything that we asked him to do, that I
was aware of, minutes, board meetings, et cetera, as I said. I cannot respond, Bill, to what his involvement was in 38 Studios and the conversations, because my sense is he was being relied upon by Keith and the team there, and there was heavy involvement, which there should be, he's counsel for the corporation.
Q. You know in this case one of the central questions
is this question of the financial projections of 38 Studios, right? You know that's an issue in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're aware, are you not, that staff within

EDC, particularly Michael Saul, looked at the financial projections for 38 Studios, correct?

MR. MARTLAND: Objection.
A. I don't know who looked at them. You rely on
the staff, and Mike was the point person whether he did that, or he delegated that. Who did that, I don't know specifically, but those projections, you know, should have been, and in my judgment, I'm assuming were.
Q. Well, in fact, you've seen a presentation, have you not, in your deposition where Mr. Saul is presenting certain information to the board --
9 A. Right.
20 Q. -- in connection with 38 Studios relating to the
financial projections, right?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And you have a memory of Mr. Saul doing that,
24 right?
25 A. Yes.
Q. Now, was Mr. Saul responsible for determining whether the financial projections were reasonable or not?
A. Well, somebody should have looked at them, you know. You've got to ask Keith who he was relying on. If he was relying on Mike, and Mike is the point person because he had the financial background and the other staff within the -because there are other staffers there, yes, somebody should have been reviewing these projections.
Q. And Mr. Saul made a presentation to the board about those projections, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you necessarily relied on that presentation,
did you not?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. What we relied on is, I think I've said
previously, there were a lot of -- Mike -- this is four years ago. He introduced the concept, you know, what we were trying to do, introduce 38 Studios, introduce the loan guarantee concept, overview of what they were as a company, the things that they were doing, et cetera. But we didn't have expertise within the EDC on this kind
of analysis, and that's what precipitated, you know, seeking an outside consultants, independent that would look at the industry and look at 38 Studios, look at some of those projections and give the board some feedback as to whether they seemed reasonable. Not asking them to say do the deal, don't do the deal, just tell us, do these projections look reasonable, or are they way out of line.
MR. DOLAN: I understand.
A. All I'm saying, there was a lot of data, you
know, not just Mike Saul and the team at EDC,
there was a lot of input that went into reviewing those.
Q. I understand. But certainly you took into in your
deliberations as a member of the board the presentations of the RIEDC staff?
MR. GLADSTONE: Objection.
A. One of several. Speaking for myself, I
wouldn't make a determination or decision just
based on EDC's staff recommendation alone because
I think the board felt this was, you know, an area
in which we didn't have expertise. It's not the
typical sort of transaction. So, go get people
that could be deemed to be industry experts.

1 Q. Understood. But you would at least agree with me you at least considered the information that the EDC staff was presenting to you in your capacity as a board member?

MR. GLADSTONE: Objection. Asked and answered, repeatedly.
Q. Fair?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of those areas was information about the

38 Studios financial projections, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you mentioned before that you relied on certain people to assess the reasonableness of the financial projection, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Was Mr. Saul one of those persons that you relied upon to assess the reasonableness of 38 Studios' financial projections?

MR. GLADSTONE: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. Well, I would have thought in his role he would have his own review, but then we commissioned two or three outside reviews to see if they're consistent. If somebody flagged up a contrary opinion, that would have been something
that obviously the board would want to know about. So EDC did theirs, and I would have expected Mike in his capacity, you know, to either be -- either questioning some of the work being done, reviewing the work that was being done, and see if he thought it looked reasonable.
Q. Well, I know that your answer suggests that you
would have hoped or perceived that perhaps you
should have done that. My question is much more specific, Governor, which is, did you rely upon, you in your capacity as director, did you rely upon Mr. Saul to give you information about the reasonableness of 38 Studios' financial projection?

MR. GLADSTONE: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. I don't know what you mean by rely upon. As I said in my affidavit, we -- all of the directors were in a position of needing to rely upon the work being done by the team there and their assessment as well as the outsiders. So it was all of this coming together that you were relying on that if there was a consistency. If there were major inconsistencies in the views, then it would have flagged up, you know, what's going on, and we
needed a lot more discussion.
Q. I understand that. But my question is much more
simple than that. Which is, Mr. Saul as a member of the EDC staff, right, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. He's presenting to you information about 38

Studios' financial projections?
A. I would take what he's presenting --

9 MR. GLADSTONE: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. To be important and factual and his best --
his best assessment.
Q. And something that you would rely upon in your
capacity as a member of the board, correct?
MR. GLADSTONE: Objection. Asked and answered.
A. Yes.

MR. GLADSTONE: Argumentative.
Q. Now, you had mentioned before -- strike that. Do
you have a discrete memory, specific memory as you
sit here today of Mr. Stolzman ever making any
statements to you in your capacity as director
about the reasonableness of 38 Studios' financial
projections?
A. No.

1 Q. Do you know what I mean by that?
2 A. No, I think -- the board considered very
deliberatively lots of information and came to a decision, okay. The fact that there might have been conversations going on unbeknownst to me by -- I would have been very upset if that came from my staff. The fact that it came from the Legislature or somewhere else, you know, unfortunately, that's the realities of the political world. I'm not happy about it, I tried to keep them occasionally abreast of them. Sometimes it's not a two-way street.
Q. By the leadership, you're talking about Speaker Fox?
A. I only know what I've read in the paper, and I think, you know, Former Speaker Murphy had actually visited the company, and I think it was more than Fox. I thought a couple signed non-disclosure agreements. Again, only what I read in the paper. I have no knowledge of that, to be honest.
22 Q. You know that there was a statute that had to be passed in order for the RIEDC to be able to be in a position to fund this transaction with 38 Studios, correct?
Q. As between --
A. He was legal counsel. He's not a financial analyst. I would not have expected him to be opining on the projections.
Q. Nor do you have a memory of him doing so?
A. No, I don't.
Q. You mentioned before, Governor, at some point
after the fact, after the transaction was
approved, you learned that there was earlier contact between 38 Studios and representatives of the state; do I have that right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Yeah, I don't know who. Clearly, I read in the media, and that's come out subsequently in discussions that, you know, some of the leadership in the house had visited. All right. Now I don't know whether anybody from EDC was involved in any of those discussions. I have no knowledge of that. I would hope not, because I would hope they would have told me instead of letting me feel like I'm giving them a good lead.
Q. I mean no disrespect by this, but based upon what
you've learned subsequently, do you feel like you were led down the primrose path by this?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.

