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A. About four years.
Q. Can you give us -- just briefly tell us what other positions you've held at the University of Oregon.
A. I was a sergeant when I first got hired.
Q. Was your experience in policing before the University of Oregon?
A. Well, it started in 1990 with the Coast Guard, doing maritime law enforcement, narcotics interdiction. I worked for three sheriff's offices. I worked at the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, the police academy in Oregon, and I work for the Coburg Police Department.
Q. Can you tell us what you did at the Department of Public Standards and Training?
A. I was lieutenant. I was in charge of -- I was one of the few in charge of basic recruit training for police, corrections. Mostly police and corrections.
Q. Explain for the jury what DPSST is.
A. DPSST is Department of Public Safety Standards \& Training.

It's the police academy that -- for the state of Oregon. Every police officer in the state goes to the academy there. Police corrections, parole and probation, dispatchers. I think that's about it.
Q. Did you teach at DPSST?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What did you teach?
A. I taught use of force. I taught narcotics investigations. I taught some forensics. I taught essentially anything that was needed to teach. Primarily, I was a use-of-force instructor, though. Essentially, any time one of my instructors couldn't make it or didn't show, I would fill in and teach whatever the curriculum was.
Q. And every police officer in the state of Oregon has to go through the DPSST training program; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe that training for us, the length of time?
A. The basic police academy is 16 weeks, which is four
months. Yeah.
Q. Is that full time?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. They actually live on campus; right?
A. They do.
Q. Now, do public safety officer s at the University of Oregon go to any sort of police academy like that?
A. Not like that, no.
Q. How about reserve police officers?
A. Reserve police officers go to reserve academies.
Q. Generally, tell us, what does a reserve academy entail?
A. Well, a reserve academy is run essentially off of the same
curriculum as the basic police force, the police academy for full-time officers. It varies by region, however. There's not
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any set standard state-wide for what reserve academies are or what the curriculum has to be.
Q. Is there any standard for the length of program or how many days a week to go?
A. No.
Q. Is that up to a particular jurisdiction?
A. Typically, yes. It's up to the jurisdiction as to -well, yeah, the reserve academies are run regionally. Some regions don't have any reserve academies, but essentially it's up to the particular agency that employs the reserve officer what the length and type of training is that they have.
Q. Does DPSST require continued certifications for police officers?
A. Yes.
Q. Do they have that same requirement and oversight of reserve officers?
A. No.
Q. How about public safety officers?
A. No.
Q. So can you just explain for us what the job of a public safety officer at the University of Oregon entails?
A. Public safety officers at the University of Oregon, by statute, have probable cause arrest authority and stop and frisk authority. It's very similar to a police officer; however, it's not the same as a police officer. They can,
excuse me, make arrests based on probable cause. They can cite -- issue citations for violations and for crimes into the Eugene Municipal Court.
Q. Is there a limitation on the area in which they can operate?
A. Yes. It's restricted strictly to the University of Oregon owned or controlled property.
Q. And you -- the University of Oregon is an open campus; correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So there's public streets running through campus?
A. Yes.
Q. Does a public safety officer at the University of Oregon have authority on those public streets?
A. No.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, permission to approach? THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Exhibit 406, Your Honor. Lieutenant Bechdolt, do you recognize Exhibit 406?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you us what that is?
A. It's an amendment to the memorandum of understanding or IGA, the intergovernmental agreements, between the university and the City of Eugene; and it outlines the sections of the
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Eugene Municipal Codes that the university of public safety officers can enforce.

MS. COIT: Defendants offer 406.
THE COURT: Received.
MS. COIT: Permission to publish?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. All right. So this document we're looking at, does this describe the portions of the Eugene city code that the public safety officers have authority to cite for? Is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And the agreement is with the Eugene Police Department.

Why did you need an agreement with the Eugene Police Department?
A. Well, because it's the city code and -- well, the -- the University of Oregon is within the city of Eugene. Public safety officers don't have that authority directly to use the Eugene municipal code without this type of agreement.
Q. Okay. And so the citations that public safety officers -and this was the same in 2011 and '12; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So public safety officers only have authority to issue citations that go directly to municipal court; is that correct? A. That's correct. They can enforce Oregon Revised Statute or state law. However, there's no court in the Lane County
area that will hear it or recognize it.
Q. Okay. And are public safety officers -- well, are you familiar with the field training program at the University of Oregon?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Were you involved in that program in 2011?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. As part of that program, were the reserves taught what their authority was for issuing citations?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there a difference in the background investigation that's conducted for a University of Oregon public safety officer as opposed to a University of Oregon police officer?
A. No.
Q. Was that the same in 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So we talked about the campus a little bit at the University of Oregon. Can you just kind of describe for us the people that would be encountered, the demographic on campus, working a graveyard shift at the University of Oregon ?
A. Well, the graveyard shift typically consists of the contacts that the officers are making. You know, typically, it's -- a percentage of them are students; however, it's normally nonstudent -- I'd say not normally, but typically nonstudent encounters that they're having. Primarily,
transient population and some folks that are looking to, well, commit crimes, to steal things, bicycles, and vandalize the property.
Q. So at any point in your career at the university, did you
supervise Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. When was that?
A. It must have been 2011 for a period of time.
Q. Would you have supervised him while he was still in field training, or would that have been after field training was over?
A. It was while he was in. And there was a portion while it was -- after it was over that I did. A very small time.
Q. Now, when he's in field training, he also has a field training officer; correct?
A. Yes, he does.
Q. And do you recall who that was?
A. I believe it was Michael Drake.
Q. So would Michael Drake, during that period of time, be his direct supervisor, have more day-to-day contact with him? A. He would have more day-to-day contact with him. Not necessarily a supervisor, in that he wouldn't impose any sort of discipline, or anything like that, but they were together the whole time that he was in field training.
Q. While you supervised Mr. Cleavenger, did you notice
anything of concern about his performance as a public safety officer?
A. There was some concern, yes.
Q. Can you describe that for me?
A. I can't remember specifically, exactly, without referring to the daily observation reports, but there was some officer safety concerns and there was some -- well, I don't remember if it was during field training or not. There was some judgment issues that came up.
Q. All right. Do you recall anything that gave you the impression Mr. Cleavenger wasn't taking this job seriously? A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us about that?
A. There was an incident that we had the -- it's called the OR-PAT. It's the Oregon Physical Agilities Testing. It's the test that we use for police officers. It's also used at the police academy to test their physical agility. It's a standardized, mandated course by the state. We had it for -we had -- we actually had it open for any of our officers that wanted to show up and run through it.

While we were doing testing, in this particular instance, he showed up in kind of a leisure suit, which isn't -- I wouldn't consider that appropriate attire to run a physical agility course. Typically, you're wearing shorts, a T-shirt, and some sort of gym-type shoes, running shoes.
he would take anything that I told him probably more serious or maybe take it more to heart.
Q. And during what period of time did you make these observations?
A. It was during FTEP and probably post-FTEP.
Q. So right after he started working there?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. At any point during Mr. Cleavenger's career, did you come to the opinion that he needed additional training?
A. Yes.
Q. Describe for me what -- why you came to that belief.
A. Well, there was a point after he was finished with field training and he was functioning as a solo officer that I noticed some things that needed some correction and probably some remedial training.
Q. When you say "remedial training," tell us what that means.
A. Well, essentially remedial training, meaning we've already
finished the established training period, and it wasn't --
either wasn't effective or the trainee, in this case
Mr. Cleavenger, didn't -- it didn't take, so we needed to repeat some of that.
Q. So when you describe that, are you envisioning something more of an extended field training program?
A. Yes.
Q. In your opinion, would him going off campus to, you know,
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a half-day specialized seminar on FBI training, would that achieve the goals that you thought he needed for training?
A. No.
Q. Did you personally ever witness Sergeant Cameron singling
out Mr. Cleavenger, treating him unfairly?
A. No, I never did.
Q. How about Lieutenant Lebrecht?
A. No.
Q. Chief McDermed?
A. No.
Q. All right. So we've heard testimony in this case about a submission made to the district attorney.
A. Yes.
Q. Were you around during that time period?
A. I was. I was employed with the university, yes.
Q. And can you recall when -- what year that was?
A. I want to say maybe it was 2012, but I don't remember the exact year, no.
Q. Okay. Well, I'll just --
A. I don't remember the exact year. I'm sorry.
Q. No problem. It was 2014.
A. Oh, was it '14? Okay.
Q. So you were still at the university at that time?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Do you recall being involved in some way in those
discussions about whether or not information needed to be submitted to the district attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your opinion on that?
A. Well, my opinion was that if we, as a department, possessed information, we had an obligation to provide that to the district attorney.
Q. Did you at that time believe the $U$ of $O$ possessed information that needed to be turned over to the district attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it matter -- in your opinion, did it relieve the university of its obligation to submit this information, the fact that the chief was named in a federal lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. In your opinion -- and this is the Brady obligation we're talking about; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In your opinion, is the Brady obligation for a law enforcement agency discretionary?
A. No. No, it's not. My understanding of the law is it's not at all.
Q. So did you actually have interactions with Chief McDermed prior to her submitting the information to the district attorney?
Q. How did he do in his leisure suit?
A. I believe he completed the test in the required time. I
don't remember what his time was.
Q. You don't know if he came in first?

THE COURT: Counsel, hold on. Let's get this set up
so we can hear. Let's get the microphone over.
And make sure, Christy, it's turned on. And I'll have him reask that question.

Reask the question just so we can test that.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Do you know what his score was in the leisure suit in this athletic event?
A. No.
Q. And this event took place inside a locked building?
A. I don't think it was locked, no. I think we had it open
because we were expecting other applicants to show up.
Q. It was inside, though?
A. Yes.
Q. How long did you work at DPSST?
A. About six months.
Q. Okay. Public safety officers have the authority at times to do a probable cause arrest?
A. Yes.
Q. And stop-and-frisk authority; right?
A. Yes.
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A. I probably was in a meeting about it, but I don't remember specifically, no.
Q. Okay. Well, from what you do remember, do you recall ever forming the belief or a suspicion that Chief McDermed was making this Brady submission to get back at Mr. Cleavenger for something?
A. No.
Q. Did you form an opinion on why she was making this submission?
A. My opinion was that we had the obligation. The same reason I think we should have -- that the University of Oregon police had information, and we have an obligation to submit that to the district attorney regardless of what other circumstances might be involved.

MS. COIT: All right. Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Cross-examination?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Can I have one minute with my client?
THE COURT: Certainly.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MCDOUGAL:
Q. Just some minor things before I get started. How did Mr. Cleavenger do? Did he come in first in his leisure suit?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

Bechdolt - X
Q. Can they arrest for any crime?
A. Statutorily, yes.
Q. So it's in the Oregon Revised Statutes?
A. If my recollection of the statute is correct, yes.
Q. Can they arrest for DUI?
A. Yeah, I suppose they could.
Q. Theft?
A. Yes.
Q. Stalking?
A. Yes.
Q. Burglary?
A. Yes.
Q. And can they write parking tickets?
A. Yes.
Q. Careless driving?
A. I suppose, statutorily, yes, they could.
Q. They can run tags?
A. Yes.
Q. You signed off on Mr. Cleavenger's FTEP training?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. You could have extended it then, right, if you thought he was doing poorly?
A. I could have, yes.
Q. You didn't?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. But you're here to testify that he needed more training?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You said he had judgment issues. Can you give me some examples?
A. The one issue I can think of right now is we were at an event -- outdoor event, ESPN College GameDay, on campus, and there was an instance when I saw Mr. Cleavenger come out from -- I don't remember if it was behind a building or some brush, but he had -- he was in uniform and he had angel wings on his back and a beer in each hand.
Q. Did you write him up?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did anybody?
A. I don't know. I didn't, though.
Q. If somebody did, the office -- the -- you guys would have a piece of paper. You could bring it and present it to the jury; right?
A. Yeah. I suppose we would, yeah.
Q. Officer safety concerns, what were those?
A. There was an instance when he had contacted drivers of vehicles while they were still seated in the vehicle.
Q. Do you have specifics?
A. There's one that I can think of. I don't remember names involved, but there was an instance where there was a vehicle, and I don't remember the reason for the contact, but there was
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an instance where he contacted somebody that was still seated in their vehicle.
Q. Okay. You knew you were going to testify today; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You had a chance to talk to your counsel before testifying today; right?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a serious matter; correct? This is your second time testifying; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Before you came to testify that there were officer safety concerns about Mr. Cleavenger, did it cross your mind that you might have specifics if you're going to make that conclusion in a court of law?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you get the specifics?
A. I didn't get specifics, no.
Q. Why not?
A. I didn't know I was going to be asked specifics.
Q. You didn't know your counsel was going to ask you about officer safety concerns?

MS. COIT: Object. Beyond the scope of direct. I didn't ask about specific concerns.

THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer the question.

## THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question?

## BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)

Q. You did not know -- let me not do a double negative. Did you know that you were going to be asked about officer safety concerns?
A. I suspected I might be, yes.
Q. You came to give a conclusion, but no examples?
A. I believe I just gave one, but --
Q. No specifics?
A. No.
Q. Nothing that Mr. Cleavenger can challenge?
A. No.
Q. Is that fair?
A. I don't -- I don't know if it's fair or not.
Q. You talked about giving warnings instead of citations or an arrest. Do you have any examples? You criticized him for that.
A. No, I don't have any examples.
Q. Did you know you were going to be asked about that?
A. Yeah, I did know that.
Q. And you chose just to come and give a conclusion with no examples, no specifics?
A. That's correct.
Q. Nothing he can defend against?
A. Correct.

1830
Bechdolt - X
Q. Is that how things are supposed to work?
A. I don't know how things are supposed to work.

MS. COIT: Object. Argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Give me some examples. You also said that

Officer Cleavenger did not take Cameron and Lebrecht as seriously as he took you.

Give me some examples, please.
A. Again, I don't remember specific examples, but I can -that was my recollection of the time.
Q. Did you know you were going to be asked about that?
A. I didn't know I was going to be asked for specific examples, no.
Q. But you knew you would be asked whether or not you respected him, and you came and you testified, and you had all the time to prepare, and you couldn't bring an example; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You said you noticed some things that he needed direction or remedial training on. Can you tell me what those are?
A. Again, specifically? I don't have a recollection specifically, but there was -- like I've stated before, there was officer safety, and I believe I gave one example. Q. Okay. So the question is whether or not this man is fit
to work at the police department. You're asked questions about judgment, officer safety, warnings, respect for Cameron and Lebrecht, and need for retraining.

On the need for retraining, this fifth subject, you have no specifics?
A. No.
Q. Nothing he can defend against?
A. No.
Q. All right. Obligation to provide the district attorney

Brady list materials. Serious obligation?
A. I would say so, yes.
Q. Something to be done without hesitation?
A. In my mind, yes.
Q. Okay. Tell me what conduct gave rise to the Brady-listing.
A. I don't know the specific conduct. I just know that there was information that the department had that -- if we had it, I felt we had an obligation to provide it.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay. What's our exhibit number of
this? Ours was already admitted?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: 168.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Mr. Hess, 168 has been admitted. Can
you publish that to the jury? Wait. Wait one second.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. When did you know that the public safety office, your
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employer, had Brady list materials -- Brady list issues with Mr. Cleavenger?
A. What date? I don't remember the exact date.
Q. What gave rise to it?
A. What gave rise to what?
Q. Hey, that's something that would be Brady listable?
A. I had heard from my colleagues that there was information that the department had.
Q. When?
A. Again, I don't remember the specific date, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you remember any content whatsoever --
A. Do I remember any content?
Q. -- that would be involved in Brady-listing? Any subject matter whatsoever.
A. I don't know the specifics, no. I know that there was issues of truthfulness, which is what Brady is about.
Q. Sitting here today, do you know the specifics?
A. No.
Q. Were you employed at the time that you had Brady-list concerns?
A. Yes.
Q. The minute you had those Brady-list concerns, did you say, "We've got to do something"?
A. I don't think it was the minute I heard that, no.
Q. Was it a week, a month, a year? Six months, eight months,
nine months?
A. No. I don't remember how long it was between the time that I knew and the time that I expressed that we needed to provide the information.
Q. When is the first time you expressed that you needed to provide the information?
A. Again, specific dates, I don't remember.
Q. Do you remember how you do it?
A. I did it via email.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay. Now, Mr. Hess, what's our exhibit number?

MR. HESS: 168.
MR. MCDOUGAL: 168. Okay. I've got it right here.

## All right.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Is that email that you're talking when you first decided that there were Brady issues to consider or to report, the email in Exhibit 168?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Permission to publish 168, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if that was -- I don't know if that was the first time that I had expressed those, no. BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Well, let me ask you something: Were you ever tasked to get together all of your emails about the Brady issue and give
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them to someone; for example, your legal department or your lawyer?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If they don't have an earlier one, fair to say you don't have an earlier one?
A. That's fair to say, yes.
Q. I'll represent to you that this is the earliest one that I
have that I was given.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, let's look at the timing of this. What email are you responding to?
A. I'm responding to an email from Chief McDermed.
Q. And what's it about?
A. It's the opinion of the arbitrator.
Q. Okay. And it was that you got the gist that he won and he would be reinstated?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that's dated -- 11:35 a.m.?
A. Correct.
Q. There should be no hesitation in providing Brady list materials to a DA; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Did you get the Brady-list materials in between 11:35, when you got that email, and 11:39 when you responded?
A. Did I get the materials?
Q. Yeah. Or the information.
A. No. Probably not in that four-minute period.
Q. How long did you have them?
A. I don't know how long I had them. I didn't have
specifics. I knew that there was -- there was issues.
Q. Brady-listing somebody is a very serious matter; correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. You had no -- what was your foundation for suggesting to the chief -- your knowledge for suggesting to the chief that he be Brady-listed?
A. Like I said earlier, I had heard a discussion that there were Brady issues. There were issues of truthfulness.
Q. Whose discussion?
A. Whose?
Q. Yeah.
A. It was amongst my colleagues.
Q. When? Where?
A. I don't know the date. I didn't write it down.
Q. Well, if you heard that one of your officers that you had supervised needed to be Brady-listed, did you immediately tell those people who you can't remember that told you that, "You better go tell the chief"?
A. I didn't, no.
Q. Did you ask them, "Hey, why? This is serious matter. You're talking about a man's reputation and future. You don't
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just banter about it. Hey, let me know why he should be Brady-listed"? Did you do that?
A. No.
Q. Do you think people who said he should be Brady-listed knew or should have known, "Hey, if you're going to Brady-list somebody, you do it without hesitation? You go. Dishonest."
A. I would suspect they would do that, yeah.
Q. But they didn't?
A. Apparently not. I don't -- I don't know. I don't know what they did or didn't do.
Q. Well, you know he wasn't Brady-listed within -- the idea formally wasn't said to Brady-list him, at least by you, within four -- until four minutes after you learned that he had -- was getting reinstated; right?
A. Right.
Q. And at that time you knew he hadn't been Brady-listed yet; right?
A. Right.
Q. All right. When did you learn the reasons why he should be Brady-listed?
A. I don't -- I still don't know the specifics as to why.
Q. Was the IA investigation shared with you?
A. No.
Q. Was it permissible to share it with you?
A. No.
Q. So you shouldn't have known about it?
A. I knew that there was an IA occurring.
Q. But that's not a reason to Brady-list somebody. A lot of people are IA'd and never Brady-listed; right?
A. This is true.
Q. You wrote an email that said that there was more than one internal investigation. Do you remember that?
A. I think so, yeah.
Q. Tell me -- tell me what the internal investigations were about.
A. Again, I don't know the specifics, what they were about.

I don't -- I don't -- if I knew, I don't recall what they were now.
Q. Do you know what they revealed?
A. No.
Q. So you don't know what they're about. You don't know what they revealed. They're not a basis for Brady-listing someone, but you thought he should be Brady-listed?
A. I thought that the information should be provided to the district attorney so the district attorney could make that determination. It's not my decision whether he's Brady-listed or not.
Q. You thought there was a Brady-list issue and that it
should be pursued?
A. Yeah, I did.
Q. And you can't tell me one reason why it should be pursued?
A. Specifically, no; but untruthfulness.
Q. Who told you that?
A. It was probably a combination of Lieutenant Lebrecht and
Lieutenant Morrow.
Q. Do you remember a lady who was accused of making a
fraudulent parking pass?
A. No, I don't. That happens often, so I don't know the
specifics.
Q. No. A public safety officer --
A. No.
Q. -- accused of theft. Bowes. Does that name ring a bell?
A. That name does, but that happened before I worked there.
$\quad$ MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.
$\quad$ THE COURT: Redirect?
BY MS. COIT: $\quad$ Lieutenant Bechdolt, I want you to look again at
Q.
Exhibit 168 in a minute. Okay. The third page. All right.
Let -- let's go to the second page real quick so you can see
the date on that.
A. You see the bottom email there?
Q. That's from you to -- who's Pete Deshpande?
A. Specifically, no; but untruthfulness.
Q. Who told you that?
A. It was probably a combination of Lieutenant Lebrecht and Lieutenant Morrow.
Q. Do you remember a lady who was accused of making a
fraudulent parking pass?
A. No, I don't. That happens often, so I don't know the specifics.
Q. No. A public safety officer --
A. No.
Q. -- accused of theft. Bowes. Does that name ring a bell?
A. That name does, but that happened before I worked there.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you. THE COURT: Redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COIT:
Q. Lieutenant Bechdolt, I want you to look again at Exhibit 168 in a minute. Okay. The third page. All right.
Let -- let's go to the second page real quick so you can see the date on that.

You see the bottom email there?
A. Yeah. March 12th.
Q. That's from you to -- who's Pete Deshpande?
A. At the time he was my captain.
Q. All right. Let's go to the third page.
All right. Call it out. Do you recall sending this
email?
A. Yes.
Q. So at the time you sent this email, were you aware that
Mr. Cleavenger had been terminated based on the -- in part, on
the findings of an internal affairs investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were aware that that internal affairs
investigation revealed a pattern of untruthfulness and criminal
behavior?
A. Yes.
Q. And criminal behavior by a police or public safety officer
is a reason to submit information to the district attorney for
Brady consideration; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you stand behind what you said in this email?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Did I ask you to go look up specific instances of what
happened five years ago; four years ago?
A. No, you did not.
A. At the time he was my captain.
Q. All right. Let's go to the third page.

All right. Call it out. Do you recall sending this
email?
A. Yes.
Q. So at the time you sent this email, were you aware that

Mr. Cleavenger had been terminated based on the -- in part, on the findings of an internal affairs investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were aware that that internal affairs
investigation revealed a pattern of untruthfulness and criminal behavior?
A. Yes
Q. And criminal behavior by a police or public safety officer

Brady consideration; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you stand behind what you said in this email?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Did I ask you to go look up specific instances of what happened five years ago; four years ago?

MS. COIT: All right. Thank you.

MS. COIT: That was recross, Your Honor.

Bechdolt - ReX
THE COURT: Sorry. My apologies. Recross? MS. COIT: I'm forgetting my role here. MR. MCDOUGAL: Just briefly.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCDOUGAL:
Q. This internal affairs investigation finding that you're saying gave rise to an obligation to let the DA know, what was the date on that?
A. I don't know the date on it.
Q. Was it months and months before?
A. I don't know the date on it.
Q. Okay. Was it what gave rise to Mr. Cleavenger's termination?
A. Partially. My understanding was that was it, yeah.
Q. How long had he been terminated before you sent this email?
A. I -- I don't remember the dates still.
Q. But your testimony is any officer who knew that information, if it was grounds for Brady-listing, the day they knew it they should have gone to the DA?
A. Not any officer, no. That's a function of the executive.
Q. The day Chief McDermed knew it, she should have gone to the DA?
A. I suspect that the absolute day she knew it she would
probably want to look into it. If I was -- if I was made aware of information, I would want to make sure that the information was credible and accurate.
Q. Okay. Well, you got a report from Morrow. And if you're to use it as a basis -- let me rephrase that.

If she thought it was a basis to do it, she should have done it right away?
A. Yes. I would have.
Q. Okay. So you don't wait a month, two months, three months, four months, five months, six months, seven months. You don't wait for an arbitrator decision you don't like; correct?
A. I don't, no.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Thank you.
THE COURT: May the witness be excused?
MS. COIT: Yes.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down.
Your next witness, please, Counsel?
MS. COIT: Defense calls Pete Deshpande.
THE COURT: Thank you. Step into the well of the courtroom, please, and raise your right hand, please.
/1/
///


THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated to my right. The entrance to the witness box is just to my right, closest to the

THE WITNESS: Okay, sir.
THE COURT: If you would be seated.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Move your chair closer to the microphone so we can hear you. Face the jury. State your full name, sir.

THE WITNESS: Okay. There we go. My name is

THE COURT: Thank you. Direct examination, please.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COIT:
Q. Mr. Deshpande, what is your current title?
A. I'm a reserve detective sergeant with UOPD.
Q. In 2000 -- well, when did you take over that title?
A. That title, current title, April of this year.
Q. Prior to April of this year, what was your title?
Q. At the University of Oregon?

## A. Correct.

Q. Is the police captain position directly below the chief of police?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So you're second in command?
A. Correct.
Q. How many captains were there at that time?
A. One. Just me.
Q. Prior to coming to the university, did you have law enforcement experience?
A. I did.
Q. Can you just tell us what that was?
A. Certainly. Roughly, 22 years at the City of Eugene with the Eugene Police Department.
Q. What positions did you hold at the police department in Eugene?
A. Well, all of us typically start with being a patrol
officer. So, from patrol, I got promoted to agent, then
sergeant, first-line supervisor, lieutenant. And then when I
transferred to the university, I was acting-captain at Eugene Police.
Q. Why did you move from the Eugene Police Department to the University of Oregon Police Department?
A. Well, for a myriad of reasons, but one of the compelling
things for me was the formation of a brand new police
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department. Something that I had never seen before. The transformation of essentially a security function being transformed into a police department. So that had a big draw.

Plus, other family ties to the University of Oregon. Personal ties to the university. The opportunity for my kids to attend college there, you know, at preferable rates, and so forth. If you put the whole package together, it just made sense at that time in my life.
Q. When you were at the Eugene Police Department, did you work with Carolyn McDermed?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What was your role with her? Was she your supervisor?

Were you her supervisor?
A. At different times, it was different relationships; but, predominantly, she was my supervisor at multiple times. Initially, we were peers when she first started.
Q. So how many years did you work with her at the Eugene Police Department?
A. Of the 22-plus years, I would -- I mean, I won't get this exactly right, but I would think 15-ish.
Q. And then continue to work with her at the University of Oregon?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you describe her supervisory style?
A. Certainly. She's very easygoing, not an autocrat, not
demanding, very easy to work for, easy to talk to.
Q. Describe her as a person. Do you know her personally?
A. Certainly. Yeah.
Q. What kind of person is she?
A. I mean, the same thing. What you see is what you get.

Honest. Candid. A very nice person.
Q. Have you ever known Chief McDermed to be dishonest?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you ever witnessed her retaliating against a
subordinate?
A. No, I have never seen that.
Q. In your entire almost 20 years of working with her, have you ever seen that?
A. No, I've seen her being very forgiving with folks on cases where perhaps I might not have been, so quite the opposite.
Q. So based on your personal knowledge of Chief McDermed's character, would that be out of character for her to retaliate against a subordinate?
A. Absolutely, it would be.
Q. All right. Were you involved in the discussions regarding the termination of Mr. Cleavenger's employment?
A. Very peripherally. All that happened prior to my joining the university. Or at least I believe the vast majority of it did. Q. Of the conduct?
A. Of the conduct and the proceedings and so forth.
Q. So you never supervised Mr. Cleavenger?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you know him personally? Did you work with him at all, or was he on leave when you were hired?
A. No, I did not work with him at all. He was on some sort of leave at that time.
Q. From the discussions that you were involved in regarding the termination, did you develop an understanding of why termination was being pursued?
A. Yes. And, you know, there were reams of documents and so forth. It's a little fuzzy for me right now. I did not review anything before today, coming here, but I know, recalling what I knew at the time, there was sufficient things that I recall that warranted -- warranted that action.
Q. Do you recall having any sort of discussion with Chief McDermed about the termination decision?
A. About the decision itself? I don't remember specifically, but if there had been, I would have concurred with it without a doubt.
Q. Okay. Do you know Lieutenant Lebrecht?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. When did you meet him?
A. Just prior to starting at the University of Oregon. I was still with the Eugene Police Department, and we were working a
sporting event, and that's when I met him.
Q. Since moving over to the University of Oregon, have you worked relatively closely with Lieutenant Lebrecht?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And do you have an opinion, based on your personal experiences with him, of his character?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is that?
A. He's very professional, straightforward. Doesn't play games. He's honest. He's ethical. Yeah, absolutely.
Q. Have you ever witnessed him mistreating an employee?
A. Never.
Q. Ever seen him get angry at work?
A. No. Again, I've never seen him get angry either.
Q. Never seen him raise his voice?
A. No.
Q. Would that be out of his character as a supervisor?
A. It would be. He -- if there's any sort of dynamic
situation to the contrary of getting angry, he seems to get more calm, quiet, and controlled.
Q. All right. I want to talk about the disclosure that was made to the district attorney in 2014. You were involved in that process; correct?
A. Yes. Again, pretty peripherally involved, yes.
Q. All right. First off, let's -- can you explain to the
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jury your understanding of what a Brady disclosure is, what it entails, and what are your obligations?
A. Sure. Sure. Again, I'm not an expert in this area. I should say that first. But what I do know is if there's any indication of an officer's being untruthful or the veracity of an officer's conduct or statement is questionable, then that information needs to be disclosed to the district attorney so that it could be provided for future defendants in court cases. Essentially, that's my rough understanding of it.
Q. Is it your understanding that providing the information to the district attorney automatically results in this officer being Brady-listed?
A. Oh, no. Not at all. My understanding is that we're obligated to provide information that we know, certainly, and then it's up to the DA's office to make the determination.
Q. Is that obligation that a law enforcement agency has, is that a discretionary decision?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Object. Lacks foundation. THE COURT: Sustained. More foundation.

BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. From your understanding of the obligation a law enforcement agency has to provide information to the district attorney about an officer's credibility, is that a discretionary decision?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Same objection.

THE COURT: Same ruling.
How does he know these things? Training? Conversation? Pamphlet? Just more foundation. Not an inappropriate area. MS. COIT: I understand.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. In 2013, 2014, did you attend any seminars or trainings where the Brady obligation was discussed?
A. Yes. Yes, I did.
Q. And who was leading those discussions about Brady obligations?
A. It was -- you know, it was at the police academy in Salem, and I don't remember exactly who the different instructors were, but I know that the issue of Brady disclosure was one of the topics in the training.
Q. In that training, were you taught, did you learn about -MR. MCDOUGAL: Objection. Leading. THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. In that training, did you learn about the obligation that a law enforcement agency has to turn information over to the DA?
A. Yes, we did. I think many of us -- most of us knew of that obligation, but that just sort of reinforced it and brought it up to the forefront.
Q. Did you learn in that training whether or not this
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obligation is discretionary?
A. Yes. Now, we were -- my understanding, again, is that it's not a matter of choice. Once we have information that questions an officer's veracity, we can't withhold it or hide
it. We would be remiss to do that. So we have to absolutely disclose it.

What the DA's office does with it is up to them, of course.
Q. Have you ever reviewed Mr. Cleavenger's internal affairs investigation that was conducted by Lieutenant Morrow?
A. Yes. Again, I should say I have not re-reviewed it prior to this matter today. This was probably a couple years ago or more.
Q. Sitting here today, do you have any memory of whether or not that the findings in that investigation raised Brady concerns?
A. My recollection is that there were a number of portions of that that did rise to that level. I don't recall any specific allegations of untruthfulness, per se, but I do remember some descriptions of conduct or behavior or statements that Mr. Cleavenger made that would certainly rise to that level, at least to the point of letting the DA's office review it.
Q. Can you tell us what your role was in the process of actually submitting information to the district attorney?
A. My role was really fairly simple. It turns out that

## Lieutenant Lebrecht has been here for a fairly short time in the community, three years or so, and I've been here -- by virtue of being in the community for so long, you know, I have known the DA, deputy DA, for years. So my function was to sort of introduce Brandon to him and vice versa. <br> Q. Did you have an opinion on whether or not the information the University of Oregon had about Mr. Cleavenger was something that needed to be disclosed to the district attorney? <br> A. Yes. My opinion was that it needed to be disclosed. <br> Again, what they did with it was totally up to them. I did not have a horse in the race, so to speak. <br> Q. Do you know what Lieutenant Lebrecht's role was in this submission? <br> A. His role in this thing? Primarily, to deliver the documents for the DA's review. <br> Q. Did you have discussions with him, prior to making that delivery of documents, about making the submission itself? <br> A. Yes. We have some informal discussions about the timing <br> of it and when we were going to take it there and so forth, <br> yes. <br> Q. Did those discussions with Lieutenant Lebrecht give you an impression on whether or not he wanted to make this submission ? <br> A. Yes. I got an impression. <br> Q. What was that? <br> A. My impression was that he was very reticent to do so, and
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the reality is I think all of us understood, in the command staff, that there's an obligation to do so; but, nonetheless, with, you know, pending potential litigation, and so forth, and various issues, I could sense that he was reticent to do so.
Q. Can a subordinate in Lieutenant Lebrecht's position disobey an order of his chief if that order is not illegal, immoral, or unethical?
A. No. Under those conditions, the order has to be followed.
Q. In your opinion, was there anything illegal, immoral, or unethical about Chief McDermed's directive to take this information to the district attorney?
A. Not at all.

MS. COIT: That's all I have. Thank you, sir.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Cross-examination?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCDOUGAL:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning, sir.
Q. Do you remember getting an email from Lieutenant Lebrecht
approximately eight minutes after he learned that the arbitrator had reinstated Mr. Cleavenger?
A. I'm a little bit hazy. I got many emails from the lieutenant, so --
Q. Maybe this will help. About Brady-listing.
A. I do remember an email that he sent about Brady-listing.

Yes, sir.
Q. Do you remember it being about eight minutes after he learned the arbitrator reinstated Mr. Cleavenger?
A. No. Absolutely not. I don't recall the timing of it.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay. Mr. Hess, is 412 in?
MR. HESS: I don't know.
MR. MCDOUGAL: I won't hold things up. Permission to

## approach?

THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. I highlighted this document, sir. I'm not showing you an original in that respect, but underneath it is original.
A. Okay.

MR. MCDOUGAL: This is page -- I'm sorry to reach into your space. Sorry. I need to tell the judge what page it is. We're looking at the third page of 412.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Can you -- take a second to look at it because I'm going to ask you a question.
A. Entire page or any particular section?
Q. You probably want to read down to the email from Carolyn McDermed because that would be involved in my question. A. Okay.
Q. Have you read it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you see that Carolyn McDermed sends an email ?

What time does she send an email?
A. Looks like 11:35 a.m.
Q. Does her communication, the gist of it, say Mr. Cleavenger is going to be reinstated?
A. Yes.
Q. And does Lebrecht respond?

THE COURT: Lieutenant Lebrecht or Bechdolt?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Lebrecht.
THE COURT: Lebrecht. My apologies. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yes. I see a response from him to

## Lieutenant Bechdolt's reply.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. And how many minutes is this after Chief McDermed's email ?
A. Let's see. 35. 43. Looks like eight minutes.
Q. Eight minutes later. After learning that Mr. Cleavenger is going to be reinstated, what does Mr. Lebrecht say in his email?
A. There was a reference to Brady issues and another large-scale investigation that wasn't part of the termination. Q. So he's chiming in that Mr. Cleavenger should be Brady-exposed; correct?

MS. COIT: Objection. Mischaracterizes.

MR. MCDOUGAL: I'm asking him.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Answer the question? Is that right?
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. It looks to me like the lieutenant is saying that

Brady issues and other large -- both of those categories were not part of the termination.
Q. He's bringing up Brady right after he's learning about reinstatement; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you said that -- let me get this right. You knew you were testifying today; right?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't review anything?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Were you asked not to?
A. I was not asked not to.
Q. Okay. You said that -- you were asked, "What's your opinion of Sergeant Cameron's professionalism?"

MS. COIT: Object. He was not asked that.
THE COURT: I don't believe I was asked that,
Counsel.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Okay.
THE COURT: He was asked about Lebrecht.
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BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. You said that Carolyn McDermed was very forgiving.
A. Yes.
Q. Would you consider her allowing Sergeant Cameron, who had three sexual harassment complaints against him, to continue to work, very forgiving?
A. In that context, yes.
Q. Do you have any example of when she was ever very forgiving to Mr. Cleavenger?
A. I don't know. That was before I started at the department, sir.
Q. You said you concurred with the termination without a doubt. Why? What was your basis? What facts did you rely upon?
A. Upon the information I had at the time, which was a document that Mike Morrow had prepared, and whatever else I had seen at the time. The totality of everything I had seen at the time.
Q. You can't give us specifics because you did not review anything?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. You did say that your review of the IA report indicated no specific untruthfulness.
A. What I meant is, to be clear, there was no allegation of untruthfulness unto itself.
Q. What was the basis for the Brady-listing or submitting the materials to the DA?
A. There was expressed conduct and statements that were made as part of the investigation, if I recall correctly, that questioned Mr. Cleavenger's veracity.
Q. So it was the investigation itself, that information, that was sufficient or should have given -- that gave rise to the need to let the DA know?
A. That was certainly part of it. Again, I'm not remembering the total circumstances of it, but I know at the time that I looked at it it made sense that, based on the totality of all the information available, it warranted at least a look by the DA's office.
Q. Okay. Do you know the date of that document that it was finalized?
A. Which document, sir?
Q. The IA report you were just talking about.
A. I don't recall that.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Mr. Hess, can you pull up the first page of the IA report? Never mind. I -- 331. Permission to publish?

THE COURT: You may.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Get the date on there. Mr. Hess, can you focus in on the date?
///
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```
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. July 27, 2012. Fair enough?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. The date of the emails talking about Brady-listing in
front of you? Brady disclosures.
A. Looks like March 10, 2014.
Q. March 10 --
    MS. COIT: Your Honor?
    A JUROR: Are we supposed to have this? Are we
supposed to have this on our monitors?
            MR. HESS: I think I had switched it, so let's go
back. Sorry.
    MR. MCDOUGAL: Sorry. Can I show that date again,
Your Honor?
    THE COURT: Sure.
    A JUROR: We still don't have a document.
    MR. MCDOUGAL: Still not a document?
    A JUROR: No.
    THE COURT: Our equipment should work for you, folks.
It's as simple as that. Are you not picking this up on the
screen?
    A JUROR: It's just a logo for the court.
    THE COURT: Just a logo? We're going to try that
again. If our equipment is not working, we're going to get it
fixed.
```

MR. HESS: It's malfunctioning.
THE COURT: It's malfunctioning? It's time for a recess. We can get the MIS people up here and get that fixed so you can see those documents.

Okay. So please don't discuss this matter or form or express an opinion. We'll get somebody up here and get that fixed.
(Jury not present.)

THE COURT: Counsel, why don't you take a 20-minute recess. Get this fixed.

Christy, if you can ask them to come up and get it fixed, okay?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Recess taken.) } \\
& \text { (Jury present.) }
\end{aligned}
$$

THE COURT: Jury is present. Once again, counsel.
Thank you. Parties, please be seated.
Thank you for your courtesy.
Counsel, continue your cross-examination.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes. Mr. Hess, can we go back and publish 331, the IA, report with focus on the date?

```
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
```

Q. So July 27, 2012. What was the date of Exhibit 412,
page 3 ?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Permission to publish? And I offer 412.
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MS. COIT: No objection.
THE COURT: 412 is received.

```
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
```

Q. March 10, 2014. So that's almost two years later; right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Now, from this email exchange, would you agree that it looks like Brady is being talked about directly after and in relation to him being reinstated? Mr. Cleavenger.
A. It does.
Q. If there was any other piece of paper that talked about Brady and Mr. Cleavenger that was before this, that would be some evidence that it was considered before; right?
A. That would be one -- one piece of evidence, yes.
Q. Do you know of any?
A. I don't, sir.
Q. Let's talk about that, too. Was your decision not to review anything, any documents, before testifying, was that a conscious decision you made?
A. I would say partially. I didn't want to taint what I knew and remember it from when things happened versus reviewing it just for the purpose of this hearing.
Q. Officers underneath you, when they go to court and testify, do you expect them to review their materials first?
A. Yes, I do. If they were involved in a case where they were personally involved in some action, arresting somebody,
citing somebody, yes.
Q. You would consider it unprofessional if they didn't review the documents before going into court; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. How long have you known about Brady duties?
A. I've known of the concept for -- I don't know exactly, but many years.
Q. Do you know when Brady was decided?
A. I don't remember right now.
Q. '63. JFK was president. Refresh your memory?
A. I'll take your word for it.
Q. It's old; right?
A. Right.
Q. Been around -- when did you start as a police officer?
A. I started in 1990.
Q. So it's been around long before that; right?
A. Right.
Q. This is a national thing; right?
A. Right.
Q. Not something that, quote, "Oregon has to catch up on"; right?
A. Right.
Q. And would you agree that anybody who is preparing Brady materials to give to the DA should be fair and impartial?
A. Of course, yes.
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Q. They should include not only evidence against somebody, but evidence in favor of somebody?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by that.
Q. If they have evidence that disputes some of their evidence, they should submit that, too? If there's conflicting evidence, they should --
A. You should submit, yes, the entire evidence that they
have, yes.
Q. They don't pick and choose?
A. Right.
Q. And somebody impartial should probably put that evidence together?
A. Yeah. I'm just a little confused. I know that for criminal cases you want everything of the sort you're describing. But if there are Brady issues, I'm not sure what would contradict something that shows maybe an officer was untruthful, lacked veracity, or so forth.
Q. Did you ever read the arbitration award?
A. You know, I don't recall if I did.
Q. If it said things about what the arbitrator found about truthfulness, that would contradict some things; right? Or not.
A. That would be the arbitrator's opinion certainly.
Q. But that's relevant; right? He's heard a lot of evidence and he's made a decision, just like Mr. Morrow -- or

## Lieutenant Morrow -- sorry -- did; right? Correct?

A. Right. The arbitrator made a decision. I would agree with that.
Q. Why did it take almost two years to submit Brady materials to the DA?
A. I can only speak from when I started working at the university, sir. I know that, as you said, Brady has been around forever, but it's not something that we live and breathe in the police world. It doesn't happen very often. That's the reality of it. So I know that when we attended the command leadership training in Salem around this time period that you see these emails -- again, I don't remember the exact dates, but it was in proximity of when you see these emails -- that kind of brought it to the forefront.
Q. Okay. So you go to some conference and you hear people speak; right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Did you -- who else was at the conference with you ?
A. It was some combination of the command staff.

Mike Morrow, the chief. Possibly Lieutenant Lebrecht.
Possibly Lieutenant Bechdolt. I'm not sure who all was there. It was a combination of us.
Q. Did anybody say, "Hey, Cleavenger. We need to disclose him. We just learned this. This is -- I can't believe we didn't know before"?
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A. Somebody may have. I don't remember the timing of when that whole discussion started.
Q. Well, if somebody may have right then, they should have done it right then; right?
A. Well, things percolate. I mean, anything percolates. If one has a thought that maybe we need to do $A, B$, or $C$, then things have to come together and things happen.
So, again, I don't remember the exact date, sir. I just
know that eventually it evolved into this.
Q. Okay. Let's put this in context. There's two very serious things about Brady-listing. I want to see if you agree with this. One is it can be a black mark, the death knell, of the officer's career; correct?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. Two is -- forget about the officer -- there's a
constitutional right of a criminal defendant to have this information; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So you've got two very serious matters going on; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, we've talked a lot about the effect on

Mr. Cleavenger's career, but let's look at this: At the time you were Brady-listing or submitting materials, you knew this was a constitutional issue for defendants; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Tell me everything you did to notify anybody who had a trial in between the date of the IA report and the date of the Brady disclosure to tell those defendants that their constitutional rights had been violated or possibly violated.
A. You're asking me what we did as a department in that regard?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, we, of course, would rely on the DA's office to take the lead on that and the leadership. They would be the experts. Our duty would be to disclose what we know, and then they would follow up. If they needed our assistance, we would, of course, help them. They would take the lead, sir.
Q. Did it cross your mind that waiting this long would raise red flags?
A. I didn't think of it that way at all.
Q. Did it cross your mind that the very first thing in writing about Brady disclosure is in direct response to his reinstatement and that that would show an improper motive? A. I can see that it would look that way, certainly. But then the question is just because something looks a certain way, do we not do it? That's another question to ask ourselves.
Q. Or is that the only reason you're doing it? That's a question to ask yourself; right?
A. I mean, you can ask those questions.
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Q. Did you review the Brady-list materials before they were submitted?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. You actually looked at that letter, the top six page -MR. MCDOUGAL: Pull up the Brady Materials. What's the exhibit number?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: 150.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Exhibit 150. Permission to publish? THE COURT: You may.
MR. MCDOUGAL: My screen's not showing. Oh, it is.

## Okay.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. You reviewed this document?
A. I'm not completely sure that I saw this document. I may have. I thought you were referring to the documents that were taken to the DA's office for the purpose of review.
Q. Take a minute and look at this and see if you reviewed it.

And let us know when we need to turn the page.
A. I recall elements of it and the contents of it. I'm not sure if somebody just summarized it for me or if I actually saw the document itself.
Q. Let me ask you this: Among documents that the UOPD -UOPD would ever prepare, is this the type of document, one going to the DA, challenging a man's career, that a few people should review to make sure it's correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you -- sitting here today, do you know who reviewed the
contents of Exhibit 150, the writing, the typed portion, on
UOPD stationary?
A. I don't know for a fact. I know that -- in general how
the process works, but I don't know for a fact regarding this
particular document.
Q. Let's talk about the ordinary course of business, since
you don't know about this particular document. What would
happen in the ordinary course of business?
A. Anything of this magnitude would certainly be reviewed or
generated by our general counsel.
Q. Okay. And who would -- somebody would fact-check
something like this; right? And who would do the
fact-checking?
A. It would be -- again, for a document like this, it would
be some member of command staff.
Q. And would there be a record of that?
A. I can't say for sure if there would be a record of the
fact that it was checked.
Q. If there are false statements in the document, would there
be any consequence to anyone?
A. You're saying if anything material here in this document
is incorrect, what would the consequences be? I don't know
specifically.
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Q. And just to be clear, I think you've said you knew about Morrow's IA investigation at the time, the July 27, '12, document that we showed the date on. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You, in fact, reviewed it at that time?
A. I -- if it's the 2012 document, I did not review it at that time. I saw it sometime subsequent to it being published. I didn't start with the university until September of 2012. So if you're saying July 2012, I saw it sometime after it was published.
Q. So you're sure you didn't approve it?
A. I don't see how I could have.
Q. You've never actually spoken to Mr. Cleavenger ever; correct?
A. I don't recall ever speaking to him. No, sir.
Q. Do you know him well enough to have an opinion that he has a poor veracity?

THE COURT: I'm sorry. A poor veracity? MR. MCDOUGAL: Yeah.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Do you know him well enough to know that he has an opinion -- to have an opinion that he has a poor veracity? A. I can only speak to what indications I saw in the documents that I saw.
Q. Okay.
A. And those led me to believe that there may be some questions, certainly. I can't answer with a certainty, but enough question to let somebody that's in a position to review them to make that decision. Like the DA's office to decide. Q. Did you ever have in your mind specific instances of a lack of veracity on Mr. Cleavenger's part?
A. From reading the documents, there were instances I recall that at the time led me to believe there were questions, yes.
Q. What specific instances?
A. I don't recall at this moment. I can certainly reread the documents if you would like and then highlight and then I'll be able to answer your question.
Q. Was Lieutenant Lebrecht, who had a lawsuit against him by Mr. Cleavenger at the time, allowed to put together the Brady materials?
A. I believe the reason was his role and function at the department at that time was Professional Standards Internal Affairs and that encompasses that sort of function.
Q. Did it cross your mind or did anyone on the command staff ever say -- did it ever cross their mind, to your knowledge, "You know, we should probably have somebody who doesn't -- who isn't in a relationship with Mr. Cleavenger put this together"? MS. COIT: Objection to the foundation of what crossed other people's minds.

THE COURT: Overruled.

## Deshpande - X

THE WITNESS: So, no, I did not.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. And there were plenty of competent people that could have?
A. There were people that could have, but no one was specifically assigned to that function.
Q. But they could have done it?
A. They could have, certainly.
Q. Have you heard of the bowl of dicks list?
A. I heard that phrase.
Q. When did you first hear it?
A. When the entire media -- when it came out in the media.
Q. Do you know what, if any, involvement Lebrecht had in that list?
A. Not firsthand, I don't.
Q. Well, secondhand? Who did you -- what did you hear and who did you hear it from?
A. Everybody at the department. Everyone talks, certainly, so --
Q. What did you hear?
A. I heard a number of different variation of things, so I don't know which version --
Q. How about the version that Lebrecht was involved? Did you hear that version?

MS. COIT: Object to the hearsay.
THE COURT: Overruled. Goes to state of mind.
he read verbatim the coversheet, which I think was addressed, "Fitness for duty."
Q. Do you recall Lieutenant Lebrecht telling Ms. Perlow --

MR. MCDOUGAL: Objection. Leading.
THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure it suggests the answer
yet.
Continue with the question, Counsel.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Was there anything discussed at that meeting by Lieutenant Lebrecht and Ms. Perlow about the actual allegations and findings of the internal affairs investigation?

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Obviously, there was a discussion after he read the document verbatim. I don't remember the specific elements and so forth. If you could refresh my memory, that might help.

MS. COIT: That's okay. That's all I have. Thank
you, sir.
THE COURT: Recross?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Nothing further. Thanks.
THE COURT: May the witness be excused, Counsel?
MS. COIT: Yes.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. You may step
down.
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You can answer the question, sir.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Say it again, the question.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. How about any version that Lebrecht was involved in the bowl of dicks list?
A. I read that in various media publications, that he was involved in the list.
Q. Is that professional?
A. That's a very open-ended question. I don't think he was involved in any bowl of dicks list. I don't think there was such a thing, but that wasn't your question, so I didn't answer it that way. So I don't think he was involved in any such concept. There was no such concept, from what I understand. Q. Was there a concept that certain people could eat a bowl of dicks?
A. I understood the concept to be a list kept by an officer.

That's all I knew. An officer kept a list in sort of a joking manner. I've worked at the Eugene Police Department for 22-plus years. I've seen all kinds of weird, bizarre, funny, strange stuff happen. And merely officers jokingly keeping a list to me doesn't rise to the level of anything at all.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Nothing further. THE COURT: Redirect? //1 ///

REDIRECT EXAMINATION 1

```
safety officer.
Q. And at some point did you -- were you hired on as a full
police officer?
A. I was in October of 2014.
Q. Did you attend the police academy?
A. I did.
Q. Did you graduate from the police academy?
A. I did.
Q. When was that?
A. February of this year.
Q. And your current title is?
A. Police officer.
Q. Who's your supervisor?
A. The immediate supervisor I have would be a sergeant, and I
have -- their shifts are different than mine, so I have two at
any given time.
Q. Who are they?
A. Part of the week it's Sergeant Geeting and then
Sergeant Morris. The other part of the week it would be
Sergeant Carey and then Sergeant Wade, W-A-D-E.
Q. Is Lieutenant Lebrecht currently your supervising
lieutenant?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your opinion of Lieutenant Lebrecht as a
supervisor?
```
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A. I've never had any problems with Lieutenant Lebrecht and we've gotten along very well.
Q. Have you ever been a field training officer at the University of Oregon?
A. I have.
Q. Were you in that position in early 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall if you ever were Mr. Cleavenger's field training officer?
A. Mr. Cleavenger was never assigned to me as a recruit officer. It would have been only to cover for another officer at the time.
Q. Sitting here today, do you have any recollection of training him on one or more days as a field training officer?
A. No.
Q. Do you know who his field training officer was?
A. That would be Michael Drake.
Q. What shift were you on back at that time, in 2011, if you can remember?
A. I'm not 100 percent sure.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that Michael Drake and

Mr. Cleavenger had developed a personal friendship during field training?
A. I had heard about it; but my own personal knowledge from them, no.
Q. Can you remember what shift you were on in late 2011, early 2012?
A. No.
Q. All right. So during the time that Mr. Cleavenger worked at the department, did you interact with him on several occasions? Was it a daily interaction? How would you describe it?
A. It was on a few different occasions. I don't recall what
shift I was on and what shift he was on at the time, but I know I saw him on a fairly regular basis.
Q. All right. During those occasions that you did work with him, that you interacted with him, did you observe any behaviors of his that concerned you?
A. There were a couple, yes.
Q. Can you describe what those were for us?
A. One of the occasions I was working we were on bike patrol, and he was riding with me at the time, and we were in the area of Fenton and Friendly Hall. And in between the two buildings there's a large grass area with a bunch of older trees, and there's a very large tree with branches that come down and create kind of a hiding area, basically, which we checked on a regular basis, because we would always find students, some transients that would sleep in there. The students would go in there to drink. We would catch them smoking pot. So we always went and checked those areas at night.
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And normally we would ride up into the area, black out our lights, and then look through the openings in the branches to see if we could see anybody inside, if we saw any lighters being lit, listening for noises or other things.

And that night, as I started to go around the outside of it, Mr. Cleavenger rode his bike directly across the lawn and right through the branches into the clearing underneath.
Q. Why was that of concern to you?
A. Number one, you can't really see what's going on underneath there. You have no idea how many people are in there. It's a big safety issue.

There's the possibility he could have ran right through those branches and onto somebody, if we had somebody who was sleeping that was on the ground.

With the students and -- if they were smoking pot or drinking alcohol, that were under age, and they knew what they were doing was wrong, we'd tend to have them run. On occasion, they fought us. They could have easily injured Mr. Cleavenger if they had decided to try and fight against somebody who is suddenly crashing through the branches into them and they don't know who it is.
Q. Did you report this incident to a supervisor?
A. I believe I did.
Q. Who would that have been?
A. I believe it would have been Sergeant Cameron at the time .
Q. Okay. After this happened, after you saw Mr. Cleavenger do this, did you speak to him about his conduct?
A. I did.
Q. And what did he respond to you?
A. I asked him, you know, why he did that, and he said it was no big deal; he did it all the time.
Q. Did you have an impression Mr. Cleavenger wasn't taking his role seriously?
A. Yeah, to a degree, as far as things like that.
Q. In your opinion, is it dangerous not to take your job seriously as a public safety officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that?
A. We contact the same people on campus that the Eugene police contact out in the city. There's no fences or walls around the campus, and the same people that wander the city committing crimes also tend to come onto campus committing crimes during the school year, especially being that it's more of a target-rich environment for them. There's thousands of people with thousands of things that are being left around. So we run across the same people.

And we've contacted people that are on probation for murder. We've contacted people that were want ed for murder. We've contacted people that carry guns. And I, myself, have fought a couple of people that turned out to have handguns on
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them, and I was unarmed at the time.
So it's no different working on campus than it is being out in the city, as far as the type of people we deal with.
Q. But there's a big difference; correct?
A. As far as --
Q. You don't have guns; right?
A. That's correct. At the time we did not.
Q. All right. Do you recall being asked by Sergeant Cameron and Lieutenant Lebrecht to try to help Mr. Cleavenger, help him out in the field?
A. Yes.
Q. Give us some context for how that conversation came about.
A. We had been on a call at the Romania building, and during that contact there was another officer there. I believe it may have been Officer Davis. And he was with two people that were at the Romania building for trespassing, and Officer Cleavenger was there as well.

And when I got over there, I asked Officer Davis where Officer Cleavenger was, and he said that he was around the corner in front of the Romania building's curve. So I had to walk around to see where he was because I knew he was with at least two people.

I get around to the front of the building, and I notice that Mr. Cleavenger is no longer on the Romania building parking lot area, but across the street in the Market of Choice
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parking lot. And Officer Cleavenger is standing at the trunk of the car, and the two people that he was with -- there's one at the driver's side and one at the passenger's side. The doors are open, and they're inside the car digging through items inside the car.
Q. Was that of concern to you?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Did you report this incident to Lieutenant Lebrecht and Sergeant Cameron?
A. Yes.
Q. So tell us what concerned you about Mr. Cleavenger's conduct.
A. The fact that he took two people who we don't know who
they are, no names have been given over the radio, we didn't know that they were going to a car, we had no license plate number of the car, and taking two people over to a vehicle and allowing them to dig inside it while you're trying to identify them and figure out what's going on, we have no idea of knowing what's in their car. They know what's in their car. And it could be a very dangerous situation.
Q. And, again, did you talk with Mr. Cleavenger at the time? A. I did.
Q. What did you tell him?
A. I asked him why he decided to go off the property to go over to their car, and he said it was because they didn't have
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any ID.
I explained, "You could have just asked for -- you could have asked for their names and birthdates." We run it through dispatch and have a way to decide if they're being honest with you, but there was no reason to go over to the car.
Q. Is it also dangerous to split the people up and to leave the other officer alone?
A. Yes.
Q. So you reported this to Sergeant Cameron and Lieutenant Lebrecht. Was it immediately after it had occurred? A. Yes. Q. What did they tell you in response? A. They asked me at that point if I would kind of keep an eye on him. Maybe help him out.

They said that any time that they've tried to talk with him and try to -- try to help with issues that he's having along those lines, that he would get very defensive and act like he hadn't done anything wrong. And they thought it might come across better if it was coming from another officer as opposed to a supervisor.
Q. From that conversation, did you have the impression that

Sergeant Cameron and Lieutenant Lebrecht wanted to help
Mr. Cleavenger succeed as an officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, at some point in Mr. Cleavenger's tenure at the
university, he was reassigned to do parking duties. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. During the time he was reassigned to parking duties, do you recall calling -- hearing him call out incidents over the radio?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you respond to any of those incidents?
A. I responded to one as a primary officer, yes.
Q. And did anything about that callout or your response to it concern you?
A. It made me -- once the call was over, I questioned what he was actually seeing, yes.
Q. Tell us about the call.
A. There -- he called out that we had a homeless person going through one of the dumpsters in our parking lot, 42 , which is basically back behind a bar area. And the description that Officer Cleavenger had given at the time, I immediately knew who it was he was talking about.

There's a transient that lives right around the campus area that is on campus every day. I've seen him since I've been there, since I started there in 2004, and I never had a reason to stop him or to talk with him for anything other than to wave at him as I drive by.

Officer Cleavenger at the time said that he was going
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through the dumpsters, taking out cans, and that that's against the university policy that people do that. And I asked him over the radio -- I asked him specifically if he could actually see this guy taking cans out of the dumpsters, and he says he's watching him. He's putting them into a plastic bag that's at his feet.

I drove into the parking lot. I recognized the guy as the same person I've seen every day for years, and he had a white plastic bag at his feet that was filled with baked goods because he was taking the bakery items out of the dumpster from the deli next door that they had thrown away.
Q. Did you end up contacting that person based on that call?
A. No. No, I did not.
Q. Did you report this incident to anyone?
A. I believe I did report that to Sergeant Cameron or Lieutenant Lebrecht.
Q. At some point after that occurred, did you stop relying on

Mr. Cleavenger's report of things to base probable cause findings on?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that?
A. Based on that and from what I had heard from the other officers that had been called out with calls from him, I didn't believe that I could honestly believe a hundred percent what he was telling me.

I believe that he would see something, but I would still want to be the one to go over, observe it, and then make a contact, and not just make a contact based on what he was saying.
Q. Is it important to you to be able to trust another
officer's statements he's making to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you trust Mr. Cleavenger's professional abilities as an officer?
A. I didn't, no.
Q. All right. In 2008 were you aware of who Mr. Cleavenger was?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you become aware of that?
A. Well, actually, I shouldn't say that. In 2008? That was
the Taser presentation?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. I did not know who he was prior to that.
Q. Okay. So were you at a speech with Mr. Cleavenger in 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us about that speech, his role and your role, if any.
A. It was a presentation -- or it was a discussion that was being done between the ASUO and the chief at the time,
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Kevin Williams.
Q. What's ASUO?
A. Associated Student Union -- or Associated Student at the University of Oregon.
Q. The student body government?
A. Yes. And they had a little debate that was set up in order to discuss whether or not public safety officers should be given Tasers. Since they weren't allowed to carry guns.
Q. And was that -- Chief Kevin Williams, was that his idea and something he was working on?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So did you speak at that meeting?
A. I did.
Q. And what was your presentation?
A. Mine was basically relegated to the fact that during my time there I had had to -- like I said, I caught two people that actually had handguns on them at the time. One of whom later ended up in a shooting, a couple of years later, just down the road from campus.

The people we contact have knives. They have different weapons on them, and having a Taser would be something that would help us.
Q. And do you recall Mr. Cleavenger speaking at that meeting ?
A. I do.
Q. And what, if you recall, was the message he was setting

```
forth?
A. Mr. Cleavenger -- I was -- was for the ASUO, which was
they didn't want Tasers on campus. They believed Tasers were
lethal and they killed people and that Amnesty International
had declared them as an illegal weapon or they recorded all
these deaths and didn't believe that Tasers were anything that
should be carried by people.
Q. All right. At that -- after that speech, did you cross
paths again with Mr. Cleavenger before he came to work at the
University of Oregon Public Safety?
A. I did.
Q. Where was that?
A. That was at the Lane County Sheriff's Reserve Academy.
Q. Okay. Were you attending the academy at that time?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And was Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you speak with him about that Taser speech in 2008?
A. We had a conversation about it once.
Q. How did that come up?
A. We were outside during a break, and I happened to mention
that I was surprised that he was there wanting to work as a
reserve officer. And then he had spoken at the Taser
situation, and he had mentioned that he was hired by the AUSO
to present their side, so that's what he did.
```

Phillips - D
Q. Did you get along with Mr. Cleavenger when he worked at
the University of Oregon?
A. Yes.
Q. You never had any problems between the two of you?
A. No.
Q. Are you familiar with the concept of debriefing after a call?
A. Yes.
Q. Describe for us what a debrief is, what its purpose is.
A. Usually after a call that actually has some significance, you know, where it required multiple officers or anything, we would get together and discuss the call, and it was an open forum for anybody to be able to talk and say, hey, we could have done this better or we could have done that better. You know, maybe next time, instead of coming in this way, you'd want to come in that way. It's an informal thing. So we would just stand around and talk about the call and discuss what we could do better the next time we had something similar.
Q. Is it important to hear what other people have to say about what went on in a call?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that?
A. A lot of times the first person that's there, or even the second and more, can become overwhelmed by what's happening and they don't actually see everything. There's another officer
that shows up in the middle, and he sees different things. So everybody has kind of a slightly different view of it.

So a lot of times I may not have noticed something that the third person noticed, so it's good for all of us to be able to learn from that.
Q. Were you ever at a debrief of a call with Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Are you familiar with Sergeant Cameron?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know him fairly well?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say you two are friends?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever seen -- did you ever see Sergeant Cameron
and Mr. Cleavenger having a discussion about a call out in the field?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever see Sergeant Cameron mistreating

Mr. Cleavenger?
A. No.
Q. Did Sergeant Cameron ever discuss with you his opinions that Mr. Cleavenger should not work at the University of Oregon Police Department?
A. No. We never had that discussion.
Q. Did he ever discuss with you -- and, again, you two are
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## personal friends; correct?

A. Yes.
Q. Did he ever discuss with you his desire to get

Mr. Cleavenger in trouble at the department or fired?
A. No.
Q. From what you know of Sergeant Cameron, would that be out of character for him to do that?
A. I have not seen him do that, since I started in 2004, with
anybody. We had some officers that were issues.
Q. Describe Sergeant Cameron's -- his style, his supervisory style.
A. He comes across stern. He's fair, though, when it comes
to the supervision part. He has no problem telling you where
the mistakes were made, but he also has that ability to be able
to tell you how to fix them in the future.
Q. All right. You're familiar with the Spencer View

Apartments?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that a university-owned property?
A. It is.
Q. Have you made calls -- answered calls for service at the

Spencer View Apartments?
A. A lot.
Q. About how many times, if you can estimate?
A. Wow. Probably a few hundred.
Q. A few hundred?
A. Since 2004, yeah.
Q. Now, were you there on the call to Spencer View from which
Mr. Cleavenger was ultimately reprimanded?
A. No.
Q. Had you been to the apartments short ly before that call, a
few weeks before, to respond to a complaint?
A. Probably.
Q. Okay.
A. If I knew what the call was.
$\quad$ MS. COIT: Your Honor, permission to approach?
THE COURT: You may.
offered and received. COIT: This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 29. It's been
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
BY MS. CoIT: (Continuing)
Q. Just take a minute to look at that. Does that refresh
your memory of a call that you went to at the Spencer View
Apartments?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the date of that call?
A. February 24,2012 .
MS. COIT: Your Honor, permission to publish?
say? THE COURT: You may. This is Exhibit 29, did you
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MS. COIT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. While we're trying to get this, tell us -- tell us what -who was on that call with you?
A. That was Officer Hermens and myself.
Q. What were you responding to?
A. We were responding to a report from a lady who claimed that she had gotten into an argument with an 11-year-old kid and his mother previously.
Q. What was the argument about?
A. She -- the caller had -- the one that called, she felt that the 11-year-old in the playground was playing too rough, and so she confronted him about hitting another kid in the head with a ball and escorted him from the playground and told him to leave.

The kid went home and told his mother, and his mother came back and had a discussion with the lady, and they went their separate ways.
Q. When you responded to that call, had you been told by dispatch that the two complaining -- well, the complaining party and the other involved party were back in their apartments?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you told that the other person's apartment was in a
completely separate area of the apartments?
A. Yeah. At Spencer View you can usually get -- they have certain sections with doors that are colored, so they would tell us, you know, "It's apartment 83 in the red doors," so we knew where those apartments were. So we knew what apartments were involved.
Q. And you should have it up on your screen now.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. All right. This is Officer Hermens' report; correct?
A. Uh-huh, yes.
Q. You were on this call with him?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this the call that the two of you drove directly up to the front of apartment number 60?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, at that time you knew that the other person was in an apartment on the other side of the apartment complex? A. Correct.
Q. All right. Officer Hermens writes in here that he spoke to the woman and she told -- I'll just read it. Third sentence down, "Van-Huyser told me she was frightened because she had just been attacked."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you there when she told you that -- told
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## Officer Hermens that?

A. I believe so.
Q. Was this an attack in progress that she was referring to?
A. No.
Q. Was this information anything that was dispatched to you
over the radio when you were responding to the call?
A. No.
Q. And, again, this was an altercation between a child --
children on the playground that had happened hours before. Was that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to the next page.

All right. Do you recall what action you took with regard to this call?
A. My only actions at that point were with Officer Hermens at apartment 60, where we talked to the lady there, and then I went to over to apartment 257 while Officer Hermens went and talked with the person that was working in the playground area and then he met me back over at 257.
Q. Was any enforcement action or citations issued against any of the people involved here?
A. No.
Q. Now, when you responded to this call, did you believe it to be a cold call?
A. Yes.
Q. After refreshing your memory of the incident, do you still have the belief that it was a cold call?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with me that it -- well, were you ever talked to about driving up and parking directly in front of the apartment?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if Officer Hermens was?
A. I don't know.
Q. Were you in separate cars?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Were you working at the University of Oregon
when the Occupy Eugene Movement was on campus?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever see Mr. Cleavenger eating a plate of food at the Occupy campus -- or Occupy location?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me about that.
A. Officer Johnson and I were on bike patrol that night, and we went over to Franklin and Onyx, which is where the camp had been relocated to.

Franklin and Onyx intersection, you can go north there, and it takes you into a parking lot facility. We had blocked off the road to not allow you to go any further north than the entry to the parking lot so that no one would use that back
parking lot, and Officer Cleavenger's car was there, along with some barricades.

And when we came up, he had a plate of, like, noodles and rice stuff that he was eating. And we had already been staying late that night, so I happened to ask him where he got it from, and he mentioned that the people there at Occupy had given it to him and that we could eat there as well if we wanted to.
Q. Okay. Did you ever hear Mr. Cleavenger say, "That's how we do it in Junction City"?
A. No.

MS. COIT: All right. Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Cross-examination, please.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCDOUGAL:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Did you review any documents to prepare for court today?
A. I looked at this right here.
Q. You looked at that before you got to court?
A. No. Just now, but not prior to court.
Q. Okay. Any reason not?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Reason why not?
A. Because I don't know what you're going to ask me. I don't
know what documents you would expect me to look at.
Q. Well, you knew your counsel was going to ask you some questions about some incidents; right?
A. Sure.
Q. Normally, when you're going to court to testify about an incident, especially callouts or things that you say were very dangerous officer safety issues, you would come in, you would have those reports, and you would make sure you got it right; right?
A. Sure.
Q. You didn't do that today. Why?
A. Because the only thing that I knew from counsel here is
that the Spencer View issue, which I note from the report
here -- because we talked about it. I remember the call. I remember a lot of my calls that I've gone on.
Q. So your testimony is you didn't know you were going to be asked these other areas about officer safety. She didn't know what answers you were going to give when you were getting asked; right?
A. I'm not quite understanding your question, sir.
Q. You're saying the only thing you knew you'd be questioned about was Spencer View.
A. No. That's not what I'm saying.
Q. You knew you would be questioned about broad areas where you talk about specific instances?
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A. Correct.
Q. And you knew those specific instances would have reports, dash cams, CADs, audios, potentially; right?
A. Okay.
Q. And, normally, when an officer goes -- and you said very clearly some of this stuff -- you didn't even remember Spencer View; right?
A. No, I remembered Spencer View.
Q. Okay. There were many aspects of that call where you had to look at the police report to get it right; correct?
A. Not really, no.
Q. I --
A. Just the names. The age of the child.
Q. The names -- aren't the names blacked out?
A. Only the names of the child's mother is what it looks
like.
Q. All right. Let me ask you this --
A. Sure.
Q. You're under oath.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You knew you were going to be put under oath.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You want to get it right. The best way to get it right, if you're going to be talking about somebody's career, right, making serious statements about misconduct, is to bring the

