IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CANYON

deceased; MICAELA PATRICIA)) Case No.)) CV14-20-1023)))
JR., a natural parent of ADAM ZAMUDIO, deceased; ADAM) DEPOSITION OF:)
ZAMUDIO, JR., a natural son of ADAM ZAMUDIO, deceased; and) DAVID T. SWEENEY)
GILBERT ZAMUDIO, III, a natural son of ADAM ZAMUDIO, deceased,) TAKEN JULY 23, 2021))
Plaintiffs,)
vs.)
The CITY OF NAMPA, an Idaho Municipality; CITY OF NAMPA POLICE DEPARTMENT, a Subsidiary of the City of Nampa; OFFICER RYAN PUTNAM, individually; OFFICER TRAVIS POORE, individually; and; DOES I through X, unknown individuals and/or entities, Defendants.	<pre>/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /</pre>
	,)

REPORTED REMOTELY BY:

DIANA KILPATRICK, CSR No. 727, RPR

Notary Public

1THE DEPOSITION OF DAVID T. SWEENEY was taken2on behalf of the Defendants via remote videoconference,3commencing at 1:00 p.m. on July 23, 2021, before Diana4Kilpatrick, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary5Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the6above-entitled matter.7APEARANCES:8For Plaintiffs:9(Present remotely)10Litster Frost Injury Lawyers11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLIC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE20A355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net2324		
3commencing at 1:00 p.m. on July 23, 2021, before Diana4Kilpatrick, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary5Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the6above-entitled matter.7APPEARANCES:8For Plaintiffs:9(Present remotely)10Litster Frost Injury Lawyers11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE20A355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net	1	THE DEPOSITION OF DAVID T. SWEENEY was taken
4 Kilpatrick, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary 5 Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the 6 above-entitled matter. 7 APPEARANCES: 8 For Plaintiffs: 9 (Present remotely) 10 Litster Frost Injury Lawyers 11 BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER 12 3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208 13 Boise, Idaho 83705 14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net	2	on behalf of the Defendants via remote videoconference,
5 Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the 6 above-entitled matter. 7 APPEARANCES: 8 For Plaintiffs: 9 (Present remotely) 10 Litster Frost Injury Lawyers 11 BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER 12 3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208 13 Boise, Idaho 83705 14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23	3	commencing at 1:00 p.m. on July 23, 2021, before Diana
6above-entitled matter.7APPEARANCES:8For Plaintiffs:9(Present remotely)10Litster Frost Injury Lawyers11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE204355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net23	4	Kilpatrick, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary
7APPEARANCES:8For Plaintiffs:9(Present remotely)10Litster Frost Injury Lawyers11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE20A355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net23	5	Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the
 For Plaintiffs: 9 (Present remotely) 10 Litster Frost Injury Lawyers 11 BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER 12 3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208 13 Boise, Idaho 83705 14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 	6	above-entitled matter.
 9 (Present remotely) 10 Litster Frost Injury Lawyers 11 BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER 12 3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208 13 Boise, Idaho 83705 14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23 	7	APPEARANCES:
10Litster Frost Injury Lawyers11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE204355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net23	8	For Plaintiffs:
11BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER123501 West Elder Street, Suite 20813Boise, Idaho 8370514evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com15david.bartels@litsterfrost.com16For Defendants:17(Present remotely)18Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE204355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net	9	(Present remotely)
12 3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208 13 Boise, Idaho 83705 14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23	10	Litster Frost Injury Lawyers
 Boise, Idaho 83705 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com david.bartels@litsterfrost.com For Defendants: (Present remotely) Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 Boise, Idaho 83704 mkane@ktlaw.net 	11	BY MR. EVAN S. MORTIMER
<pre>14 evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com 15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23</pre>	12	3501 West Elder Street, Suite 208
<pre>15 david.bartels@litsterfrost.com 16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23</pre>	13	Boise, Idaho 83705
<pre>16 For Defendants: 17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23</pre>	14	evan.mortimer@litsterfrost.com
<pre>17 (Present remotely) 18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23</pre>	15	david.bartels@litsterfrost.com
18 Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC 19 BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE 20 4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190 21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23	16	For Defendants:
19BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE204355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net23	17	(Present remotely)
204355 Emerald Street, Suite 19021Boise, Idaho 8370422mkane@ktlaw.net23	18	Michael Kane & Associates, PLLC
21 Boise, Idaho 83704 22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23	19	BY MR. MICHAEL J. KANE
22 mkane@ktlaw.net 23	20	4355 Emerald Street, Suite 190
23	21	Boise, Idaho 83704
	22	mkane@ktlaw.net
24	23	
	24	
25	25	

INDEX	
TESTIMONY OF DAVID SWEENEY	PAGE
Examination By Mr. Kane	5
EXHIBITS	
NO. DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exh 1 Seattle Police Department 13:031	26
Exh 2 Nampa Police Department Policy 313	51
Exh 3 Declaration of David T. Sweeney	67
	TESTIMONY OF DAVID SWEENEY Examination By Mr. Kane E X H I B I T S NO. DESCRIPTION Exh 1 Seattle Police Department 13:031 Exh 2 Nampa Police Department Policy 313

1 DEPOSITION OF DAVID T. SWEENEY, 2 COURT REPORTER: The attorneys participating 3 in this proceeding acknowledge that I am not physically 4 present in the proceeding room and that I will be 5 reporting this proceeding remotely. They further 6 acknowledge that the witness will be sworn in remotely 7 by me and that the testimony will have the same force 8 and effect under the rules as an in-person deposition. 9 The parties and their counsel consent to this 10 11 arrangement and waive any objections to this manner of 12 reporting. Please indicate your agreement by stating your name and your agreement on the record. Also, if 13 there is anyone present in the room with you not on 14 15 video, please so indicate. 16 MR. MORTIMER: Evan Mortimer, and I'm in agreement. There's nobody else in my room. 17 18 THE WITNESS: Dave Sweeney, in agreement, no one else in the room. 19 20 MR. KANE: Mike Kane. In agreement, and no 21 one else in the room, although I may have to get assistance if I can't make this chat work. 22 23 DAVID T. SWEENEY, First duly sworn to tell the truth related to said 24 cause, testified remotely as follows: 25

Г

1	MR. KANE: Thank you. Do you want to make
2	any statement before we begin, any stipulations?
3	MR. MORTIMER: Typically on video deps I
4	will just reserve objections so I don't have to
5	interfere, but it's up to you. I'm happy to object as
6	we move along, but I find it easier if I don't have to
7	unmute and jump in to object in the middle of an answer.
8	MR. KANE: That's fine. Whatever.
9	MR. MORTIMER: If we can stipulate to that,
10	then I will reserve my objections.
11	MR. KANE: So stipulated. Sure.
12	EXAMINATION
13	QUESTIONS BY MR. KANE:
14	Q. Okay, then. What do I call you? It says
15	Mary Sweeney on my screen.
16	A. On my screen?
17	Q. It says Mary Sweeney.
18	A. Let me take a look at that. That's my
19	daughter.
20	Q. You didn't look like a Mary to me.
21	A. Oh, you're right. Thank you.
22	Q. So do I call you Patrol Commander,
23	Commander, Officer, what?
24	A. David is fine, or Lieutenant.
25	Q. All right. Lieutenant, you've been sworn in

for the record. Would you please spell your name, your 1 2 last name? David Sweeney. Last name is spelled 3 Α. 4 S-w-e-e-n-e-y. And I'm looking at your declarations. 5 Ι 0. don't want to go over this in fine detail, but for the 6 record, you are a patrol commander for Oregon State 7 University Police. Correct? 8 9 A. Correct. Oregon State University Police 10 Department. 11 So in looking at that, you say, looks like 0. 12 you said you built the department. Did I read that 13 right? 14 Yes. We are starting a brand new police Α. 15 department here. They used to have a contract with the Oregon State Police, and that contract ended in 16 17 December. The chief was here in December, I was hired in March, so we are starting a brand new police 18 department at the wishes of the Oregon State University. 19 It's kind of interesting. 20 21 Q. And are you then a certified police officer 22 as you were at Seattle? 23 I am fully-commissioned law A. Yes. enforcement. Now, the State of Oregon requires me to do 24 a two-week equivalency academy sometime within the first 25

1	18 months of my employment, and so far those have been
2	limited due to COVID-19, but I do believe that the
3	classes are opening up soon, and some of the staff hired
4	before me have attended, so I assume I will attend at
5	some point. But I am certified for law enforcement in
6	Oregon.
7	Q. Great. So by that, then, would you have all
8	the powers and duties of a non-university police
9	officer?
10	A. Yes. I am authorized for law enforcement
11	anywhere in the State of Oregon.
12	Q. Great. Perfect. So briefly, would you go
13	over all of the documents you reviewed to prepare for
-0 14	that deposition?
15	A. Yes. Shall I read from my preparation here?
16	
	We have a transcript of an August 7, 2018 preliminary
17	hearing, State of Idaho vs. Joseph Michael Sena in
18	Canyon County; in-car video footage from Officer Poore,
19	Nampa Police Department, in-car video footage from
20	Officer Putnam; body-worn video footage from Officer
21	Putnam; Nampa Police Department Policy No. 313 on
22	vehicle pursuits; Nampa Police Department Policy No. 314
23	on officer response to calls; an affidavit of probable
24	cause completed by Officer Putnam; the deposition
25	transcript of Ryan Putnam; the deposition transcript of

1	Travis Poore; relevant Idaho traffic codes; Google
2	images of the area along with the pursuit route and
3	collision. Idaho Vehicle Collision Report Case
4	No. V18002134, including supplements; an IA Pro pursuit
5	review from the Nampa Police Department; and the Nampa
6	Police Department officer reports for Incident
7	No. N18-36876.
8	Q. When you say relevant statutes, what do you
9	mean?
10	A. Which letter is that one?
11	Q. I'm sorry. I don't have it in front of me.
12	A. I thought you were looking at documents.
13	Q. We're talking over each other. I apologize.
14	A. Relevant Idaho traffic codes. So primarily
15	we're talking about Title 49-623, Authorized Emergency
16	or Police Vehicles.
17	Q. Any others?
18	A. I also looked up the Idaho statutes on what
19	constitutes eluding, in order to determine what level of
20	crime we're talking about.
21	Q. Okay. Any others?
22	A. Not that I remember at this time. Those
23	were the two primary ones I looked at.
24	Q. Okay. Great. So I'd like to speak about
25	your law enforcement career.

1 Α. Sure. 2 At least in some level of detail, but we're 0. not going to beat this into the ground. 3 Α. That's fine. 4 Let's begin with what you're doing now. 5 0. Do you have the power, at least, to arrest individuals 6 driving, I presume, on university property, in an 7 erratic manner? Do you have the usual standard 8 abilities to stop vehicles? 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 All right. And have you done that at all? 0. 12 No. Α. 13 All right. It's more of your staff job, I ο. 14 would assume? 15 Α. Correct. 16 And so let's go back to your Seattle days. ο. 17 Now, I read your CV. We're not going to go through it line by line. But my impression is, for all intents and 18 purposes, is that your entire career in law enforcement 19 has been with Seattle PD. Is that correct? 20 21 I retired in March of 2021, March 15th, Α. 22 which was actually my first day starting here at Oregon 23 State University. Q. So prior to that, other than, I think you 24 had a security guard job. You've been a cop with 25

1 Seattle? 2 Α. Correct. From '87 to 2021. So almost 3 34 years. And you had a number of different 4 Q. assignments during that time period, so I'm going to 5 jump around a little bit and maybe talk about some of 6 the ones that I was rather curious about. 7 Α. Sure. 8 So let's go back. I know it's a while. 9 0. It's hard to believe that '98, '99 is over 20 years ago. 10 11 But you were a DUI enforcement officer, weren't you? 12 Α. I was. 13 So give me an idea, during that time period, 0. 14 what your responsibilities were as a DUI enforcement officer. 15 16 A. We had a traffic squad of 6 officers and a 17 Sergeant, and my primary duty was detecting, apprehending, and investigating drunk drivers in the 18 city of Seattle. So we would leave work around 7:00 at 19 night and we would work until 4:00 a.m. in the morning. 20 21 And during that time your primary responsibility was 22 detecting DUI drivers. I also had other 23 responsibilities. I could assist on any patrol call 24 that needed me if there was an emergency, but that was my primary duty as a traffic officer then. 25

1	Also, working in traffic we were responsible
2	for staffing parades and fun runs and sporting events,
3	so anything you see traffic officers directing traffic,
4	I did a lot of that as well. But my primary duty, as
5	you talked about, arresting drunk drivers.
6	Q. All right. Was there a special name for
7	your unit?
8	A. We called ourselves the DUI squad.
9	Q. And in order to qualify for that, what did
10	you have to do?
11	A. You have to show proactivity as the patrol
12	offer, and some expertise in investigating and arresting
13	drunk drivers. So when I was in the North Precinct, as
14	you see my earlier part of my patrol career, I worked in
15	that precinct for several years. And I became known as
16	the precinct DUI officer. I wasn't a member of the DUI
17	squad, but if an officer stopped a drunk driver they
18	knew they could call me because I had developed an
19	expertise with that. I was efficient, and I would take
20	the drunk driver for them, and all they had to do was
21	issue a citation and I would handle pretty much
22	everything else, which would allow for them to go back
23	out on the street. And it made for a very efficient
24	operation, because I could process a drunk driver within
25	a couple hours, that might take them 4 or 6 hours.