1 A. Yeah. There were two, if memory serves me, two levels, one was to establish a loan guarantee program, because we didn't have one, and initially the amount was 50 million. I could be wrong, but memory -- and then -- but that wouldn't accommodate a transaction like 38 Studios. So there had to be a subsequent legislation passed that would increase the amount of the authority.
Q. And that required the support of the leadership of the General Assembly, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In your experience, legislation doesn't get passed
without the participation and approval of the leadership of the General Assembly?
A. That's usually the case.
Q. And it was the case as well that -- strike that.

Speaker Fox specifically was a proponent of the Job Creation Guaranty Program, correct?
A. Well, he supported it. The first piece
passed, and then they supported the second piece. He voted for it.
Q. RIEDC really couldn't have been in a position to fund this transaction without that legislation, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Really had no access to the kind of capital that this transaction called for, correct?
A. Right. Correct.
Q. And that legislation was pushed through -- was
passed in the General Assembly in the spring of 2010, correct?
A. I don't remember the time frame. As I said,
there were two pieces, Bill, I remember, there was
the creation of the Job Guaranty Fund which I
thought, I could be wrong, I thought actually took
place or was in process, but then the increase of the amount to the 125 I thought was later than that. But maybe it's late spring, but I don't recall exactly. I mean, I had to sign it, so...
Q. Do you recall learning at some point in time that

Speaker Fox was a proponent of the legislation was in favor?
A. It wouldn't have passed without him, yes.
Q. Did you learn that he was in favor of it before it
was passed?
A. I don't recall conversation, you know, I just don't recall. It's possible.
Q. Did Andy Hodgkin have any role in the passage of
the legislation, job?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Now, I think you said before that --
A. I should say normally legislation that's
being proposed, you know, because we got
departments, human services, they all have, when
they're in session, legislation that they're going
to propose sometimes coming from the departments.
Rarely does any legislation, well, it can't come from the governor's office. You need to be sponsored by a legislator. So, generally, at that time of year, there would be a flow going on from departments so that Andy -- why I'm saying that, Andy very well could have been in the loop in terms of what legislation was being proposed by whom, and that's all.
Q. Do you recall him having a specific role in the passage --
A. No.
Q. Let me finish. You may even know the answer to my question before I articulate it?
A. Sorry.
Q. Do you recall him having a specific role in any
way in the passage of the Job Creation Guaranty
Program?
A. No. I don't recall.

25 Q. Now, you're aware, Governor, are you not, that

1 part of this legislative exercise was to increase
the available funding from 50 million to 125
million?
A. Yes.
Q. And the difference between 125 and 50 million is

75 million, correct?
A. Right.
Q. And that was the amount of the 38 Studios
transaction, right?
A. Right.
Q. Is there any relationship, in your mind, between those two facts?
A. Yeah. Absolutely.
Q. What is that?
A. I think Keith and the EDC team, you know, needed to get the amount increased in order to possibly accommodate. By the way, no decision made, but we wouldn't even have the opportunity to make a decision if the total amount were not increased and so, yeah, clearly, there was a connection between the amount of increase and the potential, no decision has been made. The board hadn't even begun the vetting process at that point, as I recall, but you know, the legislation had to enable it.
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Q. Did you ever hear Mr. Verrecchia make any
statements at any RIEDC board meetings to the effect that the Speaker, Speaker Fox, wanted the 75 million increase to go to 38 Studios?
A. You know, I can't say definitively that I
remember. I mean, there were conversations and, you know, whether it was that specific, I don't remember.
Q. But do you remember anybody making statements at any of the RIEDC board meetings concerning the position of any of the leadership, Speaker Fox, Senate President Paiva-Weed, Mr. Costantino and their view on the transaction?
A. I really don't. I mean, there would be, generally, you know, where there is a legislature, you know, support of a transaction like this of this size, that kind of conversation, but as to who was on board or not, I don't recall.
Q. So if Mr. Verrecchia testifies that he said at a
board meeting that Speaker Fox would be displeased if the additional 75 million didn't go to 38 Studios, you'd have no factual basis to dispute that statement?
24 A. No. If Al testified that's what he said, I
25 wouldn't dispute that.
Q. Did you learn at any time what Mr. Costantino, Steve Costantino's position was on either the Job Creation Program or the 38 Studios transaction?
A. No. I've been around there long enough to
know, you know, he was the finance chair at that point, if I recall, I lost track. So, generally, when legislation is going forward, you know, it's either the finance chair that usually bears the burden of making the case on behalf of the leadership.
Q. And this legislation, Job Creation Guaranty

Program, emanated out of Finance Committee, did it not, sir?
A. It would have to, I believe. I shouldn't say
that. I don't know for certain, but the Finance
Committee is generally the most powerful committee there.
Q. You don't recall learning at any point in time in connection with the transaction what
Mr. Costantino's position was with respect to it?
A. No. I mean, I really don't.
Q. You're hesitating there?
A. No. Only because if the leadership wanted
it, and the sense I got, the leadership was in
favor of it, that I got from Keith and others that
speed, just to give him a heads-up on something.
Q. You would say it's likely that you spoke to the

Speaker about this transaction at the time it was
being considered?
A. At some point I would have.
Q. As you sit here today, you actually have a memory
of having done so, don't you?
A. I'm saying -- no, not clearly I don't, but it
would have -- I most likely would have. I don't remember when, where or how.
Q. And is the same true with respect to the remainder
of the General Assembly leadership, for instance, is it likely that you had a conversation with Representative Costantino about the 38 Studios at the time it was being considered by the EDC board in 2010?
A. Less likely, okay, because the other thing I learned is that there's a pecking order, you know, so you make sure you touch base with the Speaker and the Senate President, which is where I would tend to go. Okay. Would I run into them out in the halls and made a point of, you know, interacting with different members if I saw them, but that would not be the norm for me to talk to, you know, Costantino, the finance chair.
were talking to them.
Q. So you remember learning from --