```
reports; right?
A. Okay.
Q. How many times have you seen an officer testify in court?
A. How many times have I testified or have I seen?
Q. Have you seen or have you testified.
A. Hundreds.
Q. We'll break it into two questions.
A. Hundreds of times I've gone to court and testified.
Q. And fair to say they've got their reports with them?
A. Yes.
Q. What time of day was this -- and I think you called it
a -- or maybe your counsel called it -- I don't know -- a -- I
don't have my note. What was he eating at the Occupy Movement?
    MS. COIT: Your Honor, can I just object to him
referring to me as Mr. Phillip's counsel? I'm not his counsel.
    MR. MCDOUGAL: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to create
that impression.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. What meal was it that he was eating at Occupy?
A. It was probably close to midnight or 1:00, so he was
sitting there with a white paper plate, with a plastic fork,
eating noodles and what looked like rice.
Q. Okay. Was there a CAD entry or a report or anything?
A. I don't know.
Q. You talked about some serious officer safety concerns, and
```
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was Mr. Cleavenger written up for any of those that you testified about? The specific instances that you testified about.
A. I don't know.
Q. If he's never been given it or talked to about it, if he testifies to that, you don't have any information to the contrary; correct?
A. I would guess not, unless -- although, I did tell my sergeant and my lieutenant, so --
Q. If he was written up for not shaving for a couple of days, you would expect him to be written up for these officer safety issues you're testifying about; right?
A. Sorry. I can't answer that. I'm not the one that did the discipline.
Q. Would it make sense to you in this world, given your knowledge of police departments, that he would be written up for not shaving for two days but not written up for these things that you say --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I need you to slow down.

MR. MCDOUGAL: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Reask the question. Slow down just a little bit.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Well, given your understanding of how police departments
work, would it make sense to you that he would be written up for not shaving for two days, but not written up for these serious officer safety concerns that you say you told his supervisors about?
A. I don't know.
Q. No opinion one way or the other?
A. I can't testify to why he would get written up for one and not for another.
Q. Sometimes people have a preconceived notion of something . Do you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Sometimes people hear something and they take away
from it something much different than what was said. True?
A. It can be, yes.
Q. Now, you said that Mr. Cleavenger gave a speech and was
against Tasers. Is that your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. Didn't want the department to have Tasers?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know -- did that upset you?
A. I wouldn't say it upset me.
Q. Okay. What was your response?
A. I wasn't very excited about it. I was hoping that we would get them.
Q. Do you know if his speech about Tasers said anything about

1902
Phillips - X
there should be proper training first?
A. I couldn't recall that.
Q. Anything about there should be input and review of guidelines with university input, nonpublic officer safety department input?
A. Again, I don't recall those words being used, but --
Q. If, in fact, what he says was, "Yeah, Tasers, if they're going to happen, $A$ and $B$ need to happen. Proper training and community agreement on when they can be used."

## Do you recall anything like that?

A. I don't.
Q. Would you be in disagreement with that?
A. I wouldn't say I would be in disagreement. I'm just saying I don't recall it.
Q. And if Officer Cleavenger did things that created risk to his own safety or other people's safety, those are things that he should have been written up for at the time; right?
A. I would think so; but, again, I can't determine that.
Q. Those are things where if what you're saying now -- if they had ever been written up, if they merited mention, he would have had a chance to look at the video or audio if it existed; right?
A. You're talking about the ones where -- that I've
discussed?
Q. Yeah. The ones you just talked about.
A. There was no video or audio for those at all.
Q. Okay. If there was -- all right. Police reports?
A. No police reports.
Q. No report of a serious officer safety concern was written
down?
A. I explained it to my sergeant and my lieutenant.
Q. Were you a sergeant at the time?
A. No.
Q. Since you became a sergeant, do you put that stuff in
writing; serious officer safety concerns?
A. It would depend on the situation.
Q. Would it depend on the person?
A. No. It would depend on the situation.
Q. Do you recall supervising Mr. Cleavenger?
A. No.
numbers on them.
Permission to approach and show the witness Exhibit 89 ?
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. This is a thick document. I would like you to look at it
and see if it -- and it's got attachments, so take a second
with it.
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THE COURT: Thank you.
Counsel, if he's going to go through it page by page, which he can do that, why don't we call another witness, and he can do that out in the hallway?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Let me ask him one question, and maybe
we can skip doing that.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Can you just look at your daily observation reports of Mr. Cleavenger in that stack? There's just a few of them at page 146 to page 161.
A. I don't see page numbers on here. What was the days -the dates?
Q. The dates are July 7 through the 17th of 2011.
A. July 7 through 17th. Okay.
Q. So there are a series of them there. And let me ask you one question before I ask you -- I'm going to ask you questions about your daily observation reports. Do you have -- do you think you need to read the entire document if I ask you about specific daily observation reports?
A. There's just a small amount of writing that I've done, so it's --
Q. Okay. If at any point during my questioning you think it's unfair that you look at the entire document, can you tell me?
A. I can try.
Q. All right. Let's take your daily observation report from July 9th.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you have any independent memory of that day or what happened?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Is that your handwriting?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read me the date and what the observation report says? Your handwritten portion.
A. That's July 9, 2011. It says, "Cleavenger asked questions and took feedback on a few calls from myself and Sergeant Cameron -- Cleavenger asked questions and took feedback on a few calls from myself and Sergeant Cameron. Cleavenger took it and learned from it."
Q. Okay. July 10, 2011.
A. You want me to read that again?
Q. Yeah.
A. "Cleavenger is always looking for things out of place."

THE COURT: Just a little slower, please.
"Cleavenger is always looking for things out of place."
THE WITNESS: "Or that look wrong. He found a car with plates that expired in 2009, ran it to confirm it was the right car and not stolen. Cleavenger also took the lead on a medical call and had all info ready for EFD when they arrived.
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BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. What section is that under? What is the heading that you write that under?
A. The specific incident which demonstrates performance in this area.
Q. Okay. Let's go to July -- there's another one on -- go to

July 14. They're a little out of order, but it doesn't matter.
A. July 14th. "Cleavenger initiated two contacts at the
river today. He dealt well with them, explained the situation to them, obtained their cooperation, and I FI'd them. He did well with them. Cleavenger also found a bike that turned out to be stolen."
Q. On each of the pages that you read so far, the three, it has a place below that if there's something wrong or that something needs to be addressed or a problem with his performance, you write something; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And each time you wrote "nothing" or "none"?
A. Correct.
Q. Let's go to July 15th. If you can read your handwritten --
A. "Cleavenger assisted with an APSO training I gave. He was knowledgeable, helpful, explained things to the group, and assisted in the practical exercises."
Q. No critique of him at all in the space that allows it?
A. No.
Q. The next page, July 16th.
A. "Cleavenger did well with a warrant arrest. During the contact, he was an AO and positioned himself well, assisted with handcuffing the subject and escorting him out. Cleavenger also found a laptop that he was able to confirm was stolen. He did well in all aspects on this call."
Q. Underneath that, what's the typed portion that I'm saying you're not commenting upon? What does it actually say?
A. The portion below that?
Q. Yes.
A. "The least satisfactory area of performance of the day was
rating category" -- and then you use the rating category of this page. And it says, "a specific incident which demonstrates performance in this area is" --
Q. Okay. I'm going to skip the next one. July 17th.
A. Okay.
Q. If you think there's anything negative in it, you can read it, but the jury will have it, and they can see that, and I don't want to take their time.
A. No.
Q. Okay. So anything in writing that we have contemporaneous with your dealing with Mr. Cleavenger, there's nothing negative that you've written about him?
A. No, sir.
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Q. Does this remind you that you were his FTO for a period ?
A. I believe so now, sure.
Q. With regard to the callouts, and if I've got your language wrong, just repeat me. You said, "A lot of this, everybody has a slightly different view of a call." Fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have given your opinion of a couple of callouts.

Did anybody ever investigate those callouts to see if they
reached the same conclusion you did?
A. I don't know.
Q. But, to your knowledge, they didn't?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know if some of Mr. Cleavenger's callouts were investigated?
A. I don't know.

MR. MCDOUGAL: One moment.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. In your role as a field training officer, would you actually teach people the rules of when they could make stops, what their authority was, that sort of thing?
A. That was part of the job, yes, sir.
Q. Were there areas where there simply weren't rules in the rulebook?
A. I don't know. You would have to be more specific.

MR. MCDOUGAL: That's all I have.

THE COURT: Redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

MS. COIT:
Q. Officer Phillips, Mr. McDougal seems to be implying that
you are lying here today.
MR. MCDOUGAL: Objection.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Are you telling the truth?
A. I am.
Q. Are there any reports that you would have needed to review to assist in your memory of what you testified to here today?
A. No.

MS. COIT: That's all I have.
THE COURT: Recross?

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MCDOUGAL:

Q. In all those cases where the officers testified and brought their report, fair to say the lawyer who stood up to question them after they testified had that report?
A. Probably.

MR. MCDOUGAL: That's all I've got. THE COURT: May the witness be excuse d, Counsel? MR. JASON KAFOURY: Yes.

MS. COIT: Yes. THE COURT: Thank you very much. You're excused from these proceedings.

Counsel, would you call your next witness, please?
MS. COIT: Defense calls Linda King.
THE COURT: Thank you. Step in the well of the courtroom, please. Stop at that location, and please raise your right hand.

## LINDA KING,

called as a witness in behalf of the Defendants, being first duly sworn, is examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.
THE COURT: If you would go in front of the jury box, the entrance is to my right, closest to the wall.

Thank you. If you would be seated, please. Would you pull the chair as close to the microphone as you can so we can hear you?

Now, would you face the jury, state your full name, and spell your last name, please?

THE WITNESS: Linda L. King, K-I-N-G.
THE COURT: Direct examination, please.
///
Q. Ms. King, can you please tell us what your current professional position is?
A. I'm retired from the University of Oregon.
Q. And when you retired, what was your title?
A. Associate vice president for human resources.
Q. Is that the top job of human resources at the university?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you retire?
A. October 2013.
Q. Can you give us a history of your professional background?
A. I started with the City of Eugene in the personnel department. I left there in 1981 to go to the University of Oregon, where I became benefits administrator. In 1987 I became director of human resources. And then I think it's about 2005 my title was changed to associate vice president for human resources.
Q. In 2012 what was human resources' role in disciplinary action for -- for classified -- for union employees?
A. The employee of labor relations manager worked with supervisors and departments on progressive discipline issues, pre-progressive discipline issues, up to recommendations for termination.
Q. And in 2012 who was in that role? Who was the labor HR
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## person?

A. Randy Wardlow.
Q. And did you work -- well, physically, did you work close to Mr. Wardlow?
A. I did.
Q. Same office?
A. Down the hall. Yes, same office.
Q. Was part of Mr. Wardlow's job to keep you updated on
disciplinary or pre-disciplinary issues with classified employees?
A. That's correct.
Q. But he was the hands-on day-to-day person?
A. He was. And I was his supervisor.
Q. In 2012 did you become aware of any issues that the University of Oregon Department -- or Police Department was having with an Officer James Cleavenger?
A. I was. Randy Wardlow had informed me of what was going on. Q. From your discussions with Mr. Wardlow, what did you understand was going on when you first learned of the issues? A. There were performance problems with Mr. Cleavenger, and they were doing steps of progressive discipline. Written reprimand, I believe. That sort of thing.
Q. When a union employee, a classified employee is under consideration for receiving a written reprimand, is HR at the
A. Yes
Q. And why is that?
A. Well, progressive discipline goes into the employee's
official file. There's certain requirements about language,
and it's just to ensure that the process follows the collective bargaining agreement.
Q. So these requirements that you're talking about, are those requirements set forth in the collective bargaining agreement? A. Yes.
Q. Tell us what a collective bargaining agreement is.
A. It's an agreement in this case between Service

Employees -- Service International Union, SEIU, and the Oregon University System, of which $U$ of $O$ at that point was a member .
Q. Did this collective bargaining agreement between the union and the university set forth the procedures that have to be followed when discipline is being issued?
A. Yes.
Q. And is part of your job as the head of HR to ensure that those requirements are followed?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, do you personally recall having any discussions with anyone at the University of Oregon Police Department about Mr. Cleavenger's written reprimand before it was issued?
A. I'm sure I had conversations with Randy Wardlow.
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Q. Was that your general practice?
A. Yes.
Q. What was -- what was the purpose of having that general practice to be informed of something before it was issued?
A. It was, as his supervisor, I wanted to know what was going on with employee discipline cases. I would often review the letter. It was just we met regularly, and he just kept me apprised of the situations he was working on.
Q. Was part of the purpose for that review to also ensure that you were comfortable that the university, whatever department it was, the police department in this case, was following the steps as set forth in the union contract?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you recall having any discussions with actual members of the police department before the reprimand was issued?
A. I know I spoke with members of the police department. I
can't recall the timing, if it was before the reprimand or after, but, yes, I did have some conversations directly with the department.
Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you this: Do you recall specific -- excuse me, specifically recall having any discussions with a Sergeant Scott Cameron about the written reprimand?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Would it be typical for a sergeant at that level in
the police department to actually be involved in discussions when they get to the level of HR?
A. Well, that's a supervisory position, so it would be possible if he supervised the employee in question.
Q. Okay. But you don't remember Sergeant Cameron -- a discussion with him?
A. I do not.
Q. All right. Were you consulted by the police department, either the chief or any of her command staff, in relation to the decision to remove Mr. Cleavenger from active public safety officer duties?
A. I know that was under discussion. I think. I certainly know Randy was involved. I don't recall if I was -- sat in on a meeting about that decision. I knew about it and did not object to it, supported it, but I can't remember if I actually met with him on that.
Q. What do you recall as being the motivation for that decision; for him being taken off enforcement duties?
A. There was a safety concern, a risk concern. There were problems with Mr. Cleavenger's judgment. He made some poor judgment calls that created concern about his safety, the safety of others, risk to the university.
Q. Do you recall a discussion at that time about his involvement with a woman with a firearm?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Objection. Leading.
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THE COURT: No. It doesn't suggest the answer,
Counsel. It leads into the discussion. Overruled.
You can answer the question.
THE WITNESS: Yes. My -- to my recollection, he had
put a woman into one of the police department's cars without checking what she had. In fact, she did have -- I believe it was a gun and was sitting in one of the cars with him.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Do you recall who from the police department brought that
concern to you before this decision of reassignment was made?
A. I believe it was Mike Morrow or Randy Wardlow.
Q. Okay. Do you recall being in agreement with the
reassignment?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, reassignment during an investigation, that's --
that's rare; correct?
A. I would say yes.
Q. Do you recall what it was about this particular situation
with this officer that warranted this action at that point?
A. Well, again, I think it was the risk of his -- the potential of him exhibiting, you know, additional poor -decisions that reflect poor judgment and the risk that was involved with that.
Q. Were you consulted prior to Chief McDermed making her decision -- or, excuse me, making her recommendation to
terminate Mr. Cleavenger's employment?
A. I was informed by Randy that that was -- you know, that was the step that was being considered. So, yeah, I would say I was consulted.
Q. At that point, as the HR director for the University of Oregon, did you have any concerns? Did you see any red flags with Chief McDermed's decision to recommend Mr. Cleavenger's termination?
A. I think -- it wasn't like, you know, yes, absolutely this is the -- this is the only step we can take. It was more a weighing of what was going on. The concerns about the risks versus we did skip a step in the progressive discipline process. So any time you're doing that, you have to, you know, think about it, because that's warranted in cases where the behavior or the problems are really severe.

But I was persuaded that the risks involved made it a decision that we had to do -- we had to follow.
Q. So the concern you had was with skipping a step in progressive discipline. Is that what I'm understanding you're saying?
A. Right.
Q. And progressive discipline, that's a concept in the union contract; the collective bargaining agreement?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what is the concern if you skip a step and go directly
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to termination?
A. Well, there's three steps laid out in the contract.

Reprimand, some kind of a pay action, and then dismissal. And so normally it's -- the concept is that an employee gets progressively more severe warnings and so that at the point of dismissal, he or she has received adequate information.

So skipping a step is warranted in situations where the -the infraction is really severe, and there's a risk -- risk situation where you're worried about safety.

There's also things like theft. You don't have to warn someone not to steal from the employer. But in this case it had to do with the severity of the poor judgment and the implications for health and safety.
Q. Were any of the concerns you had about skipping a step and moving to termination based on a concern that the chief was not sincere in her motives for recommending termination?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Objection. Leading. THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Did you have any concerns about the chief's motives in recommending termination?
A. No. Our conversations reflected just what I described:

The problems with the judgment and the conduct.
Q. After you had -- well, I'll ask you about the predismissal in a moment, but after you gathered all the information that
you gather before making your termination decision, were you comfortable skipping the step and going directly to termination?
A. I was.
Q. Now, in your experience, what happens if a labor
arbitrator disagrees with the skipping of a step and moving to termination?
A. Well, assuming it's gone to arbitration, then the
arbitrator reverses the dismissal decision and the employee sometimes returns to working; sometimes doesn't. I mean, those -- those can kind of occur. What happens at that point varies based on the case.
Q. Now, what is a predismissal meeting?
A. Under the collective bargaining agreement, there is a
provision for an employee to meet with what was then termed to be the appointing authority, and that's the chief human resources officer. So that would be me. And that hearing is the employee's opportunity to present mitigating circumstances as to why the termination decision shouldn't go forward.
Q. Did you have a predismissal meeting with Mr. Cleavenger ?
A. I did.
Q. Do you recall who was at that meeting?
A. Randy Wardlow was there, I believe, with me. I think a union representative named Sean Brailey may have attended on the -- by conference call on the phone. Mr. Cleavenger was
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there and his union representative.
Q. Okay. I think I skipped a step here.

Prior to the predismissal, is the employee given some sort of notice that termination has been recommended and there will be a predismissal meeting?
A. Right. Under the contract, the employee gets a letter outlining the reasons for their recommendation. And, again, under the contract, there's a seven-day period. We can't schedule the hearing any sooner than seven days.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, permission to publish
Plaintiff's Exhibit 80 ? It's been entered or received into the record.

THE COURT: You may. Exhibit 80.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. All right. On your screen there, there's a document. Do you recognize that?

MS. COIT: Show her the last page.
THE WITNESS: This is the letter informing
Mr. Cleavenger that Chief McDermed is recommending dismissal.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. All right. And, again, what's the purpose of this letter?
A. It's to notify the employee that this hearing is coming
up; that this step is going to be taken. It also puts him on suspension without pay for that seven-day period.
Q. Do you recall if you wrote this letter?
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A. No. I -- I -- I didn't write the letter, no.
Q. Sorry. The second page. All right. Is that -- is that your signature?
A. That's not my signature.
Q. Whose signature is that?
A. Mary Beth Allen.
Q. Who is she?
A. She was an associate director in the office, and I was probably out that day and asked her to sign for me so we could keep -- keep the matter moving.
Q. Okay. So she had your permission to sign this letter?
A. Oh, and I had reviewed it, yes.
Q. Okay. And what does it mean that you concur?
A. That's just a practice that the university has done, and I
think it means that the action -- just that, what it says; the action is taken with my concurrence. I agree that it's appropriate for us to have a predismissal hearing.
Q. Do you know who wrote Exhibit 80?
A. I believe that Randy Wardlow wrote it probably in consultation with people in the police department. Carolyn. Q. Now, go to the first page, please. Is the University of Oregon required to list -- pursuant to the contract, the collective bargaining agreement, is the university required to list every concern that they have about Mr. Cleavenger's judgment or misconduct in a predismissal letter?
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A. Well, I don't think it's a requirement under the contract.
Q. Is the requirement simply that what is set forth support just cause for the action?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did you have a predismissal meeting with

Mr. Cleavenger?
A. I did.
Q. Sitting here today, do you have a memory of that meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Was he represented by a union steward?
A. He was.
Q. And what is the overall purpose of the predismissal hearing? A. For the employee and his union representative to provide mitigating circumstances as to why the dismissal action should not be taken.
Q. At this point in a disciplinary process, the human resources department has been relatively heavily involved in the action, correct, reviewing what's been done so far?
A. Yes.
Q. The predismissal letter.

Is it common, when a discipline gets that far, for an intent to terminate, a recommendation for termination, to be denied? For the employer -- for you to overrule the recommendation and to keep the person employed?
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A. It's not common. It has happened, but it's not common.
Q. What do you -- well, at this predismissal hearing -- I'll
ask you if you recall a few specific things, okay? Do you
recall Mr. Cleavenger reporting to you something about a bowl
of dicks list?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall him reporting to you his feelings that there
was mistreatment of the Occupy Movement?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall him reporting to you that he felt time was
wasted at the department watching football highlights?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall him reporting to you a culture of
discrimination against women in the department?
A. No.
Q. Now, you took notes of that meeting; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your general practice, to take notes during a
predismissal meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. If Mr. Cleavenger had brought these things up to you that
I just mentioned, would it be your practice to write something
like that down in your notes?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed your notes prior to coming to court
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```
today?
A. No. Not recently.
    MS. COIT: Your Honor, may I approach?
    THE COURT: You may. What exhibit are you showing
her? It should be marked.
    MS. COIT: Oh, sorry. 404.
    THE COURT: 404. Thank you.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. What is Exhibit 404?
A. These are my handwritten notes that I took during the
predismissal hearing.
Q. You just had a chance to briefly look them over. Do you
see in there any mention of the items that I questioned you
about?
A. No.
Q. Thank you.
    Do you recall Mr. Cleavenger explaining to you in general
about he thought his supervisors were picking on him?
A. I don't recall that.
Q. Do you recall -- what do you recall him saying at that
meeting?
A. I remember him discussing a number of incidents of -- that
were raised that addressed or -- that were examples of his use
of poor judgment and problems with his work, and he explained
his perspective on those various incidents.
```

```
Q. And you agreed with everything you put into 86, the
termination letter?
A. Yeah. Yes.
    MS. COIT: That's all I have. Thank you, Ms. King.
    THE COURT: Cross-examination?
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Thank you, Your Honor.
    CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY:
Q. Ms. King, you and I have met before; isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. That was at your deposition where you gave sworn testimony
on November 11, 2014; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you became the director of human resources at the
University of Oregon in 1987; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you have been running essentially human resources for
the University of Oregon for over 30 years; right?
A. Until I retired, yes.
Q. And you managed 20 full-time employees at or around the
time of this incident; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So just so the jurors are clear, if the chief wanted to
get rid of a supervisor and not -- by not renewing their
```
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contract, that's what you dealt with; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Randy Wardlow dealt with people like Mr. Cleavenger, who were the union employees. That was the division between you and Mr. Wardlow?
A. That's correct.

I should also point out that Mary Beth Allen also worked with officer administration employment.
Q. So, for example, Casey Boyd -- you worked with the department to not renew her, for example?
A. Yes.
Q. And she, in fact, handed you a 12-page document on her very last day. Do you remember that?
A. I think she gave it to Jamie Moffitt; but, yes, I know she submitted a document.
Q. Did you read that document?
A. I did.
Q. She outlined 12 pages of retaliation she felt that

Chief McDermed and Lieutenant Lebrecht did against her, didn't she?

MS. COIT: Object as beyond the scope of direct. THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I have not -- I -- I can't say that I
recall what the document said. It certainly outlined her unhappiness and problems that she saw in the department, but I
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haven't read it in a long time and I don't recall the specifics.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. You worked with Mike Morrow as part of the investigations on her; correct?
A. On Ms. Boyd?
Q. On Ms. Boyd, yeah.
A. I may have. I don't recall.
Q. So the union contract has a three-step grievance process that's written into the contract, right, for folks like
Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. And if they don't prevail in step one, step two, or step three, the only choice is arbitration at that point; correct? A. Well, if you're talking about a dismissal, it's not a three-step process. If you're talking about something like a reprimand, that would be correct.
Q. But, generally, they have to go through a series of steps where they're -- they're not working with an independent neutral person like an arbitrator. They're working with someone on behalf of the university; right?
A. With union representation, right.
Q. Isn't it true that in all of your 30 years there, you don't remember any employee winning at a step one, two, or three in relation to a termination before having to go to
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## arbitration?

A. Well, again, if an employee is terminated, the first grievance step for that individual is step three, which is the Oregon University System. So the first two steps that are within the University of Oregon are not relevant.
Q. But you don't recall, in your 30 years, an employee getting a termination flipped at a step three hearing, do you? A. I don't.
Q. Now, as part of your role of human resources at the University of Oregon, you had the power to do departmental reviews; right? That was something in your things that -- that was the power that you had; right?
A. I wouldn't say I had the power to say we're going to do this, but certainly, for example, a vice president would usually ask for a departmental review.

THE COURT: Excuse me for just a moment. Why don't we all stand up for just a moment and stretch. Okay. Do jumping jacks. Be seated.

Counsel, thank you.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. So give the jurors a few examples of departments that you can conduct a review of.
A. Well, again, what would happen is, for example, some -- an issue might be raised with a vice president about a department in his or her area, and that vice president might ask that a
review be conducted. I'm trying to think of an example, but that -- that would be how those would -- would happen.
Q. Okay. My point is that it was different within the

Department of Public Safety. That's not how it worked within their department; right?
A. No. That would be how it worked.
Q. Didn't you testify at your deposition that investigations happened within the police -- within the police department were run by the chief. Isn't that true?
A. Investigations into the -- the officer's conduct, those would be conducted within the department.
Q. Now, as part of your dealings with Randy Wardlow, you had a weekly meeting with him where you discussed people like Mr. Cleavenger; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you would work with Mr. Wardlow on, for example, a letter of reprimand, what language should be in there; right? That was part of the meetings that you had?
A. In the meetings we discussed here's what's happening, kind of more general activity, than it would be we're going to -we're going to issue a written reprimand in a particular case. He would draft it. I would review it. It wasn't like in the meeting I told him what to say.
Q. As you said in your deposition, the point of HR working with the command staff on a letter of reprimand was that you
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wanted to make sure the letter of reprimand had all the right language in it. That was your word at your deposition?
A. That would be correct.
Q. Because you know that letters of discipline may end up through the -- at an arbitration; right? That's why you wanted to make sure it had the right language in it; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, letters of clarification, there's 2,000-plus union employees, right, within the university system?
A. Not quite that many. More like 1,500.
Q. There's a lot?
A. Yes.
Q. University-wide, only three or four letters of clarification a month; right?
A. As I explained, sometimes -- a letter of clarification is not disciplinary. It doesn't go into the employee's file. So while we're available to work with supervisors on clarifications, and they often wanted that, a supervisor could write a letter of clarification without human resources' involvement. I was estimating three to four clarifications where human resources was consulted.
Q. And only one or two letters of reprimand happened a month campus-wide; right? That was your testimony?
A. That was my estimate.
Q. So define for the jurors: What is progressive discipline?
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A. Progressive discipline is a process where employees are warned of problems with their performance, conduct, in progressively more severe sanctions.

So the first step of progressive discipline is a written reprimand under the collective bargaining agreement that the U of O has. The first step is a written reprimand. The second step is some kind of a pay action, usually a drop in one pay step for a period, like two to three months, and the third is dismissal.
Q. Do you recall about 10 years ago a situation with an Officer McIntyre involving theft of money out of a parking meter?
A. Yes.
Q. You worked on that, didn't you?
A. I have a vague recollection of that, yes.
Q. Okay. He actually was terminated, but then he got his job back, didn't he?
A. I don't recall the specifics of that situation.
Q. Got his job back but reassigned to parking duties. That doesn't ring any bell to you?
A. No. I'm sorry.
Q. Did you work with the command staff in relation to allegations of theft of service and a parking pass with an Officer Bowes?
A. Oh, I -- can you give me more specifics?
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Q. I believe it was Officer Nicole Bowes. Does that ring any bells?
A. I'm sorry. It doesn't.
Q. About five years ago?
A. No, I don't -- I don't -- I may have, but I just don't
recall.
Q. Let's talk about a concept of -- involving HR. You've
heard of the term "papering the file," haven't you?
A. When you asked me during the deposition is when I first had heard that.
Q. Let's look at your deposition. The concept of papering someone's file, you understand putting in the right language, getting the right amount of letters in there will then allow for a successful termination. You understand that conceptually, right, within HR?
A. Well, I understand that perception.
Q. Well, if you don't document things and put them in the files, someone's termination might get overturned at arbitration; right? That's why you're document ing and papering your files. That's one of the reasons, isn't it?
A. Well, the reason is to improve employee performance. But you're correct. You need a -- you need the record.
Q. But part of your duties are also risk management as the head of HR; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let's talk about risk management. So if someone is alleging that they're sexually harassed, that might lead to a lawsuit; right? That's risk you're managing when you hear about that allegation?
A. That's correct.
Q. Same with someone saying they've been discriminated against within the workplace; right? When you hear that allegation, part of your job is to manage that risk on behalf of the university; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And by managing it, you're trying to reduce that risk; isn't that true?
A. Yes.
Q. Someone speaking up and saying they were retaliated against for speaking their mind within the department, that would be potentially a lawsuit; right?
A. It could be.
Q. Now let's talk about your involvement with -- I'd like to show you what we were discussing earlier about the theft charge. I'll show you some documents and see if this refresh es your memory about them.

THE COURT: Exhibit number?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: 237.
THE COURT: Counsel, there are a number of documents, also, that are sequential. If she's going to review those, why
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don't we call another witness and have her view them quiet ly in the hallway and come back?

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Just those two incidents, Bowes and McIntyre, does that refresh your memory of those two incidents and your involvement?
A. No. I -- this is 2007 and 2009. I would need to read this. That's --
Q. Okay.
A. I don't -- I don't recall, off the top of my head, these situations.

THE COURT: There's no problem with her reading that.
The point is, though, that we can possibly just have her do that and not just sit here and watch her read.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Well, let's move on. I'll ask one question.

THE COURT: Counsel, no reason to. You've got the time. She can read those, but I just don't want her sitting here while the jury is watching her read.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: I understand.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Will you agree with me -- we'll ask it simply -- this document, December 11, 2007, that's your signature there at the bottom; correct?
A. That's my signature. That's correct.
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Q. On this document, February 12, 2007, that's your signature at the bottom of that document as well; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Let's talk about your involvement with my client, Mr. Cleavenger.

So when Mr. Wardlow got involved with my client, he would have created a separate file in his own office on
Mr. Cleavenger; right? That's how the process begins?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's a separate file that is on Mr. Cleavenger and maintained within the HR department ; right? Separate from the Department of Public Safety?
A. That would be correct.
Q. And in that HR file would be kept any letters of -letters of discipline would go there; right?
A. Can I back up? We're talking about two different files.
Q. Okay.
A. In human resources is the official personnel file, and
that contains documents like performance appraisals, you know , pay actions, documentation for pay actions, and that's the official file. And reprimands, any kind of progressive discipline goes in there.

Randy Wardlow had what you might call a working file, and that might have notes of meetings that he had with supervisors, and maybe letters of clarification, which don't go into the
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official personnel file.
Q. So my point is there's a separate file that Wardlow starts on my client related to discipline the moment he's brought in by the department; right? That's how it starts?
A. Well, that's my understanding of how he would do his files, yes.
Q. His office door is just a couple doors down from you;
right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, at these weekly meetings, you didn't take notes during those meetings, did you?
A. No.
Q. Any reason you wouldn't want to document these weekly meetings you're having with Mr. Wardlow to discuss how to get the right language in these letters?
A. Our weekly meetings were more general. It's a briefing of this is what's going on. We would probably talk about five or six employees' situations, and Mr. Cleavenger's would be one of them.

It was more broad higher-level decision-making of next steps; have you thought of this or that?
Q. So you would -- you and Mr. Wardlow would have emailed the letter of reprimand he was given on May 18, 2012. You would have emailed that back and forth; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You would have provided feedback and edits for him; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Looked for any red flags in the document?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you get that information from the command staff, you guys at HR are not doing any independent investigations about whether these allegations against him are true, are you?
A. That's correct.
Q. You're a hundred percent dependent on the information you're getting from command staff to write these letters; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, annual evaluations. At your deposition, over your 30 years, you never heard of a situation where there were three drafts of an annual evaluation dealing with the same time period?
A. I -- I had never heard of that.
Q. So I'm assuming that you've never heard of four times -four drafts of an annual evaluation. You never heard of that either; right?
A. Well, I wouldn't necessarily know if all this drafting is going on in the department.
Q. But with Mr. Cleavenger's annual evaluation, Randy Wardlow was working on that with the command staff. You know that; right?
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A. And that happened at times.
Q. Are you aware what the -- the contract -- the contract says that each union employee at the Department of Public Safety is supposed to get an annual evaluation; right?
A. That's true for the whole university.
Q. Okay. Are you aware, as you sit here today, that many people didn't get annual evaluations for many different years over the time they've worked for the Department of Public Safety?
A. That's happened campus-wide too.
Q. Now, you do remember a meeting where Mr. Cleavenger and his job reassignment were going to be discussed; right?
A. I'm not sure I remember a specific meeting. I do remember talking about it.
Q. And the command staff at the department were concerned about my client's poor judgment because of what happened with the Spencer View incident; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now let's talk about that for a moment, your understanding of how unsafe my client was in relation to the Spencer View incident.

You testified in your deposition that part of the problem about the Spencer View incident was that you believed at the time of the situation that pulling up to the door could have involved violence; right? That's what you testified to?
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A. My recollection was that he pulled too close to the door and that that -- that there was concerns about domestic violence and so that by doing so his car was visible from the door and there were other officers that were parked farther away and that it increased the risk.
Q. Okay. That's all information you learned from someone at the command staff; right?
A. And Mr. Wardlow, yes.
Q. Did you ever do any -- before you decid ed to terminate him related to this incident, did you ever do any investigation to find out exactly what happened with that Spencer View incident? A. No.
Q. Now, while you're dealing with my client, back around this time period of April, May, you knew he had a law degree, didn't you?
A. I don't remember when I learned that he had a law degree. I may not have known at the time. I just don't remember.
Q. Now, I'm jumping around here a little bit, but the reason that my client was put on paid administrative leave, your understanding was because of these problematic callouts, right, that happened in September?
A. That was -- yes. On the administrative leave, what was the time frame you're talking about?
Q. September. End of September of 2012. That was the reason, you said in your deposition, he was put on paid
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administrative leave was because of these callouts; right?
A. Right.
Q. And you said that normally your predismissal hearings, you
continue with the recommendation. It's actually more like
95 percent of the time you terminate people after a
predismissal hearing; right? That's what you testified to?
A. I would say that's accurate.
Q. And that predismissal hearing is a chance for my client to present, as you describe, mitigating circumstances. Other explanations for why things may have occurred; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you testified you went through your notes. Can you take your notes out there for us?
A. Yes.
Q. First page. Middle of the first page. It does say right in the middle of the first page, "Told to report only felonies"; right?
A. Yes.
Q. That was something that my client told you; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You also testified on direct that you don't recall anything about retaliation from his supervisors during this meeting; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let's look at 143 there at the bottom. Look at the last

```
sentence. Tell me if I'm reading this right. "Shows the
lengths Lebrecht is willing to go to get rid of JC." James
Cleavenger. That's what you wrote; right?
A. That's what I wrote.
Q. On page 145, in the middle. This is from Donna Laue's
interviewing other officers. You learned that officers believe
they're focusing on JC; right?
A. Right.
Q. And the next page. "MM" -- MM, Mike Morrow; right --
"refused to accept evidence." That's all in your handwritten
notes, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's talk about these handwritten notes.
So can you count the number of pages there in your
handwritten notes?
A. Seven.
Q. What are the Bates numbers on there?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. What are the numbers that start on the bottom and what do
they go to?
A. Oh, 16140 to 16146.
Q. So you've got 140 to 146. Can you read the Bates numbers
on the bottom of those documents?
A. }139\mathrm{ to 149.
Q. And would you agree with me that the front page is
```
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completely illegible?
A. Well, I can read it, but -- well, you're right. It's pretty much illegible.
Q. Pretty much illegible; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you go to the last three pages?

MS. COIT: Can I ask what document he's showing her?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: I gave you the Bates numbers.
You produced them.
THE WITNESS: 139.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: 139 that you -- what's the last number?

THE COURT: 145 was mentioned.
THE WITNESS: 150.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: 139 through 150.
MS. COIT: Is this an exhibit?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: I'm asking.
THE COURT: I believe these are the same notes, if
I'm not mistaken, that you have in front of you on that exhibit number. Would you read that blue exhibit number to us?

THE WITNESS: 404.
THE COURT: Are those the same notes you're looking
through, but in a different condition?
THE WITNESS: This one has more pages.
THE COURT: More pages. But look at the first
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page of each. Would those be the same, and just one is marked as an exhibit? We can see that the other one is a little difficult to read.

THE WITNESS: This one is not marked for exhibits.
These are not the same.
THE COURT: They're not the same first page?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. That clears it up, Counsel.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Can you go to the last three pages of that document I handed you? Not one of those pages is legible, are they? Not that one, but that one, that one, and the last -- turn it over. None of those last three pages are legible at all, are they?
A. No.
Q. But they are your notes?
A. It's my handwriting, yes.
Q. So counsel showed you -- can I have this back? Counsel showed you seven pages, but there's actually 139 to 150 , and four of those pages are completely illegible?

THE COURT: That's a question?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: That's what I'm asking her, yes.
THE WITNESS: Well, they're -- I can't pronounce that. They're not legible.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: We may offer this later, Your Honor. Not at this moment.
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We'll label it 274 for the record.
THE COURT: 274. Let's be certain here. 274 are the witness's notes --

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Correct.
THE COURT: -- given to plaintiff?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Correct.
THE COURT: There are more pages that you received.
That exhibit number -- what's the number that you are --
THE WITNESS: 404.
THE COURT: 404? That's the blue tag?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you. 404. Is that a correct summation?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: That's correct, Your Honor.
There are four additional pages which are illegible in
Plaintiff's 274 that's been marked.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 274 is marked. 404 is marked.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Now let's talk about -- let's talk about this document that you -- that you drafted to terminate my client, shall we?

Can you turn to Exhibit 86? Do you have it there?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. When you drafted this, you took this seriously; right?

```
A. Yes.
Q. You knew that what you put in this document at some point
would be the basis for termination that the arbitrator would be
deciding on; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you talked at length with defense counsel about this
loaded-gun incident; right? On the direct exam just now;
right?
A. Yes.
Q. You never referenced the loaded-gun incident anywhere in
this document, do you?
A. That's correct.
Q. In fact, at your deposition, I asked you for officer
safety issues, and you never referenced the loaded -gun incident
at your deposition, did you?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. So at your deposition last year, you had two years to
prepare for what were the serious safety allegations that my
client was being terminated for; right?
A. Say that again.
Q. Two years ago -- or last year, when your deposition was
taken, there was a lawsuit happening. He was being terminated.
You played a role in that. You knew that the reason he was
terminated was a critical thing at your deposition. You knew
that; right?
```
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And, yet, when we discussed officer safety issues in your deposition, the only thing you referenced was the Spencer View incident. You didn't represent anything about this loaded-gun incident?
A. Well, my recollection of that is that we were talking about some of the earlier incidents that resulted in the shift from -- to the parking position.
Q. Well, let's talk about that. When did the loaded-gun incident happen?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Could it have been before you wrote the first letter of reprimand?
A. I don't recall.
Q. What do you recall being told about this loaded-gun incident?
A. I recall that there were some examples of poor judgment, and that was one of them.
Q. Okay. Did anybody tell you that the woman had a concealed weapons permit?
A. No.
Q. Did anybody tell you that she was fleeing a dangerous husband who was stalking her and had military background? Anybody tell you those facts?
A. No.
Q. Did anybody tell you that she was asking Department of Public Safety officers for help with that problem? Did anybody ever tell you that?
A. I don't recall if they did.
Q. Did anyone tell you she was actually wearing the gun right on her hip, right here? Did anybody tell you that?
A. No.
Q. Did anybody tell you that Sergeant Cameron came to the scene where she was in a parking lot with overhead lights and was there dealing with the situation the same time my client was before he gave her a ride? Did anybody tell you that?
A. No. Not that I recall.
Q. The gun incident -- I think it's undisputed in this
case -- happened on May 6, 2012. Your decision to terminate was October 26, 2012. That's almost six months after this incident; right?
A. Yep. Yes.
Q. But defense counsel didn't ask you any questions on direct exam about how dangerous the Spencer View incident was, did she?
A. No.
Q. Let's talk about what you wrote in this termination
letter. Okay? Do you have a copy of it there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. You spent at least a few hours working on it; right?
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## A. That's correct.

Q. It says on October 1st you received notice of disciplinary suspension. In fact, this letter was not given to my client until the meeting the morning of October 2nd; isn't that correct?
A. I don't know when he was given the letter.
Q. It was right after a meeting he just had with Brian Smith. Does that ring a bell?
A. I know who Brian Smith is. I don't know about a meeting .

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Mr. Hess, can you publish
portions of this for us? The second paragraph, "You have been employed."

MR. HESS: Which page?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Page 1, paragraph 2.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Okay. So you wrote that he was given a letter of clarification on November 11, 2011; right?
A. Correct.
Q. What's the date on the letter of clarification?
A. November 18, 2011.
Q. So you were off by seven days on that portion; right?

## Correct?

A. Yes.
Q. You were off by seven days. Okay. Let's talk about this letter of clarification. You said this is not discipline,

```
didn't you?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. Well, why, then, if it's not discipline, is it
going into his letter of termination, discussing his grooming
standards there right in that paragraph?
A. Well, it -- it talks about more than the grooming
standards. It's been my practice to -- in doing a letter of
dismissal or any -- any disciplinary letter, to cite the
progressive discipline that led up to it.
Q. So it's not discipline, except you use it for discipline
when you write letters like this. Is that what you're saying?
A. It's a warning to employees, and so it's a statement that
you were warned.
Q. The letter of discipline is supposed to be removed after
one year from his file, isn't it?
A. No. Letters of discipline --
Q. Sorry. Letters of clarification. I'm sorry.
A. I don't believe that's in the contract.
Q. Are you aware that this letter of clarification, written
on November 18, 2011, ended up, two and a half years later,
being given to the district attorney as part of the Brady
materials against my client? Are you aware of that?
A. No.
Q. You go through -- on pages 2 and 3 here, you go through a
series of outlining of these problematic callouts; right?
```
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A. Correct.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Can you blow up, Mr. Hess, on
page 1, 2, 3 -- blow up that paragraph in the middle in follow-up.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. So here you point out that Lieutenant Bechdolt actually
did an investigation into the details of this incident; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And because these calls were problematic, that was one of the reasons he needed to be terminated; right? That was your conclusion in this letter?
A. That's one of them, yes.
Q. Okay. Are you aware, as you sit here today, Lieutenant Bechdolt has testified at the arbitration and in this courtroom that he didn't see any problem with these callouts?
A. I was not aware of that.
Q. Did you ask Lieutenant Bechdolt at this time period, the
guy who had done the investigation, "Hey, what's your opinion about these callouts? Were they problematic or not?"
A. I don't recall. I don't think I talked to

Lieutenant Bechdolt.
Q. Can you pull up the next paragraph?

Well, you went and made comments about these callouts in this letter. Let's look at the last sentence. "Although, you
may have been well-intentioned in making the callouts, your behavior reflects repeated examples of extremely poor judgment and inability to accurately assess situations."

Now, if you had talked to Lieutenant Bechdolt and found out that he didn't see any problem with these callouts, that might have made a difference in your determination when you were investigating whether to terminate my client, wouldn't it?
A. Well, I was also talking to other people, like

Mike Morrow, who felt that they were problematic.
Q. Okay. Do you know if Mike Morrow did any investigation into the callouts?
A. I don't.
Q. While you're working on this, let's just narrow this down.

The people you're getting information from at the department were Morrow, the chief, and Lebrecht. Are those the three people you got info from?
A. That's my recollection.
Q. Okay.
A. And, again, a lot of this was Randy Wardlow, and they --
Q. Well, you wrote this letter.
A. I did, yes.
Q. You were at the predismissal hearing; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You wanted to give my client a fair shot to investigate these allegations. That was your goal; right?
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A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about that.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Can we go down to the next page,
Mr. Hess, the third paragraph?
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. This involves the recording -- the alleged illegal
recordings that my client did while he stopped folks. Do you remember those?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you say that his failure on several occasions
to notify people violated University of Oregon Police Department policy. What policy are you talking about?
A. I don't have the citation.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that Lieutenant Morrow testified yesterday in this courtroom that there wasn't a policy at this time for dash cam video recordings?
A. No. I'm not aware of that.
Q. So the only person you could have gotten this information from, just so we're clear -- because you didn't talk to anybody except for Lebrecht, the chief, or Morrow when you wrote in this official document that he violated the policy; right?
A. That's correct.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Okay. Can you -- the next sentence, Mr. Hess. The, "This does not mitigate the fact that" -- the next paragraph. The very bottom. "This does
not" --
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. So, again, you're terminating my client because of these callouts, saying that he violated the policy of the department and that's why he needs to be terminated; right?
A. That's one of the reasons.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Let's go to the next paragraph,
Mr. Hess. Blow up that whole paragraph. This one is
important.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Okay. So my client -- at this predismissal hearing, there were questions about whether he had been trained by Lieutenant Lebrecht on these recordings before this; right? That was one of the fact issues you investigated; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, as you say here, "As a justification for not knowing the following department policies, you stated Lieutenant Lebrecht reported that he shared this information at meetings that you contend could not have occurred with the report of attendees. You checked the department staffing schedule to learn when officers were scheduled to work. In checking with UOPD leadership, I learned that the scheduling resource you reviewed is not a reliable source and that it did not reflect last-minute changes to the schedules. CAD reports were reviewed and confirmed that the reported attendees,
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including you, were present at the meetings, at which the department policy on notifying contacts -- contacts of recordings were discussed. This assertion calls into question your credibility."

So you're saying my client is being dishonest in this paragraph here because he really did attend those briefings with Lieutenant Lebrecht; right? That's your conclusion?
A. That's what the records show.
Q. Okay. Where are those records?
A. I got them from -- I talked with Mike Morrow.
Q. You talked with Mike Morrow?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did you actually physically look at those CAD reports?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. So you wrote in this document. When you report "CAD
reports were reviewed and confirmed that the report of
attendees, including you, were present," that's not true, is
it? You did not look at it.
A. That's true.
Q. Now --

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Well, we can take a break for lunch, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is this a good time to recess, Counsel?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Sure.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, can I have an extra
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15 minutes today? $1: 15$. Okay? And we'll come back at a little after 1:15. Have a nice lunch. Please don't talk. By the way, has anybody talked about the case so I get to start all over again? Okay. Don't do that. Don't express an opinion. Have a nice lunch.

> (Jury not present.)

THE COURT: Counsel, 1:15.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Recess taken.) } \\
& \text { (Jury present.) }
\end{aligned}
$$

THE COURT: All right. We're back in session. The
jury is present. All the parties and counsel are present.
Counsel, if you would like to continue with your examination.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: One moment. I'll be right with you. Let me get to my page.

```
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
```

Q. When we left off we were discussing the letter that you wrote terminating my client. Before lunch; right? Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You still have a copy of it up there with you?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. I just want to make sure we're clear here. The point of the predismissal hearing, my client is supposed to present mitigating information to you; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Last page of your notes there, can you see a date there on that document?
A. What? My handwritten notes?
Q. Yeah. Do you see any date when you talk to Morrow on there?
A. I don't have any reference to Morrow. This is what you're looking at?
Q. The handwritten notes. The last page there says "MM."
A. "Refused to accept evidence." Is that what you're looking at?
Q. No. I think we're -- I think -- I'll move on for the moment. We have some other things to talk about. Let's go back to the letter. All right. We left off
talking about how --
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Mr. Hess, can you go back to the second-to-the-last page in the termination letter, please?
Second-to-last page there. Can you blow up the last paragraph ? First paragraph is what we were on before.

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Okay. So we left off at lunch -- this paragraph you're attacking my client's credibility because you stated that the CAD reports were reviewed and confirmed that the reported attendees, including you -- meaning my client -- were present at the meetings.

And you have never reviewed any CAD reports to confirm
that. That's all accurate; correct?
A. Correct.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Okay. Let's go to the next paragraph, Mr. Hess.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Now, in this paragraph you and your representatives made the point that the pace of your discipline appears accelerated, stating that the activities occurred in April, giving you insufficient time to improve your performance. My research indicates that the problematic callouts occurred recently, in September, not last April. In addition, you have received verbal and written warnings regarding potential problems with your performance over the past year without demonstrating an
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## improvement.

That's what you wrote; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the reason you're putting that in there is because one of the things about progressive discipline is that the employee has an ability to show that they've improved after they've been trained; right? That's --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What is the date there on that letter of clarification?
A. I do not have that.
Q. You don't have that stuff there? I'll grab it.
A. It's -- it's referred to in here as November 11th, and you said it was November 18th.
Q. Right. Just for the record, that's -- what is the exhibit number on that?
A. 3 .
Q. Okay. So Exhibit 3 is November 18th; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And part of the letter of clarification involves officer safety issues; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now I'd like to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

Can you tell us the date on that document?
A. The date phase began and ends?
Q. Yes. Correct.
A. The date phase began November 16, 2011. The date phase ends December 17, 2011.
Q. So that's a month after this letter of clarification where he's -- the same letter of clarification you put into his termination letter; right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So let's look at the last paragraph on that last page there.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Mr. Hess, can you blow up the last paragraph on that document?

MR. HESS: Exhibit 31? Permission to post?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Yeah, it's already in.
MR. HESS: Last paragraph?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Yeah, last paragraph. Last page.
MR. HESS: Last paragraph. Last page.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Okay. Officer Cleavenger's overall performance was at an acceptable level this week. There are approximately 30 students residing on campus for the winter break, so the calls for service are low. Cleavenger's overall performance continues to improve in all areas. I don't see it as necessary to continue weekly evaluations at this point as Officer Cleavenger immediately took it upon himself to quickly correct the points that were to be addressed.
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Doesn't this directly contradict what you wrote in his termination letter when you wrote, "You have received verbal and written warnings regarding problems of your performance over the past year without demonstrating improvement"? A. I would say it contradicts "without demonstrating improvement" for that week.
Q. Correct. And that's one of the reasons that you terminated him was because you were arguing in this letter that he hasn't demonstrated any improvement; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, would you agree with me that it's pretty hard to show improvement as a public safety officer if the last four months of that time period he wasn't allowed to operate as a public safety officer?
A. I agree.
Q. So from May until September, there was no ability to show improvement as a public safety officer; right?
A. He wasn't working as a public safety officer. So he wasn't working as a public safety officer, yeah.
Q. Okay. Now -- and those weekly evaluations there that you have, that we just talked about, those were ended early, weren't they, because he was doing so well?

MS. COIT: Your Honor, I object to the foundation with this witness. It's going far beyond the scope of my direct. She's not a defendant here.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I don't know the answer. These were

## done within the department.

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Right. But when you write in here, in his termination letter, that you received -- that he's received verbal and written warnings "regarding problems with your performance over the past year without demonstrated improvement," where are you getting that information from that he had no demonstrated improvement?
A. The incidents that occurred in September of 2012, the callouts.
Q. Okay. The callouts that the investigating officer, Lieutenant Bechdolt, didn't find any problems with. That's where you're determining that there were no improvements? A. I didn't have that information; but, yes.
Q. Well, you had the hearing. The predismissal hearing was in early October; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you didn't write -- early October 2012. You didn't write this letter until October 25, 2012; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So you had a couple of weeks to go do some research and see if the allegations my client made at the predismissal hearing were true or not; right? That was part of your job?
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A. Right.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the next paragraph in your dismissal
letter. You -- you start this paragraph, "You asserted" --
that would be my client; right?
A. That's true.
Q. "You asserted that you had submitted 33 training requests that either received no response or were denied. I learned that you did receive all the mandatory training offered to public safety officers. Individual training requests are approved based on relevance to specific positions and operational needs regarding staffing. Lieutenant Mike Morrow told me that it is appropriate for sergeants to deny and approve training requests. He stated that some of the training requests -- training you requested had little or no relevance to your assigned duties. Furthermore, it is not clear how the denied training would mitigate the specific problems with your performance or assist you in exercising better judgment and decision-making." Right? That's what you said? A. Yes.
Q. So one of the big issues that my client was terminated for was this failure to notify people about recordings; right?

## A. Right.

Q. That's for mobile dash cam videos?
A. No. My recollection is that that had to do with the recording device that he wore. It wasn't dash cam.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what the very first training request he put forth to his -- his superiors were on -- in early 2012? Do you remember what the very first one was?
A. No.
Q. Let me show you.
A. Mobile Dash Cam Video Tactics.
Q. What's the date of that training?
A. February 7, 2012.
Q. Can I have that back?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So the very first request he made, back at the beginning of 2012, Mobile Dash Cam Video Tactics, don't you agree that if he had had that training it might have mitigated "the specific problems with your performance" or assist him in exercising better judgment and decision-making?
A. Again, the problem was with voice recording. It wasn't dash cam, so I'm --
Q. Well --
A. Perhaps.
Q. Okay. Did you do anything to look into his training requests and see whether any of them might have helped him out before you wrote this sentence, "It's not clear how the denied training would mitigate the specific problems with your performance or assist you in exercising better judgment and decision-making."

1966
King - X

Did you do anything to look into his trainings?
A. I spoke with Mike Morrow about the assertion that he had been denied these trainings. And the contention, as I recall, in the hearing, was that a sergeant could not deny trainings or it was not operating procedure, and that was -- that was the contention I was checking out.
Q. I just want to be clear about this. Throughout all the materials in relation to his termination, have you ever seen anything that my client violated a policy, in regards to the PUMA audio recordings, the handheld ones?
A. I haven't seen anything.
Q. You have no idea if there was any analysis done before my client was terminated in relation to traffic stops to see if many other officers during that same time period were all doing traffic stops, did you -- do you?
A. Are you referring to the incident where he pulled the law professor over?
Q. Right. The dean stop. That was one of the reasons you put in here for terminating him; right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Did you do anything before you wrote this letter to find out if other officers were doing the exact same kinds of traffic stops for years before my client?
A. Well, I was led to believe otherwise; but, no.
Q. You read the arbitrator's opinion?

```
A. I did. Not recently, but I did.
Q. The arbitrator determined that the incidents that he was
fired for were, quote, "not extraordinarily serious or
sufficiently grave to justify skipping additional progressive
discipline and going straight to termination"; right? That was
one of his determinations?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. Oh, I'll show you, just to clear it up, that document
there.
    THE COURT: What's the number?
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Can I grab it from you real
quick? Exhibit 274.
    THE COURT: }274
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Okay. It's Bates numbered at the
bottom 147.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Does that indicate what day you spoke with Mike Morrow ?
A. Yes.
Q. What day was that?
A. October 25th.
Q. Same day you wrote the letter firing my client; right?
A. Same day I completed the letter.
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Okay. That's all I have.
    THE COURT: And redirect, please.
    MS. COIT: May I approach, Your Honor?
```
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REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. COIT:
Q. I'm handing you Defendant's 426. That, Ms. King, is the
entirety of your notes dealing with this predismissal letter,
your follow-up interview with Mike Morrow, your follow-up
investigation. Just to quell the implication from plaintiff's
counsel that we were somehow hiding information in the notes I
gave you, the prior notes that I gave you started on 16140,
dated at the top 10/12/12, James Cleavenger predismissal. Do
you see that?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Prior notes I gave you ended on 16146. Do you see that
page?
A. Yes.
Q. That would be the last page of the notes regarding the
predismissal meeting; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Next page, the additional notes that counsel gave you,
implying that I left something out, what is the date on the top
of that?
A. $10 / 25 / 12$.
Q. And that is not the date of the predismissal meeting;
correct?
A. No.
Q. All right. Look at the next page of your notes. What is
the date on that?
A. $10 / 19 / 12$.
Q. Again, not the date of the predismissal hearing; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. What does this indicate you did on that day?
A. These were my notes of follow-up calls I made after the predismissal hearing.
Q. The next page, please look at that page. What is the date on top of that page?
A. October 22, 2012.
Q. What does this page indicate you did that day?
A. I spoke with Mike Morrow.
Q. About what?
A. The testimony I received in the predismissal hearing
regarding the callouts.
Q. So follow-up investigation?
A. Yeah. Yeah, it was --
Q. And that -- excuse me, that's three days before the date
of your termination letter; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you didn't only speak to Mike Morrow on the date you wrote the letter; correct?
A. That's correct.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, I offer Exhibit 426.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: It's hearsay, Your Honor.
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any findings? Were you aware of that?
A. No.
Q. You were asked if Mr. Cleavenger could have shown improvement in his performance while he was on parking duties; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Isn't it true that he could have shown improvement in his ability to follow instructions while he was doing those duties?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. All right. You were also asked a question -- something about doesn't having an employee making complaints raised to HR the specter of possible litigation. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. The question, yeah, I do.
Q. The question, yes.

Wouldn't HR also -- well, primarily have a concern about litigation stemming from an officer, an employee's violation of a citizen's constitutional rights in the performance of his job?
A. That's true.
Q. And this papering the file accusation being levied against you, would you agree with me that if you had wanted to paper the file to make sure this termination was upheld, it would have been a better idea to actually put in there a pay sanction and not skipping a step before termination?
A. Oh, definitely. Yes.
Q. And then for terminations, why does the union contract allow an employee, a union employee, to skip steps one and two when they've been terminated?
A. For the grievance process?
Q. Yes.
A. I think -- I don't know. I wasn't in bargaining when they made that decision, but it would make sense that the institution has looked at the decision and made the decision to dismiss. So to go back and -- it would be basically the same people looking at it again, so at that point it just goes to the higher level, which is the Oregon University System.

> MS. COIT: Thank you, Ms. King.

THE COURT: Recross?

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY:
Q. You actually went and testified at the arbitration, didn't you? The arbitration my client was involved with?
A. Yes.
Q. You testified there? Administrators, supervisors for the department testified at that arbitration, didn't they?
A. I wasn't -- I didn't sit through the arbitration.
Q. Do you know that my client was the only witness that was called at the arbitration on his behalf?
A. No, I don't know that.

MS. COIT: Yes.
THE COURT: Counsel. Thank you very much. You're excused from the proceedings.

Counsel, you can call another witness, please.
MS. COIT: Alex Gardner.
THE COURT: Sir, step forward in the well of the courtroom. Stop in that location, please, and raise your right hand.

ALEXANDER GARDNER,
called as a witness in behalf of the Defendants, being first
duly sworn, is examined and testified as follows:
THE WITNESS: I do.
THE COURT: Be seated in the witness stand. The entrance is just to my right, closest to the wall. After you're seated, will you pull the chair as close as you can to the microphone so we can hear you?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Face the jury. State your full name and spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: My full name is Alexander Richard Gardner. Last is G-A-R-D-N-E-R.

THE COURT: Direct examination, please.
$1 / 1$
//1
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DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. COIT:
Q. Mr. Gardner, can you tell us what your current occupation is.
A. I'm a trooper recruit with the Oregon State Police.
Q. Is that a career change for you?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Tell us what you did before joining the Oregon State Police.
A. Prior to that, I was the Lane County District Attorney.
Q. How long were you the Lane County District Attorney?
A. I was first appointed by the governor in the summer of 2004 for a four-month term. I then -- the former DA came back and completed a term, and then I was elected to serve in 2008 and 2012. I served until going to the Oregon State Police on August 1st of this summer.
Q. Can you just give us a little background on your professional history before going to the district attorney's office?
A. Yes. I finished law school in the summer of ' 91 and was admitted to the bar that summer. I went to work for the Douglas County DA's Office, where I started with a misdemeanor caseload and progressed into felony work very quickly. I left Douglas County in 2000 and started work in the Lane County DA's office in 2001, where I served in a variety of roles prior to
becoming the district attorney. There was a brief period of time during which I worked for North River Jet Boats between those two jobs.
Q. Okay. All right. Are you familiar with the Supreme Court case of Brady v. Maryland?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just explain for the jury what the obligations are of a district attorney under that case.
A. Certainly. Brady v. Maryland requires a DA to share any information with the defense on a criminal case which might tend to either mitigate the sentence that a defendant might get or might tend to weaken the State's case in some way.

So, for example, if there's evidence which might tend to make a witness less believable to a jury or the court, we are required to provide that information to the defense attorney, so it's available to -- in their preparation for the case.
Q. Through subsequent case law after Brady, has the obligation of the district attorney's office become more defined?
A. Yes. The -- a number of cases have sort of refined and, in some sense, expanded the obligation. So early on we understood that we had a duty to disclose anything which we knew about, but subsequent case law on -- in federal court has created the obligation to do more investigation. So we, the DAs, can be held responsible for information we don't even know
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about. So we have a duty to inquire, to do our best to learn about whatever evidence there might be.

This arises most frequently in the context of police
officer witnesses. They tend to be the backbone of most criminal cases, but it applies to other witnesses as well. Q. All right. You kind of anticipated my next question. Can a criminal defendant's rights to receive Brady information about a particular officer be violated by the district attorney's office even if you don't know about that information?
A. Yes. Q. In late 2013 into 2014, were you part of a work group in Oregon that was trying to get this information out to police agencies about the obligations under Brady and its progeny? A. Yes. In fact, I was the one who catalyzed the creation of that work group.

I'm on the board of the -- or was until I moved to the state police. I was on the Board of the Department of Public Standards. It's basically the police academy in Oregon. I asked the director of the police academy if he could assist in putting together a group so that we could have more uniform treatment of this challenge in Oregon.

Part of the idea was to get input from a variety of different groups. So there were people from police unions, police management, the Attorney General's Office, the United

States Attorney's Office, basically everybody that we could include in the process, to catalyze a more robust conversation and get it figured out, because it wasn't completely clear how to handle this in a way that would provide a uniform standard across the state.
Q. Can you put an approximate date on when this work group started its work?
A. My memory is imperfect about that. I want to say maybe late 2012 we -- I started to make inquiry, I think, but I'm not confident about that.
Q. At some point did your work group or people that you had speak on its behalf start attending seminars and putting on training throughout the state of Oregon to get this information out to law enforcement agencies?
A. As we plowed through the subject more and more, we began to disseminate information. It wasn't sort of conclusions that we were sharing. It was more like progress reports and soliciting more input from police agencies and others who were working with the same challenges.

I didn't personally put on seminars, but I contributed to some training efforts.
Q. Do you recall when those trainings occurred?
A. They were ongoing. As is often the case, there were many things happening at the same time that sort of contributed to the conversation, because we would start to talk about
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Brady-related challenges at the same time that misconduct allegations were arising in the media where police agencies were having trouble with a particular employee so they would send correspondence, and we would talk about what was going on in the media and that kind of thing.

It was just a continuous evolving process for really most of the last three years.
Q. Okay. So starting in late 2012, when the work group was convened, and going forward until today?
A. Yes. It's still ongoing.
Q. Describe for us how Brady concerns, Brady issues were handled before this work group was convened and started working on this more uniform process in the state of Oregon.
A. I would say they were handled on an office-by-office basis, based on the best judgment of the attorneys working on the cases. I believe that the DAs in this state do their best to serve justice, and justice requires that if you know of something in your case that tends to make it weaker, you -- you share that, because it would -- it would frustrate justice if the defendant did not have a chance at an adequate defense.

But our understanding of the requirements of Brady was evolving and not everybody got the training at the same time, and just the amount of discussion around the topic was not as robust as it is now. The police are under a lot of scrutiny today and anything that challenges police officers is now
coming up so regularly that it's on the surface of our consciousness.

So we talk about this stuff all the time, instead of just occasionally.
Q. So if you can estimate, while you were the Lane County District Attorney, prior to, say, mid-2013, how many times had you received information unsolicited from a law enforcement agency about an officer's credibility?
A. I wouldn't want to hazard a guess, but prior to this more robust discussion, I would say only a few times. And, frankly, by the time those things surfaced, they were cases where it was so obvious that the officer's credibility was poor, there wasn't much need for discussion.
Q. In your experience, after this information was being disseminated to law enforcement agencies by your work group, did the submission of possible credibility issues about officers increase?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the obligation --

MS. COIT: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
MS. COIT: It's Exhibit 364.
THE COURT: 364. Thank you.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Have you had a chance to look through Exhibit 364?
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A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell the jury what that is?
A. It's a summary document describing best practices for
managing the challenges I've just been describing. It's dated
March 31st of 2014.
Q. Who created Exhibit 364?
A. I believe this was actually drafted primarily by

Paige Clark-Smith, from the Marion County DA's Office. It summarizes conclusions from the work group that I was on.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, we offer 364 with permission to publish.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. MCDOUGAL: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
MS. COIT: Permission to publish?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Did you have any input into the document itself?
A. My memory is that I -- I -- we all had a chance to review blocks of it. I did not edit the completed version.
Q. Okay. Let's look at page 3. On the bottom of page 3, under recommendation for law enforcement, the first sentence there, "Understanding that a Brady designation for a law enforcement witness occurs solely at the discretion of the prosecutor," what does that mean?
A. That means that the obligation is one that the prosecutor bears and the decision is ultimately the prosecutor's decision to make.
Q. As a law enforcement agency, do they have the authority to Brady-list an officer?
A. No.
Q. Can you look at page 4, the top paragraph?

All right. That first sentence, "Further, under state and federal law, a law enforcement agency's obligation to disclose exculpatory or impeachment information aris es in a context of a particular prosecution."

Can you explain to the jury what the phrase "exculpatory information" means in this context?
A. Yes. It means information which would tend to make it less likely the jury or the finder of fact would convict. It's evidence which would tend to help the defendant get off the hook, if you will. That applies not just to the conviction, but to the sentence -- the potential sentence length.
Q. And the concept of this exculpatory information, it relates to the criminal defendant, correct, not the officer with the Brady information?
A. Yes.
Q. The next sentence, sorry, it says, "Law enforcement partners are nonetheless encouraged to consider adopting policies and employment practices that allow disclosure when an
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agency makes a determination that an employee has been untruthful, has committed a crime, is biased, or has suppressed evidence."

Is that the information that a law enforcement agency has an obligation to disclose to you about an officer?
A. I believe obligation in the sense of a moral obligation, in the sense that it's the right thing to do and it's essential they have that kind of information exchange in order to make the criminal justice system work properly. If the police agency is hiding information that the officer isn't credible, obviously that's going to erode faith in the system and it's going to put the defendant at a disadvantage.
Q. And, again, let me stop you. The defendant that you're talking about is not the officer that is being considered as possibly having Brady issues. It's the criminal defendant that that officer was involved in; correct?
A. That's correct. It's the criminal defendant who stands charged with a crime, and the officer is part of the State's case of proving the defendant did the crime as alleged.
Q. All right. The categories up here of information that a law enforcement agency should disclose to you, would that include disclosure -- disclosure of information when an internal affairs investigation into an officer has revealed that he has committed a crime?
A. I'm hesitating only because the nature of the crime has
some bearing on this, obviously, but --
Q. I can make it more specific, if that helps.
A. That would be helpful.
Q. If the officer was found, in the context of an internal affairs investigation, to have made an unauthorized stop, an illegal detention of a citizen?
A. Yes, I would want to know about that.
Q. What about information that's developed through an internal affairs investigation and a -- and an internal investigation into performance that reveals the officer has violated recording laws on numerous occasions, the failure to advise of recording citizens?
A. So, to be clear, I would -- I would not be interested in -- for the purposes of Brady disclosure, I would not be interested in information which tended to show that the cop was not a great cop or made errors in judgment, but I would be interested in anything that suggested that the police officer was not honoring his or her oath of office or the police officer was doing something dishonest in some way.

So anything which bears on the fundamental character for honesty is -- should be disclosed.
Q. Do you consider the district attorney's office to be independent from law enforcement in making a Brady determination?
A. Yes. The judgment is independent. The learning process
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is collaborative.
Q. If information is provided to you by a law enforcement agency about an officer's credibility, do you undertake your own investigation?
A. To the extent we can.
Q. What would that entail?
A. It depends on circumstance s. If I was aware of witnesses who had independent, unbiased information that would shed light on a question that was close, then I would want to hear from those people. If the evidence presented by the law enforcement agency was conclusive and clear, then there wouldn't be much to talk about, for several reasons. There wouldn't be any reason for my office to inquire further.

It's worth mentioning that the DA's office also has very limited resources for doing this kind of inquiry. While -- so I should -- I should explain just one piece here. Even if something was factually incorrect but the entire community of police officers with whom the subject officer works believes that the officer is not truthful, for example, that fact alone, even if they're mistaken about the basis upon which they're making that decision, that belief that they all hold alone is Brady, Brady material, because those officers in that community could then potentially testify for the defense and say, "My opinion is that this officer is not truthful," and if I were aware of that, I would have to share that with the defense.
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it was in person, but I do remember -- it might have even been -- no, I think it was over the phone, but I'm not sure.
Q. What do you recall about that conversation?
A. What I recall is asking him for more information and to get his personal assessment, because I respect him and I've known him for a long time. My memory is that he was not -that he was cautious but that his appraisal was not favorable.
Q. To be clear, was he talking about Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Was this conversation you had with Captain Deshpende before the University of Oregon submitted information to your office?
A. I can't recall.
Q. At some point the University of Oregon did submit
information to your office, correct, about Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that went to your assistant district attorney; correct?
A. I think so. I think it went to my chief deputy, Patty Perlow.
Q. Did you ever review the information that came to you from the department?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you conduct -- well, first off, how soon after it was delivered do you believe that you reviewed it?
A. I can't recall at this point. This is more than a year and a half ago, I think, when it -- when it would have come to my attention. And, for perspective, my office can get -- well, routinely gets more than 100 new criminal cases every week. It's not uncommon to have as many as 150 or 170 new criminal cases in a week. At the time this -- this all arose, this was just another matter coming into a MASH unit that at the time wouldn't have seemed significant in the context of rapes and burglaries and robberies and all the other things going on. I don't remember. It may have sat on my desk for a number of days.
Q. Well, when you did review the information, did you take any further steps to do an investigation or to gather information?
A. I did write a letter at some point asking for a more complete appraisal or another appraisal from command staff, is my memory, from the University of Oregon.

MS. COIT: Permission to approach, Your Honor?
Permission to approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. It's Exhibit 373. Do you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. What is that?
A. This is a letter I wrote on June 30th of 2014 addressed to
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Chief Carolyn McDermed at the U of O PD.
Q. Do you recall if you also sent the same letter to the chiefs of police at Coburg and/or Junction City?
A. I did either the same letter or something substantially similar.
Q. What was --

MS. COIT: Your Honor, I offer 373 and permission to
publish.
MR. MCDOUGAL: No objection.
THE COURT: All right. 273?
MS. COIT: 373.
THE COURT: 373. Any objection, Counsel?
MR. MCDOUGAL: No objection.
THE COURT: It's received. You may publish.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. What was the purpose in writing this letter to the chiefs of local police?
A. The other chiefs would have supervised Mr. Cleavenger, because my understanding was that he also volunteered or worked as a reserve deputy for those agencies, and I was trying to find out if there was other information that would bear on his Brady status.
Q. So this was part of the investigation that you were undertaking at the district attorney's office?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. In the material that was given to you by the department, the University of Oregon Police Department, there was reference to an arbitration decision. Do you recall that?
A. I don't actually recall that.
Q. Okay. Would an arbitrator's decision, their actual findings regarding an officer's termination grievance, would that be information that you would want when you were conducting your analysis of Brady information?
A. As a general rule, I want all the information people are willing to share, anything which they think might bear on it; but there isn't anything in -- about an arbitrator's decision which is particularly weighty for me, for lots of reasons.
Q. What are those reasons?
A. In -- in my experience -- I have quite a bit of experience with arbitrators, working in the law enforcement world, and, in my experience, many of them fail to understand how law enforcement is different from other professions. Particularly in the area of character offenses.

