		Page 1		Page 3
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		1	Insurance Company.
	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN		2	DEUTCH & WEISS, LLC, 7670 North Port
			-	Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53217, by MR.
	KATHLEEN McHUGH, and DEANNA		3	CHARLES W. KRAMER, charles.kramer@mweisslaw.net,
	SCHNEIDER, Individually and on behalf]	appeared on behalf of American Motorists Insurance
	of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiffs,		4	Company.
	vs. CASE NO. 11-CV-724		5	INDEX
	MADISON-KIPP CORPORATION,		6	PETER M. UTTECH
	CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY,		7	By Mr. Busch5
	UNITED STATES FIRE INSURANCE		8	
	COMPANY and ABC INSURANCE COMPANIES 1-50,		9	By Mr. White41 By Mr. Kramer51
	Defendants,		10	By Ms. Kreil54
	and		11	EXHIBITS
	MADISON-KIPP CORPORATION,		12	No. 1 Discovery Documents; PLF_162_S_MARQ_000001
	Cross-Claimant,		13	to 0001245
	VS.		14	No. 2 Answers to Defendant Madison-Kipp Corporation's
	CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY, COLUMBIA CASUALTY COMPANY and		15	** *
	UNITED STATES FIRE INSURANCE		16	First Set of Interrogatories5 No. 3 Answers to Defendant United States Fire
	COMPANY,		17	Insurance Company's First Set of
			18	
	Cross-Claim Defendants,		19	Interrogatories5 No. 4 Responses to Defendant Madison-Kipp
	(Caption continued)		20	Corporation's First Set of Requests for
	DEPOSITION OF		21	Documents and Things5
	PETER M. UTTECH		22	No. 5 Responses to Defendant United States Fire
	Madison, Wisconsin		23	
	January 8, 2013		24	Insurance Company's First Set of Requests for Production5
	4:00 p.m. to 5:27 p.m.		25	No. 6 ARCADIS Letter, 5-15-12; MK017325 to 2638
	Kathy A. Halma, RPR	O	25	
		Page 2		Page 4
1 2	and CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY and		1	No. 7 RJN Letter, 7-20-12; RJN011684 to 9738
2	COLUMBIA CASUALTY COMPANY,		2	
3	Cross-Claim Defendants		3	
4	and		4	(The original transcript was sent to Attorney
5	and			Bianchi.)
6	LUMBERMENS MUTUAL CASUALTY COMPANY, AMERICAN MOTORISTS		5	
	INSURANCE COMPANY, and JOHN DOE		6	
7 8	INSURANCE COMPANIES 1-20, Third-Party Defendants.		7	(The original exhibits were retained by the court
9				reporter and attached to the original transcript.
10 11	A P P E A R A N C E S THE COLLINS LAW FIRM, P.C, 1770 North		8	Copies were attached to all ordered copies.)
	Park Street, Suite 200, Naperville, Illinois, 60563, by		9	
12	MR. EDWARD J. MANZKE, ejmanzke@collinslaw.com, appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs.		10	
13	VARGA, BERGER, LEDSKY, HAYES & CASEY,		11	
14	125 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1250, Chicago, Illinois,		12	
15	60606-4473, by MR. MICHAEL D. HAYES, mhayes@vblhc.com, appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs.		13	
16	MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP, 100 East		14	
17	Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202, by MR. JOHN A. BUSCH, jabusch@michaelbest.com, appeared on		15	
	behalf of Madison-Kipp Corporation.		16	
18	MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP, One		17	
19	South Pinckney Street, Suite 700, Madison, Wisconsin,		18	
20	53703, by MS. LEAH H. ZIEMBA, lhziemba@michaelbest.com, appeared on behalf of Madison-Kipp Corporation.		19	
21	TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP, 55 West Monroe		20	
22	Street, Suite 3000, Chicago, Illinois, 60603-5758, by MR. CHRISTOPHER H. WHITE,		21	
23	christopher.white@troutmansanders.com, appeared on behalf of the Defendant Continental Casualty Company.		22	
24	MEISSNER, TIERNEY, FISHER & NICHOLS,		23	
25	S.C., 111 East Kilbourn Avenue, 19th Floor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202-6622, by MS. JENNIFER KREIL,		24	
	jbk@mtfn.com, appeared on behalf of United States Fire		25	

	Page 5		Page 7
1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	1	duties that you had during that time period?
2	(Exhibits 1 through 5 were marked.)	2	A Well, I started out managing branches. I did a
3	PETER M. UTTECH, called as a witness	3	little bit of everything.
4	herein by the Defendants, after having been first	4	Q Did you originate loans?
5	duly sworn, was examined and testified as	5	A I originated loans.
6	follows:	6	Q And then you also served as a branch manager?
7	EXAMINATION	7	A Correct.
8	BY MR. BUSCH:	8	Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as
9	Q Please state your name.	9	Exhibit 2 and ask you if you can identify that,
10	A Peter M. Uttech.	10	please. Well, I will identify it for the record.
11	Q And what's your current home address?	11	These are the Answers to Interrogatories to
12	A 4710 Onyx Lane, Madison.	12	Defendant Madison-Kipp Corporation's First Set of
13	Q And can you briefly describe for me your	13	Interrogatories. Do you recall drafting these
14	educational background since high school.	14	and signing these, if you look on the back page?
15	A Four years of college.	15	A Yes, I do.
16	Q Where did you go to school?	16	Q And do you recall And this is just for
17	A Oshkosh.	17	identification purposes. Do you recall answering
18	Q Did you obtain a degree?	18	these questions and signing them?
19	A Yes.	19	A Yes, I do.
20	Q And in what?	20	Q Let me show you what's been marked as Exhibit 3,
21	A Bachelor of science.	21	which is Class Members' (Peter Uttech and Louise
22	Q In any area of specialty or major?	22	Loehnertz Uttech) Answers to Defendant United
23	A Economics and mathematics.	23	States Fire Insurance Company's First Set of
24	Q Can you briefly describe your work history since	24	Interrogatories. If you look on the last page,
25	graduating from college?	25	you will see your signature there, as well, in
	Page 6		Page 8
1	A The majority of my work history was in the	1	the verification. Do you recall answering these
2	savings and loan business for 34 years.	2	questions and signing that document?
3	Q And what did you do in the savings and loan	3	A Yes, I do.
4	business?	4	Q And do you recall doing so to the best of your
5	A Well, my last assignment was retail branch	5	ability at the time?
6	manager on the west side at the Hilldale office.	6	A Yes, I do.
7	Q Did you work for one savings and loan during that	7	Q Okay. Let me show you what's been marked as
8	time period?	8	Exhibit 4, which is and Exhibit 5, which are
9	A Yes, First Federal Savings & Loan, which was	9	your responses to the first request for documents
10	purchased by First Federal of LaCrosse and then	10	first promulgated by Madison-Kipp, which is
11	by Associated Bank.	11	Exhibit 4, and then by United States Fire
12	MS. KREIL: Can you speak up a little	12	Insurance, which is Exhibit 5. Do you see those?
13	bit. I'm having a really hard time hearing you.	13	A This one is from
14	THE WITNESS: Sure.	14	Q If you look on the last page, I think you will
15	BY MR. BUSCH:	15	probably see it.
16	Q Are you retired now?	16	A Okay.
17	A I'm retired.	17	Q And do you recall, sir, that you were asked by
18	Q And when did you retire?	18	your lawyers or otherwise to make a diligent
19	A 2005.	19	search for documents relating to the property at
20	Q Have you had any jobs, part time or otherwise,	20	162 South Marquette?
21	since retirement?	21	A Yes.
22	A I'm a volunteer and I am a caregiver.	22	Q And did you make such a diligent search?
23	Q Can you briefly describe for me while employed by	23	A I did.
24	Associated Bank, First Federal and all its	24	Q Let me show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1,
25	predecessors, was their a progression of job	25	which I have on the bottom PLF_162_S_MARQ_000001

	Page 9			Page 11
1	through 000124, which I represent to you is the	1		MR. BUSCH: I didn't see a copy of it in
2	documents that were proffered to us as being	2		the documents that were produced. I will go
3	responsive to the document requests made to you.	3		through that list again. But, Ed, if there's
4	If you could just take a moment to take a look at	4		not, I may want a copy of it.
5	it, and do those appear to be the documents that	5	BY	MR. BUSCH:
6	you supplied in response to the request for	6		Do you recall, sir, what your monthly rental is?
