

Hearing Date: October 8, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.
Objection Deadline: August 31, 2015
Reply Deadline: October 1, 2015

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No.: 12-12020 (MG)

Jointly Administered

**SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY, INC.'S OBJECTION TO
MOTION OF THE RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST FOR AN ORDER
ENFORCING PLAN INJUNCTION AND CONFIRMATION ORDER**

COZEN O'CONNOR
Frederick E. Schmidt, Jr.
277 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10172
(212) 883-4900
(646) 588-1552
eschmidt@cozen.com

-and-

JENKINS KAYAYAN LLP
pro hac vice pending
Jonathan M. Jenkins
444 S. Flower St., Ste 1530
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(310) 984-6800
jjenkins@jklitigators.com

*Attorneys for Sierra Pacific Mortgage
Company, Inc.*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. SIERRA’S CLAIMS WERE POST-EFFECTIVE DATE CLAIMS	5
II. THE DEBTORS AND TRUST WERE NOT DISCHARGED.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
 Cases	
<i>Abercrombie v. Hayden Corp. (In re Abercrombie),</i> 139 F.3d 755 (9th Cir. 1998)	8
<i>In re Amigoni,</i> 109 B.R. 341, 343 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1989)	12
<i>Bell v. Ruben,</i> No. 12 C 8311, 2013 WL 6211743 (N.D. Ill., Nov. 26, 2013)	9
<i>In re Bennett,</i> No. 09-36637, 2012 WL 2562418 (Bankr. S.D. Tex., June 28, 2012)	9
<i>Big Yank Corp. v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. (In re Water Valley Finishing, Inc.),</i> 139 F.3d 325 (2d Cir. 1998)	8, 9
<i>Boeing North American, Inc. v. Ybarra (In re Ybarra),</i> 424 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2005)	7
<i>In re Chateaugay Corp.,</i> 112 B.R. 513, 521 (S.D.N.Y. 1990)	5
<i>DePaolo v. United States (In re DePaolo),</i> 45 F.3d 373 (10th Cir. 1995)	12
<i>Dutcher v. Reorganized Pettibone Corp.,</i> 193 B.R. 667 (S.D.N.Y. 1996)	11
<i>Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp. v. Loving (In re Loving),</i> 269 B.R. 655 (Bankr. D. Ind. 2001)	12
<i>Epstein v. Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of the Estate of Piper Aircraft (In re Piper Aircraft),</i> 58 F.3d 1573 (11th Cir. 1995)	5
<i>Grynberg v. United States of America (In re Grynberg),</i> 986 F.2d 367 (10th Cir. 1993)	12
<i>In re Hadden,</i> 57 B.R. 187, 190 (Bankr. W.D. Wis. 1986)	6
<i>In re Jensen,</i> 995 F.2 925 (9th Cir. 1993)	5

<i>Johnson v. Home State Bank</i> , 501 U.S. 78, 83, 111 S.Ct. 2150, 2153, 115 L.Ed.2d 66 (1991).....	7
<i>Kadjevich v. Kadjevich (In re Kadjevich)</i> , 220 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2000)	8
<i>Kinney v. I.R.S. (In re Video Gaming, Inc.)</i> , 123 B.R. 889 (Bankr. D. Nev. 1991)	12
<i>Maple Forest Condominium Ass’n v. Spencer (In re Spencer)</i> , 457 B.R. 601 (E.D. Mich. 2011).....	9
<i>MMM Healthcare Inc. v. Quesada (In re Quesada)</i> , Bankruptcy No. 13-02057 BKT.....	12
<i>Pharaoh’s Palace, Inc. v. Foster (In re Foster)</i> , No. 02-12221, 02-1116 at *4 (Bankr. M.D. La., Oct. 22, 2003)	12
<i>Siegel v. Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation</i> , 143 F.3d 525 (9th Cir. 1998)	6, 7, 8
<i>Sure-Snap Corp. v. State of Vermont (In re Sure-Snap Corp.)</i> , 983 F.2d 1015 (11th Cir. 1993)	6
<i>Teamsters Pension Trust Fund of Philadelphia v. Malone Realty Co.</i> , 82 B.R. 346 (E.D. Penn. 1988)	1, 11
<i>Texaco Inc. v. Board of Commissioners for the LaFourche Basin Levee District</i> , 254 B.R. 536 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2000).....	9
<i>United States v. LTV Steel Co. (In re Chateaugay Corp.)</i> , 944 F.2d 997 (2nd Cir. 1991).....	5
<i>United States v. Wood (In re Wood)</i> , 240 B.R. 609 (C.D. Cal. 1999)	12
<i>In re Wood Family Interests, Ltd.</i> , 135 B.R. 407 (Bankr. D. Colo. 1989)	11
Statutes	
11 U.S.C. 1141(d)(2) and 523.....	12
11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(3)	2, 10, 11
Section 727(a) of the Bankruptcy Code.....	11
section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code.....	2, 10, 11

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No.: 12-12020 (MG)

Jointly Administered

**SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY, INC.’S OBJECTION TO
MOTION OF THE RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST FOR AN ORDER
ENFORCING PLAN INJUNCTION AND CONFIRMATION ORDER**

Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. (“Sierra”), by its counsel, Cozen O’Connor and JENKINS KAYAYAN LLP¹, as and for its objection (the “Objection”) to the *Motion of the ResCap Liquidating Trust for an Order Enforcing Plan Injunction and Confirmation Order* [ECF No. 8947] (the “Motion”), respectfully asserts as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. The ResCap Liquidating Trust (the “Trust”) argues in the Motion that Sierra’s counterclaims are run-of-the-mill prepetition claims that were discharged and subject to a plan injunction. The Trust is wrong.

2. The Trust’s own actions brought about the counterclaims when it voluntarily chose to throw its hat in the litigation ring by filing, post-confirmation, a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) in a Minnesota federal action (the “Minnesota Action”) – knowing full well that the pleading violated broad releases and covenants not to sue previously granted by the Trust’s predecessor-in-interest, Residential Funding Company, LLC (“RFC”).²

3. Sierra’s counterclaims are based primarily upon attorneys’ fees and costs incurred post-confirmation in the Minnesota Action and are entirely different than the types of claims that

¹ Substantially simultaneously herewith, Cozen O’Connor shall move for the *pro hac vice* admission of Jonathan M. Jenkins of JENKINS KAYAYAN LLP.

² RFC and its related debtors are hereafter referred to as the “Debtors.”

the Court has previously found enjoined by the Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan Proposed by Residential Capital, LLC, et al. and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (Attached as Appendix 1 to confirmation order at ECF 6065-1) (the “Plan”).

4. What makes Sierra’s counterclaims different is that they were caused by the Trust’s *deliberate and knowing post-confirmation wrongful acts*. Sierra warned the Trust in advance that filing the FAC would blatantly violate RFC’s prior settlement agreements with Sierra. Courts have found that when a debtor knowingly and deliberately commences litigation after having received a bankruptcy discharge, it cannot escape liability for attorneys’ fees arising from that litigation on the basis that the claim was discharged in bankruptcy.

5. Not only are Sierra’s counterclaims different, but *the Trust knows* they are different – it told the Court in the Minnesota Action that the Trust likely had sufficient funds to pay an award of attorneys’ fees should Sierra prevail on the settlement agreements. And unlike the other counterclaims at issue here, prior to bringing this Motion, the Trust answered Sierra’s counterclaims and actively litigated them for *11 months* (conceding along the way that at least 85% of the loans in the Minnesota Action were, in fact, released).

6. In addition, paragraph 42 of the Court’s order confirming the Plan [ECF 6065] (the “Confirmation Order”) expressly limited the discharge of claims against the Debtors to the “extent permitted by section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code.” Because the Plan was a corporate liquidating plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(3) prohibited any discharge of the Debtors. Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Sierra’s counterclaims were pre-petition dischargeable claims, they would not have been discharged pursuant to the Plan and Confirmation Order.

7. Accordingly, the Trust’s Motion should be denied in its entirety.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

8. RFC sued Sierra on December 14, 2013 in Minnesota federal court. The initial complaint did not identify any specific mortgages on which RFC purported to sue. However, on

February 28, 2014, RFC filed a motion seeking leave to file a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) that, for the first time, identified some of the specific loans on which RFC based its lawsuit.

9. Sierra opposed the motion because the FAC, among other things, violated releases and covenants not to sue contained in three prior settlement agreements between the parties – all of which expressly reference on the first page the “Client Contract dated March 13, 2002,” cited in the Motion (at p. 3), on which RFC based its FAC. (See pp. 2-6 and 18 to Sierra’s Opposition, attached as **Exhibit 1**). The Trust was clearly on notice that it was about to unilaterally violate the same set of contractual obligations on which the FAC sought to hold Sierra liable.

10. For example, one settlement agreement, effective December 19, 2007 (the “December 2007 Settlement”), released a number of specific loans (identified by loan number), as well as all loans involving “a borrower who has made the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month mandated by the contract” (hereinafter, the “First Year Payment Release”) (See December 2007 Settlement, section 2(b), attached as **Exhibit 2**). The parties promised not to “bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.” (*Id.*, section 3.) There was also a prevailing party attorneys’ fees provision. (*Id.*, section 6.)

11. At oral argument on March 24, 2014, when questioned by the Magistrate Judge, the Trust acknowledged Sierra’s affirmative rights under the settlement agreements – and conceded they are anything but common pre-petition dischargeable claims. Trust counsel Peter Calamari stated: “I understand that there could be claims that, if we pursue them, that might be subject to an attorney’s fees to a prevailing party.” (See pg. 25, lines 15-17 of March 24, 2014 hearing transcript, attached as **Exhibit 3**). Mr. Calamari further advised the Minnesota Court

that the Trust likely had sufficient funds to cover any attorneys' fees award to Sierra. (*See Id.* pg. 25, lines 19 – 25; pg. 26, lines 1 – 8). The Court subsequently granted RFC's Motion.

12. RFC then made a number of changes to the FAC prior to filing it on May 23, 2014. (See May 23, 2014 Email from RFC Counsel Donald Heeman (with excerpts from attached redline), attached as **Exhibit 4**). However, none of those changes attempted to remove from the FAC any of the released loans or released categories of loans.

13. Sierra counterclaimed against RFC and the Trust on August 16, 2014, alleging breach of the release and covenant not to sue provisions contained in the December 2007 Settlement (Exhibit 2) and in a settlement agreement dated March 10, 2008 (the "March 2008 Settlement," attached as **Exhibit 5**). RFC and the Trust answered on September 9, 2014. Sierra filed its Amended Counterclaim on September 30, 2014 (attached as **Exhibit 6**), which RFC and the Trust answered on October 14, 2014.

14. Sierra propounded discovery on its counterclaims to ascertain how many loan borrowers had timely made the first year of loan payments (thus releasing those loans pursuant to the First Year Payment Release) – and filed a Motion to Compel on this and other matters on October 29, 2014. Ultimately:

- Under the FAC, the Trust claimed that Sierra was liable on 3,492 loans. (See the Trust's "Appendix B," served on Sierra in the Minnesota Action, attached as **Exhibit 7**);
- The Trust subsequently conceded that the First Year Payment Release released, at a minimum, more than 2,900 of those loans – all but 517;
- Additional loans appeared to be released for other reasons, and on April 14, 2014, the Court in the Minnesota Action entered a stipulated order limiting discovery to just 502 of the original 3,492 loans (attached as **Exhibit 8**).

15. In other words, Sierra's counterclaim proved highly meritorious: at least 85% of the loans for which the FAC sought recovery were released by prior settlement agreements with Sierra. Establishing these facts took months of litigation and caused Sierra to incur significant attorneys' fees. Yet, not until July 20, 2015 – more than 11 months after Sierra filed its

counterclaims – did the Trust first threaten to seek relief on the basis that the counterclaim had been discharged. (See email attached as Exhibit F to Scheck Declaration, ECF 8948-6).

ARGUMENT

I. SIERRA’S CLAIMS WERE POST-EFFECTIVE DATE CLAIMS

16. The lynchpin to the Trust’s argument that Sierra’s claims were discharged and subject to the Plan injunction is the notion that the claims arose pre-petition and that Sierra did not file a proof of claim with respect to those claims.

17. Thus, the key issue is *when* Sierra’s counterclaims arose. The Trust argues that the claim arose pre-petition when the parties entered into two settlement agreements (Exhibits 2 and 5) containing the subject releases and covenants not to sue. However, Sierra’s claims arose *after* the Effective Date and, therefore, they are not subject to the Plan injunction.

18. Like several other Circuit Courts of Appeals, the Second Circuit uses the “relationship/fair contemplation” approach to determine whether a pre-petition contingent claim existed.³ The leading case on this issue in this Circuit is *United States v. LTV Steel Co. (In re Chateaugay Corp.)*, 944 F.2d 997 (2nd Cir. 1991), which held that “before a contingent claim can be discharged, it must result from pre-petition conduct fairly giving rise to that contingent claim.” *Id.* at 1005 (quoting Judge Sprizzo’s decision at *In re Chateaugay Corp.*, 112 B.R. 513, 521 (S.D.N.Y. 1990)).

19. The Eleventh Circuit also utilized the “relationship/fair contemplation” approach in *Epstein v. Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of the Estate of Piper Aircraft (In re Piper Aircraft)*, 58 F.3d 1573 (11th Cir. 1995), as did the Ninth Circuit in *In re Jensen*, 995 F.2 925 (9th Cir. 1993).

³ Notably, however, the Second Circuit has not applied this test in a case where, as here, the allegedly discharged claim arose out of the voluntary, wrongful post-petition conduct of the debtor.

20. Here, there was clearly a prepetition contractual relationship between Sierra and the Debtors. The focus, accordingly, rests on the lack of “pre-petition conduct fairly giving rise to [any] contingent claim.” Sierra respectfully submits that such conduct was lacking here.

21. Several courts utilizing the relationship/fair contemplation approach have found that where the claim arises out of the debtor’s *post-discharge voluntary conduct*, no contingent claim existed pre-petition. For example, in *Sure-Snap Corp. v. State of Vermont (In re Sure-Snap Corp.)*, 983 F.2d 1015 (11th Cir. 1993), the debtor voluntarily prosecuted a post-confirmation appeal of an earlier adverse decision from the bankruptcy court. The creditor prevailed on appeal, entitling it to attorneys’ fees and costs under its pre-petition agreement with the debtor. *Id.* at 1017. The district court denied the creditor’s request for fees and costs on the ground that confirmation of the debtor’s plan extinguished the creditor’s right to attorneys’ fees and costs. *Id.*

22. On appeal, the Eleventh Circuit reversed the district court, finding that:

[t]he confirmation of Sure-Snap’s Chapter 11 plan *discharged its pre-confirmation liabilities under the Agreement*. The attorney fees Bradford [the creditor] seeks were incurred by Bradford in defending a *post-confirmation* appeal initiated by Sure-Snap. Sure-Snap voluntarily continued to litigate the validity of the Agreement after confirmation of its Chapter 11 plan. Bradford had no choice but to defend. By choosing to appeal the validity of the Agreement after confirmation, Sure-Snap did so at the risk of incurring post-confirmation costs involved in its act. “[B]ankruptcy was intended to protect the debtor from the continuing costs of pre-bankruptcy acts but not to insulate the debtor from the costs of post-bankruptcy acts.”

Id. at 1018 (quoting *In re Hadden*, 57 B.R. 187, 190 (Bankr. W.D. Wis. 1986)) (emphasis in original).

23. Similarly, the Ninth Circuit has found discharge inapplicable where a debtor voluntarily commences or re-institutes litigation following its discharge. *Siegel v. Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation*, 143 F.3d 525 (9th Cir. 1998) considered whether a lender’s

contractual rights to attorney's fees incurred post-petition, based upon a prepetition cause of action, constituted a discharged prepetition contingent claim. There, the debtor brought a post-petition action against the creditor in state court in which the creditor prevailed (*Id.* at 528), and the prepetition deeds of trust provided for recovery of the creditor's attorney's fees. *Id.* at 531.

24. The *Siegel* Court first disposed of the debtor's argument that the discharge eliminated the attorney's fees provisions from the prepetition documents. Citing *Johnson v. Home State Bank*, 501 U.S. 78, 83, 111 S.Ct. 2150, 2153, 115 L.Ed.2d 66 (1991), the court found that "a discharge in bankruptcy does not end a party's obligation, but merely prevents one method of collection. Thus, [the debtor's] discharge in bankruptcy did not extinguish the contractual attorney's fee provision." *Id.* at 531 (citations omitted).

25. In rejecting the debtor's argument that the attorney's fees claim constituted a prepetition contingent claim, the *Siegel* Court found:

This is a case where the debtor, Siegel, had been freed from the untoward effects of contracts he had entered into. Freddie Mac [the creditor] could not pursue him further, nor could anyone else. He, however, chose to return to the fray and to use the contract as a weapon. It is perfectly just, and within the purposes of bankruptcy, to allow the same weapon to be used against him.

* * *

Siegel's decision to pursue a whole new course of litigation made him subject to the strictures of the attorney's fee provision. In other words, while his bankruptcy did protect him from the results of his past acts, including attorney's fees associated with those acts, it did not give him carte blanche to go out and commence new litigation about the contract without consequence.

Id., at 533-34.

26. The Ninth Circuit reaffirmed *Siegel* in *Boeing North American, Inc. v. Ybarra (In re Ybarra)*, 424 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2005). There, the debtor, after having filed for bankruptcy protection, continued state court litigation against a creditor that she had commenced prior to

filing her bankruptcy petition. The creditor prevailed and sought to collect the portion of the fees and costs incurred postpetition. *Id.* at 1019. The bankruptcy court ruled for the creditor, and the debtor appealed to the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel of the Ninth Circuit (“BAP”) which, in a divided opinion, reversed. The creditor appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which reversed the BAP and reaffirmed its holdings in *Siegel*:

[W]e reaffirm that claims for attorney fees and costs incurred post-petition are not discharged where post-petition, the debtor voluntarily commences litigation or otherwise voluntarily “return[s] to the fray.” Whether attorney fees and costs incurred through the continued prosecution of litigation initiated pre-petition may be discharged depends on whether the debtor has taken the affirmative post-petition action to litigate a prepetition claim and has thereby risked the liability of these litigation expenses...

In this case, after petitioning for bankruptcy, Ybarra petitioned the bankruptcy court to exempt the state suit against Rockwell, and then appealed the bankruptcy court’s denial of this exemption to the BAP and this court. On remand, Ybarra chose to pursue the state case rather than accepting Rockwell’s \$17,500 settlement offer. Ybarra actively persuaded the state court to set aside the dismissal. We conclude that by affirmatively reviving the state suit, Ybarra “returned to the fray.” Thus, under *Siegel*, Rockwell’s claim for attorney fees and costs incurred post-petition was not discharged in the bankruptcy.⁴

27. The Second Circuit has also determined that a post-confirmation award of attorney’s fees in pre-petition litigation may not constitute a pre-petition contingent claim. In *Big Yank Corp. v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. (In re Water Valley Finishing, Inc.)*, 139 F.3d 325, 328-29 (2d Cir. 1998), the Second Circuit found that a *sua sponte* post-confirmation award of attorney’s fees in pre-petition litigation was not a contingent pre-petition claim. The Court

⁴ The BAP majority relied on two cases, *Abercrombie v. Hayden Corp. (In re Abercrombie)*, 139 F.3d 755 (9th Cir. 1998) and *Kadjevich v. Kadjevich (In re Kadjevich)*, 220 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2000), which held that claims for post-petition attorney fees could not be granted administrative expense priority. *Id.* at 1021. In reversing the BAP, the Ninth Circuit held that administrative priority deals with the distribution of estate funds, whereas discharge involves post-discharge personal liability. Accordingly, the analysis of whether the attorney’s fees liability is a contingent claim is different. *Id.* at 1025. Thus, “[e]ven if a cause of action arose pre-petition, the discharge shield cannot be used as a sword that enables a debtor to undertake risk-free litigation at others’ expense.” *Id.* at 1026.

reasoned that the award was outside the reasonable contemplation of the parties despite a pre-petition statement by the trial court “that it would look to the unsuccessful party to pay attorneys’ fees.” *Id.*, at 328.

28. Other courts have also held that a debtor cannot escape post-confirmation liabilities where, as here, it voluntarily commenced or continued litigation post-petition. *See Bell v. Ruben*, No. 12 C 8311, 2013 WL 6211743 at *10 (N.D. Ill., Nov. 26, 2013) (“The focus is on why and how the debtor incurred the post-petition debt. Here, [the creditor] pursued her claims in the bankruptcy; [the debtor] voluntarily chose to throw his hat in the Arbitration ring with his former law firm and partners *after* the discharge order. Thus, the obligation at issue here accrued because of a superseding cause – i.e., [the debtor’s] decision to pursue Arbitration – not because of [the creditor’s] original claims”); *Maple Forest Condominium Ass’n v. Spencer (In re Spencer)*, 457 B.R. 601, 613 (E.D. Mich. 2011) (“Where a right to payment after the bankruptcy filing remains solely within the power of the debtor to avoid, the right to payment does not arise from the pre-petition agreement”); *In re Bennett*, No. 09-36637, 2012 WL 2562418 at *6 (Bankr. S.D. Tex., June 28, 2012) (“to the extent the fees are contingent on the acts of the *debtor*, they are not a contingent claim within the meaning of § 101(5)(A), and they are not a claim against the estate as of the petition date”); *see also Texaco Inc. v. Board of Commissioners for the LaFourche Basin Levee District*, 254 B.R. 536 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2000) (“Simply stated, the basic rule is that claims arising after confirmation from a contractual relationship are not barred by a confirmation order. It is only where the liability asserted in a claim is based upon a breach of contract that occurred before confirmation that the claim must be filed in the bankruptcy. Potential claims for liabilities for breach of obligations which might occur after confirmation cannot be filed before confirmation even if they could be anticipated”).

29. What all of the foregoing cases have in common is their refusal to allow a debtor, such as the Trust here, to voluntarily pursue a post-discharge course of conduct which gives rise

to claims – whether based on prepetition contract or statute – and escape liability for those claims based on a previous bankruptcy discharge. Sierra respectfully submits that this Court should likewise deny the Trust’s attempt to escape the consequences of its own post-confirmation actions in filing the FAC in blatant disregard of releases and covenants not to sue.

30. The Trust recognized, as far back as March, 2014, that its decision to file the FAC came with a risk that it may have to pay attorney’s fees to Sierra – a decision that was the Trust’s alone to make, and which the Trust had every opportunity to avoid. Prior to the FAC’s filing, the Trust: (a) was on notice the FAC would violate the settlement agreements; (b) acknowledged to the Court in the Minnesota Action the potential exposure to an award of attorneys’ fees; (c) had the opportunity to revise the FAC to eliminate the problem (and *did* revise the FAC, but not in any way that diminished the violation); and (d) deliberately and unilaterally filed the FAC anyway. The Trust made a conscious and voluntary post-confirmation decision to violate the same set of contractual obligations on which it seeks to hold Sierra liable in the Minnesota Action.

31. It should not now utilize this Court to escape that risk.⁵

II. THE DEBTORS AND TRUST WERE NOT DISCHARGED

32. The Motion must also be denied because the Debtors did not receive a discharge.

33. The Confirmation Order provides that the Debtors received a discharge but limited any discharge *to the extent allowed under section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code*. (See Confirmation Order ¶ 42).

34. Section 1141(d)(3) states as follows:

(3) The confirmation of a plan does not discharge a debtor if –

(A) the plan provides for the liquidation of all or substantially all of the property of the estate

⁵ Sierra incorporated herein the additional analysis and case citations contained in the Objection of Decision One.

- (B) the debtor does not engage in business after consummation of the plan; and
- (C) the debtor would be denied a discharge under section 727(a) of this title if the case were a case under chapter 7 of this title.

11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(3).

35. Section 727(a) of the Bankruptcy Code denies a discharge if “the debtor is not an individual.” 11 U.S.C. § 727(a). Thus, a debtor is not entitled to a discharge if it is not an individual, the plan provides for the liquidation of all or substantially all of the estate property, and the debtor does not engage in business post-confirmation. *See e.g. Dutcher v. Reorganized Pettibone Corp.*, 193 B.R. 667, 668 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (“[c]onfirmation of a plan discharges a corporation of all its debts unless it is a liquidating plan”); *Teamsters Pension Trust Fund of Philadelphia v. Malone Realty Co.*, 82 B.R. 346, 349 (E.D. Penn. 1988) (corporate or partnership debtor that is “both liquidating and discontinuing its business does not receive a discharge when its plan is confirmed”; accordingly, automatic stay dissolved and discharge *denied* “no later than the moment of confirmation”); *In re Wood Family Interests, Ltd.*, 135 B.R. 407, 410 (Bankr. D. Colo. 1989) (section 1141(d)(3) “and the case law interpreting it are clear that a discharge is not available to corporate or partnership debtors who propose a liquidating plan of reorganization.”)

36. Here, the Debtors were unquestionably not individuals, the Plan provided for the immediate transfer of all, or substantially all, of the estates’ assets to the Trust, and the Debtors did not continue to engage in business after the Effective Date.⁶ Accordingly, RFC was not entitled to a discharge under section 1141(d)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code.

37. The Confirmation Order recognized that fact and, accordingly, limited the discharge to the extent that section 1141 allowed. However, section 1141(d)(3) does not permit

⁶ In fact, the Liquidating Trust Agreement requires the Trust to “wind down the affairs of, and dissolve the Debtors and their subsidiaries, including the Non-Debtor Subsidiaries” [ECF 6064-1, Section 2.2(c)], and mandates that “no part of the Liquidating Trust Assets shall be caused by the Liquidating Trust Board to be used or disposed of in furtherance of any trade or business” [*Id.*, Section 7.1(b).]

any discharge. Accordingly, Sierra's counterclaims, even were they deemed pre-petition contingent claims, were not discharged.

38. Because Sierra's counterclaims were not discharged, its failure to file a proof of claim asserting such claims is of no moment. *See Grynberg v. United States of America (In re Grynberg)*, 986 F.2d 367, 370 (10th Cir. 1993) ("failure to file a proof of claim before the bar date simply precludes a creditor from participating in the voting or distribution from the debtor's estate"); *MMM Healthcare Inc. v. Quesada (In re Quesada)*, Bankruptcy No. 13-02057 BKT, Adv. Proc. No. 13-00174 BKT, 2014 WL 1329264 (Bankr. D. P.R., April 1, 2014) (finding that the failure to file a proof of claim does not affect its right to file a complaint for nondischargeability of the debt); *Pharaoh's Palace, Inc. v. Foster (In re Foster)*, No. 02-12221, 02-1116 at *4 (Bankr. M.D. La., Oct. 22, 2003) ("[a] claim can be nondischargeable even if the creditor has not filed a proof of claim in the record of a case"); *Kinney v. I.R.S. (In re Video Gaming, Inc.)*, 123 B.R. 889, 891 (Bankr. D. Nev. 1991) ("the failure of the IRS to file a proof of claim for the pre-petition 100% penalty taxes does not render its claim dischargeable").

39. Since Sierra's counterclaims were nondischargeable, it was free to pursue those claims outside of the bankruptcy process. *See DePaolo v. United States (In re DePaolo)*, 45 F.3d 373, 375 (10th Cir. 1995) ("[t]he party to whom [a nondischargeable] debt is owed is entitled after confirmation to enforce his or her rights as they would exist outside of bankruptcy") (quoting *In re Amigoni*, 109 B.R. 341, 343 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1989); *In re Grynberg*, 986 F.2d at 370 ("like any other holder of a nondischargeable debt, the IRS is also free to pursue the debtor outside bankruptcy"); *Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp. v. Loving (In re Loving)*, 269 B.R. 655, 662 (Bankr. D. Ind. 2001) ("[n]either the bankruptcy rules nor the proof of claim bar date prevents a creditors holding a nondischargeable debt who has not filed a proof of claim from collecting outside of bankruptcy"); *United States v. Wood (In re Wood)*, 240 B.R. 609, 610 (C.D. Cal.

1999) (“the taxes were a nondischargeable debt under 11 U.S.C. 1141(d)(2) and 523, and thus could have been collected outside the plan”).

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, Sierra respectfully requests that the Court deny the Motion in its entirety and grant such other and further relief as it deems just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York
August 31, 2015

COZEN O’CONNOR

By: /s/ Frederick E. Schmidt, Jr.
Frederick E. Schmidt, Jr.
277 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10172
(212) 883-4900
(646) 588-1552
eschmidt@cozen.com

-and

JENKINS KAYAYAN LLP
pro hac vice pending
Jonathan M. Jenkins
444 S. Flower St., Ste 1530
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(310) 984-6800
jjenkins@jklitigators.com

*Attorneys for Sierra Pacific Mortgage
Company, Inc.*

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RESIDENTIAL FUNDING COMPANY,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE
COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 0:13-cv-03511-RHK-FLN

**DEFENDANT SIERRA PACIFIC
MORTGAGE COMPANY, INC.'S
MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

INTRODUCTION

When does a zealous effort to recover on behalf of bankruptcy creditors go one step too far?

The question is not theoretical – it is fundamentally the issue before the Court, and the answer is clear. The zealous advocate crosses the line when:

- The bankruptcy debtor mass-litigates breach of warranty claims by filing 75+ identical “cookie cutter” lawsuits against all of its former correspondent lenders that survived the economic meltdown;
- Every one of those complaints consists of conclusory allegations that cannot survive *Iqbal/Twombly* scrutiny;
- Just one month before filings those complaints, the debtor’s counsel testified under oath in the bankruptcy proceeding that the evidence potentially supporting the claims alleged (specifically, loan files and loan-level electronic data for as many

as 190,000 mortgages) is almost entirely unsearchable and inaccessible; and

- Facing a hearing on the first Motion to Dismiss in a line of many, the debtor brings a motion for leave to file a proposed First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) that (1) rectifies none of the shortcomings of the original Complaint; (2) remains obviously and admittedly without evidentiary support; and (3) injects new allegations that patently violate broad-spanning releases and covenants not to sue contained in a prior settlement agreement with the defendant – an agreement that, according to publicly-filed billing records, the debtor’s counsel actually reviewed and discussed prior to filing suit.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Sierra Mortgage Company, Inc. (“Sierra”) began doing business with plaintiff and debtor-in-liquidation Residential Funding Company, LLC (“RFC”) in or around March 1997. (Complaint, Ex. A, p. 1.) RFC alleges that, from that time until RFC filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in May 2012 (the “Bankruptcy Action”) (*Id.*, ¶ 52), Sierra sold RFC “thousands” of residential mortgage loans. (*Id.*, ¶ 51.) The FAC puts the number of loans Sierra sold to RFC at “over 9,000,” and attaches a 195-page list of all the loans allegedly bought from Sierra from 2000 to 2007 – but *does not identify any loans that RFC contends are “defective.”* (FAC Redline, p. 7, ¶¶ 16, 18 and Ex. C [Dkt. Nos. 49-6 and 49-5]).

The December 19, 2007 Settlement Agreement

Sierra occasionally repurchased certain mortgage loans from RFC; however, contrary to the allegations of the proposed FAC (at p. 3, ¶ 5 [Dkt. No. 49-6]), Sierra did

not “acknowledge” any “material defects” regarding such loans, and retains no continuing liability on them. In fact, Sierra and RFC executed written settlement agreements that (1) disclaimed any admission of wrongdoing by Sierra; (2) contained full releases and covenants not to sue with respect to the repurchased loans; and (3) obligated RFC to reimburse Sierra its costs and attorneys’ fees in the event RFC – as it expressly does here – ever breached the covenant not to sue. (Declaration of James Coffrini (“Coffrini Dec.”), Exs. 1-3.)

One such settlement agreement, effective December 19, 2007 (the “December 19, 2007 Settlement”) – thus post-dating every loan listed in Exhibit C – provided Sierra with a broad-spanning retroactive release. (Coffrini Dec., Ex. 1.) In addition to an attached list of 29 “Subject Loans,” the December 19 Settlement defined certain “Additional Loans” that

were sold to GMAC-RFC on or before the effective date of this Agreement, which may be in breach of one or more Events of Default, as described in the Client Guide but which have not been identified as of the date of this Agreement...

(Coffrini Dec., Ex. 1, p. 1.) Section 2(b) stated that upon payment of the Settlement Amount:

...GMAC-RFC for itself, its present and past representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents, and attorneys *will fully and forever release and discharge Client... from all claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action arising out of the Subject Loans, and arising out of the Additional Loans, but only where **the Additional Loans involve a borrower who has made the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month mandated by the contract, or (ii) where the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s) is identified as the only Event of Default*** of the GMAC-RFC

Client Guide (“Client Guide”).

(*Id.*, p. 3 (emphasis added).) Sierra timely paid the full settlement amount. (Coffrini Dec., ¶ 3.) Section 3 contains a covenant not to sue: the parties promised not to “bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.” (*Id.*, Ex. 1, p. 3.) Section 4 provides that neither party admitted fault or liability (*Id.*, pp. 3-4), and Section 6 awards prevailing party costs and attorneys’ fees in the event of any dispute (*Id.*, p. 4).

RFC’s purported FAC seeks to “pursue additional recoveries” (¶ 5) against Sierra based on all previously repurchased loans, including the 29 Subject Loans expressly resolved by the December 19, 2007 Settlement. This alone is a breach of the covenant not to sue, but RFC has also opened a much uglier can of worms: its covenant not to sue extends not just to the Subject Loans, but a defined subset of Additional Loans that consists of the following: each and every loan that RFC contends is defective and purports to sue on in this action, **unless** for any such loan, **either**:

1. The borrower did not make “the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month mandated by the contract”; *or*
2. RFC can identify some other “Event of Default” pursuant to the relevant Client Guide other than “the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s).”

(Coffrini Dec., Ex. 1, p. 3.) As will shortly be discussed, RFC apparently lacks the ability to access the information necessary to make these determinations. Thus, allowing

RFC to proceed with the proposed FAC would subject Sierra to undue prejudice, because the most effective weapon against breach of the covenant not to sue – a counter-claim for attorneys’ fees – is not much of a deterrent against a bankrupt debtor with a proven track record of shooting first and asking questions *not at all*.

The Other Settlement Agreements

Given the broad retroactive effect of the December 19, 2007 Settlement, Sierra did not receive a significant number of repurchase demands from RFC following its execution. However, Sierra did subsequently enter into several similar settlement agreements with RFC, including two such agreements that completely extinguished any ostensible liability on the part of Sierra with respect to four of the “example” loans cited by the proposed FAC.

On March 10, 2008, the parties entered into a settlement (the “March 10, 2008 Settlement”) resolving seven Subject Loans. (Coffrini Dec., Ex. 2.) Among the Subject Loans were three of the “example” loans cited in RFC’s proposed FAC:

11208459 (FAC, ¶ 42(k).)

11208467 (*Id.*, ¶ 42(l).)

11301585 (*Id.*, ¶ 42(n).)

(Coffrini Dec., Ex. 2, ¶ 1(a) and Exhibit A thereto.) The March 10, 2008 Settlement contained language virtually identical to that of the December 19, 2007 Settlement: including a release and covenant not to sue with respect to each Subject Loan. (*Id.*)

Similarly, on September 17, 2008, the parties entered into another settlement agreement (the “September 17, 2008 Settlement”) releasing Sierra of liability with

respect to three Subject Loans, one of which is an RFC “example” loan cited in the proposed FAC:

11249329 (FAC, ¶ 53(c).)

(Coffrini Dec., Ex. 3, and Exhibit A thereto.) The September 17, 2008 Settlement contained the same provisions as the above-described settlement agreements. (*Id.*)

RFC counsel apparently reviewed at least one of these settlement agreements prior to the filing of this action. According to the billing records of Morrison Foerster LLP,¹ RFC’s counsel in the Bankruptcy Action – which is listed in the original complaint in this action as “Of Counsel” to RFC (Dkt. No. 1, p. 15) – on November 1, 2013, one of RFC’s lawyers billed for the following time entry: “[r]eview Sierra Pacific file documents, *including settlement agreement* (0.6); *discuss same* with [other attorney] (0.2).” (Declaration of Jonathan M. Jenkins (“Jenkins Dec.”), Ex. A, p. 2) (emphasis added.) While it is unclear which of the settlement agreements was reviewed, *all* such agreements contain a release and covenant not to sue for the repurchased Subject Loans. Thus, it is completely unclear why RFC’s proposed FAC now attempts to violate that covenant not to sue by “pursu[ing] additional recoveries stemming from” each of the repurchased loans. (Dkt. No. 49-6, ¶ 5.)

The Genesis of This Lawsuit (And 75+ Others Like It)

Prior to filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in May 2012 along with numerous

¹ As explained in the Jenkins Dec. (at ¶¶ 2-3), Morrison Foerster LLP and Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP (which is Special Litigation Counsel for RFC in the Bankruptcy Action, as well as counsel of record for RFC in this action) periodically file their billing and expense reports publicly in the Bankruptcy Action to receive compensation from the debtor estates.

affiliates, RFC was a mortgage loan aggregator, in the business of acquiring loans from numerous “correspondent lenders” such as Sierra and pooling them into securitized mortgage trusts. (FAC, ¶¶ 1-2.)

On December 11, 2013, the bankruptcy court approved RFC’s Chapter 11 Plan (the “Plan”).² Over the next several days, RFC mass-filed virtually identical lawsuits against Sierra and other former loan correspondents – 67 separate lawsuits in this federal district alone.³ (RFC also filed several similar lawsuits in Minnesota state court, as well as in New York federal and state courts). Yet, even more remarkable than the sheer volume of litigation RFC commenced is the swiftness with which it all came about.

Sometime after September 1, 2013,⁴ the bankruptcy debtors asked the Carpenter firm to “examine potential claims against certain third parties related to their roles in the

² One aspect of the Plan was creation of a Liquidating Trust to prosecute certain “Liquidating Trust Causes of Action” (including the potential claims against Sierra and other loan originators). However, RFC was blocked from bringing such claims in the Bankruptcy Action because, *inter alia*, many of RFC’s correspondent agreements contain a Minnesota choice of venue clause (Complaint, Ex. A, ¶ 13 [Dkt. No. 1-1, p. 8]). Such provisions are automatically upheld in any “non-core” proceeding (e.g. a state law breach of contract action against a non-debtor entity). See, e.g. *In Re Exide Technologies*, 544 F.3d 196, 206 (3rd Cir. 2008). Thus, Section 13.2 of the bankruptcy court-approved Liquidating Trust Agreement included a jurisdictional carve-out: “...notwithstanding... anything to the contrary set forth in the Plan, the Liquidating Trust Board shall have power to bring (or cause to be brought) any action *in any court of competent jurisdiction to prosecute any Liquidating Trust Cause of Action.*” (Jenkins Dec., Ex. D, p. 24) (emphasis added).) Therefore, RFC’s contention in its recently-filed Motion to Transfer Venue to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (Dkt. No. 54) that the bankruptcy court retained “exclusive jurisdiction” over this action is incorrect.

³ Exhibit D to Sierra’s Request for Judicial Notice in Support of its Motion to Dismiss provides a list of the 67 cases RFC filed against former correspondent lenders in the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota.

⁴ The caption to the cited “Summary of Fifth and Final Application of Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP as Special Litigation for the Debtors for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses” explains that the “Fifth Compensation Period” (when the debtors made their request to the Carpenter firm) was from September 1, 2013 through December 17, 2013. (Jenkins Dec., Ex. B, p. 3.)

Debtors' securitization to try and recover some of [sic] liabilities that were settled as part of the Global [bankruptcy] Settlement" (Jenkins Dec., Ex. B, p. 5); and sometime thereafter, the bankruptcy debtors "ultimately decided to pursue claims against certain of the correspondent lenders who had sold [RFC] loans." (*Id.*) The Carpenter firm's first billing entry regarding these correspondent lender lawsuits appears to have occurred on October 25, 2013 (*Id.*, p. 7) – just seven weeks prior to the "filing of more than 75 cases in December 2013 asserting claims against these lenders based on defective loans they had sold to RFC" (*Id.*, p. 5): "[r]eview various e-mails and related materials related to purchase of loans (.20). Conference with [other attorney] regarding potential affirmative claims (0.5)." (*Id.*, p. 7.)

Evidently, the notion of suing numerous correspondent lenders using substantially similar complaints advanced quickly. Just a few days later, on November 1, 2013, another attorney at the Carpenter firm had begun "work on draft correspondent lender complaint." (Jenkins Dec., Ex. B, p. 9.) Within several days, the Carpenter firm had designated this complaint as the "form correspondent lender complaint" or, alternatively, the "template complaint." (*Id.*, pp. 10-11.) In terms of actual due diligence, however, between October-December 2013, there appear to be only two specific references to Sierra in the Carpenter firm's billing records, amounting to less than three hours' work:

11/13/2013 Review and analyze correspondent files regarding Sierra Pacific Mortgage (1.5)

11/14/2013 Review and analyze Sierra Pacific lender file. [1.8]

(*Id.*, p. 12.)

Contemporaneously, the Carpenter firm was working on the bankruptcy debtors' Plan confirmation. The question of how much pre-filing diligence RFC performed – or *could* have performed – seems to be addressed at least in part by a declaration of attorney Jeffrey Lipps of the Carpenter firm, filed in the Bankruptcy Action on November 12, 2013 (the “Lipps Declaration” or “Lipps Dec.”). (Jenkins Dec., Ex. C.) The Lipps Declaration urged the bankruptcy court to approve the proposed Plan in part because it resolved pending securities fraud lawsuits against RFC (and the other debtors) that would otherwise require extensive discovery, including the production of copious loan files and loan-level data – information quintessentially relevant to *this* action. However, RFC *lacked the ability to access* large quantities of such information because, among other things, it had sold its entire loan servicing portfolio to Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC (“Ocwen”) for \$3 billion in early 2013.

The Lipps Declaration provided several “illustrative examples” of the discovery burdens RFC and the other bankruptcy debtors potentially faced in multiple mortgage-backed securities actions, and used as one such example the action *Allstate Insurance Co., et al. v. GMAC Mortgage, LLC et al.*, Hennepin County District Court Case No. 27-CV-11-3480:

The *Allstate* plaintiffs bought over \$553 million of RFC and GMAC RMBS certificates in twenty-five securitizations involving more than 190,000 mortgage loans between 2005 and 2007.

(Jenkins Dec., Ex. C, p. 18.) The proposed FAC concedes that “a number [of the 25 securitizations at issue in *Allstate*] included Sierra Pacific loans.” (Dkt. No. 49-6,

¶ 72(c).)

The Lipps Declaration explained that if the *Allstate* litigation (which involved “all five of RFC’s securitization shelves”) were to continue, the discovery burdens would be severe:

Many loan files exist entirely or partially in paper copy only... production of all 190,000 loan files would likely require production of tens of millions of pages. Moreover, *the personnel and systems needed to efficiently search for and copy loan files have all transferred to Ocwen, leaving the debtors with extremely limited practical ability to collect and produce those materials.*

(Jenkins Dec., Ex. C, pp. 19-20 (emphasis added).) Thus, at the same time RFC was ramping up to file dozens of lawsuits against loan originators using its “template” complaint, it was simultaneously telling the bankruptcy court that it no longer had the ability to access critical evidence it would need to prosecute such claims (let alone conduct pre-filing diligence).

Moreover, to avoid violating the broad covenant not to sue in the December 19, 2007 Settlement with Sierra, RFC should have conducted pre-filing diligence using loan-level performance data, payment histories, and underwriting parameters for *each and every loan it is purportedly suing on* – to ensure that none of them were loans as to which: (1) the borrower had made 12 consecutive monthly payments; or (2) there was no Event of Default other than the borrower’s overstatement of stated income. However, the Lipps Declaration explained that RFC lacks access to this information as well:

In addition, relevant loan-level data apart from origination files – *such as information about loan-level performance data, loan originators, underwriting parameters, due diligence, quality audit results, payment history, and other relevant metrics* – is housed in or was processed through a number of electronic systems. *Some of these electronic systems are no longer operational, so it would require extensive IT work to access them.*

(Jenkins Dec., Ex. C, p. 20 (emphasis added).) This concession perhaps shows why, as late as December 5, 2013 – just one week before RFC launched 75+ loan originator complaints into the judicial system – an attorney at the Carpenter firm was still searching for some means of corroborating RFC’s blanket allegations. The billing entry reads:

Investigation into *potential sources of quality control data to provide defect detail in complaints*.

(Jenkins Dec., Ex. B, p. 14 (emphasis added).) Evidently, at the same time RFC’s attorneys were preparing to storm courthouses, they were still struggling to find data to corroborate their “template” complaint.

Differences Between the Proposed FAC and the Original Complaint

Sierra’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 10) attacked the Complaint on, *inter alia*, *Iqbal/ Twombly* grounds. The Complaint, like the other 66 complaints RFC filed in this judicial district, was a generic “template” that could have been (and apparently was) filed against any former correspondent lender that managed to survive the housing-market meltdown and global financial crisis. In 15 pages dotted with interchangeable references to “Defendant” and “other correspondent lenders,” the Complaint offered:

- Lengthy and mostly irrelevant background regarding the Bankruptcy Action;
- Similarly irrelevant descriptions of securities fraud lawsuits brought against RFC on account of allegedly defective loans “including those sold to it by Defendant” (¶ 9);
- Generic allegations of contractual breach by “Defendant and other correspondent lenders” (¶ 31);

- An allegation that “dozens of the loans sold to RFC by Defendant violated the Client Guide and/or other representations or warranties made by Defendant” (§ 33) (emphasis added); and
- *Zero* specific loans and *zero* particular representations and warranties allegedly breached by specific loans.

After bringing an unsuccessful motion for a six-week extension of time to “decide how to respond” to the Motion to Dismiss, RFC now asks for leave to file the proposed FAC which, in a nutshell:

- Changes “Defendant” to “Sierra Pacific” in most places;
- Conveniently and inexplicably raises the number of allegedly defective Sierra loans from “*dozens*” to “*hundreds*” (§ 40);
- Provides even *more* irrelevant details regarding the Bankruptcy Action (§§ 71, 72(a)-(f), 75-76) and the securities fraud lawsuits against RFC (§§ 49, 60-61, 65);
- Violates covenants not to sue with Sierra (by, *inter alia*, seeking “additional recoveries” on all previously repurchased loans (§ 5) and using as “examples” not less than four loans covered by prior settlement agreements (§§ 42(k),(l),(n) & 53(c)); and
- *Still* fails to identify a single specific representation or warranty allegedly breached with respect to even one single Sierra loan.

The proposed FAC makes three other notable additions. First, RFC provides 17 “example” defective loans (§§ 42(a)-(n) and 53(a)-(c)). However, *none* of these “examples” actually *identifies* a specific representation or warranty that the example loan

allegedly breached. Tellingly, RFC goes on to allege that “[u]pon information and belief, many more of the loans sold to RFC by Sierra Pacific contained material defects” (¶ 43 (emphasis added)). It would appear that RFC is just guessing.

Second, the proposed FAC attaches thick exhibits: fifteen versions of Client Guide “excerpts,” and a list of 9,000+ loans purchased from Sierra. However, this “informational deluge” merely underscores the critical information RFC does not offer and does not itself know: *which* loans allegedly breached *what* contractual obligations (as established by *what* version of the Client Guide) and *how*? RFC never *connects the dots* – not even once.

Exhibits B-1 through B-15 (Dkt. Nos. 49-3 and 49-4) consist of hundreds of pages of “exemplary excerpts” from fifteen constantly-changing versions of the Client Guide. The sheer number of different versions demonstrates the difficulty in even figuring out the correct *source* of the contractual obligations applicable to any given loan – let alone the specific provisions allegedly breached. RFC makes no attempt to sort things out, stating only that the various excerpts “set the standards to which Sierra Pacific’s loans to RFC were expected to adhere” and leaving it undecipherably at that. (Dkt. No. 49-6, ¶ 17.)⁵

Exhibit C (Dkt. No. 49-5) purports to be a 195-page list of the 9,000 loans RFC bought from Sierra (FAC, ¶ 18), with sale dates as early as 2000 (and thus far outside

⁵ The proposed FAC contends that “[t]he complete versions of the Client Guide are known to the parties...” (¶ 17.) Quite the opposite. When it was in business, RFC made the Client Guides available primarily online. The most recent Sierra loan sale listed in Exhibit C was dated September 2007, more than six years ago, and RFC is out of business and in liquidation.

Minnesota's 6-year statute of limitations for breach of contract claims). Nowhere does Exhibit C specify which of these loans RFC alleges to be defective – meaning that Sierra cannot even *attempt* the process matching specific loans to particular representations and warranties scattered throughout “excerpts” from fifteen versions of the Client Guide.

Third, RFC tries to spruce up its allegations that certain (unspecified) Sierra loans “materially” breached various representations and warranties (also unspecified) by repeating the contentions made by former litigation adversaries (or contained in bankruptcy proofs of claim “stemming from *allegedly* defective mortgage loans.” (FAC, ¶¶ 49, 57, 60-61, 65.) For example, RFC alleges:

...as part of the MBIA litigation, MBIA hired an expert to review again a sampling of loans... *MBIA's expert identified 88 loans originated by Sierra Pacific that materially breached the weaker representations that RFC had provided to MBIA. Examples of the material breaches MBIA asserted were* []...

(*Id.*, ¶ 61 (emphasis added).) What this section makes clear is that, for all of RFC's references to the mortgage securitization actions, those cases involved *completely different* sets of contractual obligations, notwithstanding RFC's conclusory assertion that the other representations and warranties were “weaker” or “more limited.” (FAC, ¶ 36.)

In addition, RFC conspicuously avoids conceding that MBIA's (or any other plaintiff's) allegations were *accurate*. The proposed FAC tries to use the damaging assertions leveled against RFC in other actions as proof that Sierra breached representations and warranties in *this* case, but without conceding that RFC itself

committed wrongful conduct or caused any damages.⁶

RFC cannot have it both ways. Notably, RFC's Answer in the MBIA litigation (filed by the Carpenter firm) denied nine times "that RFC made any misrepresentations or breached any warranties" or that "there were undisclosed or misrepresented any risks related to loans in the collateral pools..." (Jenkins Dec., Ex. F.) RFC also asserted as an affirmative defense that "*general economic conditions and changes in the housing market*" were the superseding cause of MBIA's claimed mortgage securitization losses. (*Id.*, p. 40 (emphasis added).) RFC is bound to this position whether it likes it or not: its counsel in both this action and the Bankruptcy Action, Jeffrey Lipps of the Carpenter firm, also served as RFC's expert witness in the Bankruptcy Action; his expert report filed on October 3, 2012 opined on the merits of the bankruptcy debtors' "*Housing Crisis*" Defense:

[t]here is ample evidence that the true cause of the losses to these Trusts was the massive economic downturn beginning in late 2007 and escalating through 2008 and into 2009... Debtors had developed extensive factual and expert support for this argument.

⁶ Consistent with this new strategy, RFC elected to delete ¶ 35 of the Complaint from the proposed FAC (Dkt. No. 49-6, p. 18), which read:

35. Indeed, as part of its own analysis of the claims later asserted against it, RFC retained its own expert, who concluded that approximately 43.5% of the loans he reviewed were materially defective in one or more ways, and that the likely exposure to RFC and its affiliates from defective correspondent loans exceeded \$7 billion.

Apparently, as RFC attempts to convert this case into a "breach of warranty" action by citing breach of warranty caselaw (Motion, p. 3), it has become uncomfortable with the notion of conceding its own misconduct – perhaps out of concern that "breach of warranty" claims implicate a provision of Minnesota's comparative fault statute, *Minn. Stat.* § 604.01(1a).

(*Id.*, Ex. E, p. 38.)

STANDARD OF REVIEW

RFC correctly notes that F.R.C.P. Rule 15(a)(2) obligates federal courts to “freely” grant leave to amend “when justice so requires.” (Motion, p. 2.) RFC also appositely cites (at p. 2) the recent decision in *Streambend Properties III, LLC v. Sexton Lofts, LLC*, 2014 WL 316895 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2014), in which the district court denied plaintiff’s Rule 15(a)(2) motion for leave to amend because, among other reasons, the proposed amendments were “futile” and infused with bad faith.⁷

Streambend explained that a proposed amendment is “futile” when it would not survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. Thus, proposed amendments must survive *Twombly/Iqbal* scrutiny: “[a] claim that does not satisfy *Twombly* is futile under Rule 15(a).” *Id.* at *6. See also *Cornelia I. Crowell GST Trust v. Possis Medical, Inc.*, 519 F.3d 778, 781-83 (8th Cir. 2008) (upholding district court’s denial of leave to amend on ground of futility). The Court may also properly deny leave to amend where the request is apparently made in “bad faith” or would cause “undue prejudice” to the opposing party. *Streambend*, 2014 WL 316895 at *6-8.

Twombly mandates that a viable complaint must set forth enough specific facts “to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” 550 U.S. at 570. “[L]abels and conclusions” or a “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Id.* at 555. In a breach of contract case, the mere assertion that the defendant breached a

⁷ The district court in *Streambend* established that plaintiff’s proposed amendments were time-barred by citing a county recorder document that evidenced plaintiff’s constructive notice. 2014 WL 316895 at *6-8.

contractual obligation is not enough; the plaintiff must specify *what* contractual provisions are at issue, or it is “impossible to discern precisely how [the defendant] allegedly has breached them.” *Motley v. Homecomings Fin., LLC*, 557 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1013 (D. Minn. 2008). *See also T.B. Allen & Assocs., Inc. v. Euro-Pro Operating LLC*, 2012 WL 2508021 at *2 (D. Minn. June 28, 2012) (dismissing breach of contract claim when plaintiff did not sufficiently plead terms of contract).

F.R.C.P. Rule 8(a)(2)’s “short and plain” fair-notice pleading standard affords no protection to complaints that are minimally pled because of insufficient pre-filing diligence or a lack of evidentiary support:

It is the plaintiffs’ burden, under both Rule 8 and Rule 11, to reasonably investigate their claims, to research the relevant law, to plead only viable claims, and to plead those claims concisely and clearly, so that a defendant can readily respond to them and a court can readily resolve them.

Gurman v. Metro Housing and Redevelopment Authority, 842 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1153 (D. Minn. 2011). Accordingly, conclusory allegations that lack factual support and are based on “information and belief” do not satisfy Rule 8. *See Vollmer v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.*, No. 13-2617, 2014 WL 642423, at *1 (8th Cir. Feb. 20, 2014).

ARGUMENT

1. The Court Should Deny Leave to File the Proposed FAC Because It Is Futile, Smacks of Bad Faith, and Would Unduly Prejudice Sierra

On this Motion, issues of futility and bad faith run together: the proposed FAC, like the original Complaint, does not pass muster under Rule 12(b)(6) and *Twombly/Iqbal*. The proposed FAC throws up huge amounts of data (9,000 loans and 15

partial versions of a Client Guide) that only further convolutes RFC's claims – for instance, by purporting to make *clearly time-barred claims* based on loans that RFC purchased as far back as 2000.⁸ The FAC seeks additional recovery on loans that Sierra already repurchased, violating a settlement agreement and covenant not to sue that RFC's own attorneys have read, according to their publicly-filed billing records. And RFC is bound to further violate the retroactive release and covenant not to sue contained in the December 19, 2007 Settlement,⁹ because RFC apparently has no access to the electronic loan-level data (such as payment histories) necessary just to ascertain whether any given Sierra loan is subject to the settlement provisions.

Particularly concerning, however, is the question of *why* RFC now presents the Court with a *second* pleading asserting claims that lack evidentiary support. In the Lipps Declaration, RFC's own counsel (and expert witness) essentially admitted in open court – just one month before this action and 70+ other like it were filed – that plaintiff did not have the *ability* to adequately investigate and prosecute these claims. (Nonetheless, at the very same moment, RFC's attorneys were hurriedly churning out a “template” complaint in anticipation of mass litigation).

⁸ “It is well-settled [under Minnesota law] that a cause of action for breach of contract accrues immediately on a breach, though actual damages resulting therefrom do not occur until afterwards.” *Enervations, Inc. v. Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co.*, 380 F.3d 1066, 1069 n2 (8th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted) (leave to amend properly denied where extrinsic settlement agreement revealed claim to be time-barred).

⁹ While typically the Court does not look beyond the Complaint on a motion to dismiss, there is a recognized exception for “materials that are part of the public record... as well as materials that are necessarily embraced by the pleadings” – such as the December 19, 2007 Settlement. *Homeownership Preservation Foundation*, 2009 WL 6067018 at n3.

RFC cites several cases for the proposition that plaintiffs in the “RMBS litigation space” (which this two-count breach of contract action does *not* occupy) do not have to “set forth in the complaint each and every breach for every one of the thousands of loans involved.” (Motion, pp. 5-6.) This is an unavailing attempt to redirect the line of battle: RFC need concern itself with whether it must match specific contractual provisions to particular loans “thousands” of times when thus far it has failed to do so *even once*.

Federal courts in other jurisdictions have provided clear and persuasive authority regarding the application of *Twombly/Iqbal* to the breach of warranty claims that predominate in loan repurchase litigation. Those courts “have dismissed breach of representation and warranty claims, which fail to plead facts sufficient to put a defendant on notice of the nature and scope of the claims.” *Torchlight Loan Servs., LLC v. Column Fin., Inc.*, 2012 WL 3065929, at *5 (S.D.N.Y. July 25, 2012) (dismissing portions of a complaint that merely recited the warranties and alleged breaches but provided no factual underpinnings of the purported breach); *see also Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. LaSalle Bank N.A.*, 2011 WL 4837493, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 11, 2011) (dismissing breach of warranty claim where plaintiff failed to allege “the ways” in which defendant breached its warranty).

In this case, the Complaint offered lots of detail about irrelevant matters such as the Bankruptcy Action and the dozens of securities fraud actions filed against RFC, and the proposed FAC provides more of the same. However, in marked comparison, RFC’s operative allegations of contractual breach are strikingly threadbare – far more so than the complaints analyzed in *Torchlight* and *Wells Fargo*. In fact, both documents –

stripped of the irrelevant “filler” – are more similar to the skeletal complaint at issue in *Bissessur v. Indiana University Board of Trustees*, 581 F.3d 599, 604 (7th Cir. 2009), where the Court of Appeals affirmed dismissal of a student’s breach of implied contract claim against a university due to insufficient factual allegations in support of naked legal conclusions. The decision gave the plaintiff a scathing rebuke that seems equally applicable to RFC’s factually bankrupt claims against Sierra:

Allowing this case to proceed absent factual allegations that match the bare-bones recitation of the claims’ elements would sanction a fishing expedition costing both parties, and the court, valuable time and resources.

Such language calls to mind *Iqbal*’s cautionary admonition that F.R.C.P Rule 8 “does not unlock the doors of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions.” 556 U.S. at 678-79. It logically follows that the “doors of discovery” also remain barred for a plaintiff who – according to the recent testimony of its bankruptcy counsel/litigation counsel/expert witness under penalty of perjury – cannot access potential evidentiary support because it is located in untrackable loan files or on inoperative computer systems.

Without a doubt, RFC and its counsel are attempting to zealously represent the interests of bankruptcy creditors. They may hold a firm belief that evidence supporting RFC’s allegations is somewhere out in the universe. And they are clearly concerned about a rapidly closing window on the statute of limitations. Regardless, it is equally clear that RFC is undeterred by the fact that its cookie-cutter claims against Sierra and 70+ other loan originators lack adequate evidentiary support. And permitting RFC to go on marching blindly into the night – while trampling on Sierra’s rights in violation of

covenants not to sue – is not the appropriate result. As this Court has previously noted, “[a] shot in the dark is a sanctionable event, even if it somehow hits the mark.” *Brown v. Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc.*, 276 F.R.D. 599, 605 (D. Minn. 2011), citing *Vista Mfg., Inc. v. Trac-4, Inc.*, 131 F.R.D. 134, 138 (N.D. Ind. 1990).

On these facts, denial of RFC’s Motion is warranted on three grounds: futility, bad faith, and prejudice to Sierra. *Streambend*, 2014 WL 316895 at *6-8. The proposed FAC is facially defective, RFC does not have proper evidentiary support for the claims alleged, and the mere filing of the FAC would massively violate Sierra’s rights under the retroactive release and covenant not to sue contained in the December 19, 2007 Settlement. Denying RFC leave to file the FAC as proposed would not even be especially prejudicial (and certainly not the death knell this action deserves), as plaintiff’s original Complaint is still pending.