So, for example, in many professions, an indiscretion which shows a character weakness or a lapse in truthfulness isn't a career ender, but it can be and should be in many cases in law enforcement.

And I've had arbitrators require reinstatement of officers that we couldn't possibly put on the stand. I can think of one in particular and the -- the --
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THE COURT: Excuse me for just a moment. Why don't we stand up for just a second to stretch.

Thank you. Be seated.
Please continue.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Please continue with your answer.
A. Not long before this case came up, we had a situation in which an officer from another agency had been found untruthful in terms of his recording of evidence, how evidence was handled and managed in a particular case. That officer was terminated for untruthfulness and ultimately acknowledged that the police report that he wrote was not accurate, that what he had described had not actually happened, and that he had not been candid when he was interviewed by internal investigations. So it was clear he hadn't told the truth.

At arbitration, he claimed he was suffering from posttraumatic stress as a result of his divorce that was 18 months prior to this incident. Now, nobody in -- in the DA community could have found that a sensible explanation, no jury would have found that, in my opinion, a sensible explanation, and none of the cops with whom this officer worked found it a sensible explanation; but, inexplicably, the arbitrator did, and the agency was ordered to reinstate that officer.

We told police agency -- I told the police agency I didn't care if he was reinstated or not. I would never call him as a
witness because I couldn't trust his word.
So that's why an arbitrator's opinion or findings by itself is not particularly weighty. You know, if the
arbitration -- there are many confident arbitrators. If the investigation uncovered critical information, I would want to know about that.

It's just that an arbitrator's ruling isn't something I would ever substitute for our judgment, because I can't. It wouldn't be ethical to do that, and it wouldn't be reliable to do that.
Q. So the information that was submitted to you regarding Mr. Cleavenger, have you reviewed that?
A. Yes. But it's been quite a long time.
Q. At the time that you reviewed it, did you form an opinion
on -- as to whether or not that was the sort of information
that you wanted law enforcement agencies to provide to you to make a credibility determination?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that opinion?
A. I believe that it was -- that the -- the information was the sort of information that I would be obliged to turn over to a criminal defense lawyer. It wasn't conclusory, but it was the sort of information that a defense attorney would want to have and it's the sort of information that a criminal defendant ought to have, if it exists, because it might tend to erode the
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strength of the officer's testimony in the eyes of the jury. Q. So under your interpretation of a district attorney's obligations under Brady, knowing about this information regarding Mr. Cleavenger, did you, as a district attorney, have the obligation to turn it over to criminal defendants? A. Yes. And -- yes. The information that we had in that -in -- that was provided by the University of Oregon was the sort of information that we should have. It wasn't so much information that I felt like we could make determinations as to where Mr. Cleavenger fell on that spectrum, but it was enough so that it was clear we had an obligation to share it with the defense.

MS. COIT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Gardner. THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MCDOUGAL:

Q. You were the Lane County DA?
A. Yes. That's where Eugene is.
Q. Sorry. I'm Mark McDougal. We met briefly in the hall.
A. Yes. Briefly in the hall.
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Just to be clear, Lane County DA would be in charge of

```
prosecuting crimes that a Eugene Police Department person would
charge somebody with?
A. Yes. Eugene is one of the -- Eugene is the county seat
for Lane County, so it's inside of Lane County.
Q. And Carolyn McDermed was a state police officer for
Eugene; right?
A. Yes, sir. For a long time.
Q. Okay. And you ran across her, undoubtedly?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Dealt with her, undoubtedly?
A. Yes, sir. I don't have any specific recollections, but
her face was very familiar.
Q. And she was involved in IA too; right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, let's look at the Brady v. Maryland case. Do you
know what year that was decided?
A. I don't, sir. I didn't look it up before coming to court.
Q. Could it have been cited before I was born? Is it that
old?
    THE COURT: Well, we don't know when you were born,
Counsel.
    MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: Very old, Your Honor.
    MR. MCDOUGAL: Very old.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. And the obligations for police agencies to make these --
```
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give information has been around for a long time -- give information to the DA, if they have something; right?
A. Yes. As I said, the obligation has been evolving through more recent cases. But, yes, the obligation has existed. In fact, I think what Brady found was that the obligation has always existed.
Q. And for years people have been put on a Brady list or a Brady list disclosure, whatever you want to call it; correct?
A. There's no Brady list at Lane County. I understand some counties maintain a list, and for years I -- I can't tell you how long the cases have been processed in this manner. I can tell you that it just wasn't -- the obligation wasn't understood in the same way that it's understood now.
Q. Well, now it's different because you have an affirmative duty, the DA has an affirmative duty to go out and get information because of the Byers case; correct?
A. Yes, sir. I believe Byers is the one that essentially -forgive me, because I haven't plowed back through this in a very long time, of the case, actually reading the case, but is Byers the case that says that the DA has the obligation to disclose even the information of which we are not aware? Q. That's my understanding. You have the affirmative duty to go out and try to collect it.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you know when that case came out?
A. No, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, in the 2000s, before 2010, people were being Brady-listed; right?
A. Yes, sir. To one degree or another. Depending on the jurisdiction.
Q. Just to be clear, when you say Eugene doesn't have a Brady list, instead it has a Brady database?
A. Yes. To be clear, the DA's office has a data management program, a case management program, and we enter witnesses and other information in there, and this program allows us to flag a witness that has some Brady-related concern. So if a DA pulls up that case before witnesses are subpoenaed, they can see that that particular witness has some related concern. Q. One way to do it would be to do a list hold and the other is a database; right? Technology has improved?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Any doubt in your mind, whatsoever, that Carolyn McDermed was aware of Brady disclosure requirements when she worked at Eugene Internal Affairs?
A. Sir, that would be a better question for her. I don't
recall ever having that -- discussing Brady with the internal affairs folks prior to Ms. McDermed's move to the $U$ of $O$.
Q. Let me approach. Can you take a look at that document?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: 273?
THE COURT: Is this 273?
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MR. MCDOUGAL: Can you read the exhibit number?
THE COURT: What number is it?
THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Exhibit 215.
THE COURT: 215. Thank you.
BY MR. mCDougAL: (Continuing)
Q. Have you had a chance to read the email?
A. Yes, sir. I'm a slow reader when the font is this small.
It was helpful when it was blown up on the screen. I'm plowing
through.
Q. I can put it on the screen. Is that an email that you
wrote?
A. Yes, sir. Definitely that. I recognize my --
THE COURT: You want to receive it, Counsel, at this
time? 215?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.
you want.
BY MR. mCDougAL: (Continuing)
Q. Can you see it better now?
A. Yes, sir. And now I've got my glasses on.
Q. What date did you write this email?
A. March 5th of 2012.
Q. And did you send it to Carolyn McDermed?
A. Yes, sir. And all the other chiefs, sir.
Q. What was it about?

MR. MCDOUGAL: Can you read the exhibit number? THE COURT: What number is it? THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Exhibit 215. THE COURT: 215. Thank you.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Have you had a chance to read the email?
A. Yes, sir. I'm a slow reader when the font is this small.
It was helpful when it was blown up on the screen. I'm plowing
through.
Q. I can put it on the screen. Is that an email that you
wrote?
A. Yes, sir. Definitely that. I recognize my --
THE COURT: You want to receive it, Counsel, at this
time? 215?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.
THE COURT: 215 is received. You can display it if
you want.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. Can you see it better now?
A. Yes, sir. And now I've got my glasses on.
Q. What date did you write this email?
A. March 5th of 2012.
Q. And did you send it to Carolyn McDermed?
A. Yes, sir. And all the other chiefs, sir.
Q. What was it about?
A. It's about Brady

2 Q. Okay. And it's telling -- reminding chiefs about their duty to disclose under Brady, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And do you recall the date of the internal affairs
investigation done of Mr. Cleavenger?
A. No, sir.
Q. Okay. But was one purpose of this email to say, "Hey, if somebody is under investigation, we might need to know when they're under investigation"?
A. Yes, sir. It's a reminder of the Brady obligations and a request to be made aware of any relevant material.
Q. So if an investigation started a month later, your whole purpose of this email was to say, "Hey, we want to know"?
A. Yeah. I think I've said essentially that. At least that's what I tried to say.
Q. And you told them that there would be problems for the prosecutor's office if they didn't do so; right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, do you still have Exhibit 364 with you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. On page 11 of -- just to be sure. It's the best practices, the document that you helped prepare.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Way back in 2005 -- here's what I want to make sure of:
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There should be no confusion that the duty of a chief to make a Brady disclosure has been around a long time; correct -- to provide the information to the prosecutor?
A. Well, as I think I said, sir, the duty it rooted in the Constitution, so the duty has been around forever, but the awareness of the duty has not been complete, so that's -that's been evolving.

We have -- I think it's been clear that if you have a clearcut case of dishonesty involving an officer, if an officer just flat lies, I think everybody has understood that that would be -- require disclosure.

But prior to fairly recently, officers in that circumstance got terminated. The phrase in the law enforcement community was, "You lie, you die." Professionally, of course.

So what's changed over time is that we're -- the employment litigation has made it more difficult for police agencies to terminate officers who are having credibility problems, and that has sort of pushed Brady to the forefront. Many of the officers who would have been terminated in the years past are still at the agency and we're having to manage them through the Brady process, because they're still available as witnesses, they're still being deployed to investigate criminal cases.

So, yes, to answer your question, the duty has existed for a long time. The federal courts have made that clear. But our
understanding has been evolving.
Q. So your -- are you implying that at some point some police departments weren't Brady-disclosing according to the Constitution because they were afraid of employment litigation?
A. Sir, what I'm trying to make clear is that in the past the officers were just fired. There were no -- to Brady disclosure list is necessary if an officer has no cases pending and they've been terminated from the police agency.
Q. No cases pending is the key; right?
A. Yes. But in -- in some cases in the past -- I mean, some instances in the past, I'm sure the pending criminal cases were just dismissed.

We would do that in cases where, for example, the officer that I just spoke of -- once we made a determination that we would never call that person as a witness, we would look at the prior cases. And obviously if it's a murder case and there are 40 other witnesses, then we can proceed on that and that case will survive; but if it's a drug case and that officer is the only one to make the case, that case would be dismissed.

So no disclosure. There would be no obligation to disclose because he's not a witness.
Q. Have you ever had the situation -- you're a lawyer -where there was a trial or a hearing and then you tell somebody the result and they say, "Well, I can't believe that"? A. Of course.
Q. Okay. And that's because they didn't hear the evidence?
A. Sir, sometimes it's because they're familiar with the evidence and they can't believe the result occurred.

For example, the OJ case, sir, most of the folks that I know who were familiar with the evidence in that case were befuddled by the result because it was compelling evidence.
Compelling evidence. I saw it at a homicide training. It was hard to imagine how that could have been put in front of a jury and an acquittal would result. But our system isn't perfect, sir.
Q. My question is before you make an opinion about whether an arbitration decision should be considered or not, shouldn't you at least read it?
A. Sir, I think what I should have if -- if you are asking me in my role of DA, I should have the benefit of whatever information the arbitrator had. I don't need to know his conclusions, but I would like to know the benefit of evidence he reviewed.
Q. There might be occasions where his conclusions might be relevant; correct?
A. For example, sir?
Q. For example, what if his conclusions showed and it was supported by a narrative that the person making the Brady report had bias?
A. Sir, what I'm trying to say is I would want any evidence,
but I would not -- I could not substitute the arbitrator's judgment for mine or that of my team.
Q. I'm not asking you to substitute it. I'm asking you to consider it.
A. Sir, what I would like is the benefit of all the
information he had and -- and I -- without knowing him, sir, I wouldn't necessarily value his conclusions.
Q. And not to be -- the question might sound rude to people who don't know the answer. In fact, your personal opinion, in the end, when it comes to this and whether or not you have to disclose materials to the defense, doesn't really matter; right?
A. I'm not sure I follow --
Q. You get the Bradymaterials?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You could say, "I believe Mr. Cleavenger is the most honest man in the world. This is crazy."
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You've still got to give them over?
A. That's true. You're right, sir. That's accurate. It's
not my personal opinion about his veracity that matters in that context.
Q. When you're talking about, you know, do you trust jurors to make such determinations -- you said you don't go for the arbitrators. What about jurors?
A. Was there a jury decision in this case, sir?
Q. No.
A. I'm not aware of any jury decisions in the Cleavenger case.
Q. I'm asking if there was one.
A. Sir, I guess if there was a jury finding of dishonesty, that would be Brady-relevant. I wouldn't know -- I couldn't imagine the context in which a jury would be deciding a Brady-related issue, other than whether or not the defendant was convicted of a crime, but I value the opinions of people who are familiar with the officer at issue. That's the whole point. I'm trying to poll, essentially, for lack of a better word, his professional peers or his supervisors.
Q. When it comes to the truthfulness that you're evaluating for Brady purposes -- and, to be clear, you're evaluating to see what tier to put them on; right?
A. I'm evaluating first to see whether I have an obligation to disclose, and, yes, second, to see what tier they should be on.

That's one of the pieces of this system that -- that works better, if you will, that provides some margin for the person who's being scrutinized, because there's an area in which, as you've highlighted, whether I believe the officer is truthful or not truthful, I have the obligation to turn the evidence over to the defendant or the defense attorney, because it will
be evaluated in the process. And many cases like that, under these proposed guidelines, we would be looking to the judge to help us make a determination about whether we had that duty. We would basically say, "Your Honor, here's this information. We're not sure if this -- if we're required to disclose this or if a jury should hear about this. Could the Court provide some direction on that?"

That's the whole idea.
Q. When it comes to truthfulness, when you're evaluating for the tier purposes, you're talking about a knowing and intentional lie; correct? Not inadvertence?
A. I -- I can't think of a situation in which a lie is inadvertent.
Q. No, no. Sometimes people can be inadvertent?
A. Well, so, for example, if I may, a person can be mistaken about something.
Q. Right.
A. Right. And that's not a lie. That's making a mistake.
Q. Now, if, just hypothetically, you were given a summary, the Brady -- there was a letter on top of the Brady list.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Can you pull up the exhibit? MR. HESS: Exhibit 150? MR. MCDOUGAL: Yeah, 150. THE WITNESS: I don't have that one. //1
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BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. He's going to put it on the screen for you. Were you given this document?
A. I believe so, sir. I'm not a hundred percent sure. It's been quite a while. But it looks familiar.
Q. And I'm not going to mislead you in front of defense counsel. This is what they've said they gave you. Okay?

Would you expect a document of this caliber to have been reviewed with a fine-tooth comb for accuracy?
A. I would expect that they're giving me the best information they can, sir. Yes, I would expect it to be accurate. I mean, we all make mistakes, but I would expect it to be truthful and accurate.
Q. If there are statements in it that are demonstratively false, is there any repercussion s to anybody involved in making it?
A. Repercussion in the sense of professional sanctions or -Q. Any --
A. I guess I would need more context, sir.

But, generally speaking, we're all expected to do our best to communicate truthfully and candidly. So if there are statements in here which are incorrect, I would expect people to correct them.
Q. Well, let me -- at that -- but that's one setting. You're making a formal document. You have all the time to prepare.

It's a serious accusation against somebody's career. That's one scenario we looked at whether or not somebody gets it right; right? A. Okay.
Q. Another scenario, what if you asked somebody where they parked a week after, and they got it wrong by 50 feet, does that have anything to do with Brady-listing?
A. If it's just a mistake, it wouldn't have anything to do with Brady-listing. No, sir.
Q. And I --
A. Just as, sir -- if I may, just as if somebody said what
did you have -- where were you for dinner on last Thursday night, and I said I was at the pizza place, when really I was at the steak place, because I had forgot where I had dinner; or, on the other hand, if the pizza place was an alibi for a robbery that I had committed, then people around me might infer that I was intentionally representing. Right?
Q. Certainly.
A. So -- so a mistake is just a mistake. It's not a lie.
Q. I -- I agree. That's the point I'm trying to make.
A. We're on the same page, sir.
Q. Are you suggesting that every time a police officer violates constitutional rights, that that police officer should be put on your Brady-list or a Brady disclosure made to you that that happened?
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A. No, sir.
Q. Okay. There was some talk about that, but routinely police officers -- I'm not saying every day -- they do illegal searches, illegal seizures; correct?
A. Yes. That's true. I think the -- for me, the -- the issue is it's of significance whether the officer was intentionally doing something wrong.

So, if I may, sir, what was constitutional under the case law 20 years ago and what is said to be constitutional today are very different.
Q. Oh, understood.
A. So when officers have the training of 10 years ago or 20 years ago and they're not updated on the latest court decisions, they can be doing what they were told to do by last year's court or last decade's court, and now we find that that is no longer okay.

We don't -- we want them to do the best, but --
Q. And if Mr. Cleavenger is currently -- well, let me put it this way: If Mr. Cleavenger was called as a witness the day after you got these materials, you would have had to disclose them?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. If he's called as a witness next week, you'll have to disclose them?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Just give me a second.
That's all I have.
THE COURT: Redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COIT:
Q. Mr. Gardner, this Brady best practices, Exhibit 364, that we talked about earlier, do you recall sending this document to the chiefs of police sometime around the time it was completed ? A. I don't -- I don't remember whether it was this version of the document, but I do remember sharing as the document evolved.
Q. That would have been in 2014?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. And the recipient of that would have been Chief McDermed? A. Yes.

MS. COIT: That's all I have. Thank you very much. THE COURT: Recross?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MCDOUGAL:
Q. If there was an email that you sent to Chief McDermed showing an earlier version, would you have a copy of it? That was sent to her.
A. It would be in the county's email database, sir. We're required to keep all that.
Q. And you would expect her to have a copy of it too? Public records?
A. She has the same -- the University of Oregon has the same data retention requirements the county does, sir.
Q. If it's contended that she got an earlier email and it's never given to this jury, that's pretty good evidence she -MS. COIT: Your Honor, I object to this. There is no basis for making this statement.
THE COURT: No, it -- if there's a database kept, you

## can ask the question, Counsel.

BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. If it's contended she got an earlier email and it's not shown to this jury, it's pretty good evidence she didn't get it?
A. Are you -- are you asking me -- are you asking me if it's good evidence that she -- I'm not sure what you're asking me. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: It's confusing. If you're asking about the database, the retention, accessibility, you know, that's fine.
BY MR. MCDOUGAL: (Continuing)
Q. The email would be easily accessible?
A. Yes, sir. If either -- either the plaintiff or the
defense had requested that, made a public records request for any such document, we would have produced it for either party .
Q. And in your understanding of things, it would also be
easily accessible by the UOPD?
A. Yes, sir. I would assume.

MR. MCDOUGAL: Thank you.
THE COURT: May the witness be excused, Counsel?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes.
MS. COIT: Yes.
THE COURT: Excused?
MS. COIT: Yes.
THE COURT: Counsel, excused?
MR. MCDOUGAL: Yes. Sorry.
THE COURT: Sir, thank you very much. Step down.
And, Counsel, who is your next witness?
MS. COIT: Mark Chase.
THE COURT: Will he be lengthy? I'm trying to gauge
where we take a break. I don't want to interrupt.
MS. COIT: If you want my opinion, this would be a great time for a bathroom break.

THE COURT: Don't discuss this matter amongst yourselves or follow jurors. Don't express any opinions. Get you back in 20 minutes. Thanks a lot.
(Jury not present.)
THE COURT: Counsel, go take a break.
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> (Recess taken.)
> (Jury present.)

THE COURT: That's all right. So we're back in session. The jury is present. All counsel are present. And, Counsel, your next witness, please.

MS. COIT: Defense calls Mark Chase.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you would step
forward into the well and be kind enough to raise your right hand, sir.

## MARK CHASE

called as a witness in behalf of the Defendants, being first
duly sworn, is examined and testified as follows:
THE WITNESS: I do.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please be seated in the
witness box. The entrance is closest to the wall. After
you're seated, will you pull that chair as close as you can to the microphone so we can hear you?

Please be seated. And if you face the jury and state your full name and spell your last.

THE WITNESS: My name is Mark Chase, C-H-A-S-E.
THE COURT: Maybe you're the one witness who can slide back.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
A JUROR: You don't need a microphone.

BY MS. COIT:
Q. Thank you. Chief Chase, can you tell us your current position?
A. I'm the City of Junction City chief of police.
Q. How long have you been the chief of police for Junction City?
A. Since April of 2009.
Q. Can you describe for us your educational and your law enforcement background?
A. Yes. I have a -- let's see here. 32 years of experience.

I started when I was a senior in high school, actually, as a volunteer, and then worked as a cadet for Salem Police Department, and then I -- after being a cadet, I applied for a jail position in Marion County, Oregon, down there in Salem. I worked as a jail deputy for about nine months, and then I got hired full time at the City of Dallas, where I grew up and went to school at.

From there, I worked for Dallas Oregon Police Department for 11 years. I worked pretty much every position there, except a supervisory position, when some of my old friends at Salem Police Department recruited me back to work for Salem Oregon Police Department in the capital city of Oregon. I worked there for about 11 years, 10 and a half years. I worked patrol, gang enforcement youth services. I worked the variety
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of jobs throughout my career.
And then in 2009 my mentor said I was ready for a chief 's
job, and so I started applying and accepted the one at Junction City where I've been at nine years.

I have a bachelor of science degree and associate of arts degree in criminal justice, law enforcement, and I don't recall how many hours I have, but I did take some master's coursework in constitutional law up here in Portland at Lewis and Clark College, but I never did finish my master's degree.
Q. Thank you. And you talk a little fast, so slow down a tiny bit for the court reporter. Okay?
A. Sure.
Q. Were you in the position of chief of Junction City when

Mr. Cleavenger began working at the department?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Did you know Mr. Cleavenger prior to then?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you recall the month and year that Mr. Cleavenger started working at the department?
A. Well, reviewing some of the documents, I think it was in 2010 or '11, but I'm not certain. I would have to look at the paperwork in order to be certain.
Q. All right. Do you recall if he was one of the first wave of reserves that you hired at Junction City?
A. I believe he was.
Q. Tell us about the reserve program that you implemented at Junction City.
A. Well, there was already a reserve program at Junction City
at the time when I came, but I kind of pulled back the reserve program because of what I felt was a lack of training and oversight of the program. We kind of restarted it again. And so we went out for hiring just like a regular application for a police officer. They go through the same process.

Now they go through the same process. At the time, we never did a psychological evaluation on any of the reserves that we hired. However, now we do that.

And so we had different coordinators, and they got accepted to the position and did a full background. And then went to the Lane County Sheriff's Office Reserve Academy. It's not a basic police academy. It's a shortened version of it. It has local instructors. And they use a different curriculum but it's real similar to what the Department of Public Safety Standard and Training uses at the Oregon Police Academy in Salem.

And so after that first group graduated, then we began the field training process for them.
Q. Did you hire Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall interviewing him?
A. I've interviewed him a couple of times, I believe.
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Probably for his reserve -- I usually have a chief's interview, kind of get to know the candidates and why they're there. I did that. I do that both for reserves and for full-time positions. If I recall correctly, I interviewed him once as a reserve and once as a full-time officer candidate.
Q. Do you recall what he told you about himself when he interviewed as a reserve?
A. I remembered, in particular, I was kind of curious why he was wanting to be a police officer if he graduated from law school, and so we talked a lot about that, and he said he had a passion for being a police officer. I don't recall specifically, but I do remember wondering and being kind of curious as to why would you choose law enforcement, which is a lesser paid job, less -- most often cases, over a -- you know, being an attorney, and he just said he wanted to get as much experience as he could being a police officer and that would help him with his law degree.
Q. All right. Can you explain to the jury the role of a reserve officer under your administration at Junction City?
A. Yes. They are not what we call a solo officer. They're a volunteer. Sometimes they have paid positions. But they support the full-time police officers. So they have functions down there. We have the Scandinavian Festival, which has been going on for about 50 years and it requires a lot of additional security. When I first got there the reserve program only had
a few members, and that was one of the reasons why I wanted to expand the reserve program so we didn't have to hire out from other agencies. We could support the security within our own department.

So they provide security for Scandinavian Festival. We have a number of other events within the community, like Function for Junction, Trout Function, to name -- name some of them. They provide patrol and security for that.
Q. Describe the mix of people that you have as reserve officers at Junction City. Do they generally have other jobs? A. Some do and some are going to college, and so I always try to create a reserve program where we have some -- I do know that we have some that work full time. In fact, we have one that works full time at the University of Oregon as a -- he was an officer there and still works there and works as a reserve officer with us.

We have some that -- we just hired -- one of our reserves, he was an auto body man in an auto body shop, and going to school, and trying to become a police officer, and he was reserve for us for six years, and I just hired him a few months ago.

We have males and females at different educational levels and different educational background, but it's a mix of people that have full-time jobs that just want to volunteer and enjoy being a law enforcement officer part time, as well as those who
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actually are younger and are striving to be a full-time police officer.

I was a reserve officer before, and I knew the value that it had. It can give you a beginning start to becoming a full-time police officer, but there's a big difference between, you know, being a reserve officer part time and being a full-time police officer.
Q. All right. You touched briefly on some of the limitations reserve officers had. Can you just explain that more for us? A. Yeah, they have to -- there's a phase process that we have in our policies, so they're required to go through certain training and evaluation and then testing before they would become ultimately solo, where they could work solely by themselves.

We're a small agency, and so reserves aren't ever allowed to work by themselves without any other full-time officer being present out in the field.

I do have a couple that we've hired as temp hires, but they work under -- either ride with an officer, or they patrol around and do, like, ordinance enforcement, sometimes traffic stops, but their authority is limited. They can't -- they can arrest, they can make -- write reports, but they have to work under the direction of the officer that's on the shift at that time.
Q. What is the purpose of having those limitations on your
reserves?
A. They don't have the training and experience and haven't been through the full-time police academy, and for me it's a liability issue to have a reserve officer out there working by themselves, without any supervision, when they haven't received the certifications from the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, which is the Oregon Police Academy. That program is 16 weeks versus a reserve academy is six months, but it's part time on Tuesday and Thursday evenings and once in a while on a Saturday.
Q. Was Mr. Cleavenger ever a solo reserve officer for Junction City?
A. No.
Q. Did he have authority as a Junction City reserve to act solo to make traffic stops?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever supervise Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Not directly.
Q. Who were his direct supervisors?
A. Well, let's see, it was probably -- the first -- we had a number of reserve coordinators. I would say Brandon Nicol, John Thornburg, Corey Mertz, and maybe Eric Markell. It's been six and a half years, so there's been a number of people, and I can't remember when he exactly left and when that transition was between coordinators.
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Q. So when a reserve is in the field training program, is it his field training officer who's the supervisor?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when they're out of field training, do they have one supervisor or are all of their regular officers considered their supervisor?
A. Directly, they -- whoever the officer is on duty at the time basically has authority over the reserve, but primarily it's a reserve coordinator and then whoever the patrol sergeant is at the time.
Q. Do you recall who Mr. Cleavenger's field training officer was?
A. If I recall correctly, I think it was Cory Mertz.
Q. Were you aware of Mr. Cleavenger and Mr. Mertz's friendship?
A. Yes. Late -- as they work ed together, it was -- it became apparent that they associated with each other off duty and on duty.
Q. Did that raise any concerns for you?
A. At that level, not necessarily, no. Officers often do that and do things together privately. For a chief, I don't think it's appropriate to fraternize with the officers. That's just my personal philosophical belief.
Q. Is Officer Mertz still working at Junction City?
A. I've been advised by our city attorney that I'm not to
disclose personal, medical or disciplinary action under ORS 40.270, and so we're -- he -- I can't -- unless -- that's what our city attorney advised that I was supposed to say that. I'm not refusing to answer the question, but I was asked if I was asked about certain things that under Oregon law I can't disclose why -- what his status is.

THE COURT: Is that going to cause a problem for either one of you?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: It might for me.
THE COURT: So, Counsel, will he be stepping down, or how are we going to resolve this? I can strike his testimony.

MS. COIT: It's not a problem for me.
THE COURT: Well, it is for the defense if he's going
to be called. We were going to have a full hearing here.
MS. COIT: If Mr. Mertz or Cory Mertz is being called?

THE COURT: No. If Chief Chase is being called. It won't be a partial hearing, though. I just don't know if you're going to be asked questions. I appreciate the city attorney's advice, and it may be wise, but as far as my Court is concerned, it's irrelevant.

So how are we going to resolve that? Why don't you two talk about that for just a moment.

Why don't you give us a few moments. My apologies. I'll send you back. I don't want this to take place in your
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presence. We'll come back and get you in one second or two hours. Just kidding you. We'll come back and get you very shortly.
(Jury not present.)
THE COURT: Chief, I don't want you in that position in front of the jurors. I understand you're not refusing to answer the question. Just have a seat. Counsel, why don't we listen to the colloquy I'm about to have with the chief. I didn't want this discussion to take place in the jurors' presence, because obviously you're not refusing to answer the question, but then you have to explain it to the jury.

But at the same token, I appreciate the city attorney's advice, but it's irrelevant for my court. I didn't want to make the ruling in front of the jury ordering you to answer the question, because it would make it appear that you were reluctant.

So, first, I can simply strike your testimony and let you go have a nice holiday. I don't think either side wants that. I can overrule the city attorney and order you to answer, and then you've got a choice to make. But I didn't know what you were going to say in front of the jury, so I wanted to have that conversation with you.

So, Counsel, do you know what -- I don't know -- I know that the defense is calling, probably, as a practical matter, will avoid it. The inference has already been created there's
something wrong out there. Mental, physical, something. And I can bet you that the plaintiff is going to want to bear right in on that and ask you right in front of the jury, and now we're in that awkward position.

So if Officer Mertz is on some kind of stress leave or if he's had some difficulty with the department that bears on his bias or ability to testify, that may be -- well, let's see, just a moment.

Officer Cory Mertz previously testified. He was the 15th witness, I believe. The 16th witness.

The only part of the testimony, counsel, was that he was currently -- it was on cross-examination. It was brought up by the defense that he was currently on leave. He was on medical leave four months from Junction City, but we didn't get into the specifics of what that medical leave was.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Correct. So let -- but there was more things that were asked. Defense counsel asked Mertz if he had ever been disciplined for putting false information into a probable cause affidavit.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: I need to be able to inquire with
this chief, is that true, and I need to be able to then refute that, potentially, through rebuttal testimony if he answers yes. And --

THE COURT: Do we know the answer to that before we

Chase - D
ask that question?
MS. COIT: He said no.
THE COURT: Well, I didn't hear that.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Well --
MS. COIT: Not from the chief. Officer Mertz said

THE COURT: Not from this witness, Counsel.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: I want to inquire with this witness since defense counsel raised this issue about whether Mertz had been disciplined for putting false information into a probable cause affidavit. I want to ask him if that's true.

THE COURT: Do either one of you have information about that independent of asking the chief? In other words, with all this discovery, much of which I may not be aware of, do you know if there's an accusation he's on leave because of an alleged false probable cause affidavit?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: No, I don't think it's disputed he's on medical leave. It's not related to that. However, they put before this jury the idea that he fabricated something -- Mr. Mertz did. I believe, from what I've been told by Mr. Mertz, there is no discipline in his file, and I would like to confirm that with this witness.

THE COURT: Is that something that stops you from the direction of the county attorney or city attorney from
no. answering that question?
$\square$

教

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I was just advised to give reference to the statute of 40.270 on public officials giving disclosure about disciplinary matters and that if you ordered me to testify to it, that I would then testify to it.

THE COURT: I'm going to order you to testify. The reason for that is because it's relevant to this proceeding, but I didn't want to make that order in front of the jury. I think it creates a bias towards you, as if the Court is having you to order you to do something, when, in good faith, you've received legal advice from a city attorney.

THE WITNESS: I understand.
THE COURT: Does that relieve you -- well --
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I can't ask you your opinion if that relieves you of the obligation, but thank the city attorney for the advice and that it's been rejected.

Be kind enough to get the jury.
That way, Counsel, also, you know, and you can inquire if you choose to in your case-in-chief or leave it to the defense.

MS. COIT: Do you want me to ask him again why Mr. Mertz is on leave?

THE COURT: I'm not wanting you to do anything. I'm just saying you've heard my ruling. Now you're not prohibited from that area. That's your tactical choice whether to bring it up or have the defense bring it up.
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(Jury present.)
THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated.
All right. Counsel, if you would like to continue with your direct examination.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Chief Chase, when Mr. Cleavenger was a reserve officer, did you receive information that he was writing other officers' reports?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that raise any -- does that raise any concerns for you?
A. Absolutely. If an officer has got to write a report and they sign their name at the bottom, indicating they're the ones that actually wrote the content of that report, and if somebody else wrote that for them, and they put their signature on it, then that wouldn't be a true representation that they actually wrote that report.

Reserve officers can write their own report if they both witnessed the same thing or working on a case. A reserve officer could write their report, sign their name, and the officer as full time can sign their name. But you should never have another officer write a report and then have somebody else sign their name.
Q. Did Mr. Cleavenger always follow the Junction City policy about reserves not working alone?

```
A. No.
Q. Tell me about that.
A. I learned from Sergeant Salsbury that -- about -- shortly
after the time that he left the University of Oregon employment
that he also made another traffic stop unauthorized. He was
going out to get, if I recall correctly, he was going out to
get fuel for the car, and so he was by himself in the car. On
the way back to the station, he made a traffic stop, which he
did not have the authority to do.
Q. Did you instruct Sergeant Salsbury to speak to
Mr. Cleavenger about that?
A. Yes.
Q. What were you -- what did you tell Sergeant Salsbury to
tell Mr. Cleavenger?
A. To remind him that he did not have the authority to do
that and that was the same issues that I had been briefed on by
the University of Oregon that he had done and that if he wanted
to continue to be a reserve that he needed to stay within the
policy.
Q. Did you at any time tell Sergeant Salsbury that you were
considering ending Mr. Cleavenger's relationship with Junction
City?
A. Yes, I did
Q. Did Sergeant Salsbury relate -- to your knowledge, relate
that information to Mr. Cleavenger?
```

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Objection.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if he did or not. THE COURT: Counsel?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Objection. That's hearsay -hearsay within hearsay.

THE COURT: Well, his answer was, "I don't know if he did or not."

MR. JASON KAFOURY: As I was objecting, that's what he said.

THE COURT: It's not necessarily hearsay within
hearsay. It's whether it has the foundation. You weren't present. You don't know. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Pardon me, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You don't know if Salsbury --
THE WITNESS: Correct. I don't know if he did or
didn't.
THE COURT: Overrule the objection.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Shortly after you had this discussion with

Sergeant Salsbury about Mr. Cleavenger's employment at Junction
City, were you informed that Mr. Cleavenger had decided to resign?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you in the office when Mr. Cleavenger resigned?
A. I don't recall whether I was or was not. I don't
remember.
Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Cleavenger about his decision to resign?
A. I think Sergeant Salsbury -- I directed -- it was all
through Sergeant Salsbury and he turned in a memo to me that he
wanted to resign from the police department.
Q. Okay. And did he, in fact, resign at that time?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Did he give any notice?
A. No. It was like immediately.
Q. Do you recall the time of day that he resigned?
A. I -- I don't remember. Sorry.
Q. Did Mr. Cleavenger ever apply for a full-time officer position at Junction City?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And was this in 2012, as you recall?
A. That's the -- sounds about right. I would have to look at the testing process documents to determine for sure what date, but that sounds about right.
Q. Around the time period of 2012, what was your practice for selecting a new hire?
A. It's the same as it is today. They take a written post test issued by the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police. It's a series of four different sections, math, reading comprehension. They take that written test. If they receive a
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passing score on that, then they move on -- well, actually they take the OPAT, as well, which is the Oregon Physical Abilities Test, which basically simulates the job task analysis of strength and endurance that an officer has to face in the field if he's been in a fight.

So once they pass a written and a physical test, then they go on to an oral interview with a panelist from the police department. Sometimes a community member is present, another staff member from the city is present, to give us a good view of the candidates.

From that point on, then they -- sometimes -- it just depends if we can line it up -- they go do a community panel.

In Mr. Cleavenger's case, we had -- I had the public safety committee meetings. The council has a -- city council has a subgroup which is called the public safety committee. There's three city councilors that sit on that, and some have shared interest that they would like to participate in the process.

So we actually held a community interview with those three individuals, in which they then gave me -- we had three reserves at the time Mr. Cleavenger was going through the process, and they were just to give me their feelings, as far as how they -- best qualified, based upon their experience with the community, on a one-to-three basis.
Q. Did you have any role in the interview process, these
different parts of the application process you just described, when Mr. Cleavenger was applying for the job?
A. I don't recall if I was on the oral board when the
officers did their oral boards. Sometimes I will sit in, because I was fairly new at being the chief there, and I wanted to ensure, kind of accountability, as far as fairness in the process. So sometimes what I would do is sit on the oral board, not scoring, but I would be in the room present when they asked questions.

You have to be careful. Sometimes panels will ask candidates inappropriate questions, and you want to be protective of people's private information. So I would audit those oral boards.

The community panel, yes, I did participate in that. I asked some of the questions and kind of guided the panelist through that, and then they gave me their feedback at the end of talking to the three reserves that were taking the test to get on full time.
Q. Do you recall what the feedback was from the community panel?
A. Yeah.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Objection. Hearsay. THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. COIT: It goes to his state of mind in the selection process for the job.
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THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: We had Officer Perry Baker as number one. Number two was -- I'm trying to remember his name. Gosh. Jeremy Weldon was the second. And Mr. Cleavenger, James Cleavenger, was the third candidate.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Was that the ranking they gave?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. So overall, taking into account all parts of the
application process, where did Mr. Cleavenger finish?
A. Well, at the very last. He finished number three.
Q. Out of three?
A. Out of three.
Q. What's your practice with regard to who you hire at the end of the application process? Do you take the number one?
A. Not necessarily, no. I'll look at the top three candidates and decide from there which one is the best qualified, the best fit, and the best ready to go, especially when it comes to the reserve officers.

And then at that point we'll background them, even though they're a reserve officer, already gone through a background. I hire an outside background investigator from outside the department, so it's not the conflict of interest and somebody that knows the candidate inside. They'll do a background investigation on those candidates and then make a
recommendation to me whether or not they should move on in the process.

From that, then they go to a medical screening where they get drug tested and get their -- there's a VPSD form that the doctor has to fill out that they're required to meet vision and hearing and certain physical standards. Once they meet that, then they go on to a psychological evaluation, and we use Dr. Stewart in Corey's office up here in Lake Oswego. And then if they pass that, then they get to come on board. It's quite a process.
Q. How did you ultimately hire?
A. Officer Perry Baker.
Q. Okay. Talk to me a little bit about your understanding of the chief of police obligations today under Brady v. Maryland. A. That's been quite a hot topic. Over the last several years, we've had -- several years ago we had briefings from -a Chiefs Association representative, sheriff's office representative, and a representative from the Oregon District Attorney's Association. We received training regarding our responsibility and our obligation to report to a district attorney any issues that may be considered credibility or an officer being untruthful about anything, because the district attorney, then, has to disclose to the defense attorney potential issues that the officer has had with being untruthful.
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And so it's not a fun issue. It's been quite a -- there's a lot of debate going on still today, but we are required, as a chief of police, if we learn or hear about anything regarding an officer's credibility, we're required to forward that on to the district attorney's office so they could hand that over to the defense.
Q. And you said it is a hot topic. What do you mean by that? A. There -- well, during the Chiefs Association Meetings, we've had district attorney's office -- officers in there and talking about their opinion of Brady list and sometimes the three levels they have to choose from. Other district attorneys in other areas of the state don't use the same criteria as other district attorneys. And so we, as a Chiefs Association and Sheriff's Association, are trying to come up with some criteria, because there's times where -- in one instance that we were briefed on, where a chief of police from another jurisdiction did not agree with the district attorney's decision to place an officer on a Brady list, and that would prevent him from testifying, and, therefore, it would prevent the chief of police from employing that person in a capacity out in the field where they were interviewing people and taking reports. Because then he couldn't testify in court, because his credibility wasn't any good.

And just a discussion about how you go through that process in order to also hold officers accountable for being
truthful, but also protecting them, as a chief, if you don't feel that what they were untruthful about really was the truth or not. If that makes sense.

Hope I'm explaining that. It's a complicated matter.
And so I know there's been union debate over it, and cases where the chiefs and the unions have kind of fought back and forth trying to determine what level of Brady officers fit in.

But in -- at the end of the day, how I understand it now, as the chief of police, it's at the sole discretion of the district attorney to decide whether or not an officer's testimony is credible on the stand based upon previous truthfulness issues.

There's one case involving at the Salem Police Department, where I previously worked, where they talked about a judge actually, you know, without the jury being around, where -determined whether or not the officer has -- had to disclose that to the defense. I don't know what the outcome of that was, but that was something that, as a Chiefs Association, we like to have some third-party person make a decision about whether or not an officer is Brady or not just because it means their career. And having one person, the DA, make that final decision is pretty powerful and impactful on a police officer, and so we've petitioned for having discussions with them.

And I've sat down with our district attorney's office and discussed issues, as well, and cases and how they would handle
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that.
I'm the district representative for the District of
Oregon -- I'm on the board for the Oregon Chiefs Association, so I'm our district representative, so it's one of my responsibilities to talk to our district attorney's office and figure out how we're going to handle those and represent all the chiefs in our area.
Q. All right. All this discussion and debate that you've been describing over Brady obligations and disclosures, has that been occurring relatively recently?
A. Yeah. I became a chief in 2009. I would say it was a couple years after that. I would probably say it maybe 2011, 2012. It kind of became a hot topic.

In the last five years in Oregon, I think, if I recall correctly, the statistics for Oregon are like there's been over 80 officers that have been decertified and lost their jobs over truthfulness issues. And so it's the highest in the country. But I think it's also because we have the highest standards, professional standards, in the country for police officers.

But because of that, because so many officers have been decertified and lost their job regarding truthfulness issues, it is a sensitive topic and one that is high priority for district attorneys, chiefs of police, and sheriffs.
Q. Would you say that law enforcement's understanding of the obligations for disclosing information is changing even today?
A. Yeah. It's constantly evolving and changing on the level of information that is required of the chief of police or a sheriff to disclose to a district attorney. And -- and my personal take on that, as a leader of the organization, is that when in doubt you reveal everything to the district attorney and let them make that decision. I don't ever want to be in a position where I'm holding back information that an officer may be untruthful and then the district attorney's office loses a case because a defense attorney finds out about something, and it wasn't revealed at the time of trial.

So when in doubt, just disclose. I don't know how much detail you want to get in. But as a chief, people do lie against police officers. They'll come and file a complaint.

I've had cases involving myself where somebody comes in and makes a false accusation towards a police officer.

In one of my cases, we had it on video, and so once the city attorney was able to look at it and determine that, no, you did not use excessive force on that individual -- it's all on video -- then they realize that the person that's coming in to file a complaint is lying, or maybe they come in and they say they -- the officer said I was doing 85 in a 55 zone. Well, I was only doing 70. Well, that could be a truthfulness issue in court if a citizen is saying one thing and the officer is saying another.

So those are the minutia of talking about Brady that
sometimes we have to have a discussion that there's an internal affairs investigation against the officer for being untruthfulness on a traffic stop, what that determination is, and that's why there's the three levels of Brady. The top level being they're not going to be -- they cannot testify at all. And as I understand the second level, is where an officer is allowed to testify, but it's revealed that they have Brady issues. And then the third level is there's issues there, like we talked about, the speeding thing that really don't rise to the level of two or three that the district attorney's office is aware of, but isn't required, necessarily, to reveal that in court. Q. All right. In -- in mid-2014, do you recall being contacted by Alex Gardner regarding whether or not you had any credibility concerns about Mr. Cleavenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you plan to share those with the district attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. What happened? Well, did you ultimately share those with the district attorney?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Why not?
A. I was put on nonpaid disparate leave just shortly after I
received a letter from the district attorney by my city
administrator.
Q. Have you since learned that part of the reason you were
put on that leave was due to a complaint made by Mr. Cleavenger
about you?
A. I just recently learned that, yes.
Q. And what was the complaint that he made?
A. The complaint that he made was that I altered his written
test scores in order to illegally prevent him from becoming a
police officer with Junction City.
Q. And was that in that 2012 hiring process we just talked
about?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Did you alter his scores?
A. No, I did not. I didn't even -- I didn't even tabulate
the scores. My staff did that.
Q. Do you have an opinion on Mr. Cleavenger's truthfulness ?
A. He doesn't tell the truth.
Q. Has that allegation that Mr. Cleavenger made against you
been investigated?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. And has it been determined to be false?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. And you are fully reinstated as the chief of police for
Junction City, are you not?
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A. I am.

MS. COIT: Thank you. No further questions. THE COURT: Cross-examination

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY:
Q. It wasn't just my client who accused you of anything, was it, Chief Chase?
A. Could you be more specific?
Q. Yeah. The majority of your officers filed allegations against you with the city -- with Junction City, didn't they?
A. I don't know the answer to that question, because I have not been given the full complaints.
Q. Who found that my client's allegation was untrue?
A. That's a good question. I haven't been told yet.
Q. Wait a second. You just went and told this jury that somebody found that that was untrue, and you don't even know who it is?
A. There was a report that I was given by the city attorney, summarizing the complaints, general complaints against me, that one involving Mr. Cleavenger said it was unfounded. Whether that was by the investigator that investigated or by my former boss, Melissa Bowers, I don't know which one actually made that conclusion.
Q. Why didn't you bring that document to court?
A. I wasn't asked to.
Q. Okay. Unfounded is not the same as not true, is it? It means there's not enough evidence. Isn't that what unfounded means?
A. Could you be more specific, because each agency looks at sustained, not sustained, unfounded, and exonerated sometimes in a little different fashion.
Q. Unfounded generally means not enough evidence. It does not mean not sustained?
A. No. Unfounded basically means that the claim was not founded. Not sustained means that there's not evidence for or against one way or the other. So there's several different letters. Exonerated is that an officer did something, was accused of doing something, but they had legal rights to do what they did. That's called exonerated. That's the highest level. The next level is unfounded, meaning there's no information that leads the -- to the conclusion the situation occurred.
Q. Do you know that six of your officers have come in and not questioned anything about my client's truthfulness in this courtroom? Do you know that?
A. No, I do not.
Q. You didn't work with my client day to day out in the field, did you?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Let's go back to this investigation of you. How many months were you on administrative leave due to the investigation?
A. I was put on administrative leave on July 18th, and then I was reinstated -- I think it was February 2nd.
Q. Let's talk about this document that you got. Were all of the allegations against you in this document you got from the city attorney, were all of them listed?
A. I don't know, because I've never been able to see the whole investigation. That's still in process. So I just saw a summary of it, so I can't answer your question one way or the other.
Q. How many additional -- who gave you this summary?
A. It was the city attorney.
Q. Okay. And was the city attorney representing you at that time?
A. No, they were representing the city.
Q. Okay. How many other allegations were summarized in there in addition to my client's?
A. I can't recall exactly. It was probably about 10, 11 allegations that were made.
Q. Was one of those allegations that you disappeared your hairdresser's traffic ticket?
A. No. It wasn't that -- that's not -- that was not the complaint.
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documents. I was able to get a summary and look at it, but I don't have a copy of that with me.

One of them was that I embarrassed an employee using my bullhorn during parades. I talked about the Scandinavian Festival. I'll oftentimes get on and say, "Hey, there's Officer Cleavenger. You know, give him a hand. He does a good job for us, and he volunteers," and people clap and try to have a little fun and levity. Nothing inappropriate. That was one of them.

There was questions about my philosophy as a leader. And how I managed the police department. That's not uncommon. I mean, chiefs and sheriffs and all people get questioned about their leadership all the time. I'm trying to remember some of the other ones. That's all I can remember at this time. There were several.
Q. Okay. So there's close to a dozen allegations out against you, and those allegations are still under investigation. Is that what you're telling the jury?
A. No. I was cleared of any misconduct and returned to work -- I believe it was February 2nd.
Q. And yet you haven't seen the investigative reports.

That's what you're saying?
A. I have seen a summary of the investigative report. I have never seen the investigation itself.
Q. Did you have an attorney representing you through that

## process?

## A. Yes, I did.

Q. Now, you talked about my client's trustworthiness and you brought up a specific example. A traffic stop. I want you to tell me every detail that you can remember about that traffic stop that my client was involved in.
A. I can remember that the University of Oregon was investigating Mr. Cleavenger for making inappropriate stops outside of his authority, and I had asked my sergeant to look into that process and determine why he was terminated, and we didn't get notified of that in that process.

We started looking at Mr. Cleavenger's activities, and we found that he had made one traffic stop that we could find when he was coming back, we believe, from the gas pumps. And he was by himself, and he did not have authority to do that.

I don't recall --
Q. What day did it occur?
A. It was shortly after -- what I recall, it was in the fall of 2012. Shortly after he was terminated from the University of Oregon, as I recall, for doing the same thing. Then he did a stop with us and that was a serious concern to me.
Q. Was there a report written on this?
A. There was a report written by Chuck Salsbury about the traffic stop. He was counseled about that. There was a report written about the inquiry I asked the sergeant to do about the
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concerns that I had about him being terminated from University of Oregon Police Department, not notifying us that he was terminated and still working as a volunteer reserve police officer, and so I had asked the sergeant to look into that -those issues, because I was concerned that maybe there was something related that would cause liability for the City of Junction City.
Q. We're going to try to get through this quickly, but I would appreciate it if you would listen to my question and only answer my questions. They're very specific. Okay? I asked you: Would there be a piece of paper indicating this traffic stop that my client did?
A. A piece of paper? No, we have --
Q. Would there be a ticket that he wrote?
A. I don't recall if he wrote a ticket.
Q. Would there be a CAD report that would show where it happened?
A. Yes. There would be a CAD report.
Q. Would there be radio traffic that would show where it happened?
A. If he radioed it out, yes.
Q. And you didn't bring a shred of piece of paper to back up this allegation that this occurred, to this courtroom, did you?
A. I was not asked to bring any documentation.
Q. Defense counsel didn't say: Wow, you've got something
showing he did a traffic stop. Why don't you bring that to
court so that we can fully examine and discuss what date it
happened and what the context was. She didn't ask you to do
that?
A. No.
Q. And she -- defense counsel didn't ask you to bring this
letter from the city attorney exonerating you from all these
charges either?
A. No, she did not.
Q. Is it your testimony under oath that my client did not
disclose to the Junction City Police Department that he was
terminated from the University of Oregon?
A. Eventually he did, yes.
Q. And when did he do that?
A. I don't know exactly when he did, but it was months after
he was terminated.
Q. Now, you would agree that doing an evidence room audit is
a pretty trustworthy job, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that my client did the entire
Junction City evidence room audit at the end of 2012 after he
had been terminated at the University of Oregon?
A. Later, I was apprised of that, yes.
Q. Well, he only worked for you for three more months. So
when did you learn that he was doing that audit? when did you learn that he was doing that audit?
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A. You know, that's several years ago when I know he was doing an audit for Officer Corey Mertz, who's our accreditation manager, so he worked with, and part of our -- I don't want to answer too much of your question. I'm trying to explain it, so -- would you like me to go on or stop there?
Q. Well, it's a very simple question. It's a trustworthy job, and he did it for you three months before he resigned; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, there was some question s by defense counsel last week of some of the Junction City officers about whether or not my client was ever suspended. Was he ever suspended?
A. What do you mean by suspended?
Q. Was he ever suspended at Junction City? It's a very simple question. Yes or no?
A. I'd asked the sergeant to not allow him to be a reserve for a period of time while he investigated the allegations and determination at the University of Oregon. So I wouldn't call that suspended, but I would say that I asked him to not participate as a reserve and do any stops and come out and do any work until we could determine whether or not those issues had any liability for the City of Junction City.
Q. Isn't it a fact that multiple officers at your department looked at all the things that happened at the University of Oregon and cleared my client of any wrongdoing?
A. Could you be more specific about that?
Q. Sure. I would like you -- my client is terminated at the end of October of 2012. He leaves Junction City in March of 2013. We're dealing with about five months. Okay? I would like you to pinpoint when in those five months, in the fall, you said this alleged traffic stop occurred.
A. I would have to go back to the CAD reports and pull those
up again, but I believe it was -- based on my recollection, it was in December.
Q. Now, officers testified last week, from your department, that it was a normal practice for whoever was in charge to allow reserves to go out solo in your department.

Did you know that?
A. Eventually, I did know that, and -- yes, I did eventually learn that.
Q. So even though my client may not have been on, in your opinion, solo status, he went out, according to those guys, often solo, at their discretion. Do you have any problem with that?
A. Yes, I --

MS. COIT: Object. Mischaracterizes his testimony . THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Now, you said you had a problem with the fact that my client -- you were asked if he had actually written someone
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else's police report, and you had a problem with that; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What if he sat around with other officers in the same room and they collaboratively worked together to write a report. Do you have a problem with that?
A. Each officer -- yes, I do. Each officer should write their own report based on what they observed. So, independently, they could report that to the prosecutor so the court has an accurate recollection and facts from each specific officer. Not collaboratively coming together to write a report by three different or four different or five different individuals to write a report.

Each officer should write a report based upon what they see at the time. Even if that is something different from each other.
Q. Well, do you have any problem, for example, if someone takes a draft of the report and my client does some edits to it? Is that a problem?
A. Yes. A reserve officer should not be editing a full-time officer's report. That's the job of a sergeant.
Q. Did you ever tell anyone at the district attorney's office that my client had been terminated in the spring 2013?
A. I might have, yes.
Q. Why would you make an untruthful statement?
A. Because when they sent me the letter in 2014 and then when
I returned to work in February, I came back to my desk and some
of the stuff was on my desk that hadn't been completed. And
one of those things that I wasn't able to complete was a
request from the district attorney's office to forward over to
them the information that I had concerns about with --
regarding Mr. Cleavenger. Part of that would be letting them
know that I had concerns about his truthfulness as well.
Q. Okay. So you think you may have -- you didn't answer my
question. When did you tell the district attorney that my
client was terminated?
A. It would have been sometime in the last six months that I
would have terminated him if he would not have resigned.
Q. I would like to show you this document. Who is that an
email between? $\quad$ THE COURT: No, I don't know the exhibit number or
the document.
so we can make a clear record.
BY MR. JASon KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. While he's doing that, why would you tell the district
attorney's office in the last six months that my client was
terminated if he wasn't actually terminated from Junction City?
A. I met with him -- I think it was Alex -- over lunch, and
based upon my leave, and I said there were some things that I
would like to discuss with him about the Brady issues.
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THE COURT: You said Alex?
THE WITNESS: Excuse me. Our district attorney -- or our former district attorney, Gardner.

BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. And you met with him in the last six months to talk about this?
A. That's my recollection, yes.
Q. So have you given additional documents saying my client is untruthful to the district attorney in the last six months since you've been back?
A. No, I have not.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: We'll call this 273, Your Honor.
THE COURT: 273. Thank you.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Who's that an email between?
A. From Patty Perlow to Alex Gardner.
Q. Okay. And?
A. And Paul Graebner.
Q. Those are all people in the district attorney's office; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that email -- what's the date on that email?
A. June 23, 2014, at 2:20 p.m.
Q. June what?
A. June 23, 2014.
Q. 2014. So that is 15 months ago; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what does it say there, the highlighted
portion, about the status of my client in relation to his time at Junction City?

MS. COIT: Your Honor, I object to the testimony. It sounds like hearsay between two district attorneys. I haven't seen the document.

THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. What does it say about -- the highlighted portion, what does it say?
A. It has parentheses on it, and it says, "Terminated spring of 2013."
Q. Okay. Can you name anyone, as of June 2014, who would have told the district attorney's office my client was terminated other than you?
A. I'm not understanding your question. Sorry.
Q. Anybody -- well, where would the -- can you think of anyone in the Junction City Police Department that would have told the district attorney my client was terminated in June of 2014 other than you?
A. It could have been anybody.
Q. Okay. You agree he was not terminated, though; right?
A. Correct.
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Q. Who would the district attorney have asked to come up with this statement that my client was terminated in the spring of 2013 from Junction City Police Department? Who would they have asked?

MS. COIT: Objection. Speculation.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Could you ask the question again?
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. Yes. Who would the district attorney -- Alex, you just had lunch with, Alex Gardner. Who would they have talked to to find out that information that at the Junction City Police Department my client was terminated in the spring of 2013?
A. Any one of my staff.
Q. So you think that one of your staff members communicated with the district attorney in June of 2014 at the same time the University of Oregon was putting forth Brady materials about my client? You think someone else on your staff may have communicated that termination?
A. It's possible.
Q. Because you didn't do it?
A. Well, after June of 2014, in July, I got put on administrative pay -- on disparate pay administrative leave and I was gone until February, so I did not communicate anything to the district attorney's office after the letter was sent by the district attorney's office until I was reinstated and cleared

```
in February of this year.
Q. You keep saying you were cleared. Is there not an ongoing
investigation into what happened to you?
A. It has been concluded, and I was returned to work and
found no misconduct was found.
Q. Okay. Where is the report?
A. I don't know where the report is.
Q. Have you asked for it?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Do you know any reason why Junction City has not released
the report?
A. We've asked them to release the report and they have
refused.
Q. Let's talk about this Brady stuff for a couple of minutes.
You said 2011, }2012\mathrm{ is when the Brady materials -- the district
attorney really started working with the chiefs to get Brady
material. Is that your memory?
A. Well, Brady -- approximately, yes.
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Okay. Mr. Hess, can you bring up
Exhibit 215? Blow up the to and from. There it is. Okay. Can
you blow up the to and from in this section, please.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. So March 5, 2012. Do you remember getting this email from
Alex Gardner about Brady concerns?
A. Yes,I do.
```

started, I don't recall. We have been talking about it at the chief's association for several years, and Brady has been around for -- I'm not sure when the case actually started, but it's over 20 years old and Brady case, so it's been around a long time, but there was recently, within -- since I became a chief, a push for chiefs of police and sheriffs to report to the district attorney any Brady issue concerns. But the actual Brady case, I don't have a date in my head, but that actually occurred in, I think, 10, 20 years ago, when it was required to -- for DAs to reveal to defense attorneys the untruthfulness of, potentially, officers.
Q. Let me make sure I've got this straight. Before this 2012, there have been meetings of the chief talking about the Brady stuff a few years before this?
A. I don't know when those started, but I do recall when I became chief. That was one of the things that I was trained about and it was talked about, whether it was 2009, '10, '11. I don't recall the exact date, if you wanted to, I guess, have the exact --
Q. What year did you become a chief?
A. April of 2009.
Q. Okay. So right after you became a chief in April of 2009, that's where you started being trained and learning about the Brady stuff; is that right?
A. Well, I heard about Brady before I became a chief, but
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that was -- when I became a chief was the issues when I was told that we are required and it's our responsibility to forward information on to the DA if we have issues about untruthfulness, yes.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that many of your officers have signed documents attesting to my client's truthfulness? Are you aware of that?
A. In the last couple weeks, Ms. Coit provided me documentation of letters that not all of the staff, but some of the staff, signed.
Q. And while you were gone on administrative leave, the three acting folks responded to the district attorney on behalf of Junction City; is that right?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And they went through some of the allegations about -- in the Brady materials about the recording policy and about the cars that had them; right? They sort of detailed information in those -- in that letter?
A. If you have the document for me to review, I could be more specific.
Q. Showing you Plaintiff's 172, does that refresh your memory? Have you seen that document?
A. Yes.
Q. That was signed by the acting chief. Who else?
A. It was signed by Acting Chief Eric Markell, Acting

Sergeant Brandon Nicol, and Officer Corey Mertz.
Q. I do need to bring this up. There was questions from defense counsel about Officer Mertz last week, and there was an allegation put forth that he was disciplined for putting false information into a probable cause affidavit. Is that true?
A. He was counseled about it. Not disciplined.
Q. There's nothing in his file about that?
A. I haven't looked at his file recently, but you
generally -- when an officer is counseled, it's not put in
their personnel file. When they're disciplined formally, then that document goes into their personnel file. But if you just have a conversation with them about corrective behavior, that does not become part of their permanent record, so I wouldn't believe there would be a copy of that in his file.
Q. So you spoke with Lieutenant Lebrecht and gave him some information in relation to the Brady materials about my client; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you talk to Chief McDermed about my client and the Brady list before the materials were submitted?
A. I did not talk to her about those -- those materials, I
believe, before they were submitted. It was just strictly
Mike Morrow and Lieutenant Lebrecht.
Q. So you talked to Mike Morrow as well?
A. Yes, I called him.
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Q. When did you talk to him?
A. It would have been before Mr. Cleavenger resigned from the Junction City Police Department and sometime after my sergeant concluded his investigation into the misconduct concerns that I was concerned about why Mr. Cleavenger was terminated from $U$ of $O$.

Counsel, would you mind -- my mouth is a little dry. Can you pour me a glass of water?
Q. Did you ever talk to Chief McDermed about my client before he was terminated from the University of Oregon?
A. No. I wasn't even aware he was terminated, and that was one of my concerns. So, no.
Q. When was the last time you went to the University of Oregon Police Department? It's been in the last couple months, hasn't it?
A. Yeah. I don't know the exact date. I went down there between, I don't know, February 2nd and today.
Q. Who did you meet with there?
A. I met with Chief McDermed and their PIO person.
Q. What was the purpose of the meeting?
A. Chief McDermed and I are on a committee for the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police, the marketing committee. We're trying to market the Oregon -- what the Oregon Chiefs of Police Association does throughout the state, and Chief McDermed had an expert person in community information, public information,
marketing, and as part of the board, I wanted to bring back information to the board about the proposal of creating a magazine, like the sheriff's office does, and so we met about that.
Q. Have you applied for any jobs at the University of Oregon

Department of -- Police Department?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. When did you apply for a job?
A. It was around the time I was just coming back to work to Junction City.
Q. And what's the status of your application there?
A. I was denied employment.
Q. Do you know why?
A. I didn't meet the education -- they were looking for somebody with an education background, like from another college, that had university experience, and so I didn't meet the criteria to get into the first interviews.
Q. And, finally, I want to ask you about the department policies at the time that you gave to Lieutenant Lebrecht about audio recording. What is that document?
A. It says: Department directive. Subject: Directive 11 --
which stands for the year -- 005 mobile audio video procedure .
Q. Okay. And was this the policy in effect in 2012?
A. I -- I am assuming so, I --
Q. It was your policy; right? You came up with it?
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A. Yes. I issued it.
Q. And is it correct that this policy calls for required
activation of the mobile unit for all field contacts involving
actual or potential criminal conduct? That's how you had
that -- that's the policy in effect in 2012?
A. That's partially true.
Q. Okay.

THE COURT: What document number was that, Counsel?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: That's -- it's in the Brady
materials, which is Exhibit 150.
THE COURT: 150.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Yeah, I believe that is page 19.
THE COURT: Page 19. Thank you.
BY MR. JASON KAFOURY: (Continuing)
Q. You do agree that my client's test scores, when they were
given to him, were inaccurate? Do you agree with that?
A. The first letter that was sent out by one of my staff,
yes, were incorrect.
Q. Okay. Did you say that there's three city council members
of Junction City that are on this community board?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. Who are those -- who were they? Who were those members?
A. Well, it's changed over the years. Are you referring to
currently now or when he got interviewed?
Q. When my client was interviewed for this police position.

```
A. If I recall correctly, I believe it was Marti Templeton,
Dave Branchen, and Jim Leach.
Q. Were you in the office when my client came in to turn in
his badge and uniform officially?
A. I don't recall whether I was or wasn't.
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Thanks.
    THE COURT: Redirect?
    MS. COIT: No. No questions. Thank you, sir.
    THE COURT: May the witness be excused, Counsel? Can
the witness be excused?
    MS. COIT: Yes.
    THE COURT: Counsel, can the witness be excused?
    MR. JASON KAFOURY: Oh, yes. Sorry.
    THE WITNESS: I have a copy of one of your documents .
    THE COURT: We'll excuse you now. Thank you. Next
witness.
    MS. COIT: The defense calls Lois Yoshishige.
    THE COURT: Thank you.
    Come forward, please, into the well of the courtroom.
    MS. YOSHISHIGE: Can I put my things down?
    DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: You're welcome to put things
down on the bench.
    THE COURT: Would you stop at that location and
please raise your right hand.
```

            LOIS YOSHISHIGE,
    called as a witness in behalf of the Defendants, being first
duly sworn, is examined and testified as follows:
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you. If you could enter the
witness box and the entrance is closest to the wall. Be
seated, please.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Now, would you face the jury and state
your full name, please, and slowly spell your last name.
THE WITNESS: Lois Kiyono Yoshishige. Last name is
Y-O-S-H-I-S-H-I-G-E. And K-I-Y-O-N-O.
THE COURT: Direct examination, please.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COIT:
Q. Ms. Yoshishige, good afternoon. You're here under
subpoena; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us who your employer is.
A. University of Oregon.
Q. And what do you do at the university?
A. I do clerical work in the business office, student loan
collections.
Q. And how long have you been employed by the University of

## Oregon?

A. Thirty years.
Q. And are you a member of the union?
A. Yes.
Q. Which union is that?
A. Service Employees International Union.
Q. Do you have a role in the union?
A. Yes. I'm a steward and chief contact.
Q. How long have you been a union steward?
A. About 28 years.
Q. And tell us what -- what is the function of a union
steward?
A. It is to represent an employee around -- in meetings with
management, having to do with work issues and enforcing the contract.
Q. Would that be the collective bargaining agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever been involved in the bargaining negotiations for the contract?
A. No. I haven't been at the bargaining table.
Q. All right. And what do you mean by represent the employee? What does that entail?
A. Sitting in on meetings, advising the employee.
Q. Is it your responsibility or you hope it is to -- to help the union member to understand his or her rights and
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responsibilities under the union contract?
A. Yes.
Q. When do you recall first becoming involved with Mr. James

Cleavenger?
A. About three or four years ago.
Q. And do you recall what issue he was dealing with at the
time that he requested a steward?
A. Work performance issues.
Q. Do you recall there being a written reprimand having been
issued to him?
A. Yes.
Q. Before your testimony today, did you get any documents
from Mr. Cleavenger's counsel to review?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me what those documents consisted of?
A. Some emails, review of the grievance procedure that Chief

Steward John Ahlen put together, some testimony.
Q. Whose testimony?
A. I'm sorry. I don't recall.
Q. When did you receive those emails ? The documents from
counsel. Not when you originally received them.
A. About -- about a week and a half ago.
Q. Did you have any conversations with Mr. Cleavenger's
counsel about those emails, about what they said?
A. Yes.
Q. What were those conversations?
A. Basically what did I recall.
Q. And when you reviewed those emails, did you recall them?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Did they tell you what they thought I was going to
ask you here today?
A. They -- yeah, they had some guesses.
Q. Okay. All rightful. Well, let's see if they're right.
a period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. And at some point were other stewards brought on?
A. Yes.
Q. And who were they?
A. Donna Laue, the then-chief steward was helping me at the
time; and then John Ahlen, after I stopped being his steward.
Q. Why was Donna Laue brought in to assist you?
A. To help me with research.
Q. What sort of research?
A. Contacting other classified employees in the department.
Q. With regard to Mr. Cleavenger's reprimand?
A. Yes. His treatment in the department.
Q. Okay. Had you -- prior to Mr. Cleavenger, did you have
any prior experience as a steward for a member of the
University of Oregon Police Department?
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A. Yes.
Q. When was that?
A. Maybe a year or two before that.
Q. Do you recall Mr. Cleavenger wanting an unusually large amount of information from the University of Oregon Police Department to prepare for the grievance of his reprimand?
A. It was more than I was used to, but I couldn't say that it was unusually large.
Q. Had you ever, in your 28 years of experience as a steward, had a situation where the grievant was requesting that volume of information for a grievance of a written reprimand?
A. No.
Q. Who was your primary contact for the administration during this process?
A. I don't understand that question.
Q. Okay. Was it your role as the union steward to be the direct contact with the administration, the people who the grievance was against?
A. I think mostly I was communicating with Randy Wardlow. Q. And Mr. Wardlow was in the human resources department? A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall having a meeting with Lieutenant Lebrecht, Sergeant Cameron, yourself, and Mr. Cleavenger in July of 2012, where the four of you went over some of Mr. Cleavenger's videos, his dash cam videos?
A. Yes.
Q. There were actually two meetings where you did that; correct?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. So right now I'm talking about the first meeting.

At that meeting, do you recall going over a video that involved
Mr. Cleavenger's transport of the woman with the gun?
A. Going over a video?
Q. Watching the video in that meeting.
A. I can't say I recall.
Q. Do you recall that incident being discussed at that meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. What was discussed in your recollection about that incident?
A. What I recall was something about that management felt it was unsafe for the woman to have her firearm in the car.
Q. Do you recall at that meeting telling Lieutenant Lebrecht and Sergeant Cameron that the woman had her gun stored in a fanny pack?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Had you ever heard anything about this woman having a gun in a fanny pack? Does that ring any bells for you?
A. No.
Q. What do you recall Mr. Cleavenger telling you about that
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incident with the woman with the gun?
A. I don't recall, except that he felt it was safe.
Q. Mr. Cleavenger felt it was safe?
A. Yes.

MS. COIT: Your Honor -- permission to approach, Your
Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
MS. COIT: Exhibit 385.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Is Exhibit 385 an email sent from Mr. Cleavenger to you and Ms. Laue?
A. Yes.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, defendant offers 385 with request for permission to publish.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Can I take a look at it?
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: What's the date on it? I can't

## see it.

BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Can you see the date on that, Ms. Yoshishige? It's kind of small.
A. Yes
Q. What's the date?
A. July 13, 2012.

THE COURT: Received, Counsel.