7	production of documents?	7	À	
8	A Yes, they are.	8	Q	·
	Q When did you purchase 162 South Marquette?	9		received on a monthly basis prior to
	A 1977.	10		December 2010?
11	Q Can you describe for me the circumstances under	11	A	Slightly more.
12	which you purchased it?	12	Q	
13	A I purchased it as an investment for college funds	13	À	I don't remember. It was rented to my son.
14	for my young son at the time. I had a goal of	14	Q	
15	purchasing another one, but ran out of money.	15		monthly basis from 162 South Marquette?
16	Q Is this the only And you used it kind of as a	16	A	For that property, yes.
17	rental property. If I say it's a rental	17	Q	
18	property, is that a fair description?	18	Ā	* * * * *
19	A Um-hum.	19	Q	How did you establish the \$910 a month rental
20	Q How many units are there in this property, one or	20		value?
21	two?	21	A	I tried to look in the newspaper to figure out
22	A One unit.	22		what current market rents were going for and then
23	Q Okay. Did you ever live in it as your home?	23		adjust for my circumstances there to be able to
24	A No, I did not.	24		get a renter to pay my holding costs until I
25	Q Have you continuously rented it since 1977 to the	25		could sell it.
	Page 10			Page 12
1	present?	1	Q	And what are your holding costs?
2 .	A Yes.	2	A	I have a small mortgage on it. I have real
3	Q Has there ever been a time when it's been	3		estate taxes, insurance.
4	unoccupied?	4	Q	And on a monthly basis do you know what your
5	A Yes.	5		carrying costs are for 162 South Marquette?
6	Q When?	6	A	Not exactly.
7	A December of 2010 until about September of 2011.	7	Q	Does the \$910 defray the total expense?
	Q During that time period did you attempt to rent	8	A	
9	the place?	9	Q	And on top of it you receive some incremental
	A No. I had it listed for sale.	10		income?
	Q Okay. Since September 2011 have you rented the	11	_	
12	location?	12	Q	, and the second
	A Yes.	13		you receive?
	Q Okay. And to whom have you rented it?	14	_	No.
	A I think it was	15	Q	, and the second
	Q I will tell you that in your answers to	16 17		consideration your current circumstance, so you
17	interrogatories you list Pierre Stephenson and	17		looked at the rental value on the east side. Is
18	Sarah Wykhuis? A Yes.	18 19	٨	that fair to say? Yes.
	Q That's W-Y-K-H-U-I-S, Sarah with an H and Pierre	20	A 0	And did you reduce it based upon what you viewed
21	with two Rs and an E and Stephenson with a P-H	21	Ų	to be your then current circumstance?
	and S-O-N.	22	A	Yes.
2.2	und D O 11.			
22 23	Do you have a lease rental agreement	2.3	()	How much?
22 23 24	Do you have a lease rental agreement with Mr. Stephenson and Ms. Wykhuis?	23 24	Q A	How much? Enough so I could rent it.

		Page 13			Page 15
1		represented to you the fair market rental value?	1		your son?
2	A	*	2	Δ	Right.
3	Q	What in your opinion was the fair market rental	3		You didn't go out and do an independent view as
4	V	value?	4	Q	to what the market was?
5	A	In excess of \$1,000.	5	Α	
6	Q	How much in excess of \$1,000?	6	Q	But from time to time you would increase the
7	A	Probably like \$1,100.	7	•	rent?
8	Q	And that's based upon your review of similar	8	Α	Correct.
9		rents in the area?	9	O	What prompted you to put the property up for sale
10	A	Yes.	10		in 2010?
11	Q	Correct?	11	A	My son moved out and he bought a house, and I
12	_	Yes.	12		decided at that point in time I wanted to sell
13	Q	Did you have a discussion with Mr. Stephenson and	13		the house.
14		Ms. Wykhuis about what you viewed to be the	14	Q	Okay. And what did you do in preparation for
15		circumstances of the home when you rented it to	15		sale of the home?
16		them?	16	A	Quite a bit of rehab, upgrading it, making it
17	A	I did.	17		presentable as an owner occupied single family
18	Q		18		home.
19	A	I said there was currently an investigation of	19	Q	Did you keep track of the money that you put in
20		vapors and there was a remediation system	20		to the home?
21		installed; it was ongoing and I would keep them	21	A	I did.
22		apprised. He was concerned about planting a	22	Q	J 1
23		garden in the back yard. I said I couldn't	23	A	I don't know off the top of my head.
24		answer that.	24	Q	If I wanted to know the answer to that, could it
25	Q	Do you know if he has planted a garden in the	25		be retrieved even as we speak?
		Page 14			Page 16
1		back yard?	1	A	Definitely.
2	A	I don't believe so.	2	Q	
3	Q	How long is the lease?	3		to what you put into the property, or do you have
4		Until Monch 21 2012	4		
5	A	Until March 31, 2013.			receipts or how did you keep track?
	A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted	5	A	Both, receipts and ledger.
6	_	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be	5 6	A Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any
6 7	Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property?	5 6 7	_	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into
6 7 8	Q A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No.	5 6 7 8	Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property?
6 7 8 9	Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving	5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more.
6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month?	5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six?
6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that.
6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son lived there, which is what, about eight or nine	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take place, do you know?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son lived there, which is what, about eight or nine years?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A A Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take place, do you know? From December 2010 to July of 2011.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A A A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son lived there, which is what, about eight or nine years? Correct.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take place, do you know? From December 2010 to July of 2011. So between those two dates was the house up for
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son lived there, which is what, about eight or nine years? Correct. You would adjust the rent from time to time?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take place, do you know? From December 2010 to July of 2011. So between those two dates was the house up for sale?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A A A	Prior to December 2010, had you ever discounted the rental payments for what you believed to be the circumstances on your property? No. And prior to December of 2010, you were receiving something less than \$910 a month? Yes. But the first time you decreased what you believed to be the fair market value, rental value, was when you leased the property in September of 2011? I need to clarify that. My son lived in the property, and so he probably wasn't paying full market rent. But is it fair to say during the time your son lived there, which is what, about eight or nine years? Correct.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A A Q	Both, receipts and ledger. As you sit here today, do you have any recollection as to how much money you put into the property? I'm guessing, but, you know, \$6,000 or more. Less than ten, but more than six? I can't speak to that. Okay. You can't identify it? It was substantial and I can identify it. I had to take it as depreciation, and it was done in the view of trying to sell the house. Okay. New furnace, new windows, refinished wood floors, redid the kitchen. It's all in my records. Okay. And over what period of time did that take place, do you know? From December 2010 to July of 2011. So between those two dates was the house up for

		Page 17			Page 19
1		sale?	1	A	Yes.
2	Α	No.	2	Q	Do you recall those circumstances?
3		Now I'm going to make reference to certain	3	À	
4	•	documents that are in that pile of Exhibit 1, and	4	Q	And you didn't object to it, did you?
5		I'm going to reference them by looking at the	5	Ā	
6		Bate stamp on the bottom. It's this pile right	6	Q	
7		here. It will be in this pile right here	7		put your property up for sale, do you recall any
8		(indicating).	8		interactions with Madison-Kipp at all in regard
9		So I'm going to have you look first, you	9		to the absence, presence or issue of PCE on your
10		may want to take the clip off, but keep them in	10		property?
11		order because I'm going to bounce around a little	11	A	Well, they kept telling me everything was okay.
12		bit. If you look at the bottom and look for a	12	Q	
13		document that bears the last three numbers or the	13	À	•
14		Bate stamp 118. It's a letter to you from URS	14	Q	
15		dated December 4, 2003. Do you see that?	15		informed you that things were okay?
16	Α	Yes.	16	A	Letters like this.
17	Q	And it relates to samples taken on your Why	17	Q	Okay. So between 2004 and let's say just as a
18	_	don't you take a moment and just I'm going to	18		date the date you put it up for sale in 2010, you
19		ask you, not in any detail, but just if you want	19		had no belief that there was any concern with
20		to take a moment to look at it to refresh your	20		regard to PCE on your property?