Γ

2assignment in the DUI squad to work in traffic, which3was a separate division in the Seattle Police4Department, and I was accepted for that and I worked5there a couple years.6Q. So you would agree, I would hope, that being7a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no8problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of9law enforcement, is it not?10A. Correct.11Q. And did you, yourself, get any special12training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI13recognition enforcement?14A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs,15conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze16Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe17the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug18Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning19of that, so I'm not DRE certified.20Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI21enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just22what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time,23such as, where the vehicle came from?24A. Sure. Yes. Okay. If known.	1	Based on that, that led to me requesting an
 Department, and I was accepted for that and I worked there a couple years. Q. So you would agree, I would hope, that being a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of law enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	2	assignment in the DUI squad to work in traffic, which
 there a couple years. Q. So you would agree, I would hope, that being a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of law enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	3	was a separate division in the Seattle Police
 6 Q. So you would agree, I would hope, that being a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of law enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	4	Department, and I was accepted for that and I worked
 a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of law enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	5	there a couple years.
 problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of law enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	6	Q. So you would agree, I would hope, that being
 Jaw enforcement, is it not? A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	7	a DUI recognition officer, DUI squad, there is no
 A. Correct. Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	8	problem with that. It's a completely legitimate part of
 Q. And did you, yourself, get any special training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	9	law enforcement, is it not?
12 training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI 13 recognition enforcement? 14 A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, 15 conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze 16 Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe 17 the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug 18 Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning 19 of that, so I'm not DRE certified. 20 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI 21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	10	A. Correct.
 recognition enforcement? A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs, conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	11	Q. And did you, yourself, get any special
14A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs,15conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze16Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe17the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug18Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning19of that, so I'm not DRE certified.20Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI21enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just22what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time,23such as, where the vehicle came from?	12	training as to DRE I almost said it wrong, DRE DUI
15 conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze 16 Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe 17 the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug 18 Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning 19 of that, so I'm not DRE certified. 20 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI 21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	13	recognition enforcement?
 Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning of that, so I'm not DRE certified. Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from? 	14	A. Right. So I had training in detecting DUIs,
17 the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug 18 Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning 19 of that, so I'm not DRE certified. 20 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI 21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	15	conducting field sobriety tests, HGN, Horizontal Gaze
18 Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning 19 of that, so I'm not DRE certified. 20 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI 21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	16	Nystagmus. At that point in my career, I don't believe
19 of that, so I'm not DRE certified. 20 Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI 21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	17	the DRE program had ever been talked about. Drug
Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, such as, where the vehicle came from?	18	Recognition Expert. So I didn't get in on the beginning
21 enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just 22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	19	of that, so I'm not DRE certified.
22 what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time, 23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	20	Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say, as a DUI
23 such as, where the vehicle came from?	21	enforcement officer, you're trained to look beyond just
	22	what a vehicle is doing at that very moment in time,
A. Sure. Yes. Okay. If known.	23	such as, where the vehicle came from?
	24	A. Sure. Yes. Okay. If known.
25 Q. And then what the vehicle did, how it drove,	25	Q. And then what the vehicle did, how it drove,

how erratic they were, if there was anything unusual? 1 2 Α. Correct. Is there anything -- let me put it a 3 ο. different way. Thinking out loud here. Would you agree 4 that it is the totality of the circumstances that DUI 5 officers look for, and they could change from one case 6 to another? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Was there a special problem with DUI back in 9 0. Seattle in the late the '90s? 10 11 A special problem, did you say? Α. 12 Yes. ο. 13 No other than the usual issue. Α. No. Ι 14 remember being a patrol officer and seeing a horrible crash on Highway 99 in Seattle. It kind of inspired me 15 to learn more about it and apply myself. It was kind of 16 17 a driving motivator to me to get interested. I stopped thousands of drunk drivers, made around 500 arrests. 18 That night was very informative for me. 19 But as far as Seattle is concerned, back to 20 21 your question at hand, there was no special emphasis 22 other than, you might see news media stories from time 23 to time, if someone was killed by a drunk driver. I think I saw some things from our chief saying, yes, we 24 have a traffic squad dedicated to that problem, and 25

arresting drunk drivers at night. 1 2 But there was no great emphasis. There was a DUI squad before I started there and there was one 3 I think it's been there for many years. 4 after. It's a good unit to have in a police department. 5 Sure. You say that, because if I read it 0. 6 right, do I understand that Seattle has abandoned their 7 DUI program? 8 9 The last I heard, I talked to a couple Α. friends there, and they said basically there's no one 10 11 doing DUIs at night. Seattle's faced a severe shortage 12 of officers, and I believe most of them were reassigned to different units and/or retired or left the 13 department. 14 15 But you're not really familiar with the 0. policy decisions that caused that to end? 16 17 No. Only what might be termed as hearsay or Α. rumor from one of the officers who was kind of telling 18 me about it. He was a long-time DUI member and he'd 19 been put back on patrol. So I kind of talked to him 20 21 about it, asked him about it. 22 Q. Okay. So if I understand, kind of jumping 23 around a little bit in your CV here, you were, also in the early 2000s, a patrol sergeant at the West Precinct. 24 Is that right? 25

1 Α. Yes. 2 And did you enforce DUI laws in the West 0. Precinct? 3 I seem to remember doing a couple DUIs as a 4 Α. sergeant. It wasn't common, but because I had my recent 5 officer experience when I was promoted in 2001, I do 6 remember doing a couple DUIs to show people, Hey, you 7 can do this. It's not that bad. So to set an example 8 for others, I did. 9 Q. And I think you may have just hinted at it. 10 11 Was one of your duties to train DUI enforcement officers 12 on your watch? 13 A. Yes and no. Let's just say that a patrol 14 officer, when they work for a sergeant and you go to 15 roll call every day, I always as a sergeant use that 16 opportunity to train, guide, and motivate others. Would 17 I actually pull a squad of officers into the precinct and train them on DUI? No. But I might encourage them 18 to investigate DUIs, not disregard them, and then of 19 course supervise them when they'd made an arrest and 20 21 they'd come to the precinct. I was a great resource to 22 ask questions. Hey, Sergeant, how do you do this? 23 Where do I find this form? What do I do with a breath 24 test ticket? I guess in that way you could call it 25

training. I wouldn't call it that I was an official and 1 2 had a class. Does that kind of answer your question? Q. Yes. Did that duty change when you became a 3 watch commander in 2019? In other words, would you be 4 more training-intensive as to DUIs? 5 I suppose, you know, it's interesting, as 6 Α. you progress in your police career that -- so I became a 7 lieutenant in 2015. But as you interacted with your 8 sergeants and officers, it becomes more review of what 9 they've done, and I kind of missed that hands on 10 11 training aspect. But I do get heavily involved at that 12 point as a lieutenant from a review standpoint. 13 So you're now looking at the actions of the officers and the supervisor, and did they take proper 14 actions at a scene, and did the sergeant do their job. 15 16 So in a way, yes, I'm supervising. I don't know that I 17 would call it training at that point, other than I would issue memos and guidelines, and sometimes I would 18 send -- let's say an officer had a problem with 19 collisions. I'm not going to train them in collisions, 20 21 but I'm going to send them back to our traffic squad, 22 because they handle collisions in the police department, 23 and send them there for training. So when you move to a lieutenant, you're 24 kind of stepping out of the day-to-day operation, and 25

you have that bigger picture view of it. I hope that 1 2 answers the question. It does. Let me make it a lot easier. 3 ο. Ι was in law enforcement in one way or the other for most 4 of my career. I totally get it. So I just gave you a 5 couple of examples, when you were a patrol sergeant, 6 when you were a watch commander, when you were a DUI 7 enforcement officer. Would it be fair to say that 8 9 pretty much during the career that you've had as a line officer, at least when you were actually on patrol, DUI 10 11 enforcement was a regular responsibility you had? 12 Α. Yes. 13 All right. ο. In one form or another, like you said. 14 Α. 15 Different levels, but yes. 16 Did you ever be assigned to monitor vehicle Q. 17 pursuits at any time during that time period? 18 Α. Several. Many. All right. Let's walk through when that 19 Q. would have been, first of all. 20 21 Okay. Both as a patrol sergeant and as a Α. 22 watch commander, possibly as the operations lieutenant. 23 I think I monitored some even as an ops lieutenant. So But more commonly, as we talked about, a patrol 24 yes. 25 sergeant and a watch commander, you're going to be more

heavily involved in the monitoring of an officer's 1 2 pursuit. To talk to me about what that actually 3 0. means, monitoring. Do you listen to the radio traffic? 4 5 Α. Yes. And walk us through it. How would it 6 Q. actually work? 7 The first thing that I would listen for is 8 Α. 9 what is the officer pursuing? In other words, what's the initial crime? That's my big emphasis. Why are we 10 11 pursuing that vehicle? And then I want to know the 12 speeds, and I want to know where they're at, and what's the description of the vehicle. So that basic quick 13 information that an officer is going to broadcast over 14 15 the air to the dispatcher, in order to, one, generate a 16 call, Hey, I've got something here; and then two, get 17 his coworkers involved; and then three, what I'm looking 18 for is a sergeant answering up, and if a sergeant doesn't answer up, then I would answer up. And I would 19 say, let's say, 212 is monitoring. One of my call 20 21 signs. And hopefully that cues my sergeant, uh-oh, LT 22 is listening in, I'd better step up my game here. So 23 most sergeants then would answer, I'm monitoring as well. And that's what I want to hear. I want them 24 aware that there is a pursuit in the city and I want 25

Γ

1	them monitoring it.
2	Sometimes I might quickly direct the actions
3	of an officer. Generally we're talking about calling
4	off a pursuit. But if it was a justifiable pursuit, I
5	might let it fo for a while, depending on the level of
6	the crime and what the officer is doing as they're in
7	this pursuit.
8	Q. I think you may have said it and I may have
9	missed it. Approximately how many pursuits did you
10	monitor in that period over the years?
11	A. Since 2001, I'm going to say 30 to 40.
12	Q. They don't that happen often, then?
13	A. No. They became less and less frequent over
14	the years when Seattle's pursuit policy changed.
15	Q. And why was that?
16	A. When or why?
17	Q. Why.
18	A. The chief determined that pursuits were
19	inherently dangerous, and the reasons for the pursuit
20	did not match up with the risk to the public that was
21	created by the pursuits. To officers, pursuits were
22	severely curtailed by policy and by training and by
23	enforcement from sergeants and lieutenants like myself.
24	Q. You said there was a change. When did that
25	occur?

I'm trying to remember where I was working 1 Α. 2 when that first came out. Seems like -- my best guess, it would be, I'm going to say mid-2000s. 3 All right. So was there an attitude at Q. 4 Seattle PD, then, that pursuits were not effective? 5 Let's start with that word. 6 Was there an attitude that police pursuits 7 Α. were not effective? 8 Q. You mentioned that the chief didn't find 9 them to be -- maybe I'll use the term cost benefit 10 11 analysis. Is that approximately right? 12 I think the chief was primarily considering Α. the danger to the public, so yes. I will say, if you 13 want to get down to numbers, it could be a cost benefit 14 15 analysis. But the language and the training and the 16 guidance I gave to others, based on the chief's 17 guidelines and the policy changes, were that it was really due to life safety issues. 18 Meaning what, exactly? 19 Q. That if we were pursuing for minor 20 Α. 21 violations of the law, and our pursuit ended in a 22 collision that injures or kills someone, what's the risk 23 to the public of the offender getting away, versus the risk to the public because of the police pursuit? 24 Those two are way out of whack. 25

1	Now, we were allowed to pursue for dangerous
2	criminals. Again, that's what the courts might hold,
3	too. If you're pursuing because you need to catch the
4	bank robber, society says, We understand that. We
5	understand you're going to engage in risk, you're going
6	to engage in high-speed pursuit driving. You're going
7	to violate the law in order to stop the bank robber,
8	because societal interest in stopping the bank robber is
9	much greater than the societal interest of stopping the
10	traffic violator.
11	Q. So when the policy changed at Seattle, did
12	pursuits happen for felonies only?
13	A. Yes. Let's just say this. An officer might
14	start a pursuit, so technically they've engaged in a
15	pursuit. And it might be for a traffic violation. But
16	in general those are going to be called off, either by
17	the officer or a supervisor. So it wasn't only for
18	felonies. I think this might answer your question. The
19	ones that were continued or allowed to continue were
20	based on felony crimes.
21	Q. Okay. No matter how dangerous the driver
22	was, if it was a misdemeanor, you would probably call it
23	off. Is what you're saying?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. Did you have any accidents during the 30 or

40 that you mentioned, that you called off? 1 2 Α. I don't remember any of those ending in a 3 collision, no. Did you have any accidents at all during the Q. 4 time that you were monitoring a pursuit? 5 So do you mean an accident involving me or 6 Α. an officer? 7 No. An officer. 8 0. I think that's the same question, if I'm 9 Α. understanding it correctly. I don't remember any 10 11 officer --12 I'm sorry, I used the called off, and as 0. soon as I said it, I realized it was a stupid question. 13 Any pursuits that you were monitoring that ended up in a 14 15 crash? 16 A. When I was in S.W.A.T., we would use our 17 vehicles, sometimes intentionally, to stop a dangerous 18 suspect. Now, those weren't termed accidents, because they weren't accidental. You could term them a crash, 19 though, because two vehicles struck each other. 20 But again, it's the S.W.A.T. officer using a vehicle to 21 22 possibly, let's say pin somebody into a parking space or 23 against the wall. So we did use those tactics for, again, dangerous felons that we were trying to arrest. 24 So we might use our vehicles in that way. 25

1	Q. Right. Other than those?
2	A. Other than those. I just wanted to give you
3	that information, that caveat. Other than those, I
4	don't remember any patrol officer involved in a
5	collision where I called off the pursuit or where one of
6	my sergeants called off the pursuit.
7	Q. I was talking monitoring, not just calling
8	it off.
9	A. Just monitoring a pursuit. Okay. Let me
10	think on that. No. I can't think of any involving
11	collisions where I was monitoring. I can think of a few
12	where I arrived later on scene, maybe I came from a
13	different precinct or something like that. But nothing
14	where I was monitoring or a sergeant was monitoring. I
15	can't think of any that ended in a collision.
16	Q. And were you yourself involved in a
17	collision during a pursuit?
18	A. I believe I've only had two collisions in my
19	34 years. Wait. Let's go back. I had one. I was a
20	brand new officer, maybe 1988, that I hit a stop sign in
21	a pursuit. So I guess we'd call that a crash, but a
22	relatively minor one.
23	Q. I guess. Yeah. Okay. You say that you
24	also arrived later to investigate or whatever.
25	A. Right.