MR. WISTOW: Wait a minute. He didn't finish.
A. All I'm saying is that you've been there long
enough that if the leadership is supportive,
generally it means it will go through, and it
generally means, you know, one or more of them are supportive and want to see it get done. Now, whether privately, you know, anybody is expressing reservations to one another there, I don't know.
Q. Did you ever speak with Representative Fox about
the 38 Studios transaction --
A. I think I probably did.
Q. -- at the time it was being considered?
A. I think I probably, you know, apprised him of
the fact that we were considering this thing and that, you know, we would want him to be aware of it. It's a big transaction, et cetera, yeah, I don't remember exactly when or at what point, but it would not be uncommon. I would generally talk with the Speaker on, you know, major issues regarding education funding, you know, we got that big grant from Washington on Race to the Top. It would be fairly common for me to bring him up to
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1 Q. But it would have been the norm for you to talk to
2 Senate President Paiva-Weed about a transaction such as 38 Studios?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. And do you have a memory of having done so, sir?
6 A. Not crystal clear but...
7 Q. It sounds like you have some memory?
8 A. No, I think I would have, okay. Again,
because my -- generally what I tried to do when I was in office is -- it wasn't reciprocated, believe me, it was not reciprocated a lot, but I would try and keep the leadership in both the House and Senate apprised of what I thought were major things that they should be aware of. Often I found they already were because they've got better sources than I have, but -- so I would do that in the normal course, whatever it is, so I'm sure I would have. I don't have a specific memory of exactly having that conversation with the Senate President.
21 Q. Now, you've heard the name Michael Corso before,
22 Governor?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. And you heard that name in connection with the 38
25 Studios transaction, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you understand at the time that you first
heard his name his role to be?
A. Well, as I think I testified in one of our
first meetings, I didn't know Michael Corso from
the door stop. If he walked in today, I wouldn't
know Michael Corso. I met him in one of the meetings at Keith's office with Curt Schilling and Jen MacLean, and he was introduced as a financial advisor to 38 Studios, that's it. It's not uncommon for companies to have a financial advisor. So I didn't think more or less of it.
Q. Did you learn anything else about his role during
the time that you were considering 38 Studios transaction?
A. No, no. He was working with 38 Studios and trying to secure funding for them for Copernicus and what they needed, but that's it.
Q. Now, you understood, did you not, sir, that this
proposed transaction with -- the proposed transaction with 38 Studios involved a high degree of risk?
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Well, you know, risk. All these things have elements of risk, and the board understood that
success back in the early 2000s, that company. So -- and they were well along the way on Mercury or the RPG we've been talking about. So I think -- and Entertainment Arts (sic), which is the largest distributor was, you know, right in there. They don't take every deal that comes along and that. So I think the board felt that there's a demonstrated ability here. They've got expertise, Big Hugh Games had done one, already was working on the second one and that, you know, there are risks in these things, yes, but that risk seemed to be less because they were well along.

The biggest risk that the board focused on was Copernicus and getting that completed in a time frame that they had indicated, because in all of those things, the longer they overrun, then the more cash they're chewing up.

So it was important to understand that they would be able to do this the way they had projected it.
22 Q. You'd agree with me that one risk was the risk that 38 Studios would not complete the first game, Mercury, that was a risk?
25 A. Yes. But I think because, again, there was a
this had elements of risk, as you've heard about me talk about, you know, previously. But they were offset in the board's mind by a lot of positives about it, okay. And because this is a board that is trying to do what it thinks is best for the state, doesn't want to make, you know, bad decisions, they're considering all of the different aspects, and at the end of the day, you know, approve this, given all of the flow of information they receive, all of the due diligence, you know, on the belief that this was going to be an exciting new company for our state. Q. I understand that. But you understood, Governor, did you not, that the transaction involved a high degree of risk?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. It involved risk. Everybody understood that.
Q. You knew, for instance, that the success of the
transaction depended upon the company's ability to successfully complete two video games, right? A. Yes. They were already, what we knew, if memory serves me, again, he being Schilling, had acquired Big Hugh Games or whatever it was, a company that had already produced games. In fact, I think they had reported that they had a big

1 completion bond on that, EA was in there. I think, to speak for myself, I won't speak for the rest of the board, there was a sense that the likelihood of them not completing Mercury was not great. The question was how successful the game would be, whether it would be a long success, whether it would be mediocre or whether it would be a flop.
Q. But no one could predict with 100 percent

10 assurance that the game would be completed?
11 A. No. Nobody can predict anything with 100
percent assurance.
Q. That was one risk?
A. Yes.

5 Q. Another risk was that the company, 38 Studios, wouldn't complete the second game, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the video game business, you learned in the course of your work as a director, that the video game business is a hit-driven business, right?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Just like the movies, right?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. Some movies are successful and some aren't, right?
25 A. Yes.

develop these games.
Q. You wouldn't say that the board had a sense of
urgency that it was important to do something dramatic for the Rhode Island economy that this presented a real opportunity?
A. No. There was some, I don't remember -somebody at the board that might have said, you know, we need -- we need to do something that would make a statement, that would be, you know, good in a technology area and so forth. But you had a lot of different opinions on that. You had Karl Wadensten that said, look, you know, I want to support this, but at less money, I just -- this is too much money. It wasn't that he thought this was, the company was, you know, not sustainable or a bad company, he just felt that the amount of money and exposure, and I respected that.
Q. Do you recall seeing -- strike that. At some
point in time the details of the Job Creation Guaranty Program were disclosed to the RIEDC board, correct?

MR. WISTOW: Can I have that repeated again?
Q. Details of the Job Creation Guaranty Program were

25 disclosed to the RIEDC board at some point?
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|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | A. Again, I don't recall. I think it was after |
| 2 | the Loan Guarantee Fund legislation was completed |
| 3 | and the due diligence of the discussions were ripe |
| 4 | enough so that there was a potential transaction |
| 5 | and just sort of -- we only met monthly, so I |
| 6 | think it was probably, all right, May is when the |
| 7 | legislation was completed, you know, so June, |
| 8 | whatever, would have been a logical next meeting, |
| 9 | and then I think we had a couple of special |
| 10 | meetings, because this just wasn't the kind of |
| 11 | thing you could cover in a regular meeting. We |
| 12 | had other focus. |
| 13 | Q. Mr. Stokes and Mr. Saul didn't each have the |
| 14 | ability to unilaterally present this to the board, |
| 15 | right? They couldn't show up one day and say |
| 16 | let's have a board discussion of this, they'd have |
| 17 | to review this with you or your office before |
| 18 | doing so, right? |
| 19 | A. Yes. Normally this is what you do in |
| 20 | protocol, and they knew I was, you know, |
| 21 | knowledgeable about discussions they were having, |
| 22 | since I thought I was the one that gave them the |
| 23 | lead. So, they were aware that I -- enough to be |
| 24 | reporting to me periodically that these |
| 25 | discussions looked like they're going somewhere, |

and they could be the elements of a deal. Then when it got to the point, okay, now we need to get the board engaged, and we've got to go through a whole process because we need lots of due diligence, and the board is going to need a lot of help on this.
Q. My question is that presentation, the first presentation to the board wouldn't have happened if you hadn't said, let's go ahead and present it to the board?
A. Yeah. I think that's a fair statement.
Q. Let me show you some documents here. First, let me show you what's been marked as Exhibit 15, Governor. You may have looked at this earlier in your deposition. But I'll represent to you this is a copy of an e-mail from Michael Saul to Maureen Gurghigian?