MS. COIT: Thank you.
THE COURT: Let me make sure. Who is this from? To?
Who's it from?
MS. COIT: Mr. Cleavenger.
THE COURT: And who is it to?
MS. COIT: To the witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Received.
MS. COIT: Thank you. Permission to publish?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Ms. Yoshishige, can you look at the top -- sorry, the top
paragraph -- full paragraph there? And Mr. Cleavenger says,
"As for their offer, they're basically saying, 'Stop the
grievance or you will be fired.' That is obviously an illegal reprisal. We want them to offer this today. And, yes, I will not be able to answer any of their new allegations" --

THE COURT: Counsel, continue reading. There's a comma.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
-- "today, as I have not received the prior notice required by union contract, DPS policy, and ORS 236. I may generally refute some claims. Then I have a litany of questions for them regarding their investigation which will hopefully yield a number of additional lies."
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My question is, do you know what offer Mr. Cleavenger was talking about in this email?
A. I think it was an offer to accept retraining and -- yeah.
Q. All right. Tell me about that offer. Was that offer made to you? For Mr. Cleavenger, but was it made directly to you?
A. Yes. I think, yeah.
Q. And who made that offer?
A. Randy Wardlow.
Q. Tell me what you recall about that offer.
A. That he was saying that Mr. Cleavenger was to go through retraining for a certain period of time and that in exchange he needed to drop his grievance.
Q. And what grievance did you understand Mr. Wardlow to be talking about?
A. The written reprimand. The grievance against the written reprimand.
Q. Do you recall Mr. Wardlow ever making a part of this offer

Mr. Cleavenger's promise never to file another grievance?
A. I don't recall.
Q. And this email is dated July of 2012. Did you get the impression from Mr. Cleavenger's email to you that he was not particularly receptive to being retrained?
A. There was concern that it was a setup.
Q. A setup? Whose concern was that?
A. Mr. Cleavenger's.
Q. Do you know what his concern was?
A. That management would find things about his performance to discredit him and terminate him.
Q. Did you have prior experience dealing with Mr. Wardlow in your capacity as a union steward?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anything in that prior experience that you had with
him give you reason to believe that he was trying to set up
Mr. Cleavenger; that that's something that he would do?
A. No.
Q. Did you believe, from your conversations with Mr. Wardlow,
that he generally wanted Mr. Cleavenger to succeed in retraining?
A. I think Mr. Wardlow believed that when he was saying that.
Q. Did Mr. Cleavenger ever agree to this offer to go back
into retraining and drop the grievance?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You are the one who responded to the offer; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that response that you gave to Mr. Wardlow?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall Mr. Cleavenger going back into retraining?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall telling Mr. Wardlow that he would do what he was ordered to do but would not drop the grievance?
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Yoshishige - D
A. Yes.
Q. This is Exhibit 391.

THE COURT: 391? Thank you.
BY MS. COIT: (Continuing)
Q. Ms. Yoshishige, on Exhibit 391, there are three emails in this chain. I would like you to look at the middle email and tell me if you -- if that's you who has received it and who it's from.

Or, excuse me, the other way around. Who it's from and who it was to.
A. It was from me, and it was to James Cleavenger, Sean Brailey, and Donna Laue.

MS. COIT: Your Honor, we offer 391 and request permission to publish.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: Your Honor, same objection we had last night that we did not address.

THE COURT: Well, portions of it are relevant.
Portions of it aren't. I don't want the witness to come back, but can I see 39 for just a moment? I'm sorry, 329?

MS. COIT: 391.
THE COURT: 391.
MS. COIT: And, Your Honor, my question is focused --
THE COURT: Counsel, I don't want any discussion
right now. Have a seat.
DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: It's on the back also,

## Judge.

THE COURT: Counsel, first of all, I have no concern -- follow me closely now -- 391 with the email string starting from Shaw Ginger October 17, 2012. It goes, "Hello Lois."

I do have concern and would want to speak further with both of you outside the presence of the jury concerning the email from Lois on October 12th at 20:39:33 -- sorry, Wednesday, October 17th, 2012.

I have no concerns about the top email on October 18, 2012, beginning "I" and both -- those three lines I have no concern about.

I would want to speak to you further about the paragraph beginning "that."

And I have no concern about the last line beginning "I

## know."

Now, how are we going to resolve that, or do we need to bring the witness back next Monday?

MS. COIT: Your Honor, it is the middle email that I want to question her about.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think that needs some discussion.
I'm not foreclosing that evidence at all. I just want a thoughtful record on my part, and I'm not certain that I'm prepared to make that without listening to each of the parties again.

MS. COIT: I would be willing to put it into the record without the witness testifying about it.

THE COURT: No, I don't think so. What are you doing
next Monday? Do you live here in Portland?
THE WITNESS: No. I'm in Eugene.
THE COURT: Oh, that's not far. I just don't want to make a mistake. Okay?

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: And if you don't mind, I'm going to have
you back as our first witness on Monday so I don't feel pushed by counsel and we can discuss this outside the presence. I humbly apologize, but let's get a fair trial here.

So, Counsel, we're going to recess this evening and discuss this, and I'll bring this witness back on Monday. And she'll be I think a very brief period of time. Counsel is almost done with their direct and then cross.

Now, where are we in the case? I'll tell you where we are. I think that we're going to finish all the evidence -I'm pretty certain of this -- on Tuesday. Okay? Two more witnesses to go. I think that's a pretty good faith estimate --

MS. COIT: Yes.
THE COURT: -- based on what I've been told.
There may be a little bit of rebuttal, but I'm not sure yet. But there may be a little bit. So you'll get the case
for argument probably first thing Wednesday morning. Okay? And you'll probably have the case for your consideration, because I'm going to put a time limit of no more than an hour and a half on each counsel, so it's a timed limitation for their argument.

With the jury instructions I read to you, they're very short. It would probably take me 20 minutes to read the law to you. In fact, I'll give you my instructions back in the jury room. I'll have you just return those to me after your deliberations. The law requires me, by the way, to read the instructions to you at one time. You're not to go to separate corners and waive instructions. I have to read those to you at one time and make certain that they're read. A lot of courts don't give out jury instructions. I'm going to give them to you back in chambers.

After that, though, you have no idea and I have no idea how long your deliberations are going to take. Don't even get -- it could be very quick. It could be long. It's the process of the thoroughness and thoughtfulness of your discussions with each other. Okay? So that's my best time estimate.

We could actually go faster than that, but I think in good faith if we get to Tuesday afternoon at 3:00 or 4:00, what I don't want to do is split the arguments. I don't want to have somebody arguing on Tuesday and then the other party coming
back on Wednesday. I would like to hear that in a block of time. So if we get done early on Tuesday, like 2:00 or 3:00 or 4:00, I'm going to send you home. I don't try to get one more hour out of counsel. Fair enough? So I really think Wednesday you get it for your deliberations early on. Okay?

So now when are we coming back?
A JUROR: Monday.
THE COURT: Excellent.
A JUROR: 8:00.
THE COURT: By the way -- I apologize, you can see me
working up here -- Southwest Airlines $\$ 142$ instead of $\$ 1,200$. Not bad. Okay. I'm not advertising for Southwest. That should be on the record. I'll try Jet Blue and name them all. I think I got it back at a decent rate for the taxpayers and not $\$ 1,200$ for the taxpayers, which are you.

Counsel, anything else? Christy, let me -- we're going to talk to counsel after hours tonight.

Counsel, are there any other things that I need to say to the jury, except please don't discuss this matter with anybody? Don't even form or express an opinion in your mind. And first -- Christy, what? Oh, my goodness. Happy Birthday to juror number eight. And it's Friday.

Well, hopefully you'll able to keep both of the appointments. I wish you the best for your wife and, unfortunately, the funeral you're attending.

Goodnight. We will see you Monday at 8:00.
A JUROR: Okay.
THE COURT: Counsel, why don't you go take a break.
I need a couple minutes, and I'll be right with you. Take a recess and come on back.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Jury not present.) } \\
& \text { (Recess taken.) }
\end{aligned}
$$

THE COURT: All right. Let's go back on the record.
The jury is not present and the concern is over Exhibit
No. 137. Let's see what objections each of you have to which parts. On behalf of the defendant, are you requesting this entire document can be evidence or a portion of it?

MS. COIT: Only a portion of it. The middle email.
THE COURT: Now, it's difficult when you want a
portion because I'm concerned that the information on the chain is confusing.

MS. COIT: I have no objection to putting the whole thing in.

THE COURT: You have no objection to putting the whole thing in?

MS. COIT: No, not at all.
THE COURT: All of it? 137?
MS. COIT: No. 391.
THE COURT: 391. Yeah. The plaintiff has objected
to which portion?

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I think the whole thing should stay out because it's going to lead to confusion on the part of the jury. It's steering them away from the facts that they have to decide, and it's getting inside the -- the negotiating strategy. There's good reasons why we don't allow settlement discussions to come in, besides the fact that it tends to prevent people from settling if they thought the settlement is going to be discussed.

THE COURT: I'm confused. The earlier discussion with your cocounsel was that he wanted the middle portion in.

MR. JASON KAFOURY: No. I was -- I was arguing against the top portion. I never dealt with the middle portion yesterday. I think the middle portion is also prejudicial.

THE COURT: Well, first --
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: "Confusing" was the word,
Your Honor, used, and we would adopt that.
THE COURT: Well, first, I don't know why I would withhold the email from Cleavenger on October 18, 2012, at 3:09:24, which states he's available all on October 30th for the grievance hearing. So whatever intonation is that he walked out, wasn't available, wasn't participating is refuted by that. It's a positive piece of evidence for the plaintiff.
"Both of my job offers could care less about whether or not I was fired from the UO job, so that is not an issue."

I think that's beneficial for the defense. It shows, when
you go to damages, that he had other job offers and, quite frankly, his state of mind was he could care less about the University of Oregon job.
"Also, if I quit, instead of being fired, I will not have a cause of action tort lawsuit for wrongful dismissal."

That's state of mind, and I'm not concerned about letting that in.
"That being said, I'm open to the idea of quitting, but it would have to be a really decent deal. If you want to set up a meeting with Linda Smith to discuss it, that's fine with me."

I don't know who Linda Smith is. I'm assuming it's not an attorney, but I don't know.

MS. COIT: I think he meant to say Linda King. THE COURT: Doesn't matter who he meant. I don't know who Linda Smith is. And if so, that's an attorney-client privileged communication. When I don't know about it, I can't make a decent ruling. Who's Linda Smith?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: My client is uncertain who he was referencing at that point.

THE COURT: Maybe I should adopt the defendant's position. Linda King do you think?

MS. COIT: Maybe Linda King and Brian Smith as a co-person.

MR. CLEAVENGER: Exactly what I said. THE COURT: They're not attorneys. The attorney

## privilege doesn't apply to them, does it?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: No.
THE COURT: I can't imagine why the plaintiff would
want -- I know this case is hard, complex, and time-consuming; however, I think it's right to do the right thing.

Obviously, you want that in.
But you want the middle portion specifically?
MS. COIT: I specifically want --
THE COURT: So let's go over that. I don't know that I'm inclined to start chopping things up. It looks like there's something hidden, and there better be a good reason for the Court doing that. I'm not a big fan of redactions, as you can tell.
"Hi, James. Here is the request to schedule a hearing on October 30th for the written reprimand."

Now, this is coming from Lois. This is her thought process.

And I guess the October 18 th email that I just read to you from Cleavenger back to her can only make sense if a portion or some of this or the entire email comes into evidence. And it states, "I've been thinking about the predismissal meeting we had on Friday and the risks of going through a termination. Would being fired from $U$ of $O$ DPS affect your ability to get a job that you've been promised by the judge in Portland?"

Now, this goes to damages. They're entitled to have that.
"Even though you have a lot of evidence, I wouldn't say it is certain that your discipline determination would be overturned. With Morrow's 48-page report, I read into it that his conclusion is that you do not fit as a DPS officer."

Well, that doesn't come as a surprise. It's not prejudicial.
"In the end, every employee has to give at least the appearance that they comply with management's orders. It doesn't look as if you want to do that, so what is the point?"

Now, from the plaintiff's perspective, I would guess that they would want to keep that out.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I would guess.
THE COURT: From your perspective, subjectively, you would want to get that in. That's her thought process, though.

Why am I excluding that? Why don't I just leave that for argument? That's not Mr. Cleavenger. All Mr. Cleavenger is doing is responding to the fact that he would leave under certain circumstances and he's got a job in Oregon, et cetera.
"Gary told me that he talked to you for a while after the meeting where management gave you notice of suspension without pay. I don't know if the people offering you the job care about if you have a dismissal on your record. If they do, I think you should resign right away and ask for a mutual reference before Linda King fires you. Once she fires you, you can't ask for that anymore. Let me know what you think."

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I think "it doesn't look as if you want to do that" is somebody else's opinion --

THE COURT: Well, it is.
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: -- of my guy's opinion, and
it's not proper evidence on that basis.
THE COURT: But that can be explained in argument.
That's not his opinion. He responds as follows.
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: But then what does it come in
for if it's not proper evidence?
THE COURT: Well, the fact that your client is
stating that he's got two job offers and that it comes in for damages.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: Well, that -- that's a different argument. I'm talking about that particular line. "It doesn't look as if you want to do that." That's her impression. It's improper opinion evidence. "It doesn't look." Doesn't look to who?

THE COURT: So what specific portion -- if I rule
against you, I'll give you an opportunity to excise what specific portion you think should be excluded. Knowing you're tentatively losing this issue, now I'm giving you what I call the backup to the backup.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I appreciate it.
THE COURT: Which would you take out? What is the irrelevant portion that doesn't go to damages, which is why
this should be received if it's received?
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I think the two lines "if I
quit instead of being fired, I will not have a cause of action
tort lawsuit for wrongful dismissal."
THE COURT: Just a moment. Okay. Which --
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: Third line from the top.
THE COURT: Just a moment. Let me hear from the
opposition. Counsel?
MS. COIT: Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes, please.
MS. COIT: Well, again, I'm not concerned with the top email. If they want to redact that portion, that's fine with me. I mean, he obviously filed a lawsuit.

THE COURT: Just a moment. If they -- now, I'm not forcing you into this. I want that understood. Neither one of you know what I'm going to do, but once I make a ruling, there won't be a further discussion. So I'll thoroughly listen to both of you. You're proposing, knowing tentatively I'm ruling against you, that as a backup that what is prejudicial is "also, if I quit instead of being fired, I will not have a cause of action tort lawsuit for wrongful dismissal."

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: Yes.
THE COURT: Just a minute. That doesn't resolve the issue for you. Take some time.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: If that line is stricken, then
the next two-line paragraph needs to go as well because it's -or at least the next line has to go because it is -- it is linked to the earlier sentence. I am talking about "that being said, I'm open to the idea of quitting, but it would have to be a really decent deal." That would be read in conjunction with the one above it. Ruminations about what might be a good deal, what might not be a bad deal, and so on, is confusing to the jury. It's potentially prejudicial. It is prejudicial. And it raises the issue of wrongful dismissal, which is a claim which has been eliminated from the lawsuit. So that's one more thing we have to explain if this comes in. And it's leading them away from liability and leading them away from damages.

THE COURT: Counsel, what are your thoughts?
MS. COIT: My thoughts are all evidence is prejudicial or I wouldn't --

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MS. COIT: My thought it all evidence is prejudicial or I wouldn't offer it.

THE COURT: Let's get through that. That's an argument that doesn't --

MS. COIT: Again, I don't care if that part comes in. I'm not going to question her about it. So if that resolves it, that's fine.

THE COURT: Let's just make certain.
So the portion "that being said, I'm open to the idea of

```
quitting, but I would have to be really -- it would have to be
a really decent deal," yeah.
    MS. COIT: Excuse me. May I?
    THE COURT: Please.
    MS. COIT: That's with my understanding that the
second sentence, "both of my job offers could care less," that
that is staying in.
    THE COURT: That is staying in. Absolutely. Yeah.
It goes to damages.
Now, from the defense perspective, take a look at the rest of this document, along with your clients, and if this is harmful to you, if those excisions are harmful, I want to hear that.
Chief, talk to your counsel.
Kind of like settlement negotiations, you don't know where this is going to come out.
MS. COIT: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: I'm just joking.
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Can I raise one more issue,
```

```
Your Honor, for my client?
```