1 ο. A crash in a pursuit. Is that right? 2 Α. Yes. Approximately how many of those? 3 0. There was only one I could think of, and we Α. 4 had a suspect in Seattle armed with a firearm was going 5 to businesses and threatening people, threatening to 6 shoot them. He car-jacked a couple people with a car, 7 and he ended up in a pursuit with a lot of officers from 8 the North Precinct. And I wasn't monitoring that 9 pursuit, but it ended in our precinct, and I went out to 10 11 the scene. 12 But again, I was not watch commander. Ι 13 think I was the operations lieutenant at that point, so it wasn't my responsibility, but I did go to the scene 14 to see if there was anything I could do to help, or see 15 16 if anyone needed anything, or to assist any of the 17 sergeants or lieutenants involved in the collision. So I wasn't directly responsible for it. That's the only 18 one I can think of that ended in a collision. 19 I'm going to try now to get to the 20 0. Okay. 21 Seattle Police Department pursuit policy, if I can make 22 this work. Give me a moment, and let's see if we can do 23 this. I've got the Nampa one. Let's see. Here we go. Can you see that all right? It says Seattle Police 24 Department Manual, Police Manual --25

1 Yeah. You did it right. You're sharing Α. 2 your screen and I see it. BY MR. KANE: 3 So from your information, what I did was I 4 Q. pulled the 2017 policy. And the reason I did that is it 5 coincides with the year of the crash here in Nampa. 6 Now, I know I sent this to your counsel earlier. 7 Did you have a chance to review this at all? 8 9 Α. I took a couple minutes and reviewed it, just to see if it's the way I remember it, and pretty 10 11 much it is. 12 Q. All right. Very good. So right up on top there, 13.031-POL, there's a 1, Definitions, Eluding. 13 As you can see, the definition of eluding in Seattle 14 15 was: When an officer operating an authorized police 16 vehicle issues by hand, voice, emergency lights or siren 17 a visual and/or audible signal to the driver of the 18 vehicle to stop, and after a reasonable time to yield in response to the officer's signal, the driver does any of 19 20 the following. 21 And there are 3 points there. Increases 22 speed, takes evasive actions, refuses to stop. 23 You know, I got into this, and I did forget to do one thing. 24 I would like to have this 25 MR. KANE:

marked -- sorry about that Diana -- as Exhibit 1. 1 2 (Exhibit No. 1 Marked.) BY MR. KANE: 3 So definition of eluding is when increases Q. 4 speed, takes evasive actions, refuses to stop. Do you 5 see that? 6 7 Α. Yes. Is that the -- was that the legal definition 8 0. 9 of eluding in the state of Washington at the time? A. A lot of our police policies are based on 10 11 state law, but Seattle often takes a state law and 12 creates even more restrictive actions based on it. So I would have to see the actual state law that was in 13 effect at that time. 14 15 Okay. That's fine. The reason I ask is 0. 16 that eluding, under Seattle policy in 2017, would have 17 been exactly what Mr. Sena did here in Nampa. Would you 18 agree? Certainly increased speed, he took evasive 19 Α. 20 action and refused to stop. So yes, I would agree. 21 So was eluding a crime in Washington? 0. 22 Α. I believe that it was. 23 Was it a felony, a misdemeanor, or both? 0. I think had it was a gross misdemeanor. 24 Α. 25 Meaning something more than the average Q.

1 misdemeanor. Correct? 2 Α. Correct. Gross misdemeanors in Idaho have a higher 3 ο. penalty. Do they have a higher penalty in Washington? 4 Generally, yes. 5 Α. Okay. So if you continue, the policy also 6 Q. defines pursuit. And it's when an officer, operating an 7 authorized police vehicle with emergency lights and 8 siren activated, proceeds in an effort to keep pace with 9 and/or immediately apprehend an eluding driver. 10 11 Correct? 12 Yes. Α. 13 So was your law in Washington -- or I guess ο. 14 the policy says that both lights and siren had to be activated before it was considered a pursuit. Is that 15 16 right? 17 Α. Yes. 18 0. Now, you've read the Idaho statute. 19 Α. Yes. You would agree that, in Idaho, it's lights 20 Q. 21 or siren. Correct? And if you don't know, that's okay. 22 Α. I don't know right off the top of my head. 23 I'm happy to look it up. 24 It's a small component. All right. 0. So continuing on, do you see that there are certain 25

1 limits -- you see I'm moving my screen here. I hope you 2 can see. 3 Α. Yes. It talks about: Exercise due care and 4 Q. activate emergency equipment. 5 It says: Officers engaged in pursuit shall 6 drive with due regard for the safety of all persons and 7 will use both emergency lights and continuous siren. 8 9 Would you agree that, at least to begin a pursuit, and continue to engage in it until called off, 10 11 at all times the officer had to engage with due regard 12 for the safety of all persons? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Nothing unusual about that? 0. 15 Nothing. А. 16 Okay. And then you see down below: Q. 17 Officers will not pursue without justification. And so in Seattle, you see here that it 18 says: Officers will not pursuit solely for any one of 19 the following. 20 21 And we've got a list here. But as you have 22 already stated, it looks like no pursuits at all in 23 Seattle for a misdemeanor. 24 Correct. Α. Like DUI? 25 Q.

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. So it's an absolute forbidden act to pursue
3	for DUIs. Right?
4	A. There was a policy section that came out for
5	a while and it was it was allowing for DUI as long as
6	the public wasn't at risk. I can't quote it to you, but
7	there was a policy for a while, and I don't think it's
8	in effect anymore. I think even that got shut down.
9	But they were allowing officers to pursue for DUI for
10	the types of cases where someone just continues driving.
11	A lot of drunk drivers drive really slowly. They're
12	scared to drive fast or brain isn't processing the
13	street signs or the speed limit.
14	So there was an allowance for drunk drivers,
15	which you're right, was a misdemeanor unless you
16	committed several of them. So that was one exception we
17	had to the misdemeanor rule. I don't know if it's still
18	in effect or not. If I remember right, even that was
19	overturned.
20	Q. Okay. So do I understand you to say that
21	you could, when this policy was in effect, go after DUIs
22	when you were driving slowly and not a danger to the
23	public?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. All right. What kind of factors would have

to be determined when the public was not in danger? 1 2 А. The speed of the vehicle, the actions that the drivers take in order to get away from the officer. 3 So if they're engaging in reckless driving -- I'm trying 4 to remember if I had any. I think I did have a couple 5 DUI stops that officers were trying to make, and I said, 6 Let that one go. They're going too fast or they're 7 being too reckless, let that one go. And the officers 8 I never had an officer try and argue over the 9 would. air, or even later in my office say, Hey, I needed to 10 11 get that guy. 12 Q. Okay. So when the slow-moving driver in the scenario, as we've been talking about under this policy, 13 sped up, the pursuit was called off? 14 15 If they were engaging in reckless driving, Α. 16 yes. 17 Meaning what? Q. Driving with the intent to injure. 18 Α. It's 19 greater than gross negligence. But if they were just driving, say, 50 in a 20 0. 35, would that be a reason to call off a pursuit? 21 22 Α. I'd want to know what street that is. So a 23 35 miles an hour speed limit in Seattle might be, I discussed Highway 99 earlier. A lot of that's 35 miles 24 So 35 on a five-lane highway, probably not a 25 an hour.

Through a neighborhood, that would be called 1 problem. 2 off immediately. Yeah. Okay. I'm familiar with Seattle. 3 0. I've been there, I can't tell you how many times. 4 I've been all over the city. I can't think of anywhere where 5 eluding would even be possible, knowing the traffic in 6 Seattle. 7 Yeah. 8 Α. Are there times, particularly at night, when 9 0. there would be less public in certain areas of the city, 10 11 where simply speeding up, you could continue to follow a 12 driver without calling off the pursuit? I would need the officer to give me 13 Α. articulable facts as to why they thought it was a drunk 14 15 driver. And again, I think we're talking about a very 16 small period of time within Seattle. I don't believe, 17 looking back on any, there might have been one, maybe 18 two, where I allowed it to continue. But again, I need those specific articulable facts. If they're not 19 telling me, I would say, What's the pursuit for? And if 20 21 they said, LT, we think it's a drunk driver, we're doing 22 30 in a 25, I think I would let that one go. 23 So other than this one small period of time 0. that you're talking about that this sort of escape 24 valve, so to speak, on going after DUIs in certain 25

circumstances, other than that, would you agree that it 1 2 was the culture at Seattle PD not to pursue drunk drivers? 3 Yes. Α. 4 Was the culture based upon the thought that 5 0. it was inappropriate in all cases to do that? 6 I think I touched on this earlier. 7 Α. The main idea being -- this was what I talked to a lot of people, 8 9 a lot of officers and sergeants about, and command staff, equal rank or higher rank, is that it just didn't 10 11 balance the needs of the public to pursue at all costs. Seemed like reckless law enforcement behavior. 12 Q. I hear you, but there's a significant 13 difference between merely pursuing and pursuing at all 14 15 Would you agree? costs. 16 Α. Yes. 17 And the policy was, no pursuit at all. 0. Right? 18 Period. 19 For the most part, yes. Α. 20 Q. Did you carry that policy over to Oregon? 21 Α. Yes. 22 So are you coming from the standpoint that Q. 23 pursuits in other communities, in other states, for drunk driving, is simply wrong? 24 It seems to me that if a chief doesn't 25 Α.

consider the needs of the safety of the people that he's sworn to protect and serve, as well as those that work with him or her, they're out of balance. You have to consider, what is the crime that we're trying to solve here? What violator are we trying to stop? What level of crime has this person committed? So what actions am I able to take as a law enforcement officer in order to stop them?

9 Just because you have a bank robber in a house doesn't mean you can just shoot up the house. You 10 11 still have to be reasonable in your actions. And the 12 same thing comes with a traffic pursuit. Just because you can drive at whatever speed to follow whoever for 13 any minor crime doesn't mean it's good law enforcement 14 practice. You've engaged in something that is 15 16 inherently dangerous to the public, to the officer. 17 Think of the number of officers that we lose each year, and as well as to the violator. 18

So your answer is yes, you come from the, I 19 Q. hate to use the term -- bias, but I guess that's what it 20 21 is, that pursuits for drunk driving at all are just 22 plain wrong. It shouldn't be done.