MR. WISTOW: What's the date of that? MR. DOLAN: It's dated June 9, 2010.
Q. It's got an attachment that says, Final Draft

Executive Session. It says, "Tony and Maureen: This is the dec. being presented on 38 Studios in executive session today." And then there's an attachment, Governor. If you could look at the attachment, it says, Executive Session Briefing

1 Video Gaming Briefing, and 38 Studios Opportunity, RIEDC Board Meeting, June 9 of 2010, J. Michael Saul; do you see that?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. You're familiar with this, are you not, sir?
6 A. Well, I'm not -- I remember a presentation,
details of it, you know, I'm not -- I'd have to go through it, Bill.
Q. You have no reason to doubt this is the
presentation that Mr. Saul made to the RIEDC board on June 9?
A. No. The minutes would reflect if this were attached.
Q. If you could turn your attention to, I don't know
that there's page numbers on here, Governor, but page numbers in the bottom right-hand corner. The page that I'm at is 587 , it's very small print.

MR. WISTOW: What's the heading at the top?

MR. DOLAN: 38 Studios Company
Background.
22 Q. Do you have the page in front of you?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. You remember Mr. Saul presenting information about
2538 Studios and the company background at one of

1 the board meetings, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he's describing, among other things, the two
studios that exist, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. He's also describing the two games, one, Project

Mercury, the other being Copernicus, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he notes under Project Mercury there is a
publishing and retail distribution agreement between EA and 38 Studios, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's something that you as a board member
attach some particular significance to, correct?
A. Yes. I think that, if I recall, I mean,
somebody at some point said, you know, this is a good sign, Entertainment Arts, they just don't take on anybody and say I'm going to distribute Don Carcieri's game or Bill Dolan's game or whatever. They've got a lot of these that they're confronted with. So the fact that EA had entered into an agreement, I think generally was viewed positively, yes.
24 Q. Now it was the case, was it not, that at the time
25 the RIEDC considered and approved the 38 Studios
transaction, there was no publishing or distribution agreement with respect to Copernicus, correct?
A. I don't know that. I don't know that, Bill.
Q. As you look here on this particular page, do you
see any reference to the existence of a publishing
and retail distribution agreement between EA and
38 Studios with respect to Project Copernicus?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember as a board member ever inquiring
about whether or not such a publication and distribution agreement existed with respect to Copernicus now?
A. No, I understand that. I think I recall discussion that actually EA, Entertainment Arts was reasonably optimistic about Copernicus and an MMOG. This was a new area, a new game, but you know, not having an agreement at that point, you know, I'm not aware of it.
Q. Well, it's a positive that Mercury had a publishing and retail distribution agreement?
A. Right.
Q. That made it more likely that the game would be
successfully completed and sold, right?
A. Yes. And I think the board, I could be

1 Q. Now if you could turn your attention to the page
2 marked, it's 591, Governor.
MR. WISTOW: What's the heading?
MR. DOLAN: Project risks and
rewards.
6 Q. Do you have that page in front of you?
7 A. Yes, I do.
8 Q. So this at the very top contains an entry for
prerevenue company, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was a risk of the transaction, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it presents additional facts that appear
to speak towards the gravity of the risk?
A. I wouldn't use the word gravity of the risk.

You know, there's a whole list of things here. In fact, this is, I guess, where it came to mind. EA assumed four to five million sales of Copernicus, and 38 Studios cut that to three. So I think somehow the board -- there was a connection that EA understood this and understood what 38 was doing was, in effect, you know, I wouldn't say excited, but they saw some potential here.
24 Q. In fact, here Mr. Saul, states, does he not, in
25 the third bottom from the entry, "EA reviews 500
wrong, but my presumption -- bad word -- but I
felt that, most likely, that they would do the same for Copernicus. Whether there was an agreement in place at that juncture, I don't know.
I don't know -- Mercury was very different, a very
different game and a very different protocol,
so --
Q. Now, what facts were you relying on, Governor, to
form the conclusion that it was likely that
Electronic Arts would enter into a publishing and
retail distribution agreement with 38 Studios regarding Copernicus?
A. Well, the discussions that I recall,

Schilling and 38 Studios people felt they had a
good relationship with Entertainment Arts, and
somehow this game would get distributed.
Q. Was that it?
A. That's it.
Q. So there were no other facts that formed your
conclusion that was --
A. None I recall right now.
Q. Let me finish. -- that it was likely that

Electronic Arts would enter into a distribution agreement with 38 Studios?
25 A. Not that I can recall.

1 plus proposals a year and selects less than 10 percent," correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, the fact that there was an agreement in place
with respect to Mercury was significant to you, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But you also knew that in respect to the Project

9 Copernicus, that there were lots of proposals that
EA considered every year and only selected 10 percent of them; that was a risk with respect to Copernicus, right?
A. To be -- I don't recall a lengthy discussion about this issue at the board meeting. I think the board -- my sense was EA, if the first one works out, most likely they will be supportive of the second one, and the fact that they were optimistic about the potential sales, you know, would seem to indicate that they would be a candidate to distribute it.
Q. You and other members of the board knew that EA reviews 500 plus proposals per year and selects less than 10 percent of them, right?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And that was a risk relative to Copernicus as


1 Q. And what, if anything --
A. Copernicus wasn't due out until the fall of 2012. So, I mean, that's -- this was the game they were all hoping would be the big success because it's an MMOG, it's new, it's exciting. That's what the projections were -- these projections would reflect that. In 2012 you don't have much in the way of sales from Copernicus, and that's why you see in 2013, you know, a big jump.
10 Q. So in 2011 the revenue that's reflected, there was
revenue that was projected to be obtained from the sale of Mercury, correct?
A. Right. And that was only a portion of the year as well because I believe these are calendar year -- it doesn't say, does it? But I thought these were calendar year cash flow projections, and Mercury wasn't planned to be released until September of 2011, so you only got a quarter of sales there; hence, you see it ramping up.
Q. And you understood, did you not, that the revenue
for Mercury was going to be utilized, in part, to help in the development of Copernicus, right?
A. Yes. That the cash flow -- we were talking about this earlier, the cash flow projections anticipated the net proceeds from EDC financing as
well, was it not, sir?
A. As I said, I think that was mitigated by the
fact that they also know this company. Like anything else, once you've worked with somebody, you know their product, you know what they're able to do, and your reasonable success with that, and you tend to go back with them.
Q. If you go to the page marked Company's Most-Likely
projections, Governor?
THE WITNESS: What's the number on that?