Your Honor, for my client?
THE COURT: Not yet. Very careful, though, on both sides, because when you press too hard --
MR. JASON KAFOURY: My understanding is it's new information.
THE COURT: What you may get is an unelcome

```
surprise. Very easy for me to make a sweeping ruling one way or the other.

Okay. Thoughts, Counsel?
MS. COIT: I'm sorry. I wasn't listening.
THE COURT: It's your opportunity now.
MS. COIT: Still on the same lines?
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. COIT: I have conferred with my client s, and they also agree that we're not going to question her about that, so if they want it redacted, that's fine.

THE COURT: Redact what? "That being said, I'm open
to the idea of quitting"?
MS. COIT: Yes. Along with the line above that.
"Also, if I quit" --
THE COURT: "Instead of being fired, I will."
MS. COIT: Right.
THE COURT: Okay. Now look at the rest of the
document, though. I want to be certain because I'm not a fan of excising and chopping up what's good for one side against the other. In other words, this truly has to be a compromise what you find fair and acceptable to both sides with the pressure on the plaintiff, quite frankly, because I have indicated I have a concern about withholding certain portions out.

MS. COIT: Do you want me to argue?

THE COURT: I want you to give me your best thought.

\section*{What do you want?}

MS. COIT: Well, I had no intention of asking her about that email. I can bring in just the email from Lois if you want.

THE COURT: No. I -- I -- I'm not asking you to take anything out.

MS. COIT: Right.
THE COURT: I'm trying to see if there's some accommodation before I make a ruling because, once I do, we're sitting down. End of discussion. I don't debate with counsel after that. You're not coming back with another argument. That's the end of it. Jute.

MS. COIT: Are we discussing the second email?
THE COURT: "I am available all day on October 30th for the general grievance hearing. Both of my job offers could care less about whether or not I was fired from my U of O job so that this is not an issue. If you want to set up a meeting with Linda Smith to discuss it, that is fine with me. I know this case is hard, complex, and time-consuming; however, I think it's the right thing to do."

Then the next portion would come in in its entirety and the next portion would come in in its entirety.

MS. COIT: I say that's a good decision.
THE COURT: Well, I haven't made it yet. Now,

Counsel?
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I would accept the -THE COURT: This isn't negotiation. Tell me what else is wrong.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I think the way you've read it
is acceptable to our side.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: And my remaining concern would be the speculation in the middle of the major paragraph in the next email. "It doesn't look as if you want to do that," which is.

THE COURT: Well, you can't second-guess me. I kind of indicated what my tentative thought is. I'm about to make a ruling. I'll give you every opportunity.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: And my suggestion is that you drop that line out.

THE COURT: Which line is that?
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: The line that says "it doesn't
look as if you want to do that." It's speculative. It's unclear.

THE COURT: I can't. Oh, I see. Okay. "It doesn't look as if you want to do that, so what is the point?"

Well, isn't she entitled to be asked what his response was, and isn't she going to respond to that whether it's in an email or not?

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: She can be asked his response, but her speculation in writing is --

THE COURT: It's a distinction without a difference, but --

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: Is prejudicial.
THE COURT: Counsel?
MS. COIT: The last two sentences in that paragraph
come from his steward, who's been with him through every step of this process, who's been in the meetings, who's discussed with him what he's doing and what the perceptions are of his management and gotten his responses to their concerns about him, and it's her opinion, based on all of that personal knowledge, that he doesn't give the appearance they comply with management's orders and that -- or every employee needs to do that and it doesn't look like he wants to do that.

THE COURT: Counsel, I think it is almost a
distinction without a difference. I would allow the question to be asked what her impression was of his stance at that point.

All right. Any further discussion? If not, I'm prepared to rule on this.

Let me turn first to plaintiffs on this.
MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I believe it to be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to the jury and, to the extent they focus on it, they're being misled from the issues in the case,
which are liability and damages.
THE COURT: Okay. Counsel?
MS. COIT: No further argument.
THE COURT: All right. If you're both agreeing, I'll
strike "Also, if I quit instead of being fired, I will not have a cause of action tort lawsuit for wrongful dismissal." If you both agree, I will strike "That being said, I'm open to the idea of quitting, but it would have to be a really decent deal." As far as the rest of it, it's going to be received.

I do -- I understand the prejudicial effect. By the same token, I think the probative value is also somewhat apparent, and I think it makes the document more understandable, and, in addition, she should be allowed to be asked that question on the stand.

So if you both agree, fine; if not, then the entire document is coming in.

MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: I'll go along with that.
MS. COIT: I disagree. Just kidding. No, that's fine. We'll make the redactions and bring in the new exhibit on Monday.

THE COURT: You can do the same thing. You can just cross it out with big back ink if you would like to because all of the documents in this case have been redacted with big black ink.

I want to raise one other issue that I'm not certain of.

It came yesterday -- Counsel, have a seat for a moment.
Yesterday I was concerned about a ruling I made, and the ruling became -- Counsel, on your examination, and I -- I sustained an objection. Last night I was going over some notes. It came during Lieutenant Mike Morrow's testimony. Do you remember there was a question asked that I sustained an objection to about the opinion of whether Lieutenant Lebrecht would retaliate, and it was an objection from the other side, and I sustained that objection. Do you remember that? You asked -- you had asked Lieutenant Morrow -- well, strike that.

Lieutenant Morrow -- I got that reversed -- had been asked whether he would retaliate or not. My apologies. I'm so used to the plaintiff sitting on that side of the courtroom. You two have done a dazzling display of confusing me by where you're sitting. In fact, Judge Haggerty commented on that today, and I just said I gave you a choice, apparently, which is interesting.

You had asked the reputation about whether Lebrecht would retaliate or not, and there was an objection by plaintiff's counsel. What is seemingly -- and I sustained that objection. Do you recall?

MS. COIT: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. What is seemingly unfair about that is there's been a lot of reputational evidence and a lot of evidence so far about whether retaliation is a character
trait. And it came slipping in a couple of times. Sometimes without an objection. Now, I have about credibility and truthfulness. Some of it is stretched beyond, though. So let me reverse that. It's somewhat unfair to your position with all the evidence of retaliation coming in that Morrow is not able to cast an opinion concerning a reputation of whether Lieutenant Lebrecht would retaliate or not.

So I'm sorry if I'm reversing the two parties.
But there's been other evidence that I've allowed in without objection by either side about retaliation with some of the witnesses.

But two wrongs don't make a right, and this does seem to be an appropriate objection and appropriate ruling tentatively by the Court because it goes to the very issue in this case involving one of the three parties.

Now, seemingly, though, that has the appearance of some unfairness, so I want to hear from you again concerning that question.

MS. COIT: Lieutenant Morrow worked closely and testified that he worked closely with Lieutenant Lebrecht. They were personal friends and professional peers. He felt and testified that he had sufficient personal knowledge to develop an opinion on whether or not Lieutenant Lebrecht would retaliate.

THE COURT: Let me stop you right there. In all of

THE COURT: Okay. Can I let the court reporter go or do we need her any further this evening?

MR. JASON KAFOURY: No, I don't need the court reporter for this.

THE COURT: Okay. Let her go?
Listen, I want to thank you for a wonderful week. I want to put that on the record. You're an exemplary court reporter. It's been very much appreciated. We'll see you on Monday.
\[
\text { (Trial Day } 7 \text { adjourned.) }
\]
don't like the way that the case shaped up in some form because the question got asked a couple times by different witnesses without objection, so it came flying in.

But I don't intend to, you know, try to right the ship. So is this a character trait? And if so, can I get some research over the weekend? In other words, go take a look at it. Okay? I'll look at it also, but I -- I tend to go over my notes at night, and I can't undo a couple of the rulings I think might have been close or might have gone another way upon reflection, but if you think it's a character trait, bring that to me by Monday.

MS. COIT: Okay.
THE COURT: I don't think it is.
MS. COIT: Okay.
THE COURT: And you can do a little bit of research
also. I think it's a decent ruling, and I think it's the right
ruling. It was a right objection. Okay. What else tonight?
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Defense counsel has not given me
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
my years, and I could be humbly wrong, I haven't seen a & 1 \\
character trait allowed in on the issue of retaliation. & 2 \\
Usually it's character, credibility, truthfulness, but whether & 3 \\
I go back to Witkin or I go to Bernie Jefferson over in & 4 \\
California or whether I go to -- whatever treatise, I haven't & 5 \\
been able to find a character trait on retaliation. I just & 6 \\
don't like the way that the case shaped up in some form because & 7 \\
the question got asked a couple times by different witnesses & 8 \\
without objection, so it came flying in. & 9 \\
But I don't intend to, you know, try to right the ship. & 10 \\
So is this a character trait? And if so, can I get some & 11 \\
research over the weekend? In other words, go take a look at & 12 \\
it. Okay? I'll look at it also, but I -- I tend to go over my & 13 \\
notes at night, and I can't undo a couple of the rulings I & 14 \\
think might have been close or might have gone another way upon & 15 \\
reflection, but if you think it's a character trait, bring that & 16 \\
to me by Monday. & 17 \\
MS. COIT: Okay. \(\quad\) THE COURT: I don't think it is. & 18 \\
MS. COIT: Okay. & 19 \\
THE COURT: And you can do a little bit of research & 21 \\
ruling. It was a right objection. Okay. What else tonight? & 22 \\
MR. JASON KAFOURY: Defense counsel has not given me & 23 \\
their exhibits for Monday. & 25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
                    *
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A JUROR: [8] 1858/8 1858/15 1858/17 1858/21 2012/24 2078/6 2078/8 2079/1
DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: [2] 2063/20 2074/24
MR. CLEAVENGER: [1] 2081/23 MR. GREGORY KAFOURY: [22] 1995/21 2079/25 2080/14 2083/11 2083/25 2084/3 2084/7 2084/12 2084/22 2085/1 2085/5 2085/21 2085/24 2090/1 2090/4 2090/7 2090/14 2090/17 2090/25 2091/4 2091/22 2092/16
MR. HESS: [9] 1833/11 1853/7 1858/10 1858/25 1950/12 1961/11 1961/13 1961/15 2005/21
MR. JASON KAFOURY: [66] 1831/20 1866/6 1909/24 1915/24 1918/16 1927/5 1935/22 1936/19 1944/7 1944/10 1944/14 1944/16 1945/20 1945/23 1946/3 1946/5 1946/13 1950/9 1950/13 1952/1 1954/2 1954/22 1955/6 1956/20 1956/23 1957/13 1959/1 1959/14 1961/9 1961/12 1961/14 1967/10 1967/13 1967/22 1969/24 1974/23 1997/23 2021/8 2023/15 2023/20 2024/3 2024/7 2024/16 2027/25 2028/3 2028/7 2031/21 2051/16 2052/11 2055/18 2055/25 2056/13 2062/8 2062/11 2063/5 2063/12 2070/14 2070/16 2074/14 2080/10 2081/17 2082/1 2087/18 2087/22 2095/23 2096/2
MR. MCDOUGAL: [55] 1824/16 1831/18 1831/21 1833/9 1833/12 1833/18 1838/13 1840/2 1841/13 1841/16 1848/17 1848/24 1849/15 1853/6 1853/8 1853/15 1854/10 1854/25 1855/23 1857/18 1857/22 1858/12 1858/16 1859/18 1859/23 1866/4 1866/7 1866/9 1868/18 1871/21 1873/3 1873/19 1873/22 1899/15 1900/20 1903/15 1903/24 1904/4 1908/15 1908/24 1909/6 1909/22 1982/12 1990/8 1990/12 1995/22 1997/25 1998/14 2005/20 2005/22 2008/25 2009/18 2011/5 2011/7 2011/12
MS. COIT: [125] 1811/5 1815/15 1816/2 1816/4 1824/14 1828/21 1830/2 1839/22 1839/24 1840/1 1841/15 1841/19 1849/3 1852/12 1854/24 1855/20 1858/7 1859/25 1869/22 1870/23 1873/16 1873/21 1874/1 1891/10 1891/12 1891/22 1891/25 1896/10 1899/13 1909/13 1909/25 1910/4 1920/9 1920/16 1924/2 1924/5 1925/21 1925/23 1925/25 1926/2 1926/6 1927/3 1928/20 1944/6 1944/15 1962/22 1967/24 1969/23 1970/1 1973/11 1974/25 1975/4 1981/19 1981/21 1982/9 1982/14 1989/17 1990/6 1990/10 1994/12 2009/16 2010/8 2011/8 2011/10 2011/15 2011/18

2012/5 2021/11 2021/14 2024/1 2024/4 2025/19 2031/23 2040/1 2049/20 2053/5 2054/4 2063/7 2063/10 2063/16 2070/4 2070/7 2070/12 2070/25 2071/3 2071/5 2071/7 2074/12 2074/19 2074/21 2075/18 2075/25 2076/21 2079/12 2079/16 2079/20 2079/22 2081/12 2081/21 2082/7 2085/8 2085/10 2086/13 2086/16 2086/20 2087/2 2087/4 2087/16 2088/3 2088/5 2088/7 2088/12 2088/15 2088/24 2089/2 2089/7 2089/13 2089/23 2091/6 2092/2 2092/17 2093/21 2094/18 2095/17 2095/19
MS. YOSHISHIGE: [1] 2063/19 THE COURT REPORTER: [1] 1900/18
THE COURT: [272]
THE WITNESS: [57] 1811/11 1811/16 1828/25 1833/20 1842/3 1842/7 1842/9 1842/12 1852/13 1854/12 1855/2 1869/25 1871/1 1873/12 1874/9 1874/15 1905/21 1910/12 1910/20 1916/3 1920/17 1928/22 1944/9 1944/13 1944/20 1944/23 1945/3 1945/6 1945/21 1946/8 1946/10 1963/1 1975/11 1975/16 1975/19 1994/13 1998/2 2005/23 2012/13 2012/20 2012/23 2024/25 2025/10 2025/12 2028/1 2028/12 2028/14 2032/1 2052/1 2054/6 2056/15 2063/13 2064/3 2064/7 2064/10 2076/4 2076/7

\section*{\$}
\$1,200 [2] 2078/11 2078/15
\$142 [1] 2078/11
\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline \\
\hline '10 [1] 2057/17 \\
'11 [2] 2014/21 2057/17 \\
'12 [2] 1816/20 1868/2 \\
'14 [1] 1822/22 \\
'63 [1] 1861/10 \\
'91 [1] 1976/20 \\
'91 and [1] 1976/20 \\
'Stop [1] 2071/13 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{I}\) \\
\hline s/Jill [1] 2097/14 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{O}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{0 0 5 ~ [ 1 ] ~ 2 0 6 1 / 2 2 ~}\) \\
\(\mathbf{0 3 4 6}\) [1] 2097/16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1

1,500 [3] 1932/10 1970/9 1970/17
10 [9] 1858/6 1858/7 1860/4 1905/16
1933/10 2008/12 2013/24 2042/20
2057/9
10/12/12 [1] 1968/9
10/19/12 [1] 1969/2
10/25/12 [1] 1968/21
100 [1] 1989/4
100 percent [2] 1876/20 1987/4
1000 [1] 1808/21
10th [1] 1808/8

11 [8] 1927/13 1936/23 1950/17 1999/22 2013/20 2013/24 2042/20 2061/21
11-year-old [2] 1892/9 1892/13
11:35 [1] 1834/24
11:35 a.m [2] 1834/18 1854/5
11:39 when [1] 1834/24
11th [1] 1960/13
12 [5] 1928/18 1937/1 1968/9 1968/21 1969/2
12-page document [1] 1928/12
12/28/15 [1] 2097/15
12th [2] 1838/24 2075/8
13 [1] 2070/24
137 [2] 2079/10 2079/22
139 [5] 1943/24 1944/10 1944/11
1944/15 1945/18
14 [1] 1906/7
140 [1] 1943/22
143 [1] 1942/25
145 [2] 1943/5 1944/13
146 [2] 1904/10 1943/22
147 [1] 1967/15
149 [1] 1943/24
14th [1] 1906/8
15 [3] 1957/1 2053/1 2097/15
15-ish [1] 1844/20
150 [11] 1866/7 1866/8 1867/3
1944/14 1944/15 1945/18 1989/5
2005/22 2005/23 2062/10 2062/11
15th [2] 1906/20 2023/9
16 [5] 1807/7 1813/11 1961/2 2019/8 2097/6
161 [1] 1904/10
16140 [2] 1943/21 1968/8
16146 [2] 1943/21 1968/12
168 [7] 1831/21 1831/22 1833/12
1833/13 1833/18 1833/19 1838/20
16th [2] 1907/2 2023/10
17 [3] 1961/3 2075/4 2097/16
170 [1] 1989/5
172 [1] 2058/21
17th [4] 1904/13 1904/14 1907/16 2075/9
18 [6] 1938/23 1950/20 1951/20 1992/17 2075/10 2080/18
18th [4] 1960/14 1960/18 2042/4 2082/18
19 [2] 2062/12 2062/13
1981 [1] 1911/14
1987 [2] 1911/15 1927/16
1990 [2] 1812/7 1861/15
1:00 [1] 1899/20
1:15 [3] 1957/1 1957/2 1957/7
1st [2] 1950/2 1976/16
2
2,000-plus [1] 1932/8
2,500 [1] 1970/13
20 [8] 1845/12 1927/21 2008/9
2008/12 2011/23 2057/4 2057/9
2077/7
20-minute [1] 1859/9
200 [1] 1808/5
2000 [2] 1842/21 1976/24
2000s [1] 1997/2
2001 [1] 1976/25
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 2 & 301 [1] 1808/21 & 97204 [2] 1808/5 1808/2 \\
\hline 2004 [5] 1874/25 1883/22 1890/8 & 30th [4] 1989/25 2080/19 2082/1
2089/15 & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& 97401 \text { [1] 1808/9 } \\
& 98-0346[1] ~ 2097 / 16
\end{aligned}\right.
\] \\
\hline 1891/2 1976/13 & 31 [2] 1960/23 1961/12 & 9th [1] 1905/2 \\
\hline 2007 [3] 1936/7 1936/23 1937/1 & 31st [1] 1982/5 & A \\
\hline 2008 [5] 1885/11 1885/15 1885/20 & \[
326-8191[1] \quad 1808 / 22
\] & a.m [2] 1834/18 1854/5 \\
\hline 1887/18 1976/14
2009 [8] 1905/23 1936/7 2013/8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
326-8191 [1] 1808/22 \\
329 [1] 2074/19
\end{tabular} & abilities [2] 1885/8 2030/2 \\
\hline 2009 [8] 1905/23 1936/7 2013/8
\(2014 / 2\) 2036/11 2057/17 2057/21 & 33 [1] 1964/6 & ability [6] 1890/14 1960/6 1962/16 \\
\hline 2014/2 2036/11 \(2057 / 17\) 2057/21 2057/22 & 331 [2] 1857/20 1859/20 & 1972/8 2023/7 2082/23 \\
\hline 2010 [2] 1997/2 2014/21 & 35 [1] 1854/17 & able [17] 1869/12 1885/5 1888/1 \\
\hline 2011 [17] 1816/20 1817/6 1817/15 & 360 [1] 1808/8 & 1971/1 \\
\hline 1818/8 1876/6 1876/18 1877/1 & 364 [7] 1981/22 1981/23 1981/25 & 2023/21 2023/22 2037/17 2042/9 \\
\hline 1904/13 1905/11 1905/16 1950/17 & 1982/6 1982/10 1999/20 2009/7 & 2044/1 2051/3 2071/16 2078/23 \\
\hline 1950/20 1951/20 1961/2 1961/3 & 373 [4] 1989/22 1990/7 1990/11 1990/12 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2094/6 2095/6 \\
about [353]
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 2036/12 2055/15 2018 [48] 1822/17 1858/2 1859/22 & & above [4] 2056/2 2086/6 2088/13 \\
\hline 2012 [48] 1822/17 1858/2 1859/22
1868/6 1868/8 1868/9 1877/2 1891/22 & 39 [1] 2074/19 & 2097/10 \\
\hline 1911/19 1911/25 1912/14 1938/23 & 391 [9] 2074/2 2074/3 2074/5 2074/13 & above-entitled [1] 2097/10 \\
\hline 1941/24 1949/14 1949/15 1958/8 & 2074/20 2074/21 2075/3 2079/23 & absolute [1] 1840/25 \\
\hline 1963/11 1963/20 1963/21 1965/3 & 079 & 8] 1845/19 1847/10 \\
\hline 1965/8 1965/12 1969/10 1976/15 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 3:00 or [2] 2077/23 2078/2 } \\
& \text { 3:09:24 [1] 2080/19 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1850/5 1853/6 1881/7 1917/5 } \\
& 2087 / 8
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1979/9 1980/8 1998/22 2029/16 & & \\
\hline 2029/20 2036/13 2039/11 2045/19 & 4 & \[
1814 / 9
\] \\
\hline 2047/21 2049/3 2055/15 2055/23 2056/10 2056/23 2057/13 2061/23 & 4,000 [1] 1970/9 & academy [22] 1812/10 1812/19 \\
\hline 2062/5 2068/23 2070/24 2072/20 & 40 [1] 2001/17 & 1812/20 1813/11 1813/18 1813/22 \\
\hline 2075/4 2075/9 2075/11 2080/18 & 40.270 [2] 2021/2 2025/2 & 1813/23 1813/24 1819/17 1849/11 \\
\hline 2013 [9] 1849/6 1911/11 1978/12 & 404 [8] 1924/6 1924/7 1924/9 1944/21 & 1875/5 1875/7 1887/13 1887/14 \\
\hline 1981/6 2049/4 2050/22 2053/14 & 1946/9 1946/10 1946/12 1946/17 & 1978/19 1978/20 2015/14 2015/15 \\
\hline 2054/3 2054/12 & 406 [3] 1815/19 1815/20 1816/3 & 2015/18 2019/3 2019/7 2019/8 \\
\hline 2014 [20] 1822/21 1847/22 1849/6 & 411 [1] 1808/4 & accelerated [1] 1959/19 \\
\hline 1858/6 1860/4 1875/4 1927/13 & 412 [5] 1853/7 1853/18 1859/22 & accept [4] 1943/10 1958/21 2072/3 \\
\hline 1978/12 1982/5 1989/25 2009/13 & 25 & 209 \\
\hline 2038/13 2050/25 2052/23 2052/25 & 42 [1] 1883/16 & acceptable [3] 1961/19 2088/21 \\
\hline 2053/1 2053/15 2053/22 2054/15 & 426 [2] 1968/3 1969/24 & 2090/6 \\
\hline 2054/21 & 43 [1] 1854/17 & eepted [2] 201 \\
\hline 2015 [2] 1807/7 2097/6 & \begin{tabular}{l}
48-page report [1] 2083/3 \\
4:00 [2] 2077/23 2078/3
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
accessibility [1] 2010/21 \\
accessible [2] 2010/24 2011/4
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 20:39:33 [1] 2075/8 & & accessing [1] 2043/20 \\
\hline 215 [5] 1998/3 1998/4 1998/14 & 5 & accommodation [1] 2089/10 \\
\hline 1998/16 2055/20 & 50 [1] 2016/24 & according [2] 2001/3 2049/17 \\
\hline 22 [2] 1843/13 1969/10 & 50 feet [1] 2007/6 & account [1] 2032/9 \\
\hline 22-plus [2] 1844/19 1871/19 & 503 [1] 1808/22 & accountability [1] 2031/6 \\
\hline 23 [2] 2052/23 2052/25 & 55 [1] 2037/21 & accountable [1] 2034/25 \\
\hline  & 5th [1] 1998/22 & accreditation [1] 2048/2 \\
\hline 24 [1] 1891/22 & 6 &  \\
\hline 25 [2] 1958/8 1963/21 & 60 [2] 1893/14 1894/16 & 1974/8 1974/10 1992/12 2003/20 \\
\hline 257 [2] 1894/17 1894/19 & 6:13-cv-01908-DOC [2] 1807/5 2097/4 & 2006/11 2006/13 2050/9 \\
\hline 25th [2] 1958/10 1967/20 & & accurately [1] 1953/3 \\
\hline 26 [1] 1949/15 & 7 & accusation [5] 1972/20 2007 \\
\hline 27 [3] 1858/2 1859/22 1868/2 & 70 [1] 2037/22 & 2024/15 2037/15 2043/2 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 273 \text { [5] 1990/10 1997/24 1997/25 } \\
& 2052 / 12 \text { 2052/13 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 8 & accusations [1] 2043 \\
\hline 274 [7] 1946/1 1946/2 1946/2 1946/16 & 80 [3] 1920/11 1920/13 1921/18 & accused [4] 1838/6 1838/12 \(2040 / 7\) \\
\hline 1946/17 1967/12 1967/13 & 80 officers [1] 2036/16 & achieve [1] 1822/2 \\
\hline 28 [2] 2065/10 2068/9 & 8191 [1] 1808/22 & acknowledged [1] 1992/11 \\
\hline 29 [2] 1891/13 1891/24 & 83 [1] 1893/4 & acquittal [1] 2002/9 \\
\hline 2:00 or [1] 2078/2 & 85 [1] 2037/21 & across [7] 1878/6 1879/21 1880/25 \\
\hline 2:20 p.m [1] 2052/23 & 86 [7] 1926/1 1926/2 1926/5 1926/12 & \[
1882 / 19 \text { 1890/12 1979/5 1995/8 }
\] \\
\hline 2nd [4] 1950/4 2042/5 2044/20 & 1926/23 1927/1 1946/22 & |act [2] 1882/17 2019/14 \\
\hline 2060/17 & 89 [2] 1903/18 1903/24 & acting [5] 1843/20 2058/12 2058/24 \\
\hline 3 & 8:00 [2] 2078/9 2079/1 & 2058/25 2058/25 \\
\hline 30 [5] 1927/19 1929/23 1930/6 & 9 & g-captain [1] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1939 / 13 \text { 1961/19 } \\
& \mathbf{3 0 0} \text { [1] 1808/9 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
9/30/17 [1] 2097/16 \\
95 percent [1] 1942/5
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{|l}
\text { action [18] 1846/15 1860/25 1894/13 } \\
1894 / 20 \text { 1911/20 1916/19 1918/3 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

A
action... [11] 1921/15 1921/16 1922/3
1922/15 1922/19 1933/7 2021/1
2081/5 2085/3 2085/21 2092/6
actions [3] 1894/15 1937/20 1937/20
activation [1] 2062/3
active [1] 1915/10
activities [2] 1959/20 2045/12 activity [3] 1820/6 1820/11 1931/20 actual [7] 1873/10 1914/14 1926/20 1926/21 1991/5 2057/7 2062/4 actually [46] 1813/15 1819/19 1820/2 1823/23 1850/24 1866/4 1866/20 1868/13 1872/3 1872/21 1883/13 1884/3 1885/15 1886/17 1888/10 1888/25 1907/9 1908/19 1915/1 1915/15 1933/16 1942/4 1945/18 1949/5 1952/6 1956/13 1972/23 1973/17 1982/7 1991/4 1992/13 1996/19 2013/12 2018/1 2026/14 2026/16 2030/1 2030/19 2035/15 2040/23 2049/25 2051/22 2057/3 2057/8 2069/2 2077/22
ADAM [1] 1808/3
addition [3] 1959/23 2042/19 2092/13
additional [9] 1821/9 1916/21 1946/15
1967/4 1968/18 2016/24 2042/13
2052/8 2071/25
address [1] 2074/16
addressed [5] 1873/1 1906/15
1924/23 1961/25 1989/25
adequate [2] 1918/6 1980/20
adjourned [1] 2096/9
administration [4] 1928/8 2016/19
2068/13 2068/17
administrative [8] 1941/19 1941/22
1942/1 2042/2 2042/4 2054/22
2054/22 2058/11
administrator [2] 1911/15 2039/2
Administrators [1] 1973/20
admitted [3] 1831/20 1831/22 1976/21
adopt [2] 2080/16 2081/20
adopting [1] 1983/24
advertising [1] 2078/12
advice [6] 1987/5 1987/10 2021/20
2022/13 2025/10 2025/16
advise [3] 1985/12 2056/7 2056/21
advised [3] 2020/25 2021/3 2025/1
advising [2] 1925/15 2065/23
affairs [14] 1839/8 1839/10 1840/7
1850/9 1869/18 1872/23 1873/11
1984/23 1985/5 1985/9 1997/19
1997/22 1999/5 2038/2
affect [1] 2082/23
affidavit [4] 2023/19 2024/11 2024/16 2059/5
affirmative [3] 1996/14 1996/15 1996/22
afraid [1] 2001/4
after [62] 1818/10 1818/13 1821/6
1821/12 1836/13 1852/22 1853/4
1854/16 1854/18 1855/9 1860/7 1868/9 1873/13 1879/1 1879/1 1882/10 1884/17 1887/8 1888/6 1888/10 1895/1 1909/21 1914/18 1918/24 1918/25 1925/4 1942/5 1949/15 1950/7 1951/14 1957/2

1958/6 1960/6 1961/4 1969/6 1975/14 1977/17 1981/14 1988/24 2007/6 2008/20 2012/16 2013/14 2015/20 2027/4 2028/19 2036/12 2038/25 2045/18 2045/19 2047/15 2047/21 2054/21 2054/24 2057/22 2060/3 2067/16 2077/9 2077/16 2078/17 2083/19 2089/12
afternoon [4] 1994/23 1994/24 2064/17 2077/23
again [55] 1811/14 1830/10 1830/22 1832/10 1833/7 1837/11 1838/19 1847/14 1847/24 1848/3 1850/2 1850/11 1851/10 1857/9 1858/13 1858/24 1859/15 1863/12 1864/8 1867/16 1871/2 1881/21 1887/9 1889/25 1893/16 1894/8 1902/6 1902/18 1905/17 1916/20 1920/7 1920/21 1925/9 1925/22 1925/24 1926/24 1930/2 1930/23 1947/20 1953/19 1955/3 1957/4 1965/16 1969/3 1973/10 1984/13 2015/6 2025/20 2049/8 2054/7 2056/16 2075/25 2085/11 2086/21 2094/17 against [33] 1829/24 1831/7 1845/9 1845/18 1856/5 1862/1 1869/13 1878/19 1884/1 1894/20 1901/16 1923/14 1928/19 1935/7 1935/15 1939/7 1951/22 1972/20 2007/1 2037/13 2038/2 2039/19 2040/11 2040/20 2041/12 2042/7 2044/16 2068/18 2072/15 2080/12 2084/19 2085/19 2088/19
age [2] 1878/16 1898/13
agencies [12] 1978/14 1979/14 1979/18 1980/2 1981/15 1987/6 1987/9 1990/20 1993/16 1995/25 2000/17 2017/3
agency [21] 1814/10 1823/20 1848/16 1848/22 1849/20 1981/8 1983/4 1984/1 1984/4 1984/10 1984/21 1986/3 1986/11 1992/8 1992/23 1992/24 1992/24 2000/20 2001/8 2018/15 2041/5
agency's [1] 1983/9
agent [1] 1843/18
Agilities [1] 1819/15 agility [2] 1819/17 1819/24 ago [18] 1839/21 1839/21 1850/12 1925/10 1933/10 1934/4 1947/21 1989/2 2008/9 2008/12 2008/13 2017/21 2033/16 2048/1 2053/1 2057/9 2066/5 2066/22
agree [25] 1860/6 1861/23 1863/2 1864/11 1895/4 1921/16 1936/22 1943/25 1962/11 1962/15 1965/12 1972/21 2007/20 2034/17 2047/17 2053/24 2056/8 2056/18 2056/22 2062/15 2062/16 2073/15 2088/9 2092/7 2092/15
agreed [1] 1927/1
agreeing [1] 2092/4
agreement [15] 1816/12 1816/13 1816/18 1902/9 1913/7 1913/9 1913/11 1913/12 1913/15 1916/12 1917/23 1919/14 1921/23 1933/5 2065/16
agreements [1] 1815/24
Ahlen [2] 2066/17 2067/16
Airlines [1] 2078/11
al [1] 2097/3
alcohol [1] 1878/16
Alex [9] 1872/4 1975/5 2038/14
2051/23 2052/1 2052/16 2054/9
2054/10 2055/24
ALEXANDER [2] 1975/9 1975/20
alibi [1] 2007/15
all [167]
allegation [12] 1856/24 1935/4 1935/8
2039/19 2040/14 2043/7 2043/14
2043/16 2043/17 2046/23 2056/6 2059/4
allegations [19] 1850/19 1873/10 1933/23 1939/7 1947/18 1953/25 1963/24 1980/2 2040/10 2042/7 2042/18 2042/21 2042/22 2043/20 2044/16 2044/17 2048/17 2058/15 2071/16
alleged [4] 1954/6 1984/19 2024/16 2049/6
alleging [1] 1935/2
Allen [2] 1921/6 1928/7
allow [8] 1895/24 1934/13 1973/2
1983/25 2048/16 2049/12 2080/5 2091/17
allowed [9] 1869/14 1886/8 1962/13 1970/20 2018/15 2038/7 2092/13 2094/9 2095/2
allowing [2] 1856/4 1881/17
allows [2] 1906/25 1997/10
almost [6] 1845/12 1860/4 1863/4
1949/15 2076/16 2091/16
alone [4] 1882/7 1986/19 1986/21 2026/25
along [7] 1876/2 1882/17 1888/1 1896/1 2087/11 2088/13 2092/17 already [8] 1821/17 1831/20 1896/4 1926/3 1961/13 2015/3 2022/25 2032/21
also [40] 1818/14 1819/16 1830/6 1879/17 1882/6 1890/14 1905/24 1906/11 1907/6 1914/9 1918/10 1920/23 1926/14 1928/7 1928/7 1934/23 1935/25 1942/21 1953/8 1972/10 1972/15 1986/14 1990/2 1990/19 2011/3 2025/18 2027/5 2034/25 2035/1 2036/18 2074/25 2080/13 2081/4 2085/20 2088/9 2088/14 2092/5 2092/11 2095/13 2095/22
alter [1] 2039/14
altercation [1] 1894/8
altered [1] 2039/8
although [2] 1900/8 1952/25
always [8] 1877/22 1877/24 1905/19 1905/21 1925/7 1996/6 2017/11 2026/24
am [7] 1817/5 1909/10 2040/1 2061/24
2083/15 2086/3 2089/15
amendment [1] 1815/23
Amnesty [1] 1887/4
Among [1] 1866/22
amongst [2] 1835/16 2011/21
amount [5] 1820/11 1904/20 1934/13
amount... [2] 1980/23 2068/5 analysis [3] 1966/12 1991/8 2030/3 and Sergeant [1] 1905/12
and the [1] 1945/12
and/or [1] 1990/3
ANDREA [1] 1808/7
Andrew [3] 1811/6 1811/9 1811/17
angel [1] 1827/9
angry [3] 1847/13 1847/14 1847/19
annual [6] 1939/13 1939/15 1939/19 1939/23 1940/4 1940/7
another [27] 1854/21 1865/21 1876/11
1880/14 1882/19 1885/5 1888/25
1892/14 1901/8 1904/3 1906/6 1936/1 1975/4 1989/7 1989/16 1992/8 1997/4
2007/5 2026/22 2027/5 2030/8
2034/17 2037/24 2061/15 2072/18 2089/12 2095/15
answer [27] 1828/25 1855/3 1869/2 1869/12 1871/1 1871/11 1873/5 1900/13 1916/1 1916/3 1963/2 1992/6 2000/24 2003/9 2021/4 2022/7 2022/10 2022/14 2022/19 2023/25 2028/6 2040/12 2042/11 2046/10 2048/4 2051/8 2071/16
answered [1] 1890/21
answering [1] 2024/25
answers [2] 1897/18 2023/23
anticipated [1] 1978/6
any [146]
anybody [22] 1827/13 1861/23
1863/23 1865/1 1878/3 1888/13
1890/9 1908/8 1948/19 1948/22
1948/24 1949/1 1949/2 1949/6 1949/8
1949/11 1954/19 1957/3 2006/15
2053/19 2053/23 2078/19
anymore [1] 2083/25
anyone [8] 1867/22 1869/19 1884/14 1913/23 1949/5 2050/21 2053/15 2053/20
anything [54] 1813/2 1818/23 1819/1 1819/10 1821/1 1846/13 1852/9 1855/15 1856/20 1860/17 1864/5 1867/11 1867/23 1871/21 1873/9 1882/18 1883/10 1883/23 1887/6 1888/11 1894/5 1899/23 1901/25 1902/3 1902/10 1907/18 1907/22 1925/5 1925/8 1942/22 1948/4 1965/20 1966/1 1966/9 1966/11 1966/21 1977/22 1980/25 1985/17 1985/20 1991/10 1991/11 \(2007 / 7\) 2007/8 2025/22 2033/22 2034/3 2040/7 2041/20 2054/23 2069/22 2073/7 2078/16 2089/7
anywhere [1] 1947/10
AO [1] 1907/4
apartment [8] 1892/25 1893/4 1893/14 1893/17 1893/17 1894/16 1894/17 1895/6
apartments [8] 1890/17 1890/22
1891/6 1891/19 1892/23 1893/1
1893/5 1893/5
apologies [4] 1840/1 1854/12 2021/24 2093/12
apologize [2] 2076/12 2078/10
apparent [2] 2020/17 2092/11
apparently [2] 1836/9 2093/16 appear [1] 2022/15
appearance [3] 2083/8 2091/13 2094/16
APPEARANCES [1] 1808/1
appears [1] 1959/19
applicants [1] 1825/16
application [5] 2015/7 2031/1 2032/10 2032/15 2061/11
applied [2] 2013/14 2061/5
applies [2] 1978/5 1983/17
apply [4] 1958/1 2029/13 2061/8 2082/1
applying [2] 2014/3 2031/2
appointed [1] 1976/12
appointing [2] 1919/16 1970/18
appointments [1] 2078/24
appraisal [3] 1988/7 1989/16 1989/16
appraisals [1] 1937/19
appreciate [4] 2021/19 2022/12 2046/9 2084/23
appreciated [1] 2096/8
apprised [2] 1914/8 2047/23
approach [13] 1815/16 1853/10
1891/11 1903/18 1924/3 1925/22
1925/24 1967/25 1981/20 1989/18
1989/19 1997/23 2070/5
appropriate [8] 1819/23 1820/11
1921/17 1964/12 1971/5 2020/22
2094/13 2094/13
approve [2] 1868/11 1964/13
approved [1] 1964/10
approximate [1] 1979/6
approximately [3] 1852/22 1961/19 2055/18
April [8] 1842/22 1842/23 1941/14 1959/20 1959/23 2013/8 2057/21 2057/22
APSO [1] 1906/22
arbitration [16] 1862/18 1919/8
1929/14 1930/1 1932/5 1934/19
1952/15 1973/17 1973/18 1973/21
1973/22 1973/24 1991/3 1992/16 1993/4 2002/12
arbitrator [13] 1834/14 1841/11 1852/23 1853/5 1862/20 1863/2
1919/6 1919/9 1929/20 1947/3 1967/2 1992/22 2002/16
arbitrator's [7] 1862/23 1966/25
1991/5 1991/11 1993/2 1993/7 2003/1
arbitrators [4] 1991/15 1991/23 1993/4 2003/25
are [159]
area [21] 1815/4 1817/1 1848/3 1849/3
1877/17 1877/19 1877/21 1878/1
1880/25 1883/17 1883/21 1893/1
1894/18 1906/5 1907/12 1907/15
1930/25 1991/18 2004/22 2025/24 2036/7
areas [6] 1877/25 1897/17 1897/24
1908/22 1961/22 2034/12
aren't [3] 1898/14 2018/15 2074/18
argue [1] 2088/25
arguing [3] 1962/8 2077/25 2080/11
argument [10] 1892/9 1892/11 2077/1
2077/5 2083/16 2084/6 2084/14
2086/20 2089/12 2092/3

Argumentative [1] 1830/3
arguments [2] 1926/15 2077/24
arises [2] 1978/3 1983/10
arising [1] 1980/2
arose [1] 1989/6
around [32] 1822/14 1861/14 1861/16
1863/8 1863/11 1878/5 1879/16 1879/20 1880/19 1880/21 1880/23 1883/20 1888/17 1927/21 1941/13 1941/18 1980/23 1996/1 2000/2 2000/5 2007/16 2009/9 2018/20 2029/20 2035/15 2043/8 2050/3 2057/3 2057/4 2061/9 2065/13 2074/9
arrest [8] 1814/23 1820/14 1825/22
1826/1 1826/5 1829/16 1907/3 2018/22
arresting [1] 1860/25
arrests [1] 1815/1
arrived [1] 1905/25
arts [1] 2014/5
as [210]
ask [44] 1828/20 1828/23 1833/24
1835/24 1839/20 1853/21 1859/11 1865/21 1865/24 1865/25 1866/22 1896/5 1896/25 1897/2 1898/17 1904/5 1904/15 1904/16 1904/16 1904/18 1914/20 1918/24 1923/3 1930/15 1930/25 1936/16 1936/22 1944/7 1949/18 1952/18 2010/12 2023/3 2024/1 2024/11 2025/14 2025/20 2031/10 2047/3 2047/6 2054/7 2061/18 2067/6 2083/23 2083/25
asked [65] 1828/19 1829/4 1829/19
1830/12 1830/13 1830/15 1831/1 1855/17 1855/18 1855/19 1855/21 1855/22 1855/25 1879/5 1880/8 1880/18 1881/24 1882/2 1882/3
1882/13 1884/2 1884/3 1897/17 1897/19 1905/11 1905/13 1921/9 1934/9 1947/13 1972/3 1972/10 1974/1 1978/20 2007/5 2021/4 2021/5 2021/19 2023/17 2023/17 2031/9 2031/15 2041/1 2043/22 2045/9 2045/25 2046/4 2046/10 2046/24 2048/16 2048/19 2049/25 2054/1 2054/4 2055/8 2055/12 2090/23 2091/1 2091/18 2092/13 2093/6 2093/10 2093/10 2093/11 2093/18 2095/8
asking [19] 1855/1 1865/5 1944/17 1945/21 1949/1 1988/4 1989/15 2002/14 2003/3 2003/3 2004/5 2010/17 2010/17 2010/18 2010/20 2024/13 2056/24 2089/3 2089/6
aspects [2] 1898/9 1907/7
asserted [2] 1964/3 1964/6
assertion [2] 1956/3 1966/2
assess [1] 1953/3
assessment [1] 1988/5
assigned [3] 1870/5 1876/10 1964/15
assist [6] 1909/12 1964/17 1965/14
1965/24 1978/20 2067/17
assistance [1] 1865/11
assistant [1] 1988/17
assisted [3] 1906/22 1906/24 1907/4 associate [4] 1911/7 1911/17 1921/8
associate... [1] 2014/5
associated [3] 1886/3 1886/3 2020/17 association [11] 2029/23 2033/17 2033/19 2034/8 2034/14 2034/14 2035/18 2036/3 2057/2 2060/22 2060/24
assume [1] 2011/5
assuming [4] 1919/8 1939/18 2061/24 2081/11
ASUO [3] 1885/25 1886/2 1887/2
athletic [1] 1825/12
attachments [1] 1903/22
attack [2] 1894/3 1974/5
attacked [1] 1893/22
attacking [1] 1959/8
attend [4] 1844/6 1849/6 1875/5 1956/6
attended [2] 1863/10 1919/24
attendees [4] 1955/20 1955/25
1956/17 1959/10
attending [3] 1887/14 1979/12 2078/25
attention [1] 1989/3
attesting [1] 2058/6
attire [1] 1819/23
attorney [73] 1822/12 1823/2 1823/7
1823/10 1823/25 1824/13 1831/9 1837/20 1837/20 1839/15 1847/22 1848/7 1848/11 1848/23 1850/24 1851/8 1852/11 1872/4 1872/21 1951/21 1976/10 1976/11 1977/1 1977/8 1977/15 1978/25 1981/6 1988/17 1993/23 1994/4 2004/25 2016/15 2020/25 2021/3 2022/19 2024/24 2024/24 2025/10 2025/15 2033/21 2033/23 2033/23 2035/10 2037/3 2037/5 2037/9 2037/17 2038/19 2038/22 2039/1 2040/19 2042/8 2042/14 2042/15 2044/25 2047/7 2051/9 2052/2 2052/3 2052/9 2053/21 2054/1 2054/9 2054/15 2055/16 2056/19 2056/21 2056/23 2057/7 2058/12 2081/12 2081/15 2081/25
attorney's [26] 1872/18 1976/18 1977/18 1978/9 1979/1 1985/22 1987/3 1990/24 1994/2 2021/20 2022/12 2033/19 2034/5 2034/9 2034/17 2035/24 2036/5 2037/8 2038/10 2050/21 2051/4 2051/21 2052/19 2053/16 2054/24 2054/25
attorney-client [1] 2081/15
attorneys [7] 1980/15 2034/12 2034/13 2036/23 2053/7 2057/10 2081/25
audio [5] 1902/21 1903/1 1966/10 2061/20 2061/22
audios [1] 1898/3
audit [5] 2031/12 2047/17 2047/21 2047/25 2048/2
August [1] 1976/16
August 1st [1] 1976/16
AUSO [1] 1887/24
authority [20] 1814/23 1814/24
1815/14 1816/10 1816/17 1816/22
1817/9 1825/21 1825/24 1908/20

1919/16 1970/18 1983/4 2018/21
2019/14 2020/8 2027/9 2027/15
2045/9 2045/15
auto [2] 2017/18 2017/18
autocrat [1] 1844/25
automatically [1] 1848/11
available [7] 1857/12 1932/17 1977/16 2000/21 2080/19 2080/21 2089/15 Avenue [3] 1808/4 1808/8 1808/21 avoid [1] 2022/25
award [1] 1862/18
aware [30] 1839/6 1839/10 1841/1 1876/21 1885/11 1885/14 1912/14 1940/2 1940/6 1951/19 1951/22 1952/14 1952/17 1954/14 1954/17 1971/23 1972/1 1986/7 1986/25 1996/21 1997/18 1999/12 2004/3 2020/14 2024/14 2038/11 2047/20 2058/5 2058/7 2060/11
awareness [1] 2000/6
away [8] 1841/7 1884/11 1901/12 1941/5 2080/3 2083/23 2086/12 2086/12
awkward [1] 2023/4
B
B-E-C-H-D-O-L-T [1] 1811/17 bachelor [1] 2014/5 back [65] 1824/5 1827/10 1858/12 1859/19 1876/18 1883/17 1892/18 1892/22 1894/19 1895/25 1933/17 1933/19 1936/2 1937/16 1938/24 1941/13 1945/17 1957/1 1957/10 1958/25 1959/2 1965/9 1965/11 1973/9 1976/13 1996/18 1999/25 2011/23 2012/3 2012/23 2013/22 2015/4 2021/25 2022/1 2022/2 2027/8 2035/6 2037/7 2042/1 2043/12 2045/14 2046/22 2049/7 2051/1 2052/10 2061/1 2061/9 2073/15 2073/22 2074/18 2074/25 2075/18 2076/10 2076/14 2077/8 2077/15 2078/1 2078/6 2078/14 2079/5 2079/8 2082/19 2089/12 2092/22 2095/4 backbone [1] 1978/4
background [12] 1817/11 1911/12 1948/23 1976/17 2013/10 2015/13 2017/23 2032/20 2032/21 2032/22 2032/24 2061/15
backup [3] 2084/22 2084/22 2085/19
bad [2] 2078/12 2086/7
badge [1] 2063/4
bag [2] 1884/5 1884/9
baked [1] 1884/9
Baker [2] 2032/2 2033/12
bakery [1] 1884/10
ball [1] 1892/15
banter [1] 1836/1
bar [2] 1883/17 1976/21
bargaining [12] 1913/7 1913/9 1913/11 1913/15 1917/23 1919/14 1921/23 1933/5 1973/6 2065/16 2065/18 2065/20
barricades [1] 1896/2
base [2] 1820/24 1884/18
based [20] 1815/1 1839/7 1845/16 1847/5 1857/11 1884/12 1884/22

1885/3 1918/15 1919/12 1964/10 1980/15 2030/23 2035/11 2049/8 2050/7 2050/13 2051/24 2076/23 2091/12
basic [4] 1812/15 1813/11 1813/24 2015/15
basically [12] 1877/21 1883/17
1886/15 1973/9 1978/19 1979/1 2005/4 2020/8 2030/3 2041/10 2067/2 2071/13
basis [13] 1837/17 1841/5 1841/6 1856/13 1857/1 1877/10 1877/22 1947/3 1980/15 1986/20 2010/10 2030/24 2084/5
Bates [4] 1943/17 1943/22 1944/8 1967/14
bathroom [1] 2011/20 be [302]
bear [4] 1987/8 1990/21 1991/10 2023/2
bearing [1] 1985/1
bears [5] 1971/3 1983/2 1985/20 1987/2 2023/6
became [13] 1903/9 1911/15 1911/16 1927/15 2020/16 2036/11 2036/13 2057/5 2057/16 2057/22 2057/25 2058/1 2093/3
because [85] 1816/15 1825/16 1853/20 1853/24 1856/19 1865/20 1877/22 1880/21 1881/25 1884/10 1893/21 1896/25 1897/12 1897/14 1917/14 1932/4 1940/16 1941/20 1942/1 1952/10 1954/19 1955/3 1956/6 1959/8 1960/4 1962/8 1962/22 1974/20 1979/3 1979/25 1980/19 1984/25 1986/22 1987/13 1987/15 1988/5 1990/19 1993/1 1993/8 1993/25 1996/14 1996/16 1996/18 2000/21 2001/4 2001/21 2002/1 2002/2 2002/6 2004/22 2004/25 2007/14 2015/5 2022/10 2022/15 2024/15 2025/6 2031/5 2033/22 2034/15 2034/22 2034/22 2035/20 2036/18 2036/20 2036/20 2037/9 2040/12 2041/5 2042/9 2046/5 2050/25 2054/20 2077/3 2079/15 2080/2 2086/1 2086/2 2087/22 2088/18 2088/22 2089/10 2092/22 2094/14 2095/7
Bechdolt [15] 1811/6 1811/9 1811/17 1811/22 1815/19 1838/19 1854/10 1863/21 1952/6 1952/15 1952/18 1952/22 1953/4 1963/14 1971/20
Bechdolt's [2] 1854/14 1971/23
become [8] 1885/14 1888/24 1912/14 1977/18 2017/19 2018/13 2057/20 2059/13
becoming [4] 1977/1 2018/4 2039/9 2066/3
been [136] 1811/25 1818/8 1818/10 1831/22 1836/16 1839/7 1840/16 1845/15 1846/19 1851/1 1851/2 1861/14 1861/16 1863/7 1865/4 1872/12 1876/3 1876/11 1878/24 1878/25 1880/13 1880/15 1881/14 1883/22 1884/23 1891/6 1891/13 1892/20 1893/22 1895/21 1896/4
been... [105] 1900/5 1902/17 1902/20 1920/4 1920/11 1922/18 1922/19 1925/7 1926/3 1927/18 1935/6 1946/16 1948/12 1950/11 1951/7 1953/1 1955/12 1960/6 1966/3 1970/2 1972/23 1973/3 1982/4 1984/1 1988/2 1992/8 1992/13 1993/13 1995/18 1996/1 1996/3 1996/7 1996/11 2000/2 2000/5 2000/6 2000/7 2000/8 2000/19 2001/1 2001/8 2002/8 2006/5 2006/8 2009/13 2009/15 2013/6 2014/4 2016/23 2019/3 2019/22 2019/23 2020/25 2022/25 2023/18 2024/10 2024/20 2025/16 2027/16 2030/5 2033/15 2034/1 2035/5 2036/9 2036/10 2036/15 2036/16 2036/20 2039/20 2039/22 2040/13 2040/15 2042/9 2047/22 2049/16 2050/22 2051/2 2051/11 2052/10 2053/23 2055/4 2057/1 2057/2 2057/4 2057/13 2060/2 2060/14 2064/25 2065/9 2065/18 2065/20 2066/9 2076/23 2082/21 2082/24 2086/10 2091/8 2091/9 2092/23 2093/11 2093/24 2094/9 2095/6 2095/15 2096/8 beer [1] 1827/10 before [75] 1807/15 1812/5 1824/22 1828/5 1828/11 1830/23 1838/13 1840/11 1840/16 1844/1 1846/13 1856/10 1860/11 1860/12 1860/17 1861/3 1861/16 1863/25 1866/1 1887/9 1891/6 1891/7 1894/9 1896/20 1904/16 1913/24 1914/4 1914/15 1914/17 1916/10 1919/1 1926/19 1927/10 1929/25 1941/9 1948/12 1949/11 1955/13 1957/18 1959/5 1965/22 1966/12 1966/21 1966/23 1969/18 1972/24 1976/8 1976/18 1980/12 1988/11 1992/7 1995/17 1995/18 1997/2 1997/12 2002/11 2018/3 2018/12 2023/25 2024/19 2048/7 2056/2 2056/9 2056/23 2057/12 2057/14 2057/25 2059/20 2059/22 2060/2 2060/9 2066/12 2068/3 2083/24 2089/10
befuddled [1] 2002/6
began [5] 1960/25 1961/2 1979/15 2014/14 2015/20
beginning [5] 1965/11 2018/4 2075/11 2075/14 2075/15
begins [1] 1937/8
behalf [14] 1811/4 1811/10 1842/2
1874/8 1910/11 1929/21 1935/8 1973/24 1975/10 1979/12 2012/12 2058/12 2064/2 2079/11
behavior [6] 1839/12 1839/14 1850/20
1917/15 1953/2 2059/12
behaviors [1] 1877/13
behind [3] 1827/8 1839/18 1883/17
being [85] 1811/10 1820/1 1822/25
1842/2 1843/17 1844/2 1845/14 1846/10 1848/5 1848/12 1851/3 1853/4 1860/7 1860/8 1868/7 1874/8 1878/4 1879/18 1879/20 1880/2 1880/8 1882/4 1885/25 1902/6 1910/11 1913/17 1915/17 1915/18

1916/12 1917/3 1925/14 1925/15 1947/19 1947/22 1948/15 1951/21 1956/5 1972/20 1975/10 1981/14 1984/14 1997/2 2000/22 2004/22 2012/12 2013/14 2016/11 2016/12 2016/15 2016/16 2017/25 2018/6 2018/6 2018/16 2021/15 2021/17 2031/5 2033/22 2033/24 2034/25 2035/15 2038/2 2038/5 2038/13 2043/14 2046/1 2056/5 2057/23 2064/2 2066/9 2067/16 2069/11 2072/22 2081/4 2081/8 2082/23 2085/3 2085/20 2086/3 2086/25 2088/11 2088/15 2091/25 2092/5 2092/7
belief [6] 1820/24 1821/11 1824/4 1895/2 1986/21 2020/23
believable [1] 1977/14
believe [63] 1818/18 1820/3 1820/16 1823/8 1825/2 1829/8 1830/24 1845/23 1855/22 1863/24 1869/1 1869/8 1869/16 1878/23 1878/25 1880/14 1884/15 1884/24 1884/24 1885/1 1887/6 1894/2 1894/23 1908/2 1912/23 1916/6 1916/11 1919/23 1921/19 1925/9 1926/3 1934/1 1943/6 1944/18 1947/16 1951/18 1966/24 1980/16 1982/7 1984/6 1988/25 1993/20 1996/17 2001/24 2002/3 2003/16 2004/23 2006/4 2014/25 2015/25 2023/10 2024/20 2043/22 2044/20 2045/14 2049/8 2059/14 2059/22 2062/12 2063/1 2073/8 2073/11 2091/23
believed [4] 1887/3 1940/23 1987/8 2073/14
believes [1] 1986/18
bell [3] 1838/12 1933/20 1950/8
bells [2] 1934/2 2069/23
below [4] 1843/2 1906/14 1907/10 2097/8
bench [1] 2063/22
beneficial [1] 2080/25
benefit [3] 2002/15 2002/17 2003/5
benefits [1] 1911/15
Bernie [1] 2095/4
besides [1] 2080/6
best [18] 1898/23 1978/1 1980/15 1980/16 1982/3 1999/22 2006/10 2006/20 2008/17 2009/7 2030/23 2032/17 2032/18 2032/18 2043/25 2077/20 2078/24 2089/1
bet [1] 2023/2
Beth [2] 1921/6 1928/7
better [14] 1835/22 1882/19 1888/14 1888/14 1888/18 1964/17 1965/15 1965/24 1972/23 1997/20 1998/19 2004/12 2004/21 2082/11
between [18] 1815/24 1833/2 1834/23 1865/2 1877/18 1885/25 1888/4 1894/8 1913/12 1913/15 1928/4 1977/2 2018/5 2019/25 2051/14 2052/15 2053/7 2060/17
beyond [4] 1828/22 1928/21 1962/24 2094/3
bias [3] 2002/24 2023/7 2025/8
biased [1] 1984/2
bicycles [1] 1818/2
big [9] 1844/3 1878/11 1879/6 1880/4 1964/20 2018/5 2082/12 2092/22 2092/23
bike [4] 1877/16 1878/6 1895/19 1906/11
birthdates [1] 1882/3
Birthday [1] 2078/21
bit [10] 1817/17 1852/24 1900/23
1941/18 1991/14 2014/11 2033/13
2076/24 2076/25 2095/21
bizarre [1] 1871/19
black [3] 1864/12 1878/1 2092/23
blacked [1] 1898/14
block [1] 2078/1
blocked [1] 1895/23
blocks [1] 1982/20
blow [8] 1952/2 1952/3 1955/8 1959/4 1961/10 2055/20 2055/21 2056/14 blown [1] 1998/8
blue [3] 1944/20 1946/10 2078/13
board [9] 1978/17 1978/18 2031/3
2031/8 2033/9 2036/3 2061/1 2061/2 2062/20
boards [2] 2031/4 2031/13
Boats [1] 1977/2
body [3] 1886/5 2017/18 2017/18
born [2] 1995/18 1995/20
boss [1] 2040/23
both [15] 1855/7 2016/3 2026/18
2075/7 2075/11 2078/23 2080/23
2085/18 2087/6 2087/21 2088/21
2089/16 2092/4 2092/7 2092/15
bottom [10] 1838/23 1936/24 1937/2
1942/25 1943/19 1943/23 1954/25
1967/15 1982/21 2026/13
Bowers [1] 2040/23
Bowes [4] 1838/12 1933/24 1934/1 1936/4
bowl [5] 1870/8 1871/5 1871/10 1871/14 1923/4
box [6] 1811/14 1842/6 1874/11 1910/14 2012/16 2064/6
Boyd [3] 1928/9 1929/6 1929/7
Brady [149]
Brady disclosure [1] 1849/13
Brady-disclosing [1] 2001/3
Brady-exposed [1] 1854/24
Brady-list [10] 1832/19 1832/22
1834/23 1836/5 1836/12 1837/3
1837/23 1866/1 1983/5 2007/24
Brady-listed [12] 1835/10 1835/20
1836/2 1836/4 1836/11 1836/16
1836/20 1837/4 1837/18 1837/21 1848/12 1997/3
Brady-listing [13] 1831/15 1832/13 1835/6 1837/17 1840/20 1853/1 1853/2 1857/1 1858/4 1864/11 1864/23 2007/7 2007/9
Brady-related [3] 1980/1 1997/11 2004/9
Brady-relevant [1] 2004/7
Brailey [2] 1919/24 2074/12
Branchen [1] 2063/2
branches [5] 1877/20 1878/2 1878/7 1878/13 1878/20
brand [1] 1843/25

B
BRANDON [4] 1807/7 1851/5 2019/21 2059/1
break [8] 1887/21 1899/7 1956/21 1961/20 2011/18 2011/20 2011/25 2079/3
breathe [1] 1863/8 Brian [3] 1950/7 1950/9 2081/22
brief [2] 1977/1 2076/15
briefed [2] 2027/16 2034/16
briefing [1] 1938/16
briefings [2] 1956/6 2033/16 briefly [6] 1812/2 1840/3 1924/12 1994/21 1994/22 2018/8 bring [19] 1827/16 1830/17 1898/25 2025/24 2025/25 2040/25 2043/19 2046/22 2046/24 2047/1 2047/6 2055/19 2059/2 2061/1 2075/18 2076/14 2089/4 2092/19 2095/16
bringing [1] 1855/9
broad [2] 1897/24 1938/20
brought [10] 1849/24 1863/14
1909/20 1916/9 1923/21 1938/3
2023/12 2045/4 2067/12 2067/17
brush [1] 1827/9
building [6] 1825/14 1827/8 1880/13
1880/16 1880/23 1880/24
building's [1] 1880/20
buildings [1] 1877/18
bullhorn [1] 2044/4
bunch [1] 1877/19
burden [1] 1987/15
burglaries [1] 1989/9
Burglary [1] 1826/11
business [3] \(1867 / 8\) 1867/10 2064/23
Byers [3] 1996/16 1996/17 1996/20

\section*{C}

C-H-A-S-E [1] 2012/21
CAD [11] 1899/23 1955/24 1956/13 1956/15 1959/9 1959/12 1974/11 1974/12 2046/16 2046/18 2049/7
cadet [2] 2013/13 2013/14
CADs [1] 1898/3
caliber [1] 2006/8
California [1] 2095/5
call [47] 1811/4 1839/3 1880/13 1883/5 1883/12 1883/14 1884/12 1888/7 1888/10 1888/12 1888/17 1888/20 1889/6 1889/15 1891/3 1891/6 1891/10 1891/18 1891/21 1892/5 1892/20 1893/11 1893/13 1894/6 1894/14 1894/23 1894/24 1895/2 1897/14 1898/9 1904/3 1905/25 1907/7 1908/5 1910/4 1919/25 1925/10 1936/1 1937/23 1975/4 1992/25 1996/8 2001/15 2016/20 2048/18 2052/12 2084/21
called [22] 1811/10 1819/14 1842/2 1874/8 1883/15 1884/23 1892/12 1899/11 1899/12 1910/11 1973/24 1975/10 2008/19 2008/23 2012/12 2021/14 2021/16 2021/17 2030/15 2041/15 2059/25 2064/2
caller [1] 1892/12
calling [2] 1883/5 2022/24
callout [1] 1883/10
callouts [22] 1897/6 1908/3 1908/7 1908/8 1908/13 1941/20 1942/1 1951/25 1952/16 1952/20 1952/24 1953/1 1953/5 1953/11 1955/4 1959/22 1963/12 1963/13 1969/15 1971/22 1971/25 1974/20
calls [18] 1811/6 1841/20 1874/2 1884/23 1890/21 1890/21 1897/15 1905/12 1905/14 1910/5 1915/21 1952/10 1956/3 1961/20 1969/6 2012/6 2062/2 2063/17
calm [1] 1847/20
cam [7] 1954/16 1964/23 1964/25 1965/6 1965/12 1965/17 2068/25
came [24] 1819/9 1821/11 1825/4 1828/11 1829/7 1830/16 1870/11 1880/12 1887/9 1892/17 1896/3 1949/8 1976/13 1988/21 1992/7 1996/25 2015/4 2051/1 2061/25 2063/3 2093/1 2093/5 2094/1 2095/9
cameras [2] 2043/10 2043/20
CAMERON [24] 1807/8 1820/20
1822/4 1830/7 1831/2 1856/4 1878/25 1880/8 1881/9 1882/9 1882/22 1884/15 1889/8 1889/14 1889/18 1889/21 1890/6 1905/13 1905/14 1914/22 1915/5 1949/8 2068/23 2069/19
Cameron's [2] 1855/20 1890/10 camp [1] 1895/20
campus [20] 1813/15 1815/8 1815/11 1817/17 1817/20 1821/25 1827/6 1879/14 1879/16 1879/17 1880/2 1883/20 1883/21 1886/19 1887/3 1895/13 1895/16 1932/23 1940/10 1961/20
campus-wide [2] 1932/23 1940/10 cams [1] 1898/3
can [200]
can't [43] 1819/5 1835/21 1838/1 1850/4 1856/19 1863/24 1867/19 1869/2 1878/9 1900/13 1901/7
1902/18 1914/17 1915/15 1920/8
1925/12 1928/23 1945/22 1987/9
1987/24 1988/13 1989/1 1993/8 1996/10 2001/24 2002/3 2005/12 2018/21 2019/24 2021/2 2021/5 2025/14 2042/11 2042/20 2056/13 2069/10 2070/17 2081/16 2082/3 2083/25 2090/12 2090/21 2095/14 candid [2] 1845/6 1992/14
candidate [3] 2016/5 2032/5 2032/24
candidates [5] 2016/2 2030/10
2031/11 2032/17 2032/25
candidly [1] 2006/21
cannot [1] 2038/5
cans [2] 1884/1 1884/4
capacity [2] 2034/20 2073/5
capital [1] 2013/23
captain [6] 1839/1 1842/24 1843/2
1843/20 1987/18 1988/10
captains [1] 1843/7
car [16] 1881/2 1881/4 1881/5 1881/15 1881/16 1881/19 1881/19 1881/25 1882/5 1896/1 1905/22 1905/24 1941/3 2027/7 2027/7 2069/17
card [1] 1820/15
care [7] 1992/25 2080/23 2081/2 2083/21 2086/21 2087/6 2089/17
career [11] 1818/4 1821/8 1864/13
1864/22 1866/24 1898/24 1976/6
1991/21 2007/1 2014/1 2035/21
careful [2] 2031/10 2087/21
Careless [1] 1826/15
Carey [1] 1875/20
CAROLYN [10] 1807/7 1844/10 1853/24 1854/3 1856/2 1921/20 1990/1 1995/5 1997/17 1998/23
Carolyn McDermed [1] 1853/24
carried [1] 1887/7
carry [2] 1879/24 1886/8
cars [4] 1895/10 1916/5 1916/7 2058/17
CARTER [1] 1807/15
case [59] 1807/5 1821/19 1822/11 1860/24 1913/12 1914/11 1918/11 1919/12 1931/21 1949/14 1957/3 1977/5 1977/8 1977/10 1977/12 1977/16 1977/17 1977/23 1979/23 1980/18 1984/19 1992/7 1992/10 1995/15 1996/16 1996/19 1996/19 1996/20 1996/25 1997/9 1997/12 2000/9 2001/16 2001/17 2001/18 2001/19 2001/19 2002/4 2002/5 2004/1 2004/4 2008/8 2025/19 2026/19 2030/13 2035/13 2037/9 2057/3 2057/4 2057/8 2076/17
2076/25 2077/2 2082/4 2089/20 2091/25 2092/23 2094/14 2095/7
case-in-chief [1] 2025/19
caseload [1] 1976/23
cases [28] 1845/14 1848/8 1862/14 1909/19 1914/6 1917/14 1977/20 1978/5 1980/16 1981/11 1989/4 1989/6 1991/21 1996/4 1996/11 2000/23 2001/7 2001/9 2001/10 2001/11 2001/13 2001/16 2005/1 2016/14 2035/5 2035/25 2037/14 2037/16
Casey [1] 1928/9
cast [1] 2094/6
catalyze [1] 1979/2
catalyzed [1] 1978/15
catch [2] 1861/20 1877/24
categories [2] 1855/7 1984/20
category [2] 1907/13 1907/13
caught [1] 1886/16
cause [17] 1814/23 1815/1 1825/22 1884/18 1922/3 1925/20 2021/7 2023/19 2024/11 2024/16 2046/6 2059/5 2081/5 2085/3 2085/21 2092/6 2097/10
caution [1] 1987/7
cautious [1] 1988/7
certain [20] 1865/20 1871/14 1893/3
1913/5 1946/2 2014/21 2014/22
2018/11 2021/5 2033/6 2072/11
2075/23 2076/19 2077/13 2083/2
2083/18 2086/24 2088/18 2088/23 2092/25
certainly [21] 1824/18 1843/13 1844/25 1845/3 1848/14 1850/21 1857/9 1862/23 1865/19 1867/11 1869/2 1869/10 1870/7 1870/17
certainly... [7] 1872/12 1915/12 1928/24 1930/14 1970/16 1977/9 2007/18
certainty [1] 1869/2
certifications [2] 1814/12 2019/6
certified [1] 2097/12
certify [1] 2097/8
cetera [1] 2083/18
chain [2] 2074/6 2079/15
chair [5] 1842/11 1874/13 1910/17 1975/15 2012/17
challenge [2] 1829/11 1978/22
challenges [4] 1979/19 1980/1
1980/25 1982/4
challenging [1] 1866/24
chambers [1] 2077/15
chance [8] 1828/5 1902/21 1924/12
1942/8 1980/20 1981/25 1982/19 1998/6
change [1] 1976/6
changed [3] 1911/17 2000/15 2062/23
changes [1] 1955/24
changing [2] 2036/25 2037/1
character [14] 1845/17 1845/17
1847/6 1847/17 1890/7 1985/20
1991/18 1991/20 2093/25 2095/2
2095/3 2095/6 2095/11 2095/16
charge [7] 1812/14 1812/15 1935/20
1970/14 1994/25 1995/2 2049/11
charged [1] 1984/18
charges [1] 2047/8
Chase [8] 2011/16 2012/6 2012/11
2012/21 2013/3 2021/17 2026/6 2040/8
check [1] 1867/13
checked [5] 1867/20 1877/21 1877/25
1955/20 1974/8
checking [4] 1867/15 1916/6 1955/22 1966/6
chief [79] 1822/9 1823/14 1823/23
1824/4 1834/12 1835/9 1835/9
1835/22 1840/23 1843/2 1845/7
1845/16 1846/17 1852/6 1852/10
1854/16 1863/20 1885/25 1886/9
1915/9 1916/24 \(1917 / 7\) 1918/15 1919/16 1920/19 1927/24 1928/19 1931/9 1953/15 1954/20 1971/8 1988/19 1990/1 2000/1 2009/15 2009/23 2013/3 2013/5 2013/6 2014/13 2020/21 2021/17 2022/5 2022/8 2023/22 2024/5 2024/13 2025/19 2026/6 2031/5 2033/14 2034/3 2034/16 2034/20 2035/1 2035/9 2036/11 2037/2 2037/12 2039/24 2040/8 2057/6 2057/13 2057/16 2057/20 2057/22 2057/25 2058/1 2058/24 2058/25 2059/19 2060/9 2060/19 2060/21 2060/24 2065/8 2066/16 2067/15 2087/14 Chief Chase [4] 2013/3 2021/17 2026/6 2040/8
Chief McDermed [18] 1822/9 1823/23 1824/4 1834/12 1840/23 1845/7 1846/17 1916/24 1920/19 1928/19 1971/8 2009/15 2009/23 2059/19 2060/9 2060/19 2060/21 2060/24

Chief McDermed's [4] 1845/16
1852/10 1854/16 1917/7
chief of [1] 2013/6
chief's [4] 1918/20 2014/2 2016/1 2057/2
chiefs [22] 1990/3 1990/16 1990/18
1998/24 1999/2 2009/9 2029/23
2033/17 2034/8 2034/13 2035/6
2035/18 2036/3 2036/7 2036/23
2044/12 2055/16 2056/8 2056/19
2057/6 2060/22 2060/23
child [2] 1894/8 1898/13
child's [1] 1898/15
children [1] 1894/9
chiming [1] 1854/23
choice [6] 1850/3 1880/25 1929/14 2022/20 2025/24 2093/16
choose [4] 1862/9 2016/13 2025/19 2034/11
chopping [2] 2082/10 2088/19
chose [1] 1829/21
Chris [1] 1874/2
CHRISTOPHER [2] 1874/7 1874/16
Christy [4] 1825/7 1859/11 2078/16 2078/21
Chuck [1] 2045/23
circumstance [1] 2000/13
circumstances [8] 1824/14 1857/10
1919/18 1922/15 1942/9 1958/2
1986/7 2083/18
citation [2] 1820/13 1954/13
citations [6] 1815/2 1816/19 1816/23 1817/9 1829/15 1894/20
cite [3] 1815/2 1816/10 1951/8
cited [1] 1995/18
citing [1] 1861/1
citizen [2] 1985/6 2037/23
citizen's [1] 1972/17
citizens [1] 1985/12
city [75] 1815/25 1816/9 1816/15 1816/16 1843/13 1879/15 1879/16 1880/3 1896/9 1911/13 1990/3 2013/5 2013/5 2013/7 2013/17 2013/23 2014/4 2014/13 2014/24 2015/2 2015/3 2016/19 2017/10 2019/12 2019/14 2020/24 2020/25 2021/3 2021/19 2022/12 2022/19 2023/14 2024/24 2025/10 2025/15 2026/24 2027/22 2028/21 2029/14 2030/9 2030/14 2030/16 2037/17 2039/1 2039/10 2039/25 2040/11 2040/11 2040/19 2042/8 2042/14 2042/15 2042/17 2043/20 2046/6 2046/7 2047/7 2047/11 2047/21 2048/11 2048/14 2048/22 2048/22 2049/3 2051/22 2053/5 2053/20 2054/3 2054/11 2055/10 2058/13 2060/3 2061/10 2062/19 2062/20
claim [2] 2041/10 2086/9
claimed [2] 1892/8 1992/16
claims [1] 2071/23
clap [1] 2044/7
clarification [14] 1932/8 1932/14 1932/15 1932/19 1937/25 1950/17 1950/19 1950/25 1951/17 1951/19 1960/10 1960/20 1961/4 1961/5 clarifications [2] 1932/18 1932/20

Clark [2] 1982/8 2014/8
classified [6] 1911/20 1912/9 1912/24 1970/9 1970/16 2067/20
clear [25] 1856/24 1868/1 1872/15 1927/24 1954/19 1957/22 1964/15 1965/22 1966/7 1967/8 1979/3
1985/13 1986/11 1987/9 1988/8 1992/15 1994/11 1994/25 1997/6 1997/8 2000/8 2000/25 2001/5 2004/15 2051/18
clearcut [1] 2000/9
cleared [4] 2044/19 2048/25 2054/25 2055/2
clearing [1] 1878/7
clearly [1] 1898/6
clears [1] 1945/8
CLEAVENGER [168]
Cleavenger's [41] 1821/8 1826/19 1840/13 1845/21 1850/9 1857/5 1864/22 1869/6 1876/8 1881/11 1882/25 1884/18 1885/8 1896/1 1908/13 1913/24 1915/20 1917/1 1917/7 1921/24 1926/14 1938/18 1939/23 1961/18 1961/21 1971/3 2020/11 2027/21 2028/20 2030/13 2039/17 2045/12 2066/13 2066/23 2067/9 2067/21 2068/24 2069/7 2072/18 2072/21 2072/25
clerical [1] 2064/23
client [64] 1824/17 1937/5 1937/6 1938/3 1940/20 1941/13 1941/19 1942/8 1942/19 1946/21 1947/19 1949/10 1950/3 1951/22 1953/7 1953/24 1954/7 1955/3 1955/11 1956/5 1957/18 1957/23 1958/6 1959/10 1963/24 1964/4 1964/20 1966/9 1966/13 1966/23 1967/21 1973/18 1973/23 2040/7 2041/23 2045/6 2046/12 2047/10 2047/20 2048/12 2048/25 2049/2 2049/16 2049/25 2050/17 2050/22 2051/10 2051/21 2052/8 2053/4 2053/16 2053/21 2054/2 2054/12 2054/17 2059/16 2059/19 2060/9 2062/25 2063/3 2081/15 2081/18 2084/10 2087/20
client's [8] 1940/16 1959/8 2040/14 2041/20 2042/19 2045/3 2058/6 2062/15
clients [2] 2087/11 2088/8
close [10] 1874/13 1899/20 1910/17 1912/3 1941/1 1975/15 1986/9 2012/17 2044/16 2095/15
closely [4] 1847/3 2075/3 2094/19 2094/20
closer [1] 1842/11
closest [6] 1842/6 1874/12 1910/15 1975/14 2012/16 2064/6
co [1] 2081/23
co-person [1] 2081/23
Coast [1] 1812/7
Coburg [2] 1812/11 1990/3
cocounsel [1] 2080/10
code [3] 1816/9 1816/15 1816/18
Codes [1] 1816/1
COIT [14] 1808/7 1811/21 1838/18 1842/18 1872/2 1874/21 1909/4

COIT... [7] 1911/2 1968/2 1976/2 2009/6 2013/2 2058/8 2064/16 cold [2] 1894/24 1895/2 collaborative [1] 1986/1 collaboratively [2] 2050/4 2050/10 colleagues [2] 1832/7 1835/16 collect [1] 1996/23
collections [1] 2064/24
collective [9] 1913/6 1913/9 1913/11
1913/15 1917/23 1919/14 1921/23 1933/5 2065/16
college [5] 1827/6 1844/6 2014/9 2017/11 2061/16
colloquy [1] 2022/8
colored [1] 1893/3
comb [1] 2006/9
combination [3] 1838/4 1863/19 1863/22
come [34] 1821/8 1824/23 1827/7 1829/21 1859/11 1864/7 1877/20 1879/17 1882/19 1887/20 1888/16 1897/7 1936/2 1957/1 1989/2 2022/1 2022/2 2033/9 2034/14 2037/13 2037/20 2041/19 2048/20 2054/1 2063/19 2074/18 2079/5 2080/6 2083/5 2084/8 2087/16 2089/22 2089/23 2091/8
comes [11] 1890/12 1890/12 2003/10 2004/14 2005/9 2032/19 2037/14 2082/20 2084/11 2086/11 2086/21 comfortable [2] 1914/10 1919/2 coming [19] 1843/9 1846/13 1882/19
1888/15 1920/22 1923/25 1981/1 1989/7 1995/17 2037/19 2045/14 2050/10 2061/9 2077/25 2078/6 2082/16 2089/12 2092/16 2094/5 comma [1] 2071/18
command [15] 1843/5 1852/1 1863/10 1863/19 1867/17 1869/19 1915/9 1931/25 1933/22 1939/5 1939/10 1939/24 1940/15 1941/7 1989/16
commented [1] 2093/15
commenting [1] 1907/9
comments [1] 1952/24
commit [1] 1818/2
committed [3] 1984/2 1984/24 2007/16
committee [4] 2030/14 2030/15 2060/21 2060/22
committing [2] 1879/17 1879/17
common [4] 1922/22 1923/1 1923/1 2043/12
communicate [2] 2006/21 2054/23 communicated [2] 2054/14 2054/18 communicating [1] 2068/19 communication [2] 1854/6 2081/16
community [16] 1851/2 1851/3 1902/9 1986/17 1986/22 1992/19 2000/14 2017/6 2030/8 2030/12 2030/19 2030/24 2031/14 2031/19 2060/25 2062/20
compelling [3] 1843/24 2002/6 2002/7 competent [1] 1870/3
complaining [2] 1892/21 1892/21
complaint [7] 1891/7 2037/13 2037/20 2039/4 2039/7 2039/8 2042/25
complaints [5] 1856/5 1972/11 2040/13 2040/20 2040/20 complete [3] 1989/16 2000/6 2051/3 completed [6] 1825/2 1967/22 1976/14 1982/20 2009/9 2051/2 completely [5] 1866/14 1893/1 1944/1 1945/19 1979/3
complex[3] 1893/17 2082/4 2089/20
complicated [1] 2035/4
comply [2] 2083/8 2091/13
comprehension [1] 2029/25
compromise [1] 2088/20
concealed [1] 1948/19
concept [11] 1861/6 1871/13 1871/13 1871/14 1871/16 1888/6 1917/22 1918/4 1934/7 1934/11 1983/19