23 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Mischaracterizes testimony. 24 25

111

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1 BY MR. KANE: 2 0. Is that what you're saying? I'm waiting to hear on the objection. 3 Α. It's already been done. 4 Q. MR. MORTIMER: It's the same objection. 5 THE WITNESS: So I answer the question 6 anyway? 7 8 BY MR. KANE: 9 We don't have a referee. ο. Understood. 10 А. 11 MR. MORTIMER: Go ahead, sir. 12 THE WITNESS: Can you ask the question one 13 more time? 14 BY MR. KANE: 15 You're coming from the, I'll use the word 0. 16 bias -- if you have a better word, I'll agree with 17 you -- that pursuing a DUI in all cases in all communities, is simply wrong? 18 Sorry. Go ahead. 19 Α. Go ahead. 20 0. 21 In my career, I've spent a lot of time Α. 22 reviewing the work of others. Use of force, collisions, 23 pursuits, performance reviews, whatever the case might 24 I have learned that it is generally unwise to use be. the words all or every. Each case is different. 25 You

have to look at each individual case. And just because 1 2 the last pursuit that I reviewed, let's say the officers were out of policy and they got in a collision, or they 3 didn't follow the manual guidelines, let's say they 4 didn't use their siren, something like that. So I'm 5 hesitant to use the term all. 6 In any case, it's always been important for 7 me -- in fact, I rely on my experience and my ability to 8 review others' work, but just because something happened 9 in another case, I don't come in to a new case and say, 10 11 Hey, something is wrong. I notice this. You can't do 12 it that way. You have to still evaluate the facts. All right. 13 Q. 14 And what you're presented with, in order to Α. then make a decision about whether the pursuit was 15 16 within policy or not. 17 I understand. That's what I'm trying to get 0. to here. Because this was the Seattle policy. 18 It sounds like you carried it over to Oregon. You come 19 from a place where, absent something unusual, you would 20 21 discipline one of your officers for pursuing a DUI. Is 22 that right? 23 I think discipline would result if they Α. disobeyed an order, and I can't remember anyone 24 disobeying an order. More likely, this would be a 25

training issue. Like I said, let's say someone used lights but didn't use their siren. As you and I have talked about, there's a requirement to use lights and siren. Or maybe they -- let's say an officer is trying to get to the scene and they're driving through stop signs and lights like -- I would -- probably that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

would be a training issue. Again, in my line of thinking, you know, I'm a mistake of the heart versus a mistake of the head. Are you really thinking about what you're doing? So more likely than not it would be a training issue.

Q. So I'm trying to pin you down and you're doing a good job on not being pinned down.

A. I'm trying to give an honest answer.

Q. I hear you. Have you ever opined, as an expert, that pursuing a drunk driver, a DUI, was inappropriate, other than this case?

A. I think -- no. I don't believe. In fact,
I'm looking at my cases right here, I don't believe I've
had any involving a drunk driver, if that was the
question.

Q. Yeah. That's right. So I think what I'm
hearing you say is, despite what Seattle policy was,
despite what your policy was, while there, at least on

the surface, a flat ban on pursuing any misdemeanor, you 1 2 would be willing to listen to the facts prior to making any determination on whether it's a training issue or a 3 discipline issue. Is that right? 4 Again, if I'm in the review process? 5 Α. Yes. To make sure, there's kind of going to be a difference 6 of in the moment versus in the review process. 7 8 0. Yes. 9 Α. Yes. Always important to listen to facts. Absolutely. 10 11 Okay. So continuing on down on this same 0. 12 page, No. 4: Officers will cease pursuit when the risk of the pursuit outweighs the danger to the public if the 13 suspect is not captured. 14 15 I don't believe there are any guidances in this particular policy, 2017, as to what that exactly 16 Now, if I'm reading this right, this of course 17 means. would only occur on felonies, which is apparently still 18 allowed, at least under certain felonies, to pursue it. 19 But even then, the officer was charged with weighing the 20 21 risk. Right? 22 Α. Yes. So what guidances did your officers have as 23 0. to when the risk outweighs the danger to the public? 24 We task officers with using their judgment 25 Α.

and their reasoning and their ability to observe and 1 2 articulate facts every time that they engage in any type of law enforcement action. In all cases, we can talk 3 about pursuits, we can talk about shootings, we can talk 4 about S.W.A.T. entries, we can talk about capturing a 5 bank robber. At all times you have to be aware of the 6 situation around you, what are the facts I'm presented 7 with, and what actions am I going to take as a law 8 enforcement officer? You have to consider those cases 9 in the light of what's reasonable, what is reasonable 10 11 for an officer to do. 12 And those standards are somewhat subjective, as I think you're suggesting. They absolutely are. Yet 13 they still have a review process. They still have a 14 court hearing process. There's still a discipline 15 There's still lawsuits. There's all the 16 process. 17 things that might result, as you can think of, that 18 occur after an incident, where others are now going to look back on the officer's actions and judge their 19 reasonableness in the light of what's reasonable 20 21 behavior to take, or what is egregious behavior or 22 reckless disregard on the part of an officer. 23 So hopefully that answers your question. There's always that standard. Again, we kind of touched 24 You can't blanket statement an incident just 25 on it.

1 because, you know, you saw a short snippet on the news. 2 You have to look at all the facts presented and make a decision based on the officer's actions and whether 3 they're reasonable or not. 4 Okay. Well, your point is well-taken. 5 0. Let's talk about some of those factors you're speaking 6 about. One of them would be traffic conditions. 7 Correct? 8 9 Α. Yes. To perhaps ask the obvious, but we should 10 0. 11 get it on the record, traffic conditions meaning what, 12 exactly? How many vehicles and pedestrians are on the 13 А. road and on the city streets and on the sidewalks. 14 If 15 you're in the middle of the Nevada desert, not a lot of 16 people around there. If you're in downtown Seattle, 17 kind of different. 18 ο. Sure. In Seattle there are people on the streets and driving all times of day and night. Right? 19 20 Α. Yes. 21 But nevertheless, for pedestrians and for 0. 22 vehicles, legal vehicles on the road, DUI is a threat to 23 them, is it not? Drunk drivers? Is that what we're 24 Α. Yes. talking about? Yes. 25

David T.	Sweeney	- July	23, 2021
----------	---------	--------	----------

1

2

3

24

25

Q. So what's the tipping point on a pursuit as to when traffic factors are such that pursuit should not happen?

Again, as I said, you can't -- there is no 4 Α. blanket answer for that. There's no bright line answer 5 for when that is. You have to look at all the facts 6 that are available to the officer at the time. 7 And their decision as to what the law allows me to do in 8 order to pursue this offender, and also, but what is 9 reasonable. If the law allows for you to do something, 10 11 it doesn't always make it a good thing to do. And 12 that's what a police officer should be doing, is weighing those factors, examining all of -- everything 13 that's coming to them, all their senses, in whatever 14 police action they're involved in, and trying to decide 15 16 at that time, is it reasonable, what I'm doing right 17 now? Or uh-oh, and you get a bad feeling, this is not reasonable, let me rethink my tactics here, let me 18 approach this from a different direction, let me try 19 something else. 20 21 There is no tipping point? 0. 22 Α. Correct. 23

Q. Everything stands and falls on its own merits in the individual pursuit?

A. It does.

1 Q. Let's go to speed. 2 I'm sorry, I need to take a 2-minute break Α. if possible. 3 Q. Of course. 4 (A break was taken.) 5 BY MR. KANE: 6 So among the factors that an officer would 7 ο. be expected to think about, aside from traffic 8 9 conditions during a pursuit, would be speed. Correct? Yes. 10 Α. 11 Now, you used the example of 30 in a 25. 0. 12 Right. Α. 13 The example that you gave me, you thought Q. 14 that would be all right to pursue, given all other factors being --15 Again, yeah. It's kind of a generalization. 16 Α. 17 But I'm not going to be too alarmed at 30 in a 25. Well, when do you get alarmed? 18 0. Well, again, we've got to look, are you --19 Α. are we looking at Seattle? Are we going back to my time 20 in Seattle? 21 22 ο. We're looking at the policy. 23 My first thing I want to know is, what's the Α. 24 crime? Are we saying it's a DUI? We're on the policy. The policy pretty 25 No. Q.

1 much says felonies only. 2 Α. Right. So even then, for No. 4, the officer has to 3 ο. weigh certain factors. 4 5 Α. Sure. You spoke about traffic conditions. Now I'm 6 Q. going to speed. 7 Right. That's another factor. Absolutely. 8 Α. So other than 30 in a 25, when does it 9 0. become, I think in your term, alarming? When is the 10 11 speed alarming? 12 It's a hard question to answer. I'm trying Α. to do my best. The reason is because in Seattle the 13 pursuit's already called off, so I don't even really get 14 to hear much about speed. If an officer turns on lights 15 16 and siren, says, I'm following someone, and they're 17 refusing to stop, or failing to yield or something like 18 that, I might listen. Now, there are some times when people don't 19 They have room to pull over, they're scared from 20 stop. 21 the lights and siren. There's any number of things that 22 can happen. When it appears that the driver is now 23 taking actions in order to elude the offices, we have kind of talked about that. When they're increasing 24 their speed, when they're running stop signs, things 25

like that.

2	So to get back to your question, you talked
3	about speed, when we look at those factors. Again, I've
4	still got to know what crime we're investigating, but in
5	general, that pursuit's going to be called off. They
6	just say, I'm not pursuing at this point. They shut
7	lights and sirens down. That's why it's a hard question
8	to answer. The pursuit's not really happening at that
9	point. At least in Seattle, we haven't had one on the
10	Oregon State University. The pursuit's not even
11	happening, so you're almost getting to the point where
12	you hear about those speeds, the stop signs, or the
13	reckless driving, whatever the case might be.
14	Q. So speed is not a factor? Is that what
14 15	Q. So speed is not a factor? Is that what you're saying?
15	you're saying?
15 16	you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor.
15 16 17	you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would
15 16 17 18	you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would cause an officer to stop the pursuit?
15 16 17 18 19	you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would cause an officer to stop the pursuit? A. When it becomes part of the eluding, when
15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would cause an officer to stop the pursuit? A. When it becomes part of the eluding, when someone again, I can't define for you. There's no</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would cause an officer to stop the pursuit? A. When it becomes part of the eluding, when someone again, I can't define for you. There's no bright line. But when that officer's engaged in trying</pre>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you're saying? A. Oh, no. Definitely a factor. Q. But when does it become a factor that would cause an officer to stop the pursuit? A. When it becomes part of the eluding, when someone again, I can't define for you. There's no bright line. But when that officer's engaged in trying to stop a violator, and it becomes clear that the person

going to get shut down, because again, we're talking 1 2 about the safety factors. So what harm comes from continuing that 3 pursuit, versus what am I stopping this guy for? So 4 yeah, speed is one of those factors. I hope that 5 answers the question. I'm trying to. 6 I guess what I think I'm hearing, you tell 7 0. me if I'm wrong, is a felon, pick a felony, begins to 8 That's when you call it off? 9 elude. Now we're talking felony. That's 10 Α. No. 11 different in Seattle. An officer would be allowed to 12 pursue for a felony. Again, you have to allow for the danger to the public, the inherent risk of pursuing a 13 felon in that case. So we have to consider --14 15 I'm sorry, Commander -- Lieutenant, I've Q. been talking about felonies only. So let's stay with 16 17 felonies, then. Okay. I was still kind of back in 18 Α. misdemeanor land. 19 20 0. No. We're felonies only. 21 That kind of helps. Α. 22 Q. So again, felony pursuit in Seattle --23 Α. Yes. Traffic conditions was something that the 24 0. officers would have to think about? 25

1 Α. Yes. 2 And they would have to make the individual 0. call based on that and other factors, which we'll get to 3 in a minute, as to whether or not to continue the 4 pursuit of a felony. Correct? 5 The officer always had the responsibility to 6 Α. be reasonable in their actions. So just because a 7 8 supervisor is not calling it off doesn't mean, woo-hoo. 9 0. I get that. That's not true. So an officer is always 10 Α. 11 responsible for their actions. So from my standpoint --12 They have to weigh the risks? 0. 13 Absolutely. So no, blanket pursuit, it's Α. 14 not that you're going to do whatever you want. One risk is a traffic factor. Another is 15 0. 16 speed? 17 Α. Yes. In the context of felony pursuits in 18 0. Seattle --19 20 Α. Yes. -- talk to me more about when speed became 21 0. an overriding factor when the office should call it off? 22 23 Every time that you go faster, you've Α. 24 reduced several things. One, your ability to see. Your vision narrows to what's directly in front of you and 25

you're not able to perceive everything that's around you. Number 2, the vehicle capabilities. At higher speed it takes longer to stop and slow down and to execute a turn.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

And then 3, we talk about the violator. We don't know their driving capabilities or the capabilities of their vehicle. There's a lot going through an officer's mind when they get involved in a pursuit. Then you have tactical considerations at the same time. You're thinking, Okay, that pursuit I talked to you about earlier with the car jack suspect in Seattle. He shot at officers out the window. So I have a lot of things going on at the same time in deciding whether to pursue or not, and your job is to protect the public.