21		recollection as to the content of that document	21	A	On soil.
22		and the subject.	22	Q	On soil. How about with regard to vapor?
23	A	Okay.	23	A	Vapor, nothing was said about vapor up to that
24	Q	Do you recall in or about December of 2003 being	24		point.
25		apprised that Madison-Kipp Corporation was taking	25	Q	That's what I wanted to know. Nothing was said
		Page 18			Page 20
1		soil samples from the back yard of your rental	1		about vapor before 2010, correct? Nothing was
2		property?	2		said to you, correct?
3	A	Yes.	3	Α	Right.
4	Q	Prior to this, and using this as a basis to	4	Q	If you take a look at the same set of documents,
5		refresh your recollection, if it helps, do you	5		if you look at Document 6, this is a letter to
6		recall having any interaction with Madison-Kipp	6		you from Madison-Kipp dated August 20, 2010 from
7		or the Wisconsin DNR in regard to the absence or	7		Mr. Meunier regarding environmental monitoring
8		presence of PCE on your property?	8		indicating that further testing for soil vapor
9	Α	I don't remember.	9		would be done. Do you see that?
10	Q	Okay. Take a look at the document the next	10	Α	Yes.
11		document which starts at 121. This is a document	11	Q	As you sit here today, recognizing that I'm
12		dated November 11, 2004 from RSV Engineering. Do	12		just going off the documents you produced. Is
13		you see that?	13		this the first recollection you have or the
14	Α	Yes.	14		earliest recollection you have of subsurface soil
15	Q	Signed by a Robert Nauta. Do you see that?	15		vapors being tested on your property?
16	A	Yes.	16	Α	Clarify that for me.
17	Q	If you could just take a moment and look over	17	Q	, ,
18		this. Read as much as you want or look over it.	18		testing going on on the Madison-Kipp property,
19		I just have a couple of questions.	19		correct?
20	_	Okay.	20		Right.
21	Q	- I	21	Q	Were you aware of any vapor testing being done on
22		in 2004 you were apprised of the fact that	22		your property, per se?
23		Madison-Kipp was going to inject a reagent into	23		Yes, they put probes in.
24		property along the border, and that they were	24	Q	Okay. And they were monitored from time to time?
25		going to monitor it thereafter?	25	A	Right.

		Page 21			Page 23
1	O	And would you get the results of that monitoring	1		not replaced the furnace as of that date?
2		from time to time?	2	Α	Correct.
3	Α	Yes, and they said everything is okay, and all of	3	Q	And then it says, "Have a licensed electrician
4		a sudden they said, "Hey, they jumped, now we	4	~	fix reverse polarity outlets in the kitchen and
5		have to do more testing."	5		bring into compliance outlet in the ceiling in
6	0	And that was in 2010?	6		the basement."
7		Yes, so then the big issue took place.	7	Α	That was done.
8	Q		8	Q	That was done?
9	×	summer or fall of 2010?	9	Ā	
10	Α	That's correct.	10	Q	And this is all a result of an inspection report?
11	Q		11	Ā	Correct.
12	~	putting your house up for sale, correct?	12	Q	Three, install two steel jack posts near wood
13	Α	It was after I had the house up for sale, because	13	V	post currently in the basement. Was that done?
14		I had to amend the Real Estate Condition Report	14	Α	
15		reporting this to whomever was going to make an	15	Q	Okay. That appears to be some suggestion that
16		Offer to Purchase.	16	V	structurally there needed to be some
17	O	Let's take a look at Document 97. Now this is an	17		reinforcement, correct? It's suggested. I'm not
18	×	Offer to Purchase your property, correct?	18		saying it was needed.
19	Α	That's correct.	19	Α	It's suggested, and he was wrong again.
20	Q		20	Q	Has that ever been done?
21	×	Dennis?	21	Ă	
22	Α		22	Q	And then it says, "Have all windows that are
23	Q	And Wayne Dennis?	23		painted shut or stuck shut so they open except
24	À	-	24		the window over the sink going to the
25	Q	And it was in the amount of \$140,520?	25		three-season porch."
		Page 22			Page 24
1	٨	Yes.	1	A	
2	Q		2		
3	Q	counteroffer on your part for \$142,000.	3		ping-pong table was deleted from the Offer to
4	۸	Yes.	4		Purchase?
5	Q		5		Yes.
6	Q	there's a counteroffer, 10/21/10, for the	6		Okay. And then there's an amendment on 107 dated
7		purchase price to be \$142,000 with a credit. Do	7		November 20, 2010 where the financing date is
8		you see that?	8		extended to 11/24/2010?
9	A	Yes.	9		Yes.
10	Q	And then there's an amendment to the offer on	10	0	And then on 108 there's an 11/24/2010 where the
11	V	Page 105 dated November 1, 2010?		•	7 the then on 100 there's an 11/24/2010 where the
1			11		financing date is extended to 12/20/10?
12	Δ	_	11 12		financing date is extended to 12/20/10?
12 13		Yes.	12	A	Yes.
13	A Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person	12 13	A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated
13 14		Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as	12 13 14	A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase,
13 14 15	Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition?	12 13 14 15	A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct?
13 14 15 16	Q A	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes.	12 13 14 15 16	A Q A	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number?
13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that?	12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes.	12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q A	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into the facility. Was it after October of 2010 you	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A Q A	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the Cancellation and Mutual Release?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into the facility. Was it after October of 2010 you put the new furnace in?	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the Cancellation and Mutual Release? That's correct.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into the facility. Was it after October of 2010 you put the new furnace in? January of 2011. We had the furnace checked out,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the Cancellation and Mutual Release? That's correct. Okay. Now what was the status of the condition
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into the facility. Was it after October of 2010 you put the new furnace in? January of 2011. We had the furnace checked out, it was okay. The inspector was wrong.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the Cancellation and Mutual Release? That's correct. Okay. Now what was the status of the condition report on the property, if you recall, as of that
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q	Yes. And it talks about have a qualified HVAC person inspect, clean or repair/replace the furnace as needed to be in a safe condition? Yes. Do you see that? Yes. I believe you said you put in a new furnace into the facility. Was it after October of 2010 you put the new furnace in? January of 2011. We had the furnace checked out,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A Q	Yes. And then there's a Cancellation Agreement dated 12/10/2010 cancelling the Offer to Purchase, correct? What number? That's 109. It's on the bottom 109. I signed it 12/15. Okay. That's fine. Document 109 is the Cancellation and Mutual Release? That's correct. Okay. Now what was the status of the condition

		Page 25			Page 27
1	Q	Well, hang on. Let me see. I think I can help	1	A	I don't know.
2	×	you out. Directing your attention to Page 93?	2		But that was that came out at either 143 or
3	Α	Yes.	3		145?
4	Q		4	A	It was 144.
5		dated January 3, 2011, is that correct?	5		Now did Mr. and Mrs. Dennis, were they unable to
6	Α	Yes.	6		get financing? Is that the reason that they
7	Q		7		cancelled their agreement?
8	•	cancelled on December 15, 2010, and the Real	8	A	That's what my understanding is.
9		Estate Condition Report that you have in front of	9	0	
10		you was executed on January 3, 2011, correct?	10	À	
11	A	•	11		MR. HAYES: You have to answer out loud.
12	0	Was there a Real Estate Condition Report that	12		THE WITNESS: No, I did not.
13	`	existed prior to January 3, 2011?	13	BY	MR. BUSCH:
14	A	Yes.	14	Q	Your agent told you that?
15	Q	And this one that's dated January 3, 2011, if you	15	Ā	
16	_	look on Page 94, it says, "See attached letter	16	Q	Did you make any disclosures to Mr. or
17		about DNR vapor sampling."	17		Mrs. Dennis in regard to the vapor issues as part
18	A	Yes.	18		of the sale process?
19	Q	And then there's an attachment. "Seller was	19	A	I did.
20		notified recently that the Madison-Kipp	20	Q	Okay. When did you do that?
21		Corporation and DNR will be doing additional	21	A	It was after I had that late summer notice and
22		monitoring of possible ground vapors to finalize	22		then the follow-up meeting at Madison-Kipp.
23		the testing they have been doing over the last	23	Q	Sometime before they signed the Offer to Purchase
24		several years. These additional tests will be at	24		in October?