MR. DOLAN: This would be 594.
Q. Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. This contains, does it not, statements of
prospective revenues and expenses, right, for 38
Studios?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's showing that company is going to have negative EBITDA all the way through the end of 2012, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, EBITDA is earnings before interest,
A. Yeah.
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1 jobs depended upon whether the --
2 A. No.
3 Q. -- the transaction was approved by the board or
4 not?
5 A. I would never do that.
6 Q. Nothing like that?
7 A. No.
8 Q. That's not your style, is it?
9 A. No.
Q. That wasn't a positive, right, the fact that you
couldn't get a performance bond?
THE WITNESS: Well, it was not a positive?

MR. DOLAN: That you couldn't get one.
A. It wouldn't be a positive. The board, as I
said earlier, I think felt if we could get a
completion bond, it would be like an insurance
policy and a good thing. It wasn't a deal-breaker, if you will. On the other hand, the board felt that they would like an independent assessment of, you know, the reasonableness, again, of the company's projections and their ability to complete Copernicus. And that I think is what ultimately, it wasn't at the time, but when Keith said that there was not a commercially available bond, they came up with an alternative, in fact, had been discussing with IFG, indicated they might be able to help them with developing, using their protocols, and I don't -- I wasn't a part of any of those conversations, but all I do know is ultimately ended up with IBM and there was, you know, a pretty good discussion at the board, I don't remember which one it was before
jobs depended upon whether the --
A. No.
Q. - the transaction was approved by the board or ot.
A. I would never do that.
Q. Nothing like that?
A. No.
Q. That's not your style, is it?
A. No.
Q. You've mentioned before that one of the things
that was positive for Project Mercury was the existence of the completion bond for that project, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you mentioned as well that the board had prospect with respect to Copernicus, right?
A. Yes.
. And he went ahead and did that. He at least as he
reported back to you, he inquired as to whether a
completion bond was available for Copernicus and
learned that it wasn't, right?
Q. He reported that fact to the board, right?
A. Yes.

1 you know, at some time frame around that, but
2 there was a lot of ambiguity in that I think the 3 memo that I saw, but clearly there were several 4 people, including me, that said, you know, we 5 really should have this done before because if 6 they come back and say, you know, this isn't going 7 to fly, we need to sit down -- it doesn't mean we 8 won't go ahead, but we need to sit back down and
9 say, wait a minute, we've got somebody here saying
10 this doesn't look like, or gravely concerned that
11 you can't get this done, so if you're going to
12 need more money, then where is that going to come from?
Q. What I want to focus on, Governor, is what you
believe to be a requirement or directive that prior to closing there be an assessment. My question to you is how did the board expressly direct the staff to do that?
A. I don't recall exactly, okay. I know there was a discussion, and I'd have to go back. I think the approval, and I don't remember if it was the 22nd, which meeting, I indicated to EDC to Keith and the team that they needed to get this done prior to the closing, and he understood it because I think his memo said he understood that
something had to be done here prior to closing. I think those were the words in there. So, what happened after that, I don't know, and I don't remember exactly who said what and how that was conveyed, except that Keith -- his memo would seem to be indicating that he understood that.
Q. You believe his memo specified that there would be
an assessment undertaken prior to closing?
9 MR. WISTOW: Objection.
10 A. Well, he didn't say it exactly that way, but
clearly that was the impression that several of us, you know, gave him.
Q. So you have a memory --

MR. WISTOW: You interrupted him.
Let him finish.
A. There were several people focused on this.

As I remember, Al Verrecchia very much because he
was into the cost of this thing. Donna Cupelo,
she's managed a lot of large projects, et cetera, and I don't remember others, but there was -- but there were several that had concerns that we've got nothing, you know, we had independent advisors look at the cash flow and said it looked reasonable, but nobody has really looked at their internal projection in terms of completing

Copernicus in a time frame that they indicated and whether that looked reasonable. And so I remember that being, you know, voiced as a concern. Q. Now, let me ask this, typically when the board would act, it would do so by resolutions, right?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. Well, not always, sometimes it was a
formal -- it would be a resolution voted on and so forth. Other times it would just be a sense of the board in giving direction to the staff.
Q. Do you recall the board issuing any resolution
that required an assessment of the game prior to closing, specifically?
A. I recall the board issuing, I don't remember
it was a resolution or not, I don't recall that, Bill, but a strong opinion that there needs to -this needs to get done, whether there was a resolution or not I don't recall. What I don't recall is the expression of that opinion.

MR. DOLAN: Actually what I want to get at is the expression of that opinion.

MR. WISTOW: There is a resolution that deals with that.
Q. I want to get at the expression of the opinion by

25 the board. And you don't recall there being a
specific resolution dictating a preclosing assessment as you sit here?
A. I don't recall that.

4 Q. So then help me out to understand how it is the board expressed as a board to either Mr. Stokes, Mr. Saul or anyone else, professionals or lawyers, that there needed to specifically be a preclosing assessment of the game?
A. I don't know exactly. All I do know, if I
can find Keith's memo that came out later, it's very clear, you know -- yeah, July 22nd, he's very clear where --
Q. You're looking at Exhibit --
A. Exhibit 515. McDonald, but there's several of these in here where he says, "While we have not been yet able to outline the details of that monitoring," this is while he's talking about a cost, they -- "a third-party entity on a cost protocol on a cost and protocol for such monitoring." Monitoring was two parts in the discussion. He's only using the word monitoring here, but I think those that had expressed the concern talked about two parts, two pieces, an assessment and then the monitoring agreement. The assessment would set the basis for the monitoring
agreement, you know what I mean. You've got to do an assessment that says in order for them to succeed, they've got to meet these milestones, and then that becomes the basis for setting in place the monitoring to make sure they're meeting that. The assessment on the part of several of the board members was designed to test the reasonableness of the company's assumptions here. Now Keith understood here, "I will not proceed to close the transaction without consulting with you if such a mechanism cannot be achieved to our reasonable satisfaction."