16 From that guy, there was a great duty to 17 protect the public, especially based on his actions. So when there is a felony, and again, you said is, insert 18 your felony here, even amongst felonies there's 19 different levels. Right? The bank robber that just 20 21 shot up a place and injured or killed someone, you're 22 going to take even greater risk than, let's say, the 23 burglary suspect. Someone broke into a storage building and stole something out of it. Both are felonies, but 24 which one is the greater risk to society? Clearly the 25

bank robber who was willing to shoot it up. 1 2 Q. How about the burglar who is running stop signs and red lights? 3 That might be a pursuit. In fact, I've had Α. 4 some of those early in my career. 5 Sure. Because running red lights and stop 6 Q. signs is a danger to the public. Right? 7 Α. Absolutely. 8 9 0. So I'm going to try to put words in your mouth, and you'll have the opportunity to pick it apart. 10 11 At the end of the day, unless called off by an officer, 12 another officer, the pursuit is left up to the individual officer to weigh those factors and determine 13 whether to continue. Is that fair? 14 15 Yes and no. Absolutely the officer has the Α. greatest responsibility. They're the ones behind the 16 17 wheel, and if something goes wrong, they're the one on the stand with their hand in the air swearing to tell 18 the truth. Yet there's still a responsibility for the 19 supervisor, placed on them with the authority that 20 21 they're granted as a sergeant, lieutenant, captain, 22 chief, whatever rank they're given. And most 23 departments, abiding by common law enforcement standards, it is common that the supervisor also have 24 supervisory control of that incident. 25

1	Now, they're not driving the car. They
2	don't have their foot on the gas or the brake, or
3	they're not making that turn. Yet they still have to
4	listen to what's going on and make a decision at that
5	point. If it sounds like what they're hearing on the
6	air, sometimes even in a felony, it doesn't mean you
7	do not have blanket permission, just because it was a
8	felony, to pursue at all costs.
9	Just because your car will go 140 miles an
10	hour, it doesn't mean that that's something that you
11	would reasonably be able to do to pursue a felon out
12	there. We would find that unreasonable. The car can't
13	physically stop if something were to happen in front of
14	it. So again, there's an extreme example.
15	Q. That's pretty extreme.
16	A. But if you think about it, the car is
17	capable of doing 140 miles an hour, and on a
18	straight-shot highway, with no one around, or on a drag
19	strip, the officer is capable of driving 140 miles an
20	hour. But what have they lost? They now can't
21	recognize street signs, they can't see anyone around
22	them. You probably can't even really focus much on the
23	driver ahead of you. It's all you can do to keep the
24	car straight on the wheel. And the slightest turn,
25	you're in a crash.

I use that as an extreme exam. But to try 1 2 and explain that, just because an officer can do something physically, it might not make it reasonable. 3 And again, they're still going to be liable for their 4 actions on that pursuit. We're using a fictitious, I 5 went 140 miles an hour to pursue this individual. 6 Ιt doesn't make it reasonable to go that fast. 7 And any supervisor that hears that is going 8 to be derelict in their duties. No. This sounds okay 9 to me. No, a supervisor is then unreasonable in their 10 11 responsibilities, too, if they were to allow something 12 like that to continue. 13 Q. Okay. But my question was, during the pursuit, it's up to the individual officer, unless 14 called off, to weigh those risks in his own mind and 15 determine whether to pursue? 16 17 I think I tried to answer that by also Α. saying there's responsibility for the supervisor. 18 I get it. But unless called off, it's up to 19 Q. 20 the cop, in the arena at the moment, to make that call. 21 Right? 22 А. I'm not trying to be difficult. I still say 23 there is a responsibility for both. The supervisor's been in the position, supposedly because they have some 24 experience, some training, some supervision guidance. 25

So they are still responsible for the actions of their 1 2 officers. So you can't allow an officer to be 3 irresponsible. Now, I will say that the greatest proportion 4 is the guy behind the wheel, absolutely. Steering the 5 car action driving, braking, all of that. That's the 6 greatest responsibility. I hope that answers the 7 question. I'm trying. 8 Q. So after almost an hour and a half, we're 9 finally going to get to Nampa. Actually, not. I want 10 11 to ask one more question. Do you know of any other 12 jurisdictions in Washington that have adopted policies similar to what we're looking at here, on-screen 13 sharing, where pursuits will be pretty well banned 14 absent a felony? 15 16 Most of the Puget Sound agencies adopted Α. 17 similar standards, and that's where sometimes when a 18 pursuit would happen in a city, quite often you'll hear the offices ask for state patrol, because the Washington 19 State Patrol was still allowed to pursue, specifically 20 21 if something went on the freeway. They're not generally 22 going to come into your city to do a pursuit. But on 23 the freeway sometimes that was allowed. I would not be able to say for sure without 24 looking at all of the policies, but I know that it was 25

common that many of the Puget Sound agencies adopted 1 2 similar standards. Q. Do you know if any of the Eastern Washington 3 cities adopted that policy? 4 Α. I'm less familiar with those in Eastern 5 Washington, so I couldn't say. 6 Q. Do you know of any Idaho jurisdiction that 7 has adopted this policy? 8 9 Α. No. Is this your first Idaho case? 10 0. 11 Α. Yes. I can't think of any other Idaho 12 Correct. cases. 13 Q. All right. Okay. 14 (Exhibit No. 2 Marked.) BY MR. KANE: 15 I'm now going to officially ask that the 16 Q. 17 Nampa Police Department Policy 313 be marked as an exhibit, as 2. 18 Is there a way to make it bigger? 19 Α. I'll do that. Before I do, though, I 20 0. Yes. 21 want to just ask you some general questions. Are you familiar with Lexipol? 22 23 Α. Yes. 24 You know what they do? 0. 25 Α. Yes.

Do you have any issues as a police commander 1 0. 2 with the Lexipol policies in general? I haven't studied them extensively. This 3 Α. appears to be based on Lexipol. 4 It is. 5 0. Right. So I can't say that I've studied 6 Α. them extensively at all. We considered using Lexipol 7 here at Oregon State University, but ultimately did not 8 utilize them, and the chief is primarily responsible for 9 policy here. So I can't say that I've weighed the 10 11 different policy producers out there, for lack of a 12 better term. I can't really say. 13 Q. The reason I ask is that it may shorten the conversation if you had a view that Lexipol was somehow 14 inadequate or something like that. 15 I don't. 16 Α. 17 Okay. Well, this is the policy that Nampa Q. had adopted, and you've reviewed this. Correct? 18 19 Α. Yes. All right. You'll see that this was in 20 0. 21 effect in August of 2017. Right down there at the 22 bottom. Do you see where my little arrow is there? 23 I do. And there's the Lexipol. There you Α. 24 go. So I guess the first thing that I noticed 25 Q.

about this policy was it was significantly longer than 1 2 the Seattle policy, with a lot more flesh on the bones, for lack of a better term. Did you find anything wrong 3 with this policy? 4 There were some issues that were concerns to 5 Α. me, yes. 6 Tell me what they were. And if you need to 7 0. refer to a specific page, I'll go to it. 8 That's okay. 313.1, Purpose and Scope: 9 Α. Vehicle pursuits expose innocent citizens, law 10 11 enforcement officers, and fleeing violators to the risk 12 of serious injury or death. The primary purpose of this policy is to provide officers with guidance in balancing 13 the safety of the public and themselves against law 14 15 enforcement's duty to apprehend violators of the law. 16 So I was a little concerned, in essence, 17 that sounds good, and I'm sure we're starting to get to 18 the Nampa Police Department, but it doesn't seem that that balance took place. I think that's a lot what you 19 20 and I spent last half hour talking about. It's that 21 balance. I might term it more as reasonableness, the 22 officers weighing the reasonableness. 23 My question was, was there anything about 0. that policy that you found wanting? 24 There's a section that says, I think it's 25 Α.

still in the same section, deciding whether to pursue a motor vehicle is a critical decision that must be made quickly and under difficult and unpredictable circumstances.

1

2

3

4

18

19

25

I had a problem with that because this 5 decision need not be made quickly. You can evaluate all 6 the circumstances around you. You can still utilize 7 your, I sometimes call it police brain. Again, it's 8 reasonableness. That standard of reasonableness. 9 And as it goes on, the longer it goes, you have more time to 10 11 evaluate your actions, in any type of police action. 12 But since we're talking about pursuits here, the longer it goes the more time you have to think, and this is not 13 occurring quickly. There might be a decision as to 14 whether I make a right or a left or hit the brakes. 15 You 16 still have time to evaluate the actions that are going 17 So that was one concerning thing to me. on.

Q. What else was of concern to you? If you want me to move it, that's fine.

A. That's fine. I'm trying to look at some
notes I took. This was a little concerning to me.
313.2.1. My answers are --

Q. Slow down. Let me get it up on the screenhere.

A. Okay. No problem.

313.1.2? 1 0. 2 Α. 313.2.1. All right. When to Initiate a Pursuit? 3 0. Right. Officers are authorized to initiate 4 Α. a pursuit when it's a reasonable to believe that a 5 suspect is attempting to evade arrest or detention by 6 fleeing in a vehicle. 7 That seems a little careless in a policy to 8 9 me to give officers carte blanche, yep, you're authorized to pursue if someone's trying to get away 10 11 from you. That seems short-sighted to me when I read 12 that. 13 Maybe you can interpret it that way, but it Q. follows immediately with a series of factors that must 14 be considered, and they go on for a bit. 15 16 Right. As you and I talked about, those are Α. 17 all the factors that someone's going to be using in 18 order to evaluate your reasonableness, what's reasonable in the actions that you took. But to start off, your 19 policy as to when to initiate it, you can't argue that 20 21 language. I'm not talking about you specifically, but 22 if an officer, if someone told an officer, Hey, you 23 shouldn't have done that pursuit, I'd bring up this language right here. It says I'm allowed to. 24 I find that troubling. 25

Okay. But you would agree that right below 1 0. 2 that there are a series of factors that shall be considered. So it's not just that sentence standing 3 alone. Right? 4 I do agree that -- you're absolutely right. 5 Α. I'm sorry, is it Mike? 6 Yes. 7 0. I agree, Mike, that right below that it 8 Α. The following the factors individually and 9 says: collectively shall be considered in deciding whether to 10 11 initiate a pursuit. 12 So then we get into some of the things that you and I have talked about. The known or reasonably 13 14 suspected crime, protecting the public. So did you find anything concerning in these 15 0. 16 factors, A through L? 17 In Line H I was concerned, because it says: Α. Performance capabilities of the vehicles used in the 18 pursuit in relation to the speeds and other conditions 19 of the pursuit. 20 To me this reads about the conditions of the 21 22 officer's vehicle, and it doesn't talk about any of the 23 suspect's vehicle, the person you're trying to pursue. They're the ones leading the pursuit. They're the ones 24 leading the chase, and it seems you should consider both 25

the capabilities of the driver as well as the vehicle 1 2 they're driving. How would the officer even know what the 3 ο. capabilities of the suspect vehicle would be? 4 Exactly. That's my point. How would you 5 Α. even know? Maybe you could take a guess based on the 6 vehicle, but you don't know anything about the driver's 7 ability. So it's one thing to consider your own ability 8 and the ability of the vehicle you're driving, but what 9 about the capabilities and driving ability of the person 10 11 that you're chasing? I thought there should be some mention of that. 12 13 Okay. Any other concerns with this ο. 14 particular section? 15 Α. No. 16 Any on other concerns with the pursuit Q. 17 policy at all? A. Looking at my notes, just seeing if anything 18 else stood out to me. Yeah. Let's move to, let's --19 it's in the Section D, small letter D in the Terminate. 20 21 Move on down. 22 ο. Okay. Let's look at that. So Extended Pursuits --23 Α. 24 this is No. D -- Extended pursuits of violators for misdemeanors, not involving violence or risk of serious 25

harm independent of the pursuit are discouraged. 1 2 And granted, I understand, sometimes police policies are not bright line. But why are they 3 discouraged but not prohibited? So that was concerning 4 for me for the Nampa Police Department's standpoint. 5 Q. Well, would you agree that, if you're not 6 going to prohibit them outright, in certain 7 circumstances they can still be discouraged? 8 It's really a philosophical issue, isn't it? 9 That's what they've done, exactly what you 10 Α. 11 said. They discourage it, but they don't prohibit it. 12 And you're right, it is somewhat of a philosophical, because I'm musing on it right now. Why not prohibit 13 If you recognize the danger and you'd like to 14 it? discourage the officers from doing it, it seems like it 15 hangs the officer out to dry. Well, the department 16 17 didn't say I couldn't do this, so I'm doing it. I was a little concerned about that aspect of the policy. 18 Any other concerns about the policy? 19 Q. Let me look. We've already talked about 20 Α. 21 this, but they mention it again. In 313.2.3, 22 subsection C. 23 Yeah. 0. Whether the speeds are beyond the 24 Α. capabilities of the police vehicle, thus making its 25

1 operation unsafe. 2 Again, we've made no mention of the capabilities or the driving abilities of the offender. 3 So it's a similar problem that I had before. You talked 4 about a long policy. The way to make it long is to 5 bring up the policy twice and write about it twice. 6 Okay. Any other concerns that you had? 7 0. I think those were the only things that I 8 Α. came up with that caused me some concern as I read the 9 policy from strictly a policy standpoint, yes. 10 11 Okay. Well, you would agree that the policy 0. 12 allowed for pursuing a suspected DUI. Correct? 13 I would say the policy allowed for --Α. Yes. we talked about that one section where it went to 14 15 initiate a pursuit. And again, I'm trying not to repeat 16 myself, but we talked about that issue that it's allowed 17 when someone's trying to evade arrest or detention. But then we get into the other issues, and I don't know if 18 you're ready to discuss these issues, but then we get 19 into the judgement of some of the officers, so I do have 20 21 concern there. 22 ο. I get that. 23 Α. Yeah. 24 What I'm going at here is the policy allowed 0. my cops to pursue this guy if they believed he was a 25

potential DUI. And I realize that you come from a place 1 2 where that shouldn't have happened. But you would agree that this policy allows that. Right? 3 There is still some issue with that. 4 Α. Yes and no. We talked about, I think we've read through the 5 sections of the policy where it specifically says that 6 you can. Again, trying to not get ahead of you or ahead 7 of myself and get into issues of judgment. But there 8 are sections in the policy that talk about weighing the 9 need to get this violator. If you want, I can try to 10 11 bring up those sections. 12 Q. We'll do that in a bit. I'd just like an 13 answer to my question. I'm not trying to be obstinate. I'm trying 14 Α. 15 to answer your question. So yes, the pursuit is allowed 16 with caveats, I guess is the best way I can put it. 17 0. Sure. Obviously. 18 Α. Yeah. Are you familiar with Idaho law as to police 19 Q. 20 policies? Are you aware of any cases that speak to 21 Idaho police policies, as regarding the tort of 22 negligence? 23 There was a case that Evan sent to me that Α. seemed to have a bearing on this. I assume, if you're 24 asking, that's one we could kind of talk about. 25