25		no cost to the property owner. If any readings	25	A	That's correct.
		Page 26			Page 28
1		are not acceptable, a remediation system will be	1	O	Okay. So you disclosed to Mr. and Mrs. Dennis
2		installed at no charge to the property owner."	2		before they signed this offer that there had
3		Then it says, "See attached letter." I don't	3		been you had been contacted in August or so of
4		have the attached letter.	4		2010 regarding further vapor testing?
5		Did the real estate I have looked for	5	A	I had to.
6		another Real Estate Condition Report prior to	6	Q	I'm trying to get it chronologically.
7		this. Do you know what the Real Estate Condition	7	A	Yes.
8		Report prior to the one of January 3, 2011 stated	8	Q	And with that knowledge they signed this
9		in regard to the ground vapor issue?	9		agreement, correct?
10	A	I don't recall, but this is the one This	10	A	Correct.
11		condition report is the one when I relisted it	11	Q	And they signed it without any condition with
12		January 3, 2011, because the listing had expired.	12		respect to the vapor issue, correct?
13		There's a lot of paper.	13	A	
14	Q	I understand.	14	Q	They did, however, request a property inspection?
15		I can get you anything you want.	15	A	
16	Q	Okay. Now in your answers to interrogatories I	16	Q	
17		will just tell you that you said that there had	17		inspection that they submitted a counteroffer
18		been two appraisals that were done, one for	18		that requested that you do certain items to fix
19		\$144,000 and one for \$145,000.	19		it, correct?
20		Correct.	20	_	Yes.
21	Q	11	21	Q	And you did some of them and some of them you did
22		the Offer to Purchase that was submitted by Mr.	22	A	not do, correct?
23	Α	and Mrs. Dennis, if you know? Yes.	23 24	_	Yes. Put even though you did some they still didn't
24 25	A Q	And who did that, if you recall?	24 25	Q	But even though you did some, they still didn't buy?
∠5	Ų	And who did that, if you recall?	43		ouy:

		Page 29			Page 31
1	Α	That's correct.	1		would indicate
2	Q	Because you understood that they could not get	2		As you sit here today, do you recall
3		financing?	3		what the price was that you ultimately agreed to
4	A	That's correct.	4		with Michael Bennett?
5	Q	Did you ever talk to their loan officer?	5	Α	I don't recall.
6	A	I did not.	6	Q	
7	Q	And whatever knowledge you got you got from your			is a series of emails?
8	`	real estate agent?	8	A	What was the page?
9	A	That's correct.	9	Q	Page 23.
10	Q	I'm going to go through some documents to kind of	10	À	Okay.
11		set a chronology. Let's go to the document with	11	Q	And it starts on Page 24, which is an email from
12		66 on the bottom. That's an Offer to Purchase	12		you to Mr. Nehls-Lowe in regard to test results.
13		where the buyer is a Mr. Michael Bennett?	13	A	Yes.
14	A	Yes.	14	Q	And then it follows on the next page in this
15	Q	And this was executed on or about January 18,	15		email chain indicating that you received a
16		2011?	16		telephone call sometime in the middle of the page
17	A	Yes.	17		on the 18th of February 2011 where Mr. Nehls-Lowe
18	Q	And this is after you had amended the disclosure,	18		explained to you the February results of the
19		the Real Estate Condition Report?	19		tests?
20	A	There was a new disclosure.	20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Right. This is the new disclosure?	21	Q	And then there's an email on top of that where
22	A	Right. That's a new disclosure.	22		you're sending it looks like all these
23	Q	And you can take a moment and satisfy yourself,	23		emails to Gary Lukens, who I assume is your
24		but was there anything in this offer that	24		realtor?
25		referenced that condition report?	25	A	Yes.
		Page 30			Page 32
1	A	They have the standard language about a Real	1	Q	Okay. Do you recall sending those emails on or
2		Estate Condition Report in the offer, that I had	2	•	about that time?
3		to provide one.	3	A	I do.
4	Q	Which you did, correct?	4	Q	Okay. As you sit here today, there are a series
5	A	Yes.	5		of emails, and we can go through them, but as you
6	Q	And it's the one that you executed on or about	6		sit here today, what's your best recollection as
7		January 3rd?	7		to the ultimate resolution, if there were any, in
8	A	Yes.	8		regard to what to do about the test results that
9	Q	Okay.	9		came from your sub-slab and indoor air testing?
10		MR. MANZKE: John, I'm not sure if	10	A	Very confusing. Mr. Nauta thought it was okay.
11		there's a question pending.	11		Mr. Nehls-Lowe had concerns. All I wanted to do
12	BY	MR. BUSCH:	12		is get a certification that would be acceptable
13	Q	The offer was for \$135,000, correct, on the first	13		to my buyer that would buy my house.
14		page?	14	Q	Did you ever receive such a certification?
15	A	I don't remember. What's the number?	15	A	Not in time.
16	Q	Sixty-six.	16	Q	, ,
17	A		17		after the fact?
18	Q	And if you look at Page 75, it indicates that on	18	A	Sort of, but by then everything else was hitting
19		or about January 20, 2011 you countered?	19		the sink.
20	A	ř	20	Q	•
21	Q	It looks to me like you countered. I can't tell	21	A	1 1
22		what the amount was. Was the counter based	22		going to work on this, and you can see in one of
23		upon Was it a monetary counter?	23		my emails my frustration with dealing with these
24	A		24		people.
25	Q	Okay. Somewhere there would be a document that	25	Q	A mitigation system ultimately was installed?

		Page 33			Page 35
1	Α	Yeah.	1		immediate health concern in the house as the
2	Q		2		issue is with the soil below the subject
3	À		3		basement. My concern is the water seeping into
4		the 30th. It was like pulling teeth, and then it	4		the basement could very well be contaminated and
5		was too late.	5		could be releasing PCE vapors in the air. Again,
6	Q	The buyer had walked before March 30th?	6		I'm not an expert in this area, but I would
7	A	-	7		recommend further tests and fully agree with the
8	Q	Okay. Directing your attention to 54, Document	8		Department of Health Services in that a radon
9		54, this is a Statement of Denial from MGIC	9		sub-slab depressurization system be installed in
10		addressed to Michael Bennett and Associated Bank.	10		this house. This will help to mitigate potential
11		Do you recall the circumstances under which you	11		radon in the house, as well." Do you see that?
12		received this?	12	A	Yes.
13	A	I believe I got it from my realtor.	13	Q	That was the recommendation?
14	Q	•	14	A	Yes.
15		Because it's a Statement of Denial, correct?	15	Q	And, in fact, a mitigation system was installed,
16	A	Yes.	16		correct?
17	Q		17		Yes.
18		minimum underwriting standards due to property	18	Q	, 11
19		condition or home is located in area of	19		fair market value of \$145,000, correct?
20		contamination. MGIC required appraiser to	20	A	Yes, but if you were a lender, would you lend on
21		address all areas and find comp in area.	21	_	that property?
22		Appraiser did neither. Appraisal was sent to	22	Q	
23		management and property denied." Do you see	23		an appraisal?
24		that?	24		You didn't answer my question.
25	A	Yes.	25	Q	Well
		Page 34			Page 36
1	Q		1		MR. MANZKE: You have to answer the
2					
3	A		2		questions, Peter.
	A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56	2 3		questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH:
4		All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was	2 3 4		questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial.
4 5	Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011?	2 3 4 5		questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this
4 5 6	Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum.	2 3 4 5 6	Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders?
4 5 6 7	Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know.