Nonetheless, denial will send RFC and its counsel an overdue reminder (on behalf of Sierra and 66 other outraged mortgage originators recently hailed before this Court) that zealous advocacy has limits. Some lines may never be crossed, whether by one step or ten, even in the name of bankrupt debtors that no longer bleed.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, Sierra respectfully requests that the Court deny RFC's Motion.

Dated: March 7, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jonathan M. Jenkins
Jonathan M. Jenkins
Admitted *pro hac vice*
Lara Kayayan
Admitted *pro hac vice*
JENKINS LLP
8075 West Third St., Suite 407
Los Angeles, California 90048
Telephone: (310) 984-6800
Fax: (310) 984-6840
jjenkins@jmjenkinslaw.com
lkayayan@jmjenkinslaw.com

Richard T. Thomson (#109538)
Amy L. Schwartz (#0339350)
Lapp, Libra, Thomson, Stoeber & Push,
Chartered
120 South Sixth Street, Suite 2500
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 338-5815
Fax: (612) 338-6651
rthomson@lapplibra.com
aschwartz@lapplibra.com

Counsel for Defendant Sierra Pacific
Mortgage Company, Inc.

EXHIBIT 2

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement effective as of December 19, 2007 (may be amended, supplemented or otherwise modified from time to time, hereinafter referred to as "Agreement") is between Residential Funding Company, LLC ("GMAC-RFC") and Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company Inc. ("Client"), collectively the ("Parties") and individually the ("Party").

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, GMAC-RFC purchased from Client pursuant to the terms and conditions of that certain Client Contract dated March 13, 2002 (as amended, supplemented or otherwise modified from time to time, hereinafter referred to as the "Client Contract") those residential mortgage loans described on the attached Exhibit A (hereinafter referred to as the "Subject Loans");

WHEREAS, the parties believe there may be other loans ("Additional Loans") that were sold to GMAC-RFC on or before the effective date of this Agreement, which may be in breach of one or more Events of Default, as described in the Client Guide but which have not been identified as of the date of this Agreement;

WHEREAS, GMAC-RFC has demanded that Client repurchase the Subject Loans pursuant to the Client Contract;

WHEREAS, Client has not repurchased the Subject Loans;

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed that it is in their respective best interests to settle their disputes with respect to the Subject Loans and with respect to a sub-set of certain Additional Loans on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth;

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, GMAC-RFC and Client hereby agree as follows:

1. PAYMENT:

(a) In settlement of GMAC-RFC's claims, and in consideration of GMAC-RFC releasing its claims against Client relating to the Subject Loans and a sub-set of certain Additional Loans and all other undertakings stated in this Agreement, Client will pay to GMAC-RFC the amount of \$1,000,000

("Settlement Amount"). Client will pay the Settlement Amount to GMAC-RFC on or before December 21, 2007.

(b) Payment shall be made to GMAC-RFC no later than 12:00 Noon (Minneapolis time) on the due date and shall be made in lawful money of the United States of America in immediately available funds transferred via wire to GMAC-RFC's account at:

BANK ONE

Chicago, IL 60670

ABA #071000013

Credit to GMAC-Residential Funding Company, LLC

DDA account #1097286

Attn: Melissa Simons

RE: Sierra Pacific 12/07

(c) If Client fails to pay the Settlement Amount on a timely basis in accordance with the payment schedule, or otherwise breaches its obligation under the Client Contract or any other Agreement it has with GMAC-RFC, GMAC-RFC may, at its option, by written notice to Client, terminate this Agreement and proceed against Client with respect to the Subject Loans and all Additional Loans under the Client Agreement.

2. RELEASES:

(a) Client for itself, its present and past representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents and attorneys does hereby fully and forever release and discharge GMAC-RFC, and any entity affiliated in any manner with GMAC-RFC and its representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents, and attorneys from any and all claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action, arising out of the Subject Loans, and arising out of the Additional Loans, but only where the Additional Loans involves a borrower(s) who has made the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month due as mandated by the contract, or (ii) where the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s) is identified as the only Event of Default of

the GMAC-RFC Client Guide ("Client Guide"). All other types of Additional Loans are not included within the scope of this release and are thus subject to repurchase and other remedies. All other rights of the Parties under the "Client Guide" shall remain in full force and effect, except as expressly stated herein.

(b) Upon full payment of the Settlement Amount by Client and the performance by Client of all other terms and conditions of this Agreement, GMAC-RFC for itself, its present and past representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents, and attorneys will fully and forever release and discharge Client, and its respective representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents and attorneys from all claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action arising out of the Subject Loans, and arising out of the Additional Loans, but only where the Additional Loans involve a borrower(s) who has made the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month due as mandated by the contract, or (ii) where the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s) is identified as the only Event of Default of the GMAC-RFC Client Guide ("Client Guide"). All other types of Additional Loans are not included within the scope of this release and are thus subject to repurchase and other remedies. All other rights of the Parties under the "Client Guide" shall remain in full force and effect, except as expressly stated herein.

(c) The Parties acknowledge that they may hereafter discover facts different from or in addition to those which they know or believe to be true with respect to the Subject Loans and Additional Loans and agree that this Agreement shall be and remain effective in all respects notwithstanding such different or additional facts or the discovery thereof. Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to release any claims arising (i) under the Client Contract but unrelated to the Subject Loans and Additional Loans, or (ii) under any other Agreements now or hereafter in effect to which GMAC-RFC and Client are parties.

3. **NO OTHER ACTIONS:** Each Party represents and warrants that it has not brought and will not bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action, that is the subject of this Agreement.

4. **NO ADMISSION OF WRONGDOING:** This instrument shall not be construed as an admission of responsibility, liability or fault whatsoever for either Party's claims. Client and GMAC-RFC

deny all such responsibility and deny that they have engaged in any improper, illegal, or wrongful conduct toward each other.

5. **REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES:** Each of the Parties does hereby represent and warrant to the other that this Agreement is a valid and binding obligation of each Party enforceable in accordance with its terms.

6. **ENFORCEMENT EXPENSES OF PREVAILING PARTY:** Each Party agrees that in the event of any dispute regarding this Agreement or the claims, demands, liabilities, and causes of action included within its scope, the losing Party will be liable to reimburse, on demand, the prevailing Party for any and all expenses and costs, including, without limitation, the fees and expenses of the prevailing Party's counsel and of any other counsel, experts, consultants or agents that the prevailing Party may incur after the date hereof in connection with the enforcement of this Agreement.

7. **CONFIDENTIALITY:** All terms of this Agreement are and shall remain confidential and shall not be disclosed to other parties other than to the Party's attorneys, accountants or other professionals, or in conjunction with a due diligence investigation of any Party's business, except: a) to the extent that the Parties are obligated to make disclosure as a result of legal process or to perform other legal duty; or b) except as agreed by all Parties in separate writing.

8. **FURTHER ASSURANCES:** Each Party agrees to execute all such further documents as shall be reasonably necessary or helpful to carry out to the provisions of this Agreement.

9. **NO PRIOR ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS:** Each Party represents and warrants that said Party has not previously assigned or transferred any claim, demand, liability, or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.

10. **AMENDMENTS AND WAIVER:** No amendment of any provision of this Agreement shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by Client and GMAC-RFC, and no waiver of any provision of this Agreement, and no consent to any departure there from by Client or GMAC-RFC shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by Client and GMAC-RFC, and then such waiver or consent shall be effective only in the specific instance and for the specific purpose for which given.

11. **CONSTRUCTION:** This Agreement constitutes a negotiated document. In case of any alleged ambiguity in any term of this Agreement, such term shall not be constructed in favor of or against

either Party by reason of the participation of such Party or its attorneys in the negotiation or drafting of this Agreement.

12. **APPLICABLE LAW:** This Agreement shall be subject to and constructed and enforced in accordance with the internal laws of the State of Minnesota without giving effect to any conflicts of laws principles.

13. **BINDING EFFECT AND ASSIGNMENT; INTENDED THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY:** This Agreement shall insure to the benefit of, and shall be binding upon Client and GMAC-RFC and their respective successors and assigns.

14. **SEVERABILITY:** Any provision of this Agreement which is prohibited or unenforceable in any jurisdiction shall, as to such jurisdiction, be effective to the extent of such prohibition or unenforceability without invalidating the remaining portions hereof or affecting the validity or enforceability of such provision in any other jurisdiction, and to this end, the provisions hereof are severable.

15. **FACTUAL INVESTIGATION:** Each Party has made such investigation of the facts pertaining to this Agreement, as it deems necessary.

16. **SECTION HEADINGS:** Section headings in this Agreement are for convenience only and shall not in any way limit or effect the meaning or interpretation of any provision of this Agreement.

17. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT:** This Agreement embodies the entire agreement between the Parties as to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings relating to the subject matter hereof. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, this Agreement represents the final agreement between the Parties as to the subject matter hereof and may not be contradicted by evidence of prior, contemporaneous or subsequent oral agreements of the Parties; and there are no unwritten oral agreements between the Parties and neither GMAC-RFC nor Client, nor any officer, agent, employee, representative or attorney for GMAC-RFC or Client, has made any statement or representation to the other Party regarding any facts relied upon in entering this Agreement, and neither Party has relied upon any such statement or representation in executing this Agreement or in making this statement herein set forth.

18. **COMPREHENSION OF AGREEMENT AND DUE AUTHORIZATION:** Each Party hereto has read this Agreement and understands the contents thereof. Each of the officers or agents

executing this Agreement on behalf of their respective principals is empowered to do so and thereby binds his or her respective principal.

19. COUNTERPARTS: This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original but all of which together shall constitute but one and the same instrument.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Parties hereto has caused this Agreement to be executed and delivered by its officer thereto duly authorized as of the date first above written.

Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc

By: [Signature]

Name: Jim Coffrini

Title: President

Date: 12/19/07

State of California

County of Sacramento

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 19th day of December, 2007 by, Jim Coffrini the President of Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc a CA corporation, on behalf of the corporation.



Notary Public [Signature]

My commission Expires: 4/27/11

Residential Funding Company, LLC

By: [Signature]

Name: Dorian Whealdon

Title: Director

Date: 12/20/07

2

EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Residential Funding Company, LLC,)	File No. 13-CV-3511 (RHK/FLN)
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	Minneapolis, Minnesota
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.,)	March 24, 2014 9:36 a.m.
Defendant.)	DIGITAL AUDIO RECORDING TRANSCRIPT

BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN L. NOEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
(MOTIONS HEARING)

APPEARANCES

For the Plaintiff:	FELHABER LARSON FENLON & VOGT PA DONALD G. HEEMAN, ESQ. 220 South Sixth Street Suite 2200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-4504
	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP PETER E. CALAMARI, ESQ. 51 Madison Avenue 22nd Floor New York, New York 10010
For the Defendant:	JENKINS LLP JONATHAN M. JENKINS, ESQ. 8075 West Third Street Suite 407 Los Angeles, California 90048
	LAPP LIBRA THOMSON STOEGBNER & PUSCH, CHARTER AMY L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. 120 South Sixth Street Suite 2500 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

1 Transcribed By: CARLA R. BEBAULT, RMR, CRR, FCRR
2 316 North Robert Street
3 Suite 146 U.S. Courthouse
4 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
5

6 Proceedings recorded by digital audio recording;
7 transcript produced by computer.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 I N O P E N C O U R T

3
4 THE COURT: Okay. This is Residential Funding
5 versus Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. Let's get
6 everybody's appearance on the record. For the Plaintiff.

7 MR. HEEMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Donald
8 Heeman, Felhaber Larson. And with me is Peter Calamari from
9 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan appearing pro hac vice,
10 and Mr. Calamari will be arguing today.

11 THE COURT: Okay. For the Defendant.

12 MR. JENKINS: Good morning, your Honor. Jonathan
13 Jenkins, Jenkins, LLC, on behalf of Sierra Pacific Mortgage,
14 Incorporated. And with me is Mr. Richard Thomson of Lapp,
15 Libra, Thomson.

16 THE COURT: Okay. We're here for a hearing on the
17 Plaintiff's Motion to File a First Amended Complaint.
18 Mr. Calamari, you're up.

19 MR. CALAMARI: Thank you, your Honor, and good
20 morning. Thank you especially for letting me appear here.

21 This is a straightforward application to amend a
22 complaint. Rule 15 provides that amendments should be
23 freely granted when the interests of justice so require.
24 The application comes pre answer, pre a Rule 16 scheduling
25 conference, pre any adjudication on the merits of the

1 original complaint. Unlike some of the cases cited by
2 Defendants in their opposition papers, the First Amended
3 Complaint -- it is the First Amended Complaint. It is not a
4 series of amended complaints which have been dismissed and
5 attempts to cure problems that a court has identified in an
6 original complaint. There's been no adjudication on the
7 merits of the original complaint. Defendant's opposition
8 papers don't even bother to address the standards for
9 amended --

10 THE COURT: Let me ask you this because you may be
11 aware this isn't the only case we have with your client.

12 MR. CALAMARI: I am aware, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: What generated the perceived need to
14 amend the complaint and is this something we're gonna see in
15 the multitude of other cases that we have?

16 MR. CALAMARI: Your Honor, the answer to your
17 second question is yes. There will be amended complaints in
18 the other cases to reflect a more robust complaint in each
19 case with more specific information. That's not to say that
20 we think the first complaints wouldn't have withstood a
21 Motion to Dismiss, but a Motion to Dismiss had been filed
22 and the Motion to Dismiss raised issues about the pleadings
23 and we tried to address those issues.

24 THE COURT: So this is in response to the Motion
25 to Dismiss to attempt to avoid that?

1 MR. CALAMARI: Correct. Well, again, your Honor,
2 it is trying to make the Motion to Dismiss utterly and
3 completely irrelevant.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. CALAMARI: We think the original complaints
6 would have certainly satisfied the *Twombly* standards for a
7 breach of contract and a breach of indemnity obligation
8 agreement, which is the two issues raised here. No fraud is
9 alleged in these complaints so there's no specificity
10 requirement. It's a very straightforward pleading
11 requirement. But because a Motion to Dismiss was made and
12 it complained about lack of detail, the subsequent
13 complaints provide substantially more detail on the nature
14 of the breaches than the original complaints provided.

15 THE COURT: Okay. And on the -- so is this the
16 first of many or are we just one of many that we're right in
17 the middle of? Because all of these cases are staying, as I
18 understand it, with the individual judges, at least for now.
19 Have other judges in this district addressed a motion like
20 this to amend in response to a Motion to Dismiss or is this
21 the first of many?

22 MR. CALAMARI: This is the first. We don't think
23 there will be many because other defendants have just
24 consented to the amended complaint. Some have asked us to
25 amend the complaint before they draft a Motion to Dismiss.

1 There are a few other complaints where there is a Motion to
2 Dismiss and an amended complaint has been filed and those
3 Defendants have in effect said they'd like to go ahead with
4 their Motion to Dismiss even in the face of the amended
5 complaint. And we have asserted some opposition to that on
6 the grounds that the amended complaint moots out the
7 original complaint. But this is the first hearing on this
8 particular issue.

9 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you address -- so
10 then going to the substance of the merits, as I understand
11 it the Defendants say you still haven't identified a single
12 loan that was nonconforming and therefore you're entitled to
13 any compensation.

14 MR. CALAMARI: I think this is one of the big
15 fallacies in their papers. If you look at paragraph 42 to
16 the complaint, paragraph 42 to the complaint identifies some
17 16 -- I can check the complaint for the exact number, but --
18 sorry I left it over here. It identifies quite a number
19 of -- I can give you the exact number -- yeah, I believe
20 it's 16 separate loans, individual loans that have defects
21 in them. It specifies the loan number. It gives you the
22 nature of the defect. It provides information about why the
23 defect is material. To say that we haven't identified a
24 specific loan is simply wrong. There's just no -- no basis
25 for that claim.

1 Equally they don't really admit -- while they make
2 that bold statement, what they really say is a few of these
3 loans might be subject to settlement agreements. And that's
4 the bulk of their papers which don't belong on a motion --
5 opposition for a Motion for Leave to Amend. They make
6 summary judgment type arguments. They say, well, a couple
7 of those loans might be subject to settlement agreements.

8 Well, that's an issue to be determined after they
9 put in an answer and they raise a defense, and then that can
10 be looked at. The settlement agreements clearly don't cover
11 all of the loans in question.

12 THE COURT: Do we know if any of the 16 specifics
13 that are listed in paragraph 42 are governed by settlement
14 agreements or don't we know?

15 MR. CALAMARI: To my knowledge, three or four of
16 them might be covered by settlement agreements but the words
17 in those settlement agreements are sufficiently ambiguous to
18 make it unclear as to whether there is a release of the
19 particular indemnification claims here. But we also make
20 quite clear in the complaint that we are not seeking to
21 recover on any loans that were repurchased by Sierra. And
22 so even if one or two of these examples is covered by a
23 settlement agreement, the complaint makes clear that we are
24 not seeking to recover for those particular loans.

25 Now, it's important to understand, your Honor,

1 these cases not only in this court but there are cases on
2 repurchase claims all over the country. Some of those cases
3 have been tried, some of those cases are settled, many of
4 them are still in -- winding their way through the courts.
5 And virtually every single one of those cases has recognized
6 that the volume of loans is simply too big to allow for
7 either pleading or proving that every one individual loan
8 that breached was a breach. All of the courts that have
9 looked at these issues have resorted to a sampling approach.
10 That is, take a statistically normal sample. See if -- you
11 use 400 loans or a hundred loans, if 40 of them are
12 materially a breach, then you could assume that across the
13 whole pool 40 percent would be a material breach. So no
14 court has required pleading and proving defect in every
15 single defective loan.

16 But, again, we're getting to -- getting further
17 down the road. All we have here is whether or not we should
18 have leave to amend the complaint. We don't even in theory
19 have to establish that a complaint states a claim on this
20 motion. The -- that is yet to be decided. All we really
21 need to show is that it's plausible. And at this point it's
22 more than plausible. This is -- the detailing provided in
23 the amended complaint is very straightforward. These are
24 simple claims, and we think that the motion should be
25 granted.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. CALAMARI: I would make one other point.

3 There is a case, *Streambend*, that we cited in our papers and
4 the Defendants have endorsed. In that complaint -- in that
5 case there was initially a state court proceeding. The
6 state court proceeding went to judgment. The disappointed
7 party in that proceeding commenced a federal court
8 proceeding, filed a complaint, then filed an amendment as of
9 right. Then when that complaint was dismissed, made a
10 motion for leave to file an additional complaint. That
11 motion was granted. When that complaint was dismissed, made
12 a motion to file a third amended complaint. That motion was
13 granted in part.

14 The court didn't finally dismiss the case and
15 refused further amendment until the Motion for the Fourth
16 Amended Complaint, after three previous active adjudications
17 on the merits of the complaints. And so, your Honor, to me,
18 this is a motion that ought to be granted and we should have
19 no further argument on it. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: Okay. It's our practice to let the
21 other side argue, just because.

22 MR. CALAMARI: I apologize.

23 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

24 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, your Honor, and may it
25 please the Court:

1 This, your Honor, is the First Amended Complaint
2 that RFC seeks leave to file. It is 549 pages long; 96
3 percent of it consists entirely of exhibits. Sierra
4 contends that, particularly in light of the fact that this
5 is the First Amended Complaint of many that is about to hit
6 this Court's docket, that the Court should deny RFC leave to
7 amend for three reasons: Futility, bad faith, and undue
8 prejudice.

9 First, however, I would like to briefly address
10 certain arguments that both were and were not made in both
11 RFC's reply brief and in Mr. Calamari's oral presentation,
12 the first which was nowhere addressed. Now, Exhibit C to
13 this complaint is a 195-page list of 9,000 loans that Sierra
14 sold to RFC over a period ranging from the year 2000 all the
15 way through September 2007.

16 Now, we don't know precisely or in any sense of
17 the word how many of these loans or which loans RFC contends
18 to be defective. We know that it is something of a moving
19 target. In the original complaint RFC said that dozens of
20 Sierra loans were allegedly defective. In the proposed
21 First Amended Complaint they now have said that that number
22 is in the hundreds. And on page 5 of RFC's reply they are
23 now contending that Sierra sold thousands of defective loans
24 to RFC and now it faces hundreds of millions of dollars in
25 liability as a result.

1 THE COURT: But isn't that why God invented
2 discovery?

3 MR. JENKINS: Well, in theory yes. But under
4 *Twombly-Iqbal* the doors of discovery don't get opened until
5 Plaintiff has first proved that they actually have a
6 meritorious case. And the issue here is --

7 THE COURT: That's kind of an overstatement of
8 *Iqbal*. They have to allege a plausible claim, correct?

9 MR. JENKINS: Plausible being the key word.

10 THE COURT: Right.

11 MR. JENKINS: Now here, Exhibit C, as I mentioned,
12 the last loan, the latest loan on this list, was purchased
13 by Sierra in September 2007. Minnesota has a six-year
14 statute of limitations. This action was filed on December
15 14th, 2013. So we go back six years to December 14th, 2007,
16 every single loan on this list is time barred. And we cite
17 in our brief the *Enervations* case which makes clear that
18 under Minnesota law a breach of contract accrues for statute
19 of limitation purposes upon the moment of breach, in this
20 case when the loan was sold, regardless of whether or not
21 damages have yet to occur and do not occur until some future
22 point in time.

23 Now, neither the original complaint, the amended
24 complaint, or even the reply brief which doesn't even
25 address our statute of limitations argument, nothing is said

1 regarding potential invocation of any sort of tolling on the
2 statute of limitations. So we now have a claim that appears
3 to be completely facially time barred, and that was the
4 exact basis in the *Streambend* decision which was very
5 recent, I think January 28th, 2014, for denying leave to
6 amend on the basis that all of the claims asserted were
7 facially time barred.

8 Now, moving onto --

9 THE COURT: Let me interrupt there. What's in
10 Exhibit A and B? In other words, are all of the claims --
11 is it your contention that Exhibit C is all of the loans
12 that are the subject of this complaint and therefore the
13 entire complaint is time barred or just those that are
14 referenced in Exhibit C?

15 MR. JENKINS: Well, it would appear that they have
16 attached a list of 9,000 loans and they have represented in
17 the FAC that these are the loans on which RFC -- it's a
18 little unclear. They said these are -- this is the universe
19 of loans that was sold. They haven't identified, you know,
20 other than dozens/hundreds/thousands, how many of them they
21 allege to be defective. But the fact of the matter is it
22 doesn't matter if any of them are defective because they are
23 all timed out under the statute of limitation.

24 THE COURT: Okay. And Exhibits A and B are not
25 lists of more recent loans?

1 MR. JENKINS: No, your Honor. Exhibit A is a
2 nine-page list of the contractual agreement between Sierra
3 and RFC.

4 Exhibits B-1 through B-15 consists of 513 pages of
5 excerpts from various unspecified versions of the Client
6 Guide applicable from various times from who knows when to
7 who else knows when.

8 And I would like to say a few words about these
9 example loans that RFC has offered in his proposed FAC. And
10 first I would like to go to paragraph 17 which discusses --
11 really the only place that discusses them at all -- the 500
12 plus pages in Exhibits B-1 through B-15. "The complete
13 versions" -- and I'm reading the second sentence of
14 paragraph 17. "The complete versions of the Client Guide
15 are known to the parties and are too voluminous to attach in
16 their entirety: The omitted portions of the client guides
17 do not affect the obligations set forth in this amended
18 complaint."

19 Not true, your Honor. If you could turn to page
20 15, paragraph 42 a, b and c. They are just the first three
21 of the example loans that RFC has provided, at least four of
22 which we already know have been expressly released and RFC
23 has not even offered to remove those loans from this list.

24 Now, Exhibit A talks about a loan that was
25 allegedly deficient that was originated by RFC. And in the

1 fourth line in paragraph 42 a says: "RFC's Client Guide
2 prohibited the sale to RFC of second lien loans under these
3 circumstances because of the obvious risk posed by negative
4 amortizing first liens."

5 Well, if you look through -- again, I'm going to
6 ask your Honor to take my word on this -- if you look
7 through Exhibits B-1 through B-15 there's absolutely nothing
8 about the standards for when or when not RFC will accept a
9 second lien mortgage that is inferior to a first that
10 negatively amortized. Now the one place that that would be,
11 if you look at the index to Exhibit B-1, second lien, that's
12 a home equity loan, it should be somewhere in 6G. And now
13 I'm looking at page 9 to Document 49-3, which sets out the
14 RFC's Home Equity Loan Program.

15 So in the first instance the statement that B-1
16 through B-15 contains all of the relevant provisions and
17 that no immaterial or irrelevant provision is not included
18 is just completely wrong. The larger point for
19 *Iqbal-Twombly* purposes is that, okay, yes, they list some
20 loans and they list some problems that the loans purportedly
21 have, and they say, Oh, these problems were material. But
22 nowhere, not once, do they actually go back to the actual
23 contractual obligations and even try to say, okay, in this
24 -- for example, the sale of RFC of negative lien loans under
25 these circumstances because of the obvious risk posed by

1 negative amortizing first liens. Nowhere, not once, in any
2 of these I think 17 examples do they give an actual
3 provision that was actually breached.

4 And we think we know why that's so. It's because
5 they are -- RFC does not actually have the ability to go out
6 and find its loan files or search through electronic loan-
7 level data. They are using the information that was used by
8 the Plaintiffs in the securitized mortgage litigation cases
9 filed against RFC by, among other lawyers, Mr. Calamari
10 himself. And so they are not actually doing their own work.
11 They are recycling the work of Plaintiff's lawyers, but that
12 work involved an entirely different set of representations
13 and warranties.

14 So they are not quite sure based on this limited
15 data which provisions of the client guides for RFC that any
16 of these loans actually violated. And under *Iqbal-Twombly*
17 maybe they don't have to do it dozens or hundreds or
18 thousands of times, however many loans are at issue, but
19 they ought to be able to do it at least once and they don't.

20 And in fact if you look at loan B, paragraph 42 b
21 in the FAC, it says: "Sierra Pacific had indeed failed to
22 verify the borrower's assets as was required by the Client
23 Guide." Well, where is that provision? I have no idea even
24 just looking at the table of contents, but certainly nothing
25 in Exhibits B-1 through B-15 says anything about the

1 requirement of correspondent lender to verify the borrower's
2 assets. Maybe it's in some other part of the manual, but I
3 don't know. And the First Amended Complaint says that
4 anything that's not in here is not relevant. That's clearly
5 not the case.

6 Same thing with 42 c. It turns out that Sierra
7 Pacific had never supplied any documentation of the
8 borrower's purported business and searches of various city
9 and state business records revealed no record whatsoever of
10 the borrower's business.

11 Well, okay. But again, what provision did that
12 breach specifically? Because, again, there's nothing in
13 this 513 page or 15 Exhibit Bs that speaks to an obligation
14 for Sierra Pacific or any other correspondent lender to
15 supply any documentation. So none of these examples
16 actually get by *Iqbal-Twombly* because they still don't tell
17 us what provision was actually breached. They missed that
18 critical step. And they contradict the language of earlier
19 in the First Amended Complaint that Exhibit Bs are all you
20 need to define the source of the obligation for all of the
21 loans at issue in this case. And their example loans show
22 that that is not truly the case.

23 I would like to say a few words about the release
24 agreements, and we've identified three of them. And those
25 release agreements create problems for RFC and in particular

1 this First Amended Complaint on three levels.

2 Now, first, the three that we've attached, the big
3 one is the December 17, 2007 agreement. And it lists 29
4 loans that are expressly released for all time. There are
5 covenants not to sue. There are express releases of any and
6 all claims and any and all rights moving forward. And yet
7 these loans are listed in Exhibit C and RFC actually uses
8 four of them as their example loans.

9 And that in and of itself is a violation of the
10 settlement agreement. There's no dispute as to authenticity
11 of these settlement agreements. And cases have held that
12 the Court may look beyond the realm of the pleadings to
13 documents embraced by the pleadings. That's the *Johnson v*
14 *Homecomings* decision that we cite. *Enervations* also stands
15 for that proposition. *Streambend* itself actually looked at
16 a reported document from the public assessor to determine
17 that all of the Defendants' proposed claims in the Amended
18 Complaint were time barred.

19 So -- and more concerning is the fact that for all
20 of these loans, and all of these settlement agreements, we
21 have a prevailing party attorney's fees provision which
22 shows sort of the fundamental problem here. No solvent
23 Plaintiff would actually bring claims predicated on these 39
24 loans or any of the others covered by this settlement
25 agreement because there would be a severe financial risk in

1 doing so. But in this case, we have a bankruptcy debtor
2 that sort of lacks the typical motivations to play by the
3 rules. They have no downside. They have no exposure to
4 counterclaims for attorney's fees or prevailing party
5 attorney's fees, judgments, and they are in liquidation.
6 They have absolutely no future. They have no skin in the
7 game. So they have absolutely nothing to lose by taking an
8 outside swing at Sierra and 75 plus other correspondent
9 lenders and hoping that they get lucky.

10 The second problem with the releases and covenants
11 not to sue is that, well, yes, they are in fact expressly
12 suing for continuing liability on loans that were previously
13 repurchased. And in fact if you look at paragraph 5 of the
14 First Amended Complaint in which RFC is talking about
15 repurchased loans, the very last sentence reads: "Even
16 those loans Sierra Pacific repurchased have continued to
17 contribute to RFC's losses and liabilities, and the parties'
18 agreement expressly provides that RFC may pursue additional
19 recoveries stemming from those loans." Well, no, they can't
20 under this settlement agreement which releases and covenants
21 not to sue with respect to those loans.

22 Furthermore, paragraph 43 of the proposed First
23 Amended Complaint says again, last sentence, "While Sierra
24 Pacific has over the parties' course of dealing repurchased
25 some individual loans, thereby acknowledging it sold

1 defective loans to RFC," which is not true because every
2 settlement agreement also contained a disclaimer of
3 wrongdoing provision that applied to both parties, "it has
4 in no way fully compensated RFC for the breaches or
5 representations or warranties or the losses stemming from
6 the universe of defective loans Sierra Pacific sold to RFC
7 over time."

8 Now, they say in their reply brief closure
9 provision that seems to suggest that no, we're not in fact
10 suing for liability on previously repurchased loans. If you
11 look at paragraph 33 of the proposed FAC, which is the
12 provision they quote, they say, Well, additionally, prior to
13 the commencement of this lawsuit, Sierra Pacific previously
14 conceded that certain of its loans to RFC were materially
15 defective. In that regard, Sierra Pacific has already paid
16 substantial sums to RFC to cover those defects. In this
17 action RFC is not seeking to recover on those loans."

18 I don't know what loans those are, your Honor.
19 Because, as I said, every settlement agreement contained a
20 non-liability and no admission of wrongdoing provision. So
21 when they talk about Sierra Pacific having previously
22 conceded that certain of its loans to RFC were materially
23 defective, not a clue what loans they are. But they are
24 certainly none of the loans in the settlement agreements at
25 issue because the parties agree that there was no admission

1 of fault with respect to any of those loans.

2 Now, the last and probably the most significant
3 problem posed by the one particular settlement agreement,
4 the December 19th, 2007 settlement, which again came after
5 every single loan listed in Exhibit C, all 9,000 of them.
6 And in that provision in return for payment of one million
7 dollars, RFC agreed to retroactively release Sierra from any
8 continuing liability on any loan that subsequently turned
9 out RFC discovered that they believed it was materially
10 defective.

11 Unless -- and there are two exceptions but this is
12 the one I want to focus on now -- unless RFC can show that
13 the loan went bad within one year. The borrower didn't make
14 12 consecutive monthly payments. As long as the loan didn't
15 go bad within one year, Sierra is released from any and all
16 liability on any of these loans.

17 Now, Sierra sold these loans to RFC. We don't
18 have the borrower payment information. And according to
19 attorney Jeff Lipps, who was RFC's counsel in the bankruptcy
20 action and testified several times, one instance we provided
21 in our opposition papers, that RFC doesn't have access to
22 the -- a great deal of the loan-level electronic data that
23 they would need in order to make a determination whether or
24 not a loan went bad within the first year.

25 And, you know, therefore, we're going to be facing

1 a lot of claims and we're going to have to expend a lot of
2 time and a lot of attorney's fees to establish the -- and
3 this I think, your Honor, is one aspect of undue prejudice.
4 You know, a regular solvent litigant would go do its
5 homework and fire up these systems and make sure that
6 whatever loans it was suing on did not violate a prior
7 release with an attorney's fees provision. And yet RFC's
8 attitude --

9 THE COURT: Let me make sure -- I think I
10 understand your position but let me make sure I'm clear on
11 the overall strategy. So if we deny their Motion to Amend,
12 the hearing on your Motion to Dismiss the original complaint
13 will go forward. You anticipate prevailing, and this case
14 is over?

15 MR. JENKINS: Ideally that would be nice. I am a
16 realist, your Honor, and I recognize that your Honor has
17 extremely broad discretion here. I don't know that a death
18 knell is necessarily the appropriate result. RFC does, I
19 think -- the case can be made that they have a right to go
20 back, to do their homework, to figure out whether or not
21 they have claims that aren't time barred, that aren't
22 released. They can allege with the level of specificity
23 required by *Iqbal-Twombly*. But it is not this complaint,
24 your Honor.

25 So --

1 THE COURT: So the scenario I just posited would
2 be your best case. The more realistic is that we deny the
3 motion but they go back and make another Motion to Amend
4 with a different amended complaint that more specifically
5 identifies which loans they contend are defective.

6 MR. JENKINS: And eliminates the ones that
7 patently violate the statute of limitations and that aren't
8 covered by the release.

9 THE COURT: And the releases.

10 MR. JENKINS: And that in fact one of the
11 decisions -- I won't get into it. But, yeah, I think in
12 essence a denial of leave to amend without prejudice. If,
13 say, this one, this document, not here, not today, not this
14 court. But if you go back and if you think you can do
15 another one and if you think that you can pass muster,
16 frankly, under Rule 11 in doing so, then I suppose I have to
17 concede that they would deserve another shot.

18 But this complaint has too many problems and it
19 would be unfair and unduly prejudicial to Sierra to have to
20 defend claims that are clearly meritless when at the end of
21 the day it's contracted for a remedy to recover attorney's
22 fees or counterclaim for breach of a covenant not to sue.
23 It's just something that's not going to work against a
24 bankrupt debtor.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

1 MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

2 THE COURT: Anything else?

3 MR. CALAMARI: Just very quickly, your Honor.

4 The statute of limitations issue, what we didn't
5 hear is the fact that when the RFC entity went into
6 bankruptcy it tolls the statute of limitations. And
7 therefore, with regard to the breach of contract claims, the
8 statute of limitations stopped running, if you will, in
9 2011.

10 Equally, the indemnity claims, which are the
11 principal claims asserted here, indemnity for losses that
12 RFC had to pay out to creditors, the statute of limitations
13 does not begin to run on those claims until the indemnity --
14 the obligation for which you seek indemnity is fulfilled.

15 And so the -- if they want to raise a defense of
16 statute of limitations they can do so. If they want to make
17 a Motion to Dismiss based on statute of limitations
18 grounds --

19 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. Is this
20 the complaint you think you're gonna prevail on? In other
21 words, as I understand it there's still going to probably
22 be -- if I grant your motion.

23 MR. CALAMARI: Um-hum.

24 THE COURT: It sounds to me like they are going to
25 make a Motion to Dismiss it making all these same arguments

1 again.

2 MR. CALAMARI: Um-hum.

3 THE COURT: Is it -- you're confident that this
4 complaint will survive a Motion to Dismiss, correct?

5 MR. CALAMARI: We are very confident that the
6 complaint will survive the Motion to Dismiss. If your Honor
7 is suggesting that leave to amend would be granted but we
8 should take into account what we've heard in argument and
9 put in an amended complaint to the extent we think we
10 should --

11 THE COURT: I'm not suggesting anything. I'm
12 asking questions.

13 MR. CALAMARI: Okay. Well, yes, we are very
14 confident that this complaint would survive a Motion to
15 Dismiss and we would -- we would --

16 THE COURT: And if it doesn't, if a Motion to
17 Dismiss is granted, what happens next? Would there be yet a
18 new amended complaint or a request to amend the complaint or
19 file a new lawsuit or are we gonna be done at that point?

20 MR. CALAMARI: I can't say what would happen next.
21 Obviously it would depend on the grounds that the Court,
22 assuming it didn't sustain the complaint, assuming the Court
23 dismissed the complaint on some grounds, if the grounds were
24 curable, I certainly would think we would ask for leave to
25 cure those grounds. That would not be unusual. In the

1 course of litigation, the complaint is supposed to provide
2 notice of claims. It's not supposed to be a document that
3 outlines an entire case. However, you know, again, if the
4 grounds could not be cured, that that -- that the Court
5 cited, then more than likely it would result in an appeal
6 rather than yet another attempt to amend.

7 THE COURT: And what about the contention that
8 your client is not constrained by the usual economic
9 constraints by reason of the fact that it's an estate in
10 bankruptcy?

11 MR. CALAMARI: I think that's rhetoric for an
12 argument here. There is a liquidating trust, ResCap, which
13 took over responsibility for these claims. The trust is
14 funded. I understand our obligations under Rule 11. We
15 take them very seriously. I understand that there could be
16 claims that, if we pursue them, that might be subject to an
17 attorney's fees to a prevailing party. I don't have any
18 reason to believe --

19 THE COURT: Is that trust sufficiently funded to
20 provide payment of attorney's fees if they are the
21 prevailing party?

22 MR. CALAMARI: Yeah, I believe that it is. I
23 don't want to -- to make a statement on the record in court
24 that I don't know absolutely certainly, but I believe the
25 trust is more than sufficiently funded to make an award of

1 attorney's fees. The trust has got substantial funding.
2 It's paid out billions of dollars in claims, and it has
3 numerous claims to administer. There is a reserve. I'd
4 imagine the reserve is a public number but I did not
5 represent the trust in the bankruptcy and I don't know the
6 numbers. But that is certainly, to me, a red herring here.
7 I can't imagine that there is not sufficient money to cover
8 an attorney's fees award if that were to happen.

9 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

10 MR. JENKINS: May I respond briefly, your Honor?
11 Just two points.

12 THE COURT: 30 seconds.

13 Were you done, Mr. Calamari?

14 MR. CALAMARI: Yes, unless you had other
15 questions.

16 THE COURT: No, that was it. Thank you.

17 MR. JENKINS: Two quick points, your Honor.

18 Bankruptcy tolling. We actually dispute that
19 bankruptcy tolling would apply because that particular
20 federal statute applies only to claims brought by a trustee
21 or a debtor in possession. Upon plan confirmation on
22 December 17th, RFC was no longer a debtor in possession. So
23 we don't think that provision applies.

24 But more appropriately for the pleadings analysis,
25 it's not in the pleadings. They didn't even address our

1 statute of limitation argument in their reply brief. So
2 it's -- any contention that there may be some tolling
3 mechanism at work here, not in the complaint, not in the
4 First Amended Complaint, not in their reply brief. So if
5 they want tolling, the rule is they need --

6 THE COURT: Yeah, but isn't the statute of
7 limitations a defense? You plead that in your answer. You
8 say this claim should be dis -- or a Motion to Dismiss, it
9 should be dismissed because statute has expired. Or a
10 defense to it in answer to paragraphs 1 through 40 whatever,
11 we contend that statute of limitations has expired.

12 MR. JENKINS: We do cite several cases in our
13 papers, in our opposition, the *Enervations* case and the
14 *Streambend* case, that say when the claims in a complaint are
15 clearly and facially time barred, that -- and there's no
16 factual allegation that would support the application of
17 equitable tolling, then the claim is properly dismissed on
18 the 12(b)(6) motion, and on some occasions Rule 11 sanctions
19 have been imposed.

20 The final issue, your Honor, goes to the issue of
21 indemnification and Mr. Calamari's characterization of when
22 the statute of limitation accrues. If all of the
23 indemnification claims are predicated on breaches of
24 representations and warranties, there are no cases outside
25 the context of an insured's duty to indemnify that say that

1 indemnification claims accrue only upon the incurment [sic]
2 of a judgment or settlement that gives rise to
3 indemnification.

4 So the statute of limitation for both claims, both
5 of which are predicated in breach of contract, are the same.
6 And with that I thank your Honor for his time.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for coming.
8 Thank you for enduring our Minnesota winter, even though
9 it's spring. I'll take the matter under advisement, issue
10 an order shortly, and we are in recess or do we start the
11 other one at 10:00 and we're now 20 minutes late? So we're
12 in recess.

13 MR. CALAMARI: Thank you, your Honor.

14 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, your Honor.

15 (Court adjourned at 10:21 a.m.)

16 * * *

17
18 I, Carla R. Bebault, certify that the foregoing is
19 a correct transcript from the digital audio recording of
20 proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed to the
21 best of my skill and ability.

22
23 Certified by: s/Carla R. Bebault
24 Carla Bebault, RMR, CRR, FCRR
25

EXHIBIT 4

Subject: RFC v. Sierra Pacific First Amended Complaint

Date: Friday, May 23, 2014 at 1:52:18 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Donald G. Heeman

To: Amy L. Schwartz (ASchwartz@lapplibra.com), Richard T. Thomson (RThomson@lapplibra.com),
Jonathan M. Jenkins, lkayayan@jmjenkinslaw.com

Counsel,

RFC filed its First Amended Complaint today. Please see the attached redline changes to the First Amended Complaint, which are minor and meant to clean up some clerical mistakes.

Thanks, and enjoy the holiday weekend.

Donald G. Heeman

Attorney

220 South 6th Street, Suite 2200, Minneapolis, MN 55402
Direct: 612.373.8524 | Main: 612.339.6321 | Fax: 612.335.0535
dheeman@felhaber.com
www.felhaber.com

Felhaber ■■ Larson

Confidentiality Notice: This is a confidential communication from a law firm to the intended recipient. If you have received it by mistake, please delete it and notify the sender. Thank you.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RESIDENTIAL FUNDING COMPANY,
LLC,

Court File No. 13-cv-3511 (RHK/FLN)

Plaintiff,

**PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

v.

SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE
COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Residential Funding Company, LLC, f/k/a Residential Funding Corporation ("RFC" or "Plaintiff"), by and through its attorneys, alleges for its First Amended Complaint against defendant Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. ("Sierra Pacific" or "Defendant"), as follows:

Deleted: (

Deleted: ,",

NATURE OF ACTION

1. Plaintiff RFC was, at times prior to its bankruptcy in May 2012, in the business of acquiring and securitizing residential mortgage loans.

2. RFC's business model was built on acquiring loans from "correspondent lenders," such as Defendant Sierra Pacific, and distributing those loans by either pooling them together with other similar mortgage loans to sell into residential mortgage-backed securitization ("RMBS") trusts, or selling them to whole loan purchasers.

3. Over the course of the parties' relationship, Sierra Pacific sold over 9,000 mortgage loans, with an original principal balance in excess of \$2.6 billion, to RFC.

representations and warranties, including the portion of the global settlement attributable to those breaches.

Deleted: \$9 billion RMBS

11. Accordingly, RFC brings this action for breach of contract, and for indemnification of all liabilities and expenses RFC has incurred due to Defendant's breaches of its representations and warranties.

PARTIES

12. Plaintiff RFC is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in Minneapolis, Minnesota. RFC was formerly known as Residential Funding Corporation. When this case was commenced, RFC was a wholly owned subsidiary of GMAC-RFC Holding Company, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. GMAC-RFC Holding Company, LLC was a wholly owned subsidiary of Residential Capital, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. Residential Capital, LLC was a wholly owned subsidiary of GMAC Mortgage Group LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, which in turn was a wholly owned subsidiary of Ally Financial, Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Michigan. Pursuant to the Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan Proposed by Residential Capital, LLC, et. al. and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, Case No. 12-12020 (MG) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) [D.I. 6065-1] (the "Plan"), on December 17, 2013, GMAC-RFC Holding Company, LLC's interest in RFC was cancelled and the ResCap Liquidating

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: 13 pt

Formatted: Font: 13 pt

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

Trust (the “Trust”) succeed to all of RFC’s rights under RFC’s Agreement with Sierra Pacific and now controls RFC.¹

Formatted: Font: 13 pt

13. Defendant Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc., is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 1180 Iron Point Road, Suite 200, Folsom, California 95630.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334, in that the matter arises under title 11 or arises in or is related to the bankruptcy proceeding and 28 U.S.C. § 1332, in that the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

Deleted: ,

15. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), in that a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to this Complaint occurred in Minnesota, and because the parties have contractually agreed that Minnesota is an appropriate venue.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Agreement Between RFC and Sierra Pacific

16. Over the course of the parties’ relationship, Sierra Pacific sold over 9,000 mortgage loans to RFC pursuant to the Seller Contract attached as Exhibit A (the “Contract”).

17. The Contract incorporates into its terms and conditions the RFC Client Guide, exemplary excerpts of which are attached as Exhibit B-1 through B-15 (the The Trust is organized pursuant to the Delaware Statutory Trust Act.¹

Deleted: ¹ . On December 17, 2013, all conditions to effectiveness of the Plan were satisfied, the Plan was substantially consummated, and the Trust became the successor in interest to the Debtors.

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

GMAC-RFC based on or grounded upon, or resulting from such misstatement or omission or a breach of any representation, warranty or obligation made by GMAC-RFC in reliance upon such misstatement or omission.

(Client Guide A202.) The Client Guide also entitles RFC to recover all court costs, attorney's fees and any other costs, fees and expenses incurred by RFC in enforcing the Agreement or Client Guide.

33. Additionally, prior to the commencement of this lawsuit, Sierra Pacific previously conceded that certain of its loans sold to RFC were materially defective. In that regard, Sierra Pacific has already paid substantial sums to RFC to cover those defects. In this action, RFC is not seeking to recover on those sums.

Deleted: loans

34. RFC at all times performed all of its obligations to Sierra Pacific, if any, under the Agreement, and all conditions precedent to the relief sought in this action, if any, have been satisfied.

Defendant Materially Breached Numerous Loan-Level Representations and Warranties.

35. As noted above, the loans RFC acquired from Sierra Pacific and other correspondent lenders were sold, either into RMBS trusts that issued certificates to outside investors, or in "whole loan" portfolios to other mortgage companies and banks.

36. The loans Sierra Pacific sold RFC were eventually deposited in over 190 RMBS Trusts. When RFC sold the loans, it passed on a more limited set of representations and warranties to the Trusts, and, as required by SEC regulations, disclosed pertinent information about the loans to investors in its RMBS. In making those representations and warranties, RFC relied on information provided to it by Sierra

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

representations and warranties made by RFC to investors, purchasers, and other contractual parties. Those representations and warranties were, in most cases, identical to or less stringent than those received by RFC from Sierra Pacific, and were based on RFC's reliance on Sierra Pacific's (and other correspondent lenders') representations and warranties to RFC.

75. The Debtors initially proposed to settle portions of its RMBS liabilities for an aggregate \$8.7 billion allowed claim in its bankruptcy case. Subsequently, after protracted litigation over the reasonableness and propriety of that settlement, the Bankruptcy Court appointed the Hon. James M. Peck, a United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Southern District of New York, to serve as a mediator and to attempt to achieve a negotiated resolution of the Debtors' RMBS liabilities and of other disputed issues in the chapter 11 cases. A lengthy mediation process ensued, resulting in a global settlement that provided for the resolution of *all* of the Debtors' RMBS-related liabilities, for more than \$10 billion in allowed claims granted to the various RMBS trusts, monoline insurers, FHFA, securities law claimants, and others.

76. The Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York ultimately approved the global settlement—including the \$10 billion plus settlement of RMBS-related liabilities, finding them to be fair and reasonable and in the best interests of each of the Debtors, and confirmed the plan. (See Case No. 12-12020-mg, Doc. 6066 (Findings of Fact) (Glenn, J.), at ¶¶ 98 to 176.) RFC filed this suit on December 14,

Deleted: , as follows: (a)

Deleted: were granted a \$7.3 billion allowed claim; (b) MBIA, FGIC and other monolines were granted approximately \$2 billion in allowed claims; and (c)

Deleted: including class members in the NJ Carpenters Class Action

Deleted: investors in private label RMBS, were granted hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation.

Deleted: 9.3

Deleted: in RMBS and monoline settlements, a \$100 million

Deleted: to New Jersey Carpenters, and others—

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

2013, after RFC's RMBS-related liabilities became fixed through confirmation of the Plan. The Plan became effective on December 17, 2013.²

77. Pursuant to its express contractual indemnification obligations, Sierra Pacific is obligated to indemnify RFC for the portion of the global settlement associated with its breaches of representations and warranties, as well as for the portion of RFC's other liabilities and losses (including the tens of millions of dollars that RFC has paid in attorneys' fees to defend against, negotiate, and ultimately settle claims relating to allegedly defective loans) associated with those breaches.

Deleted: \$9.3 billion RMBS settlements that is attributable to

Deleted: expenditures

Deleted: attributable to

**COUNT ONE
(BREACH OF CONTRACT)**

78. RFC realleges each and every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 77, above, as if fully rewritten herein.

79. RFC and Defendant Sierra Pacific entered into a valid and enforceable Agreement pursuant to which RFC acquired over 9,000 mortgage loans from Sierra Pacific.

80. Pursuant to the parties' Agreement, Sierra Pacific made representations and warranties to RFC regarding the quality and characteristics of the mortgage loans Defendant sold to RFC.

81. RFC complied with all conditions precedent, if any, and all of its obligations under the Agreement.

² RFC continues to litigate other proofs of claims, including those brought by whole loan purchasers.

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

82. Defendant materially breached its representations and warranties to RFC inasmuch as the mortgage loans materially did not comply with the representations and warranties.

83. Defendant's material breaches constitute Events of Default under the Agreement.

84. RFC has suffered loss, harm, and financial exposure directly attributable to Sierra Pacific's material breaches, including liabilities and losses stemming from the defective loans, as well as attorneys' fees, litigation-related expenses, and other costs associated with both defending dozens of lawsuits and proofs of claim filed against RFC stemming in part from materially defective loans sold to RFC by Defendant, and fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action.

Deleted: .

85. Accordingly, RFC is entitled to the damages specified in the Client Guide, and/or damages sufficient to make RFC whole for its purchase of materially defective loans, in an amount to be proven at trial, which under either calculation exceeds \$75,000, together with an award of attorneys' fees, interest, and costs.

COUNT TWO (INDEMNIFICATION)

86. RFC realleges each and every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 85, above, as if fully rewritten herein.

87. RFC has incurred substantial liabilities, losses and damages arising from and relating to material defects in the mortgage loans Defendant Sierra Pacific sold to RFC, including over \$10 billion in allowed claims approved by the United States

Deleted: 9

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Field Code Changed

Deleted: ¶

EXHIBIT 5

MAR 10 2008 11:38 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.02/08

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement effective as of March 10, 2008 (may be amended, supplemented or otherwise modified from time to time, hereinafter referred to as "Agreement") is between Residential Funding Company, LLC ("GMAC-RFC") and Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. ("Client"), collectively the ("Parties") and individually the ("Party").

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, GMAC-RFC purchased from Client pursuant to the terms and conditions of that certain Client Contract dated March 13, 2002 (as amended, supplemented or otherwise modified from time to time, hereinafter referred to as the "Client Contract") those residential mortgage loans described on the attached Exhibit A (hereinafter referred to as the "Subject Loans");

WHEREAS, GMAC-RFC has demanded that Client repurchase the Subject Loans pursuant to the Client Contract;

WHEREAS, Client has not repurchased the Subject Loans;

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed that it is in their respective best interests to settle their disputes with respect to the Subject Loans on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth;

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, GMAC-RFC and Client hereby agree as follows:

1. PAYMENT:

(a) In settlement of GMAC-RFC's claims, and in consideration of GMAC-RFC releasing its claims against Client relating to the Subject Loans and all other undertakings stated in this Agreement, Client will pay to GMAC-RFC the amount of \$979,858.95 ("Settlement Amount"). Client will pay the Settlement Amount to GMAC-RFC with an initial installment of \$310,662.63 on or before May 9, 2008 for (GMAC-RFC 11208167, Client 424381), (GMAC-RFC 11249653, Client 409164), (GMAC-RFC 11208459, Client 432217) and (GMAC-RFC 19718867, Client 493663) and a final payment of \$277,313.04 on or before June 13, 2008 for (GMAC-RFC 11301421, Client 432200.)

MAR 10 2008 11:38 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.03/08

(b) Payment shall be made to GMAC-RFC no later than 12:00 Noon
(Minneapolis time) on the due date and shall be made in lawful money of the United States of America in
immediately available funds transferred via wire to GMAC-RFC's account at:

BANK ONE

Chicago, IL 60670

ABA #071000013

Credit to GMAC-Residential Funding Company, LLC

DDA account #1097286

Attn: Melissa Simons

RE: Sierra Pacific 3_08

(c) If Client fails to pay the Settlement Amount on a timely basis in accordance
with the payment schedule, or otherwise breaches its obligation under the Client Contract or any other
Agreement it has with GMAC-RFC, GMAC-RFC may, at its option, by written notice to Client, either (i)
accelerate the remaining balance or (ii) terminate this Agreement and proceed against Client with respect to
the Subject Loans under the Client Agreement.

2. RELEASES:

(a) Client for itself, its present and past representatives, heirs,
executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents and attorneys does
hereby fully and forever release and discharge GMAC-RFC, and any entity affiliated in any manner with
GMAC-RFC and its representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners,
employees, agents, and attorneys from any and all claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities,
costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action, arising out of the Subject Loans.

(b) Upon full payment of the Settlement Amount by Client and the performance
by Client of all other terms and conditions of this Agreement, GMAC-RFC for itself, its present and past
representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents,
and attorneys will fully and forever release and discharge Client, and its respective representatives, heirs,
executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents and attorneys from all

MAR 10 2008 11:39 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.04/08

claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action arising out of the Subject Loans.

(c) The Parties acknowledge that they may hereafter discover facts different from or in addition to those which they know or believe to be true with respect to the Subject Loans and agree that this Agreement shall be and remain effective in all respects notwithstanding such different or additional facts or the discovery thereof. Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to release any claims arising (i) under the Client Contract but unrelated to the Subject Loans, or (ii) under any other Agreements now or hereafter in effect to which GMAC-RFC and Client are parties.

3. **NO OTHER ACTIONS:** Each Party represents and warrants that it has not brought and will not bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action, that is the subject of this Agreement.

4. **NO ADMISSION OF WRONGDOING:** This instrument shall not be construed as an admission of responsibility, liability or fault whatsoever for either Party's claims. Client and GMAC-RFC deny all such responsibility and deny that they have engaged in any improper, illegal, or wrongful conduct toward each other.

5. **REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES:** Each of the Parties does hereby represent and warrant to the other that this Agreement is a valid and binding obligation of each Party enforceable in accordance with its terms.

6. **ENFORCEMENT EXPENSES OF PREVAILING PARTY:** Each Party agrees that in the event of any dispute regarding this Agreement or the claims, demands, liabilities, and causes of action included within its scope, the losing Party will be liable to reimburse, on demand, the prevailing Party for any and all expenses and costs, including, without limitation, the fees and expenses of the prevailing Party's counsel and of any other counsel, experts, consultants or agents that the prevailing Party may incur after the date hereof in connection with the enforcement of this Agreement.

7. **CONFIDENTIALITY:** All terms of this Agreement are and shall remain confidential and shall not be disclosed to other parties other than to the Party's attorneys, accountants or other professionals, or in conjunction with a due diligence investigation of any Party's business, except: a) to the

V.
W.
H.

MAR 10 2008 11:39 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.05/08

extent that the Parties are obligated to make disclosure as a result of legal process or to perform other legal duty; or b) except as agreed by all Parties in separate writing.

8. **FURTHER ASSURANCES:** Each Party agrees to execute all such further documents as shall be reasonably necessary or helpful to carry out to the provisions of this Agreement.

9. **NO PRIOR ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS:** Each Party represents and warrants that "said Party has not previously assigned or transferred any claim, demand, liability, or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.

10. **AMENDMENTS AND WAIVER:** No amendment of any provision of this Agreement shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by Client and GMAC-RFC, and no waiver of any provision of this Agreement, and no consent to any departure there from by Client or GMAC-RFC shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by Client and GMAC-RFC, and then such waiver or consent shall be effective only in the specific instance and for the specific purpose for which given.

11. **CONSTRUCTION:** This Agreement constitutes a negotiated document. In case of any alleged ambiguity in any term of this Agreement, such term shall not be constructed in favor of or against either Party by reason of the participation of such Party or its attorneys in the negotiation or drafting of this Agreement.

12. **APPLICABLE LAW:** This Agreement shall be subject to and constructed and enforced in accordance with the internal laws of the State of Minnesota without giving effect to any conflicts of laws principles.

13. **BINDING EFFECT AND ASSIGNMENT; INTENDED THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY:** This Agreement shall insure to the benefit of, and shall be binding upon Client and GMAC-RFC and their respective successors and assigns.

14. **SEVERABILITY:** Any provision of this Agreement which is prohibited or unenforceable in any jurisdiction shall, as to such jurisdiction, be effective to the extent of such prohibition or unenforceability without invalidating the remaining portions hereof or affecting the validity or enforceability of such provision in any other jurisdiction, and to this end, the provisions hereof are severable.

MAR 10 2008 11:39 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.06/08

15. **FACTUAL INVESTIGATION:** Each Party has made such investigation of the facts pertaining to this Agreement, as it deems necessary.

16. **SECTION HEADINGS:** Section headings in this Agreement are for convenience only and shall not in any way limit or affect the meaning or interpretation of any provision of this Agreement.

17. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT:** This Agreement embodies the entire agreement between the Parties as to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings relating to the subject matter hereof. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, this Agreement represents the final agreement between the Parties as to the subject matter hereof and may not be contradicted by evidence of prior, contemporaneous or subsequent oral agreements of the Parties; and there are no unwritten oral agreements between the Parties and neither OMAC-RFC nor Client, nor any officer, agent, employee, representative or attorney for OMAC-RFC or Client, has made any statement or representation to the other Party regarding any facts relied upon in entering this Agreement, and neither Party has relied upon any such statement or representation in executing this Agreement or in making this statement herein set forth.

18. **COMPREHENSION OF AGREEMENT AND DUE AUTHORIZATION:** Each Party hereto has read this Agreement and understands the contents thereof. Each of the officers or agents executing this Agreement on behalf of their respective principals is empowered to do so and thereby binds his or her respective principal.

19. **COUNTERPARTS:** This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original but all of which together shall constitute but one and the same instrument.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Parties hereto has caused this Agreement to be executed and delivered by its officer thereto duly authorized as of the date first above written.

Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company Inc.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

[Signature]
Name: Maria Dunn
Title: Treasurer & Assistant Secretary
Date: 3/10/08

MAR 10 2008 11:40 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.07/08

~~Residential Funding Company, LLC~~

By: 

Name:

Sudith Dallman

Title:

Director

Date:

3/12/2008

MAR 10 2008 11:48 FR 19529792550

19529792550 TO 919169320642

P.08/08

EXHIBIT A - SUBJECT LOANS

<u>Client Name and ID</u>	<u>GMAC-RFC #</u>	<u>Client #</u>	<u>Borrower</u>	<u>Orig Prin Bal</u>	<u>Product</u>	<u>Rep Letter Date</u>	<u>Rep Age</u>	<u>Estimated Loss</u>
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5380	11208467	432765	██████	\$95,000	Goal Loan	1/11/08	25	\$103,440.85
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5360	11301585	443846	██████	\$375,000	Expanded Criteria	2/8/08	31	\$268,442.33
								\$391,883.28

<u>Client Name and ID</u>	<u>GMAC-RFC #</u>	<u>Client #</u>	<u>Borrower</u>	<u>Orig Prin Bal</u>	<u>Product</u>	<u>Rep Letter Date</u>	<u>Rep Age</u>	<u>Estimated Loss</u>
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5380	11208167	424381	██████	\$40,600	Goal Loan	1/28/08	8	\$45,452.76
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5360	11249653	409164	██████	\$75,000	Goal Line	1/14/08	22	\$79,023.90
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5360	11208459	432217	██████	\$117,000	Goal Loan	1/28/08	8	\$127,106.10
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5360	19716867	493663	██████	\$157,500	Payment Option	3/3/08	7	\$59,079.85
								\$310,662.63

<u>Client Name and ID</u>	<u>GMAC-RFC #</u>	<u>Client #</u>	<u>Borrower</u>	<u>Orig Prin Bal</u>	<u>Product</u>	<u>Rep Letter Date</u>	<u>Rep Age</u>	<u>Estimated Loss</u>
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.-5360	11301421	432200	██████	\$468,000	Expanded Criteria	1/28/08	8	\$277,313.04
								\$277,313.04

Received by SPM on Monday, 10 March 2008 09:36 AM

7
 ** TOTAL PAGE 08 **

EXHIBIT 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RESIDENTIAL FUNDING COMPANY,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE
COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE
COMPANY, INC.,

Counterclaimant,

v.