I'm just asking, sound like you reviewed at 1 ο. 2 least one case? Yeah. Athay versus Rich County? 3 Α. That's one case. Q. 4 MR. MORTIMER: Don't forget about Stacy. 5 MR. KANE: Yes. 6 BY MR. KANE: 7 That case really deals with reckless 8 0. 9 disregard. I'm talking about cases that speak to how policies, police policies are treated by the courts. 10 11 I don't have any independent knowledge Α. No. 12 of that. Okay. Well, if I told you that violation of 13 0. a policy, a police policy, does not mean that a duty has 14 been violated in the law of negligence, would you have 15 16 any reason to disagree with that? 17 Α. Say it one more time. I'll try and make it easier. You understand 18 0. that in Idaho, violating a policy, in and of itself, 19 does not mean you were negligent if you're a cop? 20 21 I do know that there are going to be Α. 22 differences in policies versus differences in state law. 23 And sometimes state law allows for greater leeway for an officer's actions versus what policy says. 24 So absolutely. You might be -- a case many years ago in 25

Γ

_	
1	Seattle, an officer shot a fleeing felon. He hit him in
2	the shoulder. It was against department policy, but the
3	state allowed it, because it was authorized. I think
4	that's what you're getting at. There's a different
5	example, but yes, there are cases like that.
6	Q. And we're on the same page. So you have
7	found some concerns with this policy, but would you
8	agree that if an officer was to violate this policy, it
9	does not automatically mean he was negligent?
10	MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Calls for purely
11	a legal conclusion.
12	THE WITNESS: Sorry. I have to take this
13	call. Be back in one minute, hopefully.
14	MR. KANE: Not supposed to happen when a
15	question is pending, but okay.
16	MR. MORTIMER: To be clear, Mike, it's not
17	me.
18	THE WITNESS: I apologize, I have an
19	emergency with a weapon that I do need to attend to. I
20	suspect that I can be back fairly quickly, but I do need
21	to leave at this moment. I apologize. Not my goal. If
22	everyone is still available this afternoon, we could
23	reengage.
24	MR. KANE: When you say you could attend to
25	it quickly, what do you mean?

1 THE WITNESS: As a supervisor, I have to go 2 and supervise. This is going to require my attention. MR. KANE: An hour? 3 THE WITNESS: No. Less than that. 4 MR. KANE: How do you want to handle, Evan? 5 MR. MORTIMER: Do you want to just leave and 6 reconvene at 3:15 or 3:30? 7 THE WITNESS: That's quite a bit longer. 8 We 9 could go. MR. KANE: Half an hour from now. 10 11 MR. MORTIMER: 2:15 your time. 12 MR. KANE: Let's go off the record. (A break was taken.) 13 BY MR. KANE: 14 15 I keep calling you Chief. I hope that's 0. 16 okay. Most Idaho positions, Chief, Deputy, something 17 like that. I hope that's okay. I think we're ready to 18 go to your declaration now, so let me see if I can bring that up. Here we are. We'll make this larger. 19 20 A. Here we are. 21 And I'm not going to insult you by asking if 0. 22 you recognize this. I know you do. 23 A. I do. I can't tell you how many times I've stated 24 0. that in a deposition, and someone says, Do you recognize 25

this document? It's got their signature on it. 1 Before 2 we actually get into the dirt here, tell me how familiar you are with the layout of the City of Nampa. 3 Not very familiar. I drove through earlier 4 Α. this year, but didn't have time to stop and really -- I 5 wasn't there for this purpose, so I didn't really go to 6 any of the locations that we're talking about. 7 I only know what I saw on Google Maps, and then I have a 8 9 diagram of the pursuit. That's most of my knowledge. So in answer to your question, not a lot of knowledge of 10 11 Nampa locality, geography. 12 So you've already answered my questions. 0. 13 You didn't go to Nampa and kind of follow the route of 14 this pursuit, then? 15 No. Α. 16 When you say you drove through, do you mean Q. 17 you drove through the freeway? I think I was on the freeway. 18 Α. Yeah. So you didn't actually get off at the exits 19 Q. 20 and scope out the town, then? 21 Α. No. 22 ο. So you've never been to Nampa? 23 I didn't know which part of the city Α. No. actually went through the freeway. No. I didn't spend 24 any time in Nampa. 25

But you did a Google Map, you say? 1 Q. 2 Α. Yes. There's a thing called Google Earth that 3 0. actually gets down to the streets and has photographs. 4 Did you do any of that? 5 I didn't use Google Earth, no. Α. 6 So if I asked you about your knowledge of 7 ο. the Getaway Bar -- in fact, I will ask you. What is 8 your knowledge of the Getaway Bar? 9 Very little. I only saw it in the police 10 Α. 11 report. 12 Okay. Do you have any knowledge that would 0. 13 contradict that the Getaway Bar is probably one of the 14 most significant bars in Nampa that emanate DUIs? No. I have nothing to contradict. 15 Α. 16 Okay. Did you check the weather conditions Q. 17 for the City of Nampa on July 14, 2017, during the night time? 18 19 Α. No. Do you have any doubt that it was a clear 20 0. 21 night, the moon in its last quarter, dry conditions? 22 Α. To say for absolute certainty, I would want 23 to go back to the police officer's report and look at 24 it, but at this time I don't remember. I remember that There was no fishtailing of cars in wet 25 it was not wet.

1 weather, wet streets. That type of thing. So no, I 2 would take the officer's word for it. July 14th in Nampa, I quarantee you 3 0. 90 percent of the time is going to be dry as a bone. 4 5 Α. I agree. Is there anything in particular that you 6 Q. feel that you learned from the Google Map that was 7 helpful to you? 8 9 Α. No, sir. The more useful one was the map with the pursuit route that was marked. I'm not sure 10 11 who created it, but I had access to it. 12 Did you review the in-car footage of 0. Officers Poore and Putnam, such as it was? 13 14 Right. One had body-worn and one had in-car Α. 15 video. I think Putnam was the primary. He had a 16 body-worn camera on, so you saw only the interior of the 17 vehicle, and then you saw when he exited the vehicle. Sorry, go ahead. 18 19 Q. Go ahead. Office Poore, second in the pursuit, I got 20 Α. to see the in-car video from the vehicle camera. 21 22 Q. Okay. Now, I know that you reviewed the CAD 23 document, but did you review the radio dispatch 24 document? Or audio, I should say. So Evan had sent me some document that I 25 Α.

Γ

1	believe probably had a password expired or something
2	like that. It seems like I initially reviewed it last
3	year when we first started talking about the case, but I
4	haven't looked at it since, and I couldn't really offer
5	much of an opinion at this point.
6	Q. When we're talking about it, are you talking
7	about the CAD document?
8	A. Yes. I don't have access to it now.
9	Q. Did you review the radio dispatch, the
10	actual audio?
11	A. No. Only what I could hear in the car, but
12	that was mostly covered by siren.
13	Q. Okay. All right. I'm going to pull up some
14	stuff on this and we will talk about it. So you see
15	there on paragraph 5, Dangers involved with police
16	pursuits are well-known.
17	You cite the National Highway Traffic Safety
18	Administration.
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And they ran a, I guess an analysis of the
21	pursuit-related crashes from 1996 to 2015. They came up
22	with 6,000 fatal pursuit-related crashes.
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Now, I didn't put it in as a document.
25	(Exhibit No. 3 Marked.)

1 BY MR. KANE: 2 0. But did this analysis differentiate between the kinds of failed pursuit-related crashes? 3 Well, I remember that it talked about --Α. 4 there's also line-of-duty deaths, which I also looked 5 at, and I might be configuring those two together. 6 Some of those went into more details about what the officers 7 were doing, or one-officer patrol, two-officer patrols, 8 9 what type of thing was going on with them. So I think it would be beyond me right now to say more specifically 10 11 than that. Now, I could click the link and look at that 12 if we want to do that. Q. Well, I don't know if we need to beat it up, 13 besides which I'm asking the questions. I will tell you 14 that the link does not match -- I don't think it 15 16 matches, because the link I'm looking at says, Vehicle 17 pursuits 2012 to 2013. 18 Α. Hmm. But I guess we can leave that for another 19 Q. 20 day. I guess the point I'm trying to make here is, it 21 doesn't differentiate, at least to your knowledge -- are 22 you checking it out it now? 23 If you'd like me to, I'm happy to if Yeah. Α. you're going to ask me more questions about it. 24 We're here. Go ahead, check it out. 25 Q.

Is that an underline next to -- I think it 1 Α. 2 is. Yeah. It's really not that important. 3 0. Ι just was really curious about that. Let's get back to 4 work. It's all right. 5 I think I can answer your question really 6 Α. quickly. If you look at the link that that brought up, 7 8 the very last paragraph is what I quoted there. So 9 you're right, the report that I pulled up is from 2012 to 2013, but the language I quoted does cover '96 to 10 11 2015, so it's kind of more of an informational. 12 I was confused by the 2012 to 2013 in the 0. 13 title. 14 I was too. Α. 15 So there is only a one-page document on the Q. link. 16 17 Α. Yes. Was there anything more -- it talks about a 18 0. full report in the fine print. Did you read that full 19 20 report? I might have. I do a lot of research 21 Α. 22 involving Department of Justice statistics, National 23 Highway Traffic Safety statistics, Bureau of Justice, FBI numbers, so my memory is failing me if I definitely 24 remember looking at that particular report that came up 25

from that link. I couldn't tell you at this point. 1 2 Q. All right. Well, I don't even know how to quite ask this question. The 6,000 cases they're 3 talking about here, would you agree, obviously must 4 involve cases in which people who were being pursued 5 kill themselves? 6 Yes. Where they die of themselves, yes. 7 Α. There were 2/3 of pursuit-related fatalities involve the 8 occupant of the pursued vehicle. So that's the greater 9 portion right there. 10 11 And they also include everything from what 0. 12 you described before as the people being pursued shooting out the back window, and any other kind of 13 cases. Correct? 14 15 Yes. As you and I both know, any number of Α. 16 things can happen in law enforcement on a daily basis, 17 especially when you're looking at statistics across the 18 country, yes. Q. And obviously any pursuant is going to have 19 an element of danger, even at low speeds. Correct? 20 21 Α. Sure. Even the most minor traffic stop --22 we're not even getting to the level of pursuit --23 there's some element of danger. You don't know who you're dealing with. Even if there's not a single 24 traffic violation in a pursuit -- well, there would be. 25

I guess you could have a pursuit without a traffic 1 2 violation, they're still refusing to stop. Okay. I think OJ Simpson did that. 3 0. 4 Α. Right. Did you do any similar analysis as to the 5 0. number during these dates of fatal DUI cases, crashes? 6 I didn't go deeper into the data to look at 7 Α. that, no. 8 Any doubt in your mind that DUI, driving 9 0. under the influence, is a highly dangerous thing to do? 10 11 Α. Yes. Correct. 12 You made your living from stopping them. 0. Well, my living was as a Seattle police 13 Α. officer, but they provided me many different 14 opportunities and different jobs to do. Every 2 or 15 16 3 years I was able to change jobs and do something else, 17 yes. Q. We talked about DUI being a misdemeanor, at 18 least in the early stages, until you get two or three of 19 20 them. 21 Right. Α. 22 Q. But it's still dangerous, even though it's a 23 misdemeanor. Right? 24 Α. Yes. Okay. So I want to go to paragraph 6 here. 25 Q.

I want to get in the weeds a bit. 1 2 Α. Okay. You start with your opinion on the first 3 ο. sentence, that it was appropriate for Putnam to initiate 4 the traffic stop. 5 Α. Yes. 6 Now, you then say: It is my opinion it was 7 ο. reasonable for Officer Putnam to initiate his sirens and 8 lights to pursue Mr. Sena after he attempted to flee. 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 But by continuing to pursue Mr. Sena on 0. 12 July 14, 2018, even after it became clear that he was 13 not going to voluntarily stop his vehicle, and was going to flee at all costs, Putnam, Poor, and Nampa PD acted 14 with reckless disregard. 15 16 Okay? 17 Α. Yes. Now, I want to break that down a little bit. 18 0. When you say: It became clear that he was not going to 19 voluntarily stop his vehicle and was going to continue 20 21 to flee at all costs, what do you mean by all costs? 22 Α. It seemed that Mr. Sena -- is it pronounced 23 Sena or Sena? I believe it's Sena. I don't hang around 24 0. 25 with this guy.