4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved one way or another or this could have a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he submitted the March 22, 2011 appraisal to his
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved one way or another or this could have a very negative effect on the subject's value or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he submitted the March 22, 2011 appraisal to his lenders?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved one way or another or this could have a very negative effect on the subject's value or marketability. According to the Department of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he submitted the March 22, 2011 appraisal to his lenders? I do not know.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved one way or another or this could have a very negative effect on the subject's value or marketability. According to the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Health	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he submitted the March 22, 2011 appraisal to his lenders? I do not know. Did you continue to list your home after
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q	All right. If you look at 56, Document 56 through Document 65, that's an appraisal that was done on March 22, 2011? Um-hum. And its opinion is that a fair market value was \$145,000. Do you see that? Assuming there were no issues. Well, directing your attention to Page 63, it states, does it not, that the condition of the property It states, "My concern is that there is potential soil and water contamination with this property, and the presence of water in the basement, no matter how small, raises a concern for public safety. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I have no way of determining past, present or future health concerns. My feeling is that this potential issue needs to be resolved one way or another or this could have a very negative effect on the subject's value or marketability. According to the Department of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	questions, Peter. MR. BUSCH: Well, this is dated five days after the denial. Do you know if Mr. Bennett ever submitted this appraisal to MGIC or to his lenders? I do not know. Okay. Directing your attention to Page 86, this is a Cancellation Agreement submitted to you by Mr. Bennett that you signed on 4/4/11, correct? Yes. Okay. You returned the \$1,000 earnest money, correct? That was returned. And it ended the agreement? That's correct. Did you ever talk directly with Mr. Bennett? I did not. As you sit here today, you do not know if he submitted the March 22, 2011 appraisal to his lenders? I do not know. Did you continue to list your home after Mr. Bennett

		Page 37			Page 39
1	Q	Okay. And how long did you list your home?	1	A	No.
2		I think the standard listing was six months from	2	0	
3		January.	3		you know if ARCADIS did that work, the sealing
4	Q	So that comports with the fact that I think you	4		and the painting?
5	•	said you leased it sometime in July of 2011.	5	A	No.
6	A	July or September, somewhere in there.	6	Q	Did they do it?
7	Q	Okay. Did you receive any further offers on your	7	A	Not that I'm aware of.
8		home?	8	Q	Okay. Looking at Exhibit 7, this is a letter to
9	A	There were a couple of them.	9		you dated July 20, 2012. Do you recall receiving
10	Q	I don't have any copies of them. Were they	10		this letter?
11		written offers?	11	A	Yes.
12	A	They were written offers.	12	Q	1
13	Q	Were they at a level acceptable to you?	13		soil samples taken in two locations in your back
14	A	No.	14		yard?
15	Q	Do you know how much they were?	15	Α	Yes.
16	A	I don't recall.	16	Q	
17	Q	Do you have copies of them?	17		in any of the samples. Do you see that?
18	A	Yes.	18		Yes.
19	Q	As you sit here today, do you have any Well,	19	Q	, , , , , ,
20		we will just get copies of them.	20		receive any level of relief in learning that
21		You didn't accept them because you	21		fact?
22		didn't think they represented the fair market	22		For the soil I did, eight years late.
23		value of the property?	23	Q	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
24 25	A		24 25		tenant about extending the terms of the lease beyond 2013?
	Q	You thought it was higher, the fair market value,	25		beyond 2013?
		Page 38			Page 40
1		than what they were offering?	1		No.
2	A	Yes.	2	Q	Do you intend to continue leasing?
3	DIL	(Exhibits 6 and 7 were marked.)	3	_	As well as I can.
4	_	MR. BUSCH:	4	Q	J
5	Q	I'm going to show you what's been marked as	5		seek replacement tenants?
6		Uttech Exhibit 6 and Uttech Exhibit 7. Uttech	6	_	Summer.
7		Exhibit 6 is a letter to you from Jennine Trask	7	Q	, and the second se
8		indicating the results of an inspection of a	8		the two tenants that are there now as to whether
9 10		sub-slab depressurization system at your home.	9 10	٨	they wish to extend the lease? No.
11		Do you see that? Take a moment to take a look at it.	11	А	MR. BUSCH: Ed, if I could have a moment
12	A	Yes.	12		to talk to my colleague.
13	Q	Do you recall at some point in time ARCADIS	13		MR. MANZKE: Okay.
14	Ų	personnel came into your home and inspected the	14		(A recess was taken.)
15		sub-slab depressurization system?	15	BY	MR. BUSCH:
16	Α		16	0	
17	Q		17	~	assessor about the value of your property for tax
18	~	and did it?	18		purposes?
19	A	Yes.	19	A	No.
20	Q	And there are certain recommendations made with	20	Q	
21	•	regard to promote continued successful operation,	21	`	assessed value?
22		one being sealing the crack around the patched	22	A	No.
•		concrete, and the other is painting the exterior	23	Q	Have you ever had any radon testing at your home?
23				-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23 24		piping and brackets. Were those done? Did you	24	A	No.

		Page 41			Page 43
1		property.	1	Q	Several miles away?
2	Α	In the '90s.	2	Ā	
3	Q		3	0	And do you know how long she lived at that
4	~	recently in the last year and one-half?	4	~	location on the west side?
5	A		5	A	
6	Q		6	Q	
7	~	have not had an appraisal done?	7	Ā	1980s, early 1980s.
8	Α		8	0	Okay. Your Onyx Lane residence, approximately
9	Q		9	•	how far is that located from Madison-Kipp?
10	A		10	Α	About two or three miles.
11	Q		11	0	
12		going to lease or sell at the expiration of the	12	•	sustained any damages that occurred between
13		current lease?	13		January 1, 1980 and January 1 of 1987?
14	Α	My desire is to sell.	14	Α	Any damages? The damage that occurred is the
15	Q	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	15		questionable value of the property. You know, I
16	Ā		16		don't know how that came about.
17	Q	-	17	0	Okay. All of the attempts you have made to sell
18		On if these issues about the vapors can be	18	•	the property have been in 2010 and later?
19		resolved and eliminated.	19	Α	Correct.
20		MR. BUSCH: I have no further questions.	20	0	You didn't attempt to sell the property at any
21		EXAMINATION	21		time between 1980 and 1987, did you?
22	BY	MR. WHITE:	22	Α	No.
23	Q	Good afternoon, Mr. Uttech. My name is Chris	23	Q	
24		White. I represent Continental Casualty Company	24		that the rent you receive from the current tenant
25		and Columbia Casualty Company, which are some of	25		exceeds your costs of owning and maintaining the
		Page 42			Page 44
1		Madison-Kipp's past insurance companies. I have	1		property, is that correct?
2		a few follow-up questions. The first is	2	Α	No.
3		concerning your Onyx Lane home in Madison. How	3	Q	
4		long have you lived at that residence?	4		It covers the costs.
5	Α	Since 1979.	5	Q	So essentially you are neither making or losing
6	Q	Are you married?	6	•	money on this property, it's just sort of a wash?
7	A	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7	Α	I'm making some money on it. I don't know the
8	Q		8		exact amount. It's all relative. What's your
9	À	Yes.	9		return on the investment. If the property value
10	Q	To the same woman?	10		is zero, it's a pretty good return.
11	À		11	O	
12	Q	When did you and your current wife become	12		month on a just on a money in versus money out
13		married?	13		basis, are you currently making money, losing
14	A	I better know that, right? September 20, 2008.	14		money or neither making or losing money on the
15		My previous wife died.	15		property?
16	Q		16	A	
17	A		17	Q	And since 1979 when you purchased the home
18	Q	Do you know where Louise lived prior to moving in	18	À	'77.
19	-	with you?	19	Q	'77. Since 1977 has there always generally been
20	A	Yes.	20	_	a positive cash flow on the property?
21	Q	Where is that?	21	A	Most of the time, but it was close because I did
22	A	On 4906 Eyre Lane, Madison, Wisconsin.	22		repairs on the roof, new roof, new driveway, and
23	Q	And where in Madison relative to Madison-Kipp is	23		that eats it up for awhile.
		that location?	24	\circ	Prior to your current tenant, the previous tenant
24		that location?	24	Ų	Thor to your current tenant, the previous tenant

1		Page 45			Page 47
	A	My current tenant started in It was he and his	1	Q What I'm getting at is if y	ou believed it was
2		brother when it started in September of 2011, and	2	unsafe for anyone to live in	
3		then when I renewed that lease, it was one of the	3	wouldn't continue to rent i	
4		brothers with his girlfriend. Prior to that it	4	A I asked him if he had any	
5		was my son and a number of different roommates.	5	was for children. He has a	six-year-old son.