RESIDENTIAL FUNDING COMPANY,
LLC, and RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST,

Counterdefendants.

Case No. 0:13-cv-03511-RHK-FLN

**SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE
COMPANY, INC.'S AMENDED
ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT OF RESIDENTIAL
FUNDING COMPANY, LLC AND
COUNTERCLAIMS**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. (“Sierra”) submits its amended Answer to Residential Funding Company, LLC’s (“RFC”) First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) and Counterclaims as follows:

ANSWER

NATURE OF ACTION

1. Sierra admits that RFC was in the business of, among other things, acquiring and securitizing residential mortgage loans (together with multiple other affiliated entities) at times prior to its bankruptcy in May 2012.

2. Sierra admits that RFC acquired mortgage loans from hundreds of different originators, including its own affiliated entities and other bankruptcy Debtors. Sierra lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis, denies them.

3. Sierra admits that it sold mortgage loans to RFC. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

4. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

5. Sierra denies having any liability in connection with any loan sold to RFC, denies that any Sierra loans breached any representations or warranties or were otherwise defective, and denies that “repurchasing” or “otherwise compensating RFC” with respect to any loan constituted an acknowledgement that such loan “contained material defects.” Sierra admits that RFC is attempting to “pursue additional recoveries” on loans

previously released, in violation of its contractual promise not to do so. Sierra denies the remaining allegations.

6. Sierra denies that it ever failed to honor any contractual representations and warranties owed to RFC. Sierra admits that RFC and numerous of its affiliates, including many of the other bankruptcy Debtors, were sued by numerous entities for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

7. Sierra admits that RFC and 50 of its affiliated entities filed for bankruptcy in May 2012. Sierra admits that RFC and numerous of its affiliates, including many of the other bankruptcy Debtors, were sued by numerous entities for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

8. Sierra denies that it ever sold RFC defective loans, and denies liability to RFC on any other basis. Sierra admits that bankruptcy proofs of claim were filed against RFC and many of the other bankruptcy Debtors for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis

denies them.

9. Sierra admits that there were 51 separate bankruptcy Debtors and 51 separate bankruptcy actions, administrated jointly for administrative purposes only. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

10. Sierra denies each and every allegation contained in the paragraph.

11. Sierra states that the FAC speaks for itself, and that RFC seeks recovery on loans previously released, in violation of its contractual promise not to do so. Sierra denies that it is liable to RFC for any reason or that RFC has incurred any liabilities or expenses due in any way to Sierra, and denies each and every remaining allegation contained in the paragraph.

PARTIES

12. Sierra admits, on information and belief, that the Rescap Liquidating Trust (the "Trust") is, among other things, a publicly-traded Delaware statutory trust, RFC's successor in interest, and controls RFC. Sierra admits that RFC contends that it is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

13. Sierra admits the allegations.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. Sierra admits, on information and belief, that this Court has subject matter

jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Sierra denies that this action arises under Title 11 or arises in the Debtors' bankruptcy proceedings. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

15. Sierra admits that the parties have contractually agreed that Minnesota is the exclusive venue. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16. Sierra states that Exhibit A to the FAC consists of multiple separate contractual agreements, none of which, individually or collectively, fully describe the parties' contractual relationship at any point in time. Sierra admits that it sold mortgage loans to RFC. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

17. Sierra states that the exhibits to the FAC speak for themselves. Sierra denies that the "complete versions" of the Client Guide are available or accessible to Sierra, or that the omitted portions of the Client Guides do not affect that obligations alleged in the FAC. Sierra denies that the Contract and Client Guide collectively accurately describe the contractual relationship between the parties. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

18. Sierra presently lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

19. Sierra admits that it originated and performed underwriting and closing functions with respect to certain mortgages. Sierra denies that it was understood between the parties that “RFC would generally not be re-underwriting the loan” and, on information and belief, RFC, other Debtors, and other entities involved in the mortgage securitization process routinely utilized third-party auditors to conduct loan quality due diligence by re-underwriting batches of individual loans. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

20. Sierra denies that it was “well aware” of what RFC did with the loans after sale. On information and belief, numerous other affiliated entities and Debtors were involved in the loan securitization process. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

21. Sierra denies that it was “well aware” of what RFC did with the loans after sale. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

22. Sierra asserts that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides speak for themselves. Sierra admits knowing generally that RFC resold and serviced loans, and denies any remaining allegations.

23. Sierra states that Exhibit A to the FAC and the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves. Sierra admits that, to the extent it made any representations and warranties to RFC, they were on a loan-by-loan basis. Sierra denies any remaining allegations.

24. Sierra denies the allegations.

25. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

26. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

27. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

28. Sierra admits that RFC can only seek loan-level remedies with respect to any allegation of breach. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the remaining allegations.

29. Sierra states that Exhibit A to the FAC, the full and complete versions of the Client Guides (which changed frequently), and *Residential Funding Co., LLC v. Terrace Mortg. Co.*, 725 F.3d 910 (8th Cir. 2013) speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

30. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

31. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides –

which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

32. Sierra states that the full and complete versions of the Client Guides – which changed frequently – speak for themselves, and denies the allegations.

33. Sierra denies that it has ever conceded selling RFC “materially defective loans” and that it has paid RFC “substantial sums” to cover loan defects. Sierra states that it previously paid sums to obtain releases and promises not to ever sue or take any legal action whatsoever, however denominated, with respect to particular loans, promises that the FAC violates.

34. Sierra denies the allegations.

Defendants Materially Breached Numerous Loan-Level Representations and Warranties.

35. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

36. Sierra denies violating any representations or warranties to RFC. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

37. Sierra denies the allegations.

38. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

39. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

40. Sierra denies that it violated any version of the Client Guide or breached

any representations or warranties to RFC. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

41. Sierra denies the allegations.

42. Sierra denies that it violated any version of the Client Guide or breached any representations or warranties to RFC. Sierra states that the FAC violates RFC's releases and promises not to ever sue or take any legal action whatsoever, however denominated, with respect to particular loan. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

43. Sierra denies that it ever breached any representations or warranties made to RFC, sold RFC any defective loans, or caused RFC any loss. Sierra denies ever "acknowledging it sold defective loans to RFC." Sierra states that it previously paid sums to obtain releases and promises not to ever sue or take any legal action whatsoever, however denominated, with respect to particular loans, promises that the FAC violates. Sierra denies any remaining allegations.

44. Sierra denies the allegations.

RFC's Liabilities and Losses Stemming from Defendants' Breaches

45. Sierra denies the allegations.

46. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or ever caused RFC to sustain any liability. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph,

and on that basis denies them.

47. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC to sustain any liability. Sierra denies the remaining allegations to the extent they reference or relate to loans that Sierra sold to RFC. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

48. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

49. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

50. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

51. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

52. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

53. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

54. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

55. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

56. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

57. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

58. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

59. Sierra denies the allegations to the extent they purport to contend or imply that RFC did not receive any due diligence reports regarding the quality of loans in its securitization pools until October 2008. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this

paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

60. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

61. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

62. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

63. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra states that the First Amended Complaint in *New Jersey Carpenters et al. v. Residential Capital, LLC et al.*, Case No. 08-cv-08781 (HB) (S.D.N.Y.) speaks for itself. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

64. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra denies the allegations to the extent they purport to contend or imply that correspondent lenders were RFC's only source of "mortgage loan data" or that RFC did not receive pre-securitization due diligence reports regarding mortgages comprising its loan pools. Sierra states that the First Amended Complaint in *New Jersey*

Carpenters et al. v. Residential Capital, LLC et al., Case No. 08-cv-08781 (HB) (S.D.N.Y.) speaks for itself. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

65. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

66. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

67. Sierra admits that RFC and numerous of its affiliates, including many of the other bankruptcy Debtors, were sued by numerous entities for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

68. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

69. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

70. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

71. Sierra admits that in May 2012, 51 separate bankruptcy petitions were filed by RFC and 50 other related bankruptcy Debtors, and that the 51 separate bankruptcy actions were administrated jointly for administrative purposes only. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

72. Sierra admits that many proofs of claim were filed against multiple Debtors by numerous entities for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Sierra admits that a small percentage of the proofs of claim referenced in this paragraph were filed against RFC. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective or caused RFC any loss. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

73. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

74. Sierra denies that any of the loans it sold RFC were defective, caused RFC any loss, and that Sierra breached any representations or warranties made to RFC. Sierra states that many proofs of claim were filed against multiple Debtors by numerous entities

for, among other things, tortious and negligent misconduct including securities fraud, misrepresentation, negligence, and loan servicing violations. Only a small percentage of the proofs of claim identified in paragraph 72 were filed against RFC and/or based on breaches of representations or warranties made *by RFC*. Sierra denies the allegations regarding RFC's alleged "reliance" on Sierra and other correspondent lenders, as they purport to incorrectly contend or imply that: (a) correspondent lenders were RFC's only source of "mortgage loan data"; (b) RFC did not receive pre-securitization due diligence reports regarding mortgages comprising its loan pools; and/or (c) Debtor securitization pools were not comprised of large numbers of loans originated and underwritten by other Debtor entities.

75. Sierra states that the allegations of this paragraph are vague, as they appear to conflate multiple Debtors, proceedings, claimants, and unspecified "disputed issues." Accordingly, Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

76. Sierra states that the referenced "Findings of Fact" speak for themselves. Sierra admits that this action was filed post-Plan confirmation on or about December 14, 2013, and that the Plan's "effective date" was on or about December 17, 2013. Sierra states that the Plan speaks for itself, and that the allegation "RFC's RMBS-related liabilities became fixed through the confirmation of the Plan" is vague, misleading, and a legal conclusion to which no response is required; to the extent any response is required, Sierra denies the allegation. Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis

denies them.

77. Sierra denies that it has any contractual obligation to indemnify RFC for anything. Sierra denies that it breached any representations and warranties made to RFC. Sierra denies that it sold RFC any defective loans. Even assuming hypothetically that Sierra *had* ever breached a representation or warranty made to RFC, Sierra denies that it would even then be liable for any “portion” of the “global settlement” or RFC’s other alleged “liabilities and losses.” Sierra lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

**COUNT ONE
(BREACH OF CONTRACT)**

78. Sierra incorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each of its responses to all of the preceding paragraphs.

79. Sierra admits that it sold loans to RFC. Sierra states that the actual contractual documents, which changed over time, speak for themselves, and the term “Agreement” is vague and misleading. Sierra denies the remaining allegations.

80. Sierra states that the complete versions of the Contracts, the Client Guides, and other contractual documents speak for themselves.

81. Sierra denies the allegations.

82. Sierra states that RFC amended its original complaint in response to Sierra’s original Motion to Dismiss by adding the terms “materially breached” and “materially,” clarifying that RFC is only alleging liability for material breaches of

representations and warranties. Sierra denies the allegations.

83. Sierra states that RFC amended its original complaint in response to Sierra's original Motion to Dismiss by adding the term "material," clarifying that RFC alleges that only material breaches constituted "Events of Default." Sierra denies the allegations.

84. Sierra states that RFC amended its original complaint in response to Sierra's original Motion to Dismiss by adding the terms "material" and "materially" clarifying that RFC is only alleging liability for material breaches of representations and warranties. Sierra denies the allegations.

85. Sierra denies the allegations, and denies that it is liable to RFC in any amount.

COUNT TWO (INDEMNIFICATION)

86. Sierra incorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each of its responses to all of the preceding paragraphs. Sierra alleges that "Indemnification" is not proper as a separate count, but is merely another (duplicative) remedy potentially available with respect to RFC's count for breach of contract.

87. Sierra states that RFC amended its original complaint in response to Sierra's original Motion to Dismiss by adding the terms "material defects" and "materially defective," clarifying that RFC is only alleging liability for material contractual breaches of representations and warranties. Sierra denies the allegations.

88. Sierra denies that it breached any contractual obligations to RFC. Sierra

denies that RFC has incurred any “liabilities, losses and damages, including attorneys’ fees and costs” for which Sierra is liable. Sierra denies any remaining allegations.

89. Sierra denies the allegations, and denies that it is liable to RFC in any amount.

AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES

Without taking on any burden of proof on any matter for which the burden rests on RFC, and without waiver of any defenses that Sierra is not required to plead at this time or not presently aware of, Sierra asserts the following defenses to the FAC:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The allegations of the FAC fail to state a cause of action for which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Even should it ultimately be adjudicated that Sierra is liable to RFC for some amount, such amount must be fully setoff, fully or partially, by RFC’s liability for breach of promises not to sue contained in prior settlement agreements between the parties, as well as for recovery from collateral sources.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC has waived its claims and/or is estopped from asserting its claims by, among other things, having learned of alleged contractual breaches through pre-securitization due diligence or other means, and doing nothing, to Sierra’s prejudice and detriment.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC has expressly released and/or waived some or all of its alleged claims against

Sierra, and entered into an accord and satisfaction/novation with respect to some or all of its alleged rights to relief, by previously entering into settlement agreements with Sierra.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC is barred by the equitable doctrine of unclean hands from recovering on some or all of the alleged claims against Sierra by reason of RFC's own inequitable actions, conduct and/or omissions, including but not limited to securities fraud, misrepresentation, willful and wanton negligence, and/or loan servicing violations, as well as acquiring loans from Sierra with the knowledge and intent that RFC and/or its affiliated entities would use them for such unlawful purposes.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The applicable statutes of limitations governing, among other things, written contractual obligations, have expired with respect to some or all of the asserted claims.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Should it ultimately be adjudicated that Sierra breached any contractual obligation to RFC, such breach or breaches were not material.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC is barred from recovery on some or all of its claims, and/or Sierra is excused from any alleged nonperformance, on account of RFC's own breach of or failure to perform its own contractual obligations and covenants by, among other things, violating releases and promises not to sue contained in prior settlement agreements with Sierra, failing to provide Sierra with written notice and/or a right to appeal with respect to any alleged contractual breaches, and/or failing ever to declare any "Event of Default."

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by RFC's breaches of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing including, among other things, failing to timely notify Sierra of any alleged defaults or breaches and/or provide a right to appeal, failing to exercise fair and reasonable discretion in alleging defaults or breaches, and/or voluntarily paying sums or incurring liabilities in excess of RFC's actual obligations, if any.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The doctrine of acquiescence bars RFC's alleged indemnification rights due to RFC's inaction in the face of a dangerous condition.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC knowingly assumed the risk of the damages or injuries alleged in the FAC.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC is barred from recovering its alleged damages from Sierra (or such recovery must be reduced) to the extent RFC failed to mitigate or reasonably attempt to mitigate its damages, and/or was comparatively at fault. In particular, without limitation, RFC: (1) paid sums and/or incurred liabilities larger than fair, reasonable, or necessary; (2) otherwise failed to take commercially reasonable and diligent efforts to avoid or minimize its alleged losses; (3) "waived in" and failed to remove problem loans, identified during due diligence, from its loan pools and instead failed to notify and/or misled investors; and (4) committed or participated in unlawful misconduct with respect to investors, and borrowers whose loans RFC serviced.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's alleged right to indemnification is barred to the extent of its own willful and/or wanton negligence.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's claims are barred by the doctrine of judicial estoppel because RFC previously successfully prevailed in other proceedings, or obtained a more advantageous outcome, by taking factual or legal positions contrary to or inconsistent with the theories it presently advances. Such positions included, among others, that: (a) the Debtor loan pools did not contain loans with underwriting defects; (b) lawsuits against the Debtors were based not on inherent "defects" in the pooled loans, but misrepresentations about the underwriting standards that applied to those loans; (c) key evidence and data regarding the loans was unavailable or unduly burdensome to access; and (d) RFC's losses were attributable not to defective loans from correspondent lenders, but factors such as (i) the burdens of litigation; (ii) a widespread economic meltdown; and (iii) the pursuant of high-risk mortgages that increased the risk of borrower default.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC lacks standing to assert its claims because it assigned its rights, title and interest in those claims to third parties when it re-sold the loans on which it is suing, and RFC is not the real party in interest.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of laches.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's claims are barred because any alleged damages were the result of alternative/superseding/intervening causes over which Sierra had no control, such as the actions or omissions of third parties and/or RFC's own agents, employees, or affiliates, market forces, and RFC's pursuit of high-risk mortgages.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC may not recover its claimed damages in this action because they are speculative, vague, based on guesswork and conjecture, and would be impossible to ascertain or allocate in a fair, lawful, and just manner.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

RFC's claims are barred because it failed to comply with one or more contractual conditions precedent to bringing this lawsuit.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The relief sought by RFC is barred, in whole or in part, by RFC's failure to join indispensable parties necessary to a full, fair, and final adjudication.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The basis of RFC's claims and alleged damages against Sierra violate the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS/OTHER DEFENSES

Sierra has not completed its investigation and discovery regarding the FAC and the claims asserted by RFC therein. Sierra still has little idea which loans are at issue, or what representations and warranties they allegedly breached. Sierra reserves the right to

assert additional affirmative defenses (or modify and/or supplement existing affirmative defenses) as supported by information or facts obtained through discovery or other means during this case.

WHEREFORE, Sierra prays for judgment as follows:

1. That RFC takes nothing by its FAC;
2. That the FAC against Sierra be dismissed with prejudice;
3. That Sierra be awarded its costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred defending this suit;
4. That any relief in favor of RFC be offset by relief owed Sierra; and
5. That Sierra be awarded any other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Sierra hereby demands a jury trial on all issues raised in the FAC.

COUNTERCLAIM

PARTIES

1. Counterdefendant RFC is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in Minneapolis, Minnesota. To the extent it has any real continued existence, it is a citizen of Minnesota and Delaware. On information and belief, RFC currently exists solely to serve as the plaintiff in this case and other correspondent lender cases. On information and belief, RFC has no assets or operations, is controlled and dominated by the Trust, and observes no corporate formalities. Thus, Sierra would likely have little or no ability to either take discovery or recover from RFC

should Sierra prevail on its counterclaim at trial.

2. On information and belief (and as alleged in the FAC), counterdefendant ResCap Liquidating Trust, a Delaware statutory trust (the “ResCap Trust”) is the successor in interest to RFC; therefore, ResCap Trust is the true holder of the contractual rights, obligations, and claims alleged in both the FAC and this Counterclaim. The presence of RFC in this action, but not ResCap Trust, would serve only to insulate the real party in interest and unnecessarily thwart Sierra’s ability to bring and prosecute this compulsory counterclaim. RFC’s continued presence in this action rather than the real party in interest would only perpetrate injustice.

3. ResCap Trust is a publicly traded statutory trust organized under the laws of Delaware. Delaware law permits a statutory trust to sue and be sued in its own name, but also requires the appointment of a trustee. The designated trustee for ResCap Trust is Wilmington Trust, N.A. (“Wilmington”), a national banking association.

4. The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit has determined that the citizenship of a national bank is determined by the location of its main office. On information and belief – and according to the websites for both the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (Wilmington’s primary federal regulator) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation – Wilmington’s main office is located at Rodney Square North, 1100 North Market Street, Wilmington, DE 19890. Thus, Wilmington is a citizen of Delaware only.

5. The ResCap Trust therefore has citizenship only in Delaware, as it is organized under Delaware law and its trustee is a citizen of Delaware and nowhere else.

6. Therefore, ResCap Trust is subject to service of process, and its presence does not deprive the Court of subject matter jurisdiction. Without ResCap Trust's presence in this action as the real party in interest, the Court would be unable to accord complete relief among the existing parties. In fact, Sierra would be unable to obtain any relief, or in all likelihood even prosecute its claims.

7. Counterclaimant Sierra is a corporation organized under the laws of California. It is a mortgage company with offices in many states, but its principal place of business and nexus of operations is located in Folsom, California. It is a citizen of California only.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has subject jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to, *inter alia*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1367(a). As described herein, this counterclaim and the claims presented by the FAC are so closely related that they form part of the same case or controversy.

9. RFC is already the nominative plaintiff designated by the FAC. As its successor, ResCap Trust is the real party in interest and subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1391(b)(2) in that a substantial part of the events complained of herein – namely, the filing of the FAC in this courthouse on May 23, 2014 – occurred in this judicial district. As was recently litigated in this Court, the parties contractually agreed to Minnesota as the exclusive venue regarding the FAC, which indirectly references the settlement agreements (already familiar to the Court), on which Sierra bases its counterclaim; these

agreements are expressly governed by Minnesota law.

10. This counterclaim is compulsory under F.R.C.P. Rule 13(a). Sierra presently has the counterclaim against RFC, which arises out of the same transactions and occurrences that are the subject matter of the FAC. It was RFC's very act of filing the FAC, under the direction and control of ResCap Trust as successor and the real party in interest, that gave rise to Sierra's counterclaim.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

11. Sierra and RFC had a contractual correspondent lender relationship between 2000 to 2007, in which Sierra would sell RFC mortgage loans one at a time.

12. Occasionally, RFC would request that Sierra repurchase certain mortgages, and the parties would bargain over such factors as which loans, on what terms, and for how much.

13. Sierra and RFC entered into three binding and enforceable written settlement agreements in 2007 and 2008 (attached as Exhibits 1-3). In all three settlements, RFC expressly released Sierra from any and all future liability with respect to particular loans – including loans on which the FAC now expressly sues and/or seeks additional and further relief.

14. The first two agreements (Exhibits 1 & 2) included in Paragraph 3 express contractual promises that neither party would ever “*bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.*” (Emphasis added.)

15. In the third and final settlement (Exhibit 3), which cost Sierra just a fraction

of the amounts it had paid for each of the first two settlements, RFC insisted on removing the promise not to sue. This demonstrates the great weight, significance, and materiality that the parties gave to the promises not to sue in the first two settlements. Recent events, in fact, have showed precisely why Sierra valued such provisions so highly, and the importance of according them the weight, authority, and enforceable effect that the parties clearly intended them to have.

16. On May 23, 2014, RFC (controlled by the ResCap Trust, and through counsel it shares with the ResCap Trust) filed the FAC, changing the nature of the liability theory against Sierra and vastly expanding by an order of magnitude the overall quantity of Sierra loans allegedly at issue (“hundreds” (¶ 40) rather than “dozens”). The FAC for the first time purports to sue on loans that RFC previously released and promised not to sue on by: (a) seeking “additional recoveries” with respect to “loans Sierra Pacific repurchased,” which the FAC counts among the “universe” of defective loans it is suing on (FAC, ¶¶ 5, 43); (b) specifically listing as “examples” of defective loans certain loans expressly released (¶¶ 42, 53); and (c) asserting that Sierra’s prior repurchases were “concessions” that those loans were defective (¶¶ 5, 43), although all three settlements contain disclaimers of wrongdoing – making clear that RFC and the ResCap Trust have no intention of honoring the settlements.

17. Moreover, on December 19, 2007, Sierra and RFC entered into the first settlement agreement (“December 19, 2007 Settlement”) (Exhibit 1), which provided Sierra with broad-spanning retroactive releases and promises not to sue with respect to any allegedly defective loan sold to RFC, prior to December 19, 2007, that met at least

one of the following two criteria: (1) the borrower timely made the first 12 monthly loan payments; or (2) the only “Event of Default” identified was “the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s).”

18. Specifically, Section 2(b) of the December 19, 2007 Settlement provides:

...GMAC-RFC for itself, its present and past representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, family, partners, employees, agents, and attorneys *will fully and forever release and discharge Client...* from all claims, demands, torts, damages, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, or causes of action arising out of the Subject Loans, and arising out of the Additional Loans, but only where **the Additional Loans involve a borrower who has made the first twelve consecutive payments due GMAC-RFC within the month mandated by the contract, or (ii) where the overstatement of stated income by the borrower(s) is identified as the only Event of Default of the GMAC-RFC Client Guide (“Client Guide”).**

(Exhibit 1, p. 3, emphasis added.) The December 19 Settlement defined “Additional Loans” as any loans:

...sold to GMAC-RFC on or before the effective date of this Agreement, which may be in breach of one or more Events of Default, as described in the Client Guide but which have not been identified as of the date of this Agreement...

(*Id.*, p.1.)

19. In addition, Section 3 of the December 19, 2007 Settlement contained an express promise not to sue: the parties promised not to “*bring against the other party any other suits or actions, however denominated concerning any claim, demand, liability or cause of action that is the subject of this Agreement.*” (*Id.*, emphasis added.)

20. The releases and covenants not to sue also apply to 29 specifically-identified repurchased loans – all of which RFC now purports to sue on by seeking

“additional recoveries” with respect to “loans Sierra Pacific repurchased...” (FAC, ¶¶ 5, 43.)

21. Similarly, on March 10, 2008, the parties entered into a settlement agreement (“March 10, 2008 Settlement”) resolving seven loans, that contained releases and covenants not to sue virtually identical to those in the December 19, 2007 Settlement. (Exhibit 2.) Among the expressly released loans were three of the “example” loans cited in the FAC: (1) Loan ID # 11208459 (FAC, ¶ 42(k)); (2) Loan ID # 11208467 (*Id.*, ¶ 42(l)); and (3) Loan ID # 11301585 (*Id.*, ¶ 42(n)).

COUNT I

(Breach of Contract - Settlement Agreement)

22. Sierra incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

23. The December 19, 2007 Settlement and the March 10, 2008 Settlement were and remain binding and enforceable, including the promises not to sue (Exhibits 1 and 2, ¶ 3).

24. As described herein, RFC and the ResCap Trust violated the promises not to sue by filing the FAC.

25. As a proximate result of these breaches, Sierra has been damaged in multiple ways, including but not limited to incurring attorneys’ fees, paying for (and losing the use of) employee and management time and other company resources responding to and establishing the breaches, and in other ways. The amount of damages sustained is in an amount according to proof at trial but not less than \$75,000.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, Sierra respectfully requests that this Court:

1. For general and specific damages against RFC and the ResCap Trust according to proof at time of trial;
2. For attorneys' fees and costs according to proof;
3. For interest as allowed by law; and
4. For such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Sierra hereby demands a jury trial for all issues herein.

Dated: September 30, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jonathan M. Jenkins _____
Jonathan M. Jenkins
Admitted *pro hac vice*
Lara Kayayan
Admitted *pro hac vice*
JENKINS LLP
8075 West Third St., Suite 407
Los Angeles, California 90048
Telephone: (310) 984-6800
Fax: (310) 984-6840
jjenkins@jmjenkinslaw.com
lkayayan@jmjenkinslaw.com

Richard T. Thomson (#109538)
Amy L. Schwartz (#0339350)
Lapp, Libra, Thomson, Stoeber & Push,
Chartered
120 South Sixth Street, Suite 2500
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 338-5815
Fax: (612) 338-6651
rthomson@lapplibra.com
aschwartz@lapplibra.com

Counsel for Defendant Sierra Pacific
Mortgage Company, Inc.

EXHIBIT 7

APPENDIX B

LOAN NUMBER	Origination Date	Loan Amount	Loan Status	REPORTED D LTV	REPORTED D LTV	REPORTED PROPERTY VALUE	1. Actual property value based on AVM on origination date	2. Identified REMIC trust	3.1 LTV based on AVM	3.2 CLTV based on AVM	4. Owner occupancy flag	5a) Property value reported was 15% or more higher than calculated AVM	5b) Property value reported was 10% or more higher than calculated AVM	5c) Reported LTV is 10% or more lower than calculated AVM	5d) Reported LTV is 15% or more lower than calculated LTV based on AVM	5e) Reported LTV is 25% or more lower than calculated LTV based on AVM	5f) CLTV calculated from AVM is over 100% for 2nd lien or LTV is over 100% for 1st lien	5g) Mkt-stated owner occupancy
7977141	9-Aug-02	\$ 425,000	1	62%	62%	\$ 685,484	577,166	RMBS 2003-S12	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8048553	21-Aug-02	\$ 175,040	1	80%	80%	\$ 218,809	178,880	RAMP 2003-R54	98%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8048583	16-Aug-02	\$ 126,000	1	90%	90%	\$ 140,000	139,665	RAMP 2002-R56	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8221655	5-Nov-02	\$ 110,000	1	79%	79%	\$ 139,241	184,178	RAU 2002-QS19	60%	60%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8483430	27-Jun-03	\$ 552,000	1	77%	86%	\$ 716,883	857,451	RMBS 2003-S17	64%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8484622	19-Jun-03	\$ 92,150	1	95%	95%	\$ 97,000	74,671	RAMP 2003-R57	123%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8482730	20-Jun-03	\$ 325,500	1	95%	95%	\$ 75,000	132,657	RAMP 2003-R57	54%	54%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8502782	10-Jul-03	\$ 487,000	1	70%	79%	\$ 412,025	288,284	RAMP 2003-R57	113%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8502806	23-Jun-03	\$ 203,700	1	75%	75%	\$ 649,333	491,312	RMBS 2003-S17	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8533708	26-Jun-03	\$ 128,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 25,4625	266,673	RAMP 2003-R58	167%	167%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8533764	26-Jun-03	\$ 231,550	1	90%	90%	\$ 160,000	46,995	RAMP 2003-R58	76%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8538066	1-Jun-03	\$ 100,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 25,278	262,229	RAMP 2003-R58	272%	272%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8538080	1-Jun-03	\$ 385,000	1	76%	76%	\$ 506,579	112,227	RAMP 2003-R58	89%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8538288	29-Sep-03	\$ 175,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 218,750	483,063	RAU 2003-QS17	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8844512	26-Sep-03	\$ 135,000	1	95%	95%	\$ 142,105	132,668	RAMP 2003-R511	132%	132%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8930787	1-Mar-04	\$ 70,000	1	47%	47%	\$ 148,916	111,754	RAMP 2003-R511	121%	121%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8930791	26-Feb-04	\$ 155,000	1	50%	50%	\$ 310,000	144,010	RAMP 2004-R55	48%	48%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8930805	4-Mar-04	\$ 130,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 173,333	286,948	RAMP 2004-R55	54%	54%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8930819	9-Mar-04	\$ 444,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 555,000	185,000	RAU 2004-QS8	70%	70%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8943731	25-Mar-04	\$ 378,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 504,000	509,390	RAMP 2004-R56	87%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
8960504	7-Nov-03	\$ 383,200	1	80%	80%	\$ 479,000	466,647	RMBS 2004-S5	81%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9042704	15-Dec-03	\$ 442,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 566,667	437,634	RMBS 2004-S1	88%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9043494	11-Dec-03	\$ 501,000	1	57%	57%	\$ 475,000	497,296	RMBS 2004-S1	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9267508	12-Mar-04	\$ 100,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 878,947	716,516	RMBS 2004-S6	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9276616	18-Mar-04	\$ 255,952	1	105%	105%	\$ 319,940	138,714	RAU 2004-QS7	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9283338	3-Aug-04	\$ 120,149	1	100%	100%	\$ 268,000	302,292	RAMP 2004-R55	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9407377	27-Jul-04	\$ 268,000	1	100%	100%	\$ 371,900	84,699	RAMP 2004-R23	142%	142%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9500337	6-Aug-04	\$ 297,520	1	80%	100%	\$ 371,900	65,657	RAMP 2004-R510	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9500389	9-Aug-04	\$ 326,250	1	75%	95%	\$ 435,000	65,657	RAMP 2004-R510	452%	555%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9500415	29-Jul-04	\$ 443,000	1	80%	90%	\$ 540,000	324,477	RAU 2004-Q45	87%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507609	27-Jul-04	\$ 370,452	1	80%	80%	\$ 463,065	322,485	RAU 2004-Q44	134%	151%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507629	2-Aug-04	\$ 333,770	1	77%	100%	\$ 433,377	442,746	RAU 2004-Q44	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507637	4-Aug-04	\$ 408,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 510,000	419,782	RAU 2004-Q44	79%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507641	21-Jul-04	\$ 105,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 140,000	468,908	RAU 2004-Q44	87%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507725	28-Jul-04	\$ 232,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 290,000	159,843	RAU 2004-Q44	66%	66%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507745	12-Aug-04	\$ 304,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 380,000	204,673	RAU 2004-Q44	113%	142%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507767	2-Aug-04	\$ 192,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 350,000	349,760	RAU 2004-Q44	87%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507785	2-Aug-04	\$ 192,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 240,000	197,020	RAU 2004-Q44	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507811	2-Aug-04	\$ 92,500	1	78%	78%	\$ 118,590	103,422	RAU 2004-Q44	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507825	27-Jul-04	\$ 508,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 635,000	543,120	RAU 2004-Q44	90%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507917	9-Aug-04	\$ 224,700	1	80%	100%	\$ 280,875	223,104	RAU 2004-Q44	101%	126%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507947	2-Aug-04	\$ 316,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 395,000	355,609	RAU 2004-Q45	89%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507967	2-Aug-04	\$ 228,800	1	80%	100%	\$ 285,000	326,112	RAU 2004-Q45	95%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9507999	6-Aug-04	\$ 308,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 385,000	326,112	RAU 2004-Q45	94%	118%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9533723	4-Aug-04	\$ 360,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 480,000	461,006	RMBS 2004-S8	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9533785	4-Aug-04	\$ 362,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 482,667	421,786	RMBS 2004-S8	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9533871	19-Aug-04	\$ 512,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 640,000	324,724	RMBS 2004-S8	158%	158%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9561217	15-Sep-04	\$ 492,165	1	67%	67%	\$ 734,575	689,153	RMBS 2004-S9	71%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565673	18-Oct-04	\$ 225,200	1	80%	100%	\$ 319,000	288,219	RAU 2004-Q46	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565721	18-Oct-04	\$ 292,000	1	80%	95%	\$ 365,000	382,010	RAU 2004-Q46	76%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565741	18-Oct-04	\$ 268,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 335,000	310,000	RAU 2004-Q46	86%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565761	12-Oct-04	\$ 400,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 500,000	400,532	RAU 2004-Q46	100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565775	19-Oct-04	\$ 332,000	1	80%	100%	\$ 415,000	451,832	RAU 2004-Q46	73%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565811	20-Oct-04	\$ 180,832	1	80%	80%	\$ 201,040	222,850	RAU 2004-Q46	72%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565815	20-Oct-04	\$ 156,617	1	80%	80%	\$ 193,771	179,473	RAU 2004-Q46	87%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565817	14-Oct-04	\$ 481,400	1	80%	100%	\$ 601,750	604,989	RAU 2004-Q46	80%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565837	11-Oct-04	\$ 442,791	1	57%	57%	\$ 776,826	411,972	RAU 2005-Q41	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565847	15-Oct-04	\$ 223,200	1	80%	100%	\$ 279,000	270,912	RAU 2004-Q46	82%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565881	21-Oct-04	\$ 591,200	1	80%	80%	\$ 725,000	227,046	RAU 2004-Q46	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565895	18-Oct-04	\$ 375,000	1	75%	75%	\$ 500,000	464,224	RMBS 2004-S9	85%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9565923	5-Oct-04	\$ 290,410	1	80%	90%	\$ 363,013	277,721	RAU 2004-Q46	105%	118%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9567481	25-Oct-04	\$ 200,000	1	80%	80%	\$ 250,000	337,660	RAU 2004-Q46	59%	59%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		
9567497	20-Oct-04	\$ 156,449	1	80%	80%	\$ 195,561	221,653	RAU 2004-Q46	71%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach		

9745903	22-Oct-04	\$	219,200	1	80%	100%	\$	274,000	5	298,620	RAU 2004-Q46	73%	92%	0						
9745931	8-Oct-04	\$	151,200	1	80%	100%	\$	189,000	5	164,465	RAU 2004-Q46	92%	115%	0						
9745934	19-Oct-04	\$	292,800	1	80%	100%	\$	366,000	5	447,292	RAU 2004-Q46	65%	82%	0						
9745959	14-Oct-04	\$	199,200	1	80%	100%	\$	249,000	5	218,220	RAU 2004-Q46	91%	114%	0						
9745963	8-Oct-04	\$	301,566	1	80%	80%	\$	376,983	5	394,091	RAU 2004-Q46	79%	79%	0						
9745973	21-Oct-04	\$	234,400	1	80%	100%	\$	293,000	5	388,699	RAU 2004-Q46	60%	75%	0						
9745985	6-Oct-04	\$	282,400	1	80%	100%	\$	353,000	5	399,299	RAU 2004-Q46	79%	90%	0						
9745995	21-Oct-04	\$	154,315	1	90%	90%	\$	154,794	5	210,137	RAMP 2004-RS12	66%	66%	0						
9746015	12-Oct-04	\$	202,000	1	76%	76%	\$	265,789	5	272,383	RAU 2004-Q46	74%	74%	0						
9746025	13-Oct-04	\$	540,000	1	75%	75%	\$	720,000	5	601,551	RAU 2004-Q46	90%	90%	0						
9746033	22-Oct-04	\$	195,000	1	65%	65%	\$	300,000	5	245,878	RAU 2004-Q46	79%	79%	0						
9746073	20-Oct-04	\$	394,000	1	78%	89%	\$	493,108	5	421,938	RAU 2004-Q46	91%	104%	0						
9746075	11-Oct-04	\$	320,000	1	80%	80%	\$	400,000	5	316,056	RAU 2004-Q46	101%	101%	0						
9746077	15-Oct-04	\$	339,259	1	75%	100%	\$	452,345	5	511,037	RAU 2004-Q46	66%	89%	0						
9746078	22-Oct-04	\$	120,650	1	95%	95%	\$	127,000	5	156,082	RAU 2004-Q46	77%	77%	1						
9746079	7-Oct-04	\$	197,000	1	70%	70%	\$	281,429	5	241,402	RAU 2004-Q46	82%	82%	0						
9746083	20-Oct-04	\$	248,900	1	78%	90%	\$	313,103	5	275,970	RAU 2004-Q46	104%	104%	0						
9746087	26-Oct-04	\$	148,000	1	80%	100%	\$	185,000	5	216,651	RAU 2004-Q46	68%	83%	0						
9746099	18-Oct-04	\$	208,000	1	80%	100%	\$	260,000	5	248,012	RAU 2004-Q46	84%	105%	0						
9746149	29-Sep-04	\$	329,000	1	39%	57%	\$	843,590	5	755,079	RFMSI 2004-S9	44%	64%	0						
9746180	28-Sep-04	\$	94,400	1	80%	80%	\$	118,000	5	117,664	RAMP 2005-RS1	80%	80%	0						
9746207	25-Oct-04	\$	295,200	1	80%	100%	\$	360,000	5	316,144	RAU 2004-Q46	93%	117%	0						
9746213	7-Oct-04	\$	231,813	1	80%	80%	\$	289,766	5	266,623	RAU 2004-Q46	87%	87%	0						
9746225	19-Oct-04	\$	171,100	1	80%	100%	\$	213,875	5	264,559	RAU 2004-Q46	65%	81%	0						
9746229	4-Nov-04	\$	420,000	1	57%	57%	\$	716,842	5	492,175	RFMSI 2005-S2	85%	85%	0						
9746235	15-Nov-04	\$	359,000	1	80%	80%	\$	448,750	5	456,072	RFMSI 2005-S2	79%	79%	0						
9746283	5-Nov-04	\$	186,192	1	80%	100%	\$	232,740	5	186,168	RAU 2005-Q41	100%	125%	0						
9746293	5-Nov-04	\$	230,720	1	80%	100%	\$	288,400	5	211,736	RAU 2005-Q41	109%	136%	0						
9746305	22-Nov-04	\$	287,920	1	80%	100%	\$	353,900	5	411,390	RAU 2005-Q41	70%	87%	0						
9746309	18-Nov-04	\$	529,640	1	80%	100%	\$	662,050	5	655,274	RAU 2005-Q41	81%	101%	0						
9746323	22-Nov-04	\$	160,800	1	80%	100%	\$	201,000	5	189,632	RAU 2005-Q41	85%	106%	0						
9746331	9-Nov-04	\$	228,000	1	80%	80%	\$	285,000	5	263,851	RAU 2005-Q42	86%	86%	0						
9746343	10-Nov-04	\$	544,000	1	80%	90%	\$	680,000	5	555,396	RAU 2005-Q41	98%	110%	0						
9746347	19-Nov-04	\$	452,000	1	80%	80%	\$	565,000	5	612,407	RAU 2005-Q41	74%	74%	0						
9746349	28-Oct-04	\$	276,700	1	80%	100%	\$	345,875	5	312,124	RAU 2005-Q43	89%	111%	0						
9746363	27-Oct-04	\$	384,000	1	80%	80%	\$	460,000	5	522,883	RAU 2005-Q42	70%	70%	0						
9746373	26-Oct-04	\$	234,855	1	80%	100%	\$	293,569	5	256,434	RAU 2005-Q41	92%	114%	0						
9746389	26-Nov-04	\$	168,000	1	80%	100%	\$	213,000	5	255,185	RAU 2005-Q41	66%	82%	0						
9746395	5-Nov-04	\$	586,400	1	80%	90%	\$	733,000	5	510,523	398,677	RAU 2005-Q41	78%	87%	1					
9746397	9-Nov-04	\$	408,418	1	80%	100%	\$	510,523	5	398,677	RFMSI 2005-S41	102%	128%	0						
9746415	2-Nov-04	\$	350,000	1	65%	84%	\$	538,462	5	424,943	RFMSI 2005-S41	82%	106%	0						
9746419	15-Oct-04	\$	458,800	1	80%	100%	\$	573,500	5	439,613	RAU 2005-Q41	104%	130%	0						
9746423	3-Nov-04	\$	340,000	1	80%	80%	\$	425,000	5	324,913	RAU 2005-Q42	105%	105%	0						
9746445	10-Nov-04	\$	483,650	1	80%	100%	\$	604,563	5	612,333	RAU 2005-Q41	79%	95%	0						
9746449	4-Nov-04	\$	347,634	1	80%	100%	\$	434,554	5	457,739	RAU 2005-Q41	76%	95%	0						
9746503	29-Oct-04	\$	414,498	1	80%	100%	\$	518,123	5	420,997	RAU 2005-Q41	98%	123%	0						
9746507	27-Oct-04	\$	247,200	1	80%	100%	\$	309,000	5	180,994	RAU 2005-Q41	137%	171%	0						
9746517	4-Nov-04	\$	396,000	1	80%	100%	\$	495,000	5	305,289	RAU 2005-Q41	130%	162%	0						
9746531	9-Nov-04	\$	320,000	1	80%	80%	\$	400,000	5	372,226	RAU 2005-Q41	86%	86%	0						
9746551	29-Oct-04	\$	384,000	1	80%	100%	\$	460,000	5	377,033	RAU 2005-Q41	112%	141%	0						
9746555	4-Nov-04	\$	580,000	1	76%	76%	\$	763,158	5	628,248	RAU 2005-Q41	92%	92%	0						
9746563	19-Nov-04	\$	248,000	1	80%	100%	\$	310,000	5	274,000	RAU 2005-Q41	90%	113%	0						
9746571	19-Nov-04	\$	321,229	1	80%	100%	\$	401,536	5	455,000	RAU 2005-Q41	71%	71%	0						
9746583	17-Nov-04	\$	236,000	1	80%	80%	\$	295,000	5	343,398	RAU 2005-Q43	69%	77%	0						
9746589	12-Nov-04	\$	165,600	1	80%	90%	\$	207,000	5	152,652	RAU 2005-Q43	108%	108%	0						
9746603	19-Nov-04	\$	313,000	1	80%	100%	\$	335,000	5	347,689	RAU 2005-Q41	77%	96%	0						
9746607	19-Nov-04	\$	134,388	1	85%	85%	\$	158,104	5	150,691	RAU 2005-Q41	89%	89%	0						
9746619	9-Nov-04	\$	428,000	1	80%	100%	\$	535,000	5	546,646	RAU 2005-Q41	78%	98%	0						
9746621	2-Nov-04	\$	552,000	1	80%	100%	\$	690,000	5	602,555	RAU 2005-Q41	92%	115%	0						
9746623	3-Nov-04	\$	230,000	1	90%	90%	\$	253,556	5	199,954	RAU 2005-Q41	115%	115%	0						
9746645	18-Nov-04	\$	209,837	1	80%	80%	\$	263,296	5	248,855	RAU 2005-Q41	84%	84%	0						
9746651	5-Nov-04	\$	350,174	1	80%	80%	\$	437,718	5	421,838	RAU 2005-Q41	83%	83%	0						
9746661	27-Oct-04	\$	508,580	1	80%	100%	\$	635,725	5	515,107	RAU 2005-Q41	99%	123%	0						
9746691	17-Nov-04	\$	347,200	1	70%	70%	\$	496,000	5	526,236	RAU 2005-Q41	66%	66%	0						
9746699	23-Nov-04	\$	400,450	1	80%	80%	\$	500,563	5	439,035	RAU 2005-Q41	91%	91%	0						
9746675	3-Dec-04	\$	360,000	1	80%	100%	\$	450,000	5	475,123	RAU 2005-Q41	76%	95%	0						
9746683	29-Nov-04	\$	202,300	1	80%	100%	\$	252,875	5	241,384	RAU 2005-Q41	84%	105%	0						
9746687	2-Dec-04	\$	128,800	1	80%	100%	\$	411,000	5	386,672	RAU 2005-Q41	85%	106%	1						
9746699	24-Nov-04	\$	196,000	1	80%	100%	\$	245,000	5	171,880	RAU 2005-Q41	114%	143%	0						
9746701	6-Dec-04	\$	296,000	1	80%	95%	\$	370,000	5	356,550	RAU 2005-Q41	83%	99%	0						
9746707	2-Dec-04	\$	367,238	1	80%	100%	\$	459,048	5	466,970	RAU 2005-Q41	79%	98%	0						
9746729	8-Dec-04	\$	305,317	1	80%	100%	\$	381,646	5	361,021	RAU 2005-Q41	85%	106%	0						
9746741	6-Dec-04	\$	333,700	1	80%	80%	\$	417,125	5	333,689	RAU 2005-Q41	100%	100%	0						
9746747	2-Dec-04	\$	319,905	1	80%	95%	\$	393,881	5	382,205	RFMSI 2005-S41	99%	99%	0						
9746753	22-Nov-04	\$	420,400	1	80%	90%	\$	523,500	5	424,677	RFMSI 2005-S41	89%	111%	0						
9746759	30-Nov-04	\$	303,200	1	80%	100%	\$	379,000	5	339,332	RAMP 2005-RS1	49%	49%	0						
9746769	1-Dec-04	\$	265,000	1	58%	58%	\$	455,897	5	541,994	RFMSI 2005-S41	89%	112%	0						
9746777	30-Nov-04	\$	312,387	1	67%	86%	\$	465,249	5	453,227	RFMSI 2005-S41	69%	88%	0						
9746791	30-Nov-04	\$	497,259	1	80%	80%	\$	621,574	5	560,566	RAU 2005-Q41	89%</								

9740823	22-Nov-04	\$	356,772	1	80%	100%	\$	445,965	5	516,228	RAU 2005-QA1	69%	86%	0					
9741151	23-Nov-04	\$	188,000	1	80%	80%	\$	235,000	5	195,953	RAU 2005-QA1	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9741185	30-Nov-04	\$	191,200	1	80%	80%	\$	239,000	5	202,344	RAU 2005-QA2	95%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9741199	3-Dec-04	\$	400,000	1	80%	98%	\$	500,000	5	373,012	RAU 2005-QA1	107%	131%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9742021	24-Nov-04	\$	156,000	1	80%	100%	\$	193,000	5	185,930	RAU 2005-QA1	84%	105%	1					Breach
9742121	2-Dec-04	\$	367,920	1	80%	100%	\$	384,900	5	333,074	RAU 2005-QA1	92%	116%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9742121	1-Dec-04	\$	168,000	1	80%	80%	\$	210,000	5	184,981	RAU 2005-QA1	91%	91%	0					
9742129	10-Dec-04	\$	281,600	1	80%	100%	\$	352,000	5	344,915	RAU 2005-QA1	82%	82%	0					
9742127	30-Nov-04	\$	165,000	1	80%	100%	\$	175,000	5	185,940	RAU 2005-QA2	75%	94%	0					
9742123	29-Nov-04	\$	122,800	1	80%	100%	\$	153,600	5	133,588	RAU 2005-QA1	44%	44%	0					
9742125	30-Nov-04	\$	344,000	1	80%	100%	\$	464,865	5	499,402	RAU 2005-QA1	69%	69%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9742127	2-Dec-04	\$	212,900	1	85%	85%	\$	250,471	5	237,607	RAU 2005-QA1	90%	95%	0					
9742129	30-Nov-04	\$	175,200	1	80%	100%	\$	219,000	5	231,195	RAU 2005-QA1	76%	77%	0					
9742125	23-Nov-04	\$	324,000	1	80%	80%	\$	405,000	5	421,465	RAU 2005-QA1	77%	77%	0					
9742127	8-Dec-04	\$	326,040	1	80%	90%	\$	407,550	5	355,274	RAU 2005-QA1	92%	103%	0					
9742121	30-Nov-04	\$	164,800	1	80%	100%	\$	206,600	5	171,710	RAU 2005-QA2	96%	120%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9773885	6-Dec-04	\$	349,500	1	80%	100%	\$	436,675	5	388,297	RAU 2005-QA4	90%	113%	0					
9773903	20-Dec-04	\$	172,000	1	79%	90%	\$	217,722	5	213,333	RAU 2005-QA2	81%	92%	0					
9773907	9-Dec-04	\$	280,000	1	78%	78%	\$	358,974	5	238,270	RAU 2005-QA2	118%	118%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9773919	20-Dec-04	\$	406,480	1	80%	100%	\$	508,100	5	433,400	RAMP 2005-HS2	94%	117%	0					
9773941	8-Dec-04	\$	492,000	1	80%	95%	\$	615,000	5	603,133	RFMSI 2005-SA1	82%	97%	0					
9773949	9-Dec-04	\$	225,226	1	79%	79%	\$	281,046	5	396,972	RAMP 2005-HS2	72%	72%	0					
9773963	21-Dec-04	\$	285,108	1	80%	100%	\$	361,385	5	289,639	RAU 2005-QA2	78%	97%	0					
9773975	6-Dec-04	\$	159,200	1	80%	90%	\$	199,000	5	507,114	RAU 2005-QA4	69%	78%	1					
9774421	14-Dec-04	\$	300,148	1	80%	80%	\$	375,185	5	373,296	RAU 2005-QA2	80%	80%	0					
9774425	21-Dec-04	\$	430,742	1	80%	80%	\$	538,428	5	505,490	RAU 2005-QA2	85%	85%	0					
9774469	20-Dec-04	\$	204,800	1	80%	100%	\$	256,000	5	232,769	RAU 2005-QA2	88%	99%	0					
9774481	7-Dec-04	\$	403,832	1	80%	90%	\$	504,790	5	498,336	RAU 2005-QA2	81%	101%	0					
9774493	16-Dec-04	\$	152,000	1	43%	43%	\$	353,488	5	327,430	RAU 2005-QA2	46%	46%	0					
9774497	17-Dec-04	\$	207,500	1	80%	80%	\$	259,375	5	273,425	RAU 2005-QA2	76%	76%	0					
9804957	28-Dec-04	\$	412,000	1	80%	100%	\$	515,000	5	553,493	RAU 2005-QA3	74%	93%	0					
9804977	10-Jan-05	\$	412,000	1	80%	100%	\$	515,000	5	478,081	RAU 2005-QA3	86%	108%	0					
9804989	10-Jan-05	\$	490,860	1	80%	80%	\$	613,575	5	567,990	RAU 2005-QA4	86%	86%	0					
9805003	7-Jan-05	\$	360,163	1	80%	80%	\$	450,204	5	412,100	RAU 2005-QA4	87%	87%	0					
9805007	7-Jan-05	\$	390,029	1	80%	100%	\$	487,536	5	469,469	RAU 2005-QA3	77%	77%	0					
9805011	18-Jan-05	\$	365,600	1	80%	100%	\$	457,000	5	270,703	RAU 2005-QA3	103%	129%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805019	25-Jan-05	\$	555,000	1	68%	68%	\$	816,176	5	591,418	RAU 2005-QA3	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805061	10-Jan-05	\$	192,800	1	69%	69%	\$	279,420	5	282,401	RAU 2005-QA6	68%	68%	0					
9805063	13-Jan-05	\$	319,298	1	80%	100%	\$	399,123	5	388,613	RAU 2005-QA3	82%	103%	0					
9805065	5-Jan-05	\$	180,200	1	80%	100%	\$	225,500	5	270,269	RAU 2005-QA4	67%	83%	0					
9805077	4-Jan-05	\$	393,371	1	80%	100%	\$	421,714	5	319,627	RAU 2005-QA3	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805081	13-Jan-05	\$	304,000	1	80%	80%	\$	380,000	5	438,000	RAU 2005-QA3	69%	69%	0					
9805085	30-Dec-04	\$	189,600	1	80%	100%	\$	237,000	5	236,098	RAU 2005-QA3	80%	100%	0					
9805087	15-Dec-04	\$	271,815	1	80%	80%	\$	339,769	5	254,776	RAU 2005-QA6	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805103	6-Jan-05	\$	316,800	1	80%	100%	\$	396,600	5	357,666	RAU 2005-QA3	89%	111%	0					
9805115	20-Jan-05	\$	138,552	1	80%	100%	\$	161,940	5	145,400	RAU 2005-QA3	85%	106%	0					
9805119	30-Dec-04	\$	205,650	1	90%	90%	\$	228,500	5	215,291	RAU 2005-QA3	96%	96%	1					
9805121	18-Jan-05	\$	288,000	1	80%	100%	\$	360,000	5	257,531	RAU 2005-QA3	112%	126%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805123	13-Jan-05	\$	386,800	1	80%	100%	\$	486,000	5	300,602	RAMP 2005-HS3	86%	108%	0					
9805129	28-Dec-04	\$	232,000	1	80%	80%	\$	290,000	5	401,881	RAU 2005-QA3	97%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805131	25-Jan-05	\$	338,000	1	80%	90%	\$	422,500	5	346,620	RAMP 2005-HS3	69%	69%	0					
9805157	27-Dec-04	\$	319,635	1	80%	100%	\$	399,544	5	341,290	RAU 2005-QA3	99%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9805183	14-Jan-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	345,000	5	386,379	RAU 2005-QA3	71%	89%	0					
9805205	17-Jan-05	\$	266,400	1	80%	100%	\$	333,000	5	341,576	RAU 2005-QA3	78%	97%	0					
9805319	4-Feb-05	\$	202,000	1	78%	78%	\$	258,974	5	342,886	RAU 2005-QA4	77%	96%	0					
9831139	11-Feb-05	\$	407,000	1	67%	67%	\$	607,463	5	486,724	RFMSI 2005-SA2	103%	122%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9831723	17-Feb-05	\$	137,600	1	80%	95%	\$	172,000	5	187,771	RFMSI 2005-SA2	83%	83%	1					
9840201	2-Feb-05	\$	525,000	1	69%	69%	\$	760,870	5	157,591	RFMSI 2005-SA2	87%	104%	0					
9840209	17-Feb-05	\$	344,000	1	80%	80%	\$	430,000	5	267,434	RFMSI 2005-SA2	129%	129%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9840223	7-Feb-05	\$	207,600	1	80%	80%	\$	259,500	5	217,741	RFMSI 2005-SA2	95%	95%	1					
9841231	26-Jan-05	\$	223,346	1	80%	80%	\$	279,183	5	272,027	RAU 2005-QA4	82%	82%	0					
9841249	8-Feb-05	\$	292,800	1	80%	100%	\$	366,000	5	347,727	RAU 2005-QA4	84%	105%	0					
9841251	4-Feb-05	\$	515,649	1	80%	100%	\$	644,561	5	531,279	RAU 2005-QA4	97%	121%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9841253	2-Feb-05	\$	210,400	1	80%	100%	\$	263,000	5	242,349	RAU 2005-QA6	87%	109%	0					
9841255	27-Jan-05	\$	185,200	1	80%	100%	\$	249,875	5	258,652	RAU 2005-QA4	77%	97%	0					
9841257	22-Feb-05	\$	199,920	1	80%	80%	\$	249,900	5	172,079	RAU 2005-QA4	108%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9841263	26-Jan-05	\$	199,920	1	80%	100%	\$	249,900	5	321,601	RAU 2005-QA4	94%	89%	0					
9841267	24-Jan-05	\$	367,200	1	80%	100%	\$	459,000	5	474,156	RAU 2005-QA4	89%	111%	0					
9841271	9-Feb-05	\$	489,600	1	80%	95%	\$	612,000	5	560,547	RAU 2005-QA4	82%	104%	0					
9841279	10-Feb-05	\$	299,920	1	80%	100%	\$	374,900	5	473,893	RAU 2005-QA4	63%	79%	0					
9841285	11-Feb-05	\$	171,200	1	80%	80%	\$	214,000	5	116,972	RAU 2005-QA9	146%	166%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
9841297	28-Jan-05	\$	474,400	1	80%	80%	\$	593,000	5	563,776	RAU 2005-QA6	71%	71%	0					
9841307	3-Feb-05	\$	307,200	1	80%	100%	\$	384,000	5	385,522	RAU 2005-QA4	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	