conceptually [1] 1934/15
concern [28] 1819/1 1819/3 1878/8
1881/6 1883/11 1903/4 1915/19 1915/19 1915/21 1916/10 1917/18 1917/25 1918/15 1921/24 1972/15 1997/11 1997/13 2045/21 2072/23 2072/24 2073/1 2075/3 2075/6 2075/12 2075/15 2079/9 2088/23 2090/8
concerned [10] 1877/13 1881/11 1940/15 2021/21 2046/5 2060/5 2079/15 2081/6 2085/11 2093/2 concerning [3] 2075/7 2094/6 2094/17
concerns [32] 1819/7 1827/19 1828/12 1828/21 1828/23 1829/5 1832/20 1832/22 1850/16 1872/9 1899/25 1901/3 1903/10 1917/6 1917/11 1918/14 1918/20 1941/2 1971/7 1980/11 2020/19 2026/10 2038/15 2046/1 2051/5 2051/7 2055/24 2057/7 2060/4 2060/12 2075/10 2091/11
conclude [1] 1925/19
concluded [3] 1925/4 2055/4 2060/4
conclusion [9] 1828/13 1829/7
1829/21 1908/9 1952/12 1956/7 2040/24 2041/17 2083/4
conclusions [6] 1979/16 1982/9
2002/17 2002/19 2002/22 2003/7
conclusive [1] 1986/11
conclusory [1] 1993/22
concur [1] 1921/13
concurred [2] 1846/19 1856/12
concurrence [1] 1921/16 condition [1] 1944/23
conditions [1] 1852/8
conduct [15] 1831/14 1831/16
1845/25 1846/1 1848/6 1850/20 1857/3 1879/2 1881/12 1918/23
1930/22 1931/10 1933/2 1988/24 2062/4
conducted [4] 1817/12 1850/10 1931/1 1931/11
conducting [1] 1991/8
conference [3] 1863/15 1863/18 1919/25
conferred [1] 2088/8
confident [2] 1979/10 1993/4
confirm [4] 1905/23 1907/6 1959/12 2024/22
confirmed [3] 1955/25 1956/16 1959/9 conflict [1] 2032/23
conflicting [1] 1862/5
conformed [1] 2097/11
confronted [1] 1892/14
confused [2] 1862/13 2080/9
confusing [6] 2010/20 2079/16
2080/15 2086/7 2091/24 2093/14
confusion [2] 2000/1 2080/2
conjunction [1] 2086/5
conscious [1] 1860/18
consciousness [1] 1981/2
consequence [1] 1867/22
consequences [1] 1867/24
consider [8] 1819/23 1820/10 1833/17
1856/4 1861/2 1983/24 1985/22 2003/4
consideration [3] 1839/16 1912/25 2077/2
considered [6] 1860/12 1917/3
1984/14 2002/12 2020/5 2033/21
considering [1] 2027/21
consisted [1] 2066/15
consists [1] 1817/21
constantly [1] 2037/1
Constitution [2] 2000/5 2001/4
constitutional [8] 1864/16 1864/24
1865/4 1972/17 2007/23 2008/8 2008/9 2014/8
consultation [1] 1921/20
consulted [5] 1915/8 1916/24 1917/4
1932/21 1974/13
consuming [2] 2082/4 2089/20
contact [14] 1818/20 1818/21 1820/13
1827/25 1879/14 1879/15 1880/14
1885/3 1885/3 1886/20 1907/4 2065/8 2068/13 2068/17
contacted [6] 1827/20 1828/1 1879/22
1879/23 1879/24 2038/14
contacting [2] 1884/12 2067/20
contacts [5] 1817/22 1906/8 1956/2
1956/2 2062/3
contained [1] 1872/25
contains [1] 1937/19
contemporaneous [1] 1907/22
contend [1] 1955/19
contended [2] 2010/7 2010/14
content [3] 1832/11 1832/12 2026/14
contention [2] 1966/3 1966/6
contents [2] 1866/19 1867/3
context [12] 1856/7 1864/10 1880/12
1978/3 1983/10 1983/13 1985/4
1989/8 2003/22 2004/8 2006/19
2047/3
continue [12] 1844/21 1856/5 1859/18 1873/7 1942/4 1957/12 1961/23 1992/4 1992/6 2026/3 2027/18 2071/17
continued [1] 1814/12
continues [1] 1961/22
Continuing [1] 1810/2
continuous [1] 1980/6
contract [18] 1914/12 1917/23 1918/2 1920/6 1920/8 1921/22 1922/1 1928/1 1929/9 1929/10 1940/2 1940/2 1951/18 1973/1 2065/15 2065/19 2066/1 2071/22

damages [7] 2081/1 2082/25 2084/12 2084/25 2086/12 2087/9 2092/1 dangerous [6] 1879/10 1881/20 1882/6 1897/7 1948/22 1949/19
DAs [3] 1977/25 1980/16 2057/10 dash [8] 1898/3 1954/16 1964/23 1964/25 1965/6 1965/12 1965/17 2068/25
data [2] 1997/8 2010/6
database [5] 1997/7 1997/15 2010/1 2010/11 2010/21
date [56] 1832/3 1832/3 1832/10 1835/18 1838/22 1840/9 1840/10 1840/12 1857/14 1857/23 1857/24 1858/4 1858/13 1859/20 1859/22 1864/8 1865/2 1865/2 1868/3 1891/21 1905/9 1950/19 1958/7 1958/13 1958/16 1960/9 1960/24 1960/25 1961/2 1961/2 1965/7 1968/19 1968/22 1969/1 1969/3 1969/8 1969/18 1969/21 1979/6 1998/21 1999/5 2029/18 2047/2 2052/22 2056/11 2056/13 2056/14 2056/25 2057/8 2057/18 2060/16 2070/17 2070/20 2070/23 2097/15 2097/16 dated [4] 1834/18 1968/9 1982/4 2072/20
dates [5] 1833/7 1840/18 1863/12
1904/12 1904/13
Dave [1] 2063/2
DAVID [2] 1807/15 1874/16
Davis [2] 1880/15 1880/18
day [37] 1807/13 1818/20 1818/20
1818/21 1818/21 1822/1 1840/20
1840/23 1840/25 1883/21 1884/8
1899/11 1905/4 1907/12 1912/12
1912/12 1920/8 1920/24 1921/9
1928/13 1958/10 1967/17 1967/19
1967/21 1967/22 1969/5 1969/11
2008/3 2008/19 2029/11 2035/8
2041/23 2041/23 2045/17 2089/15 2096/9 2097/5
day-to-day [3] 1818/20 1818/21 1912/12
days [11] 1814/4 1876/14 1900/10
1900/17 1901/2 1904/11 1920/9
1950/21 1950/24 1969/18 1989/11
dazzling [1] 2093/14
deal [8] 1879/6 1880/3 2081/9 2086/5 2086/6 2086/7 2087/2 2092/9
dealing [8] 1907/23 1939/15 1941/13
1949/10 1968/4 2049/4 2066/6 2073/4
dealings [1] 1931/12
dealt [5] 1906/9 1928/1 1928/3
1995/10 2080/12
dean [1] 1966/18
death [1] 1864/12
deaths [1] 1887/6
debate [5] 1886/6 2034/2 2035/5
2036/8 2089/11
debrief [2] 1888/9 1889/6
debriefing [1] 1888/6
decade's [1] 2008/15
December [3] 1936/23 1961/3 2049/9
December 11 [1] 1936/23
December 17 [1] 1961/3
decent [7] 2078/14 2081/9 2081/17 2086/5 2087/2 2092/8 2095/22
decertified [2] 2036/16 2036/21 decide [5] 1869/4 1882/4 2032/17 2035/10 2080/4
decided [7] 1833/16 1861/8 1878/19 1881/24 1941/9 1995/16 2028/21 deciding [3] 1947/4 1971/4 2004/8 decision [46] 1837/21 1841/11 1846/17 1846/18 1848/17 1848/24 1860/16 1860/18 1862/25 1863/2 1869/4 1915/10 1915/14 1915/18 1916/10 1916/25 1917/7 1917/17 1919/1 1919/9 1919/19 1938/20 1949/14 1964/18 1965/15 1965/25 1973/7 1973/8 1973/8 1974/23 1983/2 1983/2 1986/21 1987/1 1987/16 1991/3 1991/5 1991/11 2002/12 2004/1 2029/3 2034/18 2035/19 2035/22 2037/6 2089/24
decision-making [4] 1938/20 1964/18 1965/15 1965/25
decisions [4] 1916/22 1970/20 2004/3 2008/14
declared [1] 1887/5
defend [2] 1829/24 1831/7
defendant [16] 1864/16 1962/25
1977/11 1980/20 1983/16 1983/20 1984/12 1984/13 1984/15 1984/17 1984/19 1993/24 2004/9 2004/25 2070/13 2079/11
defendant's [3] 1968/3 1978/7 2081/20
defendants [14] 1807/9 1808/7
1811/10 1816/3 1842/2 1848/8
1864/24 1865/3 1874/8 1910/11
1975/10 1994/5 2012/12 2064/2
DEFENDANTS' [2] 1809/2 1810/3
defense [40] 1811/5 1811/6 1841/20
1874/2 1910/5 1947/6 1949/18
1977/10 1977/15 1980/20 1986/23
1986/25 1993/22 1993/23 1994/12
2003/11 2004/25 2006/6 2011/1
2012/6 2021/13 2022/24 2023/13
2023/17 2024/9 2025/19 2025/25
2033/23 2034/6 2035/17 2037/9
2046/25 2047/6 2048/10 2057/10
2059/3 2063/17 2080/25 2087/10
2095/24
defensive [1] 1882/17
define [1] 1932/25
defined [1] 1977/19
definitely [2] 1972/25 1998/12
degree [8] 1879/9 1941/14 1941/16
1997/4 2014/5 2014/6 2014/9 2016/17
deli [1] 1884/11
deliberations [3] 2077/10 2077/17 2078/5
deliver [2] 1851/14 1872/18
delivered [3] 1872/24 1872/25
1988/25
delivery [1] 1851/17
demanding [1] 1845/1
demographic [1] 1817/19
demonstrated [3] 1962/9 1963/8 1963/9
demonstrates [2] 1906/4 1907/15
demonstrating [3] 1959/25 1962/4 1962/5
demonstratively [1] 2006/14
denied [6] 1922/24 1964/7 1964/16 1965/22 1966/3 2061/12
deny [2] 1964/12 1966/4
department [115] 1812/9 1812/11
1812/12 1812/18 1816/12 1816/14 1823/5 1831/1 1831/17 1832/8 1834/1
1843/14 1843/15 1843/22 1843/23
1844/1 1844/3 1844/9 1844/18
1846/25 1856/11 1865/5 1869/17
1870/17 1871/18 1874/23 1877/5
1889/23 1890/4 1901/18 1902/5
1911/14 1912/15 1912/15 1913/23 1914/11 1914/11 1914/15 1914/16 1914/19 1915/1 1915/8 1916/9
1921/20 1922/18 1923/11 1923/14 1928/10 1928/25 1930/24 1931/4 1931/5 1931/8 1931/11 1935/15 1937/11 1937/12 1938/4 1939/22 1940/3 1940/8 1940/15 1949/1 1953/14 1954/12 1955/4 1955/17 1955/20 1956/2 1963/3 1970/21 1971/14 1973/21 1974/2 1978/18 1988/22 1991/2 1991/2 1995/1
2013/14 2013/19 2013/22 2013/23
2014/14 2014/19 2015/17 2017/4
2019/6 2023/6 2029/6 2030/8 2032/23
2035/13 2043/9 2043/10 2044/11
2046/2 2047/11 2048/23 2049/10
2049/12 2053/20 2054/3 2054/12
2060/3 2060/14 2061/6 2061/6
2061/18 2061/21 2067/20 2067/22
2067/25 2068/6 2068/20
department's [1] 1916/5
departmental [2] 1930/10 1930/15
departments [5] 1900/16 1900/25
1911/22 1930/21 2001/3
depend [3] 1903/11 1903/12 1903/13
dependent [1] 1939/9
Depending [1] 1997/4
depends [2] 1986/7 2030/12
deployed [1] 2000/22
deposition [15] 1927/12 1931/7
1931/24 1932/2 1934/9 1934/11
1939/13 1940/22 1941/25 1947/13
1947/15 1947/17 1947/21 1947/24
1948/3
deputies [1] 2056/5
deputy [5] 1851/4 1872/21 1988/19 1990/20 2013/16
describe [16] 1813/10 1816/9 1817/18 1819/4 1821/11 1821/22 1844/24 1845/2 1877/6 1877/15 1888/9 1890/10 1942/9 1980/11 2013/9 2017/9
described [3] 1918/22 1992/13 2031/1
describing [4] 1862/15 1982/3 1982/4 2036/9
description [1] 1883/17
descriptions [1] 1850/20
Deshpande [6] 1838/25 1841/20 1842/1 1842/14 1842/19 1872/3
Deshpende [2] 1987/19 1988/10
designation [1] 1982/23
desire [1] 1890/3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline D & & \\
\hline desk [3] 1989/10 2051/1 2051/2 & & \[
40 /
\] \\
\hline detail [2] & \[
18
\] & 1948/2 1956/3 2035/25 2069/11 \\
\hline detailed [1] & \[
18
\] & \\
\hline details [1] 1952/7 & \[
18
\] & 1951/4 1957/17 1997/21 2089/14 \\
\hline detective [1] 1842/20 & 1975/22 1976/1 2013/1 2019/19 & discussion [28] 1835/11 1835/ \\
\hline & 2026/4 2064/13 2064/15 2068/ & 1846/16 1864/2 1872/13 1873/13 \\
\hline 1953/6 1970/19 1984/1 1985/24 & 2076/16 & 1885/24 1889/15 1 \\
\hline 1987/14 1993/17 2001/14 2005/3 & directed [1] & 1915/6 1915/12 1915/23 \\
\hline 2038/3 2048/18 2083/2 & direction [4] 1830/20 & 1980/23 1981/10 1981/13 2022/ \\
\hline determinations [3] 1967/6 1994/9 & & \\
\hline 2003/24 & directive [3] 185 & \\
\hline determine [6] 1902/18 2029/18 2035/7 & directly [14] 1816/17 1816/23 1843/2 & discussions [15] 1823/1 1845/20 \\
\hline 37/17 2045/10 2 & 1860/7 1878/6 1893/13 1895/5 & 1851/18 1856/8 1849/9 1851/16 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { determined [3] 1967/2 203 } \\
& \text { 2039/22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1914/18 1917/25 1919/2 1962 & 851/21 1912/19 \\
\hline ning & 2019/18 2020/7 2072 & 1914/22 1915/1 2035/23 2077/20 \\
\hline develop [2] & director [5] 1911/16 191 & 2080/6 \\
\hline developed [2] 1876/22 1985 & & dishonest [4] 1836/6 1845/7 1956 1985/19 \\
\hline device [1] 1964/25 & & \\
\hline dicks [5] 1870/8 1871/5 1871/10 & & \\
\hline 1/15 1923/5 & d & ssa \\
\hline did [356] & disappeared [1] & /19 1922/15 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
did you [1] \\
didn't [94]
\end{tabular} & disciplinary [9] & 1919 \\
\hline 1821/20 1826/24 & 1912/9 1922/17 1932/16 1950 & 2083/22 2085/4 2085/21 20 \\
\hline 1828/17 1828/19 1828/20 1828/23 & 1951/8 2021/1 2025/3 & 2092/6 \\
\hline 1830/13 1835/4 1835/18 1835 & discipline [33] & dismissed [3] 1926/14 2001/1 \\
\hline 1836/8 1836/10 1855/15 1860/19 & 1 & 2001/19 \\
\hline 1861/2 1863/25 1865/15 1868/8 & 914/6 1917/12 1917/ & ey \\
\hline 1868/11 1871/11 1881/14 1881/25 & 1917/22 1922/22 1932/4 1932 & disparate [2] 2038/2 \\
\hline 1884/23 1885/10 1887/3 1887/6 & 33/4 1937/ & [2] \\
\hline 1897/11 1897/16 1897/17 1898/6 & 950/25 1951/3 1951/ & 1] \\
\hline 1899/16 1901/18 1908/11 1921/1 & 1951/10 1951/14 1951/16 & spatchers [2] 1812/21 \\
\hline 1928/19 1931/7 1933/14 1933/17 & 1959/19 1960/5 1967/5 1970/14 & display [2] 1998/16 2093/14 \\
\hline 1938/10 1940/7 1941/14 1948/4 & 024/21 2083/2 & disputed [1] 2024/1 \\
\hline 1949/18 1951/1 1952/16 1953/5 & disciplined [5] 2023/18 & disputes [1] 1862/4 \\
\hline 1954/19 1956/14 1963/14 1963/16 & 2059/4 2059/6 2059/10 & disseminate [1] 1979/ \\
\hline 1963/20 1963/20 1969/21 1970/12 & disciplines [1] 1970/2 & disseminated [1] \\
\hline 1971/2 1973/17 1973/21 1973/22 & disclose [22] & distiol \\
\hline 1974/5 1974/7 1979/20 1992/24 & 1984/5 & district [83] 1807/1 1807/2 180 \\
\hline 1995/17 1999/18 2002/1 2010/15 & 1996/21 1999/3 2001/21 200 & 08/20 182 \\
\hline 2017/2 2022/9 2022/13 2022/20 & 2004/18 2005/6 2008/20 & 1823/9 1823/24 1824/13 1 \\
\hline 2023/14 2024/3 2025/7 2028 & 2021/1 2021/6 2033/23 2035/16 & 1837/20 1837/20 1839/15 1847/22 \\
\hline 2039/15 2039/15 2040/11 2040/25 & 2037/3 2037/11 2 & 1848/7 1848/11 1848/22 1850/2 \\
\hline 2041/23 2043/19 2045/11 2046/22 & disclosed [4] 1848/7 1851/8 1851/9 & 1851/8 1852/11 1872/4 187 \\
\hline 2046 & 1985/21 & 1872/21 1951/21 \\
\hline 2054/20 2061/14 2061/16 & disclosing [2] & 1976/18 1977/1 1977/8 1977/ \\
\hline die [1] 2000/14 & disclosure [17] 1847/21 1848/ & 1978/8 1981/6 1985/22 1987 \\
\hline & 1849/13 1865/3 1865/17 1983/2 & 1988/17 1990/24 1994/2 1994 \\
\hline 2018/5 2091/3 2091/17 & 1984/22 1984/22 1985/14 1996/8 & 2033/18 2033/20 2033/22 203 \\
\hline different [34] 1844/14 1844 & 1997/18 2000/2 2000/11 2001/6 & 2034/9 2034/11 2034 \\
\hline 1849/12 1870/20 1875/15 187 & 2001/20 2007/24 2025/3 & 2035/10 2035/24 203 \\
\hline 1880/2 1886/20 1889/1 1889/2 & disclosures [2] 1858/5 2036 & 2036/4 2036/5 2036/23 203 \\
\hline 13 1908/5 & discovery [1] 2024/14 & 2037/8 2038/10 2038/19 2038/22 \\
\hline 940/7 1944/23 1978/24 199 & discredit [1] 2073/3 & 2050/21 2051/4 2051/ \\
\hline 1996/14 2008/10 2015/12 2015/16 & discretion [3] 1982/24 2035/9 2049/18 & 2051/20 2052/2 205 \\
\hline 17/22 2017/23 2029/24 2031/1 & discretionary [4] 1823/20 1848/17 & 2052/19 2053/7 2053/16 2053/21 \\
\hline 041/7 2041/12 2050/11 2050/11 & 1848/24 1850/1 & 2054/9 \\
\hline 50/11 2050/14 2084/14 2095/8 & discriminated [1] & 2054/25 2055/15 2056/19 2056/21 \\
\hline cult [3] 1945/3 2000/16 2079/14 & discrimination [1] 1923/ & 056/22 2057/7 2058/1 \\
\hline difficulty [1] 2023/6 & 1888/17 1889/21 1889/25 1890/3 & divorce [1] 1992/17 \\
\hline dig [1] 1881/17 & 1938/14 2011/21 2047/2 2051/25 & do [339] \\
\hline digging [1] 1881/4 & 2076/11 2076/14 2078/19 2081/10 & |DOC [2] 1807/5 2097/ \\
\hline digitally [1] 2097/12 dinner [2] 2007/12 & & doctor [1] 2033/5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline D & \[
20
\] & \\
\hline document [73] 1816/8 1853/13 & Donna [4] 1943/5 2067/15 206 & 2041/5 2050/6 2050/6 2050/9 2050/13 \\
\hline 1856/16 1857/14 1857/16 1858/16 & & \[
205
\] \\
\hline 1858/17 1866/13 1866/14 1866/21 & door [5] 1884/11 1938/7 1940/24 & \\
\hline 1866/23 1867/7 1867/9 1867/16 & & \\
\hline 1867/21 1867/23 1868/3 1868/6 & & \\
\hline 1873/14 1903/21 1904/18 1904/23 & dod & est [3] 1834/7 2056/7 2056/21 \\
\hline \[
7 / 1
\] & doubt [5] 1846/20 1856/13 1997 & early [9] 1876/6 1877/2 1962/21 \\
\hline 1937/2 1938/13 1939/3 1944/7 & 2037/5 2037/11 & 1963/18 1963/20 1965/3 1977 \\
\hline 1945/10 1946/20 1947/2 1947/11 & Do & 2078/2 207 \\
\hline 1954/21 1956/15 1958/14 1960/24 & d & [3] \\
\hline 1961/11 1967/8 1982/3 1982/18 & 5 1877/20 & \\
\hline 1989/22 1997/23 1999/23 2006/3 & 1900/20 1900/22 & easy [3] 1845/1 1845/1 2088 \\
\hline 2006/8 2006/25 2009/8 2009/11 & 1923/23 1925/17 1938/7 1953/13 & oin \\
\hline 2009/11 2011/2 2040/25 2042/6 & 2/3 2011/14 2013/15 2014/ & 71/14 1 \\
\hline 2042/7 2043/18 2051/13 2051/16 & 2016/23 2021/10 203 & eating [5] 1895/15 1896/4 189 \\
\hline 2053/8 2058/19 2058/22 2059/11 & & \\
\hline 2061/20 2062/8 2079/12 2087/11 & dozen [1] 2044/16 & edit [1] 1982 \\
\hline 8 2092/12 & DPS [3] 2071/22 20 & editing [1] \\
\hline documentation [3] 1937/20 & DPSST [6] 1812/17 1812/18 1812 & edits [2] 1939/1 \\
\hline & 1813/8 1814/12 182 & education [2] 2061/ \\
\hline & Dr & ducational [3] 2013/9 2017/2 \\
\hline documents [28] 1846/11 1851/15 & draft [2] 1931/22 & 2017/23 \\
\hline 1851/17 1859/4 1860/17 1861/3 & drafted [3] 1946/21 1946/2 & 1] 1 \\
\hline 1866/15 1866/22 1868/24 1869/7 & & [ \\
\hline 1869/11 1872/24 1896/ & drafts [2] 1939/ & 2092/ \\
\hline 1935/20 1935/24 1937/19 1943/23 & Drake [4] 1818/18 1818/19 187 & e [1] \\
\hline 2014/20 2029/18 2044/1 2052/8 & & \\
\hline 2058/6 2063/14 20 & d & eight [6] 1 \\
\hline /20 2092/23 & & 1854/17 1854/18 2078/22 \\
\hline does [51] 1813 & ing [1] & either [16] 1821/ \\
\hline 1816/8 1818/16 1838/12 1838/13 & d & 64 \\
\hline 1849/2 1850/7 1854/4 1854/6 1854/9 & driver's [1] & 2010/25 20 \\
\hline 1860/9 1891/17 1907/9 & drivers [1] 1827/2 & 2021/8 2022/18 2024/12 2 \\
\hline 1908/1 1921/13 1934/1 1936/4 & driving [2] & 20 \\
\hline 1942/15 1950/8 1954/24 1954/25 & drop [5] 1933/7 2072/12 207 & elected [1] \\
\hline 1967/17 1969/5 1969/11 1973/1 & 2073/25 20 & elements [2] 1 \\
\hline 1982/25 1987/1 1987/2 2007/6 2010/6 & & ed \\
\hline 2025/12 2026/10 2041/8 2044/6 & & ] 18 \\
\hline 2050/17 2052/22 2053/3 2053/11 & dry [1] & 22 2054/17 2058/24 \\
\hline 2053/12 2058/21 2059/13 2060/24 & due [2] 2039/4 & 2090/4 2095/23 \\
\hline 2061/3 2065/22 2069/2 & DUI [1] 1826/5 & else's [2] 2050 \\
\hline 2084/8 2094/12 & duly [7] 1811/1 & [56] \\
\hline doesn't [31] 1847/9 1863/9 1869/21 & 10/12 1975/11 2012/13 2064/3 & 34/10 1834/12 1834/24 1837 \\
\hline 1871/21 1906/7 1916/1 1919/10 & dumpster [1] 1884/10 & 38/23 1839/4 18 \\
\hline 1932/16 1933/20 1934/3 1962/1 & dumpsters [3] 1883/16 1884/1 1884 & 1840/17 1852/21 1853/2 1853/2 \\
\hline 1972/11 1997/6 2003/11 2039/18 & during [31] 1818/19 1819/8 1821/3 & 1854/4 1854/16 1854/20 \\
\hline 2081/14 2082/1 2083/5 2083/9 2084 & 1821/5 1821/8 1822/14 1876/22 & 1860/6 1998/6 1998/10 1998/2 \\
\hline 208 & 777/4 1877/11 1879/18 1880/13 & 1999/8 1999/14 2009/23 2010 \\
\hline 208 & 1883/4 1886/15 1887/21 1904/22 & 2010/7 2010/14 2010/2 \\
\hline & 1907/3 1916/15 1923/18 1924/10 & 2052/15 2052/22 2052/22 2 \\
\hline & 1926/16 1934/9 1938/11 1942/22 & /24 2056/24 2070/10 \\
\hline & 1966/14 1977/2 1987/6 2034/8 & 2072/20 2072/21 2074/6 \\
\hline & 2043/22 2044/4 2068/13 2093/5 & 075/10 20 \\
\hline 1962/22 1966/14 1966/22 1972/8 & duties [10] 1861/5 1883/1 1883/4 & /18 2082/18 2082/20 2085/12 \\
\hline 1985/19 1986/15 & 1915/11 1915/18 1933/19 1934/23 & 2089/4 2089/4 2089/14 2090/10 \\
\hline 2008/7 2008/14 2037/21 2037/22 & 1964/15 1972/4 1972/8 & 2090/25 \\
\hline 2041/14 2045/20 2047/17 & duty [18] 1865/10 1873/2 & emailed [2] \\
\hline 2048/2 2051/20 2076/3 2082 & 1977/22 1978/1 1996/15 1996/ & [10] 1833/25 1852/24 \\
\hline 2083/17 2091/10 & 999/3 2000/1 2000 & 1863/12 1863/13 2066/16 2066/20 \\
\hline [1] 1941/2 & 2000/6 2000/24 2005/3 2020/7 & \[
\text { 2074/5 2067/3 } 4
\] \\
\hline don't [270] & dynamic [1] 1847/ & \[
183
\] \\
\hline & & 2060/12 2064 \\
\hline 1870/6 1882/18 1885/25 1888/14 & E & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1888/14 1904/20 1921/14 1922/19 } \\
& 1952 / 19 \text { 1963/3 1966/12 1999/6 }
\end{aligned}
\] & each [17] 1827/10 1906/13 1906/18 & 1912/24 1912/24 1914/6 1915/4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline E & \[
19
\] & \\
\hline employee... [25] 1918/4 1919/9 & & \\
\hline 1919/15 1920/3 1920/6 1920/22 & environment [1] 18 & 2008/3 2013/20 2045/5 2083 \\
\hline 1922/14 1929/24 1930/2 1930/6 & & \\
\hline 1934/21 1940/3 1960/5 1970/24 & Eric [2] 2019/22 2058/25 & 2000/10 22/ \\
\hline 1972/11 1973/2 1973/2 2044/3 2065/13 2065/22 & erode [2] 1984/11 1993/2 & E \\
\hline 2044/3 2065/13 & & everying [6] \\
\hline employee's [5] 1913/4 1919/18 & & \\
\hline 1932/16 1970/21 1972/16 & & \(2]\) \\
\hline employees [15] 1911/20 1912/10 & es & 186 \\
\hline 1913/13 1927/21 1928/4 1932/9 & & \\
\hline 1933/1 1951/12 1970/7 1970/9 & & \\
\hline 1970/10 1970/15 1970/16 2065/6 & es & \\
\hline 2067/20 & essentially [11] 1813/2 1813/4 1813/23 1814/9 1821/17 1844/2 &  \\
\hline employees' [1] 1938/18 & 1848/9 1927/18 1996/17 1999/15 & 2010/8 2010/15 2010/18 2041/3 \\
\hline employer [5] 1832/1 1874/22 1918/11 & 2004/12 & 2041/8 2041/11 20 \\
\hline & established & 2075/22 2076/18 2079/12 2080/ \\
\hline employment [9] 18 & estimate [5] 1890 & 2082/20 2083/ \\
\hline 1928/8 1983/25 2000/16 2001/4 & 2076/21 2077/21 & 2084/16 2086/14 2086/17 2093/24 \\
\hline 2027/4 2028/20 2 & estimating [1] 1932 et [2] 2083/18 209 & \[
\begin{array}{|l|l|}
\hline \text { 2093/25 2094/5 2094/9 } \\
\text { evolved [2] 1864/9 2009/1 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline e & \[
\text { ethical [2] } 1847 / 1
\] & evolving [6] 1980/6 1980/22 1996/3 \\
\hline encountered [1] 181 &  & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& 2000 / 7 \quad 2001 / 12037 / 1 \\
& \text { exact [101 } \\
& 1822 / 181822 / 201832
\end{aligned}\right.
\] \\
\hline encounters [1] 1817/25 & \[
\text { 1816/13 1816/16 1816/18 } 1
\] & 1863/12 1864/8 1966/22 2056/25 \\
\hline end [12] 1884/12 1932/4 & 1843/14 1843/16 1843/20 1843/2 & 2057/18 2057/19 2060/16 \\
\hline 2003/10 2031/16 2032/15 2035/8 & 1844/9 1844/17 & exactly [11] 18 \\
\hline 2047/21 2049/3 2083/7 2089/11 & 1879/14 1895/13 & 1861/6 1872/25 1925/2 1941/11 \\
\hline 2089/13 & 1995/1 1995/3 1995/3 1995/6 1997 & 2019/24 2042/20 2047/15 2081/24 \\
\hline ended [5] 1871/9 1886/18 19 & & inatio \\
\hline & evaluating [4] 2 & 09/6 1809/7 \\
\hline & 2004/17 2005/9 & 1809/11 1809/13 1809/14 \\
\hline & evaluation [7] 193 & 1809/16 1809/18 1809/19 1809/20 \\
\hline ance [1] 2030 & 1939/23 1940/4 2015/10 2018/ & 1809/21 1810/5 1810/6 1810/7 1810 \\
\hline enforce [2] 1816/2 1816 & 20 & 1810/11 1810/12 1810/14 1811/18 \\
\hline enforcement [35] 1812/8 1820/5 & ev & 1811/20 1824/16 1824/20 1838/17 \\
\hline 1820/11 1823/20 1843/10 1848/16 & 1961/23 1962/20 & 1840/5 1842/15 \\
\hline 1848/22 1849/20 1894/20 1915/18 & even [20] & 1852/17 1859/18 1872/1 1874/18 \\
\hline 1979/14 1981/7 1981/15 1982/22 & 77/25 1978/9 1986/16 1986/20 & 1874/20 1896/12 1896/14 1909/3 \\
\hline 1982/24 1983/4 1983/9 1983/23 & 1988/1 1996/21 2032/20 2036 & 1909/17 1910/2 \\
\hline 1984/4 1984/21 1985/23 1986/2 & 2039/15 2039/15 2040/17 2049 & 1927/8 1957/13 1968/1 1973/15 \\
\hline 1986/10 1987/5 1991/15 1991/17 & 2050/14 2060/11 2077/17 2078/20 & 1975/22 1976/1 1994/15 1994/17 \\
\hline 1991/22 1993/16 2000/13 2013/10 & 208 & 009/ \\
\hline 2013/25 2014/6 2016/13 2017/25 & evening [2] 2076/13 2096 & 2026/4 2040/3 2040/5 2064/13 \\
\hline 2018/20 & \begin{tabular}{l}
evenings [1] 2019/9 \\
event [5] 1825/12 1825/14 1827
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{|l}
\text { 2064/15 2093/3 } \\
\text { examine [1] 2047/2 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline en & event [5] 1825/12 1825/14 1827
\[
1827 / 61847 / 1
\] & examine [1] 2047/2
examined [7] 1811/ \\
\hline  & events [1] 2017 & 1910/12 1975/11 2012/13 206 \\
\hline enough [10] 1858/2 1868/16 & eventually [4] 1864/9 2047/1 & example [20] 1830/17 1830/24 \\
\hline 1869/3 1994/10 2012/8 2025/17 & 2049/14 2049/14 & 556/8 1928/9 1928/10 1930/14 \\
\hline 041/3 2041/8 2078/4 & ever [56] 182 & 1931/1 1931/16 1977/1 \\
\hline ensure [4] 1913/6 1913/19 1914/9 & 1845/7 1845/9 1845/13 1847/1 & 1986/19 1991/19 2001/13 2002/4 \\
\hline 2031/6 & 1847/13 1850/9 1856/8 1862/18 & 2002/21 2002/22 2005/15 2045 \\
\hline il [3] 1 & /23 1868/13 1868/15 18 & 2050/16 \\
\hline Is [2] 181 & 1869/20 & amples [13] \(1827 / 41829 / 7\) \\
\hline [2] 1997/9 2064/5 & 1889/6 1889/14 1889/14 1889/1 1889/21 1889/25 1890/3 1895/4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1829/18 1829/22 1830/6 1830 \\
1830/10 1830/14 1924/23 193
\end{tabular} \\
\hline entered [1] 1920/11 & 1895/15 1896/8 1902/20 1908/8 & 1948/17 1953/2 \\
\hline entire [12] 1845/12 1853/22 1862/7
1870/11 1872/23 1904/18 1904/23 & 1941/9 1941/10 1949/3 1966/8 1971/7 & Excellent [1] 207 \\
\hline 2086/20 & 1988/21 1993/8 1997/21 2001 & except [5] 1951/10 195 \\
\hline 2092/15 & 2018/15 2019/11 2019/17 2023/18 & 2070/2 2078/19 \\
\hline entirety [3] & 2029/13 2037/6 2048/12 204 & excessive [1] 2037/18 \\
\hline entitled [3] 2082/25 2090/23 2097/10 & 2048/14 2050/21 2060/9 2065/18 2068/9 2069/22 2072/17 2073/15 & exchange [3] 1860/6 1984/8 2072/11
excise [1] 2084/19 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
excising [1] 2088/19
excisions [1] 2087/12
excited [1] 1901/23
excluded [1] 2084/20
excluding [1] 2083/15
exculpatory [3] 1983/10 1983/12 1983/19
excuse [10] 1815/1 1914/21 1916/25 1930/16 1969/18 1992/1 2052/2 2063/15 2074/9 2087/3
excused [12] 1841/15 1873/21 1909/24 1910/2 1974/25 1975/3 2011/7 2011/10 2011/12 2063/9 2063/10 2063/12
executive [1] 1840/22
exemplary [1] 2096/7
exercises [1] 1906/24
exercising [3] 1964/17 1965/14 1965/24
exhibit [57] 1815/19 1815/20 1831/19
1833/11 1833/18 1838/20 1859/22 1866/6 1866/8 1867/3 1891/13
1891/24 1903/16 1903/18 1903/24
1920/11 1920/13 1921/18 1924/4
1924/9 1926/1 1926/5 1926/12
1926/23 1935/22 1944/16 1944/19
1944/20 1945/2 1946/8 1946/22
1960/15 1960/18 1960/23 1961/12
1967/12 1969/24 1981/22 1981/25 1982/6 1989/22 1998/1 1998/3
1999/20 2005/21 2005/22 2009/7
2051/15 2051/17 2055/20 2062/10
2070/8 2070/10 2074/2 2074/5 2079/9
2092/19
Exhibit 150 [3] 1867/3 2005/22
2062/10
Exhibit 168 [2] 1833/18 1838/20
Exhibit 215 [2] 1998/3 2055/20
Exhibit 274 [1] 1967/12
Exhibit 29 [1] 1891/24
Exhibit 3 [1] 1960/18
Exhibit 31 [1] 1961/12
Exhibit 364 [5] 1981/22 1981/25
1982/6 1999/20 2009/7
Exhibit 373 [1] 1989/22
Exhibit 385 [1] 2070/10
Exhibit 391 [2] 2074/2 2074/5
Exhibit 404 [1] 1924/9
Exhibit 406 [1] 1815/19
Exhibit 412 [1] 1859/22
Exhibit 426 [1] 1969/24
Exhibit 80 [2] 1920/13 1921/18
Exhibit 86 [5] 1926/1 1926/5 1926/12 1926/23 1946/22
Exhibit 89 [2] 1903/18 1903/24
exhibiting [1] 1916/21
exhibits [2] 1945/4 2095/25
existed [4] 1902/22 1996/4 1996/6 2000/24
exists [1] 1993/25
exonerated [3] 2041/6 2041/13 2041/15
exonerating [1] 2047/7
expand [1] 2017/2
expanded [1] 1977/21
expect [9] 1860/23 1897/1 1900/11

2006/8 2006/10 2006/11 2006/12 2006/22 2010/3
expectations [1] 1987/12
expected [1] 2006/20
expecting [1] 1825/16
experience [16] 1812/5 1843/10
1919/5 1981/14 1991/14 1991/14
1991/16 2013/11 2016/16 2019/2
2030/23 2061/16 2067/24 2068/9
2073/4 2073/7
experiences [1] 1847/6
expert [2] 1848/3 2060/25
experts [1] 1865/10
Expiration [1] 2097/16
expired [1] 1905/23
explain [11] 1812/17 1814/20 1847/25 1977/7 1983/12 1986/16 2016/18 2018/9 2022/11 2048/4 2086/11
explained [7] 1882/2 1903/6 1906/9
1906/23 1924/24 1932/15 2084/6
explaining [2] 1924/17 2035/4
explanation [3] 1992/19 1992/20 1992/22
explanations [1] 1942/10
exposed [1] 1854/24
express [4] 1859/6 1957/4 2011/22
2078/20
expressed [4] 1833/3 1833/5 1833/22 1857/3
extended [2] 1821/23 1826/21
extent [2] 1986/5 2091/24
extra [1] 1956/25
extraordinarily [1] 1967/3
extremely [1] 1953/2
eye [1] 1882/13
eyes [1] 1994/1
F
fabricated [1] 2024/19
face [8] 1842/12 1874/14 1910/19 1975/18 1995/12 2012/19 2030/4 2064/9
faced [1] 2056/6
facility [1] 1895/23
fact [35] 1823/14 1867/5 1867/6 1867/13 1867/15 1867/20 1868/5 1881/13 1886/15 1902/7 1916/6 1928/12 1947/13 1950/3 1954/14 1954/24 1955/14 1971/2 1971/14 1971/23 1978/15 1983/15 1986/19 1996/5 2003/9 2017/13 2029/7 2047/20 2048/23 2049/24 2077/8 2080/6 2083/17 2084/10 2093/15 fact-check [1] 1867/13 fact-checking [1] 1867/15
facts [5] 1856/13 1948/24 1971/25 2050/9 2080/3
factually [1] 1986/17
faculty [1] 1970/12
fail [1] 1991/16
failure [3] 1954/10 1964/21 1985/11
fair [15] 1829/13 1829/14 1834/4 1834/6 1858/2 1861/24 1889/12 1890/12 1899/9 1908/5 1909/20 1953/24 2076/12 2078/4 2088/21
fairly [6] 1850/25 1851/1 1877/10 1889/10 2000/12 2031/5
fairness [1] 2031/6
faith [4] 1984/11 2025/9 2076/20
2077/23
fall [2] 2045/18 2049/5
false [8] 1867/21 2006/15 2023/18
2024/10 2024/16 2037/15 2039/22
2059/4
familiar [10] 1817/3 1888/6 1889/8
1890/16 1977/4 1995/12 2002/2
2002/5 2004/11 2006/5
family [1] 1844/4
fan [2] 2082/12 2088/18
fanny [2] 2069/20 2069/23
far [14] 1879/9 1880/3 1880/5 1906/13
1922/19 1922/22 1962/24 2021/20
2030/22 2031/6 2056/25 2076/6
2092/9 2093/25
farther [1] 1941/4
fashion [1] 2041/7
fast [1] 2014/10
faster [1] 2077/22
favor [1] 1862/2
favorable [1] 1988/7
FBI [1] 1822/1
February [10] 1875/10 1891/22 1937/1
1965/8 2042/5 2044/20 2051/1
2054/23 2055/1 2060/17
February 12 [1] 1937/1
February 2nd [2] 2042/5 2044/20
February 7 [1] 1965/8
federal [4] 1823/14 1977/23 1983/9 2000/25
feedback [5] 1905/12 1905/13 1939/1 2031/16 2031/19
feel [3] 1820/20 2035/2 2076/10
feelings [2] 1923/7 2030/22
feet [3] 1884/6 1884/9 2007/6
fell [1] 1994/10
felonies [1] 1942/17
felony [1] 1976/23
felt [12] 1831/18 1892/12 1923/10
1928/18 1953/9 1974/6 1994/9 2015/5
2069/16 2070/2 2070/3 2094/21
females [1] 2017/22
fences [1] 1879/15
Fenton [1] 1877/18
Festival [3] 2016/23 2017/5 2044/5
few [19] 1812/15 1866/24 1877/8
1890/25 1891/1 1891/7 1904/9
1905/12 1905/14 1923/3 1926/20
1926/25 1930/21 1949/25 1981/10
2017/1 2017/20 2021/24 2057/14
FI'd [1] 1906/10
field [28] 1817/3 1818/9 1818/10 1818/14 1818/14 1818/24 1819/8 1820/14 1821/12 1821/23 1876/3
1876/8 1876/14 1876/16 1876/22
1880/10 1889/16 1908/18 2015/21
2018/17 2020/1 2020/2 2020/4
2020/11 2030/4 2034/21 2041/24
2062/3
fifth [1] 1831/4
fight [2] 1878/19 2030/5
figure [2] 1881/18 2036/6
figured [1] 1979/3
file [24] 1913/5 1932/16 1934/8
1934/12 1937/7 1937/10 1937/14
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline F & focus [3] 1857/24 1859/20 2091/25 & \[
2066
\] \\
\hline file... [17] 1937/18 1937/21 1937/23 & & ur-minute [1] 1835/2 \\
\hline 1938/1 1938/2 1951/15 1972/20 & focusing [1] 1943/7 & four-month [1] 1976/13 \\
\hline 1972/22 2024/21 2037/13 2037/20 & foggy [1] 1872/7 & frame [1] \\
\hline 2059/7 2059/8 2059/10 2059/11 & [8] 1818/1 1845/14 & frankly [3] 1981/10 2081/2 20 \\
\hline 2059/14 2072/18 & 1929/10 1954/7 1997/22 2002/4 & kly [3] 1981/10 2081/2 2088/2 \\
\hline filed [2] 2040/10 2085/13 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
fraternize [1] 2020/22 \\
fraudulent [1] 1838/7
\end{tabular} \\
\hline files [4] 1934/18 1934/20 1937/16 1938/6 & 1952/4 1968/5 1968/5 1969/6 1969/16 & free [1] 2043/3 \\
\hline fill [2] 1813/5 2033/5 & 1972/8 2003/13 2011/22 2026/2 & frequently [1] 197 \\
\hline filled [1] 1884/9 & 2075/3 & Friday [2] 2078/22 2082/22 \\
\hline final [3] 1970/19 1987/13 2035/21 & follow-up [5] 1952/4 1968/5 1968/5 1969/6 1969/16 & \begin{tabular}{l}
riendly [1] 1877/18 \\
ends [4] 1889/12 1890/1 2013/2
\end{tabular} \\
\hline finalized [1] 1857/15 & followed [3] 1852/8 1913/17 1913/20 & 2094/21 \\
\hline finally [1] 20 find [11] 18 & following [2] 1914/12 1955/17 & friendship [2] 1876/22 2020/15 \\
\hline \[
1966 / 221
\] & follows [9] 1811/11 1842/3 1874/9 & frightened [1] 1 \\
\hline 2054/11 2073/2 2088/21 2095/6 & 1910/12 1913/6 1975/11 2012/ & frisk [2] 1814/ \\
\hline finder [1] 1983/15 & 2064/3 2084/7 & front [16] 1858/5 1880/20 1880/23 \\
\hline finding [2] 1840/7 2004/6 & font [1] 1998 & 1893/14 1895/5 1910/14 1943 \\
\hline findings [7] 1839/8 1850/15 & food [1] & 1944 \\
\hline 1884/19 1972/1 1991/6 1993/2 & football [1] 1923/ & 2022/14 2022/21 2023/3 2025/7 \\
\hline finds [1] 2037/9 & force [4] 1813/1 1813/3 1813/2 & 2043/17 \\
\hline fine [9] 2006/9 2010/22 2081/10 & & ustrate \\
\hline 2085/12 2086/23 2088/10 2089/19 & foreclosing [1] 2075/2 & FTO [1] 1908/1 \\
\hline  & forefront [3] 1849/24 1863/14 2000/18 & fuel [1] 2027/7 \\
\hline \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{fit} \\
& \mathrm{fit}
\end{aligned}\right.
\] & foregoing [1] 2097/8 & full [32] 1811/15 1813/13 1813/2 \\
\hline finished [4] 1821/12 1821/18 1976/20 & forensics [1] 1813/2 & 1842/12 1874/14 1875/2 1910/19 \\
\hline 2032/11 & forever [2] 1863/8 2000/ & 1927/21 1975/18 \\
\hline & forget [1] 1864/15 & 2013/17 2015/13 2016/3 2016/5 \\
\hline fired [11] 1890/4 1967/3 2001 & forgetting [1] 1840/2 & 2016/22 2017/13 2017/14 2017/2 \\
\hline 2080/24 2081/4 2082/23 2085/3 & forgive [1] 1996/18 & 2018/1 2018/5 2018/7 2018/16 2 \\
\hline 2085/20 2088/15 2089/17 2092/5 & forgiving [4] 1845/14 1856/2 1856/6 & 2021/14 2026/21 2029/13 2031/18 \\
\hline fired.' [1] 2071/14 & 1856/9 & 2040/13 2050/19 2064/10 2071/12 \\
\hline fires [2] 2083/24 2083/2 & forgot [1] & full-time [13] 1813/25 1927/21 2016/3 \\
\hline firing [1] 1967/21 & fork [1] & 2016/22 2017/24 \\
\hline first [62] 1811/10 1812/4 182 & form [6] 1824/8 1859/5 & 18/5 2018/7 2018/16 2019/3 \\
\hline 1825/4 1833/5 1833/16 1833/22 & 2033/4 2078/20 2095/7 & 2029/13 2050/19 \\
\hline 1842/2 1843/19 1844/16 1847/25 & formal [1] 200 & fully [2] 2039/2 \\
\hline 1848/4 1857/19 1860/23 1865/16 & formally [2] 1836/12 2059/10 & fun [2] 2034/1 2044/8 \\
\hline 1870/10 1874/8 1888/23 1902/1 & formation [1] 18 & function [9] 1840/22 1844/2 1851 \\
\hline 1910/11 1912/20 1921/21 1930/2 & former [3] 1976/13 204 & 1869/16 1869/18 1870/5 2017/7 \\
\hline 1930/4 1933/4 1933/6 1934/9 1942/15 & forming [1] 1824/ & 2017/7 2065/1 \\
\hline 1942/15 1942/16 1944/25 1945/6 & forth [17] 1844/7 1846 & functioning [1] \\
\hline 1948/12 1958/7 1959/5 1965/1 1965/3 & 1851/19 1852/3 1862/17 1873/15 & functions [1] 2016/22 \\
\hline 1965/11 1975/10 1976/12 1982/22 & 1887/1 1913/9 1913/16 1914/12 & fundamental [1] 1985/20 \\
\hline 1983/8 1988/24 2004/17 2012/12 & 1922/2 1938/24 1965/2 2035/7 & funeral [1] 2078/25 \\
\hline 2014/23 2015/20 2016/25 2019/20 & 2054/16 2059/4 & funny [1] 1871/19 \\
\hline 2022/17 2061/17 2062/17 2064/2 & forum [1] 1888/13 & further [14] 1871/22 1873/20 1895/24 \\
\hline 2066/3 2069/5 2075/2 2076/10 & forward [11] 1811/7 1874/3 1919/19 & 1925/5 1983/8 1986/13 1989/1 \\
\hline 2078/21 2080/14 2080/17 2091/22 & 1974/6 1975/6 1980/9 2012/8 2034/4 & 2040/2 2075/6 2075/13 2085/1 \\
\hline first-line [1] 1843/19 & 2051/4 2058/3 2063/19 & 2091/20 2092/3 2096/2 \\
\hline firsthand [1] 187 & fought [3] 1878/18 1879/25 2035 & Furthermore [1] \\
\hline fit [4] 1830/25 2032/18 2035/7 2083 & found [17] 1862/20 1905/22 1906/11 & future [3] 1835/25 1848/8 1890/15 \\
\hline Fitness [1] 1873/2 & 1907/6 1953/4 1971/21 1985/4 1992/8 & fuzzy [1] 1846/12 \\
\hline five [8] 1839/21 1841/10 1934/4 & 2040/14 2040/17 2045/13 2055/5 & G \\
\hline 1938/17 2036/14 2049/4 2049/5 & \[
2055 / 5
\] & G-A-R-D-N-E-R [1] 1975/21 \\
\hline & foundation [7] 1835/8 1848/18 & GameDay [1] 1827/6 \\
\hline fix [1] 1890 & 1848/19 1849/3 1869/23 1962/23 & games [1] 1847/10 \\
\hline fixed [5] 1858/25 1859/3 1859/7 & 2028/11 & gang [1] 2013/25 \\
\hline & founded [1] 2041/1 & Gardner [12] 1872 \\
\hline flag [1] 1997/10 & \[
\text { four [21] } 1812 / 1181
\] & 1975/21 1976/3 1994/13 2009/7 \\
\hline flags [3] 1865/14 1917/6 1939/3 & 1836/13 1836/13 1839/21 1841/10 & 2038/14 2052/3 2052/16 2054/10 \\
\hline flat [1] 2000/10 & 1932/13 1932/20 1939/18 1939/19 & 2055/24 \\
\hline fleeing [1] 1948/22 & 1976/13 1962/12 1946/15 19 19 & Gary [2] 1808/8 2083/19 \\
\hline flipped [1] 1930/7 & 2023/14 2029/24 2043/24 2050/11 & \[
\text { gas [1] } 2045 / 14
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline G & \[
195
\] & \\
\hline gather [2] 1919/1 1989/13 & 1971/24 1991/1 2005/19 2006/3 & 1852/20 1889/4 1896/16 1896/17 \\
\hline gathered [1] 1918/25 & 2010/8 2040/13 2040/19 & 1956/23 \\
\hline gauge [1] 2011 & 6 2095/2 & 15 \\
\hline gave [30] 1819/10 1829/8 1830/24 & giving [5] 1829/15 1 & 203 \\
\hline 1831/14 1832/4 1832/5 1840/8 & & 2076/20 2077/22 2080/5 2082/11 \\
\hline 1840/13 1857/7 1901/15 1906/22 & & \\
\hline 1927/12 1928/14 1944/8 1949/11 & glasses go [95] & \\
\hline 1968/8 1968/8 1968/12 1968/18 & 1814/4 1816/23 1835/22 &  \\
\hline 1971/12 2006/7 2030/20 2031/16 & 1838/21 1839/2 1839/20 1842/13 & Gosh [1] 2032/3 \\
\hline 2032/7 2042/13 2059/15 2061/19
2073/20 2083/20 2093/16 & 1858/11 1859/19 1860/22 1863/15 & got [50] 1812/4 1832/ \\
\hline & 1877/23 1878/5 1881/24 1881/24 & 1834/15 1834/24 \\
\hline  & 1882/5 1885/2 1894/12 1895/2 & 1851/23 1852/24 1864/19 188 \\
\hline 1914/3 1923/18 1924/17 1931/20 & 1895/24 1904/2 1906/6 190 & 1896/5 1896/20 \\
\hline 1938/16 1991/9 2040/20 2089/16 & 1906/20 1910/14 1911/14 1917/25 & 1903/22 1908/3 \\
\hline General's [1] 1978 & 1919/19 1921/21 1925/7 1929/18 & 1933/19 1936/17 1937/6 \\
\hline generally [10] 1813/22 19 & 1929/25 1932/16 1937/15 1937/25 & 1953/16 1956/10 197 \\
\hline 1926/17 1929/18 2006/20 2017/ & 1943/2 1943/20 1944/6 1945/10 & 1998/20 2000/13 \\
\hline 2041/8 2059/9 2071/23 2073/12 & 1951/24 1951/24 1954/3 1955/7 & 2008/20 2010/7 2010/14 2013/16 \\
\hline generated [1] 1867/12 & 1958/5 1958/25 1959/2 1959/1 & 2015/12 2016/25 \\
\hline gentlemen [1] 1956/25 & 19 & 042/6 2042/7 \\
\hline get [94] 1824/5 1824/22 1825/5 1825/6 & & 062/24 2078/14 2083/18 \\
\hline 28/16 1828/17 1833/25 1834/23 & 2011/25 2015/8 2015/9 2018/11 & 2084/11 2093/11 2095/8 \\
\hline 1834/25 1844/19 1845/5 1847/13 & 2022/18 2030/7 2030/12 2032/18 & 4] 1876/2 1892 \\
\hline 1847/14 1847/19 1855/12 1857/23 & & \\
\hline 1858/24 1859/3 1859/3 1859/6 1859 & 2049/7 2049/12 2056/1 2072/10 & government [1] \\
\hline 1859/10 1859/11 1880/23 1882/17 & 2073/15 2076/20 2077/11 2077/22 & governor [1] 1976/12 \\
\hline 1888/1 1888/12 1890/3 1892/4 189 & 2079/3 2079/8 2081/1 2082/9 2084/25 & grab [2] 1960/12 1967 \\
\hline 1898/10 1898/23 1898/23 1901/7 & 2086/2 2092/17 2095/4 2095/4 & g \\
\hline 1901/24 1915/2 1927/25 1934/18 & 2095/12 2095/13 209 & graduated [2] 2015/20 2016/9 \\
\hline 1938/14 1939/5 1940/4 1940/7 194 & 2096/5 & Graebner [1] 20 \\
\hline 1957/3 1957/15 1974/2 1977/11 & & grass [1] 1877/19 \\
\hline 1978/13 1978/23 1979/3 1979/13 & goals [1] & \\
\hline 1983/16 1988/5 1989/3 1996/15 & goes [15] 1812/20 & yard [2] 18 \\
\hline 2003/14 2010/15 2011/22 2016/2 & 1913/4 1926/14 1937/22 1973/10 & 2] \\
\hline 2016/15 2022/1 2022/2 2023/14 & 2057/16 2031/24 2043/13 & GREGORY [1] 1808/3 \\
\hline 2025/17 2027/6 2027/7 2031/18 & 2075/4 2082/25 & grew [1] 2013/17 \\
\hline 2033/4 2033/4 2033/9 2037/12 2044/1 & going [102] 1821/25 1828/3 1828/13 & grievance [17] 1929/9 1930/3 1 \\
\hline 2044/5 2044/12 2045/11 2046/8 & 1828/19 1828/20 1829/4 1829/19 & 1991/6 2066/16 \\
\hline 2055/16 2056/8 2056/19 2061/17 & 1830/12 1830/13 1836/5 & 207 \\
\hline 2066/12 2072/20 2076/12 207 & 1853/20 1854/7 1854/19 1858/23 & 2072/15 2072/18 2073/16 2073/25 \\
\hline 2077/18 2077/23 2078/2 2078/3 & 1858/24 1861/3 1864/19 1866 & 2080/20 2089 \\
\hline 2078/5 2082/23 2083/14 2086/19 & 1878/9 1881/15 1881/18 1883/15 & dieva \\
\hline 2087/25 & 1883/25 1896/25 1897/2 1897/5 & grooming [2] 1951/4 195 \\
\hline 5] 1918/4 1920/6 1922/22 1989/4 & 1897/16 1897/18 1898/21 1898/2 & ground [1] 18 \\
\hline 2007/2 & 1902/8 1904/2 1904/16 1907/16 & grounds [1] 1840/20 \\
\hline getting [12] 1836/14 1847/19 1852/21 & 1912/17 1912/20 1914/5 1917/11 & group [12] 1906/23 1978/ \\
\hline 1897/18 1930/7 1934/13 1939/10 & 1919/2 1920/23 1930/13 1931/20 & 1 1979/6 1979/1 \\
\hline 1953/14 1963/9 2043/3 2 & 1931/21 1935/25 1938/17 1939/22 & 1980/12 1981/15 1982/9 1987 \\
\hline 2080/4 & 1940/12 1951/4 1962/24 1967/5 & 201 \\
\hline & 1976/15 1976/18 1980/4 1980/9 & groups [1] 1978/2 \\
\hline gist [2] 1834 & 1984/11 1984/12 1989/9 2006/2 & Guard [1] 1812/ \\
\hline give [39] 1812/2 1827/3 & 2006/6 2016/24 2017/11 2017/18 & guess [11] 190 \\
\hline 1829/21 1830/6 1830/9 1833/25 & 1/1 & 20 \\
\hline 1851/21 1856/19 1861/24 1872/22 & 2021/19 2021/22 2022/21 2023/2 & 2082/18 2083/10 2083/12 2090/12 \\
\hline 1880/12 1897/18 1911/12 1930/21 & 2027/6 2030/21 & \\
\hline 1933/25 1953/24 1976/17 1996/1 & 2046/8 2067/5 2069/6 & uided [1] 2031/1 \\
\hline 1996/1 2003/19 2009/1 2018/4 & 2069/8 2073/22 2075/17 2076/9 & elines [2] 1902 \\
\hline 2021/24 2025/1 2029/9 2030/9 & 2076/18 2077/3 2077/1 & gun [13] 19 \\
\hline 2030/22 2044/6 2051/17 2073/8 & 2077/17 2078/3 2078/16 2080/2 & 1947/14 1948/5 1948/9 1948/ \\
\hline 2077/8 2077/14 2077/14 2083/7 & 2080/8 2082/22 2085/16 2086/22 & 1949/5 1949/13 2069/7 206 \\
\hline 2084/19 2089/1 2090/14 2091/13 & 209/16 2088/9 2090/24 & 2069/22 2070/1 \\
\hline given [30] 1834/8 1857/7 1875/16 & 2093 & guns [3] 1879/24 \\
\hline 1881/14 1883/18 1886/8 1896/6 & g & 3] 1884/4 1884/7 1952/10 \\
\hline 1900/5 1900/15 1900/25 1908/7 & 1899/8 1919/8 2032/21 2054/23 & guys [1] \\
\hline 1920/3 1938/23 1946/5 1950/3 1950/6 & 2058/11 2095/15 & guys [3] 1827/15 1939/6 2049/17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
gym [1] 1819/25
gym-type [1] 1819/25

\section*{H}
had [225]
hadn't [4] 1836/16 1882/18 1992/15 2051/2
Haggerty [1] 2093/15
hair [1] 2043/3
haircuts [1] 2043/3
hairdresser [1] 2043/1
hairdresser's [1] 2042/23
hairstylist [1] 2043/4
half [7] 1822/1 1951/20 1989/2
2013/24 2019/23 2066/22 2077/4
half-day [1] 1822/1
hall [4] 1877/18 1912/7 1994/21 1994/22
hallway [2] 1904/4 1936/2
hand [10] 1827/10 1841/22 1874/5
1910/8 1975/8 2007/15 2012/9 2034/5 2044/6 2063/24
handcuffing [1] 1907/5
handed [2] 1928/12 1945/11
handguns [2] 1879/25 1886/17
handheld [1] 1966/10
handing [1] 1968/3
handle [4] 1970/12 1979/4 2035/25 2036/6
handled [3] 1980/12 1980/14 1992/9 hands [1] 1912/12
hands-on [1] 1912/12
handwriting [2] 1905/7 1945/16
handwritten [9] 1905/10 1906/21
1924/10 1943/10 1943/13 1943/15 1958/9 1958/15 1958/20
happen [10] 1820/15 1863/9 1864/7
1867/10 1871/20 1902/8 1902/8 1930/23 1931/2 1948/10
happened [27] 1838/13 1839/21
1845/22 1860/20 1879/1 1887/21
1894/9 1896/5 1905/5 1923/1 1931/8
1932/22 1940/1 1940/10 1940/16
1941/11 1941/21 1949/14 1974/19
1992/13 2007/25 2038/21 2046/17
2046/20 2047/3 2048/24 2055/3
happening [4] 1888/24 1931/19 1947/22 1979/24
happens [3] 1838/8 1919/5 1919/11
happy [2] 2043/18 2078/21
harassed [1] 1935/2
harassment [1] 1856/5
hard [5] 1962/11 2002/8 2082/4
2087/22 2089/20
harmful [2] 2087/12 2087/12
Harrang [1] 1808/8
has [99] 1813/7 1814/2 1818/14
1831/22 1848/16 1848/22 1849/20
1851/1 1852/8 1861/20 1863/7 1864/6
1868/16 1868/21 1868/22 1888/10
1889/2 1890/13 1890/14 1906/14
1908/4 1918/6 1920/4 1921/14
1922/18 1923/1 1925/7 1929/9 1933/6
1944/24 1952/15 1957/3 1960/6
1973/8 1974/14 1977/17 1977/23
1984/1 1984/2 1984/2 1984/4 1984/23

1984/24 1984/25 1985/10 1986/14 1996/1 1996/3 1996/4 1996/5 1996/15 1996/20 1997/7 1997/8 1997/11 1997/13 1997/15 2000/2 2000/5 2000/6 2000/10 2000/16 2000/18 2000/24 2001/1 2001/7 2010/5 2010/5 2015/16 2016/23 2020/8 2022/25 2026/12 2028/11 2030/4 2030/14 2030/15 2033/5 2033/23 2033/24 2035/16 2036/9 2039/19 2039/21 2039/22 2039/23 2050/9 2053/13 2055/4 2055/10 2057/2 2074/7 2079/24 2083/7 2086/2 2086/10 2088/20 2094/16 2095/24
hasn't [2] 1962/9 2060/15
have [446]
haven't [14] 1929/1 1934/8 1966/11
1996/18 2019/2 2019/5 2040/15
2044/21 2053/7 2059/8 2065/20 2089/25 2095/1 2095/5
having [29] 1817/25 1846/16 1872/10 1882/16 1886/21 1889/15 1912/16 1913/22 1914/3 1914/14 1914/21 1929/25 1938/14 1972/11 1980/3 1984/15 1987/21 1987/24 1997/21 2000/17 2000/20 2018/25 2025/8 2035/21 2035/23 2065/14 2066/9 2068/22 2069/22
hazard [1] 1981/9
hazy [1] 1852/24
he [348]
he's [34] 1818/14 1837/21 1847/9 1847/10 1847/10 1854/23 1855/9 1855/9 1862/24 1862/25 1882/16 1884/4 1884/5 1885/6 1890/12 1900/5 1904/2 1938/3 1944/7 1961/5 1963/6 2001/21 2006/2 2008/23 2021/13 2023/6 2024/15 2024/18 2030/5 2051/20 2080/19 2083/18 2084/11 2091/10
head [8] 1892/14 1913/19 1934/24
1936/10 1958/3 1970/10 1970/21 2057/8
heading [1] 1906/2
health [1] 1918/13
hear [26] 1817/1 1825/6 1842/12 1863/15 1870/10 1870/15 1870/16 1870/19 1870/23 1888/19 1896/8 1901/12 1910/18 1935/3 1935/7 1975/16 1986/9 2002/1 2005/6 2012/18 2024/3 2034/3 2078/1 2085/7 2087/12 2094/17
heard [20] 1822/11 1832/7 1832/24 1835/11 1835/19 1862/24 1870/8 1870/9 1870/20 1876/24 1884/22 1934/8 1934/10 1939/14 1939/17 1939/18 1939/19 2025/23 2057/25 2069/22
hearing [31] 1860/21 1883/5 1919/17 1920/9 1920/22 1921/17 1922/13 1923/2 1924/11 1926/16 1930/7 1942/6 1942/8 1953/22 1955/11 1957/23 1958/6 1963/17 1963/17 1963/25 1966/4 1969/3 1969/7 1969/14 2001/23 2021/14 2021/18 2033/6 2080/20 2082/14 2089/16 hearings [1] 1942/3
hearsay [9] 1870/24 1969/25 2028/4 2028/5 2028/5 2028/10 2028/11 2031/22 2053/7
heart [1] 1821/2
heavily [1] 1922/18
held [3] 1812/3 1977/25 2030/19
Hello [1] 2075/4
help [16] 1853/1 1865/12 1873/16 1880/9 1880/9 1882/14 1882/16 1882/22 1886/22 1925/11 1949/2 1983/16 2005/3 2016/17 2065/24 2067/18
helped [2] 1965/21 1999/23
helpful [3] 1906/23 1985/3 1998/8
helping [1] 2067/15
helps [1] 1985/2
her [62] 1823/24 1844/12 1844/13 1844/17 1844/21 1844/24 1845/2 1845/2 1845/9 1845/12 1845/14 1845/17 1854/6 1856/4 1915/9 1916/24 1916/25 1918/16 1920/17 1921/9 1924/5 1928/10 1928/12 1928/19 1928/24 1929/5 1930/25 1936/1 1936/12 1936/13 1936/14 1936/18 1936/19 1944/7 1945/21 1948/23 1949/6 1949/11 1985/18 1995/8 1995/10 1995/12 1997/20 2009/25 2010/3 2059/21 2065/25 2069/17 2069/19 2075/20 2082/16 2082/19 2083/14 2084/15 2086/22 2088/9 2089/3 2091/2 2091/12 2091/18 2096/2 2096/5
here [58] 1827/1 1832/17 1833/13 1840/2 1846/13 1850/14 1851/1 1851/2 1859/3 1859/6 1867/2 1867/23 1872/14 1874/11 1876/13 1893/19 1894/21 1896/19 1897/12 1897/14 1904/11 1909/6 1909/12 1920/2 1922/8 1936/14 1936/19 1940/6 1941/18 1946/2 1949/6 1951/24 1952/6 1952/14 1955/16 1956/6 1957/22 1958/6 1960/13 1962/25 1963/5 1966/19 1974/19 1984/20 1986/16 2006/22 2013/11 2014/8 2021/14 2033/8 2056/9 2056/13 2064/17 2067/6 2076/4 2076/12 2078/11 2082/14
here's [4] 1931/19 1974/7 1999/25 2005/4
Hermens [6] 1892/6 1893/19 1894/1 1894/15 1894/17 1895/8
Hermens' [1] 1893/9
hesitating [1] 1984/25
hesitation [3] 1831/12 1834/20 1836/6
Hess [17] 1831/22 1833/10 1853/7 1857/19 1857/23 1859/19 1950/10 1952/2 1954/4 1954/24 1955/8 1959/2 1959/16 1961/10 2055/19 2056/2 2056/15
hey [10] 1832/6 1835/24 1836/1
1836/5 1863/23 1888/13 1952/19
1999/8 1999/14 2044/5
Hi [1] 2082/14
hidden [1] 2082/11
hide [1] 1850/4
hiding [3] 1877/21 1968/7 1984/10
high [2] 2013/12 2036/22

\section*{H}
higher [2] 1938/20 1973/11
higher-level [1] 1938/20
highest [3] 2036/17 2036/18 2041/15
highlight [1] 1869/11
highlighted [4] 1853/13 2004/23 2053/3 2053/11
highlights [1] 1923/11
him [132] 1818/9 1818/20 1818/21
1821/1 1821/25 1822/5 1825/7
1827/11 1829/16 1830/16 1836/12
1846/4 1846/4 1846/6 1846/23 1847/1
1847/6 1847/11 1847/13 1847/14
1847/15 1851/5 1851/16 1854/13 1855/1 1856/5 1860/8 1863/24 1868/15 1868/16 1868/21 1869/13 1872/6 1872/8 1872/9 1876/14 1877/5 1877/10 1877/12 1877/12 1879/2 1879/5 1880/9 1881/23 1881/24 1882/14 1882/14 1882/16 1883/5 1883/21 1883/23 1883/23 1883/24 1884/2 1884/3 1884/5 1884/23 1887/18 1889/10 1890/7 1890/8 1892/14 1892/15 1892/15 1893/11 1896/5 1896/7 1899/14 1900/11 1904/5 1906/25 1907/5 1907/24 1915/6 1915/16 1915/18 1916/7 1916/21 1920/23 1923/7 1923/10 1923/13 1924/18 1924/20 1924/22 1925/14 1931/13 1931/23 1939/1 1939/7 1941/9 1962/8 1965/14 1965/21 1966/19 1971/24 1987/21 1987/24 1988/4 1988/5 1988/6 1992/25 2003/6 2015/24 2015/25 2016/4 2016/17 2017/20 2024/11 2025/20 2027/15 2034/19 2039/9 2044/6 2046/1 2048/16 2048/19 2051/12 2051/23 2051/25 2052/5 2059/15 2059/25 2060/1 2062/16 2066/10 2073/3 2073/3 2073/8 2091/8 2091/10 2091/12
himself [5] 1907/4 1961/24 2016/6 2027/7 2045/15
hip [1] 1949/6
hire [6] 2015/22 2017/2 2029/21
2032/14 2032/22 2033/11
hired [10] 1812/4 1846/5 1875/2
1887/24 2013/17 2014/24 2015/11
2017/17 2017/20 2018/18
hires [1] 2018/18
hiring [2] 2015/7 2039/11
his [133] 1818/19 1819/1 1820/19 1824/23 1825/1 1825/3 1825/11 1827/10 1847/6 1847/15 1847/17 1851/14 1852/6 1854/19 1865/17 1869/16 1876/16 1877/13 1878/6 1879/2 1879/8 1884/6 1884/9 1885/22 1886/9 1889/21 1890/3 1890/10 1890/10 1892/10 1892/17 1892/17 1899/15 1901/3 1901/25 1902/16 1906/15 1908/1 1912/13 1914/5 1915/21 1915/23 1916/20 1920/1 1922/14 1923/7 1924/18 1924/23 1924/24 1924/25 1930/25 1933/16 1933/19 1937/7 1938/5 1938/7 1940/12 1941/3 1942/22 1951/4 1951/4 1951/15 1954/10 1961/5

1962/1 1963/5 1965/2 1965/2 1965/20 1966/1 1966/8 1967/6 1971/4 1972/4 1972/7 1972/17 1973/24 1974/5 1985/18 1988/5 1988/7 1990/21 1992/9 1992/17 1993/1 2002/16 2002/19 2002/22 2003/7 2003/21 2004/13 2004/13 2016/1 2016/17 2019/19 2020/2 2021/6 2021/11 2023/6 2024/21 2028/6 2029/2 2031/24 2032/3 2034/23 2039/8 2039/14 2045/9 2049/21 2051/7 2053/4 2059/7 2059/8 2059/14 2060/4 2063/4 2065/25 2067/16 2067/22 2068/6 2068/25 2072/12 2073/1 2073/2 2081/2 2083/4 2084/7 2090/23 2091/1 2091/8 2091/10 2091/11 2091/18
history [2] 1911/12 1976/18 hitting [1] 1892/14
hold [6] 1825/5 1843/15 1853/9
1986/21 1997/14 2034/25
holding [1] 2037/7
holiday [1] 2022/18
home [2] 1892/17 2078/3
homeless [1] 1883/15
homicide [1] 2002/7
honest [4] 1845/6 1847/10 1882/4 2003/17
honestly [1] 1884/24
honesty [1] 1985/21
Honor [44] 1815/16 1815/19 1833/19 1839/25 1858/8 1858/14 1891/11 1891/23 1892/1 1899/14 1920/10 1924/3 1925/22 1927/6 1945/25 1946/14 1956/22 1962/23 1967/25 1969/24 1969/25 1981/20 1982/10 1989/18 1989/19 1990/7 1995/22 2005/4 2010/9 2025/1 2028/13 2052/12 2053/6 2070/5 2070/6 2070/13 2071/6 2074/13 2074/15 2074/22 2075/19 2080/16 2085/9 2087/20
HONORABLE [1] 1807/15
honoring [1] 1985/18
HOOD [1] 1808/7
hook [1] 1983/17
hope [2] 2035/4 2065/24
hopefully [2] 2071/25 2078/23
hoping [1] 1901/23
horse [1] 1851/11
hot [3] 2033/15 2034/7 2036/13
hour [3] 1925/2 2077/3 2078/4
hours [7] 1894/9 1926/20 1926/25 1949/25 2014/7 2022/2 2078/17
house [1] 2043/21
how [81] 1811/25 1813/20 1814/3 1814/18 1822/7 1824/23 1825/1 1825/19 1830/1 1830/2 1833/2 1833/8 1835/3 1835/4 1840/16 1843/7 1844/17 1849/2 1854/16 1861/5 1867/5 1868/12 1870/22 1871/4 1877/6 1878/10 1880/12 1885/14 1887/20 1890/15 1890/24 1896/8 1899/3 1899/4 1900/25 1925/1 1926/17 1926/23 1931/2 1931/4 1931/6 1937/8 1938/4 1938/5 1938/14 1940/20 1949/19 1959/1 1964/15

1965/22 1970/7 1976/11 1979/3 1980/11 1981/6 1987/2 1988/24 1991/16 1992/9 1996/11 2002/8 2013/6 2014/7 2021/11 2021/22 2030/23 2033/11 2034/24 2035/8 2035/25 2036/6 2037/11 2042/1 2042/13 2042/18 2044/11 2062/4 2064/25 2065/9 2075/17 2077/17
however [8] 1813/25 1814/25 1816/25 1817/23 2015/11 2024/18 2082/5 2089/20
HR [16] 1911/25 1912/25 1913/19 1915/2 1917/5 1931/24 1934/7 1934/15 1934/24 1937/11 1937/14 1939/6 1958/3 1970/10 1972/11 1972/15
huge [2] 1974/15 1974/18 huh [7] 1893/8 1893/10 1898/20
1898/22 1956/12 1965/10 1966/20
human [14] 1911/7 1911/8 1911/16 1911/18 1911/19 1919/16 1922/17 1927/15 1927/18 1930/9 1932/19
1932/21 1937/18 2068/20
humbly [2] 2076/12 2095/1
hundred [5] 1884/24 1890/25 1891/1 1939/9 2006/4
Hundreds [2] 1899/6 1899/8
husband [1] 1948/23
Huyser [1] 1893/21
hypothetically [1] 2005/19
I

I heard [1] 1832/24
I saw [1] 1868/24
I'd [5] 1817/24 1820/22 1935/18 1960/23 2048/16
I'II [30] 1811/14 1822/19 1825/7
1834/7 1861/11 1869/11 1893/20 1918/24 1923/2 1935/20 1936/16 1957/14 1958/23 1960/12 1967/8 2021/24 2032/16 2044/5 2076/14 2076/17 2077/8 2077/9 2078/13 2079/4 2084/19 2085/17 2090/14 2092/4 2092/17 2095/13
I'm [147]
I've [37] 1830/23 1833/13 1845/14 1847/14 1851/2 1861/6 1871/18 1871/19 1872/6 1872/7 1876/1 1883/21 1883/21 1884/8 1897/15 1899/8 1902/23 1904/20 1908/3 1909/23 1982/4 1987/25 1988/5 1991/23 1998/20 1999/15 2014/4 2015/25 2020/25 2024/20 2035/24 2037/14 2042/9 2057/12 2076/23 2082/21 2094/9
IA [9] 1836/22 1837/2 1856/22 1857/17 1857/20 1859/20 1865/2 1868/2 1995/13
IA'd [1] 1837/4
ID [1] 1882/1
idea [16] 1836/11 1878/10 1881/18 1886/9 1966/12 1972/23 1978/23 2005/8 2024/19 2077/16 2077/16 2081/8 2086/4 2086/25 2088/12 2092/8
identification [1] 1820/14
identify [1] 1881/17

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline I & J & 2017/10 2019/12 2019/14 2020/2 \\
\hline investigations... [1] 1992/14 & jacks [1] 1930/18 & 2023/14 2026/24 2027/21 2028/20 \\
\hline investigative [2] 2044/21 2044/23 & jail [4] 2013/15 2013/16 2043/8 & 2043/20 2046/7 2047/11 2047/21 \\
\hline investigator [2] 2032/22 2040/22 & 2043/11 & 2049/3 2048/22 2048/14 \\
\hline involve [1] 2043/1 & JAMES [10] 1807/4 1912/16 1943/2 & 2051/22 2053/5 2053/20 2054/3 \\
\hline involved [36] 1817/6 1822/25 1824/14 & 1968/9 1987/22 1987/22 2032/4 & 2054/11 2055/10 2058/13 2060/3 \\
\hline 1827/24 1832/13 1845/20 1846/8 & 2066/3 2074/11 2082/14 & \[
2061 / 10 \text { 2062/20 }
\] \\
\hline 1847/22 1847/24 1853/24 1860/24 & Jamie [1] 1928/14 & June [8] 1989/25 2052/23 2052/24 \\
\hline 1860/25 1870/22 1871/4 1871/7 & JASON [4] 1808/2 1927/9 1973/16 & 2052/25 2053/15 2053/21 2054/15 \\
\hline 1871/10 1871/12 1892/22 1893/6 1894/21 1913/1 1915/1 1915/13 & 2040/6 & 2054/21 \\
\hline 1916/23 1917/16 1922/18 1937/6 & Jefferson [1] 2095/4 & June 23 [1] 2052/25 \\
\hline 1940/25 1973/18 1984/16 1995/13 & Jeremy [1] 2032/4 & June 30th [1] 1989/25 \\
\hline 2006/15 2045/6 2065/18 2066/3 & Jessup [2] 1808/20 2097/14 & jurisdiction [4] 1814/6 1814/7 1997/5
2034/17 \\
\hline 2069/6 & Jet [2] 1977/2 2078/13 & juror [1] 2078/22 \\
\hline involvement [6] 1870/12 1915/24 1932/20 1935/18 1936/6 1937/4 & JFK [1] 1861/10 & jurors [7] 1927/24 1930/21 1932/25 \\
\hline 1932/20 1935/18 1936/6 1937/4 & Jill [2] 1808/20 & 2003/23 2003/25 2011/22 2022/6 \\
\hline involves [2] 1954/6 1960/20 & Jim [1] 2063/2 & jurors' [1] 2022/9 \\
\hline involving [8] 1933/11 1934/7 2000/9 & job [40] 1814/20 1819/11 1879/10 & jury [62] 1811/2 1811/15 1812/17 \\
\hline 2035/13 2037/14 2040/21 2062/3 & 1908/21 1911/8 1912/8 1913/19 & 1827/17 1831/23 1842/12 1848/1 \\
\hline 2094/15 & 1933/16 1933/19 1935/8 1940/12 &  \\
\hline irrelevant [3] 2021/21 2022/13 & 1958/3 1963/25 1970/23 1971/4 & \\
\hline 2084/25 & 1971/18 1972/18 1987/17 2014/3 & \\
\hline is [501] & 2016/14 2030/3 2031/2 2031/25 &  \\
\hline is focused [1] 2074/22 & 2036/21 2044/7 2047/18 2048/7 & \[
1983
\] \\
\hline ish [1] 1844/20 & 2050/20 2061/8 2080/23 2080/24 &  \\
\hline isn't [24] 1819/22 1869/22 1927/10 & 2081/1 2081/3 2082/24 2083/18 &  \\
\hline 1929/23 1931/9 1934/20 1935/12 & 2083/21 2084/11 2087/6 2089/16 &  \\
\hline 1943/11 1950/4 1951/15 1958/10 & 2089/17 & 2012/4 2012/19 2016/18 2022/4 \\
\hline 1972/7 1984/10 1991/11 1991/21 & jobs [6] 1977/3 2014/1 2017/10 &  \\
\hline 1993/7 2002/9 2038/11 2041/3 & 2017/24 2036/16 2061/5 & \\
\hline 2047/18 2048/23 2090/3 2090/23 & John [3] 2019/22 2066/17 2067/16 &  \\
\hline 2090/24 & John Ahlen [2] 2066/17 2067/16 & 2075/7 2077/6 2077/8 2077/14 \\
\hline issue [32] 1815/2 1816/22 1827/5 & John Thornburg [1] 2019/22 &  \\
\hline 1833/25 1837/23 1849/13 1864/24 & Johnson [1] 1895/19 & \\
\hline 1878/11 1897/13 1925/14 1930/24 & joining [2] 1845/22 1976/8 & justice [5] 1980/17 1980/17 1980/19 \\
\hline 1931/21 1974/15 1974/18 2004/9 & joking [2] 1871/17 2087/18 & \[
1984 / 92014 / 6
\] \\
\hline 2004/11 2008/6 2019/4 2024/9 2034/1 & jokingly [1] 1871/20 & justification [1] 1955/16 \\
\hline 2037/23 2057/7 2066/6 2080/24 & JONATHAN [1] 1808/7 & justify [1] 1967/4 \\
\hline 2084/21 2085/24 2086/9 2087/19 & judge [7] 1807/16 1853/17 2005/2 & Jute [1] 2089/13 \\
\hline 2089/18 2092/25 2094/14 2095/2 & 2035/14 2075/1 2082/24 2093/15 & Jute [1] 208913 \\
\hline issued [8] 1894/20 1913/17 1913/24 & judgment [22] 1819/8 1827/3 1831/2 & K \\
\hline 1914/4 1914/15 2029/23 2062/1 & 1915/20 1915/21 1916/22 1918/12 & K-I-N-G [1] 1910/21 \\
\hline 2066/10 & 1918/23 1921/25 1924/24 1940/16 &  \\
\hline issues [47] 1819/9 1827/3 1832/1 & 1948/17 1953/2 1958/1 1964/17 & KAFOU \\
\hline 1832/16 1833/17 1835/5 1835/12 & 1965/15 1965/24 1980/15 1985/16 & 2040/6 1927/9 1973/16 \\
\hline 1835/12 1852/4 1854/21 1855/7 & 1985/25 1993/8 2003/2 & keep [9] 1882/13 1912/8 1921/10 \\
\hline 1862/15 1872/5 1882/16 1890/9 & July [20] 1858/2 1859/22 1868/2 & 1921/10 1922/25 2010/2 2055/2 \\
\hline 1897/7 1900/12 1911/22 1911/23 & 1868/9 1904/13 1904/14 1905/2 & 2078/23 2083/11 \\
\hline 1912/9 1912/14 1912/20 1947/14 & 1905/11 1905/16 1906/6 1906/7 & keepin \\
\hline 1948/2 1955/14 1960/21 1964/20 & 1906/8 1906/20 1907/2 1907/16 &  \\
\hline 1980/11 1981/16 1984/15 2027/16 & 2042/4 2054/21 2068/23 2070/24 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Kept [5] 18/1/16 18/1/1/ 1914// } \\
& 1937 / 14 \text { 2010/11 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 2033/21 2033/24 2035/12 2035/25 & 2072/20 & Kevin [2] 1886/1 1886/9 \\
\hline 2036/17 2036/21 2038/8 2038/8 & July 13 [1] 2070/24 & Kevin Williams [1] 1886/1 \\
\hline 2046/5 2048/21 2051/25 2058/1 & July 14 [1] 1906/7 & key [1] 2001/9 \\
\hline 2058/3 2065/14 2066/8 2091/25 & July 14th [1] 1906/8 & kid [3] 1892/9 1892/14 1892/17 \\
\hline issuing [1] 1817/9 & July 15th [1] 1906/20 & kidding [2] 2022/2 2092/18 \\
\hline it [688] & July 16th [1] 1907/2 & \[
\text { kids [1] } 1844 / 5
\] \\
\hline it's [203] & July 17th [1] 1907/16 & KIEL [1] 1808/3 \\
\hline items [3] 1881/5 1884/10 1924/13 & July 18th [1] 2042/4 & killed [1] 1887/4 \\
\hline its [8] 1823/13 1888/9 1978/14 1979/7 1979/12 1987/6 2089/22 2089/23 & July 27 [3] 1858/2 1859/22 1868/2 July 7 [2] 1904/13 1904/14 & kind [31] 1817/18 1819/22 1845/4 \\
\hline  & July 7 [2] 1904/13 1904/14
July 9th [1] 1905/2 & 1863/14 1877/21 1882/13 1889/2 \\
\hline itself [8] 1846/18 1851/17 1856/25 & July 9th [1] 1905/2 & 1918/3 1919/11 1931/19 1933/7 \\
\hline 1857/6 1866/21 1982/18 1993/3 & jumping [2] 1930/18 1941/18 & 1937/21 1978/6 1980/5 1984/8 \\
\hline 2044/24 & Junction [41] 1896/9 1990/3 2013/5 2013/6 2014/3 2014/13 2014/24 2015/2 2015/3 2016/19 2017/7 & 1986/15 2012/8 2015/4 2015/6 2016/2 2016/8 2016/12 2023/5 2025/17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline K & 2064/10 2064/11 2074/16 2075/15 & \[
187
\] \\
\hline kind... [7] 2031/6 2031/15 2035/6 & 2093/4 & \[
187
\] \\
\hline 2036/13 2070/20 2087/15 2090/12 & last-minute [1] 1955/24 & 1882/10 1882/22 1884/16 1928 \\
\hline kinds [2] 1871/19 1966/22 & lasted [1] & 1943/2 1953/15 1954/20 1955/13 \\
\hline King [13] 1910/5 1910/10 1910/21 & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\text { Iate [6] 1877/1 } 1 \\
\text { 1980/8 2020/16 }
\end{array}
\] & 2061/19 2068/22 2069/18 2093/7 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1911/3 1927/4 1927/10 1968/3 1970/ } \\
& 1973 / 12 \text { 2081/13 2081/21 2081/22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & later [8] 1854/18 1860/4 1886/18 & 2093/18 2094/7 2094/20 2094/23 \\
\hline 083 & 1886/18 1945/24 1951/20 1999/13 & bbrecht's [2] 1851/12 1852/5 \\
\hline Kiyono [1] 2064/11 & 2047/23 & [4] 1869/1 1869/8 1951/9 1911 \\
\hline knell [1] 1864/12 & & left [9] 1879/20 1911/14 1957/17 \\
\hline knew [39] 1828/3 1830/15 1833/3 & Laue [4] 2067/15 2067/17 2070/ & 1958/25 1959/7 1968/19 1976/23 \\
\hline 1835/5 1836/5 1836/16 1837/2 & & 2019/24 \\
\hline 1837/12 1840/19 1840/21 1840/23 & & gal [4] 1834/1 1987/9 20 \\
\hline 1840/25 1846/14 1849/22 1855/12 & 1823/21 1828/14 1843/9 1848/16 & legible [3] \\
\hline 1860/19 1864/23 1868/1 1871/17 & 1848/21 1849/20 1941/14 1941/16 & isure [4] 1819/22 1824/24 1825/1 \\
\hline 1878/16 1880/21 1883/18 1891/10 & 1966/16 1976/20 1977/17 1977/23 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { leisure [4 } \\