6	Q	Okay. This is maybe going back in time. Looking	6	He's divorced. I said, "Is h	ne going to be
7		at your interrogatory answers, it looks to me	7	staying with you," and he	said, "No, he will
8		like your son first started renting the house in	8	visit on the weekends." Tl	
9		approximately the year 2000?	9	better. I would not want to	be put in a position
10	A	That's right.	10	that a child develops some	thing and then sues me
11	Q	Is that correct?	11	as a result of me having th	at property.
12	A	Yes.	12	Q Okay. But as far as you'r	e aware, there's
13	Q	Was the home rented prior to 2000? In other	13	nothing unsafe for an adul	t to live in the home?
14		words, was there a tenant immediately before you	14	MR. MANZKE: I w	rill object on
15		son?	15	foundation. You can answ	ver, if you can.
16	A	Yes.	16	THE WITNESS: W	hat's that?
17	Q	Did your son pay the rent as the previous tenant	17	MR. MANZKE: I ju	st made an objection on
18		or did you give him a family discount?	18	foundation for the record,	but you can answer to
19	A	I don't know the relationship from the previous	19	the extent you can.	
20		renter to my son's rent, but I gave him a family	20	THE WITNESS: W	ell, I told you my first
21		discount as long as he kept the property up and	21	wife died. She was very se	ensitive to perfumes
22		did some of the maintenance for me.	22	and petroleum products. I	don't use any perfume
23	Q	How did you locate your current tenant?	23	products. Here we're talki	
24	A	I put a sign in the front yard.	24	causing agent in a home th	
25	Q	Did you take out any ads in the paper or	25	home through no fault of r	ny own. Does it concern
		Page 46			Page 48
1		anything?	_		
		anything:	1	me? Yes, it does. Yes, it does.	does.
2	A	No.	2	me? Yes, it does. Yes, it of BY MR. WHITE:	does.
2 3	A Q	No.	2		
		No.	2	BY MR. WHITE:	ny specific conversations
3	Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to	2 3	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had a	ny specific conversations nent of Health about
3 4	Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No.	2 3 4	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had a with the DNR, the Departn	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue
3 4 5	Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No.	2 3 4 5	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had a with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou?
3 4 5 6	Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested?	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had an with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get
3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had an with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you A Well, when we had that o	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get
3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had as with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two according to the department of the two according to the statement.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accompour home, with respect.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write eccepted offers you had t to the reason why
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that o them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accompour home, with respect those offers ultimately didner.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had t to the reason why n't close, did you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that o them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accomposed offers ultimately didnated speak to anyone other than	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departn whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accomposed on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didnapeak to anyone other than about the reasons why those	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two account on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didnayeak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A. In regards to the transactions.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accomposed on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didnayeak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transaction conversation with other personners.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A A Q A A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accons your home, with respect those offers ultimately didn's speak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transaction conversation with other per Q Either.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had as with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accomposed on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didns speak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transactic conversation with other per Q Either. A I probably shared the informatics of the conversation of the conversation of the conversation of the conversation with other per Q Either.	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A A Q A A	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two accomposed on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didns speak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transaction conversation with other per Q Either. A I probably shared the information people that are in the neight	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back and forth discussions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. WHITE: Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you. A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. one. Q With respect to the two account on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didn's speak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transaction conversation with other per Q Either. A I probably shared the information people that are in the neight knew that I had difficulty seems to the proper than the people that are in the neight shows that I had difficulty seems to the proper than the people that are in the neight shows that I had difficulty seems to the proper than the people that are in the neight shows that I had difficulty seems the property of the people that are in the people that are in the neight shows that I had difficulty seems the property of the people that are in the pe	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all selling it, and that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A A Q A A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back and forth discussions? Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Okay. You haven't had at with the DNR, the Departm whether or not it's safe for living in the home, have you A Well, when we had that of them to write a statement. One. Q With respect to the two account on your home, with respect those offers ultimately didn's speak to anyone other than about the reasons why those A In regards to the transactic conversation with other people that are in the neight knew that I had difficulty strelated to them because the	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all selling it, and that ey own property.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back and forth discussions? Right. Do you believe it is safe for the tenant to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A In regards to the transactic conversation with other people that are in the neight knew that I had difficulty s related to them because the Q Apart from talking with y	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all selling it, and that ey own property. our neighbors about your
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A A Q A A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back and forth discussions? Right. Do you believe it is safe for the tenant to continue living in the home?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A In regards to the transactic conversation with other people that are in the neight knew that I had difficulty s related to them because the Q Apart from talking with y efforts to self the property,	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write cepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all selling it, and that ey own property. our neighbors about your did you receive any
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A A Q A A Q	No. On the sign did you post what rent you wanted to charge for the unit? No. It was just a phone number and call if you are interested? That's right. When the tenant that's currently renting your unit called, what was the first discussion you had with respect to what the rent amount would be? I told him it was \$895. And what was the tenant's response? He jumped at it. Isn't the current rent slightly higher than that? I raised it 15 bucks to 910 for the principle. Okay. So the tenant accepted the rent amount that you threw out there, and there was no back and forth discussions? Right. Do you believe it is safe for the tenant to continue living in the home?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A In regards to the transactic conversation with other people that are in the neight knew that I had difficulty s related to them because the Q Apart from talking with y	ny specific conversations nent of Health about someone to continue ou? ffer, I was trying to get They wouldn't write ccepted offers you had to the reason why n't close, did you to your own realtor se sales didn't close? on or just in ople? ormation with other aborhood. They all selling it, and that ey own property. our neighbors about your did you receive any other than your own

1			Page 49			Page 51		
A Mainly from my realtor. You know, they like to do all the talking. 4 Q You mentioned that you received other written offers following the Bennett offer that fell through? 5 Q Do you have any recollection as to what the offered purchase price was for any of those offers? 10 Offers? 11 A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they gor in there, they weren lowballs and they waren low and the documentation? 1	1		sales closed?	1		Thank you.		
do all the talking. You mentioned that you received other written offers following the Bennett offer that fell through? A Um-hum. Do Do you have any recollection as to what the offered purchase price was for any of those offere? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A The ouly thing if could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. A Which exhibit? A Which exhibit? MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. A Okay. A Ves. A Ves. A Ves. A Ves. A Ves. A Ves. A Okay. A Which exhibit? A Which exhibit? A Ves. A Okay. A Which exhibit? A Which an a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "no a npicable." and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the Day Baobut this vapor sampling issue that whave been talking about, right? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Wes. A Wish exhibit? A Wish exhibit and once they got in there, they weren't DAR Busch is a varient of a page of the page of th	2	A	Mainly from my realtor. You know, they like to	2				
offers following the Bennett offer that fell through? A Um-hum. Do you have any recollection as to what the offers? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't. Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. A I would have to look. A Which exhibit? MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. BUSCH: The big sack of papers. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. WHITE: Op on white same the same the same them the same the same them the same the same the same the same the same the same the s	3		• •	3	BY MR. KRAMER:			
this big stack of documents in front of you, and we talkked about Page 94 of that, is that correct? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. Which exhibit? MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITE: MR.	4	Q		4	Q	Q I'm Charles Kramer. I represent Lumbermens. Yo		
this big stack of documents in front of you, and we talkked about Page 94 of that, is that correct? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. Which exhibit? MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITE: MR.	5		offers following the Bennett offer that fell	5	are looking at Exhibit, I believe it's Exhibit 1,			
8 Q Do you have any recollection as to what the offered purchase price was for any of those offers? 11 A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't— 14 Q Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the documentation? 15 the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? 16 Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 17 A I would have to look. 18 Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 19 MR. BUSCH: The big one. 20 MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 21 BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 22 BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 23 BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. 26 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 26 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 31 A Right. 32 Q Is that on your property? 33 A Yes. 34 Yes. 35 Q Did you dos at Pages 121 through 124 at the very end? 36 A Yes. 36 Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 37 Page 50 38 PY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 38 PY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 39 Page 50 40 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 41 Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic	6		through?	6				
offered purchase price was for any of those offers? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't — 13 and once they got in there, they weren't — 14 Q Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. A Which exhibit? A Which exhibit? A Which exhibit? A Which exhibit? A O Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. A O All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Page 50 Page 50 Page 52 A Yes. A Right.	7	A	Um-hum.	7		we talked about Page 94 of that, is that correct?		
offers? A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't— Q Do you recall anything about, right? A I would have to look. Rege 50 A Which exhibit I. Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. 10 A Yes. Q Did you disclose the existence of the November 11, 2004? the troit in the prior Real Estate Condition Report? A I don't remember. A I can get one. BY MR. WHITE: A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. BY MR. WARAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 50 Page 50 Page 50 When you received this letter in 2004, did you do solve the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do solve the ewas a level of PCE found on your property? A Yes. Q And wour answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A	8	Q	Do you have any recollection as to what the	8	A	Yes.		