9941315	11-Feb-05	\$	287,900	1	80%	100%	\$	353,875	5	258,233	RAU 2005-Q46	111%	139%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941323	8-Feb-05	\$	501,200	1	80%	100%	\$	623,000	5	602,413	RAU 2005-Q44	84%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941335	10-Feb-05	\$	260,104	1	80%	80%	\$	325,130	5	336,380	RAU 2005-Q45	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941353	7-Feb-05	\$	486,000	1	80%	100%	\$	360,000	5	534,268	RAU 2005-Q45	86%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941361	2-Feb-05	\$	379,000	1	80%	80%	\$	473,750	5	469,385	RAU 2005-Q44	81%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941371	7-Feb-05	\$	439,200	1	80%	100%	\$	549,000	5	518,927	RAU 2005-Q44	85%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941373	15-Feb-05	\$	263,344	1	80%	100%	\$	323,180	5	276,458	RAU 2005-Q41	95%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941375	25-Jan-05	\$	187,900	1	80%	80%	\$	214,875	5	264,214	RAU 2005-Q44	71%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941383	8-Feb-05	\$	226,400	1	80%	100%	\$	283,000	5	251,237	RAU 2005-Q44	82%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941395	31-Jan-05	\$	326,143	1	80%	100%	\$	407,679	5	396,677	RAU 2005-Q44	77%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941397	23-Feb-05	\$	500,000	1	80%	100%	\$	625,000	5	650,016	RAU 2005-Q44	83%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941399	9-Feb-05	\$	307,650	1	80%	100%	\$	384,563	5	369,362	RAU 2005-Q44	169%	211%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941413	4-Feb-05	\$	326,552	1	80%	100%	\$	408,190	5	193,004	RAU 2005-Q44	61%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941437	14-Feb-05	\$	190,612	1	80%	100%	\$	238,465	5	310,393	RAU 2005-Q44	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941439	11-Feb-05	\$	243,200	1	80%	100%	\$	304,000	5	290,806	RAU 2005-Q44	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941449	28-Jan-05	\$	420,000	1	80%	100%	\$	525,000	5	363,609	RAU 2005-Q44	81%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941469	24-Jan-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	80%	\$	345,000	5	339,111	RAU 2005-Q44	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941479	8-Feb-05	\$	277,112	1	80%	80%	\$	346,390	5	329,990	RAU 2005-Q45	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941487	24-Jan-05	\$	144,560	1	80%	80%	\$	180,700	5	162,164	RAMP 2005-RS6	86%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941491	9-Feb-05	\$	392,000	1	80%	100%	\$	490,000	5	454,490	RAU 2005-Q44	86%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941493	8-Feb-05	\$	405,000	1	80%	90%	\$	405,000	5	297,585	RAU 2005-Q410	109%	12%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941499	23-Feb-05	\$	240,000	1	80%	100%	\$	300,000	5	233,672	RAU 2005-Q44	103%	128%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941513	9-Feb-05	\$	146,250	1	78%	78%	\$	181,500	5	149,288	RAU 2005-Q44	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941515	14-Feb-05	\$	305,425	1	95%	95%	\$	321,500	5	327,726	RAU 2005-Q44	80%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9941521	18-Feb-05	\$	422,443	1	80%	95%	\$	528,054	5	529,390	RAU 2005-Q42	102%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968759	4-Mar-05	\$	404,000	1	80%	87%	\$	505,000	5	394,236	RFMSI 2005-S42	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968801	4-Mar-05	\$	210,000	1	75%	75%	\$	280,000	5	263,498	RFMSI 2005-S42	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968807	8-Mar-05	\$	297,000	1	75%	75%	\$	396,000	5	349,988	RFMSI 2005-S42	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968813	22-Feb-05	\$	417,600	1	80%	80%	\$	523,000	5	442,725	RFMSI 2005-S42	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968827	25-Feb-05	\$	460,000	1	80%	80%	\$	500,000	5	434,751	RFMSI 2005-S42	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9968875	23-Feb-05	\$	258,800	1	70%	70%	\$	642,867	5	408,697	RFMSI 2005-S42	110%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9982021	7-Mar-05	\$	420,000	1	80%	100%	\$	283,500	5	401,409	RAU 2005-Q44	57%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9983215	3-Mar-05	\$	382,400	1	80%	100%	\$	478,000	5	479,124	RAU 2005-Q411	80%	100%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9983235	9-Mar-05	\$	288,800	1	80%	100%	\$	361,000	5	388,922	RAU 2005-RS6	74%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9983239	11-Mar-05	\$	251,200	1	80%	101%	\$	314,000	5	273,412	RAMP 2006-RS6	92%	116%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9983255	21-Mar-05	\$	294,400	1	80%	100%	\$	368,000	5	368,000	RAU 2005-Q44	80%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9983261	10-Feb-05	\$	104,000	1	80%	80%	\$	130,000	5	122,727	RAMP 2006-RS1	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913371	6-Apr-05	\$	134,400	1	80%	95%	\$	168,000	5	155,000	RFMSI 2005-S43	87%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913379	25-Mar-05	\$	164,800	1	80%	80%	\$	206,000	5	255,245	RAU 2005-Q47	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913391	8-Apr-05	\$	348,000	1	80%	80%	\$	435,000	5	363,893	RAU 2005-Q47	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913393	18-Mar-05	\$	226,055	1	80%	90%	\$	295,069	5	272,000	RAU 2005-Q47	87%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913397	11-Apr-05	\$	212,000	1	80%	80%	\$	265,000	5	382,192	RAU 2005-Q47	55%	55%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913399	8-Apr-05	\$	295,090	1	80%	90%	\$	368,863	5	248,311	RAU 2005-Q47	119%	134%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913405	12-Apr-05	\$	605,000	1	73%	73%	\$	828,767	5	688,055	RFMSI 2005-S42	88%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913407	8-Apr-05	\$	195,000	1	80%	100%	\$	195,000	5	216,688	RAU 2005-Q47	72%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913421	12-Apr-05	\$	166,500	1	73%	73%	\$	228,082	5	220,000	RAU 2005-Q47	76%	76%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913427	8-Apr-05	\$	288,000	1	80%	95%	\$	360,000	5	359,796	RAU 2005-Q49	80%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913445	14-Apr-05	\$	177,160	1	80%	100%	\$	221,450	5	210,442	RAU 2005-Q48	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913465	5-Apr-05	\$	176,000	1	80%	100%	\$	220,000	5	188,356	RAU 2005-Q47	93%	117%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913509	31-Mar-05	\$	436,400	1	80%	90%	\$	545,500	5	529,063	RAU 2005-Q47	82%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913511	13-Apr-05	\$	178,400	1	80%	80%	\$	223,000	5	196,244	RAU 2005-Q47	91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913517	8-Apr-05	\$	141,600	1	80%	90%	\$	177,000	5	127,191	RAU 2005-Q48	111%	125%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913533	6-Apr-05	\$	204,500	1	70%	70%	\$	292,143	5	275,540	RAU 2005-Q47	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913537	5-Apr-05	\$	196,000	1	80%	90%	\$	245,000	5	235,521	RAU 2005-Q47	83%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913539	1-Apr-05	\$	115,200	1	80%	100%	\$	144,000	5	139,725	RAU 2005-Q47	89%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913543	17-Mar-05	\$	213,850	1	80%	100%	\$	267,313	5	207,819	RAU 2005-Q47	103%	129%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913541	5-Apr-05	\$	256,000	1	80%	100%	\$	320,000	5	288,931	RAU 2005-Q46	89%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913542	6-Apr-05	\$	488,000	1	80%	100%	\$	610,000	5	610,000	RAU 2005-Q46	61%	76%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913545	31-Mar-05	\$	359,650	1	79%	100%	\$	455,253	5	475,815	RAU 2005-Q48	76%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913541	5-Apr-05	\$	244,000	1	80%	80%	\$	303,000	5	240,149	RAU 2005-Q46	102%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913541	5-Apr-05	\$	508,000	1	80%	95%	\$	613,000	5	361,665	RAU 2005-Q46	94%	167%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913545	8-Apr-05	\$	284,000	1	80%	100%	\$	353,000	5	303,165	RAU 2005-Q46	84%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913549	11-Apr-05	\$	295,000	1	80%	95%	\$	368,750	5	350,000	RAU 2005-Q46	82%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913545	11-Apr-05	\$	303,600	1	80%	100%	\$	373,500	5	369,995	RAU 2005-Q48	88%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913545	11-Apr-05	\$	416,000	1	80%	100%	\$	520,000	5	470,093	RAU 2005-Q46	73%	73%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913549	12-Apr-05	\$	156,000	1	80%	80%	\$	195,000	5	213,534	RAU 2005-Q47	73%	73%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
99135473	6-Apr-05	\$	199,200	1	80%	90%	\$	249,000	5	264,388	RAU 2005-Q48	75%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
99135479	7-Apr-05	\$	464,000	1	80%	100%	\$	580,000	5	551,510	RAU 2005-Q46	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
99135481	13-Apr-05	\$	285,600	1	80%	90%	\$	357,000	5	374,277	RAU 2005-Q48	76%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913527	23-Mar-05	\$	224,000	1	79%	90%	\$	283,544	5	393,216	RAU 2005-Q47	96%	65%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913543	31-Mar-05	\$	94,500	1	76%	76%	\$	123,442	5	98,389	RAU 2005-Q47	84%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913545	5-Apr-05	\$	440,000	1	80%	100%	\$	550,000	5	522,418	RAU 2005-Q46	98%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913553	12-Mar-05	\$	255,200	1	80%	100%	\$	319,000	5	546,152	RAU 2005-Q46	79%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9913569	12-Apr-05	\$	431,200	1	80%	100%	\$	519,000	5	520,000	RAU 2005-Q47	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9929007	1-Apr-05	\$	517,000	1	74%	74%	\$	698,649	5	736,199	RFMSI 2005-S43	70%	70%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9929819	14-Apr-05	\$	107,900	1	80%	80%	\$	134,875	5	132,180	RAU 2005-Q47	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
9942973	28-Mar-05	\$	289,60															

9950089	3-May-05	\$	256.833	1	75%	90%	\$	300.000	\$	329.417	RAU 2005-QS13	68%	87%	0	
9950093	2-May-05	\$	305.466	1	80%	100%	\$	258.833	5	218.748	RAU 2005-QS9	94%	117%	0	
9950101	4-May-05	\$	480.000	1	72%	94%	\$	660.565	5	656.934	RAU 2005-QS1	75%	75%	0	Breach
9950105	11-May-05	\$	663.000	1	79%	94%	\$	800.000	5	779.608	RAU 2005-QS11	81%	96%	0	
9950109	5-May-05	\$	501.500	1	59%	93%	\$	353.980	5	332.576	RAU 2005-QS9	59%	59%	0	
9950119	4-May-05	\$	258.000	1	78%	95%	\$	272.797	5	704.407	RAU 2005-QS7	75%	75%	0	
9950121	10-May-05	\$	542.400	1	78%	78%	\$	641.026	5	570.58	RAU 2005-QS9	88%	88%	0	
9950135	9-May-05	\$	302.000	1	80%	100%	\$	302.936	5	321.600	RAU 2005-QS7	75%	94%	0	Breach
9950137	9-May-05	\$	272.000	1	73%	73%	\$	368.863	5	339.403	RAU 2005-QS10	80%	80%	0	
9950141	4-May-05	\$	308.000	1	80%	100%	\$	539.950	5	368.326	RAU 2005-QS7	84%	105%	0	
9950143	28-Apr-05	\$	431.960	1	80%	100%	\$	539.950	5	463.189	RAU 2005-QS7	93%	117%	0	Breach
9950157	3-May-05	\$	228.400	1	79%	79%	\$	286.382	5	478.946	RAU 2005-QS7	82%	102%	0	Breach
9950159	9-May-05	\$	228.400	1	79%	79%	\$	286.382	5	247.619	RAU 2005-QS10	91%	91%	0	Breach
9950165	4-May-05	\$	225.000	1	80%	80%	\$	275.000	5	181.771	RAU 2005-QS10	121%	121%	0	Breach
9950167	17-May-05	\$	204.600	1	80%	100%	\$	255.750	5	218.277	RAU 2005-QS9	94%	117%	0	Breach
9950229	5-May-05	\$	151.238	1	80%	100%	\$	189.048	5	156.660	RAU 2005-QS9	97%	121%	0	Breach
9950231	9-May-05	\$	131.200	1	80%	100%	\$	164.000	5	155.779	RAU 2005-QS7	84%	105%	0	Breach
9950263	13-May-05	\$	260.100	1	90%	90%	\$	289.000	5	264.033	RAU 2005-QS7	98%	99%	0	
9950271	11-May-05	\$	191.800	1	70%	70%	\$	274.000	5	104.474	RAU 2005-QS7	184%	184%	0	Breach
9950273	11-May-05	\$	191.800	1	70%	70%	\$	274.000	5	344.325	RAU 2005-QS7	56%	56%	0	
9950289	9-May-05	\$	265.500	1	90%	90%	\$	265.000	5	281.895	RAU 2005-QS7	95%	95%	1	
9950309	2-May-05	\$	443.000	1	80%	100%	\$	565.000	5	528.166	RAU 2005-QS7	86%	107%	0	
9950319	16-May-05	\$	200.000	1	42%	42%	\$	476.190	5	457.721	RAU 2005-QS15	44%	44%	0	
9950327	11-May-05	\$	252.660	1	80%	100%	\$	315.823	5	301.869	RAU 2005-QS8	84%	105%	0	
9960401	5-May-05	\$	267.200	1	80%	100%	\$	334.000	5	309.406	RAU 2005-QS8	86%	108%	0	
9960405	4-May-05	\$	399.960	1	80%	100%	\$	489.950	5	509.024	RAU 2005-QS8	93%	124%	0	Breach
9960447	28-Apr-05	\$	177.300	1	80%	100%	\$	221.623	5	216.554	RAU 2005-QS8	82%	102%	0	
9960453	10-May-05	\$	93.600	1	80%	95%	\$	117.000	5	110.288	RAU 2005-QS8	85%	101%	0	
9960475	11-May-05	\$	200.000	1	80%	95%	\$	250.000	5	254.351	RMFSI 2005-QA3	79%	93%	0	
9960483	3-May-05	\$	300.800	1	80%										

9961817	16-May-05	\$	150,775	1	80%	90%	\$	188,469	5	175,316	RAU 2005-QA12	86%	97%	0					
9961829	17-May-05	\$	528,000	1	80%	80%	\$	660,000	5	663,735	RAU 2005-QA8	80%	80%	0					
9961839	17-May-05	\$	171,200	1	80%	100%	\$	214,000	5	136,400	RAU 2005-QA9	126%	157%	0					
9961845	18-May-05	\$	128,000	1	80%	100%	\$	325,000	5	320,670	RAU 2005-QA8	81%	100%	0					
9961851	5-May-05	\$	280,000	1	80%	98%	\$	160,000	5	160,348	RAU 2005-QA9	80%	100%	0					
9961851	10-May-05	\$	280,000	1	80%	98%	\$	353,000	5	282,021	RAU 2005-QA8	99%	122%	0					
9961863	5-May-05	\$	311,200	1	80%	100%	\$	389,000	5	392,108	RAU 2005-QA8	79%	99%	1					
9961881	2-May-05	\$	485,600	1	80%	80%	\$	385,000	5	372,708	RAU 2005-QA8	83%	83%	0					
9961887	10-May-05	\$	607,000	1	80%	100%	\$	607,000	5	536,779	RAU 2005-QA8	91%	113%	0					
9971819	23-May-05	\$	398,797	1	80%	80%	\$	409,486	5	396,161	RFMS 2005-S5	101%	101%	0					
9991319	6-Jun-05	\$	324,800	1	80%	100%	\$	405,000	5	376,322	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	108%	0					
9991513	10-Jun-05	\$	488,350	1	80%	90%	\$	610,438	5	535,012	RAU 2005-QA9	91%	103%	0					
9991513	10-Jun-05	\$	359,650	1	80%	80%	\$	449,563	5	372,006	RAU 2005-QA9	97%	97%	0					
9991613	10-Jun-05	\$	275,000	1	58%	58%	\$	474,138	5	463,170	RAU 2005-QA9	108%	121%	0					
9991613	2-Jun-05	\$	214,000	1	80%	90%	\$	225,000	5	167,055	RAU 2005-QA9	59%	59%	0					
9991613	2-Jun-05	\$	180,000	1	80%	80%	\$	267,500	5	223,443	RAU 2005-QA9	96%	96%	0					
9991613	2-Jun-05	\$	214,000	1	80%	80%	\$	224,900	5	182,816	RAU 2005-QA9	98%	111%	0					
9991617	2-Jun-05	\$	179,920	1	80%	90%	\$	492,958	5	486,682	RAU 2005-QA9	72%	72%	0					
9991617	2-Jun-05	\$	350,000	1	71%	71%	\$	302,500	5	290,015	RAU 2005-QA9	83%	104%	0					
9991617	6-Jun-05	\$	242,000	1	80%	80%	\$	208,000	5	158,689	RAU 2005-QA9	105%	105%	0					
9991811	7-Jun-05	\$	166,400	1	80%	80%	\$	393,000	5	361,607	RAU 2005-QA9	87%	109%	1					
9991919	10-Jun-05	\$	314,400	1	80%	100%	\$	372,500	5	364,692	RAU 2005-QA6	82%	102%	0					
9991919	2-Jun-05	\$	298,000	1	80%	100%	\$	396,000	5	430,941	RAU 2005-QA6	74%	92%	0					
9991919	2-Jun-05	\$	316,800	1	80%	100%	\$	258,000	5	229,099	RAU 2005-QA11	90%	90%	0					
9991920	7-Jun-05	\$	206,400	1	80%	80%	\$	285,000	5	231,884	RAU 2005-QA9	98%	98%	1					
9991920	9-Jun-05	\$	228,000	1	80%	80%	\$	292,590	5	300,049	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	2-Jun-05	\$	234,360	1	80%	90%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	78%	88%	0					
9991923	10-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	345,000	5	302,661	RAU 2005-QA13	91%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	276,000	1	80%	100%	\$	449,563	5	419,619	RAU 2005-QA9	86%	107%	0					
9991923	8-Jun-05	\$	27																

996725	26-May-05	\$	376,000	1	80%	93%	\$	470,000	5	482,222	RAU 2005-Q49	78%	91%	0					
996731	26-May-05	\$	114,000	1	80%	100%	\$	147,500	5	144,296	RAU 2005-Q49	82%	102%	0					
996737	26-May-05	\$	228,000	1	80%	80%	\$	305,000	5	277,930	RAU 2005-Q49	88%	88%	0					
996749	26-May-05	\$	262,000	1	80%	100%	\$	325,000	5	257,052	RAU 2005-Q49	101%	126%	0					
996753	27-May-05	\$	210,000	1	80%	80%	\$	265,000	5	221,050	RAU 2005-Q49	96%	96%	0					
996753	27-May-05	\$	200,800	1	80%	100%	\$	251,000	5	254,590	RAU 2005-Q49	79%	99%	0					
996753	27-May-05	\$	375,000	1	80%	100%	\$	440,000	5	267,133	RAU 2005-Q49	112%	140%	0					
996757	27-May-05	\$	352,000	1	80%	100%	\$	440,000	5	419,660	RAU 2005-Q49	84%	105%	0					
996769	27-May-05	\$	224,000	1	80%	100%	\$	280,000	5	249,226	RAU 2005-Q49	90%	90%	0					
996771	27-May-05	\$	160,162	1	80%	100%	\$	202,033	5	388,157	RAU 2005-Q49	88%	109%	0					
996771	27-May-05	\$	344,400	1	80%	100%	\$	418,000	5	374,843	RAU 2005-Q49	89%	103%	0					
996783	27-May-05	\$	252,000	1	80%	100%	\$	315,000	5	305,220	RAU 2005-Q49	82%	103%	0					
996787	27-May-05	\$	334,400	1	80%	100%	\$	418,000	5	322,025	RAU 2005-Q49	89%	112%	0					
996789	27-May-05	\$	439,200	1	80%	100%	\$	549,000	5	571,944	RAU 2005-Q49	77%	96%	0					
996801	27-May-05	\$	182,800	1	80%	100%	\$	228,500	5	212,095	RAU 2005-Q49	96%	120%	0					
996807	27-May-05	\$	449,300	1	80%	83%	\$	561,625	5	517,607	RFMS 2005-S44	86%	108%	0					
996821	27-May-05	\$	420,000	1	80%	100%	\$	525,000	5	571,450	RAU 2005-Q49	81%	92%	0					
996827	27-May-05	\$	174,000	1	80%	95%	\$	175,000	5	139,971	RAU 2005-Q49	100%	101%	0					
1000071	24-May-05	\$	248,000	1	80%	90%	\$	310,000	5	241,931	RAU 2005-Q512	103%	115%	0					
1000075	24-May-05	\$	500,000	1	77%	81%	\$	684,932	5	664,372	RAU 2005-Q512	75%	84%	0					
1000078	24-May-05	\$	270,502	1	67%	67%	\$	403,734	5	462,622	RAU 2005-Q512	58%	58%	0					
1000079	24-May-05	\$	351,000	1	65%	65%	\$	540,000	5	380,926	RAU 2005-Q512	92%	92%	0					
1000080	24-May-05	\$	85,600	1	80%	100%	\$	107,000	5	96,370	RAU 2005-Q512	89%	111%	0					
1000083	24-May-05	\$	164,700	1	90%	90%	\$	183,000	5	176,518	RAU 2005-Q512	113%	93%	1					
1000083	24-May-05	\$	102,113	1	80%	100%	\$	127,641	5	90,298	RAU 2005-Q512	112%	141%	0					
1000087	24-May-05	\$	378,502	1	66%	66%	\$	573,488	5	535,144	RAU 2005-Q513	71%	71%	0					
1000087	24-May-05	\$	80,000	1	55%	55%	\$	145,455	5	178,879	RAU 2005-Q512	45%	45%	0					
1000087	24-May-05	\$	240,000	1	80%	80%	\$	300,000	5	261,068	RAU 2005-Q512	92%	92%	0					
1000085	24-May-05	\$	146,000	1	80%	100%	\$	182,500	5	169,742	RAU 2005-Q512	86%	108%	0					
1000086	24-May-05	\$	525,000	1	70%	70%	\$	750,000	5	646,697	RAU 2005-Q512	81%	81%	0					
1000083	24-May-05	\$	123,900	1	80%	100%	\$	154,875	5	174,409	RAU 2005-Q512	71%	89%	0					
1000087	24-May-05	\$	410,000	1	79%	79%	\$	518,987	5	422,407	RAU 2005-Q512	97%	97%	0					
1000090	24-May-05	\$	212,000	1	80%	95%	\$	265,000	5	194,668	RAU 2005-Q512	109%	129%	0					
1000091	24-May-05	\$	288,757	1	80%	100%	\$	360,946	5	374,553	RAU 2005-Q512	77%	90%	0					
1000092	24-May-05	\$	226,833	1	80%	80%	\$	283,541	5	253,390	RAU 2005-Q512	90%	90%	0					
1000093	24-May-05	\$	172,000	1	80%	100%	\$	215,000	5	167,000	RAU 2005-Q512	85%	110%	0					
1000093	24-May-05	\$	172,000	1	65%	65%	\$	255,000	5	415,637	RAU 2005-Q512	103%	103%	0					
1000093	24-May-05	\$	172,000	1	80%	100%	\$	215,000	5	89,038	RAU 2005-Q512	193%	61%	0					
1000093	24-May-05	\$	556,000	1	65%	65%	\$	855,385	5	934,706	RAU 2005-Q514	59%	59%	0					
1000093	24-May-05	\$	192,800	1	80%	80%	\$	241,000	5	219,667	RAU 2005-Q514	88%	88%	0					
1000094	24-May-05	\$	514,000	1	80%	80%	\$	642,500	5	697,702	RAU 2005-Q512	74%	74%	0					
1000047	10-Jun-05	\$	140,000	1	80%	80%	\$	175,000	5	94,492	RAU 2005-Q512	148%	148%	1					
1000053	10-Jun-05	\$	110,400	1	80%	100%	\$	138,000	5	109,187	RAU 2005-Q512	101%	126%	0					
1000057	10-Jun-05	\$	208,000	1	80%	90%	\$	260,000	5	304,932	RAU 2005-Q512	68%	77%	0					
1000061	10-Jun-05	\$	400,000	1	78%	98%	\$	512,821	5	525,933	RAU 2005-Q512	76%	96%	1					
1000061	10-Jun-05	\$	216,000	1	80%	100%	\$	270,000	5	170,842	RAU 2005-Q512	126%	158%	0					
1000065	13-Jun-05	\$	216,000	1	80%	100%	\$	270,000	5	290,288	RAU 2005-Q512	74%	74%	0					
1000087	16-Jun-05	\$	154,400	1	80%	100%	\$	193,000	5	171,765	RAU 2005-Q512	90%	112%	0					
1000089	4-May-05	\$	192,000	1	80%	80%	\$	240,000	5	168,405	RAU 2005-Q512	114%	114%	0					
1000093	7-Jun-05	\$	150,000	1	75%	75%	\$	200,000	5	216,913	RFMS 2005-H58	69%	69%	0					
1000095	10-Jun-05	\$	160,000	1	80%	80%	\$	200,000	5	228,463	RFMS 2005-H58	70%	70%	0					
1000101	14-Jun-05	\$	136,000	1	80%	100%	\$	170,000	5	128,462	RAU 2005-Q512	106%	133%	0					
1000103	7-Jun-05	\$	559,200	1	80%	100%	\$	699,000	5	706,452	RAU 2005-Q512	79%	79%	0					
1000103	19-May-05	\$	184,000	1	80%	80%	\$	230,000	5	213,407	RAU 2005-Q517	86%	86%	0					
1000104	9-May-05	\$	420,000	1	75%	75%	\$	560,000	5	581,716	RAU 2005-Q512	72%	72%	0					
1000109	23-May-05	\$	488,000	1	80%	80%	\$	610,000	5	590,086	RAU 2005-Q512	74%	74%	0					
1000107	24-May-05	\$	319,200	1	80%	87%	\$	399,000	5	650,520	RAU 2005-Q512	75%	82%	0					
1000109	24-May-05	\$	244,000	1	80%	80%	\$	305,000	5	311,131	RAU 2005-Q512	103%	103%	0					
1000109	24-May-05	\$	582,150	1	80%	80%	\$	739,000	5	307,930	RAU 2005-Q512	79%	79%	0					
1003258	16-Jun-05	\$	58,215	2	10%	91%	\$	539,374	5	539,373	RFMS 2005-H51	11%	98%	0					
1003259	16-Jun-05	\$	100,000	2	10%	86%	\$	519,374	5	485,456	RFMS 2005-H51	21%	96%	0					
1003297	16-Jun-05	\$	47,800	2	20%	100%	\$	219,000	5	151,447	RFMS 2005-H51	31%	15%	0					
1003299	16-Jun-05	\$	67,800	2	24%	100%	\$	282,964	5	151,480	RFMS 2005-H51	45%	187%	0					
1003263	2-Jun-05	\$	39,600	2	20%	100%	\$	198,000	5	195,539	RFMS 2005-H51	20%	101%	0					
1003263	2-Jun-05	\$	29,000	2	10%	90%	\$	290,000	5	244,778	RFMS 2005-H51	12%	107%	0					
1003261	23-May-05	\$	31,500	2	15%	95%	\$	210,000	5	200,946	RFMS 2005-H51	16%	99%	0					
1003265	22-Jun-05	\$	85,000	2	20%	100%	\$	425,000	5	277,614	RFMS 2005-H51	31%	153%	0					
1003265	3-Jun-05	\$	62,020	2	20%	100%	\$	310,100	5	246,181	RFMS 2005-H51	25%	126%	0					
1003269	3-Jun-05	\$	34,900	2	10%	90%	\$	474,000	5	360,917	RFMS 2005-H51	10%	87%	0					
1003265	3-Jun-05	\$	94,000	2	20%	90%	\$	349,000	5	386,440	RFMS 2005-H51	24%	110%	0					
1003269	6-Jun-05	\$	45,700	2	10%	100%	\$	228,500	5	212,095	RFMS 2005-H51	22%	108%	0					
1003265	2-Jun-05	\$	26,400	2	10%	90%	\$	264,529	5	182,111	RFMS 2005-H51	14%	131%	0					
1003265	2-Jun-05	\$	19,500	2	10%	90%	\$	194,076	5	184,824	RFMS 2005-H51	10%	95%	1					
1003269	3-Jun-05	\$	38,500	2	10%	90%	\$	385,000	5	363,487	RFMS 2005-H51	11%	95%	0					
1003271	23-Jun-05	\$	21,400	2	20%	100%	\$	247,500	5	240,000	RFMS 2005-H51	21%	103%	0					
1003272	3-Jun-05	\$	21,400	2	20%	100%	\$	107,000	5	96,370	RFMS 2005-H51	22%	111%	0					
1003274	6-Jun-05	\$	50,500	2	11%	90%	\$	455,776	5	475,492	RFMS 2005-H51	11%	86%	0					
1003275	8-Jun-05	\$	38,000	2	10%	90%	\$	380,000	5	330,457	RFMS 2005-H51	11%	103%	0					
1003278	24-Jun-05	\$	2																

10032831	21-Jun-05	\$	44,100	2	10%	\$	441,000	5	427,470	RMFS2 2005-HS1	10%	93%	0						
10032849	28-Jun-05	\$	32,000	2	20%	\$	160,000	5	116,082	RMFS2 2005-HS1	28%	138%	0	Breach	Breach				
10034581	10-Jun-05	\$	530,400	1	80%	\$	663,000	5	646,580	RAU 2005-OS13	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach				
10034591	16-Jun-05	\$	215,400	1	77%	\$	279,740	5	151,480	RAMP 2005-HS8	142%	185%	0	Breach	Breach				
10034601	9-Jun-05	\$	420,000	1	80%	\$	525,000	5	522,714	RAU 2005-OS12	80%	80%	0			Breach	Breach		
10034603	16-Jun-05	\$	294,650	1	80%	\$	368,313	5	356,000	RAMP 2005-HS8	83%	103%	0						
10034605	26-May-05	\$	265,300	1	80%	\$	331,625	5	306,405	RMFS1 2005-S44	87%	87%	0						
10034607	17-Jun-05	\$	165,000	1	72%	\$	229,167	5	205,446	RAU 2005-OS14	80%	80%	0			Breach			
10034609	2-Jun-05	\$	384,000	1	80%	\$	460,000	5	435,442	RMFS1 2005-S44	84%	84%	0						
10034615	16-Jun-05	\$	180,300	1	90%	\$	204,000	5	158,407	RAU 2005-OS13	116%	116%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034617	16-Jun-05	\$	480,300	1	80%	\$	600,375	5	698,405	RAU 2005-OS14	69%	69%	0						
10034619	20-Jun-05	\$	303,920	1	80%	\$	379,900	5	309,048	RAU 2005-OS12	98%	123%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034639	3-Jun-05	\$	235,000	1	70%	\$	335,714	5	265,506	RAU 2005-OS14	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034655	31-May-05	\$	359,600	1	76%	\$	473,158	5	413,740	RAU 2005-HS8	87%	87%	0	Breach	Breach				
10034665	9-Jun-05	\$	208,000	1	90%	\$	423,000	5	370,642	RMFS1 2005-S44	104%	104%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034673	1-Jun-05	\$	400,000	1	89%	\$	449,458	5	272,708	RAU 2005-OS13	76%	95%	0			Breach	Breach		
10034675	16-Jun-05	\$	350,000	1	75%	\$	466,667	5	317,708	RMFS1 2005-S44	126%	126%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034685	24-Jun-05	\$	146,400	1	80%	\$	183,000	5	390,970	RAU 2005-OS13	90%	90%	0			Breach	Breach		
10034693	15-Jun-05	\$	480,300	1	73%	\$	589,452	5	139,072	RAU 2005-OS13	105%	131%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034699	17-Jun-05	\$	264,000	1	80%	\$	330,000	5	468,052	RAU 2005-OS12	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034707	21-Jun-05	\$	257,000	1	80%	\$	321,250	5	267,821	RAU 2005-OS13	99%	123%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034721	14-Jun-05	\$	316,000	1	61%	\$	518,033	5	321,663	RAU 2005-OS13	80%	80%	0			Breach			
10034727	21-Jun-05	\$	161,600	1	80%	\$	202,000	5	547,761	RAMP 2005-HS8	58%	58%	0			Breach			
10034733	23-Jun-05	\$	520,000	1	80%	\$	650,000	5	173,072	RAU 2005-OS16	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034745	22-Jun-05	\$	215,000	1	63%	\$	341,270	5	333,983	RAU 2005-OS12	156%	195%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034751	9-Jun-05	\$	479,150	1	78%	\$	833,333	5	369,881	RAU 2005-OS13	58%	58%	0			Breach			
10034753	17-Jun-05	\$	159,757	1	80%	\$	199,696	5	455,130	RAU 2005-OS12	105%	103%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034769	22-Jun-05	\$	350,533	1	76%	\$	463,228	5	120,189	RAMP 2005-HS8	133%	166%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034775	16-Jun-05	\$	250,000	1	30%	\$	83,333	5	391,746	RAU 2005-OS14	89%	32%	0			Breach			
10034783	17-Jun-05	\$	550,000	1	64%	\$	859,375	5	846,696	RAU 2005-OS13	65%	65%	0						
10034785	23-Jun-05	\$	472,000	1	80%	\$	590,000	5	617,173	RAU 2005-OS12	76%	96%	0			Breach			
10034807	20-Jun-05	\$	291,200	1	80%	\$	364,000	5	317,733	RMFS1 2005-S45	92%	103%	0			Breach			
10034819	21-Jun-05	\$	199,800	1	90%	\$	222,000	5	183,001	RAMP 2005-HS8	109%	109%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034827	24-Jun-05	\$	448,000	1	80%	\$	560,000	5	502,843	RAU 2005-OS12	89%	111%	0			Breach			
10034829	27-Jun-05	\$	443,200	1	80%	\$	554,000	5	494,637	RMFS1 2005-S44	90%	101%	0			Breach			
10034841	22-Jun-05	\$	264,000	1	89%	\$	296,629	5	243,179	RAU 2005-OS13	109%	109%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034847	29-Jun-05	\$	186,320	1	80%	\$	232,900	5	157,748	RAU 2005-OS13	118%	148%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034889	30-Jun-05	\$	199,200	1	80%	\$	249,000	5	196,871	RAU 2005-OS13	101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034897	28-Jun-05	\$	265,600	1	80%	\$	332,000	5	309,688	RAU 2005-OS13	86%	107%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034901	30-Jun-05	\$	424,000	1	80%	\$	530,000	5	420,000	RAU 2005-OS13	101%	126%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034913	30-Jun-05	\$	222,300	1	90%	\$	247,000	5	223,033	RAU 2005-OS13	100%	100%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034919	28-Jun-05	\$	386,000	1	80%	\$	420,000	5	417,895	RAU 2005-OS10	80%	90%	0						
10034923	7-Jul-05	\$	479,200	1	80%	\$	599,000	5	563,204	RAU 2005-OS10	85%	106%	1			Breach			
10034925	6-Jul-05	\$	248,000	1	80%	\$	310,000	5	235,492	RAU 2005-OS10	105%	132%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034929	7-Jul-05	\$	164,000	1	80%	\$	205,000	5	183,749	RAMP 2005-HS8	89%	100%	0			Breach			
10034933	5-Jul-05	\$	319,254	1	80%	\$	399,068	5	400,608	RAU 2005-HS8	80%	100%	0			Breach			
10034935	28-Jun-05	\$	262,500	1	79%	\$	332,278	5	288,615	RAU 2005-OS10	91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034945	27-Jun-05	\$	585,600	1	80%	\$	732,000	5	834,754	RAU 2005-OS10	70%	88%	0						
10034947	5-Jul-05	\$	380,000	1	80%	\$	475,000	5	476,054	RAU 2005-OS10	80%	100%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034955	13-Jul-05	\$	333,690	1	80%	\$	415,863	5	391,762	RAU 2005-OS10	85%	106%	0						
10034957	29-Jun-05	\$	226,400	1	80%	\$	283,000	5	222,941	RAU 2005-OS11	102%	127%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034961	5-Jul-05	\$	448,000	1	80%	\$	560,000	5	554,207	RAU 2005-OS10	81%	81%	0			Breach			
10034965	29-Jun-05	\$	388,000	1	80%	\$	485,000	5	454,232	RAU 2005-OS10	85%	107%	0			Breach			
10034969	5-Jul-05	\$	283,200	1	80%	\$	354,000	5	292,910	RAMP 2005-HS8	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034987	10-Jul-05	\$	244,000	1	80%	\$	305,000	5	514,884	RAU 2005-OS10	85%	107%	0			Breach			
10034989	30-Jun-05	\$	180,000	1	80%	\$	225,000	5	201,520	RAMP 2005-HS8	121%	129%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034993	7-Jul-05	\$	180,000	1	80%	\$	225,000	5	173,628	RAU 2005-OS11	104%	117%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034995	7-Jul-05	\$	180,000	1	80%	\$	225,000	5	173,628	RAU 2005-OS10	104%	117%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10034997	8-Jul-05	\$	320,000	1	80%	\$	400,000	5	429,655	RAU 2005-OS10	75%	81%	0			Breach			
10035001	8-Jul-05	\$	338,400	1	80%	\$	423,000	5	351,437	RAU 2005-OS10	96%	120%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10035009	6-Jul-05	\$	460,000	1	80%	\$	575,000	5	351,773	RAU 2005-OS10	131%	164%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10035011	5-Jul-05	\$	464,469	1	80%	\$	580,586	5	597,212	RAU 2005-OS10	78%	97%	0						
10035015	30-Jun-05	\$	310,000	1	80%	\$	387,500	5	375,994	RAU 2005-OS10	83%	103%	1						
10035035	6-Jul-05	\$	226,000	1	80%	\$	295,000	5	332,310	RAU 2005-OS10	71%	84%	0						
10035037	8-Jul-05	\$	120,000	1	80%	\$	150,000	5	188,741	RAU 2005-OS10	64%	79%	0						
10035039	11-Jul-05	\$	383,200	1	80%	\$	479,000	5	422,600	RAU 2005-OS10	91%	113%	0			Breach			
10035041	13-Jul-05	\$	311,200	1	80%	\$	389,000	5	367,195	RAU 2005-OS10	80%	100%	0			Breach			
10035059	20-Jun-05	\$	586,980	1	80%	\$	733,725	5	764,791	RMFS1 2005-S44	77%	86%	0						
10035061	29-Jun-05	\$	333,726	1	80%	\$	415,908	5	344,290	RAU 2005-OS10	97%	121%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10035063	29-Jun-05	\$	220,400	1	80%	\$	288,000	5	302,925	RAU 2005-OS10	76%	95%	0						
10035065	5-May-05	\$	220,000	1	80%	\$	275,000	5	267,228	RAU 2005-OS10	82%	98%	0						
10035071	29-Jun-05	\$	273,650	1	80%	\$	342,063	5	431,089	RAMP 2005-HS8	64%	80%	0			Breach			
10035073	22-Jun-05	\$	396,000	1	80%	\$	495,000	5	287,544	RAU 2005-OS10	92%	101%	0			Breach			
10035095	21-Jun-05	\$	226,400	1	80%	\$	283,000	5	255,468	RAU 2005-OS10	77%	92%	0						
10035097	27-Jun-05	\$	454,310	1	80%	\$	567,888	5	530,934	RAU 2005-OS10	86%	107%	0						
10035103	13-Jul-05	\$	534,000	1	75%	\$	712,000	5	617,821	RMFS1 2005-S44	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10035107	5-Jul-05	\$	150,400	1	80%	\$	188,000	5	157,617	RAU 2005-OS10	95%	119%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10035115	23-Jun-05	\$	292,000	1	80%</														

10050131	30-Jun-05	\$	260,000	1	64%	64%	\$	405,250	5	427.976	RAU 2005-Q49	61%	61%	0					
10050143	30-Jun-05	\$	193,000	1	71%	71%	\$	271,881	5	214.276	RMAS 2005-S44	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
10077757	18-Jul-05	\$	42,500	2	10%	90%	\$	425,000	5	415.728	RMAS 2005-S44	10%	92%	0					
10077765	8-Jul-05	\$	81,900	2	10%	100%	\$	409,950	5	360.535	RMAS 2005-H51	23%	114%	0		Breach			
10077767	20-Jul-05	\$	97,500	2	15%	90%	\$	650,000	5	690.013	RMAS 2005-H51	14%	85%	0					
10077777	21-Jul-05	\$	51,700	2	10%	90%	\$	517,000	5	498.477	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	93%	0					
10077783	15-Jul-05	\$	25,000	2	4%	85%	\$	752,500	5	611.748	RMAS 2005-H51	5%	105%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077801	22-Jul-05	\$	25,000	2	6%	87%	\$	400,000	5	350,000	RMAS 2005-H51	7%	99%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077805	26-Jul-05	\$	74,000	2	20%	100%	\$	370,000	5	444.225	RMAS 2005-H51	17%	83%	0					
10077809	25-Jul-05	\$	21,250	2	9%	90%	\$	216,111	5	173.777	RMAS 2005-H51	12%	126%	1		Breach	Breach		
10077821	22-Jul-05	\$	83,400	2	15%	100%	\$	438,947	5	407.528	RMAS 2005-H51	20%	108%	0					
10077831	19-Jul-05	\$	19,000	2	15%	90%	\$	181,454	5	140,000	RMAS 2005-H52	19%	123%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077839	25-Jul-05	\$	46,900	2	10%	90%	\$	469,000	5	407.714	RMAS 2005-H51	12%	104%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077845	27-Jul-05	\$	115,000	2	20%	100%	\$	575,000	5	152.730	RMAS 2005-H51	25%	123%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077849	22-Jul-05	\$	38,750	2	20%	100%	\$	193,944	5	132.200	RMAS 2005-H51	25%	127%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077855	7-Jul-05	\$	24,000	2	10%	90%	\$	240,000	5	242,000	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	89%	0					
10077861	15-Jul-05	\$	57,000	2	20%	100%	\$	285,000	5	268.522	RMAS 2005-H51	21%	106%	0					
10077877	25-Jul-05	\$	81,500	2	10%	90%	\$	815,000	5	775,000	RMAS 2005-H51	11%	95%	0					
10077887	11-Jul-05	\$	68,285	2	19%	100%	\$	319,395	5	382.802	RMAS 2005-H51	18%	94%	0					
10077901	13-Jul-05	\$	44,200	2	10%	90%	\$	442,000	5	459.425	RMAS 2005-H51	34%	87%	0					
10077903	27-Jul-05	\$	76,000	2	20%	100%	\$	380,000	5	222.102	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	171%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077907	11-Jul-05	\$	51,000	2	9%	89%	\$	543,131	5	514.118	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	94%	1					
10077909	18-Jul-05	\$	42,500	2	10%	80%	\$	425,000	5	428.410	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	79%	0					
10077917	28-Jul-05	\$	42,600	2	20%	100%	\$	213,000	5	188.332	RMAS 2005-H51	23%	113%	1					
10077919	28-Jul-05	\$	71,000	2	15%	95%	\$	473,649	5	469.184	RMAS 2005-H51	15%	96%	1					
10077925	19-Jul-05	\$	47,200	2	20%	100%	\$	236,000	5	202.684	RMAS 2005-H51	23%	116%	1		Breach	Breach		
10077937	14-Jul-05	\$	71,600	2	20%	100%	\$	358,000	5	330.679	RMAS 2005-H51	22%	108%	0					
10077945	20-Jul-05	\$	42,400	2	26%	100%	\$	160,000	5	152.747	RMAS 2005-H51	27%	105%	0					
10077955	22-Jul-05	\$	71,400	2	20%	100%	\$	357,000	5	319.200	RMAS 2005-H51	22%	112%	0					
10077961	12-Jul-05	\$	100,000	2	21%	83%	\$	484,966	5	473.045	RMAS 2005-H51	21%	85%	0					
10077963	23-Jul-05	\$	47,500	2	10%	90%	\$	475,000	5	491.118	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	87%	1					
10077965	13-Jul-05	\$	59,500	2	10%	95%	\$	595,000	5	496.936	RMAS 2005-H51	12%	108%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077967	21-Jul-05	\$	92,250	2	15%	95%	\$	615,000	5	567.009	RMAS 2005-H51	16%	103%	0					
10077979	8-Jul-05	\$	121,000	2	23%	91%	\$	524,946	5	436.520	RMAS 2005-H51	28%	110%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077983	25-Jul-05	\$	50,000	2	20%	100%	\$	250,000	5	181.092	RMAS 2005-H51	28%	138%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077985	15-Jul-05	\$	96,000	2	21%	100%	\$	454,976	5	267.771	RMAS 2005-H51	36%	170%	0		Breach	Breach		
10077991	13-Jul-05	\$	51,000	2	10%	90%	\$	510,000	5	493.882	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	93%	0					
10078001	11-Jul-05	\$	87,609	2	19%	100%	\$	461,100	5	476.812	RMAS 2005-H51	18%	97%	0					
10078013	22-Jul-05	\$	64,389	2	9%	90%	\$	715,544	5	675.249	RMAS 2005-H51	10%	95%	0					
10078015	15-Jul-05	\$	36,900	2	10%	90%	\$	369,900	5	513.733	RMAS 2005-H51	28%	138%	0		Breach	Breach		
10078017	18-Jul-05	\$	142,000	2	20%	100%	\$	710,000	5	339.286	RMAS 2005-H51	11%	98%	0					
10078023	20-Jul-05	\$	59,800	2	20%	100%	\$	575,000	5	470.996	RMAS 2005-H51	24%	122%	0		Breach	Breach		
10078031	22-Jul-05	\$	59,800	2	36%	95%	\$	164,015	5	181.576	RMAS 2005-H51	33%	86%	0					
10078033	7-Jul-05	\$	50,200	2	10%	90%	\$	502,000	5	468.522	RMAS 2005-H51	11%	96%	1					
10078055	25-Jul-05	\$	86,430	2	19%	100%	\$	454,895	5	426.021	RMAS 2005-H51	20%	107%	0					
10078059	14-Jul-05	\$	153,000	2	20%	100%	\$	265,000	5	207.449	RMAS 2005-H51	26%	128%	0		Breach	Breach		
10078067	15-Jul-05	\$	145,000	2	20%	100%	\$	764,916	5	707.285	RMAS 2005-H51	21%	108%	0					
10078069	18-Jul-05	\$	35,900	2	20%	100%	\$	725,000	5	665.259	RMAS 2005-H51	21%	106%	0					
10078085	11-Jul-05	\$	35,900	2	10%	90%	\$	359,000	5	327.442	RMAS 2005-H51	11%	99%	0					
10078095	13-Jul-05	\$	34,000	2	10%	90%	\$	340,000	5	360.088	RMAS 2005-H51	9%	85%	0					
10078099	19-Jul-05	\$	79,900	2	20%	100%	\$	399,500	5	365.820	RMAS 2005-H51	22%	109%	0					
10078109	28-Jul-05	\$	73,800	2	20%	100%	\$	369,000	5	275.873	RMAS 2005-H51	17%	134%	0					
100100181	11-Jul-05	\$	40,500	2	15%	90%	\$	270,000	5	293.023	RMAS 2005-H51	24%	88%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100241	25-Jul-05	\$	34,000	2	10%	90%	\$	340,000	5	309.320	RMAS 2005-H51	11%	99%	0					
100100337	5-Jul-05	\$	14,500	2	14%	95%	\$	240,084	5	230.029	RMAS 2005-H51	15%	99%	0					
100100405	21-Jul-05	\$	15,000	2	2%	63%	\$	602,410	5	537.063	RMAS 2005-H51	3%	71%	0					
100100409	20-Jul-05	\$	68,400	2	20%	100%	\$	342,000	5	309.447	RMAS 2005-H51	22%	111%	0					
100100469	23-Aug-05	\$	125,000	1	56%	56%	\$	223,214	5	220.235	RAU 2005-Q315	57%	57%	0					
100100479	29-Aug-05	\$	96,400	1	80%	80%	\$	120,500	5	114.011	RAU 2005-Q315	85%	85%	0					
100100489	30-Aug-05	\$	232,000	1	80%	100%	\$	290,000	5	225.513	RAU 2005-Q315	103%	129%	0					
100100639	24-Aug-05	\$	186,500	1	46%	46%	\$	405,435	5	342.633	RAU 2005-Q315	54%	54%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100613	26-Aug-05	\$	359,000	1	75%	75%	\$	473,667	5	400.854	RAU 2005-Q315	90%	90%	0					
100100613	17-Aug-05	\$	750,000	1	54%	54%	\$	1,388,889	5	1,463,569	RAU 2005-Q315	51%	51%	0					
100100613	16-Aug-05	\$	136,000	1	80%	80%	\$	170,000	5	139.106	RAU 2005-Q315	98%	98%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100619	25-Jul-05	\$	200,000	1	80%	100%	\$	250,000	5	181.092	RAU 2005-Q317	110%	138%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100619	3-Aug-05	\$	265,780	1	80%	100%	\$	332,225	5	291.604	RAU 2005-Q315	91%	114%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100619	22-Aug-05	\$	100,000	1	79%	94%	\$	125,582	5	94.211	RAU 2005-Q315	106%	126%	0		Breach	Breach		
1001006201	19-Aug-05	\$	214,844	1	51%	51%	\$	421,263	5	410.294	RAU 2005-Q315	52%	52%	0					
100100629	18-Aug-05	\$	125,000	1	68%	68%	\$	183,824	5	157.247	RAU 2005-Q316	79%	79%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100635	29-Aug-05	\$	230,400	1	80%	100%	\$	288,000	5	312.065	RAU 2005-Q315	74%	94%	0					
100100639	26-Aug-05	\$	239,900	1	80%	100%	\$	299,875	5	288.515	RAU 2005-Q315	83%	104%	0					
100100671	17-Aug-05	\$	186,800	1	80%	100%	\$	213,500	5	226.931	RAU 2005-Q315	73%	103%	0					
100100673	23-Aug-05	\$	396,106	1	80%	90%	\$	495,133	5	551.051	RAU 2005-Q315	82%	81%	0					
100100677	26-Aug-05	\$	353,050	1	78%	78%	\$	452,628	5	346.687	RAU 2005-Q315	102%	102%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100687	15-Aug-05	\$	552,000	1	80%	80%	\$	690,000	5	637.672	RAU 2005-Q315	87%	87%	0					
100100693	17-Aug-05	\$	125,500	1	80%	100%	\$	155,900	5	120.078	RAU 2005-Q315	70%	71%	0		Breach	Breach		
100100695	22-Aug-05	\$	480,357	1	80%	80%	\$	600,446	5	679.333	RAU 2005-Q315	105%	105%	0					
1001006317	24-Aug-05	\$	36,350	1	80%	80%	\$	45,438	5	55.722	RAU 2								

1016443	14-Sep-05	\$	121,600	1	80%	100%	\$	152,000	5	174,429	RAU 2005-QA11	70%	87%	0					
1016443	12-Sep-05	\$	248,800	1	80%	100%	\$	311,000	5	356,728	RAU 2005-QA11	70%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016446	9-Sep-05	\$	196,800	1	80%	100%	\$	246,000	5	191,550	RAU 2005-QA11	103%	129%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016446	10-Aug-05	\$	175,200	1	80%	100%	\$	219,000	5	248,689	RAU 2005-QA11	71%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016447	7-Sep-05	\$	274,400	1	80%	90%	\$	343,000	5	159,928	RAU 2005-QA11	172%	18%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016447	25-Jul-05	\$	461,950	1	80%	100%	\$	579,938	5	427,939	RAU 2005-QA13	109%	136%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016447	25-Jul-05	\$	250,000	1	80%	80%	\$	325,000	5	330,714	RAU 2005-QA11	79%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016448	25-Jul-05	\$	166,400	1	80%	80%	\$	208,000	5	185,003	RAU 2005-QA11	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016449	12-Sep-05	\$	156,800	1	80%	90%	\$	196,000	5	119,346	RAU 2005-QA11	131%	148%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016450	12-Sep-05	\$	181,600	1	80%	100%	\$	217,000	5	203,040	RAU 2005-QA11	93%	116%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016450	1-Sep-05	\$	221,900	1	80%	100%	\$	279,875	5	215,000	RAU 2005-QA11	81%	102%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016451	6-Sep-05	\$	495,000	1	80%	84%	\$	215,000	5	163,821	RAU 2005-QA11	105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016451	19-Aug-05	\$	172,000	1	70%	84%	\$	707,143	5	699,933	RAU 2005-QA11	71%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016452	12-Aug-05	\$	185,600	1	80%	100%	\$	680,000	5	483,350	RFMS 2005-S45	113%	141%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016452	31-Aug-05	\$	185,600	1	80%	100%	\$	232,079	5	204,457	RAU 2005-QA12	91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016459	9-Sep-05	\$	190,400	1	80%	100%	\$	525,000	5	499,066	RAU 2005-QA11	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016459	16-Sep-05	\$	190,400	1	80%	80%	\$	238,000	5	188,585	RAU 2005-QA11	101%	101%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016457	1-Sep-05	\$	241,447	1	77%	77%	\$	313,568	5	372,776	RAU 2005-QA11	132%	12%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016457	25-Aug-05	\$	359,600	1	80%	100%	\$	449,500	5	379,651	RAU 2005-QA11	95%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016457	6-Sep-05	\$	129,900	1	80%	49%	\$	571,429	5	581,422	RFMS 2005-S45	48%	48%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016459	25-Aug-05	\$	159,875	1	80%	90%	\$	162,375	5	139,680	RAU 2005-QA13	93%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016459	25-Aug-05	\$	175,200	1	80%	90%	\$	219,000	5	149,246	RAU 2005-QA11	84%	96%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016460	13-Sep-05	\$	354,800	1	80%	100%	\$	441,500	5	409,256	RAU 2005-QA11	87%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016460	25-Aug-05	\$	324,000	1	80%	100%	\$	405,000	5	386,254	RAU 2005-QA11	84%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016461	7-Sep-05	\$	135,200	1	80%	80%	\$	169,000	5	229,371	RAMP 2005-R59	59%	59%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016461	25-Aug-05	\$	224,800	1	80%	80%	\$	281,000	5	277,026	RAU 2005-QA11	91%	114%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016462	7-Sep-05	\$	260,695	1	80%	80%	\$	325,869	5	308,426	RAU 2005-QA13	85%	99%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016463	31-Aug-05	\$	158,339	1	80%	100%	\$	642,000	5	574,277	RAU 2005-QA11	89%	112%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016463	13-Sep-05	\$	285,507	1	80%	100%	\$	197,924	5	173,824	RAU 2005-QA11	91%	114%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016463	25-Aug-05	\$	395,000	1	78%	78%	\$	506,410	5	343,161	RAU 2005-QA11	83%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016464	8-Sep-05	\$	178,400	1	80%	80%	\$	223,000	5	228,838	RAU 2005-QA11	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016465	9-Sep-05	\$	357,520	1	80%	100%	\$	500,000	5	543,513	RFMS 2005-S45	51%	51%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016465	12-Sep-05	\$	277,000	1	80%	100%	\$	340,000	5	352,668	RAU 2005-R59	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016467	8-Sep-05	\$	359,650	1	70%	90%	\$	473,224	5	431,393	RAU 2005-QA11	83%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016467	31-Aug-05	\$	282,100	1	70%	70%	\$	403,000	5	372,368	RAU 2005-QA13	85%	76%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016468	7-Sep-05	\$	393,000	1	80%	100%	\$	491,250	5	461,537	RAU 2005-QA11	80%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016468	9-Sep-05	\$	476,000	1	80%	80%	\$	595,000	5	594,669	RAU 2005-QA11	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016469	9-Sep-05	\$	348,000	1	80%	100%	\$	660,000	5	627,982	RAU 2005-QA11	84%	105%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016470	7-Sep-05	\$	288,150	1	85%	85%	\$	435,000	5	483,401	RAU 2005-QA11	72%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016471	6-Sep-05	\$	291,200	1	80%	100%	\$	339,000	5	280,981	RAU 2005-QA11	103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016473	6-Sep-05	\$	269,142	1	80%	100%	\$	336,428	5	286,121	RAU 2005-QA11	102%	127%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016473	20-Sep-05	\$	385,000	1	69%	69%	\$	557,971	5	600,243	RFMS 2005-S17	64%	64%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016473	16-Sep-05	\$	470,180	1	80%	80%	\$	587,725	5	649,481	RFMS 2005-S8	72%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016477	12-Sep-05	\$	560,800	1	80%	80%	\$	701,000	5	599,358	RFMS 2005-S8	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016477	16-Sep-05	\$	508,000	1	80%	90%	\$	613,000	5	432,230	RFMS 2005-S8	118%	118%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1016477	17-Oct-05	\$	82,000	2	20%	100%	\$	410,000	5	569,709	RFMS 2005-H541	14%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1024778	5-Oct-05	\$	25,000	2	7%	88%	\$	335,121	5	301,454	RFMS 2005-H541	8%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1024778	25-Oct-05	\$	61,500	2	15%	95%	\$	410,000	5	194,392	RFMS 2005-H541	32%	200%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1024799	25-Oct-05	\$	44,550	2	15%	95%	\$	297,000	5	236,261	RFMS 2006-H541	19%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025151	17-Oct-05	\$	500,000	1	62%	62%	\$	806,462	5	748,101	RFMS 2005-S9	67%	67%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025153	17-Oct-05	\$	518,000	1	76%	76%	\$	681,579	5	623,425	RFMS 2005-S9	83%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025153	5-Oct-05	\$	520,604	1	80%	80%	\$	650,755	5	595,382	RAU 2005-Q517	87%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025153	19-Oct-05	\$	557,552	1	70%	70%	\$	795,503	5	807,861	RFMS 2005-S9	69%	69%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025153	5-Oct-05	\$	510,000	1	73%	73%	\$	698,630	5	729,177	RAU 2005-Q517	70%	70%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025154	19-Oct-05	\$	416,000	1	80%	80%	\$	520,000	5	570,351	RAU 2005-Q517	73%	73%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025154	21-Oct-05	\$	457,600	1	80%	80%	\$	572,000	5	567,504	RAU 2005-Q517	81%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025154	24-Oct-05	\$	628,000	1	80%	90%	\$	785,000	5	809,583	RAU 2005-Q517	78%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025154	17-Oct-05	\$	166,642	1	74%	74%	\$	225,192	5	197,300	RAU 2005-Q517	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025155	21-Oct-05	\$	467,000	1	72%	75%	\$	648,611	5	604,359	RAU 2005-Q517	77%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025155	14-Oct-05	\$	520,000	1	80%	80%	\$	650,000	5	575,998	RFMS 2005-S9	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	17-Oct-05	\$	424,000	1	78%	78%	\$	538,462	5	514,165	RFMS 2005-S9	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	17-Oct-05	\$	424,000	1	80%	95%	\$	530,000	5	505,854	RFMS 2005-S9	84%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	19-Oct-05	\$	644,000	1	80%	92%	\$	805,000	5	754,521	RFMS 2005-S9	85%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	26-Oct-05	\$	496,212	1	80%	80%	\$	620,465	5	541,665	RFMS 2005-S9	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	28-Oct-05	\$	568,000	1	80%	80%	\$	710,000	5	659,851	RFMS 2005-S9	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	1-Nov-05	\$	528,000	1	80%	95%	\$	660,000	5	614,677	RFMS 2005-S9	86%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	7-Nov-05	\$	384,000	1	79%	79%	\$	486,076	5	508,660	RFMS 2005-S9	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	27-Oct-05	\$	428,000	1	80%	90%	\$	535,000	5	589,214	RAU 2005-Q517	73%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	27-Oct-05	\$	321,472	1	75%	75%	\$	431,296	5	622,654	RFMS 2005-S9	52%	52%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1025157	27-Oct-05	\$	288,000	1	80%	80%	\$	360,000	5	372,368	RAU 2005-Q517	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1027810	2-Nov-05	\$	750,000	1	56%	75%	\$	1,339,286	5	1,288,766	RFMS 2005-S9	58%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1031442	16-Nov-05	\$	1,095,000	1	71%	71%	\$	1,542,254	5	1,223,168	RFMS 2005-S1	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1031442	21-Nov-05	\$	296,000	1	80%	90%	\$	370,000	5	346,208	RAU 2006-Q01	73%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1031443	21-Nov-05	\$	532,000	1	80%	90%	\$	665,000	5	733,215	RAU 2006-Q01	70%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1031443	21-Nov-05	\$	480,500	1	71%	71%	\$	606,338	5	586,527	RAU 2006-Q01	82%	70%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	