Γ

1	A. S-e-n-a. I'll call him Mr. Sena. That's
2	how I've been reading it. It seemed that Mr. Sena
3	refused to stop, and by all costs means that he would do
4	whatever it took to try to avoid capture by Officer
5	Putnam, which included running stop signs, speeding, and
6	eventually going very fast over the 16th Street bridge.
7	So all those actions so at any cost, put another way,
8	he's doing whatever he can to get away from that
9	officer.
10	Q. Yeah. I agree. But this is an opinion
11	that's already gone before the court. And when do you
12	believe that it became apparent to Officer Putnam,
13	Poore, and Nampa PD, that he was going to continue to
14	flee at all costs?
15	A. When you see the speed of the vehicle
16	increasing and you start seeing him running stop signs,
17	at that point it seemed apparent that Mr. Sena is
18	refusing to stop and is going to do what he can to avoid
19	capture, to avoid stopping his vehicle.
20	Q. So the first stop sign, in your opinion,
21	that was run, should have been the time they called off
22	the this pursuit?
23	A. I think for me to offer you an opinion on
24	that day, we need to go back and look at the video and
25	play it all together, and then I would give you my

opinion as to when I believe, one, Mr. Sena knows the 1 2 police are there. Again, I didn't see all of it. Because we 3 only see the body-worn camera from Officer Putnam 4 initially. So I'm kind of relying on the in-car video 5 from Poore, and he is not involved in the initial 6 pursuit. So it's kind of hard to answer that question. 7 From the video we have, we could throw it up and look at 8 it all together, and I could give you some opinions on 9 10 the way. 11 <u>o</u>. I don't think we need to do that. 12 Α. Okay. 13 Because the police report of Officer Putnam ο. actually lists the various stop signs and red lights 14 that were run. Did you review that? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 So my question is, as you sit here now, it's 0. 18 your opinion that the very first stop sign that was run, Officer Putnam, Poore, should have stopped the pursuit. 19 Is that what I'm hearing? 20 21 I'm not saying that. I would have to look Α. at it on an individual basis. Let's look at the video 22 23 and look at that. But I'm trying to answer your question. 24 Q. Well, you did. You already told me, as soon 25

as the guy ran a stop sign, that's when it became clear. 1 2 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Misstates his 3 testimony. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: There's two different things I 4 think we're talking about there. So the way I 5 understood the question, when we talked about it 6 earlier, there's going to be a point in that video where 7 you say, okay, Sena is trying to get away right now, or 8 9 see some of the maneuvers he's doing in order to try to get away from the officer. What we then have to advance 10 11 to, and I think this gets at your question, at what 12 point does it become unreasonable? You have to look at all the facts and render a decision right there. 13 BY MR. KANE: 14 15 Hang on for a second. 0. 16 Sure. Α. 17 I'm going to be in court Sunday on this Q. motion for summary judgment. We've got your affidavit 18 here. And you say, even after it became clear that he 19 was not going to voluntarily stop, and was going to 20 21 continue to flee at all costs, Putnam, Poore, and Nampa 22 Police Department acted in reckless disregard. When, in 23 your opinion, did it become clear that he was not going to voluntarily stop and was going to continue to flee at 24 25 all costs?

1 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Asked and 2 answered. Go ahead. 3 THE WITNESS: It was --MR. KANE: It was certainly asked, but it 4 sure as hell wasn't answered. 5 MR. MORTIMER: I think it was. 6 BY MR. KANE: 7 Q. Please give me an answer. When did it 8 become clear to these officers that he was going to 9 continue to flee at all costs? 10 11 MR. MORTIMER: I object to the question as 12 badgering and reinstate my objection as asked and answered. Go ahead. 13 THE WITNESS: I think to give you the best 14 15 answer on that -- I'm trying to answer the best I can --16 we need to actually be sitting and looking at the video, 17 whether we do it today or at another date. And I'd also like to see all the vehicle video, if it's available. 18 Again, that body-worn camera doesn't really 19 show me a lot. It's just the interior of that car. I 20 21 can read the officer' report, and I can look at that 22 body-worn camera, and I can see Officer Poore when he 23 joins the pursuit. There's a point that occurs there, and you know what? It's not an easy thing to define. 24 25 When is that exact moment? I've already told you that

1

2

3

4

I've maybe called off 30, maybe 40 pursuits. Is there an exact same time that I would do that? No. It's when I evaluate the facts that I'm faced with and render a decision as to whether to stop the pursuit.

Same with the officers in this case. 5 I'm not trying to belabor that point, but you're asking me 6 to say when the officers should have stopped the 7 pursuit. When it becomes clear that Sena is not going 8 to stop for them, you have to evaluate your head, why am 9 I pursuing this guy? Because it seems very clear to me 10 11 that this guy is not going to stop. So there might not 12 be one exact moment when that occurs, but the thought process in my head, you have to view it from the 13 standard of a reasonable officer, and where would that 14 occur? I can't answer that for you specifically. 15 Not 16 without looking at the video. And again, this might be 17 a subjective thing. I might say, It's right here, and another supervisor might say, No, no, I would have 18 stopped it one block before this. And another 19 supervisor might say, No, I think I'd let it go another 20 half mile. 21

22 So these are subjective opinions. We need 23 to sit down and listen the to the radio tape, where I 24 can actually hear everything that's going on, and look 25 at the video at the same time, and at that point I could

give an opinion, Mike, as to where is the point where I 1 2 would call it off. And beyond that, it would seem unreasonable to me, but I can't define it for you at 3 this moment. 4 BY MR. KANE: 5 I hear, but I need you to hear me. 6 Q. 7 Α. Okay. You have a signed affidavit that's being put 8 Q. 9 into a court against my motion for summary judgment. You can't tell me, as you sit here right now, when it 10 11 became clear to my officers at all, let alone when, as 12 to -- that he was not going to voluntarily stop. Yes or 13 no? In order to best answer your question, I 14 Α. 15 would want to rely on their police report, and I want to see what they say on that. Right now my link is not 16 17 working to have access to that report. So I would rely on that, and the video, the whole video of the pursuit. 18 And then I could -- I'm trying to answer your question. 19 That's the best I can say on it. I would give at a 20 21 point, I'd say, don't pursue past this point. 22 ο. And you can't do that now? 23 I can say, I watched the video last night. Α. And I saw Mr. Sena attempting to drive away from the 24 I saw him blowing stop signs and making quick 25 vehicle.

turns and speeding. At that point, I would say yes, 1 2 that's the point to stop that pursuit. Don't let it go 3 beyond that. But how do you know it became clear to the 4 Q. officers? 5 I can't. I can only judge it from the Α. 6 standpoint of a reasonable officer. 7 Q. All right. Then you say in this same 8 sentence -- you know what? I realized my door was open. 9 Let me close it. The whole office doesn't need to hear 10 11 this. Hang on a second. 12 Okay. In that same sentence, you then go on to say, Once it became clear, and he was going to flee 13 at all costs, that my cops, and Nampa PD acted with 14 reckless disregard for the safety and welfare of the 15 16 public. 17 Α. Yes. Please define what your understanding of 18 ο. reckless disregard means in this state. 19 Reckless disregard is defined in, I believe 20 Α. in the Idaho statutes. So looking at the Title 49-623 21 22 § 4: The foregoing provisions shall not relieve the 23 driver or an authorized emergency or police vehicle from the duty to drive with due regard for the safety of all 24 persons, no shall these provisions protect the driver 25

from the consequences of his reckless disregard for the 1 2 safety of Valley others. And that's obviously a legal term reckless 3 0. disregard. 4 5 Α. Right. I seem to be losing my voice here. Tell me 6 Q. what your understanding of the legal definition of 7 reckless disregard is. 8 9 Α. Acting in a way with -- there's some intent, there's knowledge of what you're doing, that it's 10 11 unreasonable. It's a different standard from 12 negligence, where you should have known what you were doing was dangerous. But now you know, what I'm doing 13 is dangerous, and I'm going to continue pursuing, even 14 though it's a traffic violator. 15 16 Okay. So let's talk about knowing it was Q. 17 dangerous. Everything a cop does out in the street when 18 he attempts an arrest can be dangerous. Right? 19 Α. Yes. 20 0. And cops know it's dangerous in the general 21 Correct? sense. 22 Α. Correct. 23 But would you agree that reckless disregard 0. is more than that? 24 It's acting with an intent. 25 Α.

Γ

1	
1	Q. To do what?
2	A. In this case, acting with an intent to
3	pursue this violator no matter what happened.
4	Q. And do you think that's what these cops did?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Pursued him no matter what happened?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. How do you get there?
9	A. The end result.
10	Q. We all know what the end result was. It was
11	extremely unfortunate.
12	A. It might end in someone's death, but I'm
13	going to keep doing it. I've got to get this violator.
14	That's reckless disregard right there. That's the very
15	definition of it.
16	Q. But would you agree that any pursuit could
17	theoretically result in somebody's death?
18	A. Yes. But society will accept that if it's
19	someone that society needs to be protected from. They
20	will give you extra leeway, and we kind of talked about
21	this earlier today. I'm talking about the homicide
22	suspect, the robbery suspect, the domestic violence
23	suspect.
24	Q. Okay. So your definition of reckless
25	disregard is knowing, at least in a general sense, that

it was dangerous to continue to pursue this individual? 1 2 Α. Yes. All right. Kind of a run-on sentence. 3 0. It goes on: Acted with reckless disregard for the safety 4 and welfare of the public, including Mr. Zamudio and De 5 La Fuente. Officer Putnam or his supervisor should have 6 terminated the pursuit when Mr. Sena increased his 7 speeds dramatically and began committing more dangerous 8 9 violations. I want to break that down. We all know that 10 11 Mr. Sena was speeding. You've seen the video, you've 12 seen the police reports. 13 Α. Right. 14 When did he increase his speed dramatically? 0. The highest speeds were over the 16th Street 15 Α. bridge, from what I could tell. He was so fast at that 16 17 point that, at least from my initial view of the video, 18 he was pretty out of video range. There's also the crest of the hill there. 19 20 Q. All right. We can certainly agree, although 21 dramatically is a bit of an adjective, but we can 22 certainly agree, I think, that he was speeding at 23 approximately 70 miles an hour when he crashed. As far as I know, based on what I read, yes. 24 А. 25 Anywhere prior to that moment, when he runs Q.

1 the red light and crests the curve, that he increased 2 his speeds dramatically? I think on the video I saw -- and it's also 3 Α. combined with, you can hear Poore's motor as he's 4 I don't know what he's driving. To me it 5 driving. sounds like a V6, but it might be a V8. But in any 6 case, you can see -- that's more my viewpoint. 7 So when you see and hear him accelerating 8 his police vehicle, and I think when you compare it to, 9 again, what can I see of Mr. Sena, admittedly a little 10 11 bit hard to see at times, because he's increasing his 12 speed dramatically -- again, the word I use there -- in order to try to get away from the officers. But it 13 seemed like he had several attempts to speed up his 14 15 vehicle as he would make a turn, hit the gas and try to take off again. 16 17 We'll probably talk about it here in a little bit. But they tried the PIT maneuver a couple 18 times when Putnam could get close enough to him. 19 It didn't work. But you keep seeing the truck speeding off 20 21 and the officers again having to accelerate quickly in 22 order to keep up with him. So those are some of the 23 dramatic speeds I'm talking about. Q. Well, dramatic is an adjective. Would you 24 agree that, up until they got to the bridge that we have 25

spoken about, it was really closer to what you might 1 2 call a moderate speed pursuit? I don't think I could fairly classify it as 3 Α. moderate right now. 4 Let me put it slightly differently. 5 0. Mr. Sena was in a 25, 30-mile-an-hour zone, and he would 6 speed until he came to a turn, and then he would by 7 definition have to slow down. 8 9 Α. Yes. In order to make the turn. Then he would 10 ο. 11 speed up again, and he would turn again, and this went on for a few minutes. 12 13 There was that neighborhood there. Α. Yeah. 14 Right. 15 So momentarily he would speed up, and he 0. 16 would slow down and speed up and slow down. Would you 17 agree that the only time that he got over approximately 50 miles an hour was when he got on that street and took 18 off over the bridge? 19 20 Α. At this point I'm unaware if there was any 21 speeds over 50 miles an hour during that twisting, 22 turning neighborhood section that you and I are 23 discussing. Certainly the greater speeds over 50 miles an hour occurred on the 16th Street bridge as he had the 24 straightaway there. I couldn't say for sure if there 25

was anything over 50 in that earlier part. 1 2 Let me go on a little bit here. You 0. 3 continue: And began committing more dangerous traffic violations. 4 Could you please tell us what you mean by 5 that? 6 The speeding and the stop signs. 7 Α. So the first time he ran a stop sign, which, 8 0. even if it was 35 miles an hour, you believe these 9 officers should have terminated the pursuit? 10 11 When it seemed clear that he was trying to Α. 12 get away, yes. This is kind of a circular question. 13 ο. I know. 14 Α. 15 I thought I was hearing you say before that, 0. 16 when he ran a stop sign, that was when they should have 17 terminated, because it, quote, became clear? 18 Α. I was answering more along the lines that, when it became clear that Mr. Sena was trying to get 19 away, that's the time to call off that pursuit. Then 20 21 you have to ask, What crime am I pursuing this guy for? 22 And now I'm making the conscious decision, Am I going to 23 continue this pursuit, yes or no? And the answer was 24 yes. Because -- you say it became clear sometime. 25 Q.