1825 / 11
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 1893/5 189 & 1979/14 1981/7 1981/15 1982/22 & length [6] 1813/10 1814/3 1814/11 \\
\hline 1898/21 1915/14 1941/14 1947/2 & 1982/23 1983/4 1983/9 1983 & 1947/6 1970/2 1983/1 \\
\hline 1947/23 1947/24 1977/23 2018/3 & 1983/23 1984/4 1984/21 1985/2 & lengths [1] \\
\hline knives [1] 1886/20 & 1986/2 1986/10 1987/5 1991/15 & lengthy [1] 2011/17 \\
\hline know [214] & 1991/16 1991/22 1993/16 2000/ & less [7] 1977/14 1983/15 2016 \\
\hline knowing [7] 1881/18 1955/17 1994/3 & 14/6 2014 & 2080/23 2081/2 2087/6 2089/17 \\
\hline 2003/6 2005/10 2084/20 2085/18 & 2016/13 2016/17 2017/25 2021/5 & lesser [1] 2016/14 \\
\hline knowledge [10] 1835/9 1845/16 & 2036/24 2077/7 2077/10 & let [34] 1829/3 183 \\
\hline 1869/20 1876/24 1900/16 1908/11 & lawn [1] 1878/6 & 1838/21 1840/8 1841/5 1855/12 \\
\hline 2027/24 2043/13 2091/13 2094/22 & laws [1] 1985/11 & 1857/8 1866/18 1866/22 1869/3 \\
\hline knowledgeable [1] 1906/23 & lawsuit [11] 1823/14 1869/13 193 & 1898/17 1904/5 1904/15 1914/20 \\
\hline known [8] 1836/5 1837/1 1845/7 & 1935/16 1947/22 2081/5 2085/4 & 1957/15 1965/5 1984/13 1997 \\
\hline 1851/4 1861/5 1861/6 1941/17 1988/6 & 2085/13 2085/21 2086/10 2092/6 & 2006/24 2008/18 2022/17 2023/16 \\
\hline knows [1] 2032/24 & lawyer [4] 1834/2 1909/20 1993/22 & 2037/6 2057/12 2071/2 2078/16 \\
\hline L & Leach [1] & 2094/25 2096/1 2096/5 \\
\hline label [1] 1946 & lead [5] 1865/9 1865/12 1905/24 & let's [55] 1825/5 1825/6 1834/10 \\
\hline labor [3] 1911/21 1911/25 1919/5 & 1935/2 2080/ & 1838/21 1839/2 1847/25 1854/ \\
\hline lack[3] 1869/6 2004/12 2015/5 & leader [2] 2037/4 2044/10 & 1858/11 1860/16 1864/10 1864/22 \\
\hline lacked [1] 1862/17 & leadership [4] 1863/11 1865/9 & 1867/8 1894/12 1905/1 1906/6 \\
\hline Lacks [1] 1848/18 & 1955/22 2044/13 & 1906/20 1934/7 1934/11 1935 \\
\hline Ladies [1] 1956/25 & leading [7] 1849/9 1849/16 1873/4 & 1935/18 1936/16 1937/4 1940/19 \\
\hline lady [4] 1838/6 1892/8 1892/18 & 1915/25 1918/17 2086/11 2086/12 & 1942/25 1943/13 1946/2 1946/20 \\
\hline 1894/16 & leads [2] 1916/2 2041/17 & 946/20 1948/9 1949/2 \\
\hline laid [1] 1918/2 & learn [10] 1836/19 1849/15 1849/19 & 1952/25 1953/13 1954/2 1955/7 \\
\hline Lake [1] 2033/8 & 1849/25 1889/5 1955/21 1978/1 & 1958/5 1958/25 1959/15 1961/8 \\
\hline Lane [12] 1816/25 1887/13 1976/10 & 2034/3 2047/25 2049/15 & 1964/2 1982/21 1995/15 2013/11 \\
\hline 1976/11 1976/24 1981/5 1994/19 & learned [14] 1836/13 1852/22 1853/5 & 2019/20 2023/7 2042/1 2042/6 \\
\hline 1994/25 1995/4 1995/4 1996/9 & 1863/24 1905/15 1912/20 1941/6 & 2055/14 2067/8 2076/12 2079/8 \\
\hline 2015/14 & 1941/16 1943/6 1955/22 1964/7 & 2079/10 2082/9 2086/19 2086/24 \\
\hline language [7] 1908/3 1913/5 1931/17 & 2027/3 2039/3 2039/6 & lethal [1] 1887/4 \\
\hline 1932/2 1932/6 1934/12 1938/15 & learning [4] 1854/18 1855/9 1985/2 & ter [70] 1866/4 1914/7 1920/6 \\
\hline lapse [1] 1991/20 & 2057/23 & 920/18 1920/21 1920/25 1921/1 \\
\hline laptop [1] 1907/6 & least [11] 1836/12 1845/23 1850/22 & 1921/11 1921/25 1922/21 1926/ \\
\hline large [6] 1854/22 1855/7 1877/19 & 57/12 1880/22 1907/12 1949/2 & 26/10 1926/18 1926/18 1926/21 \\
\hline 1877/20 2068/4 2068/8 & 1999/15 2002/13 2083/7 2086/2 & 1927/2 1931/17 1931/25 1932/ \\
\hline large-scale [1] 1854/22 & leave [24] 1846/5 1846/7 1882 & 1932/15 1932/19 1938/23 1948/1 \\
\hline last [57] 1811/15 1874/15 1910/20 & 1892/16 1941/19 1941/22 194 & 949/23 1950/3 1950/6 1950/16 \\
\hline 1920/17 1928/13 1942/25 1944/6 & 2023/5 2023/13 2023/14 2023/15 & 1950/19 1950/25 1951/4 1951/7 \\
\hline 1944/11 1945/10 1945/12 1945/13 & 2024/15 2024/18 2025/19 2025/21 & 1951/8 1951/14 1951/19 1952/1 \\
\hline 1947/17 1947/21 1952/25 1955/24 & 2038/25 2039/4 2042/2 2042/4 & 1952/25 1953/20 1957/17 1958/7 \\
\hline 1958/13 1958/20 1959/3 1959/4 & 2051/24 2054/22 2058/11 2083/15 & 1958/25 1959/3 1960/9 1960/20 \\
\hline 1959/4 1959/23 1961/8 1961/8 & 2083/17 & 1961/4 1961/5 1961/6 1962/2 196 \\
\hline 1961/11 1961/14 1961/15 1961/15 & leaves [1] 2049/3 & 1963/6 1963/21 1964/3 1966/21 \\
\hline 1961/16 1961/16 1962/12 1968/15 & LEBRECHT [51] 1807/8 1820/20 & 1967/21 1967/22 1968/4 1969/19 \\
\hline 1975/19 1975/21 1980/7 2007/12 & 1822/7 1830/7 1831/3 1838/4 1846/21 & 1969/22 1974/5 1989/15 1989/25 \\
\hline 2008/14 2008/15 2012/20 2032/11 & 1847/3 1851/1 1851/21 1852/21 & 1990/2 1990/4 1990/16 2005/20 \\
\hline 2033/15 2036/14 2048/10 2049/10 & 1854/9 1854/10 1854/11 1854/12 & 2039/1 2047/7 2050/25 2054/24 \\
\hline 2051/11 2051/21 2052/5 2052/9 & 1854/19 1855/25 1863/20 1869/13 & 2058/18 2062/17 \\
\hline 2058/8 2059/3 2060/13 2060/14 & 1870/12 1870/22 1871/4 1872/17 & letters [15] 1932/4 1932/8 1932/13 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline L & 1928/3 1929/10 1929/16 1929/20 & \[
2063 / 23
\] \\
\hline letters... [12] 1932/22 1934/13 & 1931/13 1931/22 1932/10 1933/8 & locked [2] 1825/14 1825/15 \\
\hline 1937/14 1937/15 1937/25 1938/15 & 1935/18 1937/19 1942/4 1951/11 & logo [2] 1858/22 1858/23 \\
\hline 1939/10 1951/11 1951/16 1951/17 & 1953/8 1957/12 1960/23 1979/17 & Lois [7] 2063/17 2064/1 206 \\
\hline 2041/13 2058/9 & 1994/9 2002/17 2003/5 200 &  \\
\hline letting [3] 1850/22 2051/6 2081/6 & 2029/10 2030/17 2035/19 2036/15 & \[
1833 / 2 \text { 1835/3 1835/4 1840/16 1851/3 }
\] \\
\hline level [17] 1850/18 1850/21 1871/21 & 2038/8 2048/5 2049/2 2049/5 2051/13 & 1861/5 1861/16 1865/13 1925/1 \\
\hline 1973/11 2020/20 2035/7 2037/1 & 2051/25 2053/7 2061/3 2061/15 & 1925/9 1929/1 1976/11 1988/6 1992/7 \\
\hline 2038/5 2038/6 2038/8 2038/10 & 2074/6 2078/1 2078/2 2082/10 & 1993/13 1995/7 1996/1 1996/11 \\
\hline 2041/16 2041/16 & 2087/15 2091/15 2092/22 2095/7 & 1996/19 2000/2 2000/25 2013/6 \\
\hline levels [3] 2017/22 2034/11 2038/4 & likely [1] 1983/15 & 2057/5 2064/25 2065/9 2077/17 \\
\hline levied [1] 1972/20 & limit [1] 2077/3 & 2077/18 \\
\hline levity [1] 2044/8 & limitation [2] 1815/4 2077/4 & longer [3] 1880/24 1925/3 2008/16 \\
\hline Lewis [1] 2014/8 & limitations [2] 2018/8 2018/25 & look [64] 1834/10 1838/19 1839/20 \\
\hline liability [5] 2019/4 2046/6 2048/22 & limited [2] 1986/15 2018/21 & 1841/1 1853/20 1857/12 1864/22 \\
\hline 2086/12 2092/1 & Linda [12] 1910/5 1910/10 1910/21 & 1865/19 1866/17 1878/2 1891/1 \\
\hline 1 & 2081/10 2081/11 2081/13 2081/15 & 1897/1 1898/10 1902/21 1903/21 \\
\hline & 2081/17 2081/21 2081/22 2083/24 & 1904/8 1904/23 1905/22 1924/12 \\
\hline \[
2005 / 12 \text { 2005/18 2007/19 2037/12 }
\] & 2089/19 & 1934/11 1942/25 1942/25 1944/25 \\
\hline lies [2] 2000/10 2071/25 & line [12] 1843/19 2030/12 2075/15 & 1952/25 1956/13 1956/18 1961/8 \\
\hline lieutenant [70] 1811/22 1811/24 & 2084/14 2085/6 2085/25 2086/1 & 1965/20 1966/1 1968/25 1969/8 \\
\hline 1811/25 1812/14 1815/19 1820/1 & 2086/2 2088/13 2090/16 2090/17 & 1971/2 1971/25 1981/25 1982/21 \\
\hline 1820/20 1822/7 1838/4 1838/5 & 2090/18 & 1983/7 1995/15 1995/17 1997/23 \\
\hline 1838/19 1843/19 1846/21 1847/3 & lines [5] 1882/17 2043/21 2075/11 & 2001/15 2014/21 2029/17 2032/16 \\
\hline 1850/10 1851/1 1851/12 1851/21 & 2085/2 2088/6 & 2037/17 2043/18 2044/1 2045/9 \\
\hline 1852/5 1852/21 1852/25 1854/10 & linked [1] 2086/3 & 2046/4 2070/15 2071/11 2074/6 \\
\hline 1854/14 1855/6 1863/1 1863/20 & list [36] 1831/10 1832/1 1832/1 & 2083/9 2084/1 2084/15 2084/17 \\
\hline 1863/21 1869/13 1872/17 1872/22 & 1832/19 1832/22 1834/20 1834/23 & 2084/17 2087/10 2088/17 2090/10 \\
\hline 1873/3 1873/10 1875/21 1875/22 & 1836/5 1836/12 1837/3 1837/23 & 2090/19 2090/22 2091/15 2095/12 \\
\hline 1875/24 1876/1 1880/9 1881/8 & 1866/1 1870/8 1870/13 1871/5 1871/7 & 2095/13 \\
\hline 1882/10 1882/22 1884/16 1900/9 & 1871/10 1871/16 1871/17 1871/21 & looked [10] 1857/11 1866/4 1896/19 \\
\hline 1903/6 1928/19 1952/6 1952/14 & 1921/22 1921/24 1923/5 1983/5 & 1896/20 1899/22 1939/3 1973/8 \\
\hline 1952/18 1952/22 1953/4 1954/14 & 1996/7 1996/8 1996/9 1996/10 1997 & 2007/2 2048/24 2059/8 \\
\hline 1955/13 1955/18 1956/7 1963/14 & 1997/14 2001/7 2005/20 2007/24 & looking [12] 1816/8 1818/1 1853/18 \\
\hline 1964/11 1971/20 1971/23 2059/15 & 2034/10 2034/18 2059/20 & 1905/19 1905/21 1944/22 1958/19 \\
\hline 2059/23 2061/19 2068/22 2069/18 & listable [1] 1832/6 & 1958/21 1973/10 2005/2 2045/12 \\
\hline 2093/5 2093/7 2093/10 2093/11 & listed [13] 1835/10 1835/20 1836/2 & 2061/14 \\
\hline 2094/7 2094/19 2094/20 2094/23 & 1836/4 1836/11 1836/16 1836/20 & looks [10] 1854/5 1854/17 1855/6 \\
\hline Lieutenant Bechdolt [1] 1952/22 & 1837/4 1837/18 1837/21 1848/12 & 186815 189815 \\
\hline Lieutenant Lebrecht [35] 1820/20 & 1997/3 2042/8 & 2006/5 2041/5 2082/10 \\
\hline 1822/7 1838/4 1846/21 1847/3 1851/1 & Iisten [4] 2022/8 2046/9 2085/17 & loses [1] \\
\hline 1851/21 1852/21 1854/10 1863/20 & 2096/6 & losing [1] 2084/21 \\
\hline 1869/13 1872/17 1872/22 1873/3 & listening [3] 1878/4 2075/24 2088/4 & lost [2] 2036/16 2036/2 \\
\hline 1873/10 1875/21 1875/24 1876/1 & listing [13] 1831/15 1832/13 1835/6 & lot [28] 1820/12 1837/3 1862/24 \\
\hline 1880/9 1881/8 1882/10 1882/22 & 1837/17 1840/20 1853/1 1853/2 & 1864/21 1880/25 1881/1 1883/16 \\
\hline 1884/16 1928/19 1955/13 1956/7 & 1857/1 1858/4 1864/11 1864/23 & 1884/7 \\
\hline 2059/15 2059/23 2061/19 2068/22 & 2007/7 2007/9 & 1895/23 1895/25 1896/1 1897/15 \\
\hline 2069/18 2093/7 2094/7 2094/20 & lit [1] 1878/4 & 1908/4 1932/11 1949/9 1953/19 \\
\hline 2094/23 & litany [1] 2071/23 & 1980/24 2011/23 2016/10 2016/24 \\
\hline Lieutenant Lebrecht's [2] 1851/12 & litigation [5] 1852/3 1972/12 1972/16 & 2034/2 2077/13 2083/1 2093/24 \\
\hline 1852/5 & 2000/16 2001/4 & 2093/24 \\
\hline Lieutenant Mike [1] 2093/5 & little [23] 1817/17 1846/12 1852/24 & lots [1] 1991/12 \\
\hline Lieutenant Morrow [8] 1820/1 1838/5 & 1862/13 1872/7 1886/6 1900/23 & low [1] 1961/21 \\
\hline 1850/10 1863/1 1954/14 2093/10 & 1905/20 1906/7 1925/3 1941/18 & lunch [7] 1956/22 1957/2 1957/5 \\
\hline 2093/11 2094/19 & 1945/2 1957/2 1964/14 1976/17 & 1957/18 1959/7 2051/23 2054/10 \\
\hline life [1] 1844/8 & 2014/10 2033/13 2041/7 2044/8 & lying [2] 1909/6 2037/20 \\
\hline light [1] 1986/8 & & M \\
\hline lighters [1] 1878/3 & lives [1] 1883/20 & ma'am [1] 1976/7 \\
\hline lights [2] 1878/2 1949/9 & loaded [6] 1947/7 1947/10 1947/1 & made [48] 1822/12 1841/1 1844 \\
\hline like [74] 1811/4 1813/18 1813/19 & \[
1948 / 5 \text { 1948/9 1948/15 }
\] & 1847/22 1850/21 1857/3 1857/11 \\
\hline \(1818 / 231830 / 231835 / 11\) 1841/11
\(1854 / 51854 / 171855 / 61858 / 61860 / 7\) & loaded-gun [6] 1947/7 1947/10 & 1860/18 1862/25 1863/2 1883/12 \\
\hline 1854/5 1854/17 1855/6 1858/6 1860/7 & 1947/14 1948/5 1948/9 1948/15 & 1890/14 1890/21 1915/20 1916/10 \\
\hline 1862/25 1867/14 1867/16 1869/4 & Ioan [1] 2064/23 & 1917/16 1926/16 1952/24 1953/6 \\
\hline 1869/11 1879/9 1882/18 1886/16 & local [2] 1990/17 2015/16 & 1959/18 1963/24 1965/11 1969/6 \\
\hline 1903/21 1917/9 1918/10 1923/23 & location [4] 1895/16 1910/7 1975/7 & 1973/7 1973/8 1985/5 1985/16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
made... [21] 1999/12 2000/16 2000/25 2001/14 2007/24 2011/1 2027/5 2027/8 2039/4 2039/7 2039/8 2039/19 2040/23 2042/21 2043/2 2045/13
2072/4 2072/5 2072/7 2089/25 2093/2
magazine [1] 2061/3
magnitude [1] 1867/11
maintain [1] 1996/10
maintained [1] 1937/11
major [2] 1971/14 2090/9
majority [2] 1845/23 2040/10 make [70] 1813/5 1815/1 1821/3
1825/7 1828/13 1837/20 1841/2 1848/15 1851/22 1866/25 1869/4 1885/2 1885/3 1897/8 1900/15 1901/1 1908/19 1932/1 1932/6 1957/22 1971/25 1972/22 1973/7 1977/14 1979/9 1980/18 1983/3 1983/14 1984/8 1985/2 1987/13 1987/16 1993/17 1994/9 1995/25 1999/25 2000/1 2001/5 2001/19 2002/11 2003/24 2005/3 2006/12 2007/20 2018/22 2019/15 2022/14 2022/15 2022/20 2025/7 2032/25 2035/19 2035/21 2037/6 2050/24 2051/18 2057/12 2071/2 2075/24 2076/7 2077/13 2081/17 2082/19 2085/16 2086/24 2088/1 2089/10 2090/13 2092/19 2094/12
makes [5] 1970/19 1984/1 2035/3 2037/15 2092/12
making [26] 1817/22 1824/5 1824/8
1838/6 1851/16 1851/17 1885/6 1898/25 1916/24 1916/25 1919/1 1938/20 1953/1 1964/18 1965/15 1965/25 1972/11 1985/23 1986/21 2002/23 2005/18 2006/15 2006/25 2010/10 2045/8 2072/17
males [1] 2017/22
malfunctioning [2] 1859/1 1859/2 man [3] 1830/25 2003/17 2017/18 man's [2] 1835/25 1866/24 manage [2] 1935/8 2000/20 managed [3] 1927/21 1992/10 2044/11
management [10] 1934/23 1935/1 1978/25 1997/8 1997/9 2065/14 2069/16 2073/2 2083/20 2091/11 management's [2] 2083/8 2091/14 manager [2] 1911/21 2048/3 managing [3] 1935/3 1935/11 1982/4 mandated [1] 1819/18
mandatory [1] 1964/8
manner [2] 1871/18 1996/11 many [32] 1814/4 1843/7 1844/17 1849/22 1852/24 1854/16 1861/7 1878/10 1890/24 1898/9 1899/3 1899/4 1932/10 1940/6 1940/7 1966/14 1970/7 1979/23 1981/6 1989/5 1991/16 1991/19 1991/21 1993/4 2000/19 2005/1 2014/7 2036/20 2042/1 2042/13 2042/18 2058/5
March [10] 1838/24 1858/6 1858/7 1860/4 1982/5 1998/22 2049/3 2055/23 2056/10 2056/23

March 10 [3] 1858/6 1858/7 1860/4
March 12th [1] 1838/24
March 2012 [1] 2056/10
March 31st [1] 1982/5
March 5th [1] 1998/22
margin [1] 2004/21
Marion [2] 1982/8 2013/15
maritime [1] 1812/8
mark [7] 1808/2 1864/12 1994/21
2011/16 2012/6 2012/11 2012/21
marked [6] 1924/5 1945/1 1945/4
1946/16 1946/17 1946/18
Markell [2] 2019/22 2058/25
market [2] 1880/25 2060/23
marketing [2] 2060/22 2061/1
Marti [1] 2063/1
Mary [2] 1921/6 1928/7
Maryland [4] 1977/5 1977/9 1995/15 2033/14
MASH [1] 1989/7
master's [2] 2014/7 2014/9
material [6] 1867/23 1986/22 1991/1
1999/12 2055/17 2056/25
materials [25] 1831/10 1832/1
1834/21 1834/23 1834/25 1857/2
1860/23 1861/24 1863/4 1864/23
1866/1 1866/5 1869/15 1951/22
1966/8 2003/11 2003/14 2008/20
2054/16 2055/15 2058/16 2059/16 2059/20 2059/21 2062/10
math [1] 2029/24
matter [17] 1823/12 1828/8 1832/14 1835/6 1835/24 1850/3 1850/12 1859/5 1906/7 1921/10 1989/7 2003/11 2011/21 2022/24 2035/4 2078/19 2081/14
matters [4] 1864/19 1970/12 2003/21 2025/3
may [65] 1815/17 1816/6 1833/20 1841/15 1841/18 1853/11 1857/22 1864/1 1864/3 1866/9 1866/14 1869/1 1873/21 1873/24 1880/14 1889/3 1891/12 1891/24 1903/19 1909/24 1919/24 1920/13 1924/3 1924/4 1925/25 1926/8 1929/8 1932/4 1934/5 1938/23 1941/14 1941/17 1942/10 1945/24 1949/14 1953/1 1962/16 1967/25 1974/25 1981/20 1981/21 1982/16 1989/10 1989/20 1990/14 2005/15 2007/11 2008/8 2011/7 2021/20 2023/7 2024/14 2033/21 2037/7 2049/16 2051/8 2054/17 2063/9 2070/7 2071/9 2071/22 2076/24 2076/25 2087/3 2087/25
May 18 [1] 1938/23
May 6 [1] 1949/14
maybe [24] 1820/13 1820/14 1821/2 1822/17 1853/1 1862/16 1864/6 1872/7 1882/14 1888/15 1899/12 1904/5 1925/3 1925/10 1937/25 1979/8 2012/22 2019/22 2036/12 2037/20 2046/5 2068/3 2081/20 2081/22
McDERMED [28] 1807/7 1822/9 1823/23 1824/4 1834/12 1840/23 1844/10 1845/7 1846/17 1853/24 1854/3 1856/2 1916/24 1920/19

1928/19 1971/8 1990/1 1995/5
1997/17 1998/23 2009/15 2009/23 2059/19 2060/9 2060/19 2060/21 2060/24 2097/3
McDermed's [5] 1845/16 1852/10 1854/16 1917/7 1997/22
McDOUGAL [11] 1808/2 1808/4 1824/21 1840/6 1852/18 1896/15 1909/5 1909/18 1994/18 1994/21 2009/22
McIntyre [2] 1933/11 1936/4 me [149]
meal [1] 1899/19
mean [19] 1844/19 1845/5 1862/3 1864/5 1865/25 1899/16 1919/10 1921/13 1926/18 1926/24 1982/25 2001/10 2006/11 2034/7 2041/9 2044/12 2048/13 2065/21 2085/13 meaning [3] 1821/17 1959/10 2041/16 means [13] 1821/16 1921/15 1983/1 1983/13 1983/14 1987/1 2035/20 2041/3 2041/4 2041/8 2041/10 2041/11 2097/10
meant [3] 1856/24 2081/13 2081/14
media [5] 1870/11 1870/11 1871/6 1980/2 1980/5
medical [6] 1905/25 2021/1 2023/13 2023/15 2024/18 2033/3
meet [9] 1846/23 1872/20 1919/15 1987/12 2033/5 2033/6 2060/18 2061/14 2061/16
meeting [38] 1824/1 1873/9 1886/12 1886/23 1915/14 1919/13 1919/20 1919/22 1920/5 1922/5 1922/8 1923/16 1923/19 1924/21 1925/1 1925/4 1925/6 1931/13 1931/23 1940/11 1940/13 1942/23 1950/4 1950/7 1950/9 1968/16 1968/22 2060/20 2068/22 2069/5 2069/6 2069/9 2069/12 2069/18 2081/10 2082/21 2083/20 2089/18
meetings [20] 1872/5 1931/18 1931/19 1937/24 1938/10 1938/11 1938/14 1938/16 1955/19 1956/1 1959/11 1974/7 1974/9 2030/14 2034/8 2057/13 2065/13 2065/23 2069/2 2091/9
Melissa [1] 2040/23
member [7] 1867/17 1913/14 2030/8 2030/9 2065/3 2065/25 2067/24
members [6] 1914/14 1914/16 2017/1 2054/14 2062/19 2062/22
memo [1] 2029/5
memorandum [1] 1815/23
memory [18] 1850/14 1861/10
1873/15 1891/18 1895/1 1905/4
1909/12 1922/8 1925/9 1925/18
1935/21 1936/5 1979/8 1982/19
1988/6 1989/17 2055/17 2058/22
Mental [1] 2023/1
mention [3] 1887/21 1902/20 1924/13
mentioned [4] 1887/24 1896/6
1923/22 1944/13
mentioning [1] 1986/14
mentor [1] 2014/2
merely [1] 1871/20
merited [1] 1902/20
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline M & misconduct [6] 1898/25 1921/25 & Morrow [36] 1 \\
\hline Mertz [16] 2019/22 2020/13 2020/24 & misdemeanor [1] 1976/22 & 1863/20 1916/11 1925/10 1929/4 \\
\hline 2021/15 2021/15 2023/5 2023/9 & mislead [1] 2006/6 & 1943/9 1953/9 1953/10 1953/15 \\
\hline 2059/1 & misled [1] 2091/25 & 1954/14 1954/20 1956/10 1956/ \\
\hline \[
2059 / 3
\] & mistake [5] 2005/18 2007/8 2007/19 & 1958/10 1958/16 1958/18 1964/ \\
\hline Mertz's [1] 2020/14 & 2007/19 2076/7 & 1966/2 1967/17 1968/5 1969/12 \\
\hline message [1] 1886/25 & mistaken [3] 1944/19 1986/20 & 1969/21 1971/8 1974/13 2059/23 \\
\hline met [10] 1847/1 1894/19 1914/7 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2005/15 \\
mistakes [2] 1890/14 2006/12
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2059/24 2093/10 2093/11 2094/5 } \\
& \text { 2094/19 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1915/16 1927/10 1994/21 2051/23 & mistakes [2] 1890/14 2006/12
mistreating [2] 1847/11 1889/18 & Morrow's [4] 1868/2 1872/23 2083 \\
\hline 2052/5 2060/19 2061/3 meter [1] 1933/12 & mistreatment [1] 1923/8 & 2093/5 \\
\hline Michael [4] 1818/18 1818/19 1876/17 & mitigate [4] 1954/24 1964/16 1965/23 & most [7] \\
\hline 1876/21 & 1977/11 & 1980/6 2002/4 2003/16 2016/14 \\
\hline microphone [7] 1825/6 1842/11 & mitigated [1] 1965/13 & mostly [2] 1812/16 2068/19 \\
\hline 1874/14 1910/17 1975/16 2012/18 & mitigating [5] 1919/18 1922/15 1942/9 1957/24 1958/1 & mother [4] 1892/10 1892/17 1892/17 \\
\hline 2012/25 & mix [2] 2017/9 2017/23 & motivatio \\
\hline microphones [1] 2043/21
mid [2] 1981/6 2038/13 & MM [3] 1943/9 1943/9 1958/20 & motive [1] 1865/18 \\
\hline mid [2] 1981/6 2038/13 mid-2013 [1] 1981/6 & mobile [5] 1964/23 1965/6 1965/12 & motives [2] 1918/16 1918/20 \\
\hline \[
14[1] 2038 / 13
\] & 2061/22 2062/3 & mouth [1] 20 \\
\hline middle [13] 1889/1 1942/15 1942/16 & Moffitt [1] 1928/14 & move [11] 1842/11 1843/22 1 \\
\hline 1943/5 1952/3 2074/6 2075/19 & moment [18] 1869/10 1908/16 & 1936/16 1958/23 1974/16 1974/21 \\
\hline 2079/13 2080/10 2080/12 2080/13 & 1918/25 1930/16 1930/17 1938/3 1940/19 1945/25 1957/14 1958/24 & 1997/22 2030/1 2033/1 2056/ \\
\hline 2082/7 2090/9 & 1992/1 2021/23 2023/8 2074/19 & moved [1] 1978/17 Movement [3] 1895 \\
\hline midnight [1] 1899/20 & 2085/5 2085/7 2085/14 2093/1 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Moveme } \\
\text { 1923/8 }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { might [35] 1824/14 1828/13 1829/6 } \\
1845 / 151872 / 121873 / 161882 / 18
\end{gathered}
\] & moments [1] 2021/24 & moving [4] 1847/2 1918/15 1919/6 \\
\hline 1930/24 1930/25 1934/18 1935/2 & Monday [10] 2075/18 2076/4 2076/10 & 1921/10 \\
\hline 1937/23 1937/24 1953/6 1965/13 & 2076/14 2078/7 2079/1 2092/20 & MR [13] 1824/21 1840/6 1852/18 \\
\hline 1965/21 1977/10 1977/11 1977/12 & 2095/17 2095/25 2096/8 & 1869/22 1896/15 1909/18 1927/9 \\
\hline 1977/13 1978/2 1988/1 1991/10 & money [1] 1933/11 & 1928/3 1973/16 1994/18 2009/22 \\
\hline 1993/25 1999/9 2002/19 2002/19 & monitor [1] 2043/13 & 2021/15 2040/6 \\
\hline 2003/8 2007/16 2021/9 2050/23 & monitors [2] 1858/10 & 0] \\
\hline 2086/6 2086/7 2095/15 2095/15 & month [8] 1832/25 1841/9 1932/1 & Mr. Cleavenger [133] 1818/5 1818/25 \\
\hline Mike [23] 1856/16 1863/20 1872/23 & 1932/22 1961/4 1976/13 1999/13 & 1819/11 1820/5 1820/10 1820/ \\
\hline 1916/11 1925/10 1929/4 1943/9 & 2014/18 & 1821/20 1822/5 1824/5 1824/23 \\
\hline 1953/9 1953/10 1956/10 1956/11 & months [33] 1813/12 1825/20 1832/25 & 1827/7 1828/12 1829/11 18 \\
\hline 1958/10 1964/11 1966/2 1967/17 & 1832/25 1833/1 1840/11 1840/11 & 1839/7 1846/2 1850/21 1851/7 \\
\hline 1968/5 1969/12 1969/21 1971/8 & 1841/9 1841/10 1841/10 1841/10 & 1852/23 1853/5 1854/6 1854/18 \\
\hline 1974/13 2059/23 2059/24 2093/5 & 1841/10 1841/10 1933/8 1949/15 & 1854/23 1856/9 1860/8 \\
\hline Mike Morrow [19] 1856/16 1863/20 & 1962/13 1992/18 2013/16 2017/20 & 1868/13 1869/14 1872/10 1876/10 \\
\hline 1916/11 1925/10 1929/4 1943/9 & 2019/9 2023/14 2042/2 2047/15 & 1876/22 1877/4 \\
\hline 1953/9 1953/10 1958/10 1964/11 & 2047/24 2048/7 2049/4 2049/5 & 1879/1 1879/7 1880/9 1880/24 \\
\hline 1966/2 1967/17 1968/5 1969/12 & 2051/11 2051/21 2052/5 2052/9 & 1881/21 1882/23 1885/11 1885/19 \\
\hline 1969/21 1971/8 1974/13 2059/23 & 2053/1 2060/14 & 1886/23 1887/2 1887/9 1887/1 \\
\hline 2059/24 & moral [1] 1984/6 & 1888/1 1889/6 1889/15 1889/19 \\
\hline Mike Morrow's [1] 1872/23 & more [63] 1818/20 1818/21 1821/1 & 1889/22 1890/4 1891/4 1895/15 \\
\hline military [1] 1948/23 & 1821/2 1821/23 1827/1 1837/6 & 1896/8 1900/1 190 \\
\hline mind [17] 1828/12 1831/13 1857/20 & 1847/20 1848/19 1849/3 1850/13 & 1904/9 1907/23 1912/21 1915/10 \\
\hline 1865/13 1865/16 1869/5 1869/19 & 1876/14 1879/18 1888/24 1908/24 & 1919/20 1919/25 1920/19 1922/6 \\
\hline 1869/20 1870/25 1935/15 1997/17 & 1917/10 1918/5 1931/20 1932/10 & 1923/4 1923/21 1924/17 1925/6 \\
\hline 2031/24 2060/7 2076/9 2078/20 & 1933/3 1933/25 1938/16 1938/20 & 1929/11 1931/14 1937/5 1937/8 \\
\hline 2081/2 2081/6 & 1942/4 1944/24 1944/25 1946/7 & 1937/10 1940/11 1971/9 1972/3 \\
\hline minds [1] 1869/24 & 1951/6 1958/5 1974/8 1974/10 & 1988/8 1988/15 1990/18 1993/12 \\
\hline mine [3] 1875/15 1886/15 2003/2 & 1977/18 1977/24 1978/21 1979/2 & 1994/4 1994/10 1999/6 2003/16 \\
\hline minimum [1] 1820/14 & 1979/15 1979/15 1979/17 1979/18 & 2008/18 2008/19 2014/14 2014/16 \\
\hline minor [1] 1824/22 & 1980/13 1981/9 1985/2 1988/4 1989/1 & 2014/18 2015/22 2019/11 2019/17 \\
\hline minute [10] 1824/17 1832/22 1832/24 & 1989/4 1989/15 1996/4 2000/16 & 2020/14 2026/6 2026/24 2027/11 \\
\hline 1835/2 1838/20 1859/9 1866/17 & 2006/19 2018/9 2023/17 2040/9 & 2027/14 2027/25 2028/21 2028/24 \\
\hline 1891/17 1955/24 2085/23 & 2041/5 2047/24 2049/1 2058/19 & 2029/2 2029/13 2030/21 2031/2 \\
\hline minutes [11] 1836/13 1852/22 1853/4 & 2068/7 2076/19 2077/3 2078/3 & 2032/4 2032/10 2038/15 2039/4 \\
\hline 1854/16 1854/17 1854/18 1957/1 & 2086/10 2087/19 20 & 2039/19 2040/21 2045/8 2051/6 \\
\hline 2011/23 2055/14 2077/7 2079/4 & morning [8] 1811/2 1811/22 1852/1 & 2060/2 2060/5 2067/23 2068/4 \\
\hline minutia [1] 2037/25 & 1852/20 1896/16 1896/17 1950/4 & 2068/23 2069/25 2070/3 2070/10 \\
\hline MIS [1] 1859/3 & Morris [1] 1875/19 & 2072/10 2073/9 2073/12 2073/15 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Mr. Cleavenger... [3] 2073/22 2083/16 2083/16
Mr. Cleavenger's [38] 1821/8 1826/19 1840/13 1845/21 1850/9 1857/5
1864/22 1869/6 1876/8 1881/11
1882/25 1884/18 1885/8 1908/13
1913/24 1915/20 1917/1 1917/7 1921/24 1926/14 1938/18 1939/23 1971/3 2020/11 2027/21 2028/20 2030/13 2039/17 2045/12 2066/13 2066/23 2067/9 2067/21 2068/24 2069/7 2072/18 2072/21 2072/25
Mr. Deshpande [2] 1842/19 1872/3
Mr. Gardner [3] 1976/3 1994/13 2009/7
Mr. Hess [17] 1831/22 1833/10 1853/7 1857/19 1857/23 1859/19 1950/10 1952/2 1954/4 1954/24 1955/8 1959/2 1959/16 1961/10 2055/19 2056/2 2056/15
Mr. James [2] 1987/22 2066/3
Mr. Lebrecht [1] 1854/19
Mr. McDougal [1] 1909/5
Mr. Mertz [3] 2024/20 2024/21 2025/21
Mr. Mertz's [1] 2020/14
Mr. Morrow [1] 1862/25
Mr. Phillip's [1] 1899/15
Mr. Wardlow [16] 1912/4 1912/19 1928/5 1931/16 1937/6 1938/14 1938/22 1941/8 2068/20 2072/13 2072/17 2073/4 2073/11 2073/14 2073/20 2073/24
Mr. Wardlow's [1] 1912/8
MS [21] 1811/21 1838/18 1842/18 1872/2 1874/21 1909/4 1911/2 1911/3 1927/4 1927/10 1968/2 1968/3 1970/7 1973/12 1976/2 1997/22 2009/6 2013/2 2058/8 2064/16 2071/11
Ms. [9] 1872/22 1873/3 1873/10 1929/6 1929/7 2064/17 2070/11 2070/20 2074/5
Ms. Boyd [2] 1929/6 1929/7
Ms. Laue [1] 2070/11
Ms. Perlow [3] 1872/22 1873/3 1873/10
Ms. Yoshishige [3] 2064/17 2070/20 2074/5
much [21] 1820/22 1820/22 1873/24
1901/13 1910/2 1926/17 1926/23
1944/3 1944/4 1975/2 1981/13 1986/11 1994/8 2009/17 2011/14 2013/20 2016/15 2024/14 2037/11 2048/4 2096/8
multiple [3] 1844/15 1888/11 2048/23 municipal [4] 1815/3 1816/1 1816/18 1816/23
murder [3] 1879/23 1879/23 2001/16 must [1] 1818/8
mutual [1] 2083/23
my [229]
my recollection [1] 1953/17
myriad [1] 1843/24
myself [5] 1879/24 1892/6 1905/12 1905/14 2037/14
name [28] 1811/15 1811/16 1838/12 1838/13 1842/12 1842/13 1874/14 1874/15 1874/16 1910/19 1910/20 1975/18 1975/19 1975/20 2012/20 2012/21 2017/7 2017/7 2026/13 2026/20 2026/21 2026/23 2032/3 2053/15 2064/10 2064/10 2064/11 2078/13
named [2] 1823/14 1919/24
names [7] 1827/23 1881/14 1882/3
1898/13 1898/14 1898/14 1898/15
narcotics [2] 1812/8 1813/1
narrative [1] 2002/23
narrow [1] 1953/13
national [1] 1861/18
nature [1] 1984/25
near [1] 1874/14
necessarily [7] 1818/22 1939/21 2003/7 2020/20 2028/10 2032/16 2038/11
necessary [2] 1961/22 2001/7
need [29] 1816/13 1831/3 1831/4 1853/17 1857/8 1863/23 1864/6 1866/18 1900/19 1902/8 1904/18 1934/22 1934/22 1936/7 1981/13 1987/10 1987/11 1999/9 2002/16 2006/19 2012/25 2023/21 2023/22 2059/2 2075/17 2078/18 2079/4 2096/2 2096/3
needed [20] 1813/3 1821/9 1821/14
1821/20 1822/2 1823/1 1823/9 1827/1
1830/20 1833/3 1833/5 1835/20
1851/8 1851/9 1865/11 1909/11
1952/11 1974/21 2027/18 2072/12
needs [7] 1848/7 1906/15 1955/5
1964/11 2075/21 2086/1 2091/14
negative [3] 1829/3 1907/18 1907/23
negotiating [1] 2080/4
negotiation [1] 2090/3
negotiations [2] 2065/18 2087/15
Neither [1] 2085/15
neutral [1] 1929/20
never [33] 1822/6 1837/4 1844/1 1845/11 1846/2 1847/12 1847/14 1847/15 1857/20 1868/13 1876/1 1876/10 1883/22 1888/4 1889/24 1900/5 1939/14 1939/17 1939/18 1939/19 1947/10 1947/14 1959/12 1992/25 2001/15 2010/8 2014/9 2015/10 2026/21 2042/9 2044/24 2072/18 2080/12
new [8] 1843/25 1989/4 1989/5 2029/21 2031/5 2071/16 2087/23 2092/19
next [36] 1811/4 1841/19 1874/1 1884/11 1888/15 1888/18 1894/12 1907/2 1907/16 1910/4 1938/20 1943/9 1952/23 1954/3 1954/23 1954/25 1955/7 1959/15 1964/2 1968/18 1968/25 1969/8 1978/6 1983/23 2008/23 2011/15 2012/5 2041/16 2063/15 2075/18 2076/4 2086/1 2086/2 2089/22 2089/23 2090/10
nice [4] 1845/6 1957/2 1957/5 2022/18 Nicol [2] 2019/21 2059/1

Nicole [1] 1934/1
night [8] 1877/25 1878/5 1895/19 1896/5 2007/13 2074/16 2093/4 2095/14
nine [3] 1833/1 2013/16 2014/4 no [250]
No. [1] 2079/10
No. 137 [1] 2079/10
nobody [1] 1992/18
noises [1] 1878/4
none [3] 1906/18 1945/13 1992/21
nonetheless [2] 1852/2 1983/24
nonpaid [1] 2038/25
nonpublic [1] 1902/4
nonstudent [2] 1817/24 1817/25
noodles [2] 1896/3 1899/22
normal [1] 2049/11
normally [8] 1817/24 1817/24 1878/1
1897/5 1898/5 1918/4 1942/3 1974/14
north [3] 1895/22 1895/24 1977/2 not [367]
note [2] 1897/13 1899/13
notes [33] 1923/16 1923/18 1923/23 1923/25 1924/10 1925/8 1937/24 1938/10 1942/12 1942/13 1943/11 1943/13 1943/15 1944/18 1944/22 1945/15 1946/3 1958/9 1958/9 1958/13 1958/15 1958/20 1968/4 1968/7 1968/8 1968/12 1968/15 1968/18 1968/25 1969/6 1970/1 2093/5 2095/14
nothing [11] 1829/11 1829/24 1831/7 1871/22 1873/20 1906/18 1907/23 1971/3 1971/21 2044/8 2059/7
notice [9] 1818/25 1880/23 1920/4 1926/13 1950/2 2029/9 2043/6 2071/21 2083/20
noticed [4] 1821/14 1830/20 1889/3 1889/4
notified [1] 2045/11
notify [4] 1865/1 1920/22 1954/11 1964/21
notifying [2] 1956/2 2046/2
notion [1] 1901/9
November [8] 1927/13 1950/17 1950/20 1951/20 1960/13 1960/14 1960/18 1961/2
November 11 [2] 1927/13 1950/17
November 11th [1] 1960/13
November 16 [1] 1961/2
November 18 [2] 1950/20 1951/20
November 18th [2] 1960/14 1960/18
now [103] 1813/17 1818/14 1820/16
1827/5 1833/10 1834/10 1834/18
1837/13 1846/12 1850/2 1855/12
1860/6 1861/9 1864/21 1882/25
1891/3 1893/7 1894/23 1896/21
1901/15 1902/19 1908/2 1910/19
1913/22 1916/15 1919/5 1919/13 1921/21 1923/16 1925/4 1926/10 1927/15 1930/9 1931/12 1932/8 1935/18 1938/10 1939/5 1939/13 1940/11 1940/19 1941/13 1941/18 1942/12 1946/20 1947/6 1947/7 1953/4 1954/10 1956/20 1959/18 1960/23 1962/11 1962/20 1971/20 1974/1 1980/24 1980/25 1981/19
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline N & obtained [1] 19 & \\
\hline now... [44] 1988/17 1992/18 1995/15 & & office-by-office [1] 1980/14 \\
\hline 1996/13 1996/14 1997/2 1998/19 & & \\
\hline 1998/20 1999/20 2005/19 2008/15 & 2001/16 2022/10 2071/14 2082/6 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Officer Cleavenger [2] 1 \\
1961/24
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 2015/9 2015/11 2020/4 2023/3 & occasion [1] 1878/1 & Officer Hermens [1] 1894/1 \\
\hline 2025/23 2035/8 2045/3 2047/17 & occasionally [1] 1981/4 & Officer Phillips [2] 1874/22 1909/5 \\
\hline 2069/5 2064/9 2063/15 2062/24 & occasions [7] 1877/6 1877/8 1877/11 & officer's [17] 1848/5 18 \\
\hline 2074/24 2075/3 2075/17 2076/17 & 1877/16 1954/10 & 1850/4 18 \\
\hline 2078/6 2079/14 2082/16 2082/25 & occupation [1] & 1981/8 1981/12 \\
\hline 2083/10 2084/21 2085/14 2087/10 & Occupy [7] 1895/13 1895/16 1895/1 & 1991/6 1994/1 2034/4 203 \\
\hline 2088/5 2088/17 2089/25 2094/2 & 1896/6 1899/13 1899/19 1923/8 & 2050 \\
\hline 2094/16 & Oc & \\
\hline number [38] 1831/19 1833/11 1850/17 & & \\
\hline 1866/6 1870/20 1872/6 1872/8 1878/9 & 1942/10 1955/19 1959/20 1959/22 &  \\
\hline 1881/16 1893/14 1924/22 1935/22 & 2/11 1979/22 2002/3 2041/18 & \\
\hline 1935/24 1943/14 1944/12 1944/20 & 2046/23 2049/6 2057 & 181 \\
\hline 1944/20 1946/8 1946/8 1960/16 & occurring [2] & 1860/22 1871/20 1884/23 1886/7 \\
\hline 1967/10 1974/17 1977/20 1989/10 & occurs [1] 1982/24 & 1888/11 1890/9 1909/19 \\
\hline 1998/1 1998/2 2017/6 2019/21 & October [23] 1875/4 1911/11 1949/15 & 1943/6 1943/6 1 \\
\hline 2019/23 2032/2 2032/3 2032/11 & 1950/2 1950/4 1958/8 1958/9 1958/10 & 1966/14 1966/22 1980/25 19 \\
\hline 2032/15 2051/15 2051/17 2062/8 & 1963/18 1963/20 1963/21 1967/20 & 1986/18 1986/22 1991/23 2000/12 \\
\hline 2071/25 2078/22 & 1969/10 2049/3 2075/4 2075/8 2075 & 2000/17 2000/19 2001/6 2008/3 \\
\hline numbered [2] 1967/14 1970/16 & 2075/10 2080/18 2080/19 2082/15 & 2008/12 2016/22 2017/10 2018/9 \\
\hline numbers [6] 1903/17 1904/11 1 & 2082/18 2089/15 & 2020/5 2020/20 2020/22 2026/18 \\
\hline 1943/19 1943/22 1944/8 & October 12th [1] 2075/8 & 2031/4 2032/19 2034/9 2034/25 \\
\hline numerous [1] 1985/11 & October 17 [1] 2075/4 & 2035/7 2036/16 2036/19 2036/20 \\
\hline 0 & October 18 [1] 2075/10 & 2043/12 2043/15 2048/11 2048/23 \\
\hline oath [4] 1898/ & October 18th [1] 2082/1 & 2049/10 2050/3 2056/5 2056/20 \\
\hline 2047/10 & October 1st [1] 1950/2 & 2057/11 2058/5 \\
\hline object [12] 1828/22 1830/3 1848/18 & October 2012 [1] 1963/20 & officers' [1] 2026/7 \\
\hline 1855/21 1870/24 1899/14 1915/15 & October 2013 [1] 1911/11 & offices [1] 1 \\
\hline 1928/21 1962/23 2010/9 2049/21 & October 22 [1] 1969/10 & official [6] 1913/5 1937/18 1937/21 \\
\hline 2053/6 & October 25 [1] 1958/8 & 1938/1 1954/21 2097/ \\
\hline objected & October 25th [2] 1958/10 & officially [1] \\
\hline objecting [1] 2028/8 & October 26 [1] 1949/15 & officials [1] 2025/2 \\
\hline objection [34] 1848/25 1849/16 & October 30th [3] 2080/19 2082/ & often [8] 1838/8 1863/9 1914 \\
\hline 1854/25 1860/1 1869/23 1873/4 & 2 & 1932/18 1979/23 2016/14 2020/20 \\
\hline 1909/7 1915/25 1918/17 1982/12 & O & 2049/18 [1] 2044/5 \\
\hline 1982/13 1990/9 1990/12 1990/13 & /25 1881/24 1895/2 & oftentimes [1] 2044/5 \\
\hline 2028/1 2028/4 2028/17 2031/22 & 1936/10 1950/21 1950/24 1957/17 & Oh [16] 1822/22 1848/13 1866/10 \\
\hline 2054/5 2070/16 2074/15 2079/17 & 1958/25 1959/7 1983/16 1988/24 & 1921/12 1924/6 1933/25 1943/21 \\
\hline 2079/19 2093/4 2093/7 2093/8 2093/9 & 2020 & 19 \\
\hline 2093/19 2093/20 2094/2 2094/ & offenses [1] 1991/18 & 2063/13 2071/20 2076/6 2078/21 \\
\hline 2094/13 2095/9 2095/23 & offer [20] 1816/3 1859/24 1945/24 & 2090/21 \\
\hline objections [1] 2079/10 & 1982/10 1987/9 1990/7 & OJ [1] 2002/4 \\
\hline obligated [1] 1848/14 & 2071/13 2071/15 2072/1 2072/3 & okay [192] \\
\hline obligation [38] 1823/6 1823/13 & 2072/4 2072/4 2072/7 20 & old [8] 1861/12 1892/9 1892/1 \\
\hline 1823/16 1823/19 1824/10 1824/12 & 20 & 9199 \\
\hline 1831/9 1831/10 1831/18 1840/8 & offered [2] 1891/14 1964/8 & 2057/4 \\
\hline 1848/16 1848/21 1849/7 1849/19 & offering [1] 2083/21 & older [1] \\
\hline 1849/23 1850/1 1852/2 1977/18 & offers [6] 2070/13 2080/23 2081 & once [15] 1811/13 1850/3 1859/1 \\
\hline 1977/21 1977/24 1981/19 1983/1 & 2084/11 2087/6 2089/16 & 1883/12 1887/19 2001/14 2016/4 \\
\hline 1983/9 1984/5 1984/6 1984/6 1994/5 & office [56] 1827/15 1831/25 184 & 2016/5 2019/10 2030/6 2033/6 \\
\hline 1994/11 1996/3 1996/4 1996/5 & 1850/7 1850/22 1857/13 1865/8 & 2037/16 2083/24 2085/16 2089/10 \\
\hline 1996/12 1996/20 2001/20 2004/17 & 1866/16 1869/4 1872/18 1912/6 & one [147] \\
\hline 2004/24 2025/15 2033/20 & 2/7 1921/8 1937/7 1938/7 1976 & one-to-three \\
\hline obligations [10] 1848/2 1849/10 & 1976/22 1976/25 1977/18 1978/9 1978/25 1979/1 1980/14 1980/14 & ones [5] 1902/23 1902/25 1966/10 \\
\hline 1977/7 1978/14 1994/3 1995/25 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1978 / 25 \text { 1979/1 1980/14 1980/14 } \\
& \text { 1982/8 1985/18 } 1985 / 13
\end{aligned}
\] & ongoing [3] 1979/23 1980/10 20 \\
\hline 1999/11 2033/14 2036/9 2036/25 obliged [1] 1993/21 & 1986/14 1987/3 1988/12 1988/15 & only [30] 1816/22 1862/1 1863/6 \\
\hline observation [6] 1819/6 1904/8 & 1989/3 1990/24 1997/8 1999/18 & 1865/23 1868/23 1876/11 1894/15 \\
\hline 1904/17 1904/19 1905/1 1905/9 & 2015/14 2028/24 2033/8 2033/17 & 1897/12 1897/21 1898/15 1917/10 \\
\hline ations [2] 1820/19 1821/4 & 2034/5 2034/9 2035/24 2036/5 2037/8 & 1929/14 1932/13 1932/22 1942/16 \\
\hline observe [2] 1877/12 & 2038/10 2050/21 2051/4 2051/21 & 1948/3 1954/18 1969/21 1973/23 \\
\hline observed [1] 2050/7 & 2052/19 2053/16 2054/24 2054/25 & 1974/1 1981/10 1984/25 2001/19 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 0 & 2048/18 2048/25 2054/16 2060/10 & outdoor [1] 1827/6 \\
\hline only... [7] 2016/25 2023/11 2037/22 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2060/14 2060/21 2060/23 2060/23 \\
2061/5 2064/21 2065/1 2067/25
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
outlined [2] 1928/18 \\
outlines [1] 1815/25
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 2046/9 2047/24 2079/13 2082/19
Onyx [2] 1895/20 1895/22 & 2068/5 2081/3 2083/18 2097/16 & outlining [2] 1920/7 1951/25 \\
\hline Onyx [2] 1895/20 1895/22 OPAT [1] 2030/2 & organization [1] 2037/4 & outside [7] 1878/5 1887/21 2032/22 \\
\hline open [11] 1815/8 1819/19 1825/15 & original [3] 1853/14 1853/14 2097/11 & 2032/22 2045/9 2075/7 2076/11 \\
\hline 1871/9 1881/4 1888/12 2081/8 2086/4 & originally & over [60] 1818/11 1818/13 1823/9 \\
\hline 2086/25 2088/11 & ORS [2] 2021/2 2071/22 & 1825/6 1842/21 1847/2 1849/2 \\
\hline open-ended [1] & ORS 236 [1] 20 & 18 \\
\hline openings [1] 1878/2 & ORS 40.270 [1] 202 & 1882/5 1883/5 1883/12 1884/3 \\
\hline operate [2] 1815/5 1962/13 & 73] 1812/2 1824 & 1924/12 1926/14 1927/19 1939/13 \\
\hline operating [1] 1966/5 & 1844/4 1855/7 1860/10 & 1940/8 1945/12 1957/4 1959/25 \\
\hline operational [1] 1964/1 & 1875/19 1878/4 1882/7 1883/2 & 1962/4 1963/7 1966/17 1970/9 \\
\hline \[
\mathbf{o p}
\] & 1884/22 1888/19 1892/22 1892 & 1987/25 1988/2 1993/21 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1823 / 51823 / 72 \\
& 1824 / 81824 / 10
\end{aligned}
\] & 1893/16 1893/17 1897/17 1901/6 & 2000/15 2003/19 2004/25 2016/14 \\
\hline 1851/6 1851/9 1852/9 1855/20 1859/6 & 1902/16 1941/4 1942/9 1943/6 1945/2 & 2020/8 2033/15 2034/5 2035/5 2036/9 \\
\hline 1862/23 1868/16 1868/22 1868/22 & 1953/8 1958/24 1966/14 1966/22 & 2036/15 2036/16 2051/4 2051/23 \\
\hline 1875/24 1879/10 1901/6 1908/7 & 1971/15 1978/5 1989/9 1990/ & 2057/4 2062/23 2068/24 2069 \\
\hline 1952/19 1957/5 1966/25 1986/24 & 1990/21 1991/17 1997/10 1997/14 & 2069/8 2079/9 2082/9 2093/4 2095/4 \\
\hline 1992/20 1993/2 1993/14 1993/19 & 1998/24 2001/17 2004/9 2007/15 & 2095/12 2095/13 \\
\hline 2002/11 2003/9 2003/21 2011/19 & 2017/3 2017/6 2017/10 2018/ & overall [4] 1922/12 1961/18 1961/2 \\
\hline 2025/14 2034/10 2039/17 2049/17 & 2020/17 2024/13 2026/7 2034/11 & 2032/9 \\
\hline 2078/20 2084/2 2084/4 2084/7 & & rhead \\
\hline 2084/16 2091/12 2093/7 2094/6 & 2042/18 2043/24 2044/14 2050/3 & overrule [3] 1922/24 2022/19 2028/17 \\
\hline 2094/23 & 2050/15 2053/17 2053/22 2067/12 & Overruled [13] 182 \\
\hline opinions [3] 1889/21 2004/10 2011/22 & 2067/20 2074/9 2077/20 2077/25 & 1855/2 1869/25 1870/25 1873/12 \\
\hline opportunity [5] 1844/5 1919/18 & 2078/18 2081/1 2088/2 2088/20 & 1916/2 1928/22 1963/1 2032 \\
\hline 2084/19 2088/5 2090/14 & & \[
\text { | } 20
\] \\
\hline opposed [2] 1817/13 1882/20 & others [2] 1915/22 1979/18 & overturned [2] 1934/18 2083/3 \\
\hline opposite [1] 1845/15 & otherwise [2] 1966/24 1971/18 & overwhelmed [1] 1888/24 \\
\hline opposition [1] 2085/8 & ought [1] 1993/25 & own [8] 1876/24 1902/16 1937/7 \\
\hline OR-PAT [1] 1819/15 & our [40] 1819/19 1831/19 1833/10 & 1974/3 1986/4 2017/3 2026/18 2050/7 \\
\hline \[
2031 / 13
\] & 1858/10 1858/19 1858/24 1865/10 & owned [2] 1815/7 1890/19 \\
\hline order [15] 1852/6 1852/6 1852/8 & 1865/11 1867/12 1878/1 1883/1 & P \\
\hline 1886/7 1906/7 1984/8 1987/11 & 81/1 1993/8 & \\
\hline 1987/11 2014/22 2022/19 2025/5 & 2018/11 2017/17 2017/3 & P.C [1] 1808/8 \\
\hline 2025/7 2025/9 2034/25 2039/9 & 2033/20 2033/19 2021/3 & p.m [1] 2052/23 \\
\hline ordered [3] 1992/23 2025/3 2073/25 ordering [1] 2022/14 & 2035/24 2036/4 2036/5 2036/7 2043/8 & pace [1] 1959/19 \\
\hline orders [2] 2083/8 2091/1 & 2043/8 2048/2 2048/3 2052/2 2052/3 & pack [2] 2069/20 2069/2 \\
\hline ordinance [1] 2018/20 & 2058/2 2076/10 2090/6 & package [1] 1844/7
page [59] 1838/20 1838/21 \\
\hline ordinary [2] 1867/8 1867/10 & ourselves [1] 1865/22 & 1853/16 1853/17 1853/18 1853/2 \\
\hline OREGON [107] 1807/2 1807/9 1812/3 & out [85] 1820/2 1822/5 1827/7 1839/3 & 1857/20 1859/23 1866/4 1866/18 \\
\hline 1812/6 1812/10 1812/19 1813/7 & 1845/17 1847/17 1850/25 1870/11 & 1894/12 1904/2 1904/2 1904 \\
\hline 1813/17 1814/21 1814/22 1815/6 & 1878/1 1879/15 1879/25 1880/3 & 1904/10 1904/11 1907/2 1907/14 \\
\hline 1815/8 1815/13 1816/16 1816/24 & 1880/10 1881/18 1882/14 1883/5 & 1920/17 1921/2 1921/21 1928/12 \\
\hline \(1817 / 4\) 1817/12 1817/13 1817/18 & 1883/15 1884/1 1884/4 1884/10 & 1942/15 1942/15 1942/16 1943/5 \\
\hline 1817/20 1819/15 1824/11 1826/3 & 1884/23 1889/15 1890/6 1898/ & 1943/9 1943/25 1 \\
\hline 1842/25 1843/23 1844/4 1844/22 & 1904/4 1905/19 1905/21 1906/7 & 1950/13 1950/14 1952/3 1954/3 \\
\hline 1846/24 1847/2 1851/7 1861/20 & 1906/11 1907/5 1918/2 1921/9 1928/7 & 1957/15 1958/13 1958/20 1959/3 \\
\hline 1874/23 1874/24 1876/4 1886/4 & 1933/11 1941/11 1942/13 1952/6 & \[
\text { 1959/4 1961/9 1961/15 } 196
\] \\
\hline 1887/10 1888/2 1889/22 1895/12 & 1953/5 1965/21 1966/6 1966/22 & 1968/13 1968/15 1968/18 1968/25 \\
\hline 1911/5 1911/15 1912/15 1913/13 & 1978/13 1971/2 1970/23 1988 & 1969/8 1969/8 1969/9 1969/11 \\
\hline 1913/23 1917/6 1921/22 1927/16 & 1979/3 1979/14 1990/21 1996/15 & 1982/21 1982/21 1983/7 1999/22 \\
\hline 1927/19 1930/4 1930/5 1930/10 & 1996/23 1996/25 2015/7 2017/2 & 2007/21 2062/12 2062/13 2083/3 \\
\hline 1954/11 1970/8 1973/11 1976/5 & \[
\text { 2027/6 } 2018 / 17 \text { 2019/4 2020/4 2023/1 }
\] & page 1 [2] 1950/14 1952/3 \\
\hline 1976/8 1976/15 1978/13 1978/19 & 2033/5 2032/13 2032/12 2027/6 & page 11 [1] 1999/22 \\
\hline 1978/22 1979/13 1980/13 1987/18 & 2034/21 2036/6 2037/9 2041/23 & page 145 [1] 1943/5 \\
\hline 1988/11 1988/14 1989/17 1991/2 & \[
2049
\] & page 19 [2] 2062/12 2062/ \\
\hline 1994/7 2010/5 2013/15 2013/19 & \[
2062
\] & page 3 [3] 1859/23 1982/21 1982 \\
\hline 2013/23 2013/23 2015/18 2017/14 & 2077/14 2078/4 2080/2 2080/21 & ge 4 [1] 1983/7 \\
\hline 2019/7 2021/5 2027/4 2027/17 &  & age by [1] 1904/2 \\
\hline 2029/23 2030/2 2033/18 2036/3 & 2089/7 2090/16 2092/22 & page in [1] 1959/3 \\
\hline 2036/3 2036/14 2036/15 2045/7 & outcome [1] 2035/17 & page indicate [1] 1969/11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
page is [1] 1943/25
page it [1] 1853/17
page numbers [1] 1904/11
page of [6] 1853/18 1857/20 1945/1
1958/13 1968/15 1968/25
page or [1] 1853/22
page real [1] 1838/21
page there [2] 1958/20 1961/9
pages [14] 1906/13 1928/18 1943/14
1944/6 1944/24 1944/25 1945/10
1945/11 1945/13 1945/18 1945/19
1946/7 1946/15 1951/24
paid [4] 1941/19 1941/25 2016/14 2016/21
Paige [1] 1982/8
Paige Clark-Smith [1] 1982/8
Pamphlet [1] 1849/3
panel [3] 2030/12 2031/14 2031/20
panelist [2] 2030/7 2031/15
panels [1] 2031/10
paper [7] 1827/16 1860/10 1899/21
1972/21 2046/11 2046/13 2046/22
papering [4] 1934/8 1934/11 1934/19 1972/20
paperwork [1] 2014/22
parades [1] 2044/4
paragraph [30] 1950/11 1950/14
1951/5 1952/3 1952/23 1954/4
1954/25 1955/7 1955/8 1956/6 1959/4 1959/5 1959/7 1959/16 1959/18 1961/8 1961/11 1961/14 1961/15 1961/16 1964/2 1964/3 1983/7 2056/1 2071/12 2071/12 2075/13 2086/1 2090/9 2091/7
paragraph 2 [1] 1950/14
Pardon [1] 2028/13
parentheses [1] 2053/13
parked [2] 1941/4 2007/6
parking [18] 1826/13 1838/7 1880/25 1881/1 1883/1 1883/4 1883/16 1884/7 1895/5 1895/23 1895/25 1896/1 1933/11 1933/19 1933/23 1948/8 1949/9 1972/4
parole [1] 1812/21
part [42] 1817/8 1839/7 1854/22
1855/8 1857/4 1857/9 1869/6 1875/18
1875/19 1890/13 1908/21 1912/8
1913/19 1914/9 1929/4 1930/9
1931/12 1931/18 1934/23 1935/8
1940/22 1951/21 1960/20 1963/25
1970/23 1978/12 1978/23 1984/18
1990/23 2017/25 2018/6 2019/9
2023/11 2039/3 2048/3 2051/6
2059/13 2061/1 2072/17 2075/23
2080/2 2086/21
partial [1] 2021/18
partially [3] 1840/15 1860/19 2062/6 participate [3] 2030/17 2031/14 2048/20
participating [1] 2080/21
particular [16] 1814/6 1814/10
1819/21 1853/22 1867/7 1867/9
1916/18 1931/21 1978/8 1980/3 1983/11 1991/25 1992/10 1997/13 2016/8 2084/14
particularly [4] 1991/12 1991/17

1993/3 2072/22
parties [6] 1811/3 1859/16 1957/11
2075/24 2094/8 2094/15
partners [1] 1983/24
parts [3] 2031/1 2032/9 2079/11
party [5] 1892/22 1892/22 2011/2
2035/19 2077/25
pass [4] 1838/7 1933/23 2030/6 2033/9
passenger's [1] 1881/3
passing [1] 2030/1
passion [1] 2016/11
past [7] 1959/25 1962/4 1963/8
2000/20 2001/5 2001/10 2001/11
PAT [1] 1819/15
paths [1] 1887/9
patrol [8] 1843/17 1843/18 1877/16
1895/19 2013/25 2017/8 2018/19
2020/9
pattern [1] 1839/11
Patty [3] 1872/21 1988/20 2052/16
Patty Perlow [1] 1988/20
Paul [1] 2052/18
pay [10] 1918/3 1920/24 1933/7 1933/7 1937/20 1937/20 1972/23
2054/22 2054/22 2083/21
PD [1] 1990/1
peers [3] 1844/16 2004/13 2094/21
pending [4] 1852/3 2001/7 2001/9 2001/11
people [74] 1817/19 1820/13 1835/21 1836/4 1837/4 1859/3 1863/15 1866/24 1870/3 1870/4 1871/14 1878/10 1879/14 1879/16 1879/20 1879/21 1879/22 1879/23 1879/24 1879/25 1880/3 1880/15 1880/22 1881/2 1881/13 1881/16 1882/6 1884/2 1886/16 1886/20 1887/4 1887/7 1888/19 1894/21 1896/6 1901/9 1901/12 1908/19 1921/20 1925/15 1928/3 1931/13 1940/7 1942/5 1953/8 1953/14 1953/16 1954/11 1964/21 1971/15 1973/10 1978/24 1979/11 1986/10 1991/9 1996/7 1997/2 2003/8 2004/10 2005/14 2006/22 2007/16 2017/9 2017/23 2019/23 2034/21 2037/12 2044/7 2044/12 2052/19 2056/9 2068/17 2080/7 2083/21
people's [3] 1869/24 1902/16 2031/12 per [1] 1850/19
percent [6] 1876/20 1884/24 1939/9 1942/5 1987/4 2006/4
percentage [1] 1817/23
perception [1] 1934/16
perceptions [1] 2091/10
percolate [1] 1864/5
percolates [1] 1864/5
perfect [1] 2002/9
performance [24] 1819/1 1906/4 1906/16 1907/12 1907/15 1912/21 1933/2 1934/21 1937/19 1959/21 1959/25 1961/18 1961/21 1962/3 1963/7 1964/17 1965/14 1965/24 1971/4 1972/4 1972/17 1985/10 2066/8 2073/2
perhaps [2] 1845/15 1965/19
period [22] 1818/8 1818/19 1821/3 1821/18 1822/14 1835/2 1863/11 1908/1 1920/8 1920/24 1933/8 1939/16 1941/14 1952/18 1962/13 1966/14 1977/1 2029/20 2048/17 2067/10 2072/11 2076/15
peripherally [2] 1845/22 1847/24
Perlow [6] 1872/21 1872/22 1873/3 1873/10 1988/20 2052/16
permanent [1] 2059/13
permissible [1] 1836/24
permission [25] 1815/16 1816/5 1833/19 1853/9 1857/20 1859/24 1866/8 1891/11 1891/23 1903/18 1920/10 1921/11 1925/22 1925/24 1926/7 1961/12 1982/10 1982/15 1989/18 1989/19 1990/7 2070/5 2070/14 2071/8 2074/14
permit [1] 1948/20
Perry [2] 2032/2 2033/12
person [31] 1845/2 1845/4 1845/6 1883/15 1884/8 1884/12 1888/23 1889/4 1893/16 1894/18 1903/12 1912/1 1912/12 1922/25 1929/20 1954/18 1970/14 1970/19 1988/1 1995/1 2001/15 2002/23 2004/21
2005/15 2034/20 2035/19 2035/21
2037/19 2060/19 2060/25 2081/23
person's [1] 1892/25
personal [15] 1844/5 1845/16 \(1847 / 5\)
1876/22 1876/24 1890/1 1988/5
2003/9 2003/21 2020/23 2021/1
2037/4 2091/12 2094/21 2094/22
personally [7] 1820/16 1822/4 1845/2
1846/4 1860/25 1913/22 1979/20
personnel [6] 1911/13 1937/18 1938/1 1970/12 2059/10 2059/11
perspective [5] 1924/25 1989/3
2083/10 2083/13 2087/10
persuaded [1] 1917/16
Pete [5] 1838/25 1841/20 1842/1 1842/14 1987/19
Pete Deshpande [1] 1842/14
Pete Deshpende [1] 1987/19
petitioned [1] 2035/23
phase [4] 1960/25 1961/2 1961/2 2018/10
Phillip's [1] 1899/15
Phillips [5] 1874/2 1874/7 1874/16
1874/22 1909/5
philosophical [1] 2020/23
philosophy [1] 2044/10
phone [4] 1919/25 1987/25 1988/2 2043/21
phrase [3] 1870/9 1983/12 2000/13
physical [7] 1819/15 1819/17 1819/23
2023/1 2030/2 2030/6 2033/6
physically [2] 1912/3 1956/13
pick [1] 1862/9
picking [2] 1858/20 1924/18
piece [8] 1827/16 1860/10 1860/13 1986/16 2046/11 2046/13 2046/22 2080/22
pieces [1] 2004/20
pinpoint [1] 2049/5
PIO [1] 2060/19
pizza [2] 2007/13 2007/15

\section*{P}
place [10] 1825/14 1905/19 1905/21
1906/14 2007/13 2007/14 2007/15 2021/25 2022/9 2034/18
plaintiff [11] 1807/5 1808/2 1946/5 1970/3 2010/25 2023/2 2079/24
2080/22 2082/3 2088/22 2093/13
plaintiff's [8] 1891/13 1920/11
1946/16 1960/23 1968/6 2058/21
2083/10 2093/19
plaintiffs [1] 2091/22
plan [1] 2038/19
plastic [3] 1884/5 1884/9 1899/21
plate [4] 1881/15 1895/15 1896/3 1899/21
plates [1] 1905/23
play [1] 1847/9
played [1] 1947/23
playground [4] 1892/13 1892/15 1894/9 1894/18
playing [1] 1892/13
please [47] 1811/13 1811/18 1811/22
1830/9 1841/19 1841/22 1841/22
1842/15 1859/5 1859/16 1874/1
1874/3 1874/5 1874/18 1896/12
1905/20 1910/4 1910/7 1910/7
1910/16 1910/20 1910/22 1911/3
1921/21 1957/2 1959/3 1967/24
1969/8 1975/4 1975/7 1975/22 1992/4
1992/6 2012/5 2012/15 2012/19
2055/21 2056/7 2056/21 2063/19
2063/24 2064/7 2064/10 2064/13
2078/19 2085/10 2087/4
plenty [1] 1870/3
plowed [2] 1979/15 1996/18
plowing [1] 1998/8
plus [4] 1844/4 1844/19 1871/19 1932/8
point [44] 1818/4 1820/4 1821/8 1821/12 1850/22 1875/2 1882/13 1882/25 1884/17 1894/15 1904/22 1913/1 1913/14 1916/19 1917/5 1918/5 1919/11 1922/17 1928/7 1929/14 1931/3 1931/24 1936/13 1938/2 1947/2 1952/6 1957/23 1959/19 1961/23 1973/10 1979/11 1988/14 1989/1 1989/15 2001/2 2004/12 2007/20 2030/11 2032/20 2067/12 2081/19 2083/9 2090/22 2091/19
points [1] 1961/25 police [158]
policies [4] 1955/17 1983/25 2018/11 2061/19
policing [1] 1812/5
policy [16] 1884/2 1954/12 1954/12
1954/15 1954/21 1955/4 1956/2
1966/9 2026/24 2027/19 2058/16
2061/23 2061/25 2062/2 2062/5
2071/22
poll [1] 2004/12
poor [12] 1868/17 1868/18 1868/22
1915/20 1916/21 1916/22 1918/12
1924/24 1940/16 1948/17 1953/2
1981/12
poorly [1] 1826/22
population [1] 1818/1
portion [25] 1818/12 1867/3 1905/10 1907/8 1907/10 1950/21 2053/4 2053/11 2079/12 2079/13 2079/15 2079/25 2080/10 2080/12 2080/12 2080/13 2082/7 2082/19 2084/18 2084/20 2084/25 2085/12 2086/25 2089/22 2089/23
portions [6] 1816/9 1850/17 1950/11 2074/17 2074/18 2088/23
Portland [6] 1807/9 1808/5 1808/21
2014/8 2076/4 2082/24
position [21] 1811/23 1843/2 1852/5 1869/3 1876/6 1911/4 1915/3 1948/8 2013/4 2013/15 2013/20 2013/21 2014/13 2015/13 2022/5 2023/4 2029/14 2037/7 2062/25 2081/21 2094/4
positioned [1] 1907/4
positions [5] 1812/3 1843/15 1964/10 2016/4 2016/21
positive [1] 2080/22
possessed [2] 1823/6 1823/8
possibility [1] 1878/12
possible [4] 1915/4 1972/12 1981/16 2054/19
possibly [6] 1863/20 1863/21 1865/4
1936/13 1984/15 1991/24
post [3] 1821/5 1961/12 2029/22
post-FTEP [1] 1821/5
posttraumatic [1] 1992/17
pot [2] 1877/24 1878/15
potential [6] 1852/3 1916/21 1959/24 1983/18 2033/24 2062/4
potentially [6] 1898/3 1935/16
1986/23 2023/23 2057/11 2086/8
pour [1] 2060/8
power [3] 1930/10 1930/12 1930/13
powerful [1] 2035/22
practical [2] 1906/24 2022/24
practice [12] 1914/1 1914/4 1921/14
1923/18 1923/22 1925/7 1925/13
1951/7 2029/20 2032/14 2043/9
2049/11
practices [4] 1982/3 1983/25 1999/23 2009/7
pre [2] 1911/23 1912/9
pre-disciplinary [1] 1912/9
pre-progressive [1] 1911/23
preconceived [1] 1901/9
predismissal [32] 1918/24 1919/13
1919/20 1920/3 1920/5 1921/17
1921/25 1922/5 1922/12 1922/21
1923/2 1923/19 1924/11 1926/16
1926/17 1942/3 1942/6 1942/8
1953/22 1955/11 1957/23 1958/6
1963/17 1963/24 1968/4 1968/9
1968/16 1968/22 1969/3 1969/7
1969/14 2082/21
predominantly [1] 1844/15
preferable [1] 1844/6
prejudicial [10] 2080/13 2083/6
2085/19 2086/8 2086/8 2086/15
2086/17 2091/5 2091/24 2092/10
preparation [1] 1977/16
prepare [7] 1830/17 1866/23 1896/18
1947/18 1999/23 2006/25 2068/6
prepared [3] 1856/16 2075/24 2091/20
preparing [1] 1861/23
presence [4] 2022/1 2022/10 2075/7 2076/11
present [31] 1811/2 1811/3 1811/3 1827/16 1859/8 1859/14 1859/15 1887/25 1919/18 1942/9 1956/1 1956/17 1957/6 1957/9 1957/11 1957/11 1957/24 1959/10 2011/24 2012/2 2012/4 2012/4 2018/17 2022/4 2026/1 2028/12 2030/8 2030/9 2031/8 2079/6 2079/9
presentation [3] 1885/16 1885/24 1886/14
presented [1] 1986/10
president [6] 1861/10 1911/7 1911/17
1930/14 1930/24 1930/25
press [1] 2087/22
pressure [1] 2088/22
pretty [12] 1847/24 1944/3 1944/4 1962/11 2010/8 2010/15 2013/20 2035/22 2043/12 2047/18 2076/19 2076/20
prevail [1] 1929/13
prevent [4] 2034/19 2034/19 2039/9 2080/7
previous [1] 2035/11
previously [3] 1892/10 2023/9 2035/14
primarily [6] 1813/3 1817/25 1851/14 1972/15 1982/7 2020/8
primary [3] 1883/9 2067/9 2068/13
prior [31] 1820/1 1823/24 1842/23 1843/9 1845/22 1846/24 1850/11
1851/16 1885/18 1896/21 1916/24
1920/3 1923/25 1968/8 1968/12
1970/24 1971/8 1976/10 1976/25
1981/6 1981/9 1992/18 1997/22
2000/12 2001/16 2014/16 2067/23
2067/24 2071/21 2073/4 2073/7
priority [1] 2036/22
private [1] 2031/12
privately [1] 2020/21
privilege [1] 2082/1
privileged [1] 2081/16
probable [8] 1814/23 1815/1 1825/22
1884/18 2023/19 2024/11 2024/16 2059/5
probably [30] 1820/22 1821/1 1821/5 1821/14 1824/1 1835/2 1838/4 1841/1 1850/12 1853/23 1862/11 1869/21 1890/25 1891/8 1899/20 1909/22
1921/9 1921/19 1925/2 1938/17
1970/9 1970/13 2016/1 2019/20
2022/24 2036/12 2042/20 2077/1
2077/2 2077/7
probation [2] 1812/21 1879/22
probative [1] 2092/11
problem [18] 1822/21 1872/16
1890/13 1906/15 1936/12 1940/22
1949/2 1952/16 1953/5 1965/16
2021/7 2021/12 2049/18 2049/24
2050/1 2050/5 2050/16 2050/18
problematic [7] 1941/20 1951/25 1952/10 1952/20 1953/9 1959/22 1974/20
problems [18] 1876/1 1888/4 1912/21 1915/20 1917/15 1918/23 1924/24

P
problems... [11] 1928/25 1933/2
1959/24 1962/3 1963/7 1963/14 1964/16 1965/14 1965/23 1999/17 2000/18
procedure [3] 1966/5 2061/22 2066/16
procedures [1] 1913/16
proceed [1] 2001/17
proceeding [1] 2025/6
proceedings [6] 1807/14 1811/1 1846/1 1910/3 1975/3 2097/10 process [43] 1847/23 1850/23 1867/6 1913/6 1917/13 1922/17 1929/9 1929/16 1933/1 1937/8 1973/4 1979/2 1980/6 1980/13 1985/25 2000/21 2005/1 2015/8 2015/9 2015/21 2018/10 2029/18 2030/18 2030/22 2030/25 2031/1 2031/7 2031/25 2032/10 2032/15 2033/2 2033/10 2034/25 2039/11 2042/10 2045/1 2045/10 2045/11 2068/14 2077/19 2082/17 2083/14 2091/9
processed [1] 1996/11 produced [2] 1944/9 2011/2 professional [11] 1847/9 1869/17 1871/8 1885/8 1911/4 1911/12 1976/18 2004/13 2006/17 2036/19 2094/21
professionalism [1] 1855/20 Professionally [1] 2000/14 professions [2] 1991/17 1991/19 professor [1] 1966/17 progeny [1] 1978/14 program [18] 1813/8 1814/3 1817/3 1817/6 1817/8 1821/23 1997/9 1997/9 1997/10 2015/1 2015/3 2015/5 2015/6 2016/25 2017/2 2017/12 2019/8 2020/1
progress [2] 1894/3 1979/17 progressed [1] 1976/23 progressive [15] 1911/22 1911/23 1912/22 1913/4 1917/12 1917/19 1917/22 1932/25 1933/1 1933/4 1937/21 1951/9 1960/5 1967/4 1974/14
progressively [2] 1918/5 1933/3
prohibited [1] 2025/23
promise [1] 2072/18
promised [1] 2082/24
promoted [1] 1843/18
pronounce [1] 1945/22
proper [5] 1902/1 1902/8 2043/6
2084/5 2084/9
properly [1] 1984/9
property [4] 1815/7 1818/3 1881/24
1890/19
proposal [1] 2061/2
proposed [1] 2005/2
proposing [1] 2085/18
prosecuting [1] 1995/1
prosecution [1] 1983/11
prosecutor [4] 1982/25 1983/1 2000/3 2050/8
prosecutor's [2] 1983/2 1999/18
protecting [1] 2035/1
protective [1] 2031/12
provide [15] 1823/6 1831/9 1831/18 1833/4 1833/6 1848/14 1848/22 1922/14 1977/15 1979/4 1993/16 2000/3 2005/7 2017/5 2017/8 provided [6] 1837/19 1848/8 1939/1 1986/2 1994/7 2058/8
provides [2] 1926/13 2004/21
providing [2] 1834/20 1848/10
proving [1] 1984/19
provision [1] 1919/15
proximity [1] 1863/13
psychological [2] 2015/10 2033/7 public [47] 1812/9 1812/12 1812/18 1813/17 1814/18 1814/20 1814/22 1815/11 1815/13 1815/14 1816/1 1816/9 1816/16 1816/19 1816/22 1817/2 1817/12 1819/1 1825/21 1831/25 1838/10 1839/14 1874/25 1879/11 1886/7 1887/10 1915/10 1931/4 1937/12 1940/3 1940/8 1949/2 1962/12 1962/14 1962/17 1962/18 1962/19 1964/9 1978/18 2010/3 2011/1 2015/17 2019/6 2025/2 2030/13 2030/15 2060/25
publications [1] 1871/6
publish [18] 1816/5 1831/23 1833/19
1857/21 1859/20 1859/24 1866/8 1891/23 1920/10 1926/7 1950/10 1982/11 1982/15 1990/8 1990/14 2070/14 2071/8 2074/14
published [2] 1868/7 1868/10 pull [9] 1857/19 1866/5 1874/13 1910/17 1952/23 1975/15 2005/21 2012/17 2049/7
pulled [3] 1941/1 1966/16 2015/4
pulling [1] 1940/24
pulls [1] 1997/12
PUMA [1] 1966/10
pumps [1] 2045/14
purpose [13] 1860/21 1866/16 1888/9
1914/3 1914/9 1920/21 1922/12
1926/12 1990/16 1999/8 1999/14
2018/25 2060/20
purposes [3] 1985/14 2004/15 2005/10
pursuant [1] 1921/22
pursued [3] 1837/24 1838/1 1846/10 push [4] 2056/8 2056/18 2056/22 2057/6
pushed [2] 2000/18 2076/10
put [43] 1844/7 1862/11 1864/10 1869/14 1869/22 1898/21 1903/9 1916/5 1927/1 1934/17 1941/19 1941/25 1947/2 1961/5 1965/2 1966/19 1972/23 1974/6 1979/6 1979/20 1984/12 1991/24 1996/7 1998/10 2002/8 2004/16 2006/2 2007/24 2008/18 2024/19 2026/15 2038/25 2039/4 2042/4 2054/21 2059/4 2059/9 2063/20 2063/21
2066/17 2076/1 2077/3 2096/7
puts [1] 1920/23
putting [11] 1884/5 1934/12 1960/4 1978/21 1979/12 2023/18 2024/10 2054/16 2059/4 2079/17 2079/19
\(Q\)
qualified [2] 2030/23 2032/18 quell [1] 1968/6
question [70] 1824/25 1825/8 1825/9 1828/25 1829/1 1830/25 1853/21 1853/24 1855/3 1865/20 1865/21 1865/24 1869/3 1869/12 1871/1 1871/2 1871/9 1871/11 1873/7 1897/20 1900/22 1904/5 1904/16 1909/21 1915/4 1916/3 1936/16 1945/20 1956/3 1971/11 1972/10 1972/13 1972/14 1978/6 1986/9 1997/20 2000/24 2002/11 2003/8 2010/12 2021/4 2022/7 2022/11 2022/15 2024/1 2024/25 2040/12 2040/15 2042/11 2043/22 2046/9 2048/4 2048/6 2048/15 2051/9 2053/18 2054/7 2056/16 2056/18 2068/15 2072/1 2074/22 2075/20 2086/22 2088/9 2091/17 2092/13 2093/6 2094/18 2095/8
questionable [1] 1848/6
questioned [9] 1857/5 1883/12 1897/21 1897/24 1924/13 1970/2 1971/20 2041/20 2044/12
questioning [1] 1904/22
questions [23] 1831/1 1850/4 1865/25 1869/2 1869/8 1897/3 1899/7 1904/16 1905/11 1905/13 1949/18 1955/12 2021/19 2031/9 2031/11 2031/15 2040/2 2044/10 2046/10 2048/10 2059/2 2063/8 2071/24
quick [3] 1838/21 1967/12 2077/18 quickly [3] 1961/24 1976/23 2046/8
quiet [1] 1847/20
quietly [1] 1936/1
quit [5] 2081/4 2085/3 2085/20 2088/14 2092/5
quite [11] 1845/15 1897/20 1932/10 1991/14 1993/13 2006/5 2033/9 2033/15 2034/1 2081/1 2088/22 quite a [1] 2034/1
quitting [5] 2081/8 2086/4 2087/1 2088/12 2092/8
quote [2] 1861/20 1967/3

\section*{R}
race [1] 1851/11
radio [5] 1881/14 1883/6 1884/3 1894/6 2046/19
radioed [1] 2046/21
raise [13] 1841/22 1847/15 1865/13 1874/4 1910/7 1975/7 2012/8 2020/19 2026/10 2026/10 2063/24 2087/19 2092/25
raised [7] 1850/15 1924/23 1925/6 1925/16 1930/24 1972/11 2024/9 raises [1] 2086/9
raising [1] 1925/14
ran [3] 1878/12 1905/23 1995/8
Randy [16] 1912/2 1912/17 1913/25 1915/13 1916/11 1917/2 1919/23 1921/19 1928/3 1931/12 1937/23 1939/23 1953/19 1971/24 2068/19 2072/8
ranking [1] 2032/7
rapes [1] 1989/8
rare [1] 1916/16
rate [1] 2078/14
rates [1] 1844/6
rating [2] 1907/13 1907/13
RDR [2] 1808/20 2097/14
re [1] 1850/11
re-reviewed [1] 1850/11
reach [1] 1853/16
reached [1] 1908/9
read [36] 1853/23 1854/1 1862/18
1871/6 1873/1 1873/14 1893/20
1904/18 1905/9 1905/17 1906/13 1906/20 1907/18 1928/16 1929/1 1936/7 1936/14 1936/18 1936/19
1943/22 1944/2 1944/20 1945/3
1966/25 1998/1 1998/6 2002/13
2077/6 2077/7 2077/10 2077/12
2077/13 2082/18 2083/3 2086/5 2090/5
reader [1] 1998/7
reading [6] 1869/7 1936/12 1943/1
1996/19 2029/24 2071/17
ready [3] 1905/25 2014/2 2032/18
real [3] 1838/21 1967/11 2015/17
reality [2] 1852/1 1863/10
realize [1] 2037/19
really [18] 1850/25 1878/9 1898/11
1917/15 1918/8 1956/6 1980/6
2003/11 2007/13 2035/2 2038/9
2055/16 2078/4 2081/9 2086/5 2087/1 2087/2 2092/8
reams [1] 1846/11
reask [3] 1825/8 1825/9 1900/22
reason [26] 1824/11 1827/25 1837/3
1838/1 1839/15 1865/23 1869/16
1882/5 1883/23 1896/22 1896/24
1934/21 1936/17 1938/13 1941/18
1941/25 1947/23 1960/4 1971/11
1974/19 1986/12 2025/6 2039/3
2055/10 2073/8 2082/11
reasons [14] 1836/19 1843/24 1920/7
1934/20 1952/11 1955/6 1962/7
1966/18 1974/17 1986/12 1991/12
1991/13 2017/1 2080/5
reassigned [3] 1883/1 1883/4 1933/19 reassignment [4] 1916/10 1916/13 1916/15 1940/12
rebuttal [2] 2023/23 2076/24
recall [146]
recalling [1] 1846/13
receive [6] 1964/8 1978/7 1998/13
2026/7 2029/25 2066/20
received [31] 1816/4 1820/13 1860/2