00311445	7-Nov-05	\$	290,000	1	64%	\$	453,125	5	477,994	RAU 2006-Q31	61%	61%	0	
00311449	22-Nov-05	\$	260,000	1	59%	\$	440,670	5	423,798	RAU 2006-Q01	61%	61%	0	
00311459	7-Nov-05	\$	510,000	1	73%	\$	698,680	5	631,287	RAU 2006-Q01	81%	81%	0	Breach
00311467	7-Nov-05	\$	584,354	1	80%	\$	730,441	5	704,776	RAU 2006-Q31	83%	83%	0	
00311467	1-Nov-05	\$	264,393	1	95%	\$	273,309	5	305,000	RAU 2006-Q06	87%	87%	0	
00311477	10-Nov-05	\$	176,000	1	80%	\$	220,000	5	136,008	RAU 2006-Q32	129%	129%	0	Breach
00311477	4-Nov-05	\$	276,000	1	72%	\$	411,111	5	399,245	RAU 2006-Q01	74%	74%	0	
00311489	21-Nov-05	\$	436,000	1	69%	\$	613,884	5	602,051	RAU 2006-Q01	72%	72%	0	
00311503	10-Nov-05	\$	332,000	1	80%	\$	415,000	5	410,486	RAU 2006-Q01	81%	91%	0	
00311509	18-Nov-05	\$	524,000	1	75%	\$	698,667	5	660,193	RAU 2006-Q31	79%	79%	0	
00311513	10-Nov-05	\$	407,000	1	63%	\$	646,032	5	532,768	RFMS1 2006-Q51	76%	76%	0	Breach
00311523	18-Nov-05	\$	453,000	1	75%	\$	580,000	5	501,599	RAU 2006-Q31	87%	87%	0	Breach
00311529	16-Nov-05	\$	532,000	1	80%	\$	665,000	5	462,333	RAU 2006-Q01	115%	129%	0	Breach
00311531	9-Nov-05	\$	281,116	1	80%	\$	351,395	5	412,611	RAU 2006-Q31	68%	77%	0	Breach
00311555	16-Nov-05	\$	600,000	1	80%	\$	750,000	5	529,437	RAU 2006-Q31	113%	113%	0	Breach
00311561	23-Nov-05	\$	194,750	1	80%	\$	243,438	5	213,527	RAU 2006-Q01	91%	91%	0	Breach
00311569	22-Nov-05	\$	350,000	1	70%	\$	500,000	5	352,327	RAU 2006-Q01	99%	99%	0	Breach
00311571	16-Nov-05	\$	840,000	1	69%	\$	1,217,391	5	965,401	RAU 2006-Q01	87%	87%	0	Breach
00311575	16-Nov-05	\$	415,000	1	63%	\$	658,730	5	613,830	RFMS1 2006-Q51	68%	68%	0	Breach
00311575	21-Nov-05	\$	649,900	1	73%	\$	890,274	5	967,576	RFMS1 2006-Q51	67%	67%	0	Breach
00311577	17-Nov-05	\$	548,000	1	80%	\$	685,000	5	585,538	RFMS1 2006-Q51	94%	94%	0	Breach
00311581	17-Nov-05	\$	280,000	1	80%	\$	350,000	5	300,000	RAU 2006-Q01	93%	93%	0	Breach
00311587	11-Nov-05	\$	469,000	1	70%	\$	670,000	5	815,059	RAU 2006-Q01	58%	58%	0	Breach
00311589	11-Nov-05	\$	640,000	1	80%	\$	800,000	5	765,019	RAU 2006-Q01	84%	84%	0	
00311599	10-Nov-05	\$	288,000	1	80%	\$	360,000	5	411,932	RAU 2006-Q01	70%	70%	0	
00311607	17-Nov-05	\$	226,800	1	80%	\$	296,000	5	274,774	RAU 2006-Q01	86%	86%	0	
00311611	18-Nov-05	\$	223,500	1	80%	\$	279,375	5	525,915	RAU 2006-Q01	81%	81%	0	
00311619	22-Nov-05	\$	336,800	1	80%	\$	421,000	5	452,251	RAU 2006-Q01	64%	69%	0	
00311625	22-Nov-05	\$	388,000	1	80%	\$	485,000	5	525,251	RAU 2006-Q01	86%	97%	0	
00311631	22-Nov-05	\$	284,000	1	80%	\$	355,000	5	363,032	RAU 2006-Q01	78%	88%	0	
00311633	21-Nov-05	\$	380,000	1	80%	\$	475,000	5	391,845	RAU 2006-Q01	97%	97%	0	Breach
00311633	26-Oct-05	\$	70,960	2	20%	\$	354,900	5	309,422	RFMS2 2006-H542	23%	23%	1	Breach
00311605	24-Oct-05	\$	96,600	2	19%	\$	504,966	5	514,784	RFMS2 2006-H542	19%	78%	0	
00311609	22-Nov-05	\$	60,000	2	10%	\$	600,000	5	586,527	RFMS2 2006-H542	10%	92%	0	
00311603	3-Nov-05	\$	75,000	2	15%	\$	507,442	5	486,407	RFMS2 2006-H542	15%	93%	0	
00311607	7-Nov-05	\$	121,400	2	10%	\$	1,240,041	5	724,887	RFMS2 2006-H542	17%	144%	0	Breach
00311601	31-Oct-05	\$	32,500	2	10%	\$	325,000	5	290,106	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	101%	0	Breach
00311603	31-Oct-05	\$	49,025	2	9%	\$	544,722	5	508,297	RFMS2 2006-H542	10%	96%	0	
00311605	8-Nov-05	\$	71,800	2	20%	\$	170,000	5	439,520	RFMS2 2006-H542	16%	82%	0	
00311601	31-Oct-05	\$	71,625	2	15%	\$	477,500	5	434,440	RFMS2 2006-H542	16%	104%	0	Breach
00311606	26-Oct-05	\$	29,500	2	10%	\$	295,000	5	365,382	RFMS2 2006-H542	8%	73%	0	
00311605	27-Oct-05	\$	20,000	2	9%	\$	221,976	5	199,351	RFMS2 2006-H542	10%	100%	0	Breach
00311609	26-Oct-05	\$	88,500	2	20%	\$	442,500	5	432,333	RFMS2 2006-H542	20%	102%	0	Breach
00311607	31-Oct-05	\$	63,000	2	20%	\$	315,000	5	347,655	RFMS2 2006-H542	18%	91%	0	
00311605	31-Oct-05	\$	78,000	2	20%	\$	390,000	5	357,691	RFMS2 2006-H542	22%	109%	0	Breach
00311607	27-Oct-05	\$	37,000	2	15%	\$	246,996	5	214,688	RFMS2 2006-H542	17%	109%	0	Breach
00311609	27-Oct-05	\$	25,235	2	20%	\$	126,175	5	145,117	RFMS2 2006-H542	17%	87%	0	
00311607	1-Nov-05	\$	99,000	2	15%	\$	660,000	5	614,677	RFMS2 2006-H542	16%	102%	0	Breach
00311609	2-Nov-05	\$	65,750	2	20%	\$	328,914	5	288,854	RFMS2 2006-H542	23%	114%	0	Breach
00311619	3-Nov-05	\$	36,500	2	10%	\$	366,098	5	322,831	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	102%	0	Breach
00311619	8-Nov-05	\$	83,900	2	14%	\$	599,286	5	537,768	RFMS2 2006-H542	16%	106%	0	Breach
00311613	2-Nov-05	\$	63,950	2	19%	\$	336,579	5	380,133	RFMS2 2006-H542	17%	89%	0	
00311613	8-Nov-05	\$	41,100	2	20%	\$	205,500	5	201,605	RFMS2 2006-H542	20%	102%	0	Breach
00311613	8-Nov-05	\$	59,000	2	25%	\$	240,033	5	142,106	RFMS2 2006-H542	42%	157%	0	Breach
00311619	11-Nov-05	\$	40,800	2	20%	\$	204,000	5	179,740	RFMS2 2006-H542	23%	113%	1	Breach
00311619	22-Nov-05	\$	72,000	2	20%	\$	360,000	5	331,145	RFMS2 2006-H542	22%	109%	0	Breach
00311619	29-Nov-05	\$	38,280	2	8%	\$	475,000	5	437,665	RFMS2 2006-H542	9%	96%	0	Breach
00311621	21-Nov-05	\$	21,000	2	15%	\$	255,300	5	245,563	RFMS2 2006-H542	16%	99%	1	Breach
00311627	15-Nov-05	\$	89,250	2	17%	\$	515,003	5	457,399	RFMS2 2006-H542	5%	85%	0	
00311621	21-Nov-05	\$	47,000	2	20%	\$	235,000	5	203,514	RFMS2 2006-H542	23%	115%	0	Breach
00311621	22-Nov-05	\$	37,000	2	10%	\$	370,000	5	346,208	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	96%	0	
00311621	22-Nov-05	\$	48,500	2	18%	\$	485,000	5	452,251	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	97%	0	Breach
00311621	22-Nov-05	\$	94,000	2	18%	\$	519,912	5	436,137	RFMS2 2006-H542	22%	113%	0	Breach
00311621	22-Nov-05	\$	19,000	2	85%	\$	414,847	5	264,315	RFMS2 2006-H542	7%	133%	0	Breach
00311621	23-Nov-05	\$	26,500	2	10%	\$	265,000	5	235,000	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	101%	0	Breach
00311621	23-Nov-05	\$	38,550	2	20%	\$	195,984	5	204,124	RFMS2 2006-H542	19%	95%	0	Breach
00311623	21-Nov-05	\$	155,000	2	20%	\$	775,000	5	681,723	RFMS2 2006-H542	23%	114%	0	Breach
00311664	13-Dec-05	\$	16,500	2	5%	\$	83,000	5	378,238	RFMS2 2006-H542	4%	74%	0	Breach
00311669	8-Dec-05	\$	45,000	2	10%	\$	450,000	5	387,423	RFMS2 2006-H542	12%	105%	0	Breach
00311669	8-Dec-05	\$	71,000	2	10%	\$	710,000	5	572,952	RFMS2 2006-H542	12%	112%	0	Breach
00311669	19-Dec-05	\$	25,000	2	21%	\$	113,904	5	111,224	RFMS2 2006-H544	21%	99%	0	Breach
00311669	8-Dec-05	\$	15,000	2	4%	\$	38,415	5	341,509	RFMS2 2006-H544	4%	93%	0	Breach
00311669	12-Dec-05	\$	17,000	2	10%	\$	170,000	5	161,597	RFMS2 2006-H542	11%	95%	0	
00311670	12-Dec-05	\$	78,950	2	20%	\$	394,750	5	391,000	RFMS2 2006-H544	20%	101%	0	Breach
00311670	16-Dec-05	\$	150,000	2	27%	\$	1,284,875	5	752,644	RFMS2 2006-H542	47%	137%	0	Breach
00311673	5-Dec-05	\$	120,000	2	26%	\$	585,023	5	480,218	RFMS2 2006-H542	31%	108%	0	Breach
00311679	7-Dec-05	\$	29,900	2	24%	\$	500,000	5	395,051	RFMS2 2006-H542	30%	100%	0	Breach
00311679	7-Dec-05	\$	119,800	2	20%	\$	149,500	5	553,235	RFMS2 2006-H542	22%	61%	0	Breach
00311679	30-Nov-05	\$	55,000	2	5%	\$	1,100,000	5	1,011,516	RFMS2 2006-H542	5%	87%	0	Breach

10356785	6-Dec-05	\$	103,000	2	20%	\$	515,000	5	514,583	RMAS2 2006-H542	20%	100%	0					Breach	
10356787	1-Dec-05	\$	71,400	2	20%	\$	100%	\$	252,741	RMAS2 2006-H542	28%	141%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356789	22-Nov-05	\$	42,1245	2	5%	86%	\$	42,1245	525,915	RMAS2 2006-H542	4%	69%	0						
10356801	14-Dec-05	\$	75,400	2	20%	100%	\$	377,000	342,274	RMAS2 2006-H542	22%	110%	0		Breach			Breach	
10356805	28-Nov-05	\$	56,500	2	10%	90%	\$	460,123	517,241	RMAS2 2006-H542	9%	80%	0						
10356811	19-Dec-05	\$	35,700	2	10%	90%	\$	565,000	530,210	RMAS2 2006-H542	11%	96%	0						
10356823	21-Dec-05	\$	35,700	2	10%	90%	\$	357,000	377,675	RMAS2 2006-H542	9%	85%	0						
10356829	13-Dec-05	\$	44,200	2	10%	90%	\$	422,000	448,277	RMAS2 2006-H542	10%	88%	1					Breach	
10356849	15-Dec-05	\$	44,500	2	15%	95%	\$	445,000	456,814	RMAS2 2006-H542	13%	81%	0						
10356851	19-Dec-05	\$	50,500	2	14%	90%	\$	316,891	392,769	RMAS2 2006-H544	20%	126%	0	Breach	Breach				
10356863	12-Dec-05	\$	148,761	2	100%	\$	1,062,579	759,848	RMAS2 2006-H542	21%	105%	0					Breach		
10356873	15-Dec-05	\$	85,400	2	20%	100%	\$	427,000	406,624	RMAS2 2006-H542	8%	84%	0					Breach	
10356877	7-Dec-05	\$	35,000	2	8%	89%	\$	415,184	441,624	RMAS2 2006-H542	18%	115%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356887	7-Dec-05	\$	37,050	2	15%	95%	\$	247,000	204,250	RMAS2 2006-H544	12%	105%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356893	9-Dec-05	\$	58,500	2	10%	90%	\$	585,000	501,249	RMAS2 2006-H542	12%	82%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356897	12-Dec-05	\$	78,552	2	20%	100%	\$	392,760	479,601	RMAS2 2006-H542	16%	82%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356901	16-Dec-05	\$	28,000	2	10%	90%	\$	280,280	233,473	RMAS2 2006-H542	12%	108%	0					Breach	
10356905	20-Dec-05	\$	58,000	2	10%	83%	\$	580,000	528,187	RMAS2 2006-H542	11%	93%	1					Breach	
10356909	19-Dec-05	\$	150,000	2	26%	52%	\$	585,023	456,068	RMAS2 2006-H542	33%	67%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10356911	23-Dec-05	\$	88,900	2	20%	100%	\$	444,500	435,400	RMAS2 2006-H542	20%	102%	0					Breach	
10356919	22-Dec-05	\$	56,600	2	20%	100%	\$	280,000	240,160	RMAS2 2006-H542	23%	117%	0					Breach	
10356921	19-Dec-05	\$	150,000	2	28%	100%	\$	514,950	609,270	RMAS2 2006-H544	25%	88%	0					Breach	
10356923	16-Dec-05	\$	17,500	2	10%	90%	\$	175,000	164,781	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	96%	0						
10356933	20-Dec-05	\$	76,000	2	10%	90%	\$	760,000	649,275	RMAS2 2006-H542	12%	105%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357217	22-Dec-05	\$	624,000	1	80%	80%	\$	780,000	779,072	RAU 2006-Q02	80%	80%	0						
10357219	9-Dec-05	\$	220,000	1	80%	80%	\$	275,000	356,194	RAU 2006-Q02	56%	56%	1					Breach	
10357223	22-Dec-05	\$	260,000	1	80%	80%	\$	428,000	440,827	RAU 2006-Q02	74%	74%	0						
10357225	22-Dec-05	\$	332,000	1	80%	80%	\$	415,000	426,197	RAU 2006-Q02	78%	78%	0						
10357227	8-Dec-05	\$	328,000	1	80%	90%	\$	410,000	377,929	RAU 2006-Q02	87%	98%	0						
10357231	13-Dec-05	\$	224,150	1	80%	90%	\$	280,188	233,473	RAU 2006-Q02	96%	108%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357239	21-Dec-05	\$	572,000	1	80%	90%	\$	715,000	815,248	RAU 2006-Q02	91%	79%	0						
10357241	19-Dec-05	\$	464,000	1	80%	80%	\$	580,000	507,175	RAU 2006-Q02	91%	91%	0					Breach	
10357245	16-Dec-05	\$	161,000	1	88%	88%	\$	182,955	153,156	RAU 2006-Q02	105%	105%	0					Breach	
10357249	19-Dec-05	\$	232,000	1	80%	80%	\$	290,000	240,276	RAU 2006-Q02	97%	97%	0					Breach	
10357253	14-Dec-05	\$	500,000	1	70%	70%	\$	714,486	788,089	RAU 2006-Q02	63%	63%	0					Breach	
10357257	22-Dec-05	\$	420,000	1	80%	80%	\$	525,000	417,768	RAU 2006-Q02	101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357263	8-Dec-05	\$	238,500	1	90%	90%	\$	265,000	155,113	RAU 2006-Q03	154%	154%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357267	20-Dec-05	\$	445,000	1	75%	83%	\$	580,000	528,187	RAU 2006-Q02	82%	81%	0						
10357275	7-Dec-05	\$	342,000	1	90%	90%	\$	380,000	321,236	RAU 2006-Q03	106%	93%	1						
10357291	16-Dec-05	\$	240,000	1	80%	90%	\$	300,000	288,641	RAU 2006-Q02	83%	106%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357293	16-Dec-05	\$	829,000	1	80%	90%	\$	1,086,250	956,500	RAU 2006-Q02	87%	94%	0						
10357299	14-Dec-05	\$	462,000	1	80%	90%	\$	577,500	474,917	RAU 2006-Q02	97%	109%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357301	16-Dec-05	\$	195,000	1	75%	75%	\$	260,000	250,071	RAU 2006-Q02	78%	78%	0						
10357303	9-Dec-05	\$	456,000	1	80%	90%	\$	570,000	499,169	RAU 2006-Q02	91%	103%	0					Breach	
10357323	9-Dec-05	\$	349,000	1	66%	66%	\$	528,788	561,971	RAU 2006-Q02	62%	62%	0						
10357329	1-Dec-05	\$	452,000	1	80%	80%	\$	565,000	394,661	RAU 2006-Q02	115%	115%	1	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357337	9-Dec-05	\$	279,000	1	60%	90%	\$	465,000	518,173	RAU 2006-Q02	54%	81%	0						
10357339	7-Dec-05	\$	522,800	1	80%	90%	\$	653,500	695,000	RAU 2006-Q02	75%	83%	0						
10357341	30-Nov-05	\$	456,000	1	78%	88%	\$	584,615	370,240	RAU 2006-Q02	123%	139%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10357349	30-Dec-05	\$	540,000	1	80%	90%	\$	675,000	607,670	RAU 2006-Q02	89%	100%	0					Breach	
10357357	23-Dec-05	\$	165,897	1	80%	80%	\$	207,371	190,536	RAU 2006-HS3	87%	87%	0						
10358437	27-Dec-05	\$	447,000	1	82%	82%	\$	545,122	289,607	RAU 2006-HS3	154%	154%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10358491	27-Dec-05	\$	154,000	1	78%	78%	\$	197,456	201,641	RAU 2006-QA3	76%	76%	0						
10358445	3-Jan-06	\$	277,800	1	80%	80%	\$	341,250	368,159	RAU 2006-HS3	75%	75%	0						
10358447	9-Jan-06	\$	168,000	1	80%	80%	\$	210,000	164,504	RAU 2006-HS3	102%	102%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10358449	28-Dec-05	\$	202,106	1	80%	95%	\$	252,633	209,169	RAU 2006-QA3	97%	115%	1					Breach	
10358479	5-Jan-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	100%	\$	430,000	369,606	RAU 2006-QA4	93%	116%	0					Breach	
10358491	4-Jan-06	\$	199,863	1	80%	100%	\$	249,829	229,418	RAU 2006-HS3	78%	109%	0						
10358499	4-Jan-06	\$	386,000	1	80%	90%	\$	460,000	469,515	RAU 2006-HS3	78%	88%	0						
10358629	13-Jan-06	\$	520,000	1	70%	70%	\$	742,857	674,136	RMAS1 2006-S3	77%	77%	0					Breach	
10358633	13-Jan-06	\$	333,000	1	62%	69%	\$	517,097	459,656	RAU 2006-QS3	72%	81%	0					Breach	
10358635	20-Jan-06	\$	512,000	1	80%	95%	\$	640,000	632,748	RMAS1 2006-S3	81%	96%	0						
10358639	6-Jan-06	\$	565,540	1	73%	73%	\$	774,712	829,854	RMAS1 2006-S4	68%	68%	0						
10358655	28-Dec-05	\$	615,188	1	80%	82%	\$	768,985	625,490	RMAS1 2006-S4	98%	101%	0	Breach	Breach				
10358659	9-Jan-06	\$	630,000	1	76%	76%	\$	828,947	275,221	RMAS1 2006-S3	229%	229%	0	Breach	Breach			Breach	
10358673	5-Jan-06	\$	765,603	1	80%	81%	\$	813,354	833,833	RMAS1 2006-S3	78%	78%	0						
10358679	19-Jan-06	\$	756,147	1	61%	61%	\$	1,239,585	1,086,427	RMAS1 2006-S4	70%	70%	0					Breach	
10358689	11-Jan-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	83%	\$	550,000	467,939	RMAS1 2006-S3	94%	100%	0	Breach	Breach				
10358691	13-Jan-06	\$	494,352	1	80%	90%	\$	617,940	605,708	RMAS1 2006-S3	82%	92%	0						
10358695	13-Jan-06	\$	386,000	1	80%	87%	\$	460,000	482,750	RAU 2006-QS3	76%	83%	0						
10358697	9-Jan-06	\$	448,000	1	80%	80%	\$	560,000	578,674	RMAS1 2006-S3	77%	77%	0						
10358705	11-Jan-06	\$	487,500	1	75%	75%	\$	650,000	805,823	RMAS1 2006-S4	69%	69%	0						
10358713	20-Jan-06	\$	612,000	1	80%	80%	\$	790,000	701,742	RAU 2006-HS3	78%	78%	1						Breach
10358723	24-Jan-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	80%	\$	550,000	722,201	RMAS1 2006-S3	61%	61%	0					Breach	
10358725	13-Jan-06	\$	185,400	1	80%	100%	\$	231,750	190,930	RAU 2006-QS3	97%	121%	0					Breach	
10358727	20-Jan-06	\$	584,000	1	80%	80%	\$	700,000	617,123	RMAS1 2006-S3	91%	91%	0					Breach	
10358731	23-Jan-06	\$	531,912	1	80%	64%	\$	912,500	883,221	RMAS1 2006-S4	66%	66%	0					Breach	
10358739	25-Jan-06	\$	536,000	1	80%	80%	\$	664,880	587,974	RMAS1 2006-S3	91%	91%	0						
10358741	12-Jan-06	\$																	

[illegible]

05/20/825	10-Feb-06	\$	78,869	2	10%	\$	788,690	5	784,982	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	90%		0
05/20/827	17-Feb-06	\$	130,000	2	25%	\$	510,000	5	569,430	RMAS2 2006-H544	23%	63%		0
05/20/831	28-Feb-06	\$	36,800	2	10%	\$	368,000	5	382,688	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	87%		0
05/20/833	2-Mar-06	\$	29,000	2	10%	\$	290,000	5	317,295	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	81%		0
05/20/837	6-Mar-06	\$	59,000	2	17%	\$	348,083	5	263,706	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	132%		0
05/20/849	24-Feb-06	\$	68,000	2	20%	\$	340,000	5	364,858	RMAS2 2006-H544	12%	93%		0
05/20/855	1-Mar-06	\$	36,000	2	10%	\$	360,000	5	310,090	RMAS2 2006-H544	19%	104%		1
05/20/869	24-Feb-06	\$	134,000	2	20%	\$	670,000	5	635,331	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	105%		0
05/20/875	9-Mar-06	\$	117,500	2	20%	\$	588,383	5	597,160	RMAS2 2006-H544	20%	99%		0
05/20/881	8-Mar-06	\$	83,550	2	10%	\$	417,959	5	388,873	RMAS2 2006-H544	23%	113%		0
05/20/883	7-Mar-06	\$	75,300	2	9%	\$	727,176	5	901,385	RMAS2 2006-H544	8%	73%		1
05/20/885	7-Mar-06	\$	72,000	2	10%	\$	720,000	5	805,832	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	84%		0
05/20/889	17-Mar-06	\$	84,400	2	10%	\$	422,000	5	680,327	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	95%		0
05/20/901	9-Mar-06	\$	49,000	2	10%	\$	245,000	5	388,696	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	109%		0
05/20/903	6-Mar-06	\$	19,000	2	10%	\$	202,073	5	194,635	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	81%		0
05/20/909	7-Mar-06	\$	83,800	2	20%	\$	419,000	5	400,453	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	105%		0
05/20/917	15-Mar-06	\$	150,000	2	31%	\$	484,966	5	512,487	RMAS2 2006-H544	29%	80%		0
05/20/921	3-Mar-06	\$	126,400	2	20%	\$	641,950	5	554,827	RMAS2 2006-H544	23%	101%		0
05/20/923	10-Mar-06	\$	28,273	2	4%	\$	706,825	5	533,139	RMAS2 2006-H544	5%	113%		0
05/20/927	2-Mar-06	\$	62,000	2	10%	\$	620,000	5	666,250	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	84%		0
05/20/929	6-Mar-06	\$	115,000	2	20%	\$	575,000	5	555,000	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	104%		0
05/20/935	3-Mar-06	\$	55,000	2	19%	\$	914,962	5	954,766	RMAS2 2006-H544	18%	86%		0
05/20/943	15-Mar-06	\$	170,000	2	20%	\$	275,000	5	376,506	RMAS2 2006-H544	15%	73%		0
05/20/945	9-Mar-06	\$	149,643	2	19%	\$	787,595	5	738,866	RMAS2 2006-H544	20%	107%		0
05/20/953	2-Mar-06	\$	58,000	2	10%	\$	580,000	5	619,063	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	84%		0
05/20/955	3-Mar-06	\$	150,000	2	14%	\$	1,065,341	5	1,059,657	RMAS2 2006-H544	14%	90%		0
05/20/957	15-Mar-06	\$	28,000	2	15%	\$	288,066	5	311,424	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	92%		0
05/20/963	9-Mar-06	\$	54,500	2	10%	\$	545,000	5	540,210	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	91%		0
05/20/967	22-Mar-06	\$	138,000	2	20%	\$	690,000	5	640,251	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	108%		0
05/20/969	16-Mar-06	\$	55,000	2	10%	\$	565,462	5	580,667	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	86%		0
05/20/977	8-Mar-06	\$	41,500	2	10%	\$	415,000	5	411,150	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	91%		0
05/20/979	23-Mar-06	\$	36,000	2	10%	\$	360,000	5	321,609	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	101%		0
05/20/987	1-Mar-06	\$	142,500	2	15%	\$	950,000	5	950,720	RMAS2 2006-H544	15%	90%		0
05/20/993	21-Mar-06	\$	87,950	2	29%	\$	303,276	5	261,666	RMAS2 2006-H544	34%	116%		1
05/20/995	8-Mar-06	\$	150,000	2	15%	\$	1,010,101	5	999,215	RMAS2 2006-H544	15%	91%		0
05/20/999	6-Mar-06	\$	69,000	2	20%	\$	345,345	5	335,511	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	103%		0
05/21/001	15-Mar-06	\$	85,000	2	27%	\$	315,048	5	393,636	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	60%		0
05/21/005	9-Mar-06	\$	48,863	2	10%	\$	488,630	5	447,072	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	98%		0
05/21/007	10-Mar-06	\$	189,000	2	23%	\$	838,881	5	935,825	RMAS2 2006-H544	20%	90%		0
05/21/009	7-Mar-06	\$	35,000	2	8%	\$	459,921	5	469,652	RMAS2 2006-H544	7%	86%		0
05/21/011	17-Mar-06	\$	49,500	2	10%	\$	495,000	5	461,217	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	97%		0
05/21/013	9-Mar-06	\$	126,000	2	20%	\$	630,000	5	725,182	RMAS2 2006-H544	17%	87%		0
05/21/019	20-Mar-06	\$	56,000	2	20%	\$	280,000	5	326,538	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	86%		0
05/21/021	6-Mar-06	\$	50,000	2	10%	\$	500,000	5	517,327	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	87%		0
05/21/029	17-Mar-06	\$	41,000	2	10%	\$	410,000	5	426,622	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	86%		0
05/21/037	6-Mar-06	\$	60,000	2	10%	\$	600,601	5	593,859	RMAS2 2006-H544	9%	91%		0
05/21/041	16-Mar-06	\$	50,000	2	20%	\$	249,875	5	242,242	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	103%		0
05/21/053	9-Mar-06	\$	71,000	2	10%	\$	710,000	5	878,891	RMAS2 2006-H544	8%	73%		0
05/21/055	13-Mar-06	\$	72,000	2	10%	\$	720,000	5	754,376	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	86%		0
05/21/057	7-Mar-06	\$	42,000	2	5%	\$	864,198	5	787,887	RMAS2 2006-H544	5%	88%		0
05/21/065	14-Mar-06	\$	47,000	2	20%	\$	235,000	5	189,250	RMAS2 2006-H544	25%	124%		0
05/21/069	8-Mar-06	\$	46,050	2	10%	\$	460,500	5	462,532	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	90%		0
05/21/079	22-Mar-06	\$	88,400	2	30%	\$	228,000	5	228,000	RMAS2 2006-H544	30%	100%		0
05/21/085	15-Mar-06	\$	58,350	2	11%	\$	820,130	5	825,325	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	89%		0
05/21/089	21-Mar-06	\$	56,000	2	15%	\$	389,000	5	246,601	RMAS2 2006-H544	24%	150%		0
05/21/091	21-Mar-06	\$	36,000	2	10%	\$	360,000	5	745,697	RMAS2 2006-H544	8%	68%		0
05/21/097	20-Mar-06	\$	100,000	2	19%	\$	526,316	5	338,553	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	96%		0
05/21/115	17-Mar-06	\$	63,682	2	10%	\$	636,820	5	620,513	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	108%		0
05/21/117	21-Mar-06	\$	54,350	2	20%	\$	271,886	5	327,487	RMAS2 2006-H544	17%	83%		0
05/21/119	22-Mar-06	\$	23,250	2	5%	\$	465,000	5	489,872	RMAS2 2006-H544	5%	81%		0
05/21/127	21-Mar-06	\$	46,400	2	10%	\$	464,000	5	407,344	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	102%		0
05/21/129	20-Mar-06	\$	81,500	2	10%	\$	815,000	5	854,255	RMAS2 2006-H544	10%	86%		0
05/21/133	21-Mar-06	\$	26,500	2	10%	\$	265,000	5	209,939	RMAS2 2006-H544	13%	114%		0
05/21/135	15-Mar-06	\$	37,000	2	20%	\$	185,000	5	209,584	RMAS2 2006-H544	18%	88%		0
05/21/139	20-Mar-06	\$	24,400	2	19%	\$	128,421	5	143,846	RMAS2 2006-H544	17%	89%		0
05/21/141	22-Mar-06	\$	34,450	2	10%	\$	344,845	5	311,409	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	100%		0
05/21/149	27-Mar-06	\$	18,000	2	9%	\$	205,611	5	75,281	RMAS2 2006-H544	24%	215%		0
05/21/153	16-Mar-06	\$	16,700	2	5%	\$	313,910	5	309,929	RMAS2 2006-H544	5%	76%		0
05/21/155	21-Mar-06	\$	179,000	2	20%	\$	895,000	5	918,478	RMAS2 2006-H544	19%	97%		0
05/21/167	15-Mar-06	\$	32,000	2	7%	\$	459,770	5	426,195	RMAS2 2006-H544	8%	94%		0
05/21/169	23-Mar-06	\$	163,000	2	23%	\$	714,912	5	745,620	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	77%		0
05/21/165	17-Mar-06	\$	171,000	2	21%	\$	820,144	5	566,927	RMAS2 2006-H544	30%	145%		0
05/21/171	30-Mar-06	\$	41,800	2	20%	\$	209,000	5	200,544	RMAS2 2006-H544	21%	104%		0
05/21/175	23-Mar-06	\$	35,000	2	10%	\$	175,000	5	181,989	RMAS2 2006-H544	19%	96%		0
05/21/177	27-Mar-06	\$	40,500	2	10%	\$	405,000	5	381,533	RMAS2 2006-H544	11%	96%		0
05/21/179	17-Mar-06	\$	68,000	2	20%	\$	340,000	5	348,516	RMAS2 2006-H544	13%	120%		0
05/21/197	22-Mar-06	\$	108,000	2	21%	\$	525,036	5	496,443	RMAS2 2006-H544	23%	106%		0
05/21/201	28-Mar-06	\$	68,850	2	20%	\$	334,417	5	310,654	RMAS2 2006-H544	22%	108%		1

10576043	9-Jan-06	\$	58,650	2	19%	100%	\$	303,684	5	279,185	RMAS2 2007-H542	21%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621299	12-Apr-06	\$	937,500	1	75%	90%	\$	1,250,000	5	867,008	RAU 2006-Q06	108%	130%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621307	3-Apr-06	\$	540,000	1	80%	90%	\$	675,000	5	699,068	RAU 2006-Q06	77%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621311	14-Apr-06	\$	354,500	1	86%	88%	\$	412,209	5	328,277	RAU 2006-Q06	108%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621319	5-Apr-06	\$	205,000	1	88%	86%	\$	232,955	5	173,611	RAU 2006-Q06	118%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621325	19-Apr-06	\$	122,000	1	54%	54%	\$	225,926	5	170,642	RAU 2006-Q06	71%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621331	3-Apr-06	\$	596,000	1	80%	90%	\$	632,500	5	486,457	RAU 2006-Q06	104%	117%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621339	7-Apr-06	\$	464,000	1	80%	90%	\$	550,000	5	480,697	RAU 2006-Q06	92%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621343	5-Apr-06	\$	225,000	1	80%	80%	\$	281,250	5	267,755	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621345	20-Apr-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	80%	\$	430,000	5	380,952	RAU 2006-Q06	90%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621347	21-Apr-06	\$	436,016	1	80%	80%	\$	545,020	5	642,007	RAU 2006-Q06	68%	68%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621349	22-Mar-06	\$	395,000	1	64%	64%	\$	617,188	5	461,790	RAU 2006-Q06	86%	86%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621357	3-Apr-06	\$	320,000	1	80%	88%	\$	400,000	5	388,828	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	79%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621365	24-Apr-06	\$	388,500	1	75%	75%	\$	518,000	5	529,435	RAU 2006-Q06	73%	73%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621367	17-Apr-06	\$	265,600	1	80%	90%	\$	332,000	5	326,660	RAU 2006-Q06	98%	133%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621379	5-Apr-06	\$	320,200	1	78%	89%	\$	410,513	5	469,565	RAU 2006-Q06	72%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621381	5-Apr-06	\$	336,500	1	74%	74%	\$	454,730	5	416,923	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621385	11-Apr-06	\$	346,000	1	80%	90%	\$	425,000	5	563,151	RAU 2006-Q06	88%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621397	7-Apr-06	\$	496,000	1	80%	80%	\$	587,342	5	550,285	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621403	12-Apr-06	\$	464,000	1	79%	89%	\$	730,000	5	643,873	RAU 2006-Q06	91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621411	11-Apr-06	\$	564,000	1	80%	80%	\$	662,500	5	728,956	RAU 2006-Q06	79%	79%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621421	17-Apr-06	\$	370,000	1	80%	80%	\$	462,500	5	694,326	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621427	12-Apr-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	90%	\$	731,343	5	184,935	RAU 2006-Q06	83%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621431	10-Apr-06	\$	585,074	1	80%	80%	\$	713,443	5	538,794	RAU 2006-Q06	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621441	21-Apr-06	\$	405,182	1	80%	90%	\$	506,478	5	277,398	RAU 2006-Q06	81%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621443	12-Apr-06	\$	304,000	1	80%	80%	\$	380,000	5	842,168	RAU 2006-Q06	65%	66%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621445	6-Apr-06	\$	297,000	1	71%	71%	\$	413,310	5	453,223	RAU 2006-Q06	95%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621449	14-Apr-06	\$	386,000	1	80%	90%	\$	360,000	5	479,713	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	84%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621453	19-Apr-06	\$	280,000	1	80%	90%	\$	653,990	5	661,949	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621459	20-Apr-06	\$	527,992	1	80%	84%	\$	440,000	5	429,613	RAU 2006-Q06	71%	80%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621467	11-Apr-06	\$	353,000	1	80%	90%	\$	225,500	5	1,246,060	RAU 2006-Q06	52%	63%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621469	27-Apr-06	\$	180,400	1	75%	90%	\$	866,667	5	424,866	RAU 2006-Q06	81%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621493	18-Apr-06	\$	650,000	1	80%	80%	\$	430,000	5	344,029	RAU 2006-Q06	85%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621505	21-Apr-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	80%	\$	365,000	5	627,385	RAU 2006-Q06	83%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621509	13-Apr-06	\$	292,000	1	80%	80%	\$	650,000	5	438,020	RAU 2006-Q06	96%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621511	17-Apr-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	85%	\$	525,000	5	229,868	RAU 2006-Q06	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621521	24-Apr-06	\$	208,000	1	89%	89%	\$	233,708	5	444,808	RAU 2006-Q06	74%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621525	21-Apr-06	\$	380,000	1	75%	79%	\$	546,835	5	963,205	RAU 2006-Q06	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621531	17-Apr-06	\$	443,000	1	75%	75%	\$	955,000	5	412,279	RAU 2006-Q06	61%	61%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621537	13-Apr-06	\$	716,250	1	78%	88%	\$	430,769	5	526,010	RAU 2006-Q06	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621545	20-Apr-06	\$	336,000	1	70%	70%	\$	360,000	5	768,001	RAU 2006-Q06	80%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621551	10-Apr-06	\$	252,000	1	80%	80%	\$	700,000	5	333,661	RAU 2006-Q06	76%	76%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621555	18-Apr-06	\$	560,000	1	80%	90%	\$	334,750	5	344,102	RAU 2006-Q06	55%	55%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621561	24-Apr-06	\$	614,400	1	80%	90%	\$	400,255	5	885,887	RAU 2006-Q06	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621565	20-Apr-06	\$	267,800	1	47%	47%	\$	400,255	5	344,102	RAU 2006-Q06	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621567	18-Apr-06	\$	190,000	1	79%	79%	\$	417,722	5	250,418	RAU 2006-Q06	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621571	13-Apr-06	\$	330,000	1	80%	80%	\$	851,541	5	466,602	RAU 2006-Q06	106%	120%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621573	18-Apr-06	\$	681,233	1	70%	70%	\$	727,486	5	646,732	RAU 2006-Q06	75%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621575	17-Apr-06	\$	192,000	1	80%	90%	\$	603,000	5	649,255	RAU 2006-Q06	99%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621579	21-Apr-06	\$	486,400	1	80%	90%	\$	800,000	5	220,919	RAU 2006-Q06	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621585	19-Apr-06	\$	640,000	1	80%	80%	\$	220,000	5	581,580	RAU 2006-Q06	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621601	14-Apr-06	\$	176,000	1	80%	80%	\$	587,500	5	1,021,298	RAU 2006-Q06	76%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621605	14-Apr-06	\$	470,000	1	80%	65%	\$	713,846	5	653,589	RAU 2006-Q06	60%	60%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621609	18-Apr-06	\$	464,000	1	75%	75%	\$	520,000	5	1,246,060	RAU 2006-Q06	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621611	18-Apr-06	\$	390,000	1	75%	90%	\$	1,080,000	5	1,246,060	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621613	20-Apr-06	\$	772,500	1	75%	90%	\$	1,080,000	5	371,184	RAU 2006-Q06	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621623	20-Apr-06	\$	963,000	1	75%	90%	\$	505,000	5	259,016	RAU 2006-Q06	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621627	13-Apr-06	\$	404,000	1	80%	90%	\$	395,000	5	494,759	RAU 2006-Q06	85%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621631	18-Apr-06	\$	316,000	1	75%	75%	\$	267,600	5	455,945	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	94%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621637	24-Apr-06	\$	370,700	1	80%	90%	\$	470,000	5	481,953	RAU 2006-Q06	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621641	24-Apr-06	\$	434,000	1	70%	70%	\$	610,000	5	674,157	RAU 2006-Q06	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621651	20-Apr-06	\$	549,600	1	80%	90%	\$	373,000	5	353,886	RAU 2006-Q06	99%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621655	24-Apr-06	\$	341,100	1	90%	90%	\$	298,000	5	271,036	RAU 2006-Q06	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621671	25-Apr-06	\$	268,200	1	80%	80%	\$	421,250	5	681,431	RAU 2006-Q06	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621683	24-Apr-06	\$	337,000	1	80%	84%	\$	697,000	5	671,988	RAU 2006-Q06	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621695	21-Feb-06	\$	557,600	1	80%	80%	\$	495,000	5	425,283	RAU 2006-Q06	79%	79%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621707	23-Feb-06	\$	396,000	1	80%	80%	\$	703,035	5	710,651	RAU 2006-Q06	91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621717	7-Apr-06	\$	562,428	1	80%	80%	\$	490,000	5	606,924	RAU 2006-Q06	126%	141%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621719	6-Mar-06	\$	393,000	1	67%	67%	\$	597,015	5	455,459	RAU 2006-Q06	79%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621723	8-Mar-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	90%	\$	775,000	5	161,004	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621729	11-Apr-06	\$	360,000	1	80%	90%	\$	450,000	5	343,702	RAU 2006-Q06	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10621737	26-Apr-06	\$	282,000	1	56%	56%	\$	178,571	5					0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10655629	27-Apr-06	\$	100,000	1	77%	77%	\$	365,234	5					0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach

0065631	4-May-06	\$	650,000	1	70%	\$	928,571	5	969,808	RAU 2006-Q36	67%	67%	1	Breach						
0065633	24-Mar-06	\$	251,200	1	80%	80%	\$	314,000	5	173,720	RAU 2006-Q38	145%	156%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065635	27-Mar-06	\$	56,000	1	80%	80%	\$	70,000	5	32,382	RAU 2006-Q36	174%	174%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065639	1-May-06	\$	112,450	1	80%	100%	\$	140,563	5	116,599	RAU 2006-Q36	97%	121%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065645	5-May-06	\$	139,600	1	80%	90%	\$	174,500	5	183,313	RAU 2006-Q36	76%	86%	0						
0065657	5-May-06	\$	472,000	1	80%	100%	\$	590,000	5	625,000	RAU 2006-Q36	75%	94%	0						
0065671	1-May-06	\$	218,750	1	80%	80%	\$	238,438	5	253,275	RAU 2006-Q36	75%	75%	1						Breach
0065679	24-Apr-06	\$	209,200	1	80%	80%	\$	261,500	5	249,678	RAU 2006-Q36	84%	84%	1						Breach
0065681	27-Apr-06	\$	227,500	1	80%	80%	\$	227,500	5	255,091	RAU 2006-Q36	71%	71%	0						
0065683	21-Apr-06	\$	182,000	1	65%	65%	\$	280,000	5	282,719	RAU 2006-Q36	64%	64%	0						
0065687	1-May-06	\$	173,600	1	80%	80%	\$	217,000	5	190,000	RAU 2006-Q36	91%	91%	1						Breach
0065689	26-Apr-06	\$	200,000	1	79%	79%	\$	253,165	5	234,841	RAU 2006-Q36	103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065693	21-Apr-06	\$	400,000	1	64%	64%	\$	625,000	5	734,941	RAU 2006-Q36	54%	54%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065703	28-Apr-06	\$	596,800	1	80%	80%	\$	746,000	5	469,499	RAU 2006-Q36	127%	127%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065715	15-May-06	\$	487,200	1	80%	80%	\$	609,000	5	195,270	RAU 2006-Q36	111%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065721	2-May-06	\$	250,000	1	69%	69%	\$	362,319	5	644,499	RAU 2006-Q36	76%	76%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065725	4-May-06	\$	274,000	1	80%	80%	\$	300,000	5	301,072	RAU 2006-Q36	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065737	2-May-06	\$	259,200	1	80%	80%	\$	324,000	5	267,734	RAU 2006-Q35	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065739	4-May-06	\$	246,400	1	80%	100%	\$	308,000	5	273,400	RAU 2006-Q36	90%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065741	10-May-06	\$	66,300	1	80%	80%	\$	82,875	5	43,454	RAU 2006-Q38	153%	153%	2	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065751	1-May-06	\$	337,700	1	53%	53%	\$	637,170	5	374,245	RAU 2006-Q36	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065777	11-May-06	\$	380,590	1	80%	90%	\$	475,788	5	392,939	RAU 2006-Q36	97%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065783	5-May-06	\$	202,800	1	60%	60%	\$	338,000	5	344,014	RAU 2006-Q36	59%	59%	0						
0065787	3-May-06	\$	295,920	1	100%	100%	\$	369,900	5	415,094	RAU 2006-Q36	71%	89%	0						
0065789	10-May-06	\$	319,960	1	70%	80%	\$	294,000	5	265,297	RAU 2006-Q313	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065793	1-May-06	\$	95,000	1	36%	36%	\$	263,889	5	415,252	RAU 2006-Q36	77%	77%	0						
0065801	8-May-06	\$	310,500	1	90%	90%	\$	345,000	5	296,484	RAU 2006-Q38	45%	45%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065803	2-May-06	\$	129,000	1	50%	50%	\$	258,000	5	369,673	RAU 2006-Q36	35%	35%	0						Breach
0065807	4-May-06	\$	273,692	1	80%	100%	\$	342,115	5	320,514	RAU 2006-Q36	85%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065811	4-May-06	\$	192,965	1	80%	80%	\$	241,206	5	209,111	RAU 2006-Q38	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065817	4-May-06	\$	140,442	1	53%	53%	\$	264,985	5	309,610	RAU 2006-Q36	45%	45%	0						
0065819	2-May-06	\$	201,133	1	80%	100%	\$	251,404	5	237,713	RAU 2006-Q38	85%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065823	12-May-06	\$	181,600	1	80%	80%	\$	278,000	5	159,702	RAU 2006-Q36	113%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065825	10-May-06	\$	206,000	1	78%	78%	\$	264,103	5	262,070	RAU 2006-Q36	79%	79%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065831	11-May-06	\$	339,160	1	80%	100%	\$	423,950	5	397,929	RAU 2006-Q36	85%	107%	0						
0065843	5-May-06	\$	572,000	1	80%	100%	\$	715,000	5	643,255	RAU 2006-Q36	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0065845	12-May-06	\$	382,482	1	80%	80%	\$	506,000	5	549,458	RAU 2006-Q36	74%	74%	0						
0066089	5-May-06	\$	404,800	1	80%	80%	\$	478,103	5	532,360	RAU 2006-Q36	72%	90%	0						
0066091	11-May-06	\$	339,160	1	80%	100%	\$	423,950	5	469,071	RAU 2006-Q36	82%	102%	0						
0066095	2-May-06	\$	383,200	1	80%	80%	\$	479,000	5	502,016	RAU 2006-Q36	76%	76%	0						
0066099	3-May-06	\$	551,000	1	70%	70%	\$	730,000	5	745,055	RAMP 2006-R35	69%	69%	0						
0066101	26-Apr-06	\$	352,000	1	80%	80%	\$	440,000	5	482,189	RAU 2006-Q36	73%	73%	1						Breach
0066107	8-May-06	\$	221,250	1	76%	76%	\$	291,118	5	236,184	RAU 2006-Q36	94%	94%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066111	3-May-06	\$	305,404	1	65%	65%	\$	469,852	5	466,888	RAU 2006-Q36	65%	65%	0						
0066113	4-May-06	\$	295,900	1	80%	80%	\$	369,875	5	348,619	RAU 2006-Q36	85%	85%	0						
0066115	2-May-06	\$	252,800	1	80%	80%	\$	316,000	5	307,489	RAU 2006-Q36	82%	82%	0						
0066117	20-Apr-06	\$	417,000	1	74%	100%	\$	563,514	5	502,561	RAU 2006-Q36	83%	112%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066123	24-Apr-06	\$	301,600	1	80%	100%	\$	377,000	5	358,224	RAU 2006-Q36	84%	105%	0						
0066125	24-Apr-06	\$	252,000	1	80%	95%	\$	315,000	5	279,000	RAMP 2006-R35	90%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066127	5-May-06	\$	483,000	1	69%	79%	\$	700,000	5	600,657	RAMP 2006-R35	80%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066129	1-May-06	\$	159,250	1	70%	70%	\$	227,500	5	206,697	RAU 2006-Q36	77%	77%	0						
0066133	20-Apr-06	\$	148,000	1	80%	100%	\$	185,000	5	123,748	RAU 2006-Q36	120%	150%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066135	11-Apr-06	\$	650,000	1	79%	79%	\$	822,785	5	1,000,566	RPMI 2006-S43	65%	65%	0						
0066137	24-Apr-06	\$	260,800	1	80%	80%	\$	326,000	5	303,264	RAU 2006-Q36	86%	86%	0						
0066141	21-Apr-06	\$	618,750	1	75%	75%	\$	825,000	5	745,665	RAU 2006-Q36	83%	83%	0						
0066145	21-Mar-06	\$	224,000	1	80%	80%	\$	280,000	5	248,231	RAMP 2006-R35	90%	90%	0						
0066149	30-Mar-06	\$	185,150	1	80%	100%	\$	231,438	5	231,776	RAU 2006-Q36	80%	100%	0						
0066151	31-Mar-06	\$	328,000	1	80%	80%	\$	410,000	5	353,034	RAU 2006-Q36	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066155	24-Apr-06	\$	205,000	1	64%	64%	\$	320,313	5	392,988	RAU 2006-Q36	52%	52%	0						
0066157	20-Apr-06	\$	260,000	1	80%	90%	\$	325,000	5	325,170	RAU 2006-Q36	80%	90%	0						
0066159	3-May-06	\$	572,000	1	80%	80%	\$	715,000	5	665,728	RAU 2006-Q36	86%	86%	0						
0066161	2-May-06	\$	329,064	1	80%	80%	\$	411,330	5	382,288	RAU 2006-Q36	86%	108%	0						
0066163	21-Apr-06	\$	385,000	1	70%	70%	\$	550,000	5	546,674	RAU 2006-Q36	70%	70%	0						
0066165	24-Apr-06	\$	415,000	1	79%	79%	\$	525,316	5	477,092	RAU 2006-Q36	87%	87%	0						
0066169	27-Apr-06	\$	796,000	1	80%	80%	\$	995,000	5	838,786	RAU 2006-Q36	95%	95%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066175	12-May-06	\$	395,177	1	80%	100%	\$	493,971	5	488,314	RAU 2006-Q36	81%	101%	0						
0066179	21-Apr-06	\$	463,200	1	80%	80%	\$	579,000	5	573,779	RAU 2006-Q36	73%	73%	0						
0066181	25-Apr-06	\$	666,573	1	79%	79%	\$	843,763	5	816,996	RAU 2006-Q36	82%	82%	0						
0066185	26-Apr-06	\$	296,000	1	80%	100%	\$	370,000	5	340,898	RAU 2006-Q36	87%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066189	17-Apr-06	\$	1,400,000	1	48%	48%	\$	2,916,667	5	1,444,077	RAU 2006-Q36	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066191	10-May-06	\$	546,000	1	80%	100%	\$	670,000	5	379,779	RAU 2006-Q36	141%	112%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
0066193	3-May-06	\$	590,000	1	80%	100%	\$	625,000	5	746,460	RAU 2006-Q36	67%	84%	0						
0066195	4-May-06	\$	333,750	1	75%	75%	\$	445,000	5	491,533	RAU 2006-Q36	68%	68%	0						
0066197	20-Apr-06	\$	447,000	1	80%	80%	\$	521,250	5	571,526	RAU 2006-Q36	73%	73%	0						
0066201	27-Apr-06	\$	399,590	1	80%	80%	\$	499,938</												

00669221	1-May-06	\$	239,200	1	80%	\$	299,000	5	310.575	RAU 2006-Q46	77%	96%	1	Breach	
00669229	24-Apr-06	\$	367,900	1	80%	90%	\$	459,875	5	436.736	RAU 2006-Q46	84%	95%	0	
00669233	27-Apr-06	\$	360,000	1	80%	100%	\$	450,000	5	484.752	RAU 2006-Q46	74%	93%	0	
00669235	21-Apr-06	\$	340,177	1	80%	80%	\$	425,221	5	483.743	RAU 2006-Q46	70%	70%	0	
00669237	26-Apr-06	\$	577,000	1	70%	88%	\$	824,286	5	819.956	RFMS 2006-S43	70%	89%	0	
00669239	26-Apr-06	\$	162,400	1	70%	70%	\$	232,000	5	235.970	RAU 2006-Q46	69%	69%	1	Breach
00669243	24-May-06	\$	508,000	1	70%	70%	\$	725,714	5	783.481	RFMS 2006-S43	65%	65%	0	
00669245	24-Apr-06	\$	232,000	1	80%	80%	\$	290,000	5	207.328	RAU 2006-Q46	112%	112%	0	Breach
00669249	28-Apr-06	\$	347,000	1	79%	79%	\$	439,241	5	353.848	RAU 2006-Q46	98%	98%	0	Breach
00669251	1-May-06	\$	410,800	1	80%	100%	\$	513,500	5	517.808	RAMP 2006-H55	79%	99%	0	
00669255	25-Apr-06	\$	325,500	1	80%	100%	\$	406,875	5	423.574	RAU 2006-Q46	77%	96%	0	
00669261	1-May-06	\$	257,200	1	80%	100%	\$	321,500	5	315.486	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	102%	0	
00669267	21-Apr-06	\$	276,000	1	80%	80%	\$	345,000	5	283.703	RAU 2006-Q46	97%	97%	0	Breach
00669275	4-May-06	\$	192,000	1	80%	100%	\$	240,000	5	228.392	RAU 2006-Q46	84%	105%	0	
00669279	19-Apr-06	\$	116,380	1	80%	90%	\$	145,475	5	162.375	RAMP 2006-H55	72%	81%	0	
00669283	8-May-06	\$	173,600	1	69%	90%	\$	251,594	5	251.599	RAU 2006-Q46	69%	90%	0	
00669287	1-May-06	\$	348,000	1	80%	80%	\$	435,000	5	514.253	RAU 2006-Q46	68%	68%	0	
00669291	11-May-06	\$	387,586	1	80%	90%	\$	484,483	5	366.628	RAU 2006-Q46	106%	119%	0	Breach
00669295	26-Apr-06	\$	238,395	1	70%	70%	\$	340,564	5	257.665	RAU 2006-Q46	92%	92%	0	Breach
00669307	1-May-06	\$	414,000	1	69%	69%	\$	604,348	5	483.255	RAU 2006-Q46	86%	86%	0	Breach
00669309	28-Apr-06	\$	277,154	1	80%	80%	\$	346,443	5	394.520	RAU 2006-Q46	70%	70%	0	
00669311	12-May-06	\$	120,700	1	80%	100%	\$	150,875	5	163.186	RAU 2006-Q46	74%	92%	0	
00669313	9-May-06	\$	166,400	1	80%	80%	\$	208,000	5	251.356	RAMP 2006-H55	66%	66%	0	
00669317	2-May-06	\$	212,000	1	80%	80%	\$	265,000	5	260.286	RAU 2006-Q46	81%	81%	1	Breach
00669325	28-Apr-06	\$	241,600	1	80%	80%	\$	302,000	5	247.000	RAU 2006-Q46	98%	98%	0	Breach
00669327	2-May-06	\$	244,996	1	80%	100%	\$	303,245	5	258.486	RAU 2006-Q46	95%	118%	0	Breach
00669331	8-May-06	\$	773,254	1	54%	54%	\$	1,431,952	5	1,238.804	RAU 2006-Q46	63%	63%	0	Breach
00669333	1-May-06	\$	134,000	1	73%	73%	\$	183,562	5	176.625	RAU 2006-Q46	76%	76%	0	
00669337	1-May-06	\$	256,000	1	80%	100%	\$	320,000	5	325.443	RAU 2006-Q46	79%	98%	0	
00669339	10-May-06	\$	488,000	1	80%	80%	\$	585,000	5	628.626	RAMP 2006-H55	74%	74%	0	
00669341	11-May-06	\$	229,200	1	80%	80%	\$	299,000	5	279.529	RAU 2006-Q46	86%	86%	0	
00669343	11-May-06	\$	576,800	1	80%	100%	\$	721,000	5	783.830	RAU 2006-Q46	74%	92%	0	
00669345	26-Apr-06	\$	384,000	1	80%	100%	\$	480,000	5	466.383	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	103%	0	Breach
00669349	4-May-06	\$	252,000	1	80%	80%	\$	315,000	5	229.200	RAMP 2006-H55	110%	110%	0	Breach
00669351	25-Apr-06	\$	151,200	1	80%	80%	\$	189,000	5	181.187	RAU 2006-H55	83%	83%	0	
00669353	9-May-06	\$	260,000	1	80%	100%	\$	325,000	5	314.071	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	103%	1	Breach
00669377	3-May-06	\$	504,000	1	75%	75%	\$	672,027	5	496.010	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	82%	0	
00669379	2-May-06	\$	333,000	1	80%	90%	\$	415,000	5	694.187	RAU 2006-Q46	73%	73%	0	
00669383	2-May-06	\$	277,600	1	80%	100%	\$	347,000	5	302.292	RAU 2006-Q46	110%	124%	0	Breach
00669385	25-Apr-06	\$	180,000	1	75%	75%	\$	240,000	5	329.723	RAU 2006-Q46	55%	55%	0	
00669387	5-May-06	\$	156,000	1	80%	80%	\$	195,000	5	182.138	RAU 2006-Q46	86%	86%	0	
00669389	2-May-06	\$	287,000	1	70%	70%	\$	410,000	5	435.389	RAU 2006-Q46	66%	66%	0	
00669393	4-May-06	\$	320,000	1	80%	80%	\$	400,000	5	494.743	RAU 2006-Q46	65%	65%	0	
00669403	24-Apr-06	\$	343,200	1	80%	80%	\$	429,000	5	456.103	RAU 2006-Q46	81%	81%	0	
00669405	11-May-06	\$	280,000	1	80%	80%	\$	350,000	5	341.114	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	82%	0	
00669411	10-May-06	\$	251,200	1	80%	80%	\$	314,000	5	289.726	RAU 2006-Q46	87%	87%	0	
00669415	9-May-06	\$	340,000	1	80%	80%	\$	425,000	5	366.664	RAU 2006-Q46	93%	93%	1	Breach
00669421	28-Apr-06	\$	245,144	1	80%	100%	\$	306,430	5	306.888	RAU 2006-Q46	80%	100%	1	Breach
00669423	5-May-06	\$	480,000	1	80%	80%	\$	600,000	5	641.818	RAU 2006-Q46	102%	102%	0	Breach
00669427	11-May-06	\$	143,999	1	80%	80%	\$	179,999	5	194.051	RAU 2006-Q46	75%	75%	0	
00669429	5-May-06	\$	224,000	1	80%	100%	\$	280,000	5	241.874	RAU 2006-Q46	93%	116%	0	Breach
00669435	4-May-06	\$	134,985	1	80%	80%	\$	168,731	5	171.971	RAU 2006-Q46	78%	78%	0	
00669439	8-May-06	\$	288,000	1	80%	80%	\$	360,000	5	402.206	RAU 2006-Q46	72%	72%	1	Breach
00669451	10-May-06	\$	235,200	1	80%	100%	\$	294,000	5	287.737	RAU 2006-Q46	82%	102%	0	
00669453	16-May-06	\$	197,760	1	80%	80%	\$	247,200	5	236.934	RAU 2006-Q46	84%	84%	0	
00669455	10-May-06	\$	552,000	1	80%	80%	\$	690,000	5	554.935	RAU 2006-Q46	99%	99%	0	Breach
00669457	27-Apr-06	\$	200,000	1	80%	80%	\$	250,000	5	187.724	RAU 2006-Q46	107%	107%	0	Breach
00669467	1-May-06	\$	532,000	1	80%	100%	\$	665,000	5	566.488	RAU 2006-Q46	94%	117%	0	Breach
00669469	5-May-06	\$	304,000	1	80%	100%	\$	380,000	5	336.386	RAU 2006-Q46	90%	113%	0	
00669479	11-May-06	\$	518,000	1	80%	80%	\$	647,500	5	583.786	RAU 2006-Q46	89%	89%	0	Breach
00669483	8-May-06	\$	591,200	1	80%	80%	\$	739,000	5	705.127	RAU 2006-Q46	84%	84%	0	
00669485	16-May-06	\$	240,000	1	75%	75%	\$	320,000	5	282.791	RAU 2006-Q46	85%	85%	0	
00669489	9-May-06	\$	234,500	1	70%	70%	\$	335,000	5	430.463	RAU 2006-Q46	54%	54%	0	Breach
00669491	5-May-06	\$	236,032	1	80%	100%	\$	295,040	5	294.923	RAU 2006-Q46	80%	100%	0	
00669499	12-May-06	\$	194,000	1	56%	56%	\$	346,429	5	324.136	RFMS 2006-S42	60%	60%	0	
00669501	12-May-06	\$	386,776	1	80%	100%	\$	483,470	5	509.500	RAU 2006-Q46	76%	95%	1	Breach
00669503	12-May-06	\$	227,900	1	80%	100%	\$	284,875	5	246.541	RAU 2006-Q46	92%	116%	1	Breach
00669505	8-May-06	\$	560,000	1	80%	80%	\$	700,000	5	574.815	RAMP 2006-H55	97%	97%	0	Breach
00669507	10-May-06	\$	320,000	1	80%	80%	\$	400,000	5	461.988	RAU 2006-Q46	69%	69%	0	
00669511	17-May-06	\$	255,200	1	80%	100%	\$	319,000	5	256.666	RAU 2006-Q46	99%	124%	0	Breach
00716577	9-May-06	\$	1,500,000	1	66%	66%	\$	2,272,727	5	1,004.252	RAU 2006-Q46	149%	149%	1	Breach
00716787	12-May-06	\$	2,700,000	1	90%	90%	\$	3,000,000	5	2,507.979	RAU 2006-Q46	108%	108%	0	Breach
00716801	12-May-06	\$	1,244,600	1	63%	63%	\$	1,975,556	5	756.716	RAU 2006-Q46	164%	164%	0	Breach
00716835	9-May-06	\$	317,700	1	90%	90%	\$	353,000	5	328.117	RAU 2006-Q46	97%	97%	0	Breach
00716855	16-May-06	\$	253,500	1	87%	87%	\$	291,379	5	299.928	RAU 2006-Q46	87%	87%	0	
00716873	17-May-06	\$	349,600	1	80%	80%	\$	437,000	5	402.928	RAU 2006-Q46	85%	85%	0	
00789729	30-May-06	\$	69,900	1	10%	90%	\$	550,000	5	472.769	RAU 2006-Q46	93%	105%	1	Breach
00789731	19-Jun-06	\$	141,050	2	10%	100%	\$	708,208	5	667.776	RFMS 2006-H545	17%	85%	0	
00789735	5-Jun-06	\$	94,050	2	14%	95%	\$	671,786	5	623.267	RFMS 2006-H545	15%	102%	0	Breach

[illegible]