A The only thing I remember is they were lowballs and they wanted me to do a whole bouch of stuff, and once they got in there, they weren't — 15 the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation?	9		offered purchase price was for any of those	9	Q This is the second Real Estate Condition Report			
and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff, and once they got in there, they werent — 13 and once they got in there, they werent — 14 Q Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Eshibit I. MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. Whith I want to look at Question No. 17. A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Yes. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q Do you bake a copy of that prior Real Estate Condition Report? A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one. Page 52 By MR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q Wene you received this letter in 2004, did you do - Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A Yes. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 to investigate the exent of any potentia	10		offers?	10		that was prepared, correct?		
and once they got in there, they weren't Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent for enearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Adl your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Condition Report? A I don't remember. Condition Report? A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 BYMR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 BYMR. KRAMER: A Yes. Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A Yes. Q And you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by	11	A	The only thing I remember is they were lowballs	11	A	Yes.		
the offers or would you just have to look at the or	12		and they wanted me to do a whole bunch of stuff,	12	Q	Now if you look at Pages 121 through 124 at the		
the offers or would you just have to look at the documentation? A I would have to look. 17 A I would have to look. 18 Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 20 A Which exhibit? 21 MR. BUSCH: The big one. 22 MR. WHITE: Hat big stack of papers. 23 BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. 26 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 10 A Right. 11 Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent to rearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? 24 A Yes. 25 A Okay. 26 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 27 A Right. 28 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances." The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? 3 The four pages, 121 through 124, A Yes. 4 Yes. 2 Q Did you disclose the existence of the November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found	13		and once they got in there, they weren't	13		very end?		
16	14	Q	Do you recall anything about the dollar amount of	14	A	Yes.		
17 A I would have to look. Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 20 A Which exhibit? 21 MR. BUSCH: The big one. 22 MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 23 BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions to r nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that cornect? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Widow Charlier in the prior Real Estate Condition Report? A I don't remember. A I dan't don't extended the record. BY MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 BY MR. KRAMER: A Yes. Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labele	15		the offers or would you just have to look at the	15	Q	The four pages, 121 through 124, form part of a		
18 Q Okay. And then if I could direct your attention to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 20 A Which exhibit? 21 MR. BUSCH: The big one. 22 MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 23 BY MR. WHITE: 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. 26 Page 50 1 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? 25 A Yes. 26 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the BDNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 28 A Right. 29 With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, renarry dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? 4 A Yes. 4 Yes. 4 Yes. 4 Yes. 5 Do you disclose the existence of the November 11, 2004 letter in the prior Real Estate Conditions need to Interport? 4 I don't remember. 4 I condition Report? 5 A I can get one. 5 Page 52 5 Page 52 6 Page 52 7 Page 52 8 Page 52 8 Page 52 8 Page 52 9 Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Is that on your property? 9 A Yes. 9 Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do -Strike that. 11 The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? 4 A Yes. 9 Q And your answer to that question was no, is that there's a point and	16		documentation?	16		letter dated November 11, 2004?		
19 to Page 94 of Exhibit 1. 20 A Which exhibit? 21 MR. BUSCH: The big one. 22 MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. 23 BY MR. WHITE: 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. 26 Page 50 1 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? 4 Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such for energy dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Yes	17	A	I would have to look.	17	A	Yes.		
A Which exhibit? MR. BUSCH: The big one. MR. WHITTE: That big stack of papers. BY MR. WHITTE: A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Yes. Condition Report? A I don't remember. Condition Report? A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 A I dain't remember. A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 Page 52 A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 Page 52 A I san get one. A I can get one. A I can get one. A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like to make that request on the record. BY MR. KRAMER: A Yes. Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-2-5. Do you see that? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A Yes.	18	Q	Okay. And then if I could direct your attention	18	Q	Did you disclose the existence of the		
MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. Page 50 Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "or a protable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. A Idon't remember. Condition Report? A I can ged one. Page 52 Pag	19			19		November 11, 2004 letter in the prior Real Estate		
BY MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers. BY MR. WHITE: A Okay. Page 50 Page 50 Page 50 Page 52 A All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic defects might include, but are not limited to, renerby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Do you have a copy of that prior Real Estate Condition Report? A I can get one. Page 52 Please. I'd like to make that request on the record. BY MR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do - Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	20	A	Which exhibit?	20		Condition Report?		
23 BY MR. WHITE: 24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. Page 50 1 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? 4 Where it says "Explain." Do you see that? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? 10 A Right. 11 Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such 16 defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? 21 A Yes. 22 Q And your answer to that question was no, is that 22 correct? 24 A Yes. 25 Condition Report? 26 A I can get one. MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 BY MR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do - Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good	21			21	A	I don't remember.		
24 Q All right. I want to look at Question No. 17. 25 A Okay. Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing			MR. WHITE: That big stack of papers.	22	Q	Do you have a copy of that prior Real Estate		
Page 50 RR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one, Page 52 1 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Page 52 MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like to make that request on the record. BY MR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A	23	BY	MR. WHITE:	23		Condition Report?		
Page 50 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. O Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles to x? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Page 52 Page 52 BYMR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. 10 Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. 11 The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	24	Q	All right. I want to look at Question No. 17.	24	A	I can get one.		
1 Q All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Y	25	A	Okay.	25		MR. KRAMER: Okay. I'd like one,		
then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A Yes. Q And jour answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. D When you received this letter in 2004, did you doStrike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing			Page 50			Page 52		
then a place where you can answer "yes," "no," or "not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain." you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A Yes. Q And jour answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. D When you received this letter in 2004, did you doStrike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	1	0	All right. Question No. 17 has a statement and	1		please. I'd like to make that request on the		
"not applicable," and below that there's a line where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. O Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. O With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? BY MR. KRAMER: Q Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124, there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. O Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	2			2		-		
where it says "Explain." Do you see that? A Yes. Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the B DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. Okay. With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles to X Yes. When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. A That's correct. A Yes. Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," and there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," and there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," and there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. Okay. A That's correct. A That's correct. A That's correct. Okay. A That's correct. Okadison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Okay. Okay. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	3		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3	BY	MR. KRAMER:		
5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain," 7 you make reference to an attached letter from the 8 DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have 9 been talking about, right? 10 A Right. 11 Q With respect to the answer to this question, the 12 question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by 13 unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions 14 relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic 15 substances on neighboring properties. Such 16 defects might include, but are not limited to, 17 environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent 18 or nearby dump, gas station or commercial 19 industrial business which improperly uses/handles 10 toxic substances." Do you see that? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And your answer to that question was no, is that 12 C Ornect? 13 A Yes. 15 there's a spot that's labeled in a gray trapezoid 14 HA-25. Do you see that? A Yes. 9 A Yes. 10 Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. 12 The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. 20 Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? 21 A Yes. 22 Q And your answer to that question was no, is that 22 correct? 23 A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	4			4	Q	Now if you look at the very last page, Page 124,		
Goldsy. And on the line where it says "Explain," you make reference to an attached letter from the Bonk about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, and unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles or nearby dump, gas station or commercial A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that C Q And your answer to that question was no, is that C Q And your answer to that question was no, is that C Q And, Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	5	A		5				
you make reference to an attached letter from the DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. A Yes. Q Is that on your property? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes.	6	Q	Okay. And on the line where it says "Explain,"	6				
DNR about this vapor sampling issue that we have been talking about, right? A Right. With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles to A Yes. A Yes. Q Is that on your property? 9 A Yes. 10 Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. 11 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	7	•		7	A	•		
been talking about, right? A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	8		•	8	Q	Is that on your property?		