1891/14 1918/6 1920/11 1926/3
1946/7 1950/2 1959/23 1962/2 1963/6
1963/6 1964/7 1969/14 1981/7
1982/14 1990/14 1998/16 2019/5
2025/10 2033/19 2039/1 2066/21
2070/25 2071/7 2071/21 2074/7
2085/1 2085/1 2092/9
receiving [1] 1912/25
recent [1] 1996/4
recently [8] 1924/2 1959/22 1967/1
2000/12 2036/10 2039/6 2057/5 2059/8
receptive [1] 2072/22
recess [10] 1859/3 1859/10 1859/13 1956/23 1957/8 1970/4 2012/1
2076/13 2079/5 2079/7
recipient [1] 2009/15
recognize [5] 1815/20 1817/1 1920/16 1989/22 1998/12
recognized [1] 1884/7
recollection [19] 1826/4 1830/11
1830/22 1850/17 1872/15 1876/13
1901/16 1916/4 1926/21 1933/15
1941/1 1948/6 1953/17 1964/24
2043/25 2049/8 2050/9 2052/7
2069/14
recollections [1] 1995/11
recommend [1] 1917/7
recommendation [7] 1916/25 1920/7
1922/23 1922/25 1942/4 1982/22
2033/1
recommendations [1] 1911/23
recommended [1] 1920/4
recommending [3] 1918/16 1918/21
1920/19
record [16] 1867/18 1867/19 1920/12
1934/22 1946/1 1960/15 2043/7
2051/18 2059/13 2075/23 2076/2
2078/13 2079/8 2083/22 2096/7
2097/9
recorded [2] 1887/5 1925/15
recording [10] 1954/6 1964/25
1965/16 1985/11 1985/12 1992/9
2043/5 2043/15 2058/16 2061/20
recordings [6] 1954/7 1954/16
1955/13 1956/3 1964/21 1966/10
records [6] 1956/8 1956/9 1974/8
1974/10 2010/4 2011/1
recross [15] 1809/7 1809/16 1809/21
1810/8 1839/24 1839/25 1840/1
1840/5 1873/19 1909/15 1909/17
1973/13 1973/15 2009/18 2009/21
Recross-Examination [8] 1809/7
1809/16 1809/21 1810/8 1840/5 1909/17 1973/15 2009/21
recruit [3] 1812/15 1876/10 1976/5
recruited [1] 2013/22
red [4] 1865/14 1893/4 1917/6 1939/3
redact [2] 2085/12 2088/11
redacted [2] 2088/10 2092/23
redactions [2] 2082/12 2092/19
redirect [16] 1809/6 1809/11 1809/15
1809/20 1810/7 1838/15 1838/17
1871/23 1872/1 1909/1 1909/3
1967/24 1968/1 2009/3 2009/5 2063/7
reduce [1] 1935/11
reference [5] 1854/21 1958/18 1991/3
2025/2 2083/24
referenced [3] 1947/10 1947/14
1948/3
referencing [1] 2081/19
referred [1] 1960/13
referring [6] 1819/5 1866/15 1894/3
1899/15 1966/16 2062/23
refined [1] 1977/20
reflect [2] 1916/22 1955/24
reflected [1] 1918/22
reflection [1] 2095/16
reflects [1] 1953/2
refresh [5] 1861/10 1873/15 1891/17

1936/5 2058/21
refreshes [1] 1935/20
refreshing [1] 1895/1
refused [3] 1943/10 1958/21 2055/13
refusing [3] 2021/4 2022/6 2022/10
refute [2] 2023/22 2071/23
refuted [1] 2080/21
regard [5] 1865/6 1894/13 1908/3
2032/14 2067/21
regarding [19] 1845/20 1846/8 1867/6
1959/24 1962/3 1963/7 1964/11
1968/15 1969/15 1987/22 1991/6
1993/11 1994/4 2033/19 2034/3
2036/21 2038/14 2051/6 2071/24
regardless [1] 1824/13
regards [1] 1966/9
region [1] 1813/25
regionally [1] 1814/8
regions [1] 1814/9
regular [4] 1877/10 1877/22 2015/7 2020/5
regularly [2] 1914/7 1981/1
reinforced [1] 1849/23
reinstate [1] 1992/23
reinstated [11] 1834/16 1836/14
1852/23 1853/5 1854/7 1854/19
1860/8 1992/25 2039/24 2042/5 2054/25
reinstatement [3] 1855/10 1865/18 1991/23
reintroduce [1] 1811/14
reinvestigate [1] 1970/24
rejected [1] 2025/16
relate [2] 2027/24 2027/24
related [8] 1938/3 1941/10 1980/1 1997/11 1997/13 2004/9 2024/18 2046/6
relates [1] 1983/20
relating [1] 1970/12
relation [9] 1860/8 1915/9 1929/25
1933/22 1940/20 1966/8 1966/13
2053/4 2059/16
relations [1] 1911/21
relationship [2] 1869/22 2027/21
relationships [1] 1844/14
relatively [3] 1847/3 1922/18 2036/10
release [1] 2055/12
released [1] 2055/10
relegated [1] 1886/15
relevance [2] 1964/10 1964/14
relevant [7] 1862/24 1930/5 1999/12
2002/20 2004/7 2025/6 2074/17
reliable [2] 1955/23 1993/9
relieve [2] 1823/12 2025/12
relieves [1] 2025/15
relocated [1] 1895/21
reluctant [1] 2022/16
rely [4] 1856/13 1865/8 1970/20 1971/15
relying [2] 1884/17 1974/1
remaining [1] 2090/8
remedial [4] 1821/15 1821/16 1821/17 1830/21
remember [70] 1819/5 1819/7 1822/17 1822/20 1824/1 1824/3 1825/3 1827/8
1827/23 1827/25 1830/10 1832/3
1832/10 1832/11 1832/12 1833/2
representing [4] 2007/17 2042/15 2042/17 2044/25
reprimand [24] 1912/23 1912/25 1913/24 1914/15 1914/17 1914/23 1918/3 1929/17 1931/17 1931/21 1931/25 1932/1 1932/22 1933/5 1933/6 1938/23 1948/13 2066/9 2067/21 2068/6 2068/11 2072/15 2072/16 2082/15
reprimanded [1] 1891/4
reprimands [1] 1937/21
reprisal [1] 2071/15
reputation [3] 1835/25 2093/18 2094/6
reputational [1] 2093/24
request [8] 1965/2 1965/11 1999/12 2011/1 2051/4 2070/14 2074/13 2082/14
requested [3] 1964/14 2011/1 2066/7
requesting [2] 2068/10 2079/11
requests [6] 1964/6 1964/9 1964/13
1964/14 1965/21 1971/3
require [3] 1814/12 1991/23 2000/11
required [17] 1825/2 1888/11 1921/22 1921/23 1977/15 2005/5 2010/2
2018/11 2033/5 2034/2 2034/4 2037/2
2038/11 2057/9 2058/2 2062/2
2071/22
requirement [3] 1814/15 1922/1 1922/2
requirements [8] 1913/5 1913/8 1913/9 1913/20 1980/21 1987/12 1997/18 2010/6
requires [4] 1977/9 1980/17 2016/24 2077/10
reread [1] 1869/10
research [7] 1926/19 1959/21 1963/23 2067/18 2067/19 2095/12 2095/21
reserve [49] 1813/20 1813/21 1813/21
1813/22 1813/23 1814/1 1814/8
1814/9 1814/10 1814/16 1842/20 1887/13 1887/23 1990/20 2015/1 2015/3 2015/4 2015/14 2016/1 2016/5 2016/7 2016/19 2016/25 2017/2
2017/9 2017/12 2017/15 2017/20 2018/3 2018/6 2018/9 2019/4 2019/8 2019/11 2019/14 2019/21 2020/1 2020/8 2020/9 2026/6 2026/18 2026/19 2027/18 2032/19 2032/21 2046/3 2048/16 2048/20 2050/19
reserves [11] 1817/8 2014/24 2015/10 2016/3 2017/17 2018/15 2019/1 2026/25 2030/21 2031/17 2049/12 residing [1] 1961/20
resign [5] 2028/22 2029/3 2029/6 2029/7 2083/23
resigned [5] 2028/24 2029/11 2048/7 2051/12 2060/2
resolve [4] 2021/11 2021/22 2075/17 2085/23
resolves [1] 2086/22
resource [1] 1955/23
resources [13] 1911/7 1911/8 1911/16 1911/18 1919/17 1922/18 1927/15 1927/18 1930/9 1932/21 1937/18 1986/15 2068/20
resources' [2] 1911/19 1932/19
respect [3] 1831/2 1853/14 1988/5 respected [3] 1820/17 1820/21 1830/16
respond [5] 1854/9 1879/4 1883/8 1891/7 2090/24
responded [6] 1834/24 1883/9
1892/20 1894/23 2058/12 2073/18
responding [6] 1834/11 1834/12
1892/7 1892/8 1894/6 2083/17
responds [1] 2084/7
response [9] 1854/13 1865/17
1882/12 1883/10 1901/22 1964/7
2073/20 2090/23 2091/1
responses [1] 2091/11
responsibilities [2] 2036/5 2066/1
responsibility [3] 2033/20 2058/2 2065/24
responsible [1] 1977/25
rest [3] 2087/10 2088/17 2092/9
restarted [1] 2015/6
restricted [1] 1815/6
result [5] 1992/17 2001/24 2002/3
2002/6 2002/9
resulted [1] 1948/7
results [1] 1848/11
retaliate [6] 1845/17 2093/8 2093/12
2093/19 2094/7 2094/24
retaliated [1] 1935/14
retaliating [1] 1845/9
retaliation [7] 1928/18 1942/22
2093/25 2094/5 2094/10 2095/2 2095/6
retention [2] 2010/6 2010/21
reticent [2] 1851/25 1852/4
retire [1] 1911/10
retired [3] 1911/5 1911/6 1927/20
retrained [1] 2072/22
retraining [7] 1831/3 1831/4 2072/3
2072/11 2073/13 2073/16 2073/22
return [1] 2077/9
returned [3] 2044/19 2051/1 2055/4
returns [1] 1919/10
reveal [3] 2037/5 2038/11 2057/10
revealed [6] 1837/14 1837/17 1839/11
1984/23 2037/10 2038/7
reveals [1] 1985/10
reverse [1] 2094/4
reversed [1] 2093/11
reverses [1] 1919/9
reversing [1] 2094/8
review [30] 1846/12 1850/22 1851/15 1855/15 1856/19 1856/22 1860/17 1860/23 1861/2 1866/1 1866/16 1866/25 1868/6 1869/3 1896/18 1902/3 1909/11 1914/6 1914/9 1930/15 1930/22 1931/1 1931/22 1935/25 1982/19 1988/21 1989/12 2058/19 2066/13 2066/16
reviewed [20] 1850/9 1850/11 1866/13 1866/17 1867/2 1867/11 1868/5 1921/12 1923/25 1955/23 1955/25 1956/16 1959/9 1959/12 1988/25 1993/12 1993/14 2002/18 2006/9 2067/3
reviewing [3] 1860/20 1922/19 2014/20
reviews [1] 1930/11

Revised [2] 1816/24 1826/3
rice [2] 1896/4 1899/22
rich [1] 1879/19
Richard [1] 1975/20
rid [2] 1927/25 1943/2
ride [3] 1878/1 1949/11 2018/19
riding [1] 1877/17
right [308]
rightful [1] 2067/8
rights [6] 1865/4 1972/17 1978/7
2007/23 2041/14 2065/25
ring [5] 1838/12 1933/20 1934/1
1950/8 2069/23
rise [10] 1831/14 1832/4 1832/5 1840/8 1840/13 1850/18 1850/21
1857/7 1871/21 2038/9
risk [13] 1902/15 1915/19 1915/22
1916/20 1916/22 1918/8 1918/8
1934/23 1935/1 1935/3 1935/8
1935/11 1941/5
risks [3] 1917/11 1917/16 2082/22
river [2] 1906/9 1977/2
RMR [2] 1808/20 2097/14
road [2] 1886/19 1895/24
robberies [1] 1989/9
robbery [1] 2007/16
robust [3] 1979/2 1980/24 1981/10
rode [1] 1878/6
role [22] 1840/2 1844/12 1850/23
1850/25 1851/12 1851/14 1869/16
1879/8 1885/22 1885/22 1908/18
1911/19 1911/25 1930/9 1947/23
1970/18 1971/14 2002/15 2016/18
2030/25 2065/7 2068/16
roles [1] 1976/25
Romania [4] 1880/13 1880/16 1880/20 1880/24
room [7] 1808/21 2031/8 2043/12
2047/17 2047/21 2050/4 2077/9
rooted [1] 2000/4
rough [2] 1848/9 1892/13
Roughly [1] 1843/13
routinely [2] 1989/4 2008/2
rude [1] 2003/8
Rudnick [1] 1808/8
rule [3] 1991/9 2084/18 2091/21
rulebook [1] 1908/23
rules [2] 1908/19 1908/22
ruling [15] 1849/1 1993/7 2022/14
2025/23 2081/17 2085/16 2085/18
2088/1 2089/10 2090/14 2093/2
2093/3 2094/13 2095/22 2095/23
rulings [1] 2095/14
Ruminations [1] 2086/6
run [11] 1813/23 1814/8 1819/20
1819/23 1820/1 1826/17 1878/17
1879/21 1882/3 1931/9 1971/14
running [3] 1815/11 1819/25 1927/18

\section*{S}
safe [3] 1970/13 2070/2 2070/3 safety [68] 1812/10 1812/18 1813/17 1814/18 1814/21 1814/22 1815/13 1816/1 1816/10 1816/17 1816/19 1816/22 1817/2 1817/12 1819/1 1819/7 1825/21 1827/19 1828/11

1828/21 1829/5 1830/24 1831/2 1831/25 1838/10 1839/14 1875/1 1878/11 1879/11 1886/7 1887/10 1897/7 1897/17 1899/25 1900/11 1901/3 1902/4 1902/16 1902/16 1903/4 1903/10 1915/10 1915/19 1915/21 1915/22 1918/9 1918/13 1931/4 1937/12 1940/4 1940/9 1947/14 1947/18 1948/2 1949/2 1960/21 1962/12 1962/14 1962/17 1962/18 1962/19 1964/9 1974/15 1974/18 2015/17 2019/6 2030/14 2030/15
said [65] 1827/3 1830/6 1830/20 1835/11 1836/4 1836/12 1837/6 1839/18 1855/12 1855/19 1856/2 1856/12 1862/20 1863/7 1868/1 1879/5 1880/19 1881/25 1882/15 1883/25 1886/16 1898/5 1901/13 1901/15 1901/25 1908/4 1928/24 1931/24 1941/25 1942/3 1950/25 1960/14 1964/18 1974/8 1974/13 1996/3 1999/15 2000/4 2003/24 2006/7 2007/11 2007/13 2008/9 2014/2 2016/10 2016/15 2024/2 2024/5 2028/9 2034/7 2037/21 2040/21 2049/6 2049/24 2051/24 2052/1 2055/15 2066/24 2081/8 2081/24 2086/4 2086/25 2088/11 2092/7 2093/16
Salem [8] 1849/11 1863/11 2013/13 2013/15 2013/22 2013/22 2015/19 2035/13
Salsbury [10] 2027/3 2027/10 2027/13 2027/20 2027/24 2028/14 2028/20 2029/4 2029/5 2045/23
same [56] 1813/23 1814/15 1814/25 1816/20 1817/15 1824/10 1845/5 1848/25 1849/1 1879/14 1879/16 1879/21 1884/8 1908/9 1912/6 1912/7 1935/6 1939/15 1944/18 1944/22 1945/1 1945/5 1945/6 1949/10 1958/10 1961/5 1966/14 1966/22 1967/21 1967/22 1973/9 1979/19 1979/24 1980/1 1980/22 1990/2 1990/4 1996/13 2007/21 2010/5 2010/5 2015/8 2015/9 2022/12 2026/19 2027/16 2029/22 2034/12 2041/2 2045/20 2050/4 2054/15 2074/15 2088/6 2092/10 2092/21 sanction [1] 1972/23
sanctions [2] 1933/3 2006/17
sat [4] 1915/13 1989/10 2035/24 2050/3
satisfactory [1] 1907/12
Saturday [1] 2019/10
saw [13] 1827/7 1866/14 1866/20 1868/7 1868/9 1868/23 1868/24 1877/10 1878/3 1879/1 1928/25 2002/7 2042/10
say [81] 1817/24 1820/22 1821/16 1822/17 1831/11 1832/22 1834/4 1834/6 1848/4 1850/11 1854/6 1854/19 1856/22 1860/19 1863/23 1867/19 1869/20 1871/2 1885/15 1888/13 1888/19 1889/12 1891/25 1896/8 1897/6 1899/9 1900/18 1901/3

1901/21 1902/13 1907/9 1908/5 1909/20 1916/17 1917/3 1925/2 1928/23 1930/13 1930/13 1931/23 1942/7 1942/15 1947/20 1954/10 1955/16 1962/5 1970/13 1979/8 1980/14 1981/6 1981/10 1986/23 1987/10 1997/6 1999/8 1999/14 1999/16 2001/24 2002/25 2003/16 2005/4 2019/21 2021/3 2022/21 2036/11 2036/12 2036/24 2037/21 2044/5 2046/25 2048/19 2053/3 2053/11 2053/12 2062/19 2068/7 2069/10 2078/18 2081/13 2083/1 2089/24
saying [29] 1840/8 1855/6 1867/23 1868/9 1885/4 1897/21 1897/23 1902/14 1902/19 1907/8 1917/20 1924/20 1925/11 1935/6 1935/14 1951/11 1955/4 1956/5 1974/6 2008/3 2025/23 2037/23 2037/24 2044/22 2052/8 2055/2 2071/13 2072/10 2073/14
says [15] 1884/4 1902/7 1905/10 1905/11 1907/14 1921/15 1940/3 1950/2 1958/20 1983/23 1996/20 2053/13 2061/21 2071/12 2090/18 scale [1] 1854/22
Scandinavian [3] 2016/23 2017/5 2044/4
scenario [2] 2007/2 2007/5
scene [1] 1949/9
schedule [3] 1920/9 1955/21 2082/14
scheduled [1] 1955/21
schedules [1] 1955/24
scheduling [1] 1955/22
school [6] 1879/18 1976/20 2013/12 2013/18 2016/10 2017/19
science [1] 2014/5
scope [3] 1828/22 1928/21 1962/24
score [2] 1825/11 2030/1
scores [4] 2039/9 2039/14 2039/16 2062/15
scoring [1] 2031/8
SCOTT [2] 1807/8 1914/22
screen [6] 1858/21 1893/7 1920/15
1998/8 1998/10 2006/2
screen's [1] 1866/10
screening [1] 2033/3
scrutinized [1] 2004/22
scrutiny [1] 1980/24
se [1] 1850/19
Sean [2] 1919/24 2074/12
Sean Brailey [1] 2074/12
searches [1] 2008/4
seat [4] 1995/3 2022/7 2074/24 2093/1
seated [19] 1811/3 1811/13 1827/21
1828/1 1842/5 1842/9 1859/16
1874/11 1874/13 1910/16 1930/18
1975/13 1975/15 1992/3 2012/15
2012/17 2012/19 2026/2 2064/7
second [23] 1808/4 1828/8 1831/23
1838/21 1843/5 1853/20 1888/24
1903/22 1921/2 1933/6 1950/11
1959/3 1959/4 1992/2 2004/18 2009/1 2022/1 2032/4 2038/6 2040/16 2087/6 2089/14 2090/12
second-guess [1] 2090/12

Second-to-last [1] 1959/4
second-to-the-last [1] 1959/3
secondhand [1] 1870/15
section [3] 1853/22 1906/2 2055/21
sections [3] 1815/25 1893/3 2029/24
security [5] 1844/2 2016/25 2017/3
2017/5 2017/8
see [66] 1838/21 1838/23 1845/5
1854/3 1854/13 1854/17 1859/4
1863/12 1863/13 1864/11 1865/19
1866/17 1868/12 1878/3 1878/3
1878/9 1880/21 1884/4 1885/1
1888/25 1889/14 1889/18 1893/23
1895/15 1903/22 1904/11 1907/19
1908/8 1917/6 1924/13 1925/8
1925/16 1935/20 1945/2 1952/16
1953/5 1958/1 1958/13 1958/16
1961/22 1963/24 1965/21 1966/13
1968/10 1968/12 1997/13 1998/19
2004/16 2004/17 2004/18 2013/11
2019/20 2023/7 2042/9 2050/14
2056/13 2067/8 2070/18 2070/20
2074/19 2078/10 2079/1 2079/10
2089/9 2090/21 2096/8
seeing [1] 1883/13
seem [2] 1820/11 2094/12
seemed [3] 1820/9 1820/25 1989/8
seemingly [3] 2093/20 2093/23
2094/16
seems [2] 1847/19 1909/5
seen [26] 1844/1 1845/11 1845/13
1845/14 1847/13 1847/14 1847/15
1856/17 1856/17 1871/19 1872/6
1883/21 1884/8 1889/14 1890/8
1899/3 1899/4 1899/5 1966/8 1966/11
2044/21 2044/23 2044/24 2053/8
2058/22 2095/1
sees [1] 1889/1
SEIU [1] 1913/13
seizures [1] 2008/4
selecting [1] 2029/21
selection [1] 2031/25
seminar [1] 1822/1
seminars [3] 1849/6 1979/12 1979/20
send [6] 1854/4 1980/4 1987/7
1998/23 2021/25 2078/3
sending [2] 1839/3 2009/8
sends [1] 1854/3
senior [1] 2013/12
sense [12] 1844/8 1852/4 1857/11
1900/15 1901/1 1973/7 1977/21
1984/6 1984/7 2006/17 2035/3
2082/19
sensible [3] 1992/19 1992/20 1992/22 sensitive [1] 2036/22
sent [12] 1820/2 1839/6 1840/16
1853/2 1990/2 2009/23 2009/25
2050/25 2054/24 2056/24 2062/17 2070/10
sentence [13] 1893/20 1943/1
1952/25 1954/24 1965/22 1977/11
1982/22 1983/8 1983/18 1983/18
1983/23 2086/3 2087/6
sentences [1] 2091/7
separate [8] 1892/19 1893/1 1895/10 1937/7 1937/10 1937/11 1938/2

2077/11
September [9] 1807/7 1868/8 1941/21 1941/24 1941/24 1959/23 1962/16 1963/11 2097/6
sequential [1] 1935/25
sergeant [53] 1812/4 1820/20 1822/4
1842/20 1843/19 1855/20 1856/4
1875/14 1875/18 1875/19 1875/20
1875/20 1878/25 1880/8 1881/9
1882/9 1882/22 1884/15 1889/8
1889/14 1889/18 1889/21 1890/6
1890/10 1900/9 1903/6 1903/7 1903/9
1905/12 1905/14 1914/22 1914/25
1915/5 1949/8 1966/4 2020/9 2027/3
2027/10 2027/13 2027/20 2027/24
2028/20 2029/4 2029/5 2045/9
2045/25 2046/4 2048/16 2050/20
2059/1 2060/3 2068/23 2069/19
Sergeant Cameron [1] 1820/20
Sergeant Morris [1] 1875/19
Sergeant Salsbury [1] 2028/20
sergeants [1] 1964/12
series [5] 1872/24 1904/15 1929/18 1951/25 2029/24
serious [16] 1821/1 1828/8 1831/10
1835/6 1835/24 1864/11 1864/19
1898/25 1899/25 1901/3 1903/4
1903/10 1947/18 1967/3 2007/1
2045/21
seriously [5] 1819/11 1830/8 1879/8 1879/11 1946/24
serve [2] 1976/14 1980/17
served [2] 1976/15 1976/25
service [6] 1890/21 1913/12 1913/13
1933/23 1961/21 2065/6
services [1] 2013/25
session [2] 1957/10 2012/4
set [10] 1814/1 1825/5 1886/6 1913/9
1913/16 1914/12 1922/2 2073/8
2081/9 2089/18
setting [2] 1886/25 2006/24
settlement [3] 2080/5 2080/7 2087/15
settling [1] 2080/7
setup [2] 2072/23 2072/24
seven [9] 1841/10 1920/8 1920/9 1920/24 1943/16 1945/18 1950/21 1950/24 2043/24
seven-day [2] 1920/8 1920/24
several [9] 1877/5 1954/10 1986/12
2033/15 2033/16 2041/12 2044/15 2048/1 2057/2
severe [4] 1917/15 1918/5 1918/8 1933/3
severity [1] 1918/12
sexual [1] 1856/5
sexually [1] 1935/2
shall [1] 1946/21
shaped [1] 2095/7
share [8] 1836/24 1977/9 1980/19 1986/25 1991/10 1994/11 2038/19 2038/21
shared [3] 1836/22 1955/18 2030/17
sharing [2] 1979/17 2009/11
shaving [3] 1900/10 1900/17 1901/2
Shaw [1] 2075/4
she [57] 1824/8 1840/23 1840/25
1840/25 1841/6 1841/6 1844/12

1844/15 1844/16 1845/4 1854/4 1856/8 1892/9 1892/12 1892/12 1892/14 1893/20 1893/21 1893/21 1893/25 1894/3 1897/17 1916/6 1916/6 1918/6 1921/7 1921/8 1921/11 1928/12 1928/14 1928/14 1928/18 1928/18 1928/20 1928/25 1936/18 1948/22 1949/1 1949/5 1949/9 1949/20 1995/13 1997/18 2010/5 2010/7 2010/8 2010/14 2010/15 2010/18 2047/3 2047/6 2047/9 2083/24 2090/23 2090/24 2091/1 2092/13
she'Il [1] 2076/15
she's [3] 1844/25 1935/25 1962/25
shed [1] 1986/8
sheriff [1] 2037/3
sheriff's [6] 1812/9 1887/13 2015/14
2033/17 2034/14 2061/3
sheriffs [3] 2036/23 2044/12 2057/6
shift [8] 1817/20 1817/21 1876/18
1877/1 1877/9 1877/9 1948/7 2018/23
shifts [1] 1875/15
ship [1] 2095/10
shirt [1] 1819/24
shoes [2] 1819/25 1819/25
shooting [1] 1886/18
shop [1] 2017/18
short [2] 1851/1 2077/7
shortened [1] 2015/15
shortly [7] 1891/6 2022/3 2027/3
2028/19 2038/25 2045/18 2045/19
shorts [1] 1819/24
shot [1] 1953/24
should [65] 1820/13 1824/11 1834/20
1836/1 1836/4 1836/5 1836/19
1837/18 1837/19 1837/24 1838/1
1840/21 1840/23 1841/6 1848/4
1850/11 1854/23 1857/7 1858/19
1861/24 1862/1 1862/5 1862/6 1862/7
1862/11 1864/3 1866/25 1869/21
1886/7 1887/7 1889/22 1893/7 1902/1
1902/3 1902/17 1922/15 1924/5
1925/8 1928/7 1931/17 1984/21
1985/21 1986/16 1986/16 1991/21
1994/8 2000/1 2002/12 2002/14
2002/15 2004/18 2005/6 2007/23
2026/21 2033/1 2050/6 2050/13
2050/19 2078/12 2080/1 2081/20
2083/23 2084/20 2085/1 2092/13
shouldn't [4] 1837/1 1885/15 1919/19 2002/12
show [20] 1813/5 1819/20 1825/16 1858/13 1865/18 1903/18 1920/17 1935/19 1935/20 1956/8 1960/6 1960/23 1962/12 1962/16 1965/5 1967/8 1985/15 2046/16 2046/19 2051/13
showed [5] 1819/22 1868/3 1945/17 1945/18 2002/22
showing [7] 1853/13 1866/10 1924/4
1944/7 2009/24 2047/1 2058/21
shown [3] 1972/3 1972/7 2010/15
shows [5] 1862/16 1889/1 1943/1
1991/20 2080/25
shred [1] 2046/22
side [11] 1881/3 1881/3 1887/25
side... [8] 1893/17 1987/7 2022/18 2088/19 2090/6 2093/8 2093/13 2094/10
sides [2] 2087/22 2088/21
sign [6] 1921/9 1921/11 2026/13
2026/20 2026/21 2026/23
signature [11] 1921/3 1921/4 1921/5 1936/23 1936/25 1937/1 2026/15 2097/11 2097/11 2097/12 2097/15
signed [6] 1826/19 2058/6 2058/10 2058/24 2058/25 2097/12
significance [2] 1888/10 2008/6 significant [1] 1989/8
signing [1] 2097/8
similar [4] 1814/24 1888/18 1990/5 2015/17
simple [4] 1850/25 1858/20 2048/6 2048/15
simply [6] 1908/22 1922/2 1936/22 1971/24 1971/25 2022/17
simulates [1] 2030/3
since [13] 1847/2 1867/8 1883/21
1883/22 1886/8 1890/8 1891/2 1903/9
2013/8 2024/9 2039/3 2052/10 2057/5
sincere [1] 1918/16
sincerely [2] 2056/2 2056/3 singling [1] 1822/4
sir [89] 1811/13 1811/15 1824/15
1832/10 1841/18 1842/8 1842/10
1842/12 1852/13 1852/20 1853/3
1853/13 1854/2 1856/11 1857/16
1858/3 1860/15 1863/7 1864/8
1865/12 1868/15 1871/1 1873/18 1873/24 1874/3 1874/13 1896/11 1897/20 1907/25 1908/21 1975/6 1975/17 1995/7 1995/9 1995/11 1995/14 1995/17 1996/17 1996/24 1997/1 1997/4 1997/16 1997/20 1998/7 1998/12 1998/20 1998/24 1998/24 1999/4 1999/7 1999/11 1999/19 1999/21 1999/24 2000/4 2001/5 2002/2 2002/4 2002/10 2002/14 2002/21 2002/25 2003/5 2003/6 2003/15 2003/18 2003/20 2004/1 2004/6 2006/4 2006/11 2006/19 2007/9 2007/11 2007/21 2008/1 2008/8 2008/22 2008/25 2010/1 2010/6 2010/25 2011/5 2011/14 2012/7 2012/9 2012/15 2025/13 2063/8
sit [8] 1936/14 1940/6 1952/14 1973/22 1974/7 2030/16 2031/4 2031/7
sitting [13] 1832/17 1850/14 1867/2 1872/14 1876/13 1899/21 1916/7 1922/8 1936/18 2065/23 2089/11 2093/13 2093/15
situation [18] 1847/19 1881/20 1887/24 1903/11 1903/13 1906/9 1916/18 1918/9 1933/10 1933/18 1939/14 1940/24 1949/10 1992/7 2001/22 2005/12 2041/17 2068/10 situations [5] 1914/8 1918/7 1936/11 1938/18 1953/3
six [15] 1825/20 1832/25 1841/10 1866/4 1938/18 1949/15 2017/20

2019/8 2019/23 2041/19 2043/24
2051/11 2051/21 2052/5 2052/9
skip [7] 1904/6 1907/16 1917/12
1917/25 1925/20 1973/2 1974/15
skipped [2] 1920/2 1974/21
skipping [7] 1917/18 1918/7 1918/14
1919/2 1919/6 1967/4 1972/24
sleep [1] 1877/23
sleeping [1] 1878/14
slide [1] 2012/23
slightly [2] 1889/2 1908/5
slipping [1] 2094/1
slow [4] 1900/19 1900/22 1998/7 2014/10
slower [1] 1905/20
slowly [1] 2064/10
small [5] 1818/13 1904/20 1998/7 2018/15 2070/21
Smith [9] 1950/7 1950/9 1982/8 2081/10 2081/11 2081/15 2081/17 2081/22 2089/19
smoking [2] 1877/24 1878/15 so [323]
sole [1] 2035/9
solely [2] 1982/24 2018/13
soliciting [1] 1979/18
solo [8] 1821/13 2016/20 2018/13 2019/11 2019/15 2049/12 2049/17 2049/18
some [118] 1813/2 1814/8 1818/1
1819/3 1819/6 1819/7 1819/8 1819/25 1820/4 1821/14 1821/14 1821/15 1821/21 1822/25 1824/22 1827/4 1827/8 1830/6 1830/9 1830/20 1846/6 1850/19 1851/18 1860/12 1860/25 1862/4 1862/21 1863/15 1863/19 1867/17 1869/1 1875/2 1877/22 1880/12 1882/25 1884/17 1888/10 1890/9 1896/2 1897/2 1897/3 1898/6 1899/25 1908/13 1914/18 1915/20 1918/3 1920/3 1930/23 1933/7 1935/20 1947/2 1948/7 1948/17 1958/5 1958/24 1963/23 1964/13 1974/15 1977/12 1977/21 1979/11 1979/21 1985/1 1985/19 1988/14 1989/15 1996/9 1997/11 1997/13 2001/2 2001/2 2001/10 2001/10 2004/21 2005/7 2008/2 2013/21 2014/7 2014/20 2017/7 2017/11 2017/11 2017/12 2017/13 2017/17 2018/8 2023/5 2023/6 2030/16 2031/15 2034/15 2035/19 2044/13 2048/10 2048/11 2050/17 2051/1 2051/24 2058/9 2058/15 2059/15 2066/16 2066/17 2067/7 2067/12 2068/24 2071/23 2075/21 2082/20 2085/24 2089/9 2093/4 2094/3 2094/10 2094/16 2095/7 2095/11 somebody [35] 1827/15 1828/1 1835/6 1836/6 1837/3 1859/6 1860/25 1861/1 1862/1 1862/2 1862/11 1864/1 1864/3 1866/20 1867/13 1869/3 1869/21 1878/13 1878/13 1878/19 1995/2 1999/9 2001/23 2007/2 2007/5 2007/11 2026/14 2026/22 2032/23 2037/14 2040/17 2043/2 2061/15 2077/25 2084/2
somebody's [2] 1898/24 2007/1 somehow [1] 1968/7
someone [12] 1834/1 1837/17 1918/11 1925/10 1929/21 1935/1 1935/6 1935/14 1941/6 2049/25 2050/16 2054/17
someone's [2] 1934/12 1934/18 something [55] 1821/22 1824/6 1831/12 1832/6 1832/23 1833/24 1844/1 1851/7 1861/20 1862/16 1863/8 1865/20 1867/14 1885/1 1886/10 1886/21 1888/18 1889/3 1901/9 1901/12 1901/13 1906/14 1906/15 1906/16 1914/4 1923/4 1923/22 1929/16 1930/11 1942/19 1968/19 1972/10 1980/18 1985/19 1986/17 1990/4 1993/7 1996/2 2005/16 2008/7 2023/1 2023/1 2024/20 2024/23 2025/9 2035/18 2037/9 2041/13 2041/14 2046/6 2046/25 2050/14 2069/16 2073/9 2082/11
sometime [6] 1868/7 1868/9 2009/9 2051/11 2056/9 2060/3
sometimes [18] 1901/9 1901/12 1919/10 1919/10 1932/15 2002/2 2005/14 2016/21 2018/20 2030/8 2030/11 2031/4 2031/7 2031/10 2034/10 2038/1 2041/6 2094/1
somewhat [2] 2092/11 2094/4
soon [1] 1988/24
sooner [1] 1920/9
sorry [41] 1822/20 1824/25 1840/1 1853/16 1853/17 1858/12 1858/13 1863/1 1868/18 1871/2 1896/23 1899/16 1900/13 1900/19 1900/21 1921/2 1924/6 1925/23 1926/18 1933/21 1934/3 1943/18 1951/17 1951/17 1983/23 1994/21 2010/19 2011/13 2012/24 2029/12 2053/18 2063/13 2066/19 2071/11 2071/20 2074/19 2075/8 2086/16 2087/17 2088/4 2094/8
sort [25] 1813/18 1818/22 1819/25 1846/6 1846/16 1847/18 1849/23 1851/4 1862/14 1869/18 1871/17 1908/20 1912/23 1920/3 1977/20 1979/16 1979/24 1993/15 1993/21 1993/23 1993/24 1994/8 2000/18 2058/17 2067/19
sound [1] 2003/8
sounds [3] 2029/17 2029/19 2053/7 source [1] 1955/23
Southwest [2] 2078/11 2078/12
space [2] 1853/17 1906/25
speak [12] 1851/11 1863/6 1863/16 1868/23 1879/2 1886/12 1887/18 1969/21 1979/12 2027/10 2075/6 2075/13
speaking [7] 1868/15 1872/3 1872/9 1886/23 1935/14 1935/15 2006/20
specialized [1] 1822/1
specific [39] 1828/23 1830/10 1830/13 1831/16 1832/10 1833/7 1839/20 1850/18 1856/23 1869/5 1869/9 1872/7 1873/14 1897/25 1898/2 1900/2 1904/19 1906/4 1907/14
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline S & 189 & 1957/20 1980/10 1999/20 2000/20 \\
\hline specific... [20] 1908/24 1914/21 & 1976/24 19 & 2000/21 200 \\
\hline 1923/3 1940/13 1964/10 1964/16 & 1999/13 2013/12 2014/3 20 & \[
202
\] \\
\hline 1965/13 1965/23 1970/21 1985/2 & & 2046/3 2088/6 \\
\hline 1995/11 2040/9 2041/5 2045/4 & starting [3] 1846/24 1980/8 2075 & \begin{tabular}{l}
stolen [3] 1905/24 1906/12 1907/6 \\
stood [1] 1909/20
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
2084
\] & starts [2] 1938/2 1938 & stop [23] 1814/23 \\
\hline specifically [15] 1819/5 1824/2 & state [29] & 17191 \\
\hline 1830/22 1830/23 1838/2 1846/18 & 18 & 984/13 \\
\hline 1867/25 1870/5 1872/9 1884/3 & 1842/12 1870/25 1874/14 1910/ & 2045/4 2045/6 204 \\
\hline 1914/21 1926/24 2016/12 2082/7 & 1975/18 1976/5 1976/8 19 & 045/24 2046/12 \\
\hline 2082/8 & 1988/18 1979/5 1979/13 1980/13 & 2049/6 2063/23 2094/ \\
\hline specifics [20] 1827/22 1828/13 & 1980/16 1983/8 1995/5 201 & stop-and-frisk [1] \\
\hline 1828/16 1828/17 1828/19 1829/9 & 20 & [2] 1954/7 \\
\hline 1829/22 1831/5 1832/15 1832/17 & & stops [9] 1908/19 1966/13 1966/15 \\
\hline 1835/5 1836/21 1837/11 1838/9 & te's [2] 1977/12 1984/18 &  \\
\hline 1856/19 1925/12 1929/2 1933/18 & \[
\text { stated [4] 1830/23 1955/17 } 195
\] & stored [1] 2069/19 \\
\hline & 19 & straight [2] 1967/5 2 \\
\hline  & statement [5] & straightforward [1] 1847 \\
\hline speculation [3] 2054/5 & 2 & strange [1] 18 \\
\hline & st & gy [1] 2080/5 \\
\hline speech [6] 1885/19 1885 & & \\
\hline 1887/18 1901/15 1901/25 & 2006/22 & ets [2] 1815/11 \\
\hline sp & \[
\mathbf{s t}
\] & th [2] \\
\hline spell [6] 1811/15 1874/15 1975/19 2012/20 2064/10 & stating [2] 1959/20 2084 & [2] 1930/17 1992/2 \\
\hline Spencer [15] & & d \\
\hline 1 & stationary [1] & ken [1] 2 \\
\hline 1898/6 1898/8 1940/17 1940/20 & statistics [1] 2036/15 status [5] 1990/22 2021/6 2049/17 & \begin{tabular}{l}
strictly [2] 1815/6 2059/22 \\
strike [5] 2021/11 2022/17 2092/5
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1940/23 1941/11 1948/4 1949/19 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { status [5] 1990/22 2021/6 2049/1 } \\
& \text { 2053/4 2061/11 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { strike [5] 2021/11 2022/17 2092/5 } \\
& \text { 2092/7 2093/10 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & statute [4] 1814/23 1816/24 1826 & string [1] 2075 \\
\hline & 2025/2 & striving [1] 2018 \\
\hline 1967/17 1969 & Statutes & student [4] 1886/3 1886/3 1886 \\
\hline spoken [3] 1868/13 1872/7 1887/23 & statutorily [2] & 2064/23 \\
\hline sporting [1] & \begin{tabular}{l}
stay [2] 2027/18 2080/2 \\
staying [3] 1896/4 2087/7 2087
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { students [5] } 181 \\
1878 / 151961 / 20
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { spring [4] } \\
& \text { 2054/12 }
\end{aligned}
\] & steak [1] 2007/14 & stuff [10] 1871/20 1896/4 1898 \\
\hline & steal [2] & /9 1960/12 19 \\
\hline staff [21] 1852/2 186 & & 2055/14 2057/14 2057/24 \\
\hline 1869/19 1915/9 1931/25 1933/22 & stemming [1] & style [3] 1844/24 1 \\
\hline 1939/5 1939/10 1939/24 1940/15 & stenographic & subgroup [1] \\
\hline 1941/7 1989/16 2030/9 2039/16 & st & \\
\hline 2054/13 2054/14 2054/17 2058/9 & & 1979/15 1986/18 2061/21 \\
\hline 2058/10 2062/17 & 1 & subjectively [1] \\
\hline fing [2] 1955/20 & 1 & submission [7] 1822/12 1824/5 \\
\hline stalking [2] 1826/9 1948/23 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1920/23 1925/20 1929/9 1929/13 \\
1929/13 1929/13 1929/16 1929/24
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1824/9 1851/13 1851/17 } 1851 \\
& \text { 1981/16 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline stance [1] 2091/18 & 1930/3 1930/3 1930/7 1933/4 & submit [7] 1823/13 1824/12 183 \\
\hline stand [8] 1839/18 1888/17 1930/1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1930 / 31930 / 31930 / 71933 / 419: \\
& 1933 / 71933 / 81972 / 241974 / 15
\end{aligned}
\] & 1862/5 1862/7 1863/4 1988/14 \\
\hline 1975/13 1991/24 1992/2 2035/11 & 1974/21 1975/6 2011/14 2012/7 & submitted [8] \\
\hline & 20 & 6 1988/11 1993/11 2059/20 \\
\hline 2015/18 2043/9 & stepping & 2059/22 \\
\hline standardized [1] & steps [9] 1912/22 191 & submitting [4] 1823/24 1850/2 \\
\hline standards [11] 1812/10 1812/13 & 1929/18 1930/4 1938/21 1958/5 1973/2 1989/13 &  \\
\hline 1812/18 1869/17 1951/5 1951/7 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1973/2 1989/13 \\
stern [1] 1890/1
\end{tabular} & subordinate [3] 1845/10 1845/18
1852/5 \\
\hline 1978/19 2019/7 2033/6 2036/18 2036/19 & steward [14] 1922/10 2065/8 2065/9 & subpoena [1] 2064/1 \\
\hline  & 2065/12 2066/7 2066/17 206 & subpoenaed [1] 1997/12 \\
\hline ands [2] 198 & 2067/15 2067/16 2067/24 2068/ & subsequent [3] 1868/7 1977/1 \\
\hline start [11] 1843/17 1861/14 1868/8 & 2068/16 2073 & 1977/23 \\
\hline 1874/24 1943/19 1957/3 1964/3 & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1979/12 1979/25 2018/4 2082/10 \\
started [31] 1812/7 1821/6 1824/22
\end{tabular} & still [25] 1818/9 18 & succeed [2] 1882/23 2073/1 \\
\hline 1844/16 1856/10 1861/15 1863/6 & 8/1 1836/21 1840/18 1846/25 & successful [1] 193 \\
\hline 1864/2 1874/25 1878/5 1883/22 & 1858/16 1858/17 1885/1 1895/1 & such [6] 1871/11 1871/12 1871/13 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
such... [3] 1872/6 2003/24 2011/2 suddenly [1] 1878/20
suffering [1] 1992/16
sufficient [6] 1820/5 1846/14 1857/7
1925/20 1958/2 2094/22
sufficiently [1] 1967/4
suggest [1] 1916/1
suggested [1] 1985/17
suggesting [3] 1835/8 1835/9 2007/22
suggestion [1] 2090/15
suggests [1] 1873/5
suit [4] 1819/22 1824/24 1825/1
1825/11
Suite [2] 1808/5 1808/9
summarized [2] 1866/20 2042/18
summarizes [1] 1982/9
summarizing [1] 2040/20
summary [6] 1982/3 2005/19 2042/11
2042/13 2044/1 2044/23
summation [1] 1946/13
summer [4] 1976/12 1976/16 1976/20 1976/21
superiors [1] 1965/2
supervise [2] 1818/5 2019/17
supervised [6] 1818/9 1818/25
1835/20 1846/2 1915/4 1990/18
supervising [2] 1875/21 1903/14
supervision [2] 1890/13 2019/5
supervisor [20] 1818/20 1818/22
1820/17 1843/19 1844/12 1844/13 1844/15 1847/17 1875/13 1875/14 1875/25 1878/22 1882/20 1912/13 1914/5 1927/25 1932/18 2020/2 2020/5 2020/6
supervisors [10] 1820/21 1901/4 1911/22 1924/18 1932/17 1937/24 1942/22 1973/20 2004/13 2019/19 supervisory [4] 1844/24 1890/10 1915/3 2013/21
support [3] 1922/2 2016/22 2017/3
supported [3] 1915/15 2002/23 2056/6
suppose [3] 1826/6 1826/16 1827/18 supposed [8] 1830/1 1830/2 1858/9
1858/10 1940/4 1951/14 1957/23 2021/3
suppressed [1] 1984/2
Supreme [1] \(1977 / 4\)
sure [43] 1825/7 1841/2 1848/3
1848/3 1858/15 1862/3 1862/15
1863/21 1866/14 1866/20 1866/25
1867/19 1868/11 1873/5 1876/20
1897/4 1897/8 1897/10 1898/18
1908/2 1913/25 1932/1 1932/6
1940/13 1956/24 1957/22 1972/22
1988/2 1999/22 1999/25 2001/11
2003/13 2005/5 2006/4 2010/18
2014/12 2029/18 2049/2 2056/12
2057/3 2057/12 2071/2 2076/24
surface [1] 1981/1
surfaced [1] 1981/11
surprise [2] 2083/5 2088/1
surprised [1] 1887/22
surrounding [1] 2043/10
surveillance [1] 2043/8
survive [1] 2001/18
suspect [2] 1836/7 1840/25 suspected [1] 1829/6 suspended [5] 2048/12 2048/12 2048/13 2048/14 2048/19
suspension [3] 1920/24 1950/3 2083/20
suspicion [1] 1824/4
sustained [11] 1830/4 1848/19
1918/18 2041/6 2041/6 2041/9
2041/11 2093/4 2093/6 2093/9 2093/20
SW [2] 1808/4 1808/21
sweeping [1] 2088/1
switched [1] 1858/11
sworn [9] 1811/7 1811/11 1842/3 1874/9 1910/12 1927/12 1975/11 2012/13 2064/3
system [8] 1913/14 1930/4 1932/9 1973/11 1984/9 1984/11 2002/9 2004/20
T
T-shirt [1] 1819/24
table [1] 2065/20
tabulate [1] 2039/15
tactical [1] 2025/24
Tactics [2] 1965/6 1965/12
tag [1] 1946/10
tags [1] 1826/17
taint [1] 1860/19
take [51] 1821/1 1821/2 1821/20 1830/7 1842/21 1851/19 1852/10 1853/20 1859/9 1861/11 1863/4 1865/8 1865/12 1866/17 1879/10 1891/17 1901/12 1903/22 1905/1 1907/20 1917/10 1923/18 1926/17 1926/25 1938/10 1942/13 1956/21 1970/4 1974/3 1989/12 1997/23 2011/18 2011/25 2014/7 2021/25 2022/9 2029/22 2029/25 2030/2 2032/15 2037/4 2070/15 2077/7 2077/17 2079/3 2079/4 2084/24 2085/24 2087/10 2089/6 2095/12 taken [11] 1859/13 1866/16 1915/18 1920/23 1921/16 1922/16 1947/22 1957/8 2012/1 2079/7 2097/9 takes [3] 1895/23 1926/20 2050/17 taking [11] 1819/11 1820/5 1820/10 1879/7 1881/16 1884/1 1884/4 1884/10 2031/17 2032/9 2034/21 talk [46] 1828/5 1845/1 1847/21 1860/16 1867/8 1881/21 1882/15 1883/23 1888/13 1888/17 1897/25 1934/7 1935/1 1935/18 1937/4 1938/17 1940/19 1943/13 1946/20 1946/20 1948/9 1949/22 1950/24 1954/2 1954/19 1957/2 1958/16 1958/24 1979/25 1980/4 1981/3 1986/12 2008/2 2014/10 2021/23 2033/13 2036/5 2042/6 2052/5 2055/14 2059/19 2059/21 2060/1 2060/9 2078/17 2087/14
talked [31] 1817/17 1829/15 1860/7 1860/10 1864/21 1894/16 1894/18 1895/4 1897/14 1899/25 1900/5 1902/25 1947/6 1952/21 1953/4 1956/10 1956/11 1957/3 1958/10

1962/21 2009/8 2016/10 2035/14 2038/9 2039/11 2044/4 2045/3 2054/10 2057/17 2059/24 2083/19 talking [32] 1823/17 1833/16 1835/25 1857/17 1858/4 1883/19 1898/24 1902/23 1913/8 1929/15 1929/16 1937/16 1940/14 1941/23 1948/6 1953/8 1954/12 1959/1 1984/14 1988/8 2003/23 2005/10 2031/17 2034/10 2037/25 2057/1 2057/13 2069/5 2072/2 2072/14 2084/14 2086/3
talks [2] 1870/17 1951/6
target [1] 1879/19
target-rich [1] 1879/19
Taser [4] 1885/16 1886/21 1887/18 1887/23
Tasers [8] 1886/8 1887/3 1887/3 1887/6 1901/16 1901/18 1901/25 1902/7
task [3] 1971/23 1971/24 2030/3 tasked [1] 1833/24
taught [6] 1813/1 1813/1 1813/2 1813/2 1817/8 1849/15
taxpayers [2] 2078/14 2078/15 teach [5] 1812/23 1812/25 1813/3 1813/6 1908/19
team [1] 2003/2
Technology [1] 1997/15
tell [71] 1812/2 1812/12 1813/22
1819/13 1820/8 1821/16 1830/21
1831/14 1835/20 1835/22 1837/9
1837/9 1838/1 1843/12 1850/23
1853/17 1865/1 1865/3 1874/22
1881/11 1881/23 1882/12 1883/14 1885/22 1890/15 1892/4 1892/4 1893/4 1895/18 1900/8 1904/23 1911/3 1913/11 1943/1 1948/19 1948/22 1948/24 1949/1 1949/3 1949/5 1949/6 1949/8 1949/11 1960/24 1976/3 1976/8 1982/2 1996/10 1996/12 2001/23 2013/3 2015/1 2027/2 2027/13 2027/14 2027/20 2039/18 2045/5 2050/21 2051/9 2051/20 2064/20 2065/11 2066/15 2067/5 2072/4 2072/9 2074/7 2076/17 2082/13 2090/3
telling [9] 1873/3 1884/25 1890/13
1909/9 1999/2 2044/18 2069/18
2069/25 2073/24
temp [1] 2018/18
Templeton [1] 2063/1
tend [10] 1878/17 1879/17 1977/11
1977/12 1977/13 1978/4 1983/14
1983/16 1993/25 2095/13
tended [1] 1985/15
tends [2] 1980/18 2080/6
tentative [1] 2090/13
tentatively [3] 2084/21 2085/18 2094/13
tenure [1] 1882/25
term [3] 1934/8 1976/13 1976/14
termed [1] 1919/15
terminate [10] 1917/1 1922/23 1941/9
1942/5 1946/21 1949/14 1953/7
1958/2 2000/17 2073/3
terminated [39] 1839/7 1840/16
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline T & 1927/6 1930/19 1945/8 1946/12 & 2026/22 2030/1 2030/6 2030/ \\
\hline terminated... [37] 1930/2 1933/16 & 1946/17 1973/12 1975/2 1981/23 & 2030/20 2031/16 2032/20 2032/25 \\
\hline 1947/19 1947/22 1947/24 1952/11 & 1992/3 1994/13 1998/4 2009/17 & 2033/3 2033/7 2033/8 2033/9 2033 \\
\hline 1955/5 1962/8 1964/20 1966/13 & 2011/6 2011/14 2012/7 2012/15 & 2034/22 2037/8 2037/19 2038/8 \\
\hline 1973/3 1992/10 2000/13 2000/19 & 2013/3 2014/10 2025/15 2026/2 & 2042/4 2045/20 2050/25 2059/10 \\
\hline 2001/8 2045/10 2045/19 2046/1 & 2040/2 2052/13 2062/13 2063/8 & 2067/15 2067/16 \\
\hline 2046/3 2047/12 2047/16 2047/22 & 207/15 2063/18 2064/5 2071/1 & 2077/25 2084/8 2085/25 2089/22 \\
\hline 2049/2 2050/22 2051/10 2051/12 & 2071/8 2074/3 2096/6 & 2092 \\
\hline 2051/22 2051/22 2053/13 2053/17 & Thanks [3] 1873/20 201 & then-chief [ \\
\hline 2053/21 2053/24 2054/2 2054/12 & & District [1] 1872/4 \\
\hline 2060/5 2060/10 2060/11 & [1] & 247] \\
\hline terminating [3] 1955/3 1957/18 & that's [221] & [74] \\
\hline 1966/19 & & 1827/23 1847/18 1848/4 1852/2 \\
\hline termination [48] 1840/14 1845/21 & 1933/11 1933/2 & 1862/5 \\
\hline 1846/9 1846/10 1846/17 1854/22 & their [62] 1817/9 1819/17 1828/2 &  \\
\hline 1855/8 1856/12 1911/24 1917/8 & & 25 \\
\hline 1918/1 1918/15 1918/16 1918/21 & 1/25 & 1904/9 1904/20 1906/6 1906/14 \\
\hline 1919/1 1919/3 1919/7 1919/19 1920/4 & 22 & 1907/18 1907/23 1913/5 1918/2 \\
\hline 1922/23 1925/20 1926/18 1927/2 & 1899/9 1906/10 1907/20 1908/20 & 1918/8 1918/10 1920/8 1920/15 \\
\hline 1929/25 1930/7 1934/14 1934/18 & 1909/20 1920/7 1927/25 1931/5 & 1925/8 1926/19 1932/8 1932/11 \\
\hline 1947/3 1949/22 1951/4 1959/3 1961/6 & 193/2 1935/15 1977/16 1980/16 & 1936/12 1938/2 1945/18 1971/18 \\
\hline 1962/2 1963/5 1966/8 1967/5 1969/19 & 1991/5 1999/2 2018/21 2020/5 2020/6 & 1974/17 1977/13 1996/9 2004/22 \\
\hline 1970/19 1971/5 1971/9 1972/22 & 2026/13 2026/15 2026/18 2026/20 & 2010/11 2018/5 2018/10 2019/23 \\
\hline 1972/24 1974/5 1974/16 1974/22 & 2026/20 2026/21 2026/23 2030/22 & 2022/25 2024/15 2030/16 2033/4 \\
\hline 1991/6 2054/18 2082/22 & 2030/23 2031/4 2031/16 2033/4 & 2034/1 2034/15 2035/5 2035/13 \\
\hline terminations [1] 1973/1 & 2034/10 2035/21 2036/16 2036/21 & 2036/15 2038/1 2038/4 2038/8 20 \\
\hline terms [1] 1992/9 & 2044/13 2049/18 2050/7 2059/10 & 2041/11 2041/12 2041/16 2043/10 \\
\hline test [12] 1819/16 18 & 2059/11 2059/13 2060/19 2071/13 & 2044/5 2044/16 2059/7 2062/19 \\
\hline 1825/2 1825/9 2029/23 2029/25 & 2071/16 2071/24 2076/16 2077/5 & 2071/17 2080/5 2082/11 2089/9 \\
\hline 2030/3 2030/6 2031/17 2039/9 & 2091/11 2095/25 & 2093/24 2094/9 \\
\hline 2062/15 & them [83] 1817/23 1820/21 1834/1 & therefore [1] 2034/19 \\
\hline tested [1] 2033/4 & 1835/3 1835 & these [46] 1821/3 1849/2 1863/1 \\
\hline testified [30] 1811/11 1830/16 1842/3 & 1851/10 1859/11 1860/23 1865/12 & 1863/13 1872/4 1887/6 1897/17 \\
\hline 1874/9 1899/4 1899/5 1899/8 1900/2 & 9/4 1872/25 1876/25 1877/24 & 1900/11 1900/17 1901/2 1903/16 \\
\hline 1900/2 1909/12 1909/19 1909/21 & 1878/17 1878/20 1879/19 1880/1 & 1910/3 1913/8 1923/21 1924/10 \\
\hline 1910/12 1940/22 1940/25 1942/6 & 1881/17 1881/18 1884/5 1886/17 & 1936/10 1938/10 1938/13 1938/15 \\
\hline 1942/12 1942/21 1952/15 1954/14 & 1886/21 1887/5 1890/15 1899/9 & 1939/7 1939/10 1941/20 1942/1 \\
\hline 1973/17 1973/20 1973/21 1975/11 & 1901/24 1903/17 1904/9 1904/15 & 1943/13 1944/18 1945/5 1951/25 \\
\hline 2012/13 2023/9 20 & 1906/9 1906/10 1906/10 1906/11 & 1952/10 1952/16 1952/20 1952/24 \\
\hline 2094/20 2094/22 & 1909/21 1924/12 1934/17 1935/21 & 1953/5 1953/25 1955/3 1955/13 \\
\hline testifies [1] 1900 & 1936/1 1938/19 1944/9 1948/18 & 1963/2 1966/3 1969/6 1974/7 1974/20 \\
\hline testify [16] 1 & 1952/13 1956/10 1965/21 1974/4 & 1987/22 1995/25 2005/2 2008/20 \\
\hline 1860/23 1897/5 1899/3 1901/7 1931/7 & 1974/18 1991/16 1999/17 2000/21 & 2030/25 2047/7 \\
\hline  & 2003/19 2004/16 2006/23 2008/17 & they [234] \\
\hline 2034/22 2038/5 2038/7 & 2008/21 2008/24 2015/21 2017/8 & They'll [2] 2032/24 2037/13 \\
\hline & 2026/15 2032/20 2035/1 2035/23 & they're [40] 1817/25 1837/16 1837/17 \\
\hline 180/12 2034/19 2076/2 & 2037/6 2042/8 2043/15 2044/3 2044/9 & 1881/4 1882/4 1902/7 1906/7 1929/19 \\
\hline testimony [20] 1822/11 1840/19 & 2051/5 2051/6 2055/12 2058/17 & 1929/19 1929/20 1935/2 1943/7 \\
\hline 1897/16 1927/12 1932/23 1969/14 & 2059/12 2066/21 2067/3 2071/15 & 1945/6 1945/22 1945/23 1986/20 \\
\hline 1974/20 1994/1 2021/11 2022/17 & 2071/24 2077/14 2078/13 2080/3 & 1986/20 1999/10 2000/21 2000/22 \\
\hline 2023/11 2023/23 2035/11 2047/10 & 2082/1 2086/12 2086/12 & 2002/2 2006/10 2008/13 2016/2 \\
\hline 2049/21 2053/6 2066/12 2066/17 & themselves [3] 2018/14 2018/16 & 2016/20 2018/11 \\
\hline 2066/18 2093/5 & 2019/5 & 2032/21 2033/5 2038/5 2046/10 \\
\hline testing [4] 1819 & then [85] 1826/21 1843/18 1843/19 & 2059/10 2067/8 2071/13 2077/6 \\
\hline 2029/18 & 1844/21 1848/6 1848/15 1864/3 & 2077/13 2081/25 2082/25 2091/2 \\
\hline than [17] & 1864/4 1864/6 1865/10 1865/20 & they've [9] 1882/15 1899/9 1935/6 \\
\hline 1883/23 1895/24 1901/13 1920/9 & 1869/11 1869/11 1872/4 1875/18 & 1940/8 1960/6 1960/6 1973/3 2001/8 \\
\hline 1931/20 1951/6 1989/1 1989/4 2004/9 & 1875/20 1878/2 1885/2 1887/23 & 2006/7 \\
\hline 2053/17 2053/22 2068/7 2077/3 & 1894/16 1894/19 1907/13 1911/16 & thick [1] 1903/21 \\
\hline 2077/22 & 1918/3 1919/8 1919/15 1926/20 & thing [27] 1845/5 1851/14 1861/18 \\
\hline thank [59] 1811/13 1824/15 1838/14 & 1933/16 1934/13 1951/3 1973/1 & 1865/16 1871/11 1888/16 1897/12 \\
\hline 1839/23 1841/14 1841/18 1841/21 & 1974/4 1974/8 1976/13 1976/14 & 1897/21 1908/20 1912/23 1947/24 \\
\hline 1842/5 1842/10 1842/15 1852/13 & 1986/9 1986/11 1986/23 2001/17 & 1948/3 1980/5 1984/7 1987/11 \\
\hline 1852/14 1854/12 1859/16 1859/17 & 2001/23 2007/16 2013/13 2013/14 & 2026/19 2037/23 2038/9 2045/20 \\
\hline 1873/17 1873/24 1874/3 1891/15 & 2013/16 2014/2 2014/16 2015/13 & 2077/1 2079/18 2079/20 2080/1 \\
\hline 1892/2 1896/11 1904/1 1910/2 1910/6 & 2015/20 2018/12 2020/9 2022/11 & 2082/5 2086/11 2089/21 2092/21 \\
\hline 1910/16 1924/7 1924/16 1927/4 & 2022/20 2023/22 2025/4 2026/16 & things [55] 1818/2 1821/14 1824/22 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline U & 1885/22 1886/22 1888/9 1889/4 & 2043/8 2043/8 2043/10 2043/13 \\
\hline university... [7] 2061/16 2064/21 & 1892/4 1892/4 1893/4 1911/3 1911 & 2061/22 2069/6 2069/8 2069 \\
\hline 2064/22 2064/25 2067/25 2068/5 & & 2068/2 \\
\hline 2081/3 & 1950/11 1960/24 1976/3 197 & view [19] 1889/2 1890/16 \\
\hline university-owned [1] 1890/19 & 1976/17 1980/11 1997/10 2005/3 &  \\
\hline University-wide [1] 1932/13 & 2017/20 2018/9 2021/24 & 1940/17 1940/20 1940/23 1941/11 \\
\hline unprofessional [1] 1861/2 & 2044/7 2045/21 2046/2 2064/20 & 1948/4 1949/19 2030/9 \\
\hline unsafe [2] 1940/20 2069/17 & 2065/11 & violated [8] 1865/4 1865/4 1954/11 \\
\hline unsolicited [1] 1981/7 & us & 1954/21 1955/4 1966/9 1978/8 \\
\hline until [12] 1836/13 1868/8 1927/20 & 1924/23 1951/10 2015/16 2033/7 & violates \\
\hline 1950/4 1962/16 1963/21 1976/15 & 2034/12 2037/18 & violation [1] 1972/16 \\
\hline 2054/25 & use-of-force [1] 1813/3 & violations [1] 1815/2 \\
\hline unto [1] 1856/25 & used [7] 1819/16 1902/6 1902/9 & violence [2] 1940/25 1941/3 \\
\hline untrue [2] 2040/14 2040/17 & uses [1] 2015/18 & \[
\begin{gathered}
1851 / 3 \\
1941 / 3
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline untruthful [11] 1848/5 1862/17 1984/2 & using [1] 2044/3 & vision [1] 2033/5 \\
\hline 1992/8 2033/22 2033/25 2035/2 & usually [6] 1888/10 1893/2 1930/15 & voice [2] 1847/15 1965/16 \\
\hline untruthfulness [10] 1838/2 1839/11 & 1933/7 2016/1 2095/3 & volume [1] 2068/10 \\
\hline 1850/19 1856/23 1856/25 1992/11 & V & 4 2046 \\
\hline unusually [2] 2068/4 2068/8 & vague [1] 1933/15 & volunteered [1] 1990/19 \\
\hline unwelcome [1] 2087/25 & Vaguely [1] 1926/22 & volunteers [1] 2044/7 \\
\hline UO [1] 2080/24 & validity [1] 1971/11 & VPSD [1] 2033/4 \\
\hline UOPD [9] 1811/23 1842/20 1866/22 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\mathbf{v a} \\
20
\end{array}
\] & W \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1866/23 1867/4 1872/10 1925/10 } \\
& 1955 / 22 \text { 2011/4 }
\end{aligned}
\] & Van [1] 1893/21 & W-A-D-E [1] 1875/20 \\
\hline up [105] 1814/6 1814/7 1814/10 & Van-Huyser [1] & Wade [1] 1875/ \\
\hline 1819/9 1819/20 1819/22 1825/5 & vandalize [1] 18 & wait [5] 1831/23 1831/23 1841 \\
\hline 1825/16 1827/11 1839/20 1848/15 & varies [2] 1813/25 1919/ & waiting [1] \\
\hline 1849/24 1850/7 1851/10 1853/9 & variety [3] 1976/25 1978/23 2013/25 & waive [1] 2077/12 \\
\hline 5/9 1857/19 1858/20 1859/3 & various [3] 1852/4 1871/6 1924/25 & walk [1] 1880/21 \\
\hline 1866/5 1878/1 1882/6 1884/12 1886/6 & vast [1] 1845/23 & walked [1] 2080/21 \\
\hline 1886/18 1887/20 1889/1 1893/7 & vehicle [4] 1827/21 1827/24 1828/2 & wall [6] 1842/7 1874/12 1910/15 \\
\hline 1893/13 1895/5 1896/3 1900/1 & &  \\
\hline 1900/10 1900/11 1900/16 1900/17 & veracity [9] 1848/5 1850/4 1857/5 & wander [1] 1879/16 \\
\hline 1901/1 1901/2 1901/7 1902/17
1902/20 1909/20 1911/23 1920/23 & 1862/17 1868/17 1868/18 1868/22 & want [93] 1822/17 1838/19 1841/1 \\
\hline 1902/20 1909/20 1911/23 1920/23 & 1869/6 2003/21 & 1841/2 1847/21 1853/23 1860/19 \\
\hline 1923/21 1925/9 1930/17 1932/4 & verbal [3] 1959/24 1962/2 1963/6 & 1862/14 1864/11 1885/2 1887/3 \\
\hline 1935/14 1937/16 1940/24 1945/8
1951/9 1951/20 1952/2 1952/3 1952/4 & verbatim [2] 1873/1 1873/14 & 1888/16 1898/23 1901/18 1905/17 \\
\hline 1951/9 1951/20 1952/2 1952/3 1952/4 & versa [1] 1851/5 & 1907/20 1925/18 1936/18 1938/13 \\
\hline 1952/23 1955/8 1957/20 1959/4 & version [8] 1870/21 1870/22 1870/23 & 1957/22 1966/7 1979/8 1981/9 1985 \\
\hline 1961/10 1967/8 1968/5 1968/5 1969/6 & 1871/4 1982/20 2009/10 2009/24 & 1986/9 1987/15 1991/7 1991/9 1993/5 \\
\hline 1969/16 1970/4 1981/1 1984/20 & 2015/15 & 1993/23 1996/8 1998/13 1998 \\
\hline 1992/2 1992/7 1995/17 1997/12 & & 1999/14 1999 \\
\hline 1998/8 2005/21 2013/17 2014/8 & very [54] 1814/24 1818/13 1835/6 & 2011/18 2011/19 2017/24 2021/25 \\
\hline 2023/12 2025/25 2025/25 2030/12 & 1844/25 1845/1 1845/6 1845/14 & 2022/5 2022/9 2022/13 2023/2 2024/8 \\
\hline 2033/8 2034/14 2045/4 2046/22 & 1845/22 1847/9 1851/25 1856/2 & 2024/11 2025/7 2025/20 2 \\
\hline 2049/8 2054/1 2055/19 2055/20 & 1856/6 1856/8 1863/9 1864/10 & 2048/3 2045/4 2037/12 \\
\hline 2055/21 2056/14 2059/2 2061/25 & 1864/19 1865/16 1871/9 1873/24 & 2074/23 2074/18 2071/15 \\
\hline 2073/8 2078/11 2081/9 2082/10 & 1876/2 1877/20 1881/20 1882/17 & 2075/6 2075/13 2075/20 2075/22 \\
\hline 2088/19 2089/18 2095/7 & 1897/6 1898/5 1901/23 1910/2 & 2076/6 2077/24 2077/24 2079/14 \\
\hline updated [2] 1912/8 2008/13 & 1928/13 1954/25 1965/1 1965/3 & 2081/9 2082/4 2082/6 2082/7 2082/8 \\
\hline upheld [1] 1972/22 & 1965/11 1975/2 1976/23 1986/14 & 2083/9 2083/11 2083/14 2084/2 \\
\hline upon [11] 1856/14 1856/15 1907/9 & 1995/12 1995/22 1995/23 1996/19 & 2084/15 2085/12 2085/15 2087/12 \\
\hline 1961/24 1986/20 1987/15 2030/23 & 2008/10 2009/17 2011/14 2022/2 & 2088/25 2088/10 2088/18 \\
\hline 2035/11 2050/13 2051/24 2095/15 & 2032/11 2046/10 2048/6 2048/14 & 2089/2 2089/5 2089/18 2090/10 \\
\hline upset [2] 1901/20 1901/21 & 2076/15 2077/6 2077/18 2087/21 & 2090/19 2090/22 2092/25 2094/17 \\
\hline us [61] 1811/23 1812/2 1812/2 & 2088/1 2094/14 2096/8 & 2096/6 2096/6 \\
\hline 1812/12 1813/10 1813/22 1814/20 1815/22 1817/18 1819/13 1820/8 & via [1] 1833/9 & wanted [24] 1819/20 1851/22 1879/23 \\
\hline 1815/22 1817/18 1819/13 1820/8 1821/16 1843/12 1843/17 1849/22 & vice [6] 1851/5 1911/7 1911/17 & 1882/22 1896/7 1914/5 1927/24 \\
\hline 1821/16 1843/12 1843/17 1849/22 & 1930/14 1930/24 1930/25 & 1932/1 1932/5 1932/18 1953/24 \\
\hline 1849/22 1850/23 1852/1 1856/19 & video [15] 1902/21 1903/1 1954/16 & 1972/21 1987/13 1993/16 2016/15 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lll}1863 / 22 & 1866 / 18 & 1874 / 22 \\ 1878 / 18 & 1880 / 12 & 1881 / 11 \\ 1883 / 14\end{array}\) & 1965/6 1965/12 2037/16 2037/19 & 2017/1 2022/21 2027/17 2029/6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline W & 186 & \[
20
\] \\
\hline w & 1879/24 2018/18 2033/16 2034/ & 2017/12 2018/13 2032/10 2033 \\
\hline 2073/12 2080/10 & 2035/23 2055/12 & 2034/15 2034/16 2034/21 2035 \\
\hline wanting [4] 1887/22 2016/9 2025/22 & weaken [1] 1977/12 & 2035/14 2035/14 2035/15 2037/7 \\
\hline 2068/4 [4] 1887/22 2016/9 2025/22 & weaker [1] 1980/18 & 2037/14 2038/6 2046/16 2046/19 \\
\hline wants [2] 2022/18 2091/15 & weakness [1] 1991/20 & 2053/19 2055/6 2055/7 2057/23 \\
\hline Wardlow [31] 1912/2 1912/4 1912/17 & weapon [1] & 2068/10 2068/24 2069/2 2076/1 \\
\hline 1912/19 1913/25 1916/11 1919/23 & weapons [2] 1886/21 1948/20 wear [1] 1820/2 & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { 2076/17 2083/20 2087/15 2093/14 } \\
\text { whether [52] 1823/1 1830/15 1830/25 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline 1921/19 1928/3 1928/5 1931/12 & wearing [2] 1819/24 1949/5 & 1837/21 1849/25 1850/14 1851/6 \\
\hline 1938/14 1938/22 1939/23 1941/8 & Wednesday [4] 2075/9 2077/1 20 & 1851/22 1886/7 1939/7 1953/7 \\
\hline 1953/19 1971/24 2068/19 2068/20 & 2078/4 & 1955/12 1965/21 1971/21 1987/15 \\
\hline 2072/8 2072/13 2072/17 2073/4 & week [15] 1814/4 1832/25 1875/18 & 1987/25 1987/25 1993/15 2002/11 \\
\hline 2073/11 2073/14 2073/20 2073/24 & 1875/19 1961/19 1962/6 1989/4 & 2003/10 2004/9 2004/17 2004/2 \\
\hline Wardlow's [1] 1912/8 & 1989/6 2007/6 2008/23 2048/10 & 2005/3 2007/2 2008/6 2009/10 2024/9 \\
\hline warn [1] 1918/10 & 2049/10 2059/3 2066/22 2096/6 & 2025/24 2028/11 2028/25 2033/1 \\
\hline warned [2] & weekend [1] & 2035/10 2035/16 2035/20 2038/14 \\
\hline warning [2] 1951/12 2043/14 & weekly [6] 1931/13 1938/10 1938/13 & 2040/21 2048/11 2048/21 2057/17 \\
\hline warnings [7] 1820/12 1829/1 & 1938/16 1961/23 1962 & 2063/5 2080/23 2089/17 2090/24 \\
\hline 1918/5 1959/24 1962/3 1963/7 & weeks [5] 1813/11 1891/7 1963/23 & 2093/7 2093/12 2093/18 2093/25 \\
\hline warrant [1] 1907/3 & 2019/8 2058/8 & 2094/6 2094/23 2095/3 2095/5 \\
\hline warranted [6] 1846/15 1846/15 & weighing [1] & 2] 1813/11 1815/4 1819/2 \\
\hline 1857/12 1916/19 1917/14 1918/7 & weighty [2] & 2/16 1856/15 1857/16 1870/21 \\
\hline was [802] & weird [1] 1871 & 1872/7 1873/1 1877/21 1883/16 \\
\hline wasn't [40] & welcome [1] 2063/2 & 1887/2 1891/3 1895/20 1897/ \\
\hline 1821/18 1821/19 1836/11 1836/12 & Weldon [1] 2032/4 & 1904/3 1906/4 1907/14 1913/14 \\
\hline 1854/22 1871/11 1879/7 1901/23 & well [146] & 1930/3 1937/25 1946/15 1950/13 \\
\hline 1917/9 1931/22 1954/15 1962/13 & well-intentioned [1] & 1956/1 1970/16 1973/11 1977/2 \\
\hline 1962/18 1962/19 1964/25 1965/1 & well-supported [1] 2056/6 & 1977/10 1977/13 1977/22 1983/ \\
\hline 1973/6 1973/22 1979/3 1979/16 & went [24] 1872/17 1877/25 1888/2 & 1983/16 1985/15 1985/20 1986/20 \\
\hline 1981/13 1993/22 1994/8 1996/12 & 1891/18 1892/17 1892/18 1894/17 & 1991/10 1991/12 1991/20 1992/8 \\
\hline 1996/12 2034/23 2037/10 2040/7 & 1894/17 1895/20 1942/12 1952/24 & 1996/21 2004/8 2004/22 2005/12 \\
\hline 2041/1 2042/24 2051/3 2051/22 & 1973/17 1976/21 1988/17 1988/1 & 2006/22 2016/13 2016/23 2019/7 \\
\hline 2060/11 2063/5 2080 & 2013/17 2015/7 2015/14 2040/16 & 2024/14 2027/8 2030/2 2030/3 \\
\hline 2088/4 & 2049/17 2058/15 2060/13 2060/16 & 2030/15 2030/20 2032/17 2040/23 \\
\hline wasted [1] & 2068/24 & 2061/22 2062/10 2065/5 2071/24 \\
\hline watch [3] & were [252] & 2078/15 2079/10 2079/25 2080/19 \\
\hline watching [4] 1884/5 1923/11 1936/19 & weren't [5] 1886/8 1908/22 1962/22 & 2084/24 2084/25 2085/5 2086/9 \\
\hline 2069/9 & 2001/3 2028/11 & 2086/10 2090/10 2090/17 2092/1 \\
\hline water [1] & what [364] & 2093/ \\
\hline wave [2] 1883/24 2014/23 & what's [30] 1831/19 1833/10 1834/13 & while [24] \\
\hline way [30] 1822/25 1865/15 1865/19 & 19186 & 1818/25 1819/21 1827/21 1881/17 \\
\hline 1865/21 1871/12 1882/4 1888/15 & 1881/19 1881/19 1886/2 1888/24 & 1892/4 1894/17 1932/17 1936/19 \\
\hline 1888/16 1898/23 1901/6 1957/3 & 1907/8 1920/21 1922/19 & 1941 \\
\hline 1971/18 1977/12 1979/4 1985/19 & 1938/17 1944/11 1946/8 1950/19 & 1972/8 1981/5 1986/15 2006/5 \\
\hline 1996/13 1997/14 1999/25 2008/19 & 1952/19 1958/7 1965/7 1967/10 & 2019/10 2048/17 2051/20 2058/1 \\
\hline 2025/18 2027/8 2041/12 2042/11 & 2000/15 2032/14 2052/22 2061/1 & 2083/19 \\
\hline 2074/9 2077/10 2078/10 2088 & 2070/17 2070/23 2088/19 & white [2] 1884/8 1899/21 \\
\hline 2090/5 2095/7 2095/15 & whatever [8] 1813/6 1856/16 1914/10 & who [99] 1818/17 1835/21 1836/4 \\
\hline ways [1] 1892/19 & 996/8 2002/1 & \(31838 / 6\) 1840/19 1849/9 \\
\hline & 2095/5 & 1849/12 1856/4 1861/23 1863/18 \\
\hline we'd [1] 187 & whatsoever [3] 1832/11 1832/14 & 1863/21 1865/1 1867/2 1867/13 \\
\hline & 1997/17 & 1867/14 1869/13 1869/21 1869/2 \\
\hline 1946/1 1957/1 1970/4 2022/1 2022/2 & when [167] & 1870/15 1870/16 1872/20 1874/22 \\
\hline 2032/20 2052/12 2063 & where [83] 1820/12 1827/24 1828/1 & 1875/17 1876/16 1878/13 1878/19 \\
\hline 2096/8 & 1835/17 1845/15 1849/7 1860/24 & 1878/21 1878/24 1881/13 1881/13 \\
\hline & 1880/18 1880/21 1887/12 1888/11 & 1883/19 1885/11 1885/18 1892/5 \\
\hline 1853/18 1858/23 1858/24 1892/4 & 1890/13 1893/5 1894/16 1895/20 & 1892/8 1909/20 1911/25 1911/25 \\
\hline 1930/13 1931/20 1931/21 1932/17 & 1896/5 1897/24 1898/9 1902/19 & 1916/9 1919/22 1921/7 1921/18 \\
\hline 1937/16 1954/19 1957/10 1957/22 & 1902/23 1908/22 1909/19 1911/15 & 1928/3 1948/23 1950/9 1952/19 \\
\hline 1958/23 2000/15 2000/20 2005/5 & 1917/14 1918/7 1918/9 1927/12 & 1953/9 1970/19 1978/15 1979/18 \\
\hline 2005/5 2006/20 2007/21 2010/1 & 1929/19 1931/13 1932/21 1933/1 & 1982/6 1984/17 1986/8 2000/17 \\
\hline 2012/3 2018/15 2021/2 2023/4 2034/4 & 1939/14 1940/11 1949/9 1956/9 & 2000/19 2002/5 2003/9 2004/11 \\
\hline 2036/6 2046/8 2049/4 2060/22 & 1961/4 1963/8 1963/15 1966/16 & 2011/15 2012/22 2017/25 2019/19 \\
\hline 2076/13 2076/18 2078/16 2088/9 & 1974/12 1976/22 1976/25 1980/2 & 2020/11 2032/14 2040/7 2040/14 \\
\hline 2089/10 & 1981/11 1994/10 1994/20 2001/13 & 2040/18 2042/13 2043/2 2051/13 \\
\hline we've [13] 1821/17 1822/11 1832/23 & 2001/23 2002/19 2007/5 2007/12 & 2053/15 2054/1 2054/3 2054/9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Y & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{you've [19] 1812/3 1864/19 1868/1 1868/13 1907/24 1934/7 1936/17} \\
\hline yeah... [35] 1879/9 1891/2 1893/2 & \\
\hline 1902/7 1902/25 1905/18 1917/3 & 2022/20 2025/9 2025/23 2036/8 \\
\hline 1926/22 1927/3 1929/7 1958/16 & 2046/25 2052/10 2082/24 2090/5 \\
\hline 1961/13 1961/15 1962/19 1969/17 & younger [1] 2018/1 \\
\hline 2018/10 2023/20 2031/21 2036/11 & your [335] \\
\hline 2037/1 2040/10 2060/16 2062/12 & Your Honor [3] 1945/25 2080/16 \\
\hline 2067/4 2067/7 2072/3 2072/6 2075/21 &  \\
\hline 2079/24 2087/2 2087/8 & yourself [3] 1811/14 1865/24 2068/23 yourselves [1] 2011/22 \\
\hline year [23] 1822/16 1822/18 1822/20 & youth [1] 2013/25 \\
\hline 1879/18 1892/9 1892/13 1947/17 & Z \\
\hline 1963/8 1989/1 1995/16 2014/18 & zone [1] 2037/21 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2055/1 2057/20 2061/22 2068/3} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{year's [1] 2008/15} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{years [57] 1812/1 1839/21 1839/21} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1843/13 1844/17 1844/19 1845/12} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1850/12 1851/2 1851/4 1860/4 1861/7} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1863/4 1871/19 1884/8 1886/18} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1927/19 1929/23 1930/6 1933/10} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1934/4 1939/14 1940/7 1947/17} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1947/21 1951/20 1966/23 1980/7} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1996/7 1996/10 2000/20 2008/9} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2008/12 2008/13 2013/11 2013/20} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2013/24 2013/24 2014/4 2016/24} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2017/20 2019/23 2033/16 2033/16} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2036/12 2036/14 2048/1 2057/2} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2057/4 2057/9 2057/14 2062/23} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2065/2 2065/10 2066/5 2068/9 2095/1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Yep [1] 1949/17
yes [396]}} \\
\hline & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{yesterday [4] 1954/15 2080/13 2093/1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2093/2} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{yet [8] 1836/16 1873/6 1948/2 2040/15} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2044/21 2076/25 2087/21 2089/25} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{yield [1] 2071/25} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Yoshishige [7] 2063/17 2064/1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2064/11 2064/17 2070/20 2071/11} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2074/5} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{you [1553]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{you'd [2] 1888/15 1897/21} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{you'll [4] 2008/23 2076/25 2077/2} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2078/23} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{you're [87] 1819/24 1827/1 1828/13} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1831/1 1833/16 1835/25 1836/5} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1840/7 1841/4 1843/5 1862/14 1865/5} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1865/23 1867/23 1868/9 1868/11} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1881/17 1890/16 1896/25 1897/5} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1897/21 1898/19 1898/24 1900/12} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1902/19 1902/23 1907/9 1910/2} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1913/8 1917/13 1917/19 1918/9} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1929/15 1929/16 1934/19 1934/22} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1935/3 1935/11 1938/14 1939/9} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1939/10 1941/13 1941/23 1944/2} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1944/22 1951/11 1953/13 1953/14} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1955/3 1956/5 1958/18 1958/21} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1959/7 1960/4 1963/15 1974/2 1975/2} \\
\hline 1975/15 1984/13 2001/22 2003/20 & \\
\hline 2003/23 2004/14 2004/15 2005/9 & \\
\hline 2005/10 2006/24 2010/18 2010/20 & \\
\hline 2012/17 2012/22 2021/19 2022/6 & \\
\hline 2022/10 2025/23 2044/18 2044/22 & \\
\hline 2063/21 2064/17 2077/11 2078/25 & \\
\hline 2084/20 2085/18 2089/12 2092/4 & \\
\hline 2093/15 2096/7 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```