And then asked for some input back and so, you know, four years -- I don't remember all the conversations and all the details, Bill, but I think there was a strong indication to Keith, and Keith understood this had to be in place, you know, prior to the closing.
Q. Now his memo doesn't mention anything about a preclosing assessment, does it?
A. No. He's using the term monitoring, but I think the context of the whole discussion was assessment and monitoring, two steps.
Q. I understand that completely. I'm asking a
specific question, which is, the communication to
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the board on this subject says nothing about a preclosing assessment, does it?
A. No, I understand. But the board was concerned about in the absence of being able to get insurance, that there was a reassurance in some way that this game could be completed on the time frame and in the financing that they indicated. So, you know, all I know is that was the sense of the board and would have expected that the assessment would be done prior to the closing, it would make no sense to do one afterwards.
Q. I understand completely. What I'm trying to get
at, Governor, is how it is that any member of the
board instructed the staff to do this very
important assessment before the closing?
MR. WISTOW: He's already testified
to that several times.
Q. No, he hasn't. He has given me generalities, his belief?
A. I said I don't remember exactly, Bill, what was said by whom when, you know, at what point. All I know is that, you know, Keith understood that there was a step to take place here before the closing.

1 Q. How did he know that?
2 A. Because it says that.
3 MR. MARTLAND: Move to strike.
4 Q. How did he know that?
5 A. It says it. It was a communication as part
of the board. I think there may have been a resolution that in fact directed that. I don't recall, but there may have been.
Q. So the board could express its directive through a
resolution if it wanted, right, that was one way of doing it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Another way was a board member saying something
specifically to one of the staff, right?
A. No. That wouldn't be -- not a board member.

The board -- it would be a sense of the board, not some board member going to EDC staff and saying do this.
Q. There would have to be statements by board members
at board meetings?
A. Exactly.
Q. Directing the staff to do something specific like
this?
A. Exactly.
Q. Do you have a memory?

1 A. And there were --
Q. Do you have a memory of specific statements --

MR. WISTOW: You cut him off.
Q. -- by members of the board --

MR. WISTOW: You cut him off.
MR. DOLAN: Max. --
MR. WISTOW: Did you catch it, he
said, "and there were" --
9 Q. That's what I'm getting at. As you sit here today
10 under oath, do you have a specific memory of a board member, one or more board members specifically telling Stokes, Saul or Stolzman to do a preclosing assessment?
A. Yes. I remember conversations. Now who they
were, as I said, two that were very concerned were the ones I mentioned, whether there were others, because there were a number of people that shared the same concern about this.
Q. You've mentioned Mr. Verrecchia?

20 A. Right.
21 Q. What did Mr. Verrecchia specifically state to
22 either Mr. Saul, Mr. Stokes or Mr. Stolzman --
23 A. I don't recall specifically, Bill.
24 Q. -- about the requirement of a preclosing
25 assessment?
that the transaction was approved in July of 2010 until the time of the closing in November of 2010 what the status of the preliminary assessment was?
A. Not to my knowledge. I just don't recall.
Q. You don't remember any member of the board ever
asking a question about that from and after the closing?
A. No.
Q. You gave an interview in the wake of the collapse
of 38 Studios, do you remember that?
A. I remember giving an interview. I don't remember what I said.
Q. Did you remember expressing the view that it
shouldn't have come as a surprise to RIEDC that 38
Studios was running out of money?
A. Yes.
Q. And why did you hold that view?
A. Well, again, I had been out of office for a
year and a half, Bill, so I had no contact with anybody at EDC, 38 Studios, nothing. I was just, you know, John Q. Public reading the paper when these things were breaking. It just startled me, that's all, that you know, we're just finding out that they're running out of cash the day before bankruptcy -- I'm exaggerating, but the day before that came as a surprise, right?
A. Yes. I'm just reacting to what I read in the newspaper, Bill, okay, and then I would have thought that if this thing were running out of cash, you know, there would be a lot of signals a lot earlier and there would have been, you know, activity taking place to try and find additional capital or whatever, but again, this was just a gut reaction, not knowing anything. As I said, gut reaction, not knowing anything. As I said,
there may have been discussions going on for additional capital, for all I know, but I was just sort of surprised.
bankruptcy. I thought we had a monitoring agreement in place, I thought there was a process that we were supposed to be following, that's all. But I had no knowledge, this was just my general, you know, view of what was happening and just being surprised. Now, I could be all wrong, there may have been all kinds of discussions going on that were not in the paper because my only source of information of what was being reported, and I should know better than pay much attention to that, but...
Q. You were surprised as an ex-banker that the lender
here apparently was stating its belief publicly;

1 Q. Have you read the amended complaint in this case?
2 THE WITNESS: The amended complaint?
3 Q. The complaint that the plaintiff filed against the
4 defendants?
5 A. No.
6 Q. Have you learned anything about the claims that
7 the plaintiff in this case is bringing against the defendants, the nature of the claims?
9 A. You know, not a whole lot of substance, no.
10 Q. Are you aware that, among other things, that
plaintiff here is suggesting that certain of the defendants committed fraud?
A. Yes. What's been reported. I didn't read
the complaint, but that's been reported in the paper.
Q. Do you have a view as to the -- strike that. The

RIEDC here approved the transaction to 38 Studios, correct?
A. Yes.

20 Q. And the board approved that transaction?
21 A. The board approved the transaction.
22 Q. And now the very same agency is suing the
23 financial advisors and the lawyers who were
24 involved in the transaction for fraud, correct?
25 A. Well, you said it. I don't know it. I'm
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|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | that's all. |
| 2 | Q. Now, there were no personal guarantees given by |
| 3 | any of the members of 38 Studios guaranteeing |
| 4 | repayment of this loan, were there? |
| 5 | A. Not to my knowledge. You know, I don't |
| 6 | believe so, but again -- I was not involved. |
| 7 | Q. I'm sorry. Was that an issue that was brought up |
| 8 | to the board? |
| 9 | A. I don't recall it being discussed, you know, |
| 10 | at any length, no. |
| 11 | Q. But it was discussed to some extent? |
| 12 | A. I don't recall it. I just don't. I just |
| 13 | don't remember it. |
| 14 | Q. $\quad$ Governor, there was a prior deposition, as you |
| 15 | know, of Stephen Lane, one of the members of the |
| 16 | board, and at that deposition, and I think the |
| 17 | best way to do this is Ill refer to the |
| 18 | transcript in Mr. Lane's deposition, which is Page |
| 19 | 262, starting with -- I'm sorry, yes, Page 262, |
| 20 | starting with Line 21. And what I asked Mr. Lane, |
| 21 | Governor, was, "Do you recall at some point, be it |
| 22 | Donna Cupelo or somebody asking Mike Saul the |
| 23 | question as to his opinion, do you recall Governor |
| 24 | Carcieri, in essence, cutting off that discussion |
| 25 | and saying, we have a sophisticated board and |