A Right. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q When you received this letter in 2004, did you do Strike that. The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	9		1 1 0	9	-			
Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q With respect to the answer to this question, the question is, "I am aware of a defect caused by 12 The letter that is dated November 11, 2004 indicates that there was a level of PCE found on your property, correct? A That's correct. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	10	A		10	Q	When you received this letter in 2004, did you		
unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	11	Q	With respect to the answer to this question, the	11		do Strike that.		
unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	12		•	12		The letter that is dated November 11,		
relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	13		unsafe concentrations of, or unsafe conditions	13				
substances on neighboring properties. Such defects might include, but are not limited to, environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And it was your understanding back in 2004 that those PCEs were alleged to have come from Madison-Kipp, correct? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	14		relating to, or the storage of hazardous or toxic	14		found on your property, correct?		
environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	15			15	A			
environmental hazards resulting from an adjacent or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	16		9 91 1	16	Q	And it was your understanding back in 2004 that		
or nearby dump, gas station or commercial industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	17		•	17				
industrial business which improperly uses/handles toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. A Yes. A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	18		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18		<u>~</u>		
toxic substances." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A Yes. Q Did you do anything back in 2004 to investigate the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing	19			19	A			
A Yes. Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. 21 the extent of any potential contamination on your property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing								
Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? Q And your answer to that question was no, is that correct? A Yes. Property by Madison-Kipp? A No, because I figured they were a good corporate neighbor and they were going to inject this thing		A	<u> </u>		_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
23 correct? 23 A No, because I figured they were a good corporate 24 A Yes. 24 neighbor and they were going to inject this thing		Q		22		, <u>,</u>		
24 A Yes. 24 neighbor and they were going to inject this thing		`	-	23	A			
	24	A	Yes.	24				
	25		MR. WHITE: That's all that I have.	25				

		Page 53			Page 55
1	Q	After the injection happened, did you do anything	1		told Mr. Kramer that you never approved a loan on
2		to investigate whether the injection actually	2		a property that had environmental issues?
3		remedied the property?	3	A	That's correct.
4	A	I didn't. I assume they did.	4	Q	Is that because that didn't arise or because you
5	Q	Okay.	5		outright rejected those?
6	A	But they didn't.	6	A	I don't recall.
7	Q	Back in 2004 did you do anything to	7	Q	Okay. You also talked to a couple different
8		investigate Strike that.	8		people here about the offers that you received
9		In 2011 when the first set of tenants	9		after the Michael Bennett offer. Do you recall
10		post withdrawn offers contacted you, were the	10		whether you countered any of those offers?
11		people that you rented to the first set of people	11	A	Yes.
12		that contacted you with regard to renting the	12	Q	Do you remember Well, let's start with this.
13		property?	13		Do you remember how many offers you received?
14	A	Yes.	14		I would be guessing. I mean, there were two or
15	Q	Okay. You mentioned, sir, in connection with the	15		three of them.
16	•	sale that you did a number of improvements to the	16	Q	Okay. Do you know if you countered two or three
17		property?	17		offers?
18	A	Yes.	18	A	Probably.
19	Q	Have you been depreciating those items?	19	Q	Okay.
20	À		20		MS. KREIL: I think that's all the
21	Q	And so when and if you eventually sell the	21		questions I have.
22	•	property, you are going to have to pay capital	22		MR. BUSCH: Sorry to have messed up your
23		gains on any recapture that you have?	23		afternoon. Thank you.
24	A		24		MR. MANZKE: We'll reserve.
25	Q	You said that you worked at a savings and loan	25		
		Page 54			Page 56
1		while you were or during your working and	1		CERTIFICATE OF WITNESS
2		non-retired life?	2		CERTIFICATE OF WITHERS
3	Δ	Yes.	3		
4	Q		4		I, PETER M. UTTECH, have read the
5	Q	lending?	5	fc	oregoing page and the corrections, if any, having been
6	٨	Yes.	6		oted. The same is now a true and correct transcript
7	Q		7		f my testimony.
8	Ų	lending on homes?	8	O.	my testimony.
9	٨	Yes.	9		
10	A 0		10		ETER M. UTTECH
11	Ų	Did you ever approve a loan on a property that had a radon issue?	11	Г	ETER W. UTTECH
12	٨		12		
	A	8,	13	C'	TATE OF WICCONCIN
13 14	Ų	Did you ever approve a loan that was on a	14		TATE OF WISCONSIN) COUNTY)
	Λ.	property that had an environmental issue?	15	_	COUNTY)
15	A		16	C.	who will add and assessment a before many this
16	Q				ubscribed and sworn to before me this
17		result from the sigma of having a property with	17	_	day of, 2013.
18	٨	environmental issues?	18		
19	A	Yes.	19		
20		MR. KRAMER: Nothing further.	20		Octomy Dyshilio
21		MS. KREIL: I have a couple questions.	21		otary Public
22	DV.	EXAMINATION MS. KDEH	22		and for the State of Wisconsin
23		MS. KREIL:	23	IV.	ly commission expires,
24	Q	My name is Jennifer Kreil on behalf of United	24		
25		States Fire Insurance Company. I think you just	25		

	Page 57		Page	59
1	STATE OF WISCONSIN)	1		
2	MILWAUKEE COUNTY)			
3	I, KATHY A. HALMA, Registered	2		
4	Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the	3		
5	State of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the	4		
		5		
6	deposition of PETER M. UTTECH, was taken before me at	6		
7	the law offices of MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP, One	7		
8	South Pinckney Street, Suite 700, Madison, Wisconsin,	8 Notary Public in and		
9	on the 8th day of January, 2013, commencing at 4:00	9 for the State of Wisconsin		
10	o'clock in the afternoon.			
11	That it was taken at the instance of the	10		
12	Defendants upon verbal interrogatories.	11	_	
13	That said statement was taken to be used	Dated this 16th day of January, 201	3,	
14	in an action now pending in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT	13 Milwaukee, Wisconsin.		
15	COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, in whi	^{ch} 14		
16	KATHLEEN MC HUGH, et al., are the Plaintiffs and	15		
17	MADISON-KIPP, et al., are the Defendants and	16		
18	MADISON-KIPP CORPORATION is the Cross-Claimant and	17		
19	CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY, et al., are the	18		
20	Cross-Complainants and LUMBERMENS MUTUAL CASUALTY			
21	COMPANY are the Third-Party Defendants.	19		
22	APPEARANCES	20		
23	THE COLLINS LAW FIRM, P.C, 1770 North	21		
	Park Street, Suite 200, Naperville, Illinois, 60563, by	22		
24	MR. EDWARD J. MANZKE, ejmanzke@collinslaw.com, appeared	23		
	on behalf of the Plaintiffs.	24		
25		25		
	Page 58			
1	_			
1	VARGA, BERGER, LEDSKY, HAYES & CASEY, 125 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1250, Chicago, Illinois,			
2	60606-4473, by MR. MICHAEL D. HAYES, mhayes@vblhc.com, appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs.			
	MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP, 100 East			
4	Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202, by MR.			
5	JOHN A. BUSCH, jabusch@michaelbest.com, appeared on behalf of Madison-Kipp Corporation.			
6	MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP, One			
7	South Pinckney Street, Suite 700, Madison, Wisconsin, 53703, by MS. LEAH H. ZIEMBA, Ihziemba@michaelbest.com,			
	appeared on behalf of Madison-Kipp Corporation.			
8	TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP, 55 West Monroe			
9	Street, Suite 3000, Chicago, Illinois, 60603-5758, by MR. CHRISTOPHER H. WHITE,			
10	christopher.white@troutmansanders.com, appeared on behalf of the Defendant Continental Casualty Company.			
11	ochan of the Defendant Continental Castianty Company.			
1.0	MEISSNER, TIERNEY, FISHER & NICHOLS,			
12	S.C., 111 East Kilbourn Avenue, 19th Floor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202-6622, by MS. JENNIFER KREIL,			
13	jbk@mtfn.com, appeared on behalf of United States Fire			
14	Insurance Company.			
	DEUTCH & WEISS, LLC, 7670 North Port			
15	Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53217, by MR. CHARLES W. KRAMER, charles.kramer@mweisslaw.net,			
16	appeared on behalf of American Motorists Insurance Company.			
17				
18	That said deponent, before examination,			
19 20	was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause.			
21	That the foregoing is a full, true and			
22 23	correct record of all the proceedings had in the matter of the taking of said deposition, as reflected by my			
24	original machine shorthand notes taken at said time and			
25	place.			