07/30/11	20-Jun-06	\$	113,000	2	21%	90%	\$	350,000	3	335.577	RHMS2 2006-HS45	10%	94%	0	
07/30/15	27-Jun-06	\$	113,000	2	21%	10%	\$	550,019	5	493.519	RHMS2 2006-HS45	23%	107%	0	
07/30/21	22-Jun-06	\$	73,800	2	10%	90%	\$	738,000	5	678.178	RHMS2 2006-HS45	11%	98%	0	
07/30/22	20-Jun-06	\$	56,000	2	8%	88%	\$	725,389	5	759.238	RHMS2 2006-HS45	7%	84%	0	
07/30/27	16-Jun-06	\$	42,500	2	10%	90%	\$	425,000	5	269.966	RHMS2 2006-HS45	16%	142%	0	
07/30/29	19-Jun-06	\$	61,500	2	10%	90%	\$	615,000	5	680.376	RHMS2 2006-HS45	9%	81%	0	
07/30/31	19-Jun-06	\$	64,000	2	20%	100%	\$	320,000	5	330.495	RHMS2 2006-HS45	19%	97%	1	
07/30/37	23-Jun-06	\$	61,000	2	20%	100%	\$	304,848	5	240.000	RHMS2 2006-HS45	25%	127%	0	
07/30/39	23-Jun-06	\$	62,800	2	20%	100%	\$	314,000	5	333.557	RHMS2 2006-HS45	19%	94%	0	
07/30/41	22-Jun-06	\$	125,000	2	12%	87%	\$	1,299.827	5	1,268.911	RHMS2 2006-HS45	12%	89%	0	
07/30/45	27-Jun-06	\$	136,000	2	20%	100%	\$	680,000	5	568.811	RHMS2 2006-HS45	24%	120%	0	
07/30/53	27-Jun-06	\$	43,000	2	10%	90%	\$	400,000	5	263.839	RHMS2 2006-HS45	15%	130%	0	
07/30/57	27-Jun-06	\$	21,500	2	10%	90%	\$	215,500	5	197.000	RHMS2 2006-HS45	11%	98%	0	
07/30/61	22-Jun-06	\$	102,200	2	18%	90%	\$	557,860	5	317.117	RHMS2 2006-HS45	32%	158%	0	
07/30/63	22-Jun-06	\$	48,750	2	15%	92%	\$	325,000	5	374.057	RHMS2 2006-HS45	13%	83%	0	
07/30/67	22-Jun-06	\$	150,000	2	18%	77%	\$	837,989	5	947.007	RHMS2 2006-HS45	16%	64%	0	
07/30/79	30-Jun-06	\$	63,800	2	20%	100%	\$	349,000	5	240.111	RHMS2 2006-HS45	29%	145%	0	
07/30/81	28-Jun-06	\$	183,750	2	15%	90%	\$	1,225,000	5	1,354.820	RHMS2 2006-HS45	14%	81%	0	
07/30/83	30-Jun-06	\$	44,000	2	20%	100%	\$	220,000	5	212.262	RHMS2 2006-HS45	21%	104%	0	
07/30/89	13-Jun-06	\$	180,200	2	20%	100%	\$	901,000	5	830.542	RHMS2 2006-HM4	22%	108%	0	
07/30/93	29-Jun-06	\$	181,000	2	21%	100%	\$	874,819	5	828.571	RHMS2 2006-HM4	22%	106%	1	
07/30/96	19-Jun-06	\$	566,460	1	80%	100%	\$	708,063	5	830.328	RAU 2006-QA7	68%	85%	0	
07/30/99	14-Apr-06	\$	148,840	1	123.88%	90%	\$	186,000	5	123.881	RAU 2006-HS5	121%	136%	0	
07/30/03	22-Jun-06	\$	597,980	1	80%	100%	\$	747,475	5	820.018	RAU 2006-HS5	73%	91%	0	
07/30/05	16-Jun-06	\$	282,660	1	80%	100%	\$	353,325	5	457.948	RAU 2006-QA7	62%	77%	1	
07/30/11	20-Jun-06	\$	212,000	1	75%	75%	\$	282,667	5	343.317	RAU 2006-QA7	75%	62%	0	
07/30/15	20-Jun-06	\$	414,153	1	70%	70%	\$	591,647	5	551.152	RAU 2006-QA7	75%	75%	0	
07/30/17	07/30/17	20-Jun-06	\$	588,000	1	80%	80%	\$	735,000	5	725.359	RAU 2006-QA7	81%	81%	0
07/30/21	07/30/21	23-Jun-06	\$	334,821	1	80%	100%	\$	418,526	5	413.714	RAU 2006-QA7	101%	101%	1
07/30/23	12-Jun-06	\$	598,200	1	80%	100%	\$	747,750	5	733.998	RAU 2006-QA7	81%	102%	0	
07/30/27	13-Jun-06	\$	232,000	1	80%	90%	\$	290,000	5	273.827	RAU 2006-HS5	85%	95%	0	
07/30/31	16-Jun-06	\$	385,250	1	80%	90%	\$	481,543	5	502.456	RAU 2006-QA7	77%	86%	0	
07/30/35	23-Jun-06	\$	638,150	1	80%	100%	\$	797,688	5	622.605	RAU 2006-QA7	102%	128%	0	
07/30/39	15-Jun-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	95%	\$	430,000	5	446.361	RAU 2006-QA7	77%	92%	1	
07/30/41	16-Jun-06	\$	210,400	1	80%	100%	\$	263,000	5	534.546	RAU 2006-QA7	75%	94%	1	
07/30/45	16-Jun-06	\$	377,800	1	80%	89%	\$	466,000	5	528.684	RAU 2006-QA7	70%	78%	0	
07/30/45	14-Jun-06	\$	650,000	1	76%	90%	\$	855,263	5	558.716	RAU 2006-QA7	116%	138%	0	
07/30/45	16-Jun-06	\$	352,000	1	80%	80%	\$	440,000	5	508.726	RAU 2006-QA7	69%	69%	0	
07/30/45	22-Jun-06	\$	317,000	1	80%	100%	\$	390,000	5	404.104	RAU 2006-QA7	77%	97%	0	
07/30/57	27-Jun-06	\$	492,000	1	80%	100%	\$	615,000	5	652.819	RAU 2006-QA7	75%	94%	0	
07/30/57	12-Jun-06	\$	289,000	1	80%	100%	\$	355,000	5	409.666	RAU 2006-QA7	69%	87%	0	
07/30/57	20-Jun-06	\$	320,000	1	80%	80%	\$	400,000	5	301.554	RAU 2006-QA7	100%	106%	0	
07/30/58	16-Jun-06	\$	419,000	1	80%	80%	\$	595,000	5	582.256	RAU 2006-QA7	82%	82%	0	
07/30/58	21-Jun-06	\$	62,000	1	80%	100%	\$	240,000	5	115.727	RAU 2006-QA7	109%	117%	0	
07/30/58	8-Jun-06	\$	191,350	1	80%	80%	\$	239,188	5	216.807	RAU 2006-QA7	88%	88%	0	
07/30/58	29-Jun-06	\$	260,000	1	80%	100%	\$	332,500	5	341.519	RAU 2006-QA7	78%	97%	0	
07/30/59	16-Jun-06	\$	462,000	1	65%	90%	\$	250,000	5	234.888	RAU 2006-QA7	85%	96%	0	
07/30/59	15-Jun-06	\$	694,000	1	80%	100%	\$	62,3077	5	724.97	RAU 2006-QA7	36%	56%	0	
07/30/59	29-Jun-06	\$	477,600	1	80%	100%	\$	897,500	5	828.571	RAU 2006-QA7	84%	105%	1	
07/30/59	27-Jun-06	\$	375,200	1	80%	100%	\$	469,000	5	350.71	RAU 2006-QA7	117%	102%	0	
07/30/59	15-Jun-06	\$	368,265	1	80%	100%	\$	386,656	5	230.146	RAU 2006-QA7	104%	135%	0	
07/30/60	12-Jun-06	\$	282,000	1	80%	80%	\$	365,000	5	279.278	RAU 2006-QA7	97%	87%	0	
07/30/60	19-Jun-06	\$	1,257,209	1	70%	70%	\$	1,853,000	5	1,757.788	RAU 2006-QA7	72%	72%	0	
07/30/60	16-Jun-06	\$	460,000	1	60%	80%	\$	648,550	5	648.550	RAU 2006-QA7	154%	154%	0	
07/30/60	20-Jun-06	\$	340,000	1	75%	80%	\$	600,000	5	548.697	RHMS 2006-H44	82%	82%	0	
07/30/60	16-Jun-06	\$	340,000	1	80%	80%	\$	300,000	5	297.157	RAU 2006-QA7	81%	81%	0	
07/30/62	13-Jun-06	\$	515,000	1	80%	80%	\$	660,000	5	648.381	RAU 2006-QA7	85%	85%	0	
07/30/62	23-Jun-06	\$	515,000	1	80%	100%	\$	645,000	5	492.328	RAU 2006-QA7	105%	113%	0	
07/30/62	15-Jun-06	\$	467,000	1	80%	100%	\$	575,000	5	558.080	RAU 2006-QA7	82%	103%	0	
07/30/62	13-Jun-06	\$	417,000	1	77%	100%	\$	541,548	5	544.670	RAU 2006-QA7	77%	99%	0	
07/30/63	21-Jun-06	\$	401,941	1	80%	80%	\$	504,926	5	255.384	RAU 2006-QA7	115%	158%	0	
07/30/63	16-Jun-06	\$	222,501	1	80%	80%	\$	338,290	5	344.531	RAU 2006-QA7	79%	79%	0	
07/30/63	16-Jun-06	\$	623,436	1	80%	100%	\$	948,238	5	319.481	RAU 2006-QA7	87%	109%	0	
07/30/64	16-Jun-06	\$	196,000	1	80%	100%	\$	245,000	5	779.255	RAU 2006-QA7	78%	88%	0	
07/30/64	15-Jun-06	\$	196,000	1	80%	100%	\$	245,000	5	253.081	RAU 2006-QA7	77%	97%	0	
07/30/64	20-Jun-06	\$	528,000	1	80%	100%	\$	660,000	5	76.659	RAU 2006-QA7	235%	294%	1	
07/30/65	16-Jun-06	\$	156,579	1	55%	55%	\$	284,689	5	663.691	RAU 2006-QA7	80%	99%	0	
07/30/65	22-Jun-06	\$	385,000	1	66%	66%	\$	583,333	5	266.547	RAU 2006-QA7	59%	59%	0	
07/30/65	26-Jun-06	\$	392,000	1	80%	80%	\$	490,000	5	832.673	RAU 2006-QA7	104%	104%	0	
07/30/65	20-Jun-06	\$	386,400	1	80%	90%	\$	483,000	5	304.616	RAU 2006-QA7	127%	143%	0	
07/30/65	27-Jun-06	\$	204,000	1	80%	100%	\$	255,000	5	228.099	RAU 2006-QA7	89%	112%	0	
07/30/67	19-Jun-06	\$	141,400	1	80%	100%	\$	176,750	5	202.999	RAU 2006-QA7	70%	87%	1	
07/30/67	22-Jun-06	\$	450,000	1	54%	72%	\$	873,333	5	947.007	RAU 2006-QA7	48%	63%	0	
07/30/67	15-Jun-06	\$	489,600	1	80%	80%	\$	330,000	5	313.200	RAU 2006-HS5	84%	84%	0	
07/30/68	15-Jun-06	\$	313,863	1	80%	100%	\$	399,829	5	590.172	RAU 2006-QA7	83%	104%	0	
07/30/68	19-Jun-06	\$	160,569	1	79%	79%	\$	214,644	5	388.748	RAU 2006-QA7	82%	103%	1	
07/30/68	15-Jun-06	\$	321,600	1	80%	100%	\$	402,000	5	189.364	RAU 2006-QA7	90%	90%	0	
07/30/69	21-Jun-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	100%	\$	500,000	5	173.133	RAU 2006-QA7	18%	232%	0	
07/30/69	29-Jun-06	\$	248,000	1	80%	80%	\$	310,000	5	523.973	RAU 2006-QA7	82%	104%	0	
07/30/69	21-Jun-06	\$	248,000	1	80%	80%	\$	310,000	5	328.328	RAU 2006-QA7	76%	76%	0	

[illegible]

00832037	7-Jul-06	\$	280,000	1	77%	\$	363,636	5	387,552	RAU 2006-Q47	72%	72%	0						
00832039	23-Jun-06	\$	501,600	1	80%	80%	\$	627,000	5	553,675	RAU 2006-Q47	91%	91%	0					
00832041	6-Jul-06	\$	159,900	1	80%	80%	\$	440,000	5	367,797	RAU 2006-Q47	96%	96%	0					
00832043	7-Jul-06	\$	199,900	1	80%	80%	\$	199,875	5	227,210	RAU 2006-Q47	70%	70%	0					
00832045	3-Jul-06	\$	159,900	1	80%	100%	\$	249,500	5	208,314	RAU 2006-Q47	96%	120%	0					
00832049	10-Jul-06	\$	100%	1	80%	100%	\$	400,000	5	489,990	RAU 2006-Q47	65%	82%	0					
00832051	12-Jul-06	\$	564,200	1	80%	100%	\$	704,000	5	617,994	RAU 2006-Q47	91%	114%	0					
00832055	3-Jul-06	\$	219,900	1	75%	75%	\$	293,200	5	279,667	RAU 2006-Q47	79%	79%	1					
00832061	6-Jul-06	\$	270,000	1	80%	80%	\$	337,500	5	390,344	RAU 2006-Q47	69%	69%	0					
00832063	5-Jul-06	\$	354,000	1	80%	80%	\$	705,000	5	762,784	RAU 2006-Q47	74%	74%	0					
00832065	29-Jun-06	\$	336,000	1	80%	80%	\$	420,000	5	519,665	RAMP 2006-H5	65%	65%	0					
00832067	30-Jun-06	\$	250,000	1	39%	39%	\$	641,026	5	706,136	RAU 2006-Q47	35%	35%	0					
00832069	240-Jun-06	\$	240,000	1	80%	100%	\$	300,000	5	266,627	RAU 2006-Q47	90%	113%	0					
00832075	3-Jul-06	\$	125,022	1	74%	74%	\$	168,949	5	259,451	RAU 2006-Q47	48%	48%	0					
00832081	23-Jun-06	\$	237,600	1	80%	80%	\$	297,000	5	288,518	RAU 2006-Q47	82%	82%	0					
00832085	10-Jul-06	\$	384,000	1	78%	90%	\$	471,795	5	454,312	RAU 2006-Q47	81%	93%	1					
00832089	11-Jul-06	\$	123,200	1	80%	100%	\$	154,000	5	114,256	RAU 2006-Q47	108%	135%	0					
00832093	10-Jul-06	\$	375,200	1	80%	100%	\$	375,000	5	343,954	RAU 2006-Q47	87%	109%	0					
00832097	5-Jul-06	\$	375,200	1	80%	100%	\$	469,000	5	459,000	RAU 2006-Q47	82%	102%	0					
00832099	7-Jul-06	\$	192,000	1	80%	80%	\$	240,000	5	214,331	RAU 2006-Q47	89%	89%	0					
00832101	28-Jun-06	\$	228,000	1	80%	80%	\$	285,000	5	314,931	RAU 2006-Q47	73%	73%	0					
00832105	5-Jul-06	\$	485,000	1	75%	75%	\$	646,667	5	611,718	RAU 2006-Q47	79%	79%	0					
00832107	30-Jun-06	\$	263,900	1	80%	100%	\$	323,875	5	339,530	RAU 2006-Q47	78%	97%	0					
00832111	10-Jul-06	\$	378,700	1	70%	70%	\$	541,000	5	417,326	RAU 2006-Q47	91%	91%	0					
00832115	12-Jul-06	\$	191,200	1	80%	80%	\$	219,000	5	276,685	RAU 2006-Q47	69%	69%	0					
00832117	7-Jul-06	\$	209,600	1	80%	80%	\$	262,000	5	277,568	RAU 2006-Q47	76%	76%	0					
00832119	12-Jul-06	\$	209,600	1	80%	95%	\$	465,000	5	360,652	RAU 2006-Q47	103%	122%	0					
00832121	6-Jul-06	\$	262,360	1	80%	100%	\$	327,950	5	306,216	RAU 2006-Q47	86%	107%	0					
00832129	12-Jul-06	\$	573,600	1	80%	80%	\$	717,000	5	739,604	RAU 2006-Q47	78%	78%	0					
00832131	11-Jul-06	\$	169,600	1	80%	80%	\$	212,000	5	198,126	RAU 2006-Q47	86%	86%	0					
00832133	10-Jul-06	\$	193,500	1	80%	100%	\$	241,875	5	230,100	RAU 2006-Q47	84%	105%	0					
00832135	7-Jul-06	\$	347,120	1	80%	100%	\$	433,900	5	333,818	RAU 2006-Q47	104%	130%	0					
00832137	10-Jul-06	\$	442,973	1	80%	80%	\$	523,966	5	474,093	RAU 2006-Q47	89%	89%	0					
00832139	13-Jul-06	\$	275,000	1	76%	76%	\$	361,842	5	343,066	RAU 2006-Q47	80%	80%	0					
00832143	12-Jul-06	\$	511,200	1	80%	80%	\$	619,000	5	456,449	RAU 2006-Q47	112%	112%	0					
00832145	10-Jul-06	\$	397,000	1	80%	100%	\$	465,000	5	392,875	RAU 2006-Q47	95%	95%	1					
00832147	13-Jul-06	\$	293,606	1	80%	100%	\$	367,008	5	363,353	RAU 2006-Q47	81%	101%	0					
00832149	13-Jul-06	\$	224,000	1	80%	100%	\$	280,000	5	347,669	RAU 2006-Q47	65%	81%	0					
00832639	3-Jul-06	\$	350,000	1	70%	70%	\$	500,000	5	554,645	RAU 2006-Q47	63%	63%	0					
00832641	3-Jul-06	\$	372,000	1	80%	90%	\$	465,000	5	467,037	RAU 2006-Q47	80%	90%	0					
00832643	3-Jul-06	\$	364,000	1	80%	80%	\$	455,000	5	482,090	RAU 2006-Q47	76%	76%	0					
00832655	3-Jul-06	\$	537,000	1	77%	77%	\$	697,403	5	614,615	RAU 2006-Q47	87%	87%	0					
00832657	3-Jul-06	\$	297,000	1	88%	88%	\$	337,500	5	833,045	RAU 2006-Q47	78%	88%	0					
00832663	29-Jun-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	80%	\$	650,000	5	560,617	RAU 2006-Q47	91%	91%	0					
00832665	3-Jul-06	\$	325,000	1	79%	79%	\$	411,392	5	501,555	RAU 2006-Q47	93%	93%	0					
00832667	27-Jun-06	\$	700,000	1	80%	80%	\$	875,000	5	745,764	RAU 2006-Q47	94%	94%	0					
00832675	30-Jun-06	\$	202,000	1	80%	90%	\$	510,000	5	489,602	RAU 2006-Q47	83%	83%	0					
00832689	3-Jul-06	\$	584,000	1	75%	75%	\$	730,000	5	242,748	RAU 2006-Q47	82%	93%	0					
00832697	12-Jul-06	\$	285,000	1	73%	73%	\$	390,411	5	709,920	RAU 2006-Q47	82%	93%	0					
00832703	30-Jun-06	\$	440,000	1	94%	94%	\$	425,532	5	228,669	RAU 2006-Q47	125%	125%	0					
00832707	29-Jun-06	\$	532,140	1	80%	90%	\$	665,175	5	373,020	RAU 2006-Q47	107%	107%	0					
00832709	6-Jul-06	\$	258,400	1	80%	80%	\$	323,000	5	665,318	RAU 2006-Q47	80%	90%	0					
00832721	6-Jul-06	\$	559,887	1	80%	80%	\$	699,859	5	211,846	RAU 2006-Q47	122%	122%	0					
00832723	28-Jun-06	\$	412,500	1	75%	75%	\$	555,000	5	597,278	RAU 2006-Q47	94%	94%	0					
00832727	29-Jun-06	\$	532,000	1	80%	80%	\$	665,000	5	608,522	RAU 2006-Q47	68%	68%	0					
00832729	28-Jun-06	\$	200,000	1	80%	90%	\$	250,000	5	588,050	RAU 2006-Q47	90%	90%	1					
00832731	27-Jun-06	\$	468,000	1	68%	83%	\$	688,235	5	261,090	RAU 2006-Q47	77%	86%	0					
00832733	30-Jun-06	\$	512,000	1	80%	80%	\$	640,000	5	756,029	RAU 2006-Q47	62%	76%	0					
00832735	12-Jul-06	\$	391,000	1	85%	85%	\$	460,000	5	610,683	RAU 2006-Q47	84%	84%	0					
00832737	10-Jul-06	\$	329,000	1	70%	70%	\$	470,000	5	486,116	RAU 2006-Q47	80%	80%	0					
00832747	14-Jul-06	\$	228,750	1	75%	75%	\$	305,000	5	489,115	RAU 2006-Q47	67%	67%	0					
00832751	5-Jul-06	\$	440,000	1	78%	78%	\$	615,385	5	310,843	RAU 2006-Q47	74%	74%	0					
00832757	29-Jun-06	\$	544,000	1	80%	85%	\$	680,000	5	359,390	RAU 2006-Q47	134%	134%	0					
00832763	30-Jun-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	80%	\$	555,000	5	559,148	RAU 2006-Q47	97%	103%	0					
00832769	1-Jul-06	\$	592,000	1	80%	80%	\$	740,000	5	608,396	RAU 2006-Q47	97%	97%	0					
00832779	7-Jul-06	\$	460,400	1	80%	90%	\$	575,000	5	591,265	RAU 2006-Q47	78%	88%	0					
00832781	7-Jul-06	\$	596,400	1	80%	80%	\$	633,000	5	643,000	RAU 2006-Q47	79%	79%	0					
00832789	6-Jul-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	80%	\$	430,000	5	467,890	RAU 2006-Q47	74%	74%	0					
00832793	5-Jul-06	\$	283,900	1	90%	80%	\$	354,875	5	364,800	RAU 2006-Q47	78%	78%	0					
00832797	6-Jul-06	\$	227,700	1	90%	90%	\$	253,000	5	296,486	RAU 2006-Q47	77%	77%	0					
00832799	11-Jul-06	\$	455,000	1	70%	70%	\$	650,000	5	406,386	RAU 2006-Q47	112%	112%	0					
00832801	7-Jul-06	\$	487,600	1	74%	74%	\$	540,541	5	451,434	RAU 2006-Q47	89%	89%	0					
00832809	10-Jul-06	\$	288,000	1	80%	80%	\$	360,000	5	371,550	RAU 2006-Q47	91%	91%	0					
00832811	10-Jul-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	80%	\$	500,000	5	361,001	RAU 2006-Q47	111%	111%	0					
00832815	7-Jul-06	\$	292,600	1	95%	95%	\$	308,000	5	216,715	RAU 2006-Q47	135%	135%	0					
00832821	17-Jul-06	\$	512,000	1	80%	80%	\$	640,000	5	666,828	RAU 2006-Q47	75%	75%	0					
00832825	18-Jul-06	\$	408,200	1	80%	90%	\$	510,000	5	214,582	RAU 2006-Q47	190%	214%	1					
00866653	13-Jul-06	\$	355,112	1	80%	100%	\$	443,890	5	445,944	RAU 2006-Q48	80%	80%	0					
008666																			

1086689	20-Jul-06	\$	207,920	1	80%	80%	\$	253,900	1	195,462	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
1086687	6-Jul-06	\$	321,600	1	80%	100%	\$	402,000	1	460,544	70%	84%	0					
1086683	14-Jul-06	\$	317,765	1	80%	100%	\$	397,206	5	424,468	75%	94%	0					
1086685	30-Jun-06	\$	352,000	1	80%	100%	\$	440,000	5	406,009	87%	108%	0					
1086687	17-Jul-06	\$	128,000	1	80%	80%	\$	160,000	5	156,000	82%	82%	0					
1086685	24-Jul-06	\$	352,688	1	80%	92%	\$	440,860	5	451,181	78%	90%	0					
1086689	19-Jul-06	\$	260,109	1	80%	100%	\$	336,366	5	414,229	65%	81%	0					
1086697	27-Jul-06	\$	264,000	1	80%	80%	\$	330,000	5	347,545	76%	76%	0					
1086691	17-Jul-06	\$	340,000	1	52%	52%	\$	653,846	5	640,955	53%	53%	0					
1086697	12-Jul-06	\$	279,200	1	80%	100%	\$	450,000	5	433,934	83%	104%	0					
1086691	10-Jul-06	\$	279,200	1	80%	100%	\$	349,000	5	345,024	81%	101%	0					
1086697	14-Jul-06	\$	488,000	1	80%	80%	\$	340,373	5	322,656	84%	84%	0					
1086691	14-Jul-06	\$	488,000	1	80%	80%	\$	610,000	5	687,596	71%	71%	0					
1086692	12-Jul-06	\$	630,000	1	70%	80%	\$	900,000	5	1,072,249	59%	67%	0					
1086693	12-Jul-06	\$	232,000	1	80%	100%	\$	290,000	5	390,713	59%	74%	0					
1086692	12-Jul-06	\$	232,000	1	80%	80%	\$	272,000	5	246,283	88%	88%	0					
1086697	11-Jul-06	\$	157,600	1	80%	100%	\$	197,000	5	213,394	74%	92%	1					
1086697	11-Jul-06	\$	157,600	1	80%	80%	\$	458,000	5	471,386	77%	77%	0					
1086699	19-Jul-06	\$	366,400	1	80%	80%	\$	458,000	5	399,342	92%	92%	0					
1086694	12-Jul-06	\$	140,000	1	65%	65%	\$	215,385	5	222,240	63%	63%	0					
1086694	24-Jul-06	\$	256,000	1	80%	80%	\$	320,000	5	287,200	89%	89%	0					
1086697	28-Jul-06	\$	275,000	1	80%	90%	\$	275,000	5	239,748	92%	103%	0					
1086699	7-Jul-06	\$	511,950	1	80%	80%	\$	619,938	5	393,103	130%	130%	0					
1086691	12-Jul-06	\$	292,500	1	75%	75%	\$	390,000	5	402,882	73%	73%	0					
1086697	13-Jul-06	\$	480,000	1	80%	80%	\$	600,000	5	566,000	85%	85%	0					
1086699	17-Jul-06	\$	120,000	1	80%	100%	\$	150,000	5	152,000	79%	99%	1					
1086697	11-Jul-06	\$	209,500	1	56%	56%	\$	374,107	5	420,155	50%	50%	0					
1086697	18-Jul-06	\$	168,551	1	70%	70%	\$	240,787	5	219,864	77%	77%	0					
1086697	20-Jul-06	\$	328,000	1	80%	100%	\$	410,000	5	463,346	71%	88%	0					
1086697	17-Jul-06	\$	248,000	1	80%	80%	\$	310,000	5	383,073	65%	65%	0					
1086693	12-Jul-06	\$	347,950	1	80%	100%	\$	434,938	5	426,765	82%	102%	0					
1086697	13-Jul-06	\$	264,000	1	80%	80%	\$	330,000	5	320,682	82%	82%	0					
1086691	11-Jul-06	\$	316,656	1	80%	80%	\$	395,820	5	415,962	76%	76%	0					
1086693	19-Jul-06	\$	469,988	1	69%	83%	\$	681,142	5	563,62	83%	103%	0					
1086701	20-Jul-06	\$	325,000	1	80%	80%	\$	325,000	5	390,110	67%	67%	0					
1086703	19-Jul-06	\$	208,000	1	80%	80%	\$	260,000	5	268,038	78%	78%	0					
1086709	11-Jul-06	\$	472,000	1	80%	100%	\$	590,000	5	569,050	83%	104%	0					
1086711	13-Jul-06	\$	455,000	1	79%	79%	\$	575,949	5	553,448	82%	82%	0					
1086713	12-Jul-06	\$	403,200	1	80%	100%	\$	504,000	5	450,232	89%	112%	0					
1086715	18-Jul-06	\$	905,500	1	68%	68%	\$	1,331,618	5	945,633	89%	96%	0					
1086717	18-Jul-06	\$	110,000	1	69%	100%	\$	159,420	5	199,991	55%	80%	0					
1086719	12-Jul-06	\$	578,804	1	78%	78%	\$	742,056	5	819,878	71%	71%	0					
1086721	11-Jul-06	\$	337,168	1	80%	100%	\$	421,460	5	482,270	70%	87%	0					
1086725	21-Jul-06	\$	275,000	1	69%	69%	\$	398,551	5	402,892	68%	68%	0					
1086733	14-Jul-06	\$	324,000	1	80%	100%	\$	405,000	5	480,397	67%	84%	0					
1086735	12-Jul-06	\$	360,000	1	80%	100%	\$	450,000	5	431,195	83%	104%	0					
1086741	27-Jul-06	\$	342,400	1	80%	80%	\$	428,000	5	373,984	92%	92%	0					
1086743	26-Jul-06	\$	205,600	1	80%	100%	\$	510,000	5	446,697	91%	114%	0					
1086749	14-Jul-06	\$	408,000	1	80%	100%	\$	257,000	5	268,033	76%	96%	0					
1086749	20-Jul-06	\$	1,500,000	1	64%	64%	\$	2,343,750	5	464,618	88%	110%	0					
1086751	21-Jul-06	\$	250,400	1	80%	100%	\$	253,000	5	1,510,607	99%	99%	0					
1086759	20-Jul-06	\$	202,400	1	80%	100%	\$	253,000	5	239,093	85%	106%	0					
1086761	17-Jul-06	\$	190,300	1	80%	80%	\$	237,875	5	235,104	81%	81%	0					
1086763	18-Jul-06	\$	434,400	1	80%	80%	\$	543,000	5	480,534	90%	90%	1					
1086769	14-Jul-06	\$	507,200	1	80%	100%	\$	634,000	5	833,125	59%	74%	0					
1086775	14-Jul-06	\$	295,050	1	80%	80%	\$	368,813	5	382,489	77%	77%	0					
1086781	11-Jul-06	\$	280,000	1	80%	100%	\$	350,000	5	393,128	71%	89%	0					
1086783	11-Jul-06	\$	417,000	1	80%	80%	\$	521,250	5	596,337	70%	70%	0					
1086785	14-Jul-06	\$	560,000	1	80%	100%	\$	700,000	5	732,223	76%	96%	0					
1086787	14-Jul-06	\$	370,000	1	78%	78%	\$	474,359	5	505,779	73%	73%	0					
1086789	18-Jul-06	\$	344,000	1	50%	64%	\$	688,000	5	309,008	142%	142%	0					
1086791	21-Jul-06	\$	319,950	1	80%	80%	\$	399,938	5	320,679	100%	100%	0					
1086793	14-Jul-06	\$	189,600	1	80%	100%	\$	237,000	5	247,183	77%	77%	0					
1086795	14-Jul-06	\$	250,000	1	70%	91%	\$	357,143	5	402,500	62%	81%	0					
1086799	13-Jul-06	\$	246,400	1	80%	100%	\$	308,000	5	312,466	79%	99%	1					
1086701	21-Jul-06	\$	246,400	1	80%	80%	\$	307,500	5	308,529	80%	80%	0					
1086703	18-Jul-06	\$	311,684	1	80%	80%	\$	389,618	5	495,491	63%	63%	0					
1086705	25-Jul-06	\$	237,800	1	80%	80%	\$	297,250	5	289,779	82%	82%	0					
1086707	14-Jul-06	\$	228,166	1	70%	70%	\$	325,951	5	308,435	74%	74%	0					
1086721	20-Jul-06	\$	319,920	1	80%	80%	\$	399,900	5	451,047	71%	71%	0					
1086725	24-Jul-06	\$	151,616	1	80%	80%	\$	189,520	5	145,945	104%	104%	0					
1086727	21-Jul-06	\$	119,200	1	80%	80%	\$	149,000	5	248,024	48%	48%	0					
1086733	19-Jul-06	\$	308,000	1	80%	93%	\$	385,000	5	371,336	111%	129%	0					
1086735	21-Jul-06	\$	240,000	1	58%	58%	\$	413,793	5	277,990	65%	65%	0					
1086741	21-Jul-06	\$	350,000	1	80%	80%	\$	375,000	5	358,442	84%	84%	0					
1086743	20-Jul-06	\$	250,642	1	77%	77%	\$	325,509	5	309,724	81%	81%	0					
1086745	19-Jul-06	\$	445,749	1	79%	79%	\$	538,923	5	554,667	77%	77%	0					
1086747	18-Jul-06	\$	243,600	1	80%	80%	\$	304,500	5	299,629	74%	74%	0					
1086751	17-Jul-06	\$	417,000	1	79%	79%	\$	527,848	5	504,345	83%	83%	0					
1086757	20-Jul-06	\$	182,950	1	80%	100%	\$	228,688	5	211,368	87%	108%	0					
1086763	17-Jul-06	\$	492,800	1	80%	80%	\$	616,000	5	482,175	102%	102%	0					

10867167	25-Jul-06	\$	174,000	1	72%	\$	241,667	5	205,721	RAU 2006-Q48	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867169	18-Jul-06	\$	342,400	1	80%	\$	423,000	5	538,098	RAU 2006-Q48	64%	80%	0						
10867173	20-Jul-06	\$	340,000	1	80%	\$	425,000	5	391,284	RAU 2006-Q48	87%	80%	0						
10867175	21-Jul-06	\$	357,500	1	65%	\$	555,000	5	617,092	RAU 2006-Q48	58%	58%	0						
10867177	21-Jul-06	\$	392,000	1	80%	\$	490,000	5	348,075	RAU 2006-Q48	113%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867179	31-Jul-06	\$	249,566	1	80%	\$	311,958	5	278,994	RAU 2006-Q48	90%	90%	1						
10867183	21-Jul-06	\$	201,490	1	80%	\$	251,983	5	255,300	RAU 2006-Q48	79%	99%	0						
10867185	24-Jul-06	\$	184,000	1	80%	\$	185,000	5	154,905	RAU 2006-Q48	96%	96%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867189	24-Jul-06	\$	384,000	1	80%	\$	480,000	5	482,553	RAU 2006-Q48	80%	99%	0						
10867191	17-Jul-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	\$	550,000	5	553,672	RAU 2006-Q48	79%	99%	0						
10867197	26-Jul-06	\$	456,000	1	80%	\$	570,000	5	352,175	RAU 2006-Q48	120%	146%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867199	19-Jul-06	\$	700,000	1	80%	\$	875,000	5	916,796	RAU 2006-Q48	69%	76%	0						
10867201	26-Jul-06	\$	348,800	1	80%	\$	436,000	5	505,123	RAU 2006-Q48	69%	86%	0						
10867203	20-Jul-06	\$	452,000	1	80%	\$	565,000	5	633,043	RAU 2006-Q48	71%	89%	0						
10867205	19-Jul-06	\$	304,000	1	80%	\$	380,000	5	388,481	RAU 2006-Q48	78%	78%	0						
10867207	18-Jul-06	\$	408,000	1	80%	\$	510,000	5	487,192	RAMP 2006-RS6	84%	89%	0						
10867213	26-Jul-06	\$	286,000	1	80%	\$	295,000	5	350,326	RAU 2006-Q48	67%	84%	0						
10867215	24-Jul-06	\$	410,000	1	69%	\$	594,203	5	594,980	RAU 2006-Q48	69%	69%	0						
10867219	21-Jul-06	\$	322,400	1	80%	\$	403,000	5	376,325	RAU 2006-Q48	86%	86%	0						
10867225	27-Jul-06	\$	196,000	1	80%	\$	245,000	5	268,311	RAU 2006-Q48	73%	91%	0						
10867229	26-Jul-06	\$	231,200	1	80%	\$	289,000	5	254,059	RAU 2006-Q48	91%	114%	0						
10867233	20-Jul-06	\$	376,000	1	80%	\$	470,000	5	493,082	RAU 2006-Q48	76%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867237	25-Jul-06	\$	612,000	1	80%	\$	765,000	5	820,018	RAU 2006-Q48	75%	93%	0						
10867239	19-Jul-06	\$	375,000	1	80%	\$	375,000	5	354,790	RAU 2006-Q48	85%	85%	0						
10867241	26-Jul-06	\$	417,000	1	80%	\$	521,250	5	411,271	RAU 2006-Q48	101%	127%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867253	26-Jul-06	\$	315,000	1	72%	\$	437,500	5	421,651	RAU 2006-Q48	75%	75%	0						
10867255	27-Jul-06	\$	581,000	1	80%	\$	726,250	5	368,345	RAU 2006-Q48	158%	197%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10867281	27-Jul-06	\$	164,000	1	100%	\$	164,000	5	202,905	RAU 2006-Q514	81%	81%	0						
10867383	21-Jul-06	\$	389,129	1	95%	\$	409,609	5	434,000	RAU 2006-Q514	90%	90%	0						
10867393	26-Jul-06	\$	262,200	1	95%	\$	276,000	5	259,617	RAMP 2006-RS6	101%	101%	0						
10867395	26-Jul-06	\$	299,625	1	100%	\$	299,625	5	377,400	RAU 2006-Q512	79%	79%	0						
10867397	20-Jul-06	\$	299,000	1	95%	\$	420,000	5	437,971	RAU 2006-Q514	91%	91%	0						
10868009	24-Jul-06	\$	229,000	1	100%	\$	229,000	5	224,252	RAU 2006-Q514	102%	102%	0						
10868311	19-Jul-06	\$	217,700	1	100%	\$	217,700	5	212,171	RAU 2006-Q514	103%	103%	0						
10868311	13-Jul-06	\$	593,507	1	95%	\$	624,444	5	593,222	RAU 2006-Q512	100%	100%	0						
10868321	26-Jul-06	\$	192,900	1	100%	\$	192,900	5	186,691	RAU 2006-Q514	103%	103%	0						
10868323	26-Jul-06	\$	415,800	1	90%	\$	462,000	5	469,211	RAU 2006-Q514	89%	89%	0						
10868325	24-Jul-06	\$	243,505	1	90%	\$	270,561	5	430,697	RAU 2006-Q512	57%	57%	0						
10868327	25-Jul-06	\$	330,000	1	100%	\$	330,000	5	335,103	RAU 2006-Q514	98%	98%	1						
10868335	24-Jul-06	\$	80,750	1	85%	\$	95,000	5	106,731	RAU 2006-Q514	76%	76%	0						
10868337	26-Jul-06	\$	325,300	1	90%	\$	360,000	5	364,357	RAMP 2006-RS6	89%	89%	0						
10868339	26-Jul-06	\$	379,300	1	90%	\$	417,000	5	383,728	RAU 2006-Q515	98%	98%	0						
10868341	1-Aug-06	\$	329,900	1	100%	\$	329,900	5	155,655	RAU 2006-Q515	212%	212%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10868419	5-Jul-06	\$	727,000	2	20%	\$	360,000	5	317,728	RFMS2 2007-H542	23%	113%	0						
10868469	21-Jul-06	\$	380,000	2	16%	\$	2,400,505	5	1,510,607	RFMS2 2007-H542	25%	126%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10868415	20-Jul-06	\$	79,980	2	20%	\$	399,900	5	451,047	RFMS2 2007-H542	18%	89%	0						
10914507	2-Aug-06	\$	506,232	1	80%	\$	632,790	5	634,958	RAU 2006-Q08	80%	90%	0						
10914511	2-Aug-06	\$	172,000	1	77%	\$	223,377	5	218,528	RAU 2006-Q08	79%	79%	0						
10914513	4-Aug-06	\$	563,116	1	80%	\$	703,895	5	719,995	RAU 2006-Q08	78%	88%	0						
10914517	2-Aug-06	\$	273,150	1	90%	\$	303,500	5	294,875	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	93%	0						
10914521	26-Jul-06	\$	634,000	1	90%	\$	704,444	5	795,284	RAU 2006-Q08	80%	80%	0						
10914523	1-Aug-06	\$	300,800	1	80%	\$	376,000	5	336,839	RAU 2006-Q08	89%	100%	1						
10914531	24-Jul-06	\$	470,610	1	80%	\$	584,353	5	577,026	RAU 2006-Q08	82%	92%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914537	1-Aug-06	\$	184,500	1	88%	\$	209,659	5	175,244	RAU 2006-Q08	105%	105%	0						
10914551	4-Aug-06	\$	552,000	1	80%	\$	690,000	5	705,244	RAU 2006-Q08	78%	88%	0						
10914557	26-Jul-06	\$	447,000	1	80%	\$	590,000	5	505,193	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914569	1-Aug-06	\$	247,960	1	80%	\$	309,950	5	261,162	RAU 2006-Q08	95%	95%	0						
10914593	1-Aug-06	\$	650,000	1	49%	\$	1,316,531	5	1,108,322	RAU 2006-Q08	59%	59%	0						
10914599	4-Aug-06	\$	240,000	1	80%	\$	300,000	5	324,523	RAU 2006-Q08	74%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914605	26-Jul-06	\$	149,000	1	71%	\$	209,859	5	217,197	RAU 2006-Q08	69%	69%	1						
10914615	31-Jul-06	\$	524,000	1	80%	\$	655,000	5	563,000	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914617	27-Jul-06	\$	495,000	1	80%	\$	615,000	5	639,391	RAU 2006-Q08	77%	77%	0						
10914627	2-Aug-06	\$	469,000	1	75%	\$	660,000	5	556,733	RAU 2006-Q08	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914637	2-Aug-06	\$	600,000	1	88%	\$	681,818	5	724,549	RAU 2006-Q08	83%	83%	0						
10914641	3-Aug-06	\$	132,000	1	80%	\$	165,000	5	140,278	RAU 2006-Q08	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914649	1-Aug-06	\$	330,000	1	76%	\$	434,211	5	405,664	RAU 2006-Q08	81%	81%	0						
10914655	1-Aug-06	\$	620,000	1	80%	\$	775,000	5	587,535	RAU 2006-Q08	106%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914661	1-Aug-06	\$	177,000	1	75%	\$	236,000	5	234,519	RAU 2006-Q08	75%	75%	0						
10914687	21-Jul-06	\$	296,000	1	80%	\$	370,000	5	340,396	RAU 2006-Q08	87%	87%	0						
10914691	1-Aug-06	\$	208,000	1	80%	\$	260,000	5	258,487	RAU 2006-Q08	80%	80%	0						
10914705	1-Aug-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	\$	500,000	5	479,212	RAU 2006-Q08	83%	94%	0						
10914709	2-Aug-06	\$	1,500,000	1	68%	\$	2,205,882	5	1,496,633	RAU 2006-Q08	100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914711	1-Aug-06	\$	280,000	1	80%	\$	350,000	5	314,775	RAU 2006-Q08	89%	100%	1						
10914721	1-Aug-06	\$	624,750	1	75%	\$	813,000	5	758,399	RAU 2006-Q08	82%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914723	25-Jul-06	\$	399,750	1	75%	\$	513,000	5	351,294	RAU 2006-Q08	114%	114%	0						
10914743	9-Aug-06	\$	244,000	1	76%	\$	321,053	5	327,991	RAU 2006-Q08	75%	83%	0						
10914745	25-Jul-06	\$	393,900	1	65%	\$	606,000	5	530,000	RAU 2006-Q08	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach
10914757	10-Aug-06	\$	196,000	1	67%	\$	292,537	5	283,814	RAU 2006-Q08	74%	74%	0						

10914819	3-Aug-06	\$	140,500	1	95%	\$	147,895	5	136,000	RAU 2006-Q08	103%	103%	0				Breach
10914825	12-Jul-06	\$	307,200	1	80%	90%	\$	384,000	5	376,513	RAU 2006-Q08	82%	92%	0			
10914837	2-Aug-06	\$	401,200	1	80%	90%	\$	501,500	5	548,155	RAU 2006-Q08	73%	82%	0			
10914849	7-Aug-06	\$	232,800	1	80%	80%	\$	291,000	5	252,992	RAU 2006-Q08	92%	92%	0			Breach
10914853	9-Aug-06	\$	296,000	1	80%	80%	\$	371,000	5	345,777	RAU 2006-Q08	86%	86%	0			Breach
10914855	9-Aug-06	\$	548,000	1	80%	90%	\$	685,000	5	441,418	RAU 2006-Q08	124%	140%	0			Breach
10914861	7-Aug-06	\$	524,000	1	80%	90%	\$	655,000	5	584,077	RAU 2006-Q08	90%	101%	0			Breach
10914871	10-Aug-06	\$	300,000	1	77%	77%	\$	389,610	5	380,007	RAU 2006-Q08	79%	79%	0			
10914873	10-Aug-06	\$	504,000	1	80%	90%	\$	631,000	5	622,835	RAU 2006-Q08	81%	91%	1			Breach
10917913	9-Aug-06	\$	405,300	1	60%	60%	\$	675,500	5	703,340	RAU 2006-Q08	58%	58%	0			
10917915	4-Aug-06	\$	320,000	1	80%	90%	\$	400,000	5	310,722	RAU 2006-Q08	103%	116%	0			Breach
10917921	14-Aug-06	\$	244,000	1	80%	91%	\$	305,000	5	257,152	RAU 2006-Q08	95%	98%	0			Breach
10917925	11-Aug-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	84%	\$	550,000	5	498,386	RAU 2006-Q08	88%	108%	0			Breach
10917931	9-Aug-06	\$	709,375	1	64%	84%	\$	709,375	5	614,978	RAU 2006-Q08	74%	91%	0			Breach
10917937	10-Aug-06	\$	650,000	1	80%	90%	\$	812,500	5	804,255	RAU 2006-Q08	81%	91%	0			Breach
10917949	11-Aug-06	\$	524,000	1	75%	75%	\$	668,667	5	730,104	RAU 2006-Q08	72%	72%	0			
10917951	14-Aug-06	\$	479,000	1	75%	75%	\$	638,667	5	777,672	RAU 2006-Q08	66%	66%	0			
10917975	16-Aug-06	\$	380,000	1	80%	80%	\$	600,000	5	516,781	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	93%	0			Breach
10917977	14-Aug-06	\$	480,000	1	61%	86%	\$	631,344	5	611,956	RAU 2006-Q08	64%	90%	0			Breach
10917979	16-Aug-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	80%	\$	500,000	5	261,338	RAU 2006-Q08	153%	153%	0			Breach
10917991	18-Aug-06	\$	776,000	1	77%	77%	\$	877,922	5	930,779	RAU 2006-Q08	73%	73%	0			Breach
10918163	28-Jul-06	\$	110,000	2	20%	100%	\$	550,000	5	522,117	RAU 2006-Q08	21%	105%	0			Breach
10918481	8-Aug-06	\$	396,000	1	80%	100%	\$	495,000	5	478,743	RAU 2006-Q08	83%	103%	0			
10918481	11-Aug-06	\$	543,992	1	80%	100%	\$	673,990	5	728,988	RAU 2007-Q01	75%	93%	0			
10918491	9-Aug-06	\$	599,600	1	80%	100%	\$	749,563	5	713,348	RAU 2006-Q08	84%	105%	0			
10918505	27-Jul-06	\$	367,000	1	75%	75%	\$	489,333	5	455,907	RAU 2006-Q08	75%	123%	0			Breach
10918525	1-Aug-06	\$	372,000	1	80%	100%	\$	465,000	5	455,907	RAU 2006-Q08	82%	102%	0			Breach
10918535	26-Jul-06	\$	261,600	1	80%	90%	\$	327,000	5	334,533	RAU 2006-Q08	74%	83%	0			
10918555	1-Aug-06	\$	469,000	1	70%	95%	\$	670,000	5	458,457	RAU 2006-Q08	102%	139%	0			Breach
10918577	2-Aug-06	\$	271,200	1	80%	100%	\$	333,000	5	351,090	RAU 2006-Q08	77%	97%	1			Breach
10918631	2-Aug-06	\$	417,000	1	65%	65%	\$	641,538	5	763,714	RAU 2006-Q08	55%	55%	1			Breach
10918639	2-Aug-06	\$	239,920	1	80%	100%	\$	299,900	5	290,671	RAU 2006-Q08	83%	103%	0			Breach
10918641	27-Jul-06	\$	204,000	1	70%	80%	\$	291,429	5	270,894	RAU 2006-Q08	75%	86%	0			Breach
10918655	2-Aug-06	\$	518,000	1	70%	84%	\$	681,579	5	554,210	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	103%	0			Breach
10918671	3-Aug-06	\$	300,000	1	80%	100%	\$	450,000	5	357,306	RAU 2006-Q08	101%	126%	0			Breach
10918691	4-Aug-06	\$	300,000	1	54%	54%	\$	555,556	5	589,515	RAU 2006-Q08	51%	51%	0			Breach
10918695	28-Jul-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	100%	\$	650,000	5	709,223	RAU 2006-Q08	73%	92%	0			
10918703	2-Aug-06	\$	287,200	1	80%	100%	\$	359,000	5	197,243	RAU 2006-Q08	145%	182%	0			Breach
10918745	17-Aug-06	\$	139,276	2	20%	100%	\$	669,380	5	627,009	RAU 2007-Q01	22%	116%	0			Breach
10918777	8-Aug-06	\$	175,000	2	10%	61%	\$	1,824,818	5	958,329	RAU 2007-Q01	18%	116%	0			Breach
10918777	1-Aug-06	\$	77,500	2	10%	90%	\$	775,000	5	587,835	RAU 2007-Q01	13%	119%	0			Breach
10918801	31-Jul-06	\$	51,000	2	10%	90%	\$	510,000	5	517,888	RAU 2007-Q01	10%	89%	0			
10918837	14-Aug-06	\$	45,800	2	20%	100%	\$	223,000	5	321,401	RAU 2007-Q01	14%	71%	0			
10918845	8-Aug-06	\$	441,000	1	78%	78%	\$	567,949	5	520,416	RAU 2006-Q08	85%	85%	0			Breach
10918847	21-Aug-06	\$	605,000	1	80%	90%	\$	812,500	5	674,338	RAU 2006-Q08	96%	108%	1			Breach
10918851	23-Aug-06	\$	454,000	1	80%	80%	\$	568,000	5	406,301	RAU 2006-Q08	112%	112%	0			Breach
10918855	18-Aug-06	\$	507,186	1	52%	77%	\$	975,358	5	953,886	RAU 2006-Q08	53%	74%	0			
10918857	17-Aug-06	\$	489,000	1	70%	70%	\$	698,571	5	814,931	RAU 2006-Q08	60%	60%	0			
10918961	23-Aug-06	\$	644,950	1	70%	82%	\$	921,357	5	1,023,076	RAU 2006-Q08	63%	74%	0			Breach
10918963	16-Aug-06	\$	430,258	1	77%	84%	\$	558,777	5	345,935	RAU 2006-Q08	124%	136%	0			Breach
10918967	23-Aug-06	\$	172,500	1	75%	75%	\$	230,000	5	640,128	RAU 2006-Q08	72%	72%	0			
10918989	23-Aug-06	\$	461,000	1	73%	73%	\$	634,347	5	226,537	RAU 2006-Q08	76%	76%	1			Breach
10918989	14-Aug-06	\$	469,590	1	69%	69%	\$	680,565	5	725,338	RAU 2006-Q08	65%	65%	0			Breach
10918995	25-Aug-06	\$	663,750	1	75%	90%	\$	885,000	5	607,934	RAU 2006-Q08	109%	131%	0			Breach
10918995	16-Aug-06	\$	455,000	1	68%	68%	\$	669,118	5	696,936	RAU 2006-Q08	65%	65%	0			Breach
10919063	22-Aug-06	\$	567,000	1	80%	90%	\$	708,750	5	626,643	RAU 2006-Q08	91%	102%	0			Breach
10919063	16-Aug-06	\$	637,124	1	74%	74%	\$	860,978	5	790,601	RAU 2006-Q08	81%	81%	0			Breach
10919067	23-Aug-06	\$	439,900	1	80%	95%	\$	549,875	5	422,607	RAU 2006-Q08	104%	124%	0			Breach
10919067	23-Aug-06	\$	436,000	1	80%	90%	\$	545,000	5	565,000	RAU 2006-Q08	77%	87%	0			Breach
10919067	23-Aug-06	\$	460,000	1	80%	80%	\$	575,000	5	486,092	RAU 2006-Q08	95%	95%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Aug-06	\$	424,000	1	80%	90%	\$	530,000	5	507,000	RAU 2006-Q08	84%	94%	0			Breach
10919073	23-Aug-06	\$	489,000	1	76%	76%	\$	643,421	5	704,673	RAU 2006-Q08	69%	69%	0			Breach
10919073	23-Aug-06	\$	489,000	1	80%	80%	\$	615,000	5	527,453	RAU 2006-Q08	93%	93%	0			Breach
10919073	23-Aug-06	\$	536,000	1	80%	80%	\$	670,000	5	691,950	RAU 2006-Q08	78%	78%	0			Breach
10919073	23-Aug-06	\$	435,000	1	78%	78%	\$	612,821	5	609,634	RAU 2006-Q08	78%	78%	0			Breach
10919073	23-Aug-06	\$	435,000	1	68%	68%	\$	639,706	5	582,192	RAU 2006-Q08	75%	75%	0			Breach
10919073	11-Sep-06	\$	746,000	1	85%	85%	\$	544,706	5	551,021	RAU 2006-Q08	84%	84%	0			Breach
10919073	11-Sep-06	\$	746,000	1	73%	73%	\$	1,027,397	5	1,060,096	RAU 2006-Q08	71%	71%	0			Breach
10919073	20-Sep-06	\$	445,000	1	64%	64%	\$	695,313	5	671,564	RAU 2006-Q08	66%	66%	0			Breach
10919073	21-Sep-06	\$	475,344	1	77%	77%	\$	617,330	5	813,333	RAU 2006-Q08	70%	70%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Sep-06	\$	693,000	1	75%	75%	\$	924,000	5	650,000	RAU 2006-Q08	128%	128%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Sep-06	\$	501,200	1	80%	80%	\$	625,500	5	539,925	RAU 2006-Q08	91%	91%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Sep-06	\$	181,000	1	80%	80%	\$	228,500	5	166,655	RAU 2006-Q08	110%	110%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Sep-06	\$	548,000	1	80%	80%	\$	705,000	5	749,225	RAU 2006-Q08	68%	68%	0			Breach
10919073	15-Sep-06	\$	548,000	1	80%	80%	\$	705,000	5	749,225	RAU 2006-Q08	67%	67%	0			Breach
10919073	18-Sep-06	\$	564,000	1	77%	77%	\$	648,052	5	508,911	RAU 2006-Q08	98%	98%	0			Breach
10919073	21-Sep-06	\$	514,000	1	80%	80%	\$	643,000	5	513,978	RAU 2006-Q08	100%	100%	0			Breach
10919073	12-Sep-06	\$	519,000	1	67%	67%	\$	774,627	5	627,943	RAU 2006-Q08	83%	83%	0			Breach
10919073	8-Sep-06	\$	497,700	1	80%	80%	\$	665,000	5	672,358	RAU 2006-Q08	79%	79%	0			Breach
10919073	13-Sep-06	\$	532,000	1	79%	79%	\$	630,000	5	708,803	RAU 2006-Q08	70%	70%	0			Breach

1103737	18-Sep-06	\$	600,000	1	80%	90%	\$	750,000	5	680,219	RMFS 2006-510	88%	99%	0		Breach		
1103745	12-Sep-06	\$	547,200	1	49%	49%	\$	1,306,122	5	994,718	RMFS 2006-510	64%	64%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103757	12-Sep-06	\$	587,200	1	80%	80%	\$	734,000	5	735,950	RMFS 2006-510	80%	80%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103763	18-Sep-06	\$	358,000	1	80%	70%	\$	440,000	5	404,022	RAU 2006-0315	87%	87%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103765	13-Sep-06	\$	768,000	1	70%	70%	\$	768,571	5	573,389	RMFS 2006-510	94%	94%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103771	14-Sep-06	\$	468,000	1	73%	73%	\$	846,154	5	769,946	RAU 2006-0316	86%	86%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103775	18-Sep-06	\$	468,000	1	78%	78%	\$	641,096	5	693,999	RMFS 2006-511	67%	67%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103787	11-Sep-06	\$	436,000	1	80%	80%	\$	545,000	5	545,637	RMFS 2006-510	80%	80%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103793	13-Sep-06	\$	172,000	1	80%	80%	\$	215,000	5	198,179	RAU 2006-0317	87%	87%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103797	13-Sep-06	\$	453,960	1	80%	86%	\$	567,450	5	534,598	RMFS 2006-510	85%	91%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103795	8-Sep-06	\$	143,411	1	46%	46%	\$	311,763	5	274,724	RAU 2006-0315	52%	52%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037407	13-Sep-06	\$	791,330	1	77%	77%	\$	767,961	5	718,119	RMFS 2006-510	82%	82%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037409	14-Sep-06	\$	374,000	1	56%	56%	\$	667,887	5	360,992	RAU 2006-0316	104%	104%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037415	25-Sep-06	\$	597,500	1	70%	70%	\$	83,571	5	901,467	RMFS 2006-510	66%	66%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037425	25-Sep-06	\$	427,996	1	80%	95%	\$	534,995	5	742,362	RMFS 2006-510	58%	68%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037431	20-Sep-06	\$	620,000	1	80%	80%	\$	775,000	5	841,433	RMFS 2006-510	74%	74%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037437	18-Sep-06	\$	500,000	1	80%	90%	\$	812,500	5	903,018	RMFS 2006-510	72%	81%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037437	12-Sep-06	\$	500,000	1	69%	79%	\$	724,688	5	640,881	RMFS 2006-510	78%	89%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037443	19-Sep-06	\$	187,391	1	78%	78%	\$	240,245	5	235,000	RAU 2006-0315	80%	80%	0		Breach	Breach	
1103745	19-Sep-06	\$	545,500	1	77%	77%	\$	708,442	5	883,100	RMFS 2006-510	62%	62%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037453	15-Sep-06	\$	479,600	1	80%	95%	\$	599,500	5	582,601	RMFS 2006-510	82%	98%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037455	14-Sep-06	\$	456,000	1	80%	80%	\$	570,000	5	331,094	RMFS 2006-510	138%	138%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037459	15-Sep-06	\$	770,000	1	55%	55%	\$	1,400,000	5	1,261,593	RMFS 2006-510	61%	61%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037461	18-Sep-06	\$	426,000	1	67%	67%	\$	613,821	5	606,168	RMFS 2006-510	70%	70%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037465	13-Sep-06	\$	428,000	1	80%	90%	\$	535,000	5	171,066	RMFS 2006-510	250%	281%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037475	21-Sep-06	\$	476,000	1	80%	80%	\$	595,000	5	394,237	RMFS 2006-510	121%	121%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037477	21-Sep-06	\$	480,000	1	80%	80%	\$	600,000	5	558,138	RMFS 2006-510	86%	86%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037479	25-Sep-06	\$	530,577	1	80%	95%	\$	663,221	5	417,227	RMFS 2006-510	127%	151%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037483	22-Sep-06	\$	482,000	1	63%	63%	\$	765,079	5	508,910	RMFS 2006-510	95%	95%	0		Breach	Breach	
11037497	26-Sep-06	\$	781,250	1	75%	75%	\$	975,000	5	405,978	RAU 2006-510	180%	180%	1		Breach	Breach	
11037509	27-Sep-06	\$	188,000	1	80%	100%	\$	235,000	5	259,008	RAU 2007-031	72%	90%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038627	25-Sep-06	\$	86,800	2	20%	100%	\$	434,000	5	455,852	RMFS 2007-H5A1	19%	95%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038631	5-Sep-06	\$	53,500	2	10%	90%	\$	535,000	5	516,821	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	93%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038633	6-Sep-06	\$	250,000	2	14%	66%	\$	1,760,563	5	975,671	RMFS 2007-H5A1	26%	119%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038643	11-Sep-06	\$	81,200	2	20%	100%	\$	406,000	5	398,134	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	102%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038647	24-Aug-06	\$	40,025	2	9%	89%	\$	427,161	5	294,285	RMFS 2007-H5A1	14%	129%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038649	25-Aug-06	\$	67,000	2	13%	92%	\$	527,559	5	481,165	RMFS 2007-H5A1	14%	101%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038671	29-Aug-06	\$	73,800	2	10%	90%	\$	738,000	5	653,457	RMFS 2007-H5A1	11%	102%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038673	30-Aug-06	\$	26,500	2	10%	90%	\$	265,000	5	268,179	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	89%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038683	13-Sep-06	\$	55,000	2	14%	90%	\$	387,051	5	351,000	RMFS 2007-H5A1	16%	99%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038685	29-Aug-06	\$	188,000	2	20%	100%	\$	690,000	5	669,086	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	100%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038697	1-Sep-06	\$	37,000	2	20%	90%	\$	185,000	5	151,697	RMFS 2007-H5A1	24%	110%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038703	5-Sep-06	\$	36,000	2	20%	90%	\$	180,000	5	132,609	RMFS 2007-H5A1	29%	132%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038705	8-Sep-06	\$	90,000	2	23%	99%	\$	384,944	5	249,835	RMFS 2007-H5A1	36%	153%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038707	12-Sep-06	\$	25,600	2	10%	90%	\$	258,065	5	184,071	RMFS 2007-H5A1	14%	126%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038711	6-Sep-06	\$	26,500	2	10%	90%	\$	265,000	5	231,956	RMFS 2007-H5A1	11%	103%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038717	30-Aug-06	\$	134,000	2	31%	100%	\$	425,938	5	488,328	RMFS 2007-H5A1	27%	87%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038719	25-Aug-06	\$	47,000	2	10%	90%	\$	470,000	5	448,400	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	94%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038725	15-Sep-06	\$	71,000	2	10%	90%	\$	710,000	5	846,688	RMFS 2007-H5A1	8%	75%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038733	7-Sep-06	\$	20,000	2	5%	85%	\$	409,836	5	401,373	RMFS 2007-H5A1	5%	87%	1		Breach	Breach	
11038735	8-Sep-06	\$	26,300	2	10%	90%	\$	263,000	5	271,407	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	87%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038741	31-Aug-06	\$	15,000	2	3%	83%	\$	464,396	5	519,010	RMFS 2007-H5A1	3%	74%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038763	6-Sep-06	\$	78,000	2	20%	100%	\$	390,000	5	398,837	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	98%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038767	13-Sep-06	\$	127,800	2	20%	100%	\$	639,000	5	421,250	RMFS 2007-H5A1	30%	152%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038771	5-Sep-06	\$	290,500	2	28%	90%	\$	1,044,964	5	889,924	RMFS 2007-H5A1	33%	106%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038783	11-Sep-06	\$	82,000	2	20%	100%	\$	410,000	5	500,039	RMFS 2007-H5A1	16%	82%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038787	26-Sep-06	\$	200,000	2	20%	100%	\$	1,000,000	5	594,171	RMFS 2007-H5A1	34%	168%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038789	12-Sep-06	\$	70,600	2	20%	100%	\$	353,000	5	366,781	RMFS 2007-H5A1	19%	96%	1		Breach	Breach	
11038797	13-Sep-06	\$	58,800	2	20%	100%	\$	294,000	5	293,222	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	100%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038799	8-Sep-06	\$	105,000	2	20%	100%	\$	525,000	5	478,518	RMFS 2007-H5A1	22%	110%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038805	21-Sep-06	\$	103,773	2	20%	100%	\$	518,865	5	523,870	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	99%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038809	18-Sep-06	\$	29,900	2	10%	90%	\$	299,000	5	324,089	RMFS 2007-H5A1	9%	83%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038811	18-Sep-06	\$	66,800	2	10%	100%	\$	334,000	5	388,335	RMFS 2007-H5A1	17%	86%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038813	13-Sep-06	\$	65,000	2	10%	90%	\$	650,000	5	652,778	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	90%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038819	13-Sep-06	\$	56,339	2	10%	90%	\$	563,390	5	513,665	RMFS 2007-H5A1	11%	99%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038821	26-Sep-06	\$	84,000	2	20%	100%	\$	420,000	5	395,769	RMFS 2007-H5A1	21%	106%	1		Breach	Breach	
11038825	22-Sep-06	\$	72,819	2	20%	100%	\$	364,095	5	401,056	RMFS 2007-H5A1	18%	91%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038829	18-Sep-06	\$	16,000	2	3%	84%	\$	498,442	5	559,574	RMFS 2007-H5A1	3%	75%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038833	26-Sep-06	\$	62,000	2	20%	90%	\$	310,000	5	284,991	RMFS 2007-H5A1	22%	98%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038837	18-Sep-06	\$	55,500	2	10%	90%	\$	555,000	5	542,016	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	92%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038841	13-Sep-06	\$	75,000	2	18%	55%	\$	410,060	5	417,453	RMFS 2007-H5A1	18%	54%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038843	14-Sep-06	\$	47,400	2	10%	80%	\$	410,000	5	423,643	RMFS 2007-H5A1	10%	77%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038849	14-Sep-06	\$	47,400	2	20%	100%	\$	237,000	5	240,941	RMFS 2007-H5A1	20%	98%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038859	22-Sep-06	\$	76,000	2	10%	90%	\$	760,000	5	655,182	RMFS 2007-H5A1	12%	104%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038863	22-Sep-06	\$	33,400	2	10%	90%	\$	167,000	5	188,821	RMFS 2007-H5A1	18%	80%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038869	22-Sep-06	\$	120,000	2	14%	90%	\$	857,143	5	660,223	RMFS 2007-H5A1	18%	117%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038871	21-Sep-06	\$	154,300	2	20%	100%	\$	771,114	5	744,738	RMFS 2007-H5A1	21%	104%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038877	26-Sep-06	\$	54,600	2	10%	90%	\$	335,005	5	267,428	RMFS 2007-H5A1	12%	113%	0		Breach	Breach	
11038879	2																	