they're capable of making their own decisions?"
Then Mr. Lane answered that, Governor. "I have a recollection of Mike being cut off by the governor. I can't give you specifics around what was being said specifically at a specific meeting but it was during the -- it was during, clearly, like when we're near the decision making point, and that's when I referred earlier to this kind of the Governor made the recommendation. There was a
bit of this last word. This is what we're voting for, and he articulated the deal in the highest -I'm sorry, in the highest, most simplistic terms. Obviously, it had been well beaten down by then, and I believe that was kind of like the end of the conversation. So do I remember specifically what he was saying, I truly don't." I then asked Mr. Lane the question, "But you do have a recollection of him" -- and that means you, Governor, I apologize for the him -- "cutting Mike off?" And the answer by Mr. Lane was, "Absolutely." Do you recall a conversation of that sort at the meeting?
23 A. Not at all. I'm sorry, Bruce, but I don't recall. I don't recall even the context of the discussion that he's referring to. I don't
understand the first part of that.
Q. Well, what it was, if I may try to rephrase it

## Governor?

MR. WISTOW: No, no, don't rephrase
it. You read him some testimony --
Q. Let me ask it in a different way. At some point
at a meeting did Director Cupelo say -- ask Mike
Saul whether he had an opinion as to whether the EDC board should vote to approve this loan or not, and prior to Mr. Saul answering, you interjected, stopping him from answering, saying this is a very sophisticated board or words to the effect of this is a very sophisticated board who can make their own decisions based on the information given?

MR. WISTOW: Objection. There is no foundation for what you're suggesting Cupelo was asking. No foundation. I object.
A. To answer your question, I don't remember that at all, okay. I mean, again, it would be out of character for me, if Donna asked a question for me to say to Mike or to anybody, don't answer that question. I mean, there's no reason for me to say that, that's not my style. You know, if a board member had a question and asked the question -- so I don't have any recollection whatsoever of that
conversation, no.
Q. Governor, I understand you're saying, it's not
your style and that you don't recall it, but in
that Mr. Lane does recall it, it's possible that did happen; is that correct?
A. Well, I don't even understand what he was saying.

MR. WISTOW: It's completely unclear.
A. And what his response was, truthfully, Bruce,

I'd have to read it. I didn't follow what he was saying.
Q. Do you think it would be helpful if I marked this
page and showed it to you, Governor, so you could read it?
A. I can't --

MR. WISTOW: You don't have to mark it, just show it to you.
A. I'm not going to guess. If Steve Lane
testified under oath that this is something he observed or whatever, you know, I'm not going to say it didn't happen. What I'm saying is I have no memory or recollection of anything like that or -- no. That's all.

MR. WISTOW: Do you want to tell him what Donna Cupelo testified to about that?
the EDC board were replaced; is that correct?
A. I don't remember the exact time frame, but as we were discussing earlier, the whole board was restructured and what we did, because there was an Economic Policy Council that I co-chaired with, Paul Choquette chaired that. It had a lot of business leadership. And then there was EDC board, much smaller, and I had always felt in my years of dealing with the two, that there was duplicity, they really weren't communicating, first of all, an economic policy and strategy should be connected to economic development, and so the Legislature passed a statute that reconstituted the EDC board, enlarged it, and I don't remember the exact date of that, Bruce, but then so following on that, then, yes, we had to appoint all new members. I took some members from the former Economic Policy Council and retained some that were already on the EDC board. So -but it was a whole new board that was constituted,
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and I don't remember exactly the time frame.
Q. Governor, do you remember which board members were on the Economic Policy Council who you did appoint to the reconstituted EDC board?
A. I just -- I can't. I don't remember who was where.
Q. Governor, my final question, and I'll acknowledge
before I ask it, I'll use the language to say it's
a loaded question. If you had remained Governor
as opposed to Governor Chafee, do you think there
are things you could have done to have helped 38
Studios survive their economic hardships?
MR. DeSISTO: Objection.
MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. I can't answer that. As I said earlier in
response to Bill's question, you know, I was out a
year and a half. Okay. When I left, we were all excited, okay, the company was moving, we were -you know, we were excited about the prospects. What happened, I don't know, you know, I really don't. I had no contact with anybody at 38 Studios or with EDC. So that would not be a fair thing for me to even answer because I just don't know.

MR. GLADSTONE: Fair enough. No
further questions. Thank you, Governor.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Bruce.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off.
(OFF THE RECORD)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record.
EXAMINATION BY MR. MARTLAND
Q. Good afternoon, Governor. David Martland, I
represent Keith Stokes.
A. Okay, David.
Q. I will try to be brief, as I know it's been a very
long day and actually most of my co-counsel have covered many of the topics I was going to get into. If I could ask you, do you recall when and how you met Keith Stokes?
A. Well, Keith had been on the board of EDC for years, and so when I came in, he might have been on the board when I came in, I don't recall that, but he was on the board of the old EDC and, you know, I had a lot of respect and admiration for him. I used to run into him down on Aquidneck Island and in his role down there doing some terrific things.

When we reconstituted the board, and we did the national search, which turned into a debacle
in the sense that we identified somebody, brought her in, and then she backed out. And then after -- this was a lengthy search using, you know, a top flight placement firm, and so I, in consultation with some of the other board members said, look, you know, I think the guy that could do this job and could do it well would be Keith, and approached him to see if he would be interested because he had the job down on Aquidneck Island.

So, I had known him and worked with him on the EDC board in his role as a board member and had seen him in action, if you will, on Aquidneck Island and a number of things he was working on. Q. When you decided to appoint him as executive director, what was involved in that selection process for you?
A. Well, I think a lot of different elements. I thought in speaking to Keith and his strengths, you know, he knew the entity. I mean, he had been involved in the board, so he understood the economic development board. He understood the mission and was doing some of that kind of work, if you will, down on Aquidneck Island. In my judgment, doing a good job down there. that to the broad community, business community and the community in general, and Keith was well liked, well respected, handled himself very well on his feet and was a good spokesperson, if you will, and a good representation.

So, I thought the mix of all those things put together that, you know, he would be a very good person in that job.
Q. Were you aware of any particular business
background that Mr. Stokes may have had?
A. No. No. Outside of the EDC, you know, which

I would see him at all the monthly board meetings. My involvement with him or observation of him would have been in his work in Aquidneck Island, but I've forgotten his actual title there, but he was involved in a lot of the economic development on the island. So business background outside of that, no.
Q. Would it be fair to say that he was more of a public policy type of figure?
A. Well, I think public policy is something he
in this case, is that Mr. Stokes pushed through the 38 Studios deal through the board to remain in your good graces?