11040835	25-Aug-06	\$	44,700	2	19%	100%	\$	235,463	5	227,781	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	103%				Breach
11040909	15-Sep-06	\$	59,704	2	19%	100%	\$	314,432	5	369,616	RMAS2 2007-H542	16%	85%				Breach
11040941	29-Aug-06	\$	120,000	2	20%	100%	\$	549,900	5	539,210	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	102%				Breach
11040965	24-Aug-06	\$	64,400	2	20%	100%	\$	600,000	5	729,513	RMAS2 2007-H542	16%	82%				Breach
11041211	15-Sep-06	\$	46,000	2	10%	90%	\$	460,000	5	347,350	RMAS2 2007-H542	19%	93%				
11041231	13-Sep-06	\$	115,800	2	20%	100%	\$	573,000	5	422,896	RMAS2 2007-H542	11%	98%				
11041239	7-Sep-06	\$	87,000	2	20%	100%	\$	435,000	5	437,119	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	100%				
11041249	29-Aug-06	\$	156,000	2	20%	100%	\$	780,000	5	795,037	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	98%				
11041253	15-Sep-06	\$	175,000	2	20%	100%	\$	875,000	5	928,675	RMAS2 2007-H542	19%	94%				
11041293	8-Sep-06	\$	95,000	2	20%	100%	\$	475,000	5	465,000	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	102%				Breach
11041331	13-Sep-06	\$	80,400	2	20%	100%	\$	402,000	5	155,125	RMAS2 2007-H542	52%	259%				Breach
11041351	15-Sep-06	\$	96,000	2	20%	100%	\$	480,000	5	164,448	RMAS2 2007-H542	52%	260%				Breach
11041355	25-Sep-06	\$	60,000	2	20%	100%	\$	319,000	5	243,007	RMAS2 2007-H542	26%	131%				Breach
11041451	25-Sep-06	\$	60,000	2	20%	100%	\$	300,000	5	300,002	RMAS2 2007-H542	20%	100%				Breach
11041493	21-Sep-06	\$	565,097	2	18%	99%	\$	565,097	5	488,873	RMAS2 2007-H542	21%	114%				Breach
11041497	26-Sep-06	\$	85,800	2	10%	100%	\$	423,000	5	449,981	RMAS2 2007-H542	19%	95%				Breach
11041511	22-Sep-06	\$	200,000	2	32%	100%	\$	619,963	5	585,000	RMAS2 2007-H542	34%	106%				Breach
11042433	16-Aug-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	90%	\$	650,000	5	307,455	RAU 2006-Q09	169%	190%				Breach
11042443	8-Sep-06	\$	197,000	1	76%	76%	\$	259,211	5	362,648	RAU 2006-Q09	54%	54%				Breach
11042445	15-Sep-06	\$	1,000,000	1	66%	66%	\$	1,515,152	5	782,188	RAU 2006-Q09	128%	128%				Breach
11042451	20-Sep-06	\$	324,000	1	76%	76%	\$	423,316	5	392,000	RAU 2006-Q09	83%	83%				Breach
11042455	5-Sep-06	\$	624,000	1	80%	82%	\$	780,000	5	973,154	RAU 2006-Q09	64%	66%				Breach
11042463	12-Sep-06	\$	290,250	1	75%	75%	\$	387,000	5	351,000	RAU 2006-Q09	83%	83%				Breach
11042465	21-Sep-06	\$	336,000	1	80%	80%	\$	420,000	5	381,989	RAU 2006-Q09	88%	88%				Breach
11042471	15-Sep-06	\$	129,500	1	70%	90%	\$	185,000	5	151,897	RAU 2006-Q09	85%	110%				Breach
11042473	1-Sep-06	\$	126,000	1	70%	90%	\$	185,000	5	122,609	RAU 2006-Q09	103%	132%				Breach
11042477	13-Sep-06	\$	182,000	1	65%	94%	\$	280,000	5	320,003	RAU 2006-Q09	57%	82%				Breach
11042487	15-Sep-06	\$	568,000	1	80%	80%	\$	710,000	5	846,688	RAU 2006-Q09	67%	67%				Breach
11042491	25-Sep-06	\$	365,700	1	73%	73%	\$	500,959	5	525,379	RAU 2006-Q09	70%	70%				Breach
11042497	14-Sep-06	\$	287,000	1	70%	80%	\$	410,000	5	423,643	RAU 2006-Q09	68%	77%				Breach
11042499	13-Sep-06	\$	232,000	1	80%	90%	\$	290,000	5	243,750	RAU 2006-Q09	95%	107%				Breach
11042503	7-Sep-06	\$	566,250	1	75%	75%	\$	755,000	5	806,409	RAU 2006-Q10	70%	70%				Breach
11042521	8-Sep-06	\$	486,400	1	80%	90%	\$	608,000	5	552,269	RAU 2006-Q09	88%	88%				Breach
11042523	25-Sep-06	\$	283,500	1	70%	70%	\$	405,000	5	408,317	RAU 2006-Q09	69%	69%				Breach
11042525	25-Sep-06	\$	304,500	1	70%	70%	\$	435,000	5	459,971	RAU 2006-Q09	66%	66%				Breach
11042531	14-Sep-06	\$	347,500	1	70%	70%	\$	498,429	5	440,175	RAU 2006-Q09	79%	79%				Breach
11042535	14-Sep-06	\$	268,000	1	80%	80%	\$	335,000	5	335,193	RAU 2006-Q09	80%	80%				Breach
11042539	20-Sep-06	\$	344,000	1	80%	80%	\$	430,000	5	354,402	RAU 2006-Q09	97%	97%				Breach
11042551	18-Sep-06	\$	239,200	1	80%	80%	\$	299,000	5	324,089	RAU 2006-Q09	74%	74%				Breach
11042563	25-Sep-06	\$	387,850	1	80%	80%	\$	484,813	5	443,887	RAU 2006-Q09	87%	87%				Breach
11042565	13-Sep-06	\$	476,000	1	80%	80%	\$	650,000	5	652,778	RAU 2006-Q09	80%	80%				Breach
11042569	15-Sep-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	80%	\$	595,000	5	611,667	RAU 2006-Q09	78%	78%				Breach
11042577	18-Sep-06	\$	420,000	1	70%	70%	\$	314,286	5	261,929	RAU 2006-Q09	84%	84%				Breach
11042585	22-Sep-06	\$	452,800	1	80%	80%	\$	566,000	5	559,872	RAU 2006-Q09	81%	81%				Breach
11042591	18-Sep-06	\$	444,000	1	80%	90%	\$	555,000	5	542,016	RAU 2006-Q09	82%	82%				Breach
11042603	19-Sep-06	\$	400,000	1	75%	79%	\$	513,333	5	502,996	RAU 2006-Q09	80%	84%				Breach
11042607	22-Sep-06	\$	388,000	1	80%	83%	\$	485,000	5	692,405	RAU 2006-Q10	56%	58%				Breach
11042609	14-Sep-06	\$	464,000	1	80%	80%	\$	580,000	5	529,833	RAU 2006-Q09	88%	88%				Breach
11042615	15-Sep-06	\$	340,000	1	80%	80%	\$	425,000	5	378,931	RAU 2006-Q09	90%	90%				Breach
11042616	21-Sep-06	\$	562,500	1	75%	75%	\$	750,000	5	718,797	RAU 2006-Q09	78%	78%				Breach
11042617	22-Sep-06	\$	608,000	1	80%	90%	\$	760,000	5	655,182	RAU 2006-Q09	93%	104%				Breach
11042623	22-Sep-06	\$	195,300	1	90%	90%	\$	217,000	5	224,510	RAU 2007-Q01	87%	87%				Breach
11042625	22-Sep-06	\$	116,900	1	70%	90%	\$	167,000	5	188,821	RAU 2006-Q09	62%	80%				Breach
11042635	20-Sep-06	\$	376,000	1	80%	80%	\$	470,000	5	502,503	RAU 2006-Q09	75%	75%				Breach
11042637	21-Sep-06	\$	440,000	1	79%	79%	\$	555,962	5	599,942	RAU 2006-Q09	73%	73%				Breach
11042641	25-Sep-06	\$	800,000	1	60%	60%	\$	1,333,333	5	1,286,837	RAU 2006-Q09	62%	62%				Breach
11042651	25-Sep-06	\$	538,400	1	80%	91%	\$	673,000	5	431,457	RAU 2006-Q09	125%	142%				Breach
11042445	25-Sep-06	\$	518,000	1	68%	68%	\$	761,765	5	735,481	RMAS1 2006-512	70%	70%				Breach
11042467	25-Sep-06	\$	457,000	1	77%	81%	\$	593,506	5	613,610	RMAS1 2006-512	74%	78%				Breach
11042469	20-Sep-06	\$	516,279	1	80%	86%	\$	645,349	5	701,715	RMAS1 2006-512	74%	79%				Breach
11042451	19-Sep-06	\$	900,000	1	75%	80%	\$	1,200,000	5	544,895	RMAS1 2006-512	84%	84%				Breach
11042452	15-Sep-06	\$	462,600	1	70%	70%	\$	570,000	5	924,65	RMAS1 2006-511	97%	117%				Breach
11042453	22-Sep-06	\$	474,882	1	80%	80%	\$	593,603	5	945,681	RMAS1 2006-512	68%	68%				Breach
11042454	5-Oct-06	\$	520,000	1	80%	80%	\$	680,000	5	599,293	RMAS1 2006-512	79%	79%				Breach
11042457	1-Oct-06	\$	648,500	1	73%	73%	\$	888,356	5	543,806	RMAS1 2006-512	96%	96%				Breach
11042459	2-Oct-06	\$	616,000	1	80%	90%	\$	790,000	5	810,184	RMAS1 2006-511	80%	80%				Breach
11042461	3-Oct-06	\$	472,000	1	80%	80%	\$	590,000	5	622,939	RMAS1 2006-511	99%	111%				Breach
11042469	2-Oct-06	\$	430,000	1	79%	79%	\$	544,304	5	591,664	RMAS1 2006-512	80%	80%				Breach
11042473	25-Sep-06	\$	527,000	1	70%	70%	\$	752,857	5	164,466	RMAS1 2006-512	262%	71%				Breach
11042481	2-Oct-06	\$	584,000	1	80%	80%	\$	730,000	5	739,669	RMAS1 2006-512	71%	71%				Breach
11042487	6-Oct-06	\$	550,000	1	79%	79%	\$	693,203	5	457,995	RMAS1 2006-511	128%	128%				Breach
11042491	27-Sep-06	\$	358,163	1	79%	79%	\$	453,371	5	687,492	RMAS1 2006-512	80%	80%				Breach
11042497	10-Oct-06	\$	472,000	1	80%	95%	\$	590,000	5	493,529	RMAS1 2006-512	82%	97%				Breach
11042461	28-Sep-06	\$	545,250	1	75%	75%	\$	727,000	5	578,596	RMAS1 2006-512	77%	77%				Breach
11042461	28-Sep-06	\$	489,563	1	80%	88%	\$	611,954	5	709,191	RMAS1 2006-512	78%	86%				Breach
11042467	3-Oct-06	\$	427,313	1	76%	76%	\$	562,254	5	752,747	RMAS1 2006-512	66%	66%				Breach
11042462	3-Oct-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	80%	\$	550,000	5	473,114	RAU 2006-Q517	93%	93%				Breach
11042462	6-Oct-06	\$	568,000	1	75%	75%	\$	757,333	5	756,616	RMAS1 2006-512	75%	75%				Breach
11042469	29-Sep-06	\$	1,000,000	1	68%	68%	\$	1,470,588	5	1,843,241	RMAS1 2006-511	54%	54%				Breach
11042469	26-Oct-06	\$	448,000	1	80%	90%	\$	560,000	5	487,672	RAU 2007-QH1	92%	103%				Breach

[illegible]

1110583	6-Oct-06	\$	79,000	2	20%	100%	\$	393,000	5	406,947	RMAS 2007-H542	19%	97%	1			Breach
1110595	24-Oct-06	\$	58,000	2	10%	90%	\$	580,000	5	579,771	RMAS 2007-H542	10%	90%	0			Breach
1110601	25-Oct-06	\$	22,200	2	5%	85%	\$	452,138	5	354,693	RMAS 2007-H542	6%	108%	0			Breach
1110817	28-Sep-06	\$	212,400	1	90%	90%	\$	236,600	5	174,958	RAU 2006-0318	121%	121%	0			Breach
11110821	11-Oct-06	\$	376,972	1	100%	100%	\$	376,972	5	401,245	RAU 2006-0318	94%	94%	0			Breach
11110823	26-Sep-06	\$	460,000	1	100%	100%	\$	460,000	5	484,392	RAU 2006-0318	101%	101%	0			Breach
11110827	5-Sep-06	\$	213,000	1	100%	100%	\$	213,000	5	243,198	RAU 2006-0318	88%	88%	1			Breach
11110831	14-Sep-06	\$	307,650	1	95%	95%	\$	323,842	5	398,245	RAU 2006-0318	77%	77%	1			Breach
11110839	30-Sep-06	\$	629,000	1	90%	90%	\$	698,869	5	730,091	RAU 2006-0318	86%	86%	0			Breach
11110843	11-Oct-06	\$	352,000	1	86%	86%	\$	403,302	5	316,176	RAU 2006-0318	111%	111%	0			Breach
11110845	2-Oct-06	\$	430,992	1	100%	100%	\$	430,992	5	432,245	RAU 2006-0318	100%	100%	0			Breach
11110849	10-Oct-06	\$	373,500	1	90%	90%	\$	415,000	5	314,870	RAU 2007-H51	119%	119%	0			Breach
11110853	13-Oct-06	\$	252,311	1	90%	90%	\$	280,346	5	335,314	RAU 2006-0318	75%	75%	0			Breach
11110857	22-Sep-06	\$	153,000	1	100%	100%	\$	783,304	5	711,387	RAU 2006-0318	110%	110%	0			Breach
11110865	6-Oct-06	\$	570,400	1	90%	90%	\$	620,000	5	125,243	RAU 2006-0318	122%	122%	1			Breach
11110869	9-Oct-06	\$	82,800	1	90%	92%	\$	92,000	5	630,604	RAU 2006-0318	90%	90%	0			Breach
11110873	26-Sep-06	\$	198,000	1	84%	84%	\$	235,714	5	41,073	RAU 2006-0318	199%	199%	0			Breach
11110885	3-Oct-06	\$	297,350	1	95%	95%	\$	313,000	5	206,534	RAU 2006-0318	144%	144%	0			Breach
11110887	2-Oct-06	\$	365,000	1	100%	100%	\$	365,000	5	267,534	RAU 2006-0318	137%	137%	0			Breach
11110893	18-Sep-06	\$	200,000	1	100%	100%	\$	200,000	5	198,512	RAU 2006-0318	101%	101%	0			Breach
11110895	9-Oct-06	\$	286,200	1	87%	87%	\$	323,965	5	315,468	RAU 2006-0318	91%	91%	0			Breach
11110913	3-Oct-06	\$	417,050	1	90%	90%	\$	463,189	5	234,794	RAU 2006-0318	178%	178%	0			Breach
11110917	2-Oct-06	\$	170,000	1	100%	100%	\$	170,000	5	133,750	RAU 2006-0318	127%	127%	0			Breach
11110923	5-Oct-06	\$	299,000	1	88%	88%	\$	333,773	5	309,844	RAU 2006-0318	97%	97%	0			Breach
11110927	28-Sep-06	\$	185,950	1	95%	95%	\$	195,737	5	180,993	RAU 2006-0318	103%	103%	1			Breach
11110929	29-Sep-06	\$	399,000	1	100%	100%	\$	490,000	5	597,905	RAU 2006-0318	82%	82%	0			Breach
11110931	3-Oct-06	\$	256,000	1	100%	100%	\$	256,000	5	356,594	RAU 2006-0318	103%	103%	1			Breach
11110939	4-Oct-06	\$	325,000	1	100%	100%	\$	325,000	5	361,436	RAU 2006-0318	72%	72%	0			Breach
11110941	18-Oct-06	\$	310,000	1	100%	100%	\$	310,000	5	362,535	RAU 2006-0318	86%	86%	0			Breach
11110949	24-Oct-06	\$	280,000	1	100%	100%	\$	280,000	5	275,407	RAU 2006-0318	102%	102%	0			Breach
11110951	11-Oct-06	\$	179,000	1	100%	100%	\$	179,000	5	155,556	RAU 2006-0318	115%	115%	0			Breach
11110961	9-Oct-06	\$	363,530	1	100%	100%	\$	363,530	5	352,376	RAU 2006-0318	103%	103%	0			Breach
11110965	13-Oct-06	\$	289,529	1	85%	85%	\$	289,529	5	226,333	RAU 2006-0318	109%	109%	0			Breach
11110973	6-Oct-06	\$	231,200	1	85%	85%	\$	272,000	5	276,033	RAU 2007-H51	84%	84%	0			Breach
11110975	6-Oct-06	\$	157,250	1	85%	85%	\$	185,000	5	211,965	RAU 2007-H51	74%	74%	0			Breach
11110977	5-Oct-06	\$	189,474	1	95%	95%	\$	189,474	5	179,238	RAU 2007-H51	100%	100%	0			Breach
11110985	12-Oct-06	\$	205,000	1	100%	100%	\$	205,000	5	251,679	RAU 2006-0318	81%	81%	0			Breach
11110987	30-Oct-06	\$	197,000	1	100%	100%	\$	197,000	5	184,499	RAU 2006-0318	107%	107%	0			Breach
11110991	24-Oct-06	\$	487,400	1	90%	90%	\$	486,000	5	454,006	RAU 2007-H51	96%	96%	0			Breach
11110995	25-Oct-06	\$	464,000	1	80%	90%	\$	605,000	5	436,906	RAU 2006-512	111%	125%	0			Breach
11125695	1-Nov-06	\$	324,000	1	80%	90%	\$	405,000	5	455,488	RAU 2007-031	71%	80%	0			Breach
11125703	26-Oct-06	\$	564,000	1	80%	95%	\$	705,000	5	611,057	RAU 2006-512	92%	110%	0			Breach
11125707	2-Nov-06	\$	640,000	1	80%	80%	\$	800,000	5	711,330	RAU 2006-512	90%	90%	0			Breach
11125711	26-Oct-06	\$	475,000	1	71%	71%	\$	669,014	5	656,660	RAU 2006-512	72%	72%	0			Breach
11125733	27-Oct-06	\$	502,800	1	80%	89%	\$	624,500	5	610,000	RAU 2006-512	84%	92%	0			Breach
11125737	6-Nov-06	\$	479,950	1	80%	90%	\$	599,938	5	510,114	RAU 2006-512	94%	106%	0			Breach
11125751	2-Nov-06	\$	200,000	1	80%	80%	\$	560,000	5	575,666	RAU 2006-512	78%	78%	0			Breach
11125779	7-Nov-06	\$	536,000	1	80%	80%	\$	670,000	5	255,258	RAU 2006-0317	78%	98%	1			Breach
11125783	30-Oct-06	\$	1,000,000	1	75%	84%	\$	1,333,333	5	1,263,290	RAU 2006-512	79%	82%	0			Breach
11125785	7-Nov-06	\$	308,000	1	80%	100%	\$	385,000	5	379,000	RAU 2006-0317	81%	102%	0			Breach
11125799	31-Oct-06	\$	573,539	1	64%	68%	\$	896,155	5	866,574	RAU 2006-512	65%	70%	0			Breach
11125813	31-Oct-06	\$	505,659	1	80%	95%	\$	632,074	5	594,095	RAU 2006-512	85%	101%	0			Breach
11125815	25-Oct-06	\$	540,000	1	72%	72%	\$	694,444	5	475,066	RAU 2006-512	105%	105%	0			Breach
11125819	22-Oct-06	\$	524,965	1	80%	85%	\$	656,306	5	583,589	RAU 2006-512	85%	93%	0			Breach
11125821	25-Oct-06	\$	603,000	1	77%	77%	\$	779,221	5	722,772	RAU 2006-512	83%	83%	0			Breach
11125823	30-Oct-06	\$	453,800	1	65%	89%	\$	589,351	5	493,451	RAU 2006-512	92%	92%	0			Breach
11125843	27-Oct-06	\$	546,000	1	80%	90%	\$	470,000	5	679,524	RAU 2006-512	80%	91%	0			Breach
11125849	1-Nov-06	\$	376,000	1	80%	80%	\$	470,000	5	435,625	RAU 2007-041	70%	70%	0			Breach
11125862	2-Nov-06	\$	532,000	1	80%	80%	\$	665,000	5	759,239	RAU 2007-041	88%	88%	0			Breach
11125935	15-Nov-06	\$	275,000	1	89%	89%	\$	308,989	5	311,486	RAU 2007-041	88%	88%	0			Breach
11126019	2-Nov-06	\$	564,000	1	80%	80%	\$	705,000	5	664,936	RAU 2007-041	85%	85%	0			Breach
11126135	16-Nov-06	\$	1,495,000	1	65%	65%	\$	2,300,000	5	591,993	RAU 2007-041	253%	253%	0			Breach
11126941	20-Nov-06	\$	435,000	1	75%	75%	\$	580,000	5	557,673	RAU 2007-041	78%	78%	0			Breach
11170999	3-Nov-06	\$	515,000	1	64%	64%	\$	804,688	5	743,161	RAU 2007-51	69%	69%	0			Breach
11171005	8-Nov-06	\$	560,000	1	73%	73%	\$	767,123	5	741,301	RAU 2007-51	76%	76%	0			Breach
11171007	27-Oct-06	\$	580,000	1	80%	80%	\$	725,000	5	768,668	RAU 2007-51	75%	75%	0			Breach
11171009	7-Nov-06	\$	590,000	1	80%	93%	\$	625,000	5	636,829	RAU 2007-51	79%	79%	0			Breach
11171013	13-Nov-06	\$	435,000	1	63%	63%	\$	690,476	5	382,669	RAU 2007-51	114%	114%	1			Breach
11171017	3-Nov-06	\$	509,000	1	56%	56%	\$	908,929	5	939,039	RAU 2007-51	54%	54%	0			Breach
11171025	13-Nov-06	\$	462,400	1	80%	100%	\$	578,000	5	679,993	RAU 2007-51	68%	85%	0			Breach
11171035	9-Nov-06	\$	161,200	1	80%	80%	\$	204,000	5	164,462	RAU 2007-031	99%	99%	0			Breach
11171045	6-Nov-06	\$	504,000	1	77%	95%	\$	649,351	5	617,789	RAU 2007-51	81%	100%	0			Breach
11171049	7-Nov-06	\$	446,000	1	80%	80%	\$	630,000	5	493,099	RAU 2007-51	102%	102%	0			Breach
11171063	17-Nov-06	\$	249,900	1	70%	70%	\$	580,000	5	569,000	RAU 2007-51	71%	71%	0			Breach
11171073	9-Nov-06	\$	194,400	1	80%	95%	\$	243,000	5	364,820	RAU 2007-52	68%	68%	0			Breach
11171079	26-Oct-06	\$	288,000	1	80%	95%	\$	360,000	5	259,894	RAU 2007-031	75%	89%	0			Breach
11171101	16-Nov-06	\$	184,000	1	80%	100%	\$	360,000	5	359,071	RAU 2007-031	80%	100%	0			Breach

[illegible]

11218905	11-Nov-06	\$	616,000	1	80%	\$	770,000	5	650,236	RAU 2007-Q02	95%	95%	0	Breach	Breach
1118907	20-Nov-06	\$	225,000	1	73%	\$	321,918	5	329,536	RAU 2007-Q01	71%	91%	0	Breach	Breach
1118909	9-Nov-06	\$	382,400	1	80%	\$	453,000	5	401,947	RAU 2007-Q01	90%	70%	1	Breach	Breach
1118917	15-Nov-06	\$	306,000	1	80%	\$	450,000	5	401,212	RAU 2007-Q02	90%	101%	0	Breach	Breach
1118921	16-Nov-06	\$	528,000	1	80%	\$	660,000	5	583,400	RAU 2007-Q02	90%	102%	0	Breach	Breach
1118923	27-Nov-06	\$	234,000	1	90%	\$	260,000	5	273,550	RAU 2007-Q02	86%	86%	1	Breach	Breach
1118933	20-Nov-06	\$	650,000	1	67%	\$	970,149	5	865,010	RAU 2007-Q02	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach
1118425	20-Nov-06	\$	336,000	1	80%	\$	420,000	5	412,608	RAU 2007-Q01	81%	92%	0	Breach	Breach
1118713	30-Nov-06	\$	440,000	1	80%	\$	550,000	5	539,344	RAU 2007-Q01	82%	86%	0	Breach	Breach
1118735	20-Nov-06	\$	406,000	1	70%	\$	580,000	5	626,718	RAU 2007-Q01	65%	65%	0	Breach	Breach
1120877	1-Dec-06	\$	400,000	1	75%	\$	534,667	5	537,202	RAU 2007-Q02	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach
11207309	5-Dec-06	\$	350,000	1	72%	\$	486,111	5	490,997	RAU 2007-Q01	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach
11208131	27-Oct-06	\$	113,900	2	19%	\$	599,474	5	598,086	RAU 2007-H542	19%	100%	0	Breach	Breach
11208133	17-Nov-06	\$	130,000	2	17%	\$	750,144	5	810,607	RAU 2007-H542	16%	90%	0	Breach	Breach
11208159	17-Oct-06	\$	46,500	2	15%	\$	310,000	5	321,256	RAU 2007-H542	14%	92%	1	Breach	Breach
11208161	17-Oct-06	\$	77,619	2	20%	\$	388,095	5	461,592	RAU 2007-H01	17%	84%	0	Breach	Breach
11208181	27-Oct-06	\$	117,000	2	20%	\$	585,000	5	456,154	RAU 2007-H542	26%	128%	0	Breach	Breach
11208183	2-Nov-06	\$	102,800	2	13%	\$	81,206	5	607,160	RAU 2007-H542	17%	120%	0	Breach	Breach
11208185	16-Oct-06	\$	70,000	2	100%	\$	350,000	5	376,923	RAU 2007-H542	19%	93%	0	Breach	Breach
11208209	9-Nov-06	\$	28,500	2	7%	\$	604,281	5	395,975	RAU 2007-H542	7%	89%	0	Breach	Breach
11208219	7-Nov-06	\$	87,750	2	14%	\$	614,926	5	597,561	RAU 2007-H542	15%	94%	0	Breach	Breach
11208241	8-Nov-06	\$	34,950	2	100%	\$	174,925	5	116,771	RAU 2007-H542	30%	150%	0	Breach	Breach
11208249	8-Nov-06	\$	77,000	2	20%	\$	385,000	5	340,065	RAU 2007-H542	23%	113%	0	Breach	Breach
11208253	3-Nov-06	\$	87,800	2	20%	\$	439,000	5	338,882	RAU 2007-H542	26%	130%	0	Breach	Breach
11208257	2-Nov-06	\$	68,250	2	15%	\$	455,000	5	431,820	RAU 2007-H542	16%	100%	0	Breach	Breach
11208259	19-Oct-06	\$	102,200	2	20%	\$	315,000	5	318,209	RAU 2007-H543	22%	99%	0	Breach	Breach
11208267	27-Oct-06	\$	102,200	2	20%	\$	380,000	5	468,410	RAU 2007-H543	25%	109%	0	Breach	Breach
11208303	13-Nov-06	\$	76,000	2	20%	\$	245,000	5	307,663	RAU 2007-H542	22%	124%	1	Breach	Breach
11208307	30-Oct-06	\$	49,000	2	20%	\$	599,000	5	280,971	RAU 2007-H542	17%	87%	1	Breach	Breach
11208325	14-Nov-06	\$	119,800	2	20%	\$	599,000	5	579,707	RAU 2007-H542	21%	103%	0	Breach	Breach
11208327	6-Nov-06	\$	90,997	2	15%	\$	606,647	5	630,901	RAU 2007-H542	14%	92%	0	Breach	Breach
11208331	8-Nov-06	\$	92,200	2	20%	\$	461,000	5	459,611	RAU 2007-H542	16%	79%	1	Breach	Breach
11208335	31-Oct-06	\$	80,000	2	20%	\$	400,000	5	459,667	RAU 2007-H542	17%	87%	0	Breach	Breach
11208347	27-Oct-06	\$	90,000	2	20%	\$	450,000	5	519,192	RAU 2007-H542	17%	87%	0	Breach	Breach
11208353	14-Nov-06	\$	55,000	2	20%	\$	275,000	5	289,879	RAU 2007-H542	19%	95%	0	Breach	Breach
11208373	10-Nov-06	\$	36,953	2	20%	\$	184,765	5	248,086	RAU 2007-H542	15%	74%	0	Breach	Breach
11208385	6-Nov-06	\$	110,000	2	20%	\$	550,000	5	332,884	RAU 2007-H542	33%	165%	0	Breach	Breach
11208389	2-Nov-06	\$	55,000	2	20%	\$	275,000	5	333,633	RAU 2007-H542	16%	82%	0	Breach	Breach
11208395	8-Nov-06	\$	24,288	2	20%	\$	121,480	5	119,914	RAU 2007-H542	20%	101%	0	Breach	Breach
11208399	14-Nov-06	\$	70,000	2	100%	\$	350,175	5	333,357	RAU 2007-H542	21%	105%	0	Breach	Breach
11208401	21-Nov-06	\$	80,863	2	19%	\$	320,332	5	333,063	RAU 2007-H542	18%	96%	0	Breach	Breach
11208403	2-Nov-06	\$	131,500	2	10%	\$	315,000	5	327,085	RAU 2007-H542	10%	87%	0	Breach	Breach
11208405	22-Nov-06	\$	147,500	2	30%	\$	485,038	5	459,350	RAU 2007-H542	32%	74%	0	Breach	Breach
11208409	15-Nov-06	\$	77,200	2	20%	\$	386,000	5	391,304	RAU 2007-H542	20%	99%	0	Breach	Breach
11208413	2-Nov-06	\$	53,354	2	20%	\$	266,770	5	325,165	RAU 2007-H542	16%	82%	0	Breach	Breach
11208415	29-Nov-06	\$	59,000	2	20%	\$	295,000	5	291,087	RAU 2007-H543	20%	101%	1	Breach	Breach
11208433	29-Nov-06	\$	35,000	2	20%	\$	175,000	5	152,600	RAU 2007-H542	23%	115%	1	Breach	Breach
11208439	21-Nov-06	\$	129,900	2	19%	\$	681,684	5	747,652	RAU 2007-H542	17%	91%	0	Breach	Breach
11208445	17-Nov-06	\$	65,998	2	20%	\$	323,990	5	362,037	RAU 2007-H542	18%	91%	0	Breach	Breach
11208453	9-Nov-06	\$	112,000	2	20%	\$	560,000	5	473,665	RAU 2007-H542	24%	106%	0	Breach	Breach
11208461	14-Nov-06	\$	15,000	2	3%	\$	500,000	5	466,475	RAU 2007-H542	3%	33%	0	Breach	Breach
11208463	17-Nov-06	\$	57,200	2	20%	\$	286,143	5	402,060	RAU 2007-H542	14%	71%	1	Breach	Breach
11208463	21-Nov-06	\$	49,980	2	20%	\$	249,900	5	249,056	RAU 2007-H542	20%	100%	0	Breach	Breach
11208503	22-Nov-06	\$	38,000	2	20%	\$	190,000	5	232,152	RAU 2007-H542	16%	82%	0	Breach	Breach
11208511	22-Nov-06	\$	49,000	2	20%	\$	245,000	5	263,088	RAU 2007-H01	19%	93%	0	Breach	Breach
11208517	27-Nov-06	\$	101,700	2	19%	\$	535,463	5	480,849	RAU 2007-H542	21%	111%	0	Breach	Breach
11208525	20-Nov-06	\$	65,950	2	20%	\$	330,080	5	384,622	RAU 2007-H542	17%	86%	1	Breach	Breach
11208541	15-Nov-06	\$	35,250	2	15%	\$	235,000	5	195,000	RAU 2007-H542	18%	114%	0	Breach	Breach
11208541	20-Oct-06	\$	225,000	2	27%	\$	819,971	5	801,546	RAU 2007-H541	28%	73%	0	Breach	Breach
11210433	1-Nov-06	\$	200,000	2	21%	\$	950,119	5	830,116	RAU 2007-H541	24%	103%	0	Breach	Breach
11210433	14-Nov-06	\$	38,900	2	10%	\$	400,206	5	353,727	RAU 2007-H541	11%	100%	0	Breach	Breach
11210445	1-Nov-06	\$	61,400	2	10%	\$	614,000	5	646,768	RAU 2007-H541	9%	85%	0	Breach	Breach
11210445	13-Nov-06	\$	206,000	2	15%	\$	1,340,273	5	1,395,877	RAU 2007-H541	15%	86%	0	Breach	Breach
11210445	30-Oct-06	\$	157,000	2	24%	\$	666,950	5	616,300	RAU 2007-H541	25%	103%	0	Breach	Breach
11210473	30-Oct-06	\$	37,900	2	10%	\$	379,000	5	391,132	RAU 2007-H541	10%	87%	0	Breach	Breach
11210479	6-Nov-06	\$	114,000	2	20%	\$	600,000	5	575,867	RAU 2007-H541	10%	94%	0	Breach	Breach
11210483	30-Oct-06	\$	114,000	2	20%	\$	570,500	5	577,500	RAU 2007-H541	13%	65%	0	Breach	Breach
11210485	27-Oct-06	\$	39,800	2	10%	\$	398,000	5	367,619	RAU 2007-H541	11%	97%	0	Breach	Breach
11210495	2-Nov-06	\$	74,000	2	20%	\$	370,000	5	352,202	RAU 2007-H541	21%	105%	0	Breach	Breach
11210497	14-Nov-06	\$	31,214	2	10%	\$	312,140	5	338,836	RAU 2007-H541	9%	83%	0	Breach	Breach
11210503	2-Nov-06	\$	62,000	2	10%	\$	363,333	5	371,876	RAU 2007-H541	9%	88%	0	Breach	Breach
11210511	10-Nov-06	\$	62,000	2	20%	\$	310,000	5	289,617	RAU 2007-H541	21%	107%	0	Breach	Breach
11210515	8-Nov-06	\$	47,000	2	10%	\$	470,000	5	726,101	RAU 2007-H541	11%	92%	0	Breach	Breach
11210517	17-Nov-06	\$	46,500	2	10%	\$	465,000	5	435,625	RAU 2007-H541	11%	97%	0	Breach	Breach
11210521	26-Oct-06	\$	136,000	2	20%	\$	680,000	5	430,126	RAU 2007-H541	19%	95%	0	Breach	Breach
11210527	13-Nov-06	\$	29,200	2	15%	\$	469,000	5	397,714	RAU 2007-H541	18%	112%	0	Breach	Breach
11210539	9-Nov-06	\$	23,000	2	9%	\$	268,065	5	280,222	RAU 2007-H541	10%	94%	0	Breach	Breach
11210549	6-Nov-06	\$	41,500	2	10%	\$	415,000	5	275,545	RAU 2007-H541	8%	77%	0	Breach	Breach
11210553	3-Nov-06	\$	58,600	2	20%	\$	293,000	5	262,600	RAU 2007-H541	22%	112%	0	Breach	Breach
11210559	10-Nov-06	\$	38,000	2	20%	\$	190,000	5	190,796	RAU 2007-H541	20%	100%	1	Breach	Breach

11210565	21-Nov-06	\$	150,000	2	16%	88%	\$	910,194	5	632,399	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	24%	127%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210567	6-Nov-06	\$	15,000	2	4%	84%	\$	394,737	5	460,618	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	3%	72%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210575	7-Nov-06	\$	58,000	2	22%	85%	\$	665,116	5	593,314	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	24%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210577	14-Nov-06	\$	67,500	2	20%	100%	\$	290,000	5	559,732	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	19%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210581	8-Nov-06	\$	61,000	2	15%	95%	\$	450,000	5	530,922	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	12%	76%	1	Breach	Breach	
11210583	14-Nov-06	\$	61,000	2	10%	90%	\$	610,000	5	441,192	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	124%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210585	15-Nov-06	\$	57,000	2	20%	100%	\$	570,000	5	579,641	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210591	29-Nov-06	\$	139,000	2	20%	100%	\$	695,000	5	414,949	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	33%	167%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210593	8-Nov-06	\$	131,250	2	15%	90%	\$	875,000	5	896,872	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	15%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210597	21-Nov-06	\$	75,000	2	15%	89%	\$	509,857	5	519,628	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210601	16-Nov-06	\$	57,495	2	10%	90%	\$	574,950	5	621,286	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	9%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210605	14-Nov-06	\$	32,500	2	10%	89%	\$	323,949	5	249,233	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	13%	118%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210609	15-Nov-06	\$	45,000	2	10%	90%	\$	450,000	5	401,212	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	11%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210613	28-Nov-06	\$	151,000	2	8%	78%	\$	200,000	5	147,736	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210615	9-Nov-06	\$	15,000	2	23%	88%	\$	650,022	5	477,669	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	32%	120%	1	Breach	Breach	
11210617	28-Nov-06	\$	59,000	2	10%	90%	\$	590,000	5	598,472	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210621	14-Nov-06	\$	55,000	2	10%	90%	\$	660,000	5	583,240	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	11%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210625	16-Nov-06	\$	60,000	2	11%	68%	\$	549,954	5	296,659	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	19%	93%	1	Breach	Breach	
11210631	22-Nov-06	\$	81,000	2	10%	90%	\$	810,000	5	456,517	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	13%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210641	20-Nov-06	\$	125,000	2	20%	100%	\$	625,000	5	782,625	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	29%	143%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210643	20-Nov-06	\$	42,000	2	10%	90%	\$	420,000	5	438,285	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	
11210651	27-Nov-06	\$	128,600	2	24%	100%	\$	545,609	5	412,608	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	36%	152%	0	Breach	Breach	
11211435	4-Dec-06	\$	212,000	1	80%	80%	\$	265,000	5	358,554	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	
11212367	1-Dec-06	\$	540,000	1	80%	80%	\$	675,000	5	598,056	RAU 2007-QH2	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	
11212683	1-Dec-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	90%	\$	500,000	5	345,360	RAU 2007-QH2	73%	124%	0	Breach	Breach	
11223407	11-Dec-06	\$	208,000	1	80%	80%	\$	260,000	5	546,452	RAU 2007-QH2	10%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	
11224655	13-Nov-06	\$	512,000	1	80%	90%	\$	640,000	5	247,714	RAU 2007-QH1	63%	71%	0	Breach	Breach	
11224739	16-Nov-06	\$	459,960	1	80%	78%	\$	574,950	5	621,286	RAU 2007-QH2	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	
11240043	15-Dec-06	\$	316,000	1	80%	80%	\$	395,000	5	379,585	RAU 2007-QH2	95%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	
11240167	20-Dec-06	\$	1,000,000	1	67%	67%	\$	1,492,557	5	624,914	RAU 2007-QH3	160%	160%	0	Breach	Breach	
11240209	11-Dec-06	\$	161,600	1	80%	80%	\$	202,000	5	162,046	RAU 2007-QH2	100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	
11240221	19-Dec-06	\$	394,000	1	79%	79%	\$	454,430	5	339,930	RAU 2007-QH1	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	
11240307	21-Dec-06	\$	420,000	1	80%	80%	\$	525,000	5	362,213	RAU 2007-QH2	103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	
11241163	19-Dec-06	\$	279,000	1	76%	76%	\$	507,895	5	491,954	RAU 2007-QH2	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach	
11243303	20-Dec-06	\$	312,000	1	80%	80%	\$	390,000	5	417,888	RAU 2007-QH2	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	
11246371	8-Dec-06	\$	384,000	1	80%	80%	\$	480,000	5	513,250	RAU 2007-QH2	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249181	12-Dec-06	\$	748,200	2	19%	100%	\$	748,421	5	760,613	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249185	15-Nov-06	\$	93,000	2	24%	98%	\$	485,027	5	390,629	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	29%	122%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249201	29-Nov-06	\$	88,400	2	16%	95%	\$	525,048	5	593,911	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	14%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249219	7-Dec-06	\$	45,000	2	30%	100%	\$	150,000	5	177,247	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	25%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249223	4-Dec-06	\$	57,316	2	20%	100%	\$	285,580	5	295,507	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249231	30-Nov-06	\$	50,980	2	20%	100%	\$	254,900	5	253,669	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249293	11-Dec-06	\$	95,000	2	20%	100%	\$	475,000	5	511,427	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249299	5-Dec-06	\$	98,000	2	20%	100%	\$	440,000	5	559,724	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	18%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249323	7-Dec-06	\$	73,150	2	19%	100%	\$	385,000	5	474,490	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	15%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249339	14-Dec-06	\$	58,101	2	19%	100%	\$	305,795	5	291,720	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249339	30-Nov-06	\$	67,696	2	20%	100%	\$	333,480	5	370,737	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	18%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249353	4-Dec-06	\$	104,000	2	20%	100%	\$	520,000	5	461,563	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	23%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249359	1-Dec-06	\$	35,800	2	20%	100%	\$	179,000	5	168,373	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	21%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249367	14-Dec-06	\$	29,600	2	20%	100%	\$	148,000	5	122,005	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	24%	121%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249379	28-Nov-06	\$	51,300	2	13%	93%	\$	394,919	5	384,553	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	13%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249381	5-Dec-06	\$	176,000	2	20%	100%	\$	880,000	5	698,248	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	25%	126%	1	Breach	Breach	
11249385	29-Nov-06	\$	137,200	2	20%	100%	\$	686,000	5	630,247	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	22%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249395	1-Dec-06	\$	157,000	2	27%	100%	\$	584,948	5	542,235	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	29%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249397	1-Dec-06	\$	40,500	2	10%	90%	\$	405,000	5	362,813	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	11%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249401	1-Dec-06	\$	61,200	2	20%	100%	\$	306,000	5	283,980	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	22%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249403	29-Nov-06	\$	99,997	2	19%	100%	\$	525,300	5	479,082	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	21%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249405	1-Dec-06	\$	121,600	2	20%	100%	\$	608,000	5	656,651	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249415	15-Dec-06	\$	78,000	2	20%	100%	\$	390,000	5	342,425	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	23%	114%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249425	20-Dec-06	\$	133,500	2	20%	100%	\$	667,500	5	612,222	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	22%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249429	6-Dec-06	\$	75,500	2	15%	95%	\$	505,000	5	543,442	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	14%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249431	5-Dec-06	\$	86,667	2	20%	100%	\$	432,686	5	436,000	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249441	6-Dec-06	\$	71,400	2	20%	100%	\$	357,000	5	313,167	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	23%	114%	1	Breach	Breach	
11249459	7-Dec-06	\$	46,000	2	20%	100%	\$	230,000	5	279,920	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	16%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249509	19-Dec-06	\$	116,500	2	20%	100%	\$	585,133	5	638,803	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	18%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249533	18-Dec-06	\$	113,000	2	21%	100%	\$	530,019	5	444,701	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	25%	119%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249543	20-Dec-06	\$	81,500	2	19%	100%	\$	420,103	5	438,350	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249549	8-Dec-06	\$	59,800	2	20%	100%	\$	299,000	5	264,943	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	23%	113%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249553	11-Dec-06	\$	198,000	2	20%	100%	\$	193,902	5	994,135	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	10%	99%	1	Breach	Breach	
11249577	12-Dec-06	\$	39,000	2	10%	90%	\$	990,000	5	367,085	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	11%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249581	19-Dec-06	\$	46,500	2	20%	100%	\$	232,500	5	233,579	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249583	27-Dec-06	\$	98,000	2	20%	100%	\$	490,000	5	440,296	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	22%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249593	21-Dec-06	\$	124,000	2	20%	100%	\$	620,000	5	622,045	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	
11249599	22-Dec-06	\$	65,550	2	15%	95%	\$	437,000	5	406,903	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	16%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	

1124603	22-Dec-06	\$	157,598	2	20%	\$	787,990	5	796,955	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	99%	0	
1124605	18-Dec-06	\$	97,180	2	20%	\$	485,900	5	492,504	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	20%	99%	0	
1124625	21-Dec-06	\$	107,985	2	15%	\$	719,900	5	706,741	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	15%	97%	0	Breach
1124637	19-Dec-06	\$	124,950	2	15%	\$	293,000	5	237,778	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	19%	117%	0	Breach
1124649	27-Dec-06	\$	90,400	2	20%	\$	452,000	5	494,669	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	25%	125%	0	Breach
1124651	27-Dec-06	\$	165,000	2	33%	\$	500,000	5	366,895	RMAS2 2007-H5A2	18%	91%	0	Breach
1124655	8-Dec-06	\$	57,156	2	9%	\$	613,067	5	476,032	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	20%	99%	1	Breach
1124659	7-Dec-06	\$	159,188	2	14%	\$	1,137,057	5	1,124,087	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	91%	0	Breach
1124661	12-Dec-06	\$	136,050	2	15%	\$	907,000	5	988,401	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	83%	0	Breach
1124669	1-Dec-06	\$	50,000	2	10%	\$	514,993	5	510,999	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	91%	0	Breach
1124675	30-Nov-06	\$	42,000	2	10%	\$	475,000	5	345,600	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	124%	0	Breach
1124677	27-Nov-06	\$	148,500	2	11%	\$	820,130	5	651,114	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	96%	0	Breach
1124681	7-Dec-06	\$	88,000	2	15%	\$	990,000	5	663,669	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	22%	134%	0	Breach
1124689	1-Dec-06	\$	79,000	2	10%	\$	834,000	5	554,188	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	15%	135%	0	Breach
1124693	30-Nov-06	\$	98,000	2	20%	\$	490,000	5	823,630	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	86%	0	Breach
1124699	29-Nov-06	\$	24,000	2	10%	\$	545,000	5	529,488	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	21%	103%	0	Breach
1124703	15-Dec-06	\$	15,000	2	12%	\$	123,000	5	52,296	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	46%	415%	0	Breach
1124705	5-Dec-06	\$	80,945	2	25%	\$	323,984	5	333,204	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	24%	79%	0	Breach
1124707	27-Nov-06	\$	102,000	2	20%	\$	510,000	5	349,242	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	29%	146%	0	Breach
1124719	30-Nov-06	\$	22,000	2	4%	\$	550,000	5	539,244	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	4%	86%	0	Breach
1124723	7-Dec-06	\$	42,000	2	5%	\$	850,202	5	936,532	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	4%	73%	0	Breach
1124727	28-Nov-06	\$	59,000	2	20%	\$	295,000	5	275,048	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	21%	107%	0	Breach
1124741	5-Dec-06	\$	118,000	2	13%	\$	879,940	5	840,915	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	14%	92%	0	Breach
1124743	15-Dec-06	\$	105,400	2	20%	\$	527,000	5	480,716	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	22%	110%	0	Breach
1124745	22-Dec-06	\$	67,500	2	10%	\$	675,000	5	339,427	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	20%	179%	1	Breach
1124749	12-Dec-06	\$	159,400	2	20%	\$	797,000	5	1,190,318	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	13%	67%	0	Breach
1124749	5-Dec-06	\$	21,750	2	5%	\$	435,000	5	415,512	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	5%	89%	0	Breach
1124751	7-Dec-06	\$	60,000	2	10%	\$	604,899	5	556,050	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	11%	98%	0	Breach
1124755	12-Dec-06	\$	68,999	2	25%	\$	689,990	5	781,944	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	9%	79%	0	Breach
1124757	6-Dec-06	\$	196,000	2	20%	\$	196,000	5	97,979	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	50%	200%	0	Breach
1124769	11-Dec-06	\$	145,800	2	20%	\$	723,000	5	637,466	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	23%	114%	0	Breach
1124777	4-Dec-06	\$	78,000	2	23%	\$	344,980	5	565,276	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	10%	89%	0	Breach
1124787	21-Dec-06	\$	95,500	2	16%	\$	589,870	5	325,295	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	29%	145%	0	Breach
1124795	13-Dec-06	\$	58,500	2	15%	\$	390,000	5	389,646	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	15%	95%	0	Breach
1124797	15-Dec-06	\$	77,000	2	10%	\$	770,000	5	639,841	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	12%	108%	0	Breach
1124805	7-Dec-06	\$	172,000	2	20%	\$	860,000	5	909,177	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	19%	95%	0	Breach
1124807	19-Dec-06	\$	85,068	2	20%	\$	425,340	5	412,478	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	21%	103%	0	Breach
1124811	7-Dec-06	\$	115,000	2	14%	\$	849,963	5	836,623	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	18%	92%	1	Breach
1124815	22-Dec-06	\$	115,000	2	20%	\$	350,000	5	1,061,434	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	11%	7%	0	Breach
1124817	18-Dec-06	\$	115,850	2	19%	\$	603,737	5	351,835	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	20%	99%	0	Breach
1124829	18-Dec-06	\$	143,200	2	20%	\$	716,000	5	277,994	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	42%	220%	0	Breach
1124831	15-Dec-06	\$	117,000	2	20%	\$	585,000	5	565,639	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	25%	127%	0	Breach
1124833	21-Dec-06	\$	22,000	2	9%	\$	254,925	5	235,971	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	21%	103%	0	Breach
1124843	14-Dec-06	\$	46,000	2	15%	\$	404,500	5	385,201	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	16%	100%	0	Breach
1124843	20-Dec-06	\$	41,000	2	20%	\$	230,000	5	296,784	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	15%	77%	0	Breach
1124851	18-Dec-06	\$	179,800	2	20%	\$	899,000	5	485,481	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	8%	76%	0	Breach
1124853	20-Dec-06	\$	197,000	2	20%	\$	986,480	5	882,248	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	20%	102%	0	Breach
1124861	21-Dec-06	\$	67,000	2	20%	\$	315,000	5	951,902	RMAS2 2007-H5A3	21%	104%	0	Breach
1124863	27-Dec-06	\$	28,500	2	5%	\$	570,000	5	382,056	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	18%	88%	0	Breach
1124869	11-Dec-06	\$	232,500	1	90%	\$	253,333	5	692,589	RMAS2 2007-H5A1	4%	70%	0	Breach
1124861	2-Jan-07	\$	307,800	1	77%	\$	393,740	5	240,617	RAU 2007-QH2	96%	96%	0	Breach
1124815	2-Jan-07	\$	548,000	1	80%	\$	685,000	5	112,715	RAU 2007-QH3	130%	130%	0	Breach
1124815	27-Dec-06	\$	364,000	1	80%	\$	455,000	5	338,986	RAU 2007-QH2	162%	273%	0	Breach
1124815	27-Dec-06	\$	152,000	1	80%	\$	190,000	5	437,027	RAU 2007-QH2	83%	94%	0	Breach
1124815	28-Dec-06	\$	127,500	1	69%	\$	250,000	5	118,994	RAU 2007-QH6	128%	142%	0	Breach
1124815	5-Jan-07	\$	272,000	1	80%	\$	340,000	5	165,739	RAU 2007-QH2	104%	104%	0	Breach
1124815	4-Jan-07	\$	391,400	1	82%	\$	371,951	5	353,414	RAU 2007-QH2	86%	115%	0	Breach
1124815	10-Jan-07	\$	280,000	1	78%	\$	318,974	5	381,944	RAU 2007-QH3	73%	73%	0	Breach
1124815	12-Jan-07	\$	1,000,000	1	55%	\$	423,091	5	344,773	RAU 2007-QH3	68%	68%	0	Breach
1124815	7-Nov-06	\$	585,000	1	77%	\$	759,740	5	649,372	RAU 2007-QA2	126%	142%	0	Breach
1124815	10-Jan-07	\$	384,800	1	80%	\$	461,000	5	586,111	RAU 2007-QA3	73%	79%	1	Breach
1124815	22-Nov-06	\$	337,500	1	70%	\$	482,143	5	459,350	RAU 2007-QA3	63%	105%	0	Breach
1124815	20-Nov-06	\$	399,960	1	80%	\$	469,950	5	391,033	RAU 2007-QA3	102%	128%	0	Breach
1124815	27-Dec-06	\$	414,227	1	80%	\$	517,844	5	341,855	RMAS1 2007-SA2	97%	97%	0	Breach
1124815	13-Dec-06	\$	412,000	1	80%	\$	515,000	5	470,844	RAU 2007-QA3	88%	88%	0	Breach
1124815	20-Nov-06	\$	590,000	1	70%	\$	1,155,000	5	438,585	RAU 2007-QA2	114%	143%	0	Breach
1124815	26-Dec-06	\$	393,250	1	65%	\$	603,000	5	855,443	RAU 2007-QA2	95%	12%	0	Breach
1124815	13-Dec-06	\$	328,000	1	80%	\$	410,000	5	618,468	RAU 2007-QA3	64%	78%	0	Breach
1124815	13-Dec-06	\$	328,000	1	80%	\$	410,000	5	429,345	RAU 2007-QA3	76%	86%	0	Breach

11301459	29-Dec-06	\$	280,000	1	70%	\$	400,000	5	383,942	RAU 2007-Q42	73%	73%	0							
11301461	21-Dec-06	\$	310,400	1	80%	100%	\$	388,000	5	410,002	RAU 2007-Q43	76%	95%	0						
11301463	1-Dec-06	\$	308,000	1	80%	100%	\$	385,000	5	377,661	RAU 2007-Q43	82%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301465	29-Dec-06	\$	492,000	1	80%	80%	\$	615,000	5	408,469	RAU 2007-Q43	120%	120%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301467	18-Jan-07	\$	285,600	1	80%	100%	\$	357,000	5	184,544	RAU 2007-Q42	155%	193%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301469	12-Jan-07	\$	470,400	1	80%	100%	\$	588,000	5	558,191	RAU 2007-Q42	84%	105%	0						
11301471	10-Jan-07	\$	296,000	1	80%	100%	\$	370,000	5	342,391	RAU 2007-Q43	86%	108%	0						
11301473	1-Dec-06	\$	640,000	1	80%	100%	\$	800,000	5	854,407	RFMS 2007-542	75%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301475	29-Dec-06	\$	227,500	1	70%	90%	\$	325,000	5	273,297	RAU 2007-Q43	83%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301477	22-Dec-06	\$	540,480	1	80%	80%	\$	675,600	5	389,351	RAU 2007-Q42	139%	139%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301479	21-Dec-06	\$	214,000	1	83%	83%	\$	257,831	5	233,663	RAU 2007-Q42	84%	84%	0						
11301481	19-Dec-06	\$	172,000	1	62%	62%	\$	277,419	5	235,376	RAU 2007-Q43	73%	73%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301483	21-Dec-06	\$	340,000	1	80%	100%	\$	425,000	5	354,386	RAU 2007-Q42	96%	120%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301485	3-Jan-07	\$	304,000	1	80%	90%	\$	380,000	5	394,256	RAU 2007-Q43	77%	87%	0						
11301487	27-Dec-06	\$	264,000	1	80%	100%	\$	330,000	5	356,552	RAU 2007-Q43	74%	93%	0						
11301495	26-Dec-06	\$	260,500	1	73%	73%	\$	356,849	5	350,689	RAU 2007-Q42	74%	74%	0						
11301497	27-Dec-06	\$	314,400	1	80%	100%	\$	393,000	5	505,864	RAU 2007-Q42	62%	78%	0						
11301503	28-Dec-06	\$	364,529	1	80%	100%	\$	455,661	5	539,911	RAU 2007-Q43	68%	84%	0						
11301507	10-Jan-07	\$	476,000	1	80%	100%	\$	595,000	5	633,965	RAU 2007-Q42	75%	94%	0						
11301509	29-Dec-06	\$	303,200	1	80%	80%	\$	379,000	5	356,172	RFMS 2007-542	85%	85%	0						
11301513	10-Jan-07	\$	364,000	1	80%	100%	\$	455,000	5	462,857	RAU 2007-Q42	79%	98%	0						
11301515	15-Dec-06	\$	161,600	1	80%	100%	\$	202,000	5	266,325	RAU 2007-Q43	61%	76%	0						
11301519	26-Dec-06	\$	240,000	1	80%	100%	\$	425,000	5	456,157	RAU 2007-Q42	75%	93%	0						
11301523	3-Jan-07	\$	128,400	1	80%	100%	\$	298,000	5	391,984	RAU 2007-Q43	61%	76%	0						
11301525	20-Dec-06	\$	292,000	1	80%	100%	\$	162,000	5	166,000	RAU 2007-Q42	78%	98%	0						
11301527	13-Dec-06	\$	308,895	1	80%	100%	\$	386,119	5	459,264	RAU 2007-Q42	67%	84%	0						
11301529	22-Dec-06	\$	400,000	1	80%	100%	\$	500,000	5	487,066	RAU 2007-Q43	82%	103%	0						
11301531	26-Dec-06	\$	240,000	1	80%	100%	\$	300,000	5	286,969	RAU 2007-Q42	84%	105%	0						
11301533	4-Jan-07	\$	292,000	1	80%	80%	\$	365,000	5	397,172	RAU 2007-Q43	74%	74%	0						
11301537	18-Dec-06	\$	445,440	1	80%	95%	\$	556,800	5	477,169	RAU 2007-Q42	93%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301539	29-Dec-06	\$	375,000	1	80%	100%	\$	375,000	5	335,106	RAU 2007-Q42	90%	112%	0						
11301547	16-Jan-07	\$	179,500	1	67%	67%	\$	267,910	5	231,887	RAU 2007-Q43	77%	77%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301551	27-Dec-06	\$	375,000	1	80%	80%	\$	375,000	5	390,664	RAU 2007-Q43	77%	77%	0						
11301555	5-Jan-07	\$	291,200	1	66%	66%	\$	66,061	5	649,925	RAU 2007-Q43	62%	62%	0						
11301557	19-Dec-06	\$	291,200	1	80%	100%	\$	364,000	5	340,538	RAU 2007-Q42	86%	107%	0						
11301561	8-Jan-07	\$	430,031	1	77%	73%	\$	287,671	5	281,777	RAU 2007-Q43	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301563	22-Dec-06	\$	210,000	1	77%	83%	\$	554,482	5	472,662	RAU 2007-Q43	91%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301565	21-Dec-06	\$	395,500	1	70%	86%	\$	565,000	5	379,606	RFMS 2007-542	104%	128%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301571	2-Jan-07	\$	316,846	1	78%	78%	\$	406,213	5	375,328	RAU 2007-Q42	84%	84%	0						
11301575	4-Jan-07	\$	362,082	1	80%	100%	\$	453,603	5	542,542	RAU 2007-Q42	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301579	9-Jan-07	\$	263,173	1	80%	100%	\$	328,966	5	355,991	RAU 2007-Q43	99%	124%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301581	26-Dec-06	\$	333,000	1	80%	100%	\$	415,000	5	422,657	RAU 2007-Q42	79%	98%	0						
11301589	22-Dec-06	\$	277,898	1	80%	100%	\$	341,123	5	364,040	RAU 2007-Q43	75%	94%	0						
11301591	11-Jan-07	\$	160,000	1	80%	100%	\$	200,000	5	227,792	RAU 2007-Q43	70%	88%	1						
11301599	10-Jan-07	\$	594,000	1	80%	95%	\$	630,000	5	680,878	RAU 2007-Q42	74%	88%	0						
11301603	22-Dec-06	\$	578,871	1	80%	80%	\$	723,589	5	758,317	RAU 2007-Q42	76%	76%	0						
11301605	12-Jan-07	\$	181,200	1	80%	100%	\$	229,000	5	183,077	RAU 2007-Q42	100%	125%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301609	12-Jan-07	\$	180,800	1	80%	100%	\$	226,000	5	238,677	RAU 2007-Q43	76%	95%	0						
11301611	3-Jan-07	\$	410,000	1	80%	80%	\$	500,000	5	511,739	RAU 2007-Q43	78%	78%	0						
11301617	10-Jan-07	\$	512,000	1	80%	100%	\$	640,000	5	522,047	RAU 2007-Q43	98%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301619	8-Jan-07	\$	425,600	1	80%	90%	\$	521,250	5	459,661	RAU 2007-Q43	91%	102%	0						
11301627	15-Jan-07	\$	311,171	1	80%	80%	\$	388,964	5	359,318	RAU 2007-Q43	87%	87%	0						
11301629	17-Jan-07	\$	700,000	1	80%	100%	\$	875,000	5	417,077	RAU 2007-Q42	168%	210%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301633	8-Jan-07	\$	300,000	1	65%	65%	\$	461,538	5	430,171	RAU 2007-Q43	70%	70%	0						
11301635	10-Jan-07	\$	467,937	1	80%	90%	\$	584,921	5	551,427	RAU 2007-Q42	85%	95%	0						
11301643	15-Jan-07	\$	260,000	1	76%	76%	\$	342,105	5	337,259	RAU 2007-Q43	77%	77%	0						
11301645	11-Jan-07	\$	200,000	1	77%	77%	\$	259,740	5	196,888	RAU 2007-Q42	102%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301647	16-Jan-07	\$	670,871	1	76%	99%	\$	882,725	5	891,321	RAU 2007-Q42	75%	98%	0						
11301649	17-Jan-07	\$	692,000	1	80%	80%	\$	865,000	5	824,777	RAU 2007-Q43	84%	84%	0						
11301657	18-Jan-07	\$	540,000	1	90%	90%	\$	600,000	5	591,060	RAU 2007-Q42	91%	91%	1						
11301659	2-Jan-07	\$	383,297	1	80%	100%	\$	479,121	5	463,222	RAU 2007-Q43	83%	103%	0						
11301667	13-Dec-06	\$	197,600	1	80%	90%	\$	247,000	5	264,982	RAU 2007-Q43	75%	75%	0						
11301689	20-Dec-06	\$	460,000	1	80%	80%	\$	575,000	5	426,279	RAU 2007-Q43	108%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301685	8-Dec-06	\$	280,000	1	78%	78%	\$	358,974	5	368,401	RAU 2007-Q43	76%	76%	0						
11301691	29-Jan-07	\$	548,000	1	80%	90%	\$	685,000	5	572,488	RAU 2007-Q43	96%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301693	28-Dec-06	\$	417,000	1	76%	76%	\$	548,684	5	482,555	RAU 2007-Q43	86%	86%	0						
11301697	28-Dec-06	\$	386,000	1	80%	80%	\$	420,000	5	362,883	RAU 2007-Q43	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301713	26-Dec-06	\$	392,000	1	80%	80%	\$	490,000	5	377,669	RAU 2007-Q43	104%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301713	28-Dec-06	\$	412,000	1	75%	75%	\$	549,333	5	589,461	RAU 2007-Q43	70%	70%	1						
11301769	31-Jan-07	\$	196,650	1	95%	95%	\$	207,000	5	189,499	RAU 2007-Q43	104%	104%	0						
11301977	17-Jan-07	\$	540,299	1	76%	89%	\$	710,920	5	664,248	RFMS 2007-53	81%	95%	0						
11301981	19-Jan-07	\$	684,000	1	80%	90%	\$	855,000	5	1,163,102	RFMS 2007-53	59%	66%	0						
11301985	11-Jan-07	\$	460,000	1	68%	90%	\$	661,765	5	688,073	RFMS 2007-53	65%	87%	1						
11301987	23-Jan-07	\$	451,000	1	79%	79%	\$	570,886	5	592,092	RFMS 2007-53	76%	76%	0						
11301991	19-Jan-07	\$	476,000	1	80%	90%	\$	595,000	5	567,159	RFMS 2007-53	109%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11301993	23-Jan-07	\$	536,000	1	77%	77%	\$	584,416	5	609,365	RFMS 2007-53	88%	99%	0						
11302005	22-Jan-07	\$	311,000	1	73%	73%	\$	426,027	5	444,545										

113.20023	22-Jan-07	\$	585,000	1	78%	\$	750,000	5	710.310	RFMSI 2007-53	82%	82%	0						
113.20047	24-Jan-07	\$	396,000	1	80%	80%	\$	495,000	5	451.074	RAU 2007-Q48	88%	88%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
113.21181	12-Jan-07	\$	264,000	1	80%	80%	\$	330,000	5	283.956	RAU 2007-Q03	93%	93%	0					
113.21183	24-Jan-07	\$	227,500	1	67%	75%	\$	333,552	5	370.609	RAU 2007-Q03	61%	61%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
113.21191	24-Jan-07	\$	300,000	1	75%	67%	\$	400,000	5	336.628	RAU 2007-Q03	89%	89%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach		
113.23201	23-Jan-07	\$	266,400	1	80%	90%	\$	333,000	5	360.195	RAU 2007-Q03	74%	83%	0					
113.23207	24-Jan-07	\$	448,000	1	80%	90%	\$	560,000	5	542.354	RAU 2007-Q03	83%	93%	0					
113.23211	30-Jan-07	\$	116,000	1	73%	73%	\$	158.904	5	159.821	RAU 2007-Q03	73%	73%	0					
113.23213	23-Jan-07	\$	187,000	1	75%	75%	\$	249.333	5	283.735	RAU 2007-Q03	66%	66%	0					
113.23215	26-Jan-07	\$	270,600	1	95%	95%	\$	284.842	5	366.007	RAU 2007-Q03	88%	88%	0					
113.23223	2-Jan-07	\$	312,000	1	80%	80%	\$	390,000	5	364.500	RAU 2007-Q03	86%	86%	0					
113.23229	9-Jan-07	\$	170,000	1	66%	66%	\$	217.576	5	262.379	RAU 2007-Q03	65%	65%	0					
113.23243	22-Dec-06	\$	220,000	1	80%	80%	\$	275,000	5	276.120	RAU 2007-Q03	80%	80%	0					
113.23269	28-Dec-06	\$	181,600	1	70%	70%	\$	258.571	5	247.640	RAU 2007-Q03	73%	73%	0					
113.23279	4-Jan-07	\$	530,640	1	80%	90%	\$	663.300	5	777.825	RAU 2007-Q03	73%	82%	0					
113.23283	11-Jan-07	\$	104,200	1	62%	62%	\$	168.065	5	153.390	RAU 2007-Q03	68%	68%	0					
113.23287	29-Dec-06	\$	399,200	1	80%	95%	\$	290.000	5	293.438	RAU 2007-Q03	94%	94%	0					
113.23293	2-Jan-07	\$	268,000	1	80%	80%	\$	499,000	5	481.484	RAU 2007-Q03	83%	83%	0					
113.23297	3-Jan-07	\$	349,600	1	80%	90%	\$	437,000	5	347.064	RAU 2007-Q03	77%	77%	0					
113.23303	16-Jan-07	\$	436,000	1	80%	80%	\$	545,000	5	408.950	RAU 2007-Q03	85%	96%	0					
113.23311	10-Jan-07	\$	296,000	1	80%	80%	\$	370,000	5	527.733	RAU 2007-Q03	83%	83%	1					
113.23315	5-Jan-07	\$	547,500	1	75%	90%	\$	730,000	5	396.006	RAU 2007-Q03	75%	75%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23317	28-Dec-06	\$	240,000	1	75%	75%	\$	513.333	5	500.239	RAU 2007-Q03	103%	124%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23319	23-Jan-07	\$	548,000	1	80%	90%	\$	300,000	5	277.437	RAU 2007-Q03	87%	97%	1					
113.23331	9-Jan-07	\$	510,000	1	80%	90%	\$	685,000	5	641.452	RAU 2007-Q03	85%	96%	0					
113.23333	9-Jan-07	\$	510,000	1	75%	75%	\$	685,000	5	516.420	RAU 2007-Q03	99%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
113.23341	9-Jan-07	\$	516,000	1	80%	90%	\$	645,000	5	693.075	RAU 2007-Q03	74%	84%	0					
113.23345	9-Jan-07	\$	372,000	1	80%	88%	\$	465,000	5	510,000	RAU 2007-Q03	73%	80%	1					
113.23347	21-Dec-06	\$	448,000	1	80%	85%	\$	560,000	5	361.991	RAU 2007-Q03	124%	131%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23353	10-Jan-07	\$	310,400	1	80%	90%	\$	388,000	5	345.688	RAU 2007-Q03	90%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23355	4-Jan-07	\$	624,000	1	80%	80%	\$	780,000	5	442.555	RAU 2007-Q03	141%	141%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23357	4-Jan-07	\$	333,600	1	80%	90%	\$	417,000	5	407.406	RAU 2007-Q03	82%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23365	2-Jan-07	\$	442,000	1	80%	80%	\$	540,000	5	412.714	RAU 2007-Q03	105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23369	28-Dec-06	\$	490,000	1	80%	90%	\$	612,500	5	577.753	RAU 2007-Q03	85%	95%	1					
113.23375	2-Jan-07	\$	508,000	1	80%	88%	\$	615,000	5	564.728	RAU 2007-Q03	90%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23376	17-Jan-07	\$	308,000	1	80%	90%	\$	385,000	5	274.716	RAU 2007-Q03	112%	126%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23381	12-Jan-07	\$	196,000	1	70%	70%	\$	280,000	5	275.634	RAU 2007-Q03	71%	71%	0					
113.23387	2-Jan-07	\$	387,200	1	80%	90%	\$	484,000	5	504.348	RAU 2007-Q03	77%	86%	0					
113.23389	23-Jan-07	\$	455,000	1	80%	80%	\$	568,750	5	427.137	RAU 2007-Q03	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23393	3-Jan-07	\$	473,000	1	74%	74%	\$	568,750	5	458.295	RAU 2007-Q03	103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23403	12-Jan-07	\$	416,000	1	80%	90%	\$	520,000	5	411.537	RAU 2007-Q03	101%	114%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.23547	3-Jan-07	\$	596,000	1	80%	89%	\$	745,000	5	875.723	RAU 2007-Q03	68%	76%	0					
113.23569	29-Jan-07	\$	660,000	1	75%	90%	\$	833.333	5	689.663	RFMSI 2007-53	94%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235703	1-Feb-07	\$	682,000	1	78%	90%	\$	903.333	5	880.054	RFMSI 2007-53	77%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235709	25-Jan-07	\$	477,000	1	71%	77%	\$	671.881	5	566.008	RFMSI 2007-53	84%	91%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235739	2-Feb-07	\$	449,000	1	72%	72%	\$	623.611	5	425.616	RFMSI 2007-53	105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235741	7-Feb-07	\$	450,000	1	78%	78%	\$	576.923	5	523.682	RAU 2007-Q04	86%	86%	0					
113.235755	30-Jan-07	\$	501,373	1	80%	90%	\$	626,716	5	632.104	RAU 2007-Q06	93%	93%	0					
113.235759	8-Feb-07	\$	519,200	1	80%	95%	\$	626,716	5	511.653	RFMSI 2007-53	98%	116%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235763	5-Feb-07	\$	454,750	1	85%	85%	\$	649,000	5	605.000	RFMSI 2007-53	86%	86%	0					
113.235779	5-Feb-07	\$	457,000	1	71%	71%	\$	643.662	5	630.735	RFMSI 2007-53	72%	72%	0					
113.235781	31-Jan-07	\$	320,000	1	80%	87%	\$	400,000	5	415.724	RFMSI 2007-53	77%	84%	0					
113.235783	31-Jan-07	\$	352,000	1	80%	84%	\$	440,000	5	393.244	RFMSI 2007-53	90%	94%	0					
113.235785	29-Jan-07	\$	479,000	1	69%	69%	\$	694.203	5	548.382	RFMSI 2007-53	87%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235793	8-Feb-07	\$	246,400	1	80%	100%	\$	308,000	5	340,000	RAU 2007-Q06	72%	71%	0					
113.235797	6-Feb-07	\$	566,400	1	80%	80%	\$	708,000	5	739.106	RFMSI 2007-53	77%	77%	0					
113.235801	18-Jan-07	\$	1,000,000	1	73%	90%	\$	1,369.863	5	1,529.079	RAU 2007-Q05	65%	81%	0					
113.235791	5-Feb-07	\$	245,500	1	90%	90%	\$	272.778	5	304.333	RAU 2007-Q04	81%	81%	0					
113.235795	12-Feb-07	\$	61,200	1	80%	90%	\$	789,000	5	678.828	RAU 2007-Q04	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	8-Feb-07	\$	280,000	1	70%	70%	\$	400,000	5	367,004	RAU 2007-Q04	76%	76%	0					
113.235799	22-Feb-07	\$	431,000	1	80%	90%	\$	538,750	5	559.528	RAU 2007-Q04	77%	87%	0					
113.235799	9-Feb-07	\$	194,000	1	75%	90%	\$	253.667	5	238.243	RAU 2007-Q04	81%	98%	1					
113.235799	7-Feb-07	\$	430,000	1	72%	72%	\$	597.222	5	444.132	RAU 2007-Q05	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	7-Feb-07	\$	372,000	1	80%	80%	\$	465,000	5	218.570	RAU 2007-Q04	170%	170%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	14-Feb-07	\$	250,000	1	77%	77%	\$	324.675	5	291.014	RAU 2007-Q04	86%	86%	0					
113.235799	14-Feb-07	\$	284,000	1	80%	85%	\$	353,000	5	269.661	RAU 2007-Q04	105%	112%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	16-Feb-07	\$	208,000	1	80%	90%	\$	260,000	5	223.200	RAU 2007-Q04	93%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	8-Feb-07	\$	318,500	1	75%	75%	\$	424.667	5	390.079	RAU 2007-Q04	81%	81%	0					
113.235799	21-Feb-07	\$	700,000	1	64%	64%	\$	1,093.750	5	1,070.504	RAU 2007-Q04	65%	65%	0					
113.235799	20-Feb-07	\$	645,600	1	80%	90%	\$	807,000	5	786.654	RAU 2007-Q04	82%	92%	0					
113.235799	22-Feb-07	\$	472,000	1	80%	80%	\$	580,000	5	619.950	RAU 2007-Q05	75%	75%	0					
113.235799	28-Nov-06	\$	460,000	1	80%	90%	\$	590,000	5	598.472	RAU 2007-Q05	89%	89%	0					
113.235799	27-Feb-07	\$	490,000	1	80%	90%	\$	612,500	5	574,661	RAU 2007-Q06	85%	96%	0					
113.235799	5-Mar-07	\$	460,000	1	80%	95%	\$	575,000	5	377.556	RFMSI 2007-54	140%	167%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
113.235799	28-Feb-07	\$	468,500	1	68%	68%	\$	894.853	5	824.771	RFMSI 2007-54	74%	74%	0					
113.235799	26-Feb-07	\$	469,500	1	78%	78%	\$	613.692	5	625.356	RFMSI 2007-56	79%	79%	0					
113.235799	22-Feb-07	\$	446,400	1	80%														

11427911	2-Mar-07	\$	264,000	1	80%	90%	\$	330,000	5	305,154	RAU 2007-037	87%	97%	0					
11427919	2-Mar-07	\$	281,250	1	75%	90%	\$	375,000	5	493,159	RAU 2007-037	57%	67%	0					
11427925	21-Feb-07	\$	288,000	1	80%	90%	\$	550,000	5	424,516	RFMSI 2007-55	104%	117%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11427931	27-Feb-07	\$	400,000	1	52%	5%	\$	775,000	5	843,078	RFMSI 2007-54	48%	48%	0					
11427933	23-Feb-07	\$	420,000	1	69%	5%	\$	608,696	5	584,675	RFMSI 2007-55	72%	72%	0					
11427939	22-Feb-07	\$	464,000	1	78%	78%	\$	594,872	5	560,749	RFMSI 2007-56	83%	83%	0					
11427951	22-Feb-07	\$	559,000	1	61%	72%	\$	916,393	5	857,189	RFMSI 2007-55	65%	77%	0					
11427953	2-Mar-07	\$	612,000	1	80%	89%	\$	790,000	5	712,020	RFMSI 2007-55	89%	99%	0					
11427961	28-Feb-07	\$	442,000	1	79%	79%	\$	540,506	5	499,116	RFMSI 2007-56	86%	86%	0					
11427965	6-Mar-07	\$	570,000	1	74%	74%	\$	770,270	5	825,481	RAU 2007-036	69%	69%	0					
11427969	14-Mar-07	\$	384,156	1	80%	100%	\$	480,245	5	505,206	RAU 2007-036	76%	95%	0					
11427973	26-Feb-07	\$	665,000	1	70%	90%	\$	950,000	5	784,091	RFMSI 2007-54	85%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11427987	1-Mar-07	\$	510,000	1	74%	74%	\$	700,000	5	715,593	RFMSI 2007-54	72%	72%	0					
11427993	5-Mar-07	\$	556,000	1	77%	77%	\$	662,338	5	604,103	RFMSI 2007-55	84%	84%	0					
11427999	27-Feb-07	\$	512,000	1	80%	90%	\$	695,000	5	589,005	RFMSI 2007-56	94%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428005	5-Mar-07	\$	645,000	1	80%	90%	\$	640,000	5	723,461	RFMSI 2007-54	71%	80%	0					
11428007	14-Mar-07	\$	645,450	1	70%	73%	\$	883,562	5	810,323	RFMSI 2007-55	80%	80%	0					
11428011	5-Mar-07	\$	958,000	1	69%	69%	\$	1,388,406	5	727,719	RFMSI 2007-54	76%	76%	0					
11428013	9-Mar-07	\$	180,000	1	80%	90%	\$	225,000	5	721,681	RFMSI 2007-54	133%	133%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428025	5-Mar-07	\$	450,000	1	57%	57%	\$	789,474	5	898,333	RFMSI 2007-54	50%	50%	0					
11428029	5-Mar-07	\$	475,000	1	78%	78%	\$	608,974	5	547,120	RFMSI 2007-56	87%	87%	0					
11428031	6-Mar-07	\$	399,000	1	60%	60%	\$	665,000	5	699,087	RFMSI 2007-55	57%	57%	0					
11428033	2-Mar-07	\$	353,600	1	80%	95%	\$	442,000	5	413,157	RFMSI 2007-54	86%	102%	0					
11428041	12-Mar-07	\$	671,250	1	75%	90%	\$	895,000	5	746,183	RFMSI 2007-54	90%	108%	0					
11428051	6-Mar-07	\$	630,000	1	75%	75%	\$	840,000	5	769,884	RFMSI 2007-54	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428053	9-Mar-07	\$	417,000	1	78%	83%	\$	534,615	5	509,842	RFMSI 2007-55	82%	89%	0					
11428055	8-Mar-07	\$	440,000	1	75%	84%	\$	533,333	5	411,489	RAU 2007-036	97%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428057	7-Mar-07	\$	565,000	1	66%	66%	\$	855,061	5	539,992	RFMSI 2007-54	105%	105%	0					
11428065	8-Mar-07	\$	490,000	1	100%	100%	\$	612,500	5	572,210	RAU 2007-036	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428073	13-Mar-07	\$	923,529	1	68%	68%	\$	923,529	5	789,414	RFMSI 2007-54	80%	80%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428077	15-Mar-07	\$	479,017	1	80%	80%	\$	598,771	5	594,158	RFMSI 2007-55	81%	81%	0					
11428081	1-Feb-07	\$	420,000	1	78%	78%	\$	820,513	5	492,082	RAU 2007-034	130%	130%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428087	12-Feb-07	\$	292,000	1	80%	90%	\$	365,000	5	322,838	RAU 2007-034	90%	102%	0					
11428095	13-Mar-07	\$	308,000	1	80%	80%	\$	385,000	5	349,046	RAU 2007-034	88%	88%	0					
11428097	2-Mar-07	\$	228,000	1	80%	90%	\$	285,000	5	299,395	RAU 2007-034	76%	86%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428099	5-Mar-07	\$	399,000	1	78%	78%	\$	511,538	5	384,694	RAU 2007-034	104%	104%	0					
11428103	2-Mar-07	\$	776,250	1	75%	90%	\$	1,015,000	5	988,098	RAU 2007-034	79%	94%	0					
11428105	23-Feb-07	\$	325,010	1	85%	85%	\$	382,465	5	300,674	RAU 2007-034	92%	92%	0					
11428107	7-Mar-07	\$	176,800	1	NA	80%	\$	221,000	5	218,666	RAU 2007-035	78%	78%	0					
11428137	19-Mar-07	\$	356,000	1	80%	90%	\$	445,000	5	490,733	RAU 2007-034	81%	81%	0					
11428145	21-Mar-07	\$	548,500	1	74%	74%	\$	741,216	5	872,174	RAU 2007-034	73%	82%	0					
11428165	22-Mar-07	\$	572,000	1	62%	62%	\$	922,581	5	774,803	RAU 2007-035	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428167	22-Mar-07	\$	650,000	1	75%	75%	\$	866,667	5	775,602	RAU 2007-035	84%	84%	0					
11428181	7-Mar-07	\$	312,010	1	80%	80%	\$	390,013	5	365,000	RAU 2007-035	85%	85%	0					
11428185	14-Feb-07	\$	247,000	1	80%	80%	\$	307,750	5	329,457	RAU 2007-035	75%	75%	0					
11428189	14-Feb-07	\$	875,000	1	70%	70%	\$	1,250,000	5	912,390	RAU 2007-035	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428195	1-Mar-07	\$	243,500	1	74%	74%	\$	323,054	5	295,538	RAU 2007-035	82%	82%	1					
11428197	1-Mar-07	\$	370,000	1	86%	86%	\$	315,977	5	370,104	RAU 2007-035	83%	83%	0					
11428199	8-Mar-07	\$	340,000	1	74%	74%	\$	500,000	5	631,825	RAU 2007-035	59%	59%	0					
11428205	19-Mar-07	\$	340,000	1	80%	80%	\$	425,000	5	337,093	RAU 2007-035	101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428207	5-Mar-07	\$	324,000	1	80%	84%	\$	380,000	5	378,162	RAU 2007-035	80%	84%	1					
11428223	13-Mar-07	\$	328,000	1	80%	80%	\$	410,000	5	456,514	RAU 2007-035	72%	72%	0					
11428233	6-Mar-07	\$	220,255	1	90%	90%	\$	244,728	5	244,454	RAU 2007-035	90%	90%	0					
11428235	2-Mar-07	\$	161,900	1	69%	69%	\$	237,536	5	213,172	RAU 2007-035	77%	77%	0					
11428239	22-Mar-07	\$	556,000	1	72%	72%	\$	772,222	5	668,687	RAU 2007-035	83%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428247	17-Mar-07	\$	306,000	1	90%	90%	\$	340,000	5	323,123	RAU 2007-035	95%	95%	1					
11428255	7-Mar-07	\$	513,750	1	75%	75%	\$	685,000	5	719,972	RAU 2007-035	71%	71%	0					
11428271	9-Mar-07	\$	712,500	1	75%	90%	\$	950,000	5	855,761	RAU 2007-035	83%	100%	0					
11428281	16-Mar-07	\$	802,500	1	75%	90%	\$	1,070,000	5	987,230	RAU 2007-035	79%	79%	0					
11428283	23-Mar-07	\$	240,000	1	80%	80%	\$	300,000	5	305,210	RAU 2007-035	81%	98%	0					
11428285	15-Mar-07	\$	524,000	1	80%	90%	\$	655,000	5	551,485	RAU 2007-035	95%	107%	0					
11428287	9-Mar-07	\$	220,000	1	88%	88%	\$	250,000	5	236,286	RAU 2007-035	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428289	16-Mar-07	\$	303,500	1	78%	78%	\$	389,103	5	353,549	RAU 2007-035	86%	86%	0					
11428291	9-Mar-07	\$	205,000	1	65%	65%	\$	315,385	5	316,616	RAU 2007-035	65%	65%	0					
11428299	12-Mar-07	\$	170,000	1	78%	78%	\$	223,684	5	172,699	RAU 2007-035	98%	98%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428301	23-Mar-07	\$	382,000	1	78%	76%	\$	464,103	5	386,407	RAU 2007-035	94%	94%	0					
11428303	23-Mar-07	\$	448,000	1	80%	80%	\$	560,000	5	405,649	RAU 2007-035	110%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428305	27-Mar-07	\$	900,000	1	75%	75%	\$	1,200,000	5	1,004,700	RFMSI 2007-55	90%	90%	0					
11428309	28-Mar-07	\$	484,000	1	80%	90%	\$	530,000	5	572,578	RFMSI 2007-56	74%	74%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
11428317	5-Apr-07	\$	486,500	1	69%	69%	\$	705,072	5	656,637	RFMSI 2007-55	83%	83%	0					
11428319	11-Apr-07	\$	431,200	1	80%	80%	\$	519,000	5	563,200	RFMSI 2007-56	77%	77%	0					
11428323	5-Apr-07	\$	468,000	1	80%	80%	\$	585,000	5	616,456	RFMSI 2007-55	76%	76%	0					
11428327	6-Apr-07	\$	556,000	1	80%	80%	\$	695,000	5	739,890	RFMSI 2007-57	75%	75%	0					
11428329	2-Apr-07	\$	521,000	1	80%	80%	\$	651,250	5	567,674	RAU 2007-037	92%	92%	0					
11428331	4-Apr-07	\$	512,000	1	79%	90%	\$	648,101	5	718,187	RFMSI 2007-55	71%	81%	0					
11428333	23-Mar-07	\$	470,000	1	78%	78%	\$	602,564	5	680,085	RFMSI 2007-56	69%	69%	0					
11428335	4-Apr-07	\$	775,000	1	70%	70%	\$	1,021,429	5	955,705	RFMSI 2007-56	75%	75%	0					
11428341	23-Mar-07	\$	476,000	1															

1303835	2-Apr-07	\$	447,200	1	80%	\$	559,000	5	567,865	RFMS 2007-56	79%	79%	0						
1303843	27-Mar-07	\$	482,000	1	57%	\$	845,614	5	799,688	RFMS 2007-55	60%	60%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303845	6-Apr-07	\$	555,000	1	73%	\$	757,554	5	649,088	RFMS 2007-55	85%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303849	26-Mar-07	\$	545,000	1	69%	\$	789,855	5	627,100	RFMS 2007-55	87%	87%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303853	28-Mar-07	\$	304,000	1	80%	\$	380,000	5	546,450	RFAL 2007-437	56%	56%	1						Breach
1303859	4-Apr-07	\$	500,000	1	80%	\$	625,000	5	786,696	RFMS 2007-56	64%	64%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303861	25-Mar-07	\$	443,245	1	67%	\$	661,560	5	482,600	RFMS 2007-55	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303865	4-Apr-07	\$	997,400	1	69%	\$	1,445,507	5	1,221,033	RFMS 2007-55	82%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303867	7-Apr-07	\$	288,000	1	80%	\$	360,000	5	314,666	RFMS 2007-55	91%	103%	0						
1303875	28-Mar-07	\$	417,000	1	79%	\$	527,848	5	509,669	RFMS 2007-55	82%	93%	0						
1303879	2-Apr-07	\$	348,000	1	80%	\$	435,000	5	412,771	RFAL 2007-437	84%	90%	0						
1303879	6-Apr-07	\$	543,850	1	85%	\$	639,824	5	697,930	RFMS 2007-56	116%	116%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	12-Apr-07	\$	625,600	1	80%	\$	782,000	5	664,605	RFMS 2007-56	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	17-Apr-07	\$	504,500	1	68%	\$	741,912	5	379,832	RFMS 2007-55	124%	124%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	12-Apr-07	\$	472,000	1	80%	\$	590,000	5	597,882	RFMS 2007-56	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	9-Apr-07	\$	447,200	1	80%	\$	534,000	5	594,915	RFMS 2007-56	72%	72%	0						
1303879	17-Apr-07	\$	525,600	1	72%	\$	739,000	5	572,912	RFMS 2007-55	92%	92%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	11-Apr-07	\$	480,000	1	80%	\$	537,500	5	497,229	RFMS 2007-56	86%	86%	0						
1303879	17-Apr-07	\$	456,000	1	80%	\$	570,000	5	590,060	RFMS 2007-56	77%	77%	0						
1303879	10-Apr-07	\$	465,000	1	74%	\$	628,378	5	564,545	RFMS 2007-55	82%	82%	0						
1303879	13-Apr-07	\$	479,000	1	78%	\$	614,103	5	561,210	RFMS 2007-56	85%	85%	0						
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	620,500	1	78%	\$	795,513	5	382,926	RFMS 2007-56	162%	162%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	17-Apr-07	\$	447,500	1	72%	\$	621,528	5	580,804	RFMS 2007-55	77%	77%	0						
1303879	18-Apr-07	\$	417,000	1	62%	\$	672,581	5	730,097	RFMS 2007-55	57%	57%	0						
1303879	5-Apr-07	\$	528,000	1	80%	\$	660,000	5	640,220	RFMS 2007-55	82%	82%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	17-Apr-07	\$	239,550	1	80%	\$	299,438	5	249,688	RFMS 2007-55	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	20-Apr-07	\$	650,000	1	80%	\$	812,500	5	561,061	RFMS 2007-55	116%	116%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	24-Apr-07	\$	417,000	1	72%	\$	579,167	5	561,768	RFMS 2007-55	74%	74%	0						
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	665,000	1	78%	\$	775,641	5	697,000	RFMS 2007-56	87%	87%	0						
1303879	19-Apr-07	\$	672,000	1	80%	\$	840,000	5	904,335	RFAL 2007-437	74%	74%	0						
1303879	20-Apr-07	\$	520,000	1	80%	\$	650,000	5	583,243	RFMS 2007-57	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	24-Apr-07	\$	565,000	1	80%	\$	696,000	5	481,834	RFMS 2007-55	94%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	18-Apr-07	\$	672,000	1	75%	\$	896,600	5	938,649	RFAL 2007-437	72%	72%	0						
1303879	25-Apr-07	\$	627,500	1	80%	\$	627,500	5	273,914	RFMS 2007-56	183%	183%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	23-Apr-07	\$	626,400	1	80%	\$	783,800	5	723,227	RFMS 2007-55	87%	87%	0						
1303879	23-Apr-07	\$	1,000,000	1	72%	\$	1,388,889	5	1,570,409	RFMS 2007-55	64%	64%	0						
1303879	9-Apr-07	\$	476,000	1	76%	\$	623,316	5	616,429	RFMS 2007-55	111%	111%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	450,000	1	76%	\$	623,316	5	451,299	RFMS 2007-55	77%	77%	0						
1303879	4-Apr-07	\$	464,000	1	80%	\$	580,000	5	901,991	RFMS 2007-55	49%	49%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	528,000	1	80%	\$	660,000	5	482,241	RFMS 2007-56	109%	109%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	26-Mar-07	\$	546,600	1	80%	\$	683,250	5	519,271	RFAL 2007-437	129%	129%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	24-Apr-07	\$	475,000	1	75%	\$	1,166,667	5	986,277	RFAL 2007-437	89%	89%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	12-Apr-07	\$	410,000	1	76%	\$	539,474	5	395,670	RFMS 2007-56	104%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	10-Apr-07	\$	491,000	1	73%	\$	672,603	5	583,171	RFMS 2007-56	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	624,000	1	80%	\$	780,000	5	731,405	RFMS 2007-57	85%	85%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	28-Feb-07	\$	275,000	1	100%	\$	275,000	5	284,356	RFAL 2007-438	97%	97%	0						
1303879	16-Apr-07	\$	501,500	1	95%	\$	527,895	5	521,306	RFAL 2007-439	96%	96%	0						
1303879	5-Apr-07	\$	155,000	1	84%	\$	184,524	5	230,796	RFAL 2007-439	67%	67%	1						Breach
1303879	29-Mar-07	\$	301,750	1	85%	\$	355,000	5	313,198	RFAL 2007-439	96%	96%	0						
1303879	12-Apr-07	\$	202,000	1	89%	\$	225,966	5	188,462	RFAL 2007-439	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	27-Mar-07	\$	121,500	1	90%	\$	135,000	5	138,467	RFAL 2007-439	38%	38%	0						
1303879	8-Mar-07	\$	261,630	1	95%	\$	275,400	5	115,564	RFAL 2007-439	227%	227%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	22-Mar-07	\$	203,300	1	95%	\$	215,000	5	226,288	RFAL 2007-439	90%	90%	0						
1303879	28-Mar-07	\$	239,572	1	90%	\$	266,191	5	204,204	RFAL 2007-439	117%	117%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	30-Mar-07	\$	86,861	1	88%	\$	98,706	5	82,277	RFAL 2007-439	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	26-Mar-07	\$	324,000	1	90%	\$	360,000	5	383,802	RFAL 2007-439	84%	84%	0						
1303879	28-Mar-07	\$	122,804	1	83%	\$	147,957	5	122,466	RFAL 2007-439	100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1303879	20-Mar-07	\$	450,000	1	95%	\$	473,684	5	466,073	RFAL 2007-439	97%	97%	0						
1303879	6-Apr-07	\$	400,214	1	95%	\$	421,278	5	400,065	RFAL 2007-439	100%	100%	0						
1303879	28-Mar-07	\$	373,500	1	90%	\$	415,000	5	430,620	RFAL 2007-439	87%	87%	0						
1303879	29-Mar-07	\$	326,700	1	90%	\$	363,000	5	387,943	RFAL 2007-439	84%	84%	0						
1303879	26-Mar-07	\$	261,250	1	95%	\$	275,000	5	343,551	RFAL 2007-439	76%	76%	0						
1303879	6-Apr-07	\$	465,500	1	95%	\$	490,000	5	513,889	RFAL 2007-439	91%	91%	0						
1303879	1-Apr-07	\$	496,114	1	83%	\$	597,728	5	610,483	RFAL 2007-439	81%	81%	0						
1303879	6-Apr-07	\$	535,000	1	100%	\$	535,000	5	504,589	RFAL 2007-439	106%	106%	0						
1303879	12-Apr-07	\$	255,600	1	90%	\$	284,000	5	185,248	RFAL 2007-439	138%	138%	0						
1303879	9-Apr-07	\$	204,250	1	95%	\$	215,000	5	218,945	RFAL 2007-439	93%	93%	0						
1303879	10-Apr-07	\$	297,000	1	90%	\$	330,000	5	293,058	RFAL 2007-439	101%	101%	0						
1303879	26-Apr-07	\$	306,000	1	95%	\$	340,000	5	348,660	RFAL 2007-439	88%	88%	0						
1303879	28-Mar-07	\$	283,100	1	95%	\$	298,000	5	299,835	RFAL 2007-439	94%	94%	0						
1303879	10-Apr-07	\$	155,700	1	90%	\$	171,000	5	256,862	RFAL 2007-439	61%	61%	0						
1303879	13-Apr-07	\$	284,026	1	95%	\$	298,975	5	320,224	RFAL 2007-439	89%	89%	0						
1303879	18-Apr-07	\$	231,980	1	90%	\$	257,756	5	240,415	RFAL 2007-439	96%	96%	0						
1303879	25-Apr-07	\$	403,750	1	95%	\$	425,000	5	390,083	RFAL 2007-439	104%	104%	0						
1303879	26-Apr-07	\$	255,500	1	97%	\$	263,402	5	269,340	RFAL 2007-439	95%	95%	0						
1303879	3-May-07	\$	616,000	1	80%	\$	770,000	5	871,470	RFMS 2007-56	71%	74%	0						
1303879	23-Apr-07	\$	485,000	1	80%	\$	530,000	5	528,032	RFMS 2007-56	80%	80%	0						
1303879	8-Mar-07	\$	777,864	1	80%	\$	965,080	5	645,088	RFMS 2007-56									

13942629	30-Apr-07	\$	450,000	NA	85%	\$	529,412	5	557,618	RFMSI 2007-57	81%	81%	0						
13942633	1-May-07	\$	501,400	NA	79%	\$	634,684	5	639,089	RFMSI 2007-57	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach			
13942643	8-May-07	\$	507,000	NA	80%	\$	634,750	5	518,675	RFMSI 2007-58	98%	98%	0						
13942649	9-May-07	\$	487,711	1	79%	88%	\$	617,356	5	559,378	RFMSI 2007-56	87%	97%	0	Breach	Breach			
13942689	15-May-07	\$	448,000	NA	80%	90%	\$	560,000	5	598,442	RFMSI 2007-57	75%	84%	0					
13942901	11-May-07	\$	210,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	263,000	5	330,134	RAU 2007-Q49	64%	64%	0					
13942907	22-May-07	\$	200,000	1	80%	80%	\$	253,000	5	235,951	RAU 2007-Q47	85%	85%	0					
13942909	18-May-07	\$	449,600	NA	80%	95%	\$	562,000	5	527,850	RAU 2007-Q48	85%	96%	0					
13942913	22-May-07	\$	195,000	NA	95%	95%	\$	195,000	5	195,110	RAU 2007-Q49	95%	95%	0					
13942915	23-May-07	\$	200,000	NA	89%	89%	\$	224,719	5	192,047	RAU 2007-Q49	104%	104%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942917	25-May-07	\$	410,000	1	80%	80%	\$	512,500	5	629,705	RAU 2007-Q47	65%	65%	0					
13942923	17-May-07	\$	197,600	NA	80%	95%	\$	247,000	5	236,680	RAU 2007-Q48	83%	94%	1					
13942925	25-May-07	\$	280,250	NA	95%	95%	\$	295,000	5	296,188	RAU 2007-Q48	95%	95%	1					
13942929	21-May-07	\$	228,750	1	75%	75%	\$	305,000	5	273,466	RAU 2007-Q47	84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942931	22-May-07	\$	229,500	NA	78%	78%	\$	294,231	5	239,331	RAU 2007-Q49	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942939	24-May-07	\$	288,000	NA	90%	90%	\$	320,000	5	301,295	RAU 2007-Q48	95%	95%	0					
13942941	1-May-07	\$	999,750	NA	75%	89%	\$	1,325,000	5	493,453	RAU 2007-Q48	201%	299%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942943	7-May-07	\$	529,500	1	90%	90%	\$	253,000	5	263,485	RAU 2007-Q47	87%	87%	0					
13942947	2-May-07	\$	295,000	1	65%	65%	\$	776,923	5	708,199	RAU 2007-Q47	71%	71%	0					
13942951	24-Apr-07	\$	248,000	1	80%	84%	\$	310,000	5	277,591	RAU 2007-Q47	89%	94%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942955	10-May-07	\$	398,000	1	76%	76%	\$	523,684	5	295,294	RAU 2007-Q47	135%	135%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942957	4-May-07	\$	220,000	1	52%	52%	\$	423,077	5	317,010	RAU 2007-Q47	69%	69%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942959	7-May-07	\$	315,000	1	59%	59%	\$	513,898	5	417,845	RAU 2007-Q47	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942961	15-May-07	\$	380,000	NA	95%	95%	\$	400,000	5	390,887	RAU 2007-Q48	97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942963	25-Apr-07	\$	135,000	NA	90%	90%	\$	150,000	5	94,344	RAU 2007-Q49	143%	143%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942965	8-May-07	\$	219,000	NA	75%	75%	\$	292,000	5	287,085	RAU 2007-Q49	76%	76%	0					
13942967	10-May-07	\$	269,500	NA	89%	89%	\$	302,809	5	290,111	RAU 2007-Q49	93%	93%	1					
13942969	11-May-07	\$	228,000	NA	85%	85%	\$	280,000	5	315,520	RAU 2007-Q48	75%	75%	0					
13942971	7-May-07	\$	360,000	1	80%	80%	\$	450,000	5	340,673	RAU 2007-Q47	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942973	2-May-07	\$	217,800	1	90%	90%	\$	242,000	5	191,013	RAU 2007-Q47	114%	114%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942981	2-May-07	\$	316,800	NA	80%	80%	\$	396,000	5	404,497	RAU 2007-Q48	78%	78%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942985	22-May-07	\$	319,500	NA	90%	90%	\$	315,000	5	304,605	RAU 2007-Q49	105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942987	3-May-07	\$	359,500	1	85%	85%	\$	423,000	5	354,186	RAU 2007-Q47	102%	102%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942989	4-May-07	\$	290,700	NA	90%	90%	\$	323,000	5	373,660	RAU 2007-Q48	78%	78%	1					
13942991	8-May-07	\$	420,000	NA	70%	70%	\$	600,000	5	811,915	RAU 2007-Q48	52%	52%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942995	8-May-07	\$	359,995	1	75%	75%	\$	479,993	5	388,241	RAU 2007-Q47	93%	93%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13942999	23-May-07	\$	212,250	1	75%	75%	\$	283,000	5	155,080	RAU 2007-Q47	137%	137%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940001	20-Apr-07	\$	600,000	NA	80%	80%	\$	753,000	5	853,724	RAU 2007-Q49	70%	70%	0					
13940013	8-May-07	\$	528,000	1	84%	84%	\$	628,571	5	610,510	RAU 2007-Q47	86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940037	8-May-07	\$	334,500	NA	75%	75%	\$	446,000	5	370,771	RAU 2007-Q48	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940041	15-May-07	\$	320,000	1	78%	78%	\$	410,256	5	474,771	RAU 2007-Q47	67%	67%	0					
13940047	17-May-07	\$	146,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	183,000	5	258,051	RAU 2007-Q48	57%	57%	0					
13940049	11-May-07	\$	192,500	1	70%	70%	\$	275,000	5	260,732	RAU 2007-Q47	74%	74%	0					
13940053	7-May-07	\$	450,500	NA	90%	90%	\$	642,857	5	599,888	RAU 2007-Q48	75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940057	8-May-07	\$	409,500	NA	90%	90%	\$	455,000	5	364,055	RAU 2007-Q48	112%	112%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940059	2-May-07	\$	75	NA	75%	75%	\$	400,000	5	333,909	RAU 2007-Q48	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940061	25-May-07	\$	900,000	1	75%	75%	\$	1,200,000	5	940,248	RAU 2007-Q47	96%	96%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940063	14-May-07	\$	189,680	1	80%	80%	\$	231,100	5	234,050	RAU 2007-Q47	81%	81%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940067	17-May-07	\$	173,000	NA	75%	75%	\$	175,000	5	130,077	RAU 2007-Q48	101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940071	11-May-07	\$	131,250	NA	90%	90%	\$	294,967	5	295,402	RAU 2007-Q48	90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940175	17-May-07	\$	180,500	1	95%	95%	\$	190,000	5	127,532	RAU 2007-Q510	142%	142%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940177	24-May-07	\$	325,400	1	95%	95%	\$	342,526	5	289,535	RAU 2007-Q511	112%	112%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940181	2-May-07	\$	171,360	1	90%	90%	\$	190,400	5	189,538	RAU 2007-Q510	90%	90%	0					
13940185	3-May-07	\$	189,976	1	95%	95%	\$	199,975	5	233,419	RAU 2007-Q511	81%	81%	1					
13940187	21-May-07	\$	298,750	1	92%	92%	\$	324,728	5	320,657	RAU 2007-Q511	93%	93%	1					
13940193	17-May-07	\$	370,450	1	95%	95%	\$	389,947	5	300,657	RAU 2007-Q511	123%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940195	10-May-07	\$	266,150	1	95%	95%	\$	280,158	5	285,790	RAU 2007-Q511	93%	93%	1					
13940197	14-May-07	\$	202,500	1	90%	90%	\$	225,000	5	225,737	RAU 2007-Q511	90%	90%	0					
13940199	21-May-07	\$	199,500	1	95%	95%	\$	210,000	5	181,019	RAU 2007-Q511	110%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940203	21-May-07	\$	188,100	1	95%	95%	\$	198,000	5	199,959	RAU 2007-Q511	94%	94%	0					
13940207	29-May-07	\$	175,000	1	90%	90%	\$	194,444	5	222,474	RAU 2007-Q511	79%	79%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940209	16-May-07	\$	250,000	1	100%	100%	\$	253,000	5	189,256	RAU 2007-Q511	132%	132%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940211	16-May-07	\$	465,500	1	95%	95%	\$	490,000	5	470,018	RAU 2007-Q511	99%	99%	0					
13940213	24-May-07	\$	343,500	1	85%	85%	\$	430,000	5	311,335	RAU 2007-Q510	117%	117%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940215	18-May-07	\$	353,400	1	100%	100%	\$	372,000	5	351,477	RAU 2007-Q511	98%	98%	0					
13940217	30-May-07	\$	357,300	1	95%	95%	\$	397,000	5	293,999	RAU 2007-Q511	107%	107%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940223	22-May-07	\$	115,940	1	90%	90%	\$	128,822	5	183,224	RAU 2007-Q511	122%	122%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940225	1-May-07	\$	244,150	1	95%	95%	\$	257,000	5	231,038	RAU 2007-Q511	106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940227	19-Apr-07	\$	211,500	1	94%	94%	\$	225,000	5	227,160	RAU 2007-Q511	93%	93%	0					
13940229	1-May-07	\$	76,500	1	90%	90%	\$	85,000	5	49,435	RAU 2007-Q511	156%	156%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940237	19-Apr-07	\$	385,700	1	95%	95%	\$	406,000	5	374,448	RAU 2007-Q511	103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940241	30-Apr-07	\$	291,987	1	85%	85%	\$	343,514	5	308,022	RAU 2007-Q511	95%	95%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940245	2-May-07	\$	221,000	1	85%	85%	\$	260,000	5	200,070	RAU 2007-Q511	110%	110%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940251	27-Apr-07	\$	315,500	1	95%	95%	\$	332,105	5	195,172	RAU 2007-Q511	162%	162%	0					
13940259	27-Apr-07	\$	140,000	1	100%	100%	\$	140,000	5	171,216	RAU 2007-Q511	82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach		
13940261	4-May-07	\$	189,000	1	90%	90%	\$	210,000	5	238,657	RAU 2007-Q511	79%	79%	0					
13940265	9-May-07	\$	318,750	1	84%	84%	\$	379,464	5	395,657	RAU 2007-Q510	89%</							

1964728	3-May-07	\$	54,429	1	100%	\$	515,000	5	517,143	RAJ 2007-QH9		93%	93%	1						Breach	
1964725	3-May-07	\$	634,500	1	955%	\$	670,000	3	517,670	RAJ 2007-QH9		98%	123%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1964726	4-May-07	\$	237,500	1	80%	\$	263,889	3	242,543	RAJ 2007-QS10		98%	98%	0							
1964729	4-May-07	\$	258,000	1	89%	\$	287,960	3	279,576	RAJ 2007-QS9		92%	92%	0							
1964727	4-May-07	\$	282,000	1	100%	100%	\$	282,000	3	289,572	RAJ 2007-QS9		97%	97%	0						
1964729	5-May-07	\$	335,900	1	90%	90%	\$	339,900	3	335,981	RAJ 2007-QS9		86%	86%	0						
1964730	5-May-07	\$	213,750	1	95%	95%	\$	225,000	3	212,764	RAJ 2007-QS11		100%	100%	0						
1964737	3-Jun-07	\$	377,400	1	95%	95%	\$	392,000	3	333,994	RAJ 2007-QS11		115%	115%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965393	3-Jun-07	\$	185,000	1	67%	67%	\$	276,119	5	241,958	RAJ 2007-QH7		75%	75%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965397	4-Jun-07	\$	793,000	NA	73%	80%	\$	1,006,849	5	891,346	RAJ 2007-QH8		82%	82%	0						Breach
1965805	2-Jul-07	\$	228,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	283,000	5	426,157	RAJ 2007-QH8		87%	87%	0						
1965817	2-Jul-07	\$	203,250	NA	75%	75%	\$	271,000	5	276,669	RAJ 2007-QH8		82%	82%	0						
1965819	11-Jul-07	\$	173,600	NA	80%	80%	\$	217,000	5	253,284	RAJ 2007-QH8		80%	80%	0						
1965821	2-Jul-07	\$	565,500	NA	80%	80%	\$	706,875	5	179,741	RAJ 2007-QH9		97%	97%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965823	12-Jul-07	\$	142,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	178,000	5	780,098	RAJ 2007-QH8		72%	72%	0						
1965825	2-Jul-07	\$	237,200	NA	94%	94%	\$	252,660	5	158,816	RAJ 2007-QH8		90%	90%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965829	3-Jul-07	\$	353,600	NA	90%	90%	\$	442,000	5	297,055	RAJ 2007-QH8		80%	80%	0						
1965833	3-Jul-07	\$	312,000	NA	95%	95%	\$	340,000	5	480,561	RAJ 2007-QH9		74%	74%	0						
1965837	5-Jul-07	\$	234,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	293,000	5	317,492	RAJ 2007-QH9		102%	102%	0						
1965841	9-Jul-07	\$	1,500,000	NA	75%	75%	\$	2,000,000	5	232,839	RAJ 2007-QH9		101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965843	11-Jul-07	\$	262,800	NA	90%	90%	\$	292,000	5	1,656,667	RAJ 2007-QH8		91%	91%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965847	6-Jul-07	\$	293,500	NA	90%	90%	\$	325,000	5	261,935	RAJ 2007-QH9		100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965869	5-Jul-07	\$	194,400	NA	80%	80%	\$	243,000	5	277,100	RAJ 2007-QH8		106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965861	5-Jul-07	\$	560,000	NA	75%	75%	\$	746,667	5	137,700	RAJ 2007-QH8		141%	141%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1965835	2-Jul-07	\$	323,500	NA	66%	66%	\$	490,152	5	855,801	RAJ 2007-QH8		65%	65%	0						
1965869	10-Jul-07	\$	205,000	NA	78%	78%	\$	262,821	5	525,000	RAJ 2007-QH9		62%	62%	0						
19683701	12-Jul-07	\$	337,800	NA	78%	78%	\$	433,077	5	292,057	RAJ 2007-QH9		70%	70%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19683703	5-Jul-07	\$	270,750	NA	95%	95%	\$	285,000	5	340,936	RAJ 2007-QH8		99%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19683711	13-Jul-07	\$	400,000	NA	78%	78%	\$	512,821	5	274,662	RAJ 2007-QH8		93%	93%	0						
19683713	12-Jul-07	\$	328,000	NA	80%	80%	\$	410,000	5	493,175	RAJ 2007-QH8		81%	81%	0						
19683715	18-Jul-07	\$	447,000	NA	80%	80%	\$	590,000	5	373,929	RAJ 2007-QH8		88%	88%	0						
19683717	13-Jul-07	\$	333,500	NA	74%	74%	\$	494,324	5	458,074	RAJ 2007-QH8		103%	103%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19688859	13-Jul-07	\$	468,750	NA	75%	88%	\$	625,000	5	395,556	RAJ 2007-QH8		84%	84%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19688865	26-Jun-07	\$	544,000	NA	74%	74%	\$	745,162	5	549,986	RMFSI 2007-58		85%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19688875	13-Jul-07	\$	462,200	NA	82%	62%	\$	745,484	5	743,263	RMFSI 2007-58		75%	70%	0						
19688877	5-Jul-07	\$	558,700	NA	75%	82%	\$	745,000	5	698,278	RMFSI 2007-58		66%	66%	0						
19688893	29-Jun-07	\$	680,000	1	80%	80%	\$	853,000	5	712,561	RMFSI 2007-58		78%	86%	0						
19688893	13-Jul-07	\$	238,500	1	75%	95%	\$	318,000	5	647,095	RAJ 2007-QS10		105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19688899	2-Jul-07	\$	320,000	1	80%	90%	\$	400,000	5	298,680	RAJ 2007-QS11		80%	101%	0						
19688903	6-Jul-07	\$	493,000	NA	85%	85%	\$	580,000	5	591,402	RAJ 2007-QS11		54%	61%	0						
19688905	13-Jul-07	\$	405,000	NA	77%	77%	\$	642,857	5	470,381	RMFSI 2007-58		105%	105%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19688909	10-Jul-07	\$	800,000	NA	70%	70%	\$	1,142,857	5	600,361	RMFSI 2007-58		82%	82%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
1968915	16-Jul-07	\$	443,000	NA	80%	80%	\$	540,000	5	793,775	RMFSI 2007-58		106%	106%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19718865	9-Jul-07	\$	556,000	NA	80%	80%	\$	695,000	5	492,174	RMFSI 2007-58		83%	88%	0						
19718873	26-Jul-07	\$	198,000	NA	90%	90%	\$	220,000	5	666,543	RAJ 2007-QH9		83%	94%	0						
19718881	9-Jul-07	\$	270,000	NA	78%	78%	\$	346,154	5	196,725	RAJ 2007-QH9		101%	101%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19718883	18-Jul-07	\$	1,500,000	NA	69%	69%	\$	2,173,913	5	273,660	RAJ 2007-QH8		99%	99%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19846713	20-Jul-07	\$	759,650	NA	90%	90%	\$	288,500	5	1,895,939	RAJ 2007-QH8		79%	79%	0						
19846733	20-Jul-07	\$	199,750	NA	95%	85%	\$	325,000	5	279,669	RAJ 2007-QH8		91%	91%	0						
19846737	23-Jul-07	\$	399,000	NA	95%	95%	\$	420,000	5	220,833	RAJ 2007-QH9		90%	90%	0						
19847011	23-Jul-07	\$	199,750	NA	95%	95%	\$	420,000	5	412,713	RAJ 2007-QH9		97%	97%	1						
19847246	30-Jul-07	\$	194,000	NA	70%	70%	\$	301,366	5	338,407	RAJ 2007-QH9		115%	115%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19847319	30-Jul-07	\$	559,200	NA	80%	80%	\$	690,000	5	472,385	RAJ 2007-QH9		118%	118%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19847369	26-Jul-07	\$	382,500	NA	85%	85%	\$	463,000	5	339,888	RAJ 2007-QH8		108%	108%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19847375	26-Jul-07	\$	400,000	NA	92%	92%	\$	464,883	5	329,000	RAJ 2007-QH8		122%	122%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19847375	26-Jul-07	\$	294,000	NA	75%	75%	\$	392,000	5	234,097	RAJ 2007-QH9		100%	100%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19850313	18-Jul-07	\$	343,000	NA	70%	70%	\$	747,826	5	336,603	RAJ 2007-QH9		86%	86%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19850349	26-Jul-07	\$	510,000	NA	69%	69%	\$	1,080,000	5	537,560	RAJ 2007-QH9		80%	83%	0	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	
19868935	5-Jul-07	\$	310,000	NA	73%	73%	\$	424,658	5	1,082,591	RAJ 2007-QH9		74%	74%	0						
19869071	11-Aug-07	\$	267,500	NA	75%	75%	\$	353,000	5	377,591	RAJ 2007-QH9		70%	70%	0						
19870751	25-Jul-07	\$	865,600	NA	74%	90%	\$	1,180,730	5	924,130	RAJ 2007-QH9		94%	114%	1	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	Breach	

EXHIBIT 8

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

In Re: RFC and RESCAP Liquidating
Trust Litigation

Civil No. 13-3451(SRN/JJK/HB)

ORDER

This document relates to:

Residential Funding Company, LLC v.
Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc.
and Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company,
Inc. v. Residential Funding Company,
LLC and ResCap Liquidating Trust, No.
13-cv-3511 (RHK/FLN)

HILDY BOWBEER, United States Magistrate Judge

This matter is before the Court on the parties' Stipulation Regarding Plaintiffs'
Motion to Compel [Doc. No. 350]. The Court **APPROVES** the Stipulation, as follows:

1. Plaintiffs shall not seek discovery from Sierra Pacific related to the
following 16 loans unless Plaintiffs identify an additional breach related to
the loans: 9774425, 10356871, 10357217, 10669429, 10669489,
10789819, 10832021, 10866919, 11038837, 11047591, 11105077,
11105085, 11183655, 11301455, 11448955, and 19447261.
2. Sierra Pacific shall provide discovery related to the remaining 502 loans
on Appendix I, subject to the objections contained in its responses to
RFC/ResCap's Requests for Production and any agreements reached
during any meet and confers with Plaintiffs.

3. Plaintiffs' discovery requests shall be deemed limited to such remaining 502 loans, until such time as Plaintiffs can identify breaches beyond "unreasonable stated income" for the 16 loans listed in paragraph 1 above.
4. Sierra Pacific's separate response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel discovery is withdrawn. Sierra Pacific also withdraws its joinder to the argument located at Paragraph I, pages 10-19, of Defendants' Joint Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel [Doc. No. 288] ("Plaintiffs' Request for Documents Regarding All Loans on Their Loss Lists is Unduly Burdensome, Premature, and Inconsistent with the Court's Orders Focusing Discovery.").
5. Plaintiffs withdraw their Motion to Compel as to Sierra Pacific on the issue raised in Paragraph I, pages 16-24, of Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel [Doc. No. 202] ("Plaintiffs are Entitled to Discovery Concerning the Loans Identified on Their Loan Lists").

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 13, 2015

s/ Hildy Bowbeer
HILDY BOWBEER
United States Magistrate Judge