MR. WISTOW: Objection.
A. I was leaving office so I don't know -- that would make no sense to me, all right. He wouldn't -- if you had a question, I'm sorry I interjected. But whatever your question is. Q. I was going to ask if you had any thoughts regarding that particular allegation?
A. That's absurd -- not absurd. First of all, as I testified earlier, when I became aware of who 38 Studios was, and Curt Schilling, I referred Keith to them, and then as far as I was concerned, Keith and the team, not just Keith, they had a whole team, Mike Saul and all the others, you know, then ran, took the ball to see whether there was anything here or not in terms of a transaction but, you know, I don't believe I ever conveyed to Keith that, you know, this is a deal we got to get done. I didn't know enough about it to even do that. You've got to have, you know, the due diligence and the whole process.

So, why he would want to stay in my good graces when I'm leaving offices in three, four
obviously had a background in. But as I said, when I looked at the things that he had done and was doing on Aquidneck Island, there were a lot of really good things. And by the way, one of the things he spent a lot of time on, which I think was a positive for our state, was trying to get the America's Cup back again and, you know, he was really the point person. I give Keith the credit for orchestrating all that, meeting with the Oracle syndicate people and trying to identify what we had to do to possibly get the Cup races here. We didn't succeed, but we got the trials here. So I think he was a good business development guy.
Q. In your interactions with Mr. Stokes, was he
forthright with you with information?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. I believe you testified earlier you don't believe
that Mr. Stokes kept any information from you or
the board in connection with the 38 Studios transaction?
A. No. I'd be hugely disappointed, obviously,
but, you know, I trusted him and had confidence in his abilities.
25 Q. One of the contentions of the EDC, the plaintiff

1 months, wouldn't make any sense to me.
2 Q. Right. You never instructed Mr. Stokes to get
3 this deal done?
4 A. No. No.
5 Q. Are you aware of anyone in the General Assembly
6 that instructed Mr. Stokes to get this deal done?
A. No. I'm not aware of that.
Q. Previously you testified that you had some
conversations with Speaker Fox regarding 38
Studios?
A. I think it was just what I said is that my
style, and I believe I did in this case was to apprise both the Speaker and the Senate President of a sizable transaction, that this was under discussion, which I would do on a lot of different policy issues. So, that would just be the way I tried to operate. It wasn't a lengthy conversation. It wasn't any of the details of the deal or anything like that, it was just that, you know, EDC and the team there had been evaluating and in discussion with 38 Studios, and this looked it, you know, could potentially be a good transaction, a good opportunity for the state.
4 Q. Do you recall specifically what was discussed?
25 A. No.
Q. Do you recall having any discussions with General

Assembly leadership regarding the Rhode Island Jobs Creation Guaranty Program?
A. No, I really don't. I think that, you know, Keith, as part of the restructuring, as I said earlier of EDC, that there were several programs that we felt needed to be sort of arrows in the quiver from an economic development standpoint that needed the General Assembly to pass legislation that the loan guarantee was just one of them. I just don't remember, there were two or three others we needed to update the capacity on, et cetera.

So, I don't recall there being any lengthy discussion. I don't recall a discussion with the leadership on those things. I think as part of the whole restructuring that was being done of EDC, these were pieces that were put in place that were deemed to be, you know, part of the whole package.
Q. And would it be fair to say that Keith was undertaking a lot of those discussions regarding the program with the General Assembly leadership?
A. Yes. That would be the norm. His
predecessors did the same thing. You know, Mike
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McMahon for the first four years, generally, you
know, when he was trying to get some things through the General Assembly, he and his team would be having conversations with the leadership. If they had a problem or needed some help, they would come to me and say could you maybe talk to the Speaker about this or that, but that didn't happen in this case.

I think the legislative leadership was pretty supportive of what we were trying to do in terms of all the programs, the whole package of things that were restructuring EDC.
Q. Is it fair to say that you wanted Keith to see if
he could get those programs implemented?
A. Yes.

MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. I don't
have any further questions.
MR. WISTOW: I just got a couple to
keep things lively.

## EXAMINATION BY MR. WISTOW

Q. You were asked some questions about Michael Corso
earlier. During the time that you were involved
as chairman of the board of EDC, had you ever
heard that Corso had an agreement to get a
finder's fee if the 38 Studios transaction went
through, successfully through the EDC?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever hear that he had an agreement to get
a broker's commission if the loan by the EDC to 38
Studios went through?
A. No.
Q. Now, I'm going to show you Exhibit 36 -- I don't
have additional copies, I didn't anticipate we'd be using this, I think you all have Exhibit 36.

MR. DOLAN: Could you identify it?
MR. WISTOW: It's an e-mail from Rob
Stolzman, Wednesday, March 31st, 2010 at 2:05 to
Keith Stokes, Fred Hashway and Michael Saul, subject, RIEDC 38 Studios.
MR. DOLAN: Thank you.
Q. I'm just going to read this to you, Governor, and
then I have some questions about it. "Hello, all. I just got a call from Michael Corso. He told me that his post meetings went well last night and that Gordon and Steve C. want to put the moral ob. program in the fiscal year 2010 supplemental budget, which currently might be heard as early as next week, that coincides with Sharon Reynolds calling me from the House Fiscal while I was at your office and leaving me a message that Steve C.

## it?

MR. DOLAN: Form. Foundation.
Q. I'll withdraw the question.

THE WITNESS: Refresh my memory, when did I go up to Schilling's house?

MR. WISTOW: March 6th.
MR. HOLT: No question pending.
MR. WISTOW: We're done.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off.
(DEPOSITION CLOSED AT 3:45 P.M.)
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[^0]:    1 Q. Now, Exhibit 914 does not mention Wells Fargo by
    2 name, does it?
    3 A. No.
    4 Q. Let's turn to another exhibit here, Exhibit 756,
    please. Directing your attention to what's been marked for identification as Exhibit 756. Do you have that?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And that's an e-mail from Melissa Chambers at

    RIEDC dated September 8, 2010 to you and other board members of the EDC, right?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And did you have any reason to believe that you would not have received this?
    A. No.
    Q. So, this basically is a cover memorandum that's referring to certain calls and requests for information coming from both the public and from the Providence Journal regarding the 38 Studios transaction, right?
    A. Yes. As I recall, Melissa Chambers was the communications, you know, person from EDC. She was the focal point for any inquiries from the media at EDC.
    25 Q. To the best of your recollection, why would Ms.