1 Α. Right. 2 And then later you say it's reckless 0. disregard because it became clear? 3 Α. Yes. 4 When he began committing more dangerous 5 0. traffic violations? 6 Yes. Going through stop signs and speeding. 7 Α. And you say that would be speeding and 8 0. running stop signs? 9 Yes. 10 Α. 11 So at the time of the first stop sign, they 0. 12 should have terminated the pursuit? 13 We'd have to go back to the video so we Α. 14 could break it down stop sign by stop sign. I can't really do that at this minute, but I'm happy to do that 15 16 if you want me to. 17 I just started to move down, and you say, Q. Mainly running stop signs. The pursuit should have 18 terminated within one or two blocks of these increased 19 dangers. He ran a stop sign, ran another stop sign, 20 that's when they should have terminated? 21 22 Α. Yes. 23 Then you say: Because it was clear Okay. 0. that the danger to the public greatly outweighed the 24 danger of letting Mr. Sena, a mere traffic violator, 25

Γ

1	escape arrest.
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Now, let's break that down. Again, there's
4	that word, clear. We've already spoken about the
5	weighing that officers have to go to. When did it
6	become clear? Or better I'm sorry. Scratch that.
7	How do you know it became clear?
8	A. I believe the officer wrote in his report,
9	which again, I don't have access to right now, but when
10	it became clear to the officer, and he wrote that
11	Mr. Sena is trying to get away from him, I think you
12	have to leave some leeway and give the officers the
13	benefit of the doubt that sometimes when you try a
14	traffic stop, people don't always pull over right away.
15	There are several reasons why they don't. They're
16	confused, they're scared, they don't have a place to
17	park, they're nervous. Or they could be intoxicated and
18	they don't even realize that a police officer is behind
19	them. They're unaware of their surroundings.
20	It's reasonable for the officers to follow
21	for a couple blocks, like, does this guy even know we're
22	here? That's what I was trying to describe. When you
23	see him beginning to increase speeds and running stop
24	signs, okay, he knows we're here. This is not just a
25	mistake or being unaware on his part. He's actually

trying to get away from us. So I can't answer that for 1 2 them, but I can apply my own standard to it, and when I see it, that's the time to stop the pursuit. 3 And it being the running of the stop signs? 4 Q. That is certainly, yes, one indicator that 5 Α. says, this guy really knows we're here, and wow, he's 6 really accelerating, and he's blowing stop signs and 7 taking that corner unsafely. He's trying to get away 8 There's a minute when that light's going to 9 from me. come on and you're trying to do a traffic stop, and you 10 11 realize someone's trying to get away from you. 12 And that's the moment you're supposed to 0. terminate? 13 I would say yes. Then you start to look at, 14 Α. what am I pursuing this guy for? What's the totality of 15 the circumstances? You look back, what's my initial 16 17 violation? What am I trying to do here? Should I continue this pursuit or should I stop it? And that's 18 when I say, you should stop it. 19 And by not stopping it at that moment in 20 0. 21 time, that's when it becomes reckless disregard. Is 22 that what you're saying? 23 Especially, yes, the longer it goes on. Α. But the minute the first stop sign was run, 24 0. you're saying that it's your opinion my guys are in 25

1 reckless disregard? 2 I think we need to go back and look at the Α. 3 video for that, and I need to see the whole video, and then I can give you a better answer on that question. 4 Let me ask this. Would you -- are you 5 0. saying that you don't know when reckless disregard 6 began? 7 It begins after the officers realize that 8 Α. Mr. Sena's not going to stop, and he's going to try to 9 get away from them. To continue pursuing at that point 10 11 would be reckless disregard for the safety of others. 12 Q. As you sit here, do you think that happened when they got to the bridge? 13 14 I think it occurred before the bridge. Α. 15 Can you tell us when? 0. 16 As I've tried to explain, I can't give you Α. 17 that definite moment. If we watched the video, I would point out when I would call it off, let's say if I was 18 an officer. I might even say, if I were a supervisor, 19 here's when I would call it off. 20 21 All right. In the last clause there: 0. This 22 pursuit should have been terminated within one or two 23 blocks of these increased dangers. 24 Do you see that sentence? 25 Yes. Α.

1 You then say: It was clear that the danger Q. 2 to the public greatly outweighed the danger of letting Mr. Sena, a mere traffic violator, escape arrest. 3 A. Yes. 4 Why is he a mere traffic violator? 5 0. He'd only committed a traffic violation at 6 Α. that point. So that's what he is. 7 Q. Well, officers are allowed to pursue on 8 9 probable cause. Correct? A. Are officers allowed to pursue on probable 10 11 cause? A DUI. Let's make it even clearer. 12 0. Are officers allowed to pursue on probable 13 А. cause? Well, if we look at the Nampa Police Department 14 manual, it might be discouraged. I think we discussed 15 16 that before, but not prohibited. 17 Q. Well, you -- officers stop, everywhere in 18 the country, DUIs? They only have probable cause. So that's allowed. Right? You can stop a guy on probable 19 20 cause. I always said that I didn't have probable 21 Α. 22 cause until I've been up to the window, and maybe I've 23 combined with some observations, some odor, a field sobriety test, and upon that point do I then determine 24 probable cause. Are you talking about reasonable 25

1 suspicion? 2 0. Indeed I am. You actually hit it for me. You got there. Yes. Let's go to that. It is not 3 illegal, immoral, or against policy to stop a car with 4 reasonable suspicion of DUI. We can certainly agree on 5 that? 6 Agreed. 7 Α. 8 All right. Now, every stop starts with a 0. 9 guy who exhibits -- or a woman, exhibits a potential to be DUI. Correct? Such as weaving, running a stop sign, 10 11 you name it. There are all kinds of reasons somebody 12 might attempt to stop a vehicle. Correct? 13 MR. MORTIMER: Object to the form. 14 THE WITNESS: Really long question. MR. MORTIMER: Go ahead. 15 16 THE WITNESS: Is the question, can an 17 officer stop a violator? Is that what I'm hearing? BY MR. KANE: 18 19 Q. Yes. 20 Α. Yes. They can. 21 So the term, "mere traffic violator," does 0. that include DUI? 22 23 They didn't have knowledge that he was DUI Α. 24 at that point, so that's why I put in a mere traffic violator. 25

1 Q. But they certainly had reasonable suspicion, 2 didn't they? He left the scene at that bar that we talked 3 Α. about, and then he stopped in the road and then he left. 4 Is that a reasonable suspicion for DUI? I would say 5 it's a reasonable suspicion for a traffic violation. 6 You might -- again, lot of experience in this area of 7 DUIS. You might think that it could be a DUI, but you 8 never knew for sure. So is it a suspicion? Sure. 9 Absolutely. It's a reasonable suspicion this guy might 10 11 be drunk. He left the scene of a bar. He stopped in 12 the road, and now he's weaving. That's why I said the officers had a reasonable suspicion to make that traffic 13 14 stop. Yes. 15 Q. Yeah. First of all, he didn't just stop in 16 the road. He stopped for 20 to 30 seconds, after 17 leaving a very, very well-known DUI bar. Okay? 18 Α. Yes. Can you accept that? 19 Q. 20 Α. I don't know about really well-known DUI 21 bar. But it's a bar, sure. 22 Q. All right. So that, in and of itself, would 23 be a reasonable suspicion, would it not? I would say for the traffic violation only. 24 Α. So you disagree that it might be reasonable 25 Q.

suspicion for a DUI at midnight, coming out of a bar? 1 2 A. It's a very subjective description that we're weighing there. One officer might say you don't 3 have reasonable suspicion for DUI there, one officer 4 might. 5 But you want my opinion. Is it reasonable 6 suspicion for a DUI? Here's exactly how I would term 7 I have reasonable suspicion for a traffic stop. 8 it. Now, if I go up to the window and I get the telltale 9 odor and some of the signs, now I'm on to reasonable 10 11 suspicion for DUI. 12 0. Okay. 13 So at first I'm total traffic stop, knowing Α. that there's a possibility DUI, but not reasonable 14 suspicion for it. 15 16 Q. All right. How about this. He now runs a stop sign and tries to get away from you. Do you think 17 that's reasonable suspicion for DUI? 18 No. At this point now I think the guy's 19 А. trying to get away. He might be wanted for something. 20 21 A DUI is still a possibility. You never know, why is 22 that guy running from us. You don't know. But your 23 guesses now expand. 24 Q. All right. But I'm sticking to the, "mere traffic violator." He's beyond that. Right? When he 25

1 runs the stop sign? 2 I'd say he's still a traffic violator at Α. 3 that point. How about eluding? 4 Q. Then he gets to eluding. Right. 5 Α. Yeah. We've now upped it, where he's taken those definite 6 steps as defined in the Nampa Police policy, to take the 7 steps to get away from the officers, yes. Now you're up 8 9 to eluding. Q. All right. So would you agree that running 10 11 a stop sign, deliberately running stop sign, is 12 dangerous to the public? 13 Α. Yes. 14 And not only the individuals, but also their 0. 15 property? 16 Α. Yes. 17 All right. What is your understanding of Q. the law of eluding in Idaho? 18 That if you take any -- I think their policy 19 Α. is kind of based on it. If you're taking those 20 21 affirmative actions in order to try to get away from the 22 officer, then you're taking efforts to elude the 23 officer. You're increasing your speed, you're running through stop signs, you're refusing to stop for that 24 audible or visual signal from the officer. 25

And what is your understanding of what the 1 Q. 2 penalty for eluding is in Idaho? Eluding is a misdemeanor, if I am 3 Α. remembering correctly. 4 If I told you that the law is that if you 5 0. endanger the public, it's a felony, would you --6 I think this was a section about that, and 7 Α. they defined it, if you were going a certain mile an 8 hour over the speed limit. Things like that. 9 I had it printed, now I can't find it. 10 0. 11 It's Policy 313.2. Α. 12 Well, if I told you that it was endangering 0. the public, that's when it's at felony level, would you 13 agree with me that what Mr. Sena was doing was 14 endangering the public? 15 16 MR. MORTIMER: Object to the 17 characterization. Misstates 49-1404. 18 BY MR. KANE: Go ahead with my question, sir. 19 Q. One more time on the question, then. 20 Α. 21 Would you agree that endangering the public 0. 22 was what Mr. Sena was doing? 23 Α. Yes. If I told you that that is enough to get you 24 0. to felony eluding, would you disagree with me? 25

I would not disagree. 1 Α. 2 All right. So now we don't have a mere 0. traffic violator anymore. We have a felon. Right? 3 Again, coming from Seattle, we don't count 4 Α. the eluding part of that. We look at what was the 5 reason for the initial stop. 6 But in Nampa --7 0. Α. That's what the officers are trying to 8 9 protect the public from. In Nampa it is not unreasonable, illegal, or 10 0. 11 against policy to attempt to stop a felony eluder. So 12 would you agree that that is more than a mere traffic 13 violator? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Going onto the next paragraph: My review of Q. the above-listed information revealed a complete lack of 16 17 Officer Putnam's and Officer Poore's consideration of the known risks and inherent dangers to the public 18 during a pursuit compared to the known risks and 19 inherent dangers to the public if they let Mr. Sena, a 20 traffic violator, go. 21 22 Now, you don't just say lack. You say a 23 complete lack. 24 А. Yes. 25 Q. How do you get there?

They're going to pursue this guy at all 1 Α. 2 costs, and all he did was stop in the road. Those two do not equate. We can't pursue and force someone into 3 whatever action they're going to take. You as the 4 officer have to be responsible, knowing that your 5 actions are then getting an action from the driver. And 6 if the only thing we have is a, in my words, a traffic 7 violator --8 9 0. Actually, those are your words. Not mine. They are my words. And they don't -- they 10 Α. 11 show me an officer that is thinking, I'm going to get 12 this guy no matter what. I don't care that it's just a traffic violation. I'm going to pursue him no matter 13 14 what. If he's going to go faster and faster, if he's going to drive through neighborhoods, he's going to blow 15 stop signs, he's going to speed, he's going to go 70 16 17 miles an hour over the bridge, we're still going, because this guy committed a traffic violation. That's 18 a complete lack of understanding of what the danger the 19 subject poses to the public, as opposed to how much 20 21 danger comes from a pursuit. The equation is so unequal 22 I'm baffled by it. I'm really baffled. 23 Q. Well, we just agreed that he was engaging in

Q. Well, we just agreed that he was engaging in a felony, and we just agreed that it's dangerous to the public. So how do you know they didn't take those

24

considerations into account? 1 2 Α. I don't know what's in their mind. I really don't, and I'm still baffled by it. I can't believe 3 that someone would engage in a pursuit that goes that 4 fast and that long for someone that committed a traffic 5 violation. It just doesn't make sense to me. That's 6 the complete lack of understanding. There's an 7 unawareness there that what I might be doing is 8 9 dangerous. They seem to have no recognition of it. Especially, I read their deposition 10 11 testimony too, and there's no understanding of, what's 12 the worst that happens if I let this guy go? Well, someone doesn't get a traffic ticket. What's the worst 13 that can happen if I let him keep going? 14 How about if a felon escapes? 15 0. We saw the result. 16 Α. 17 Isn't it true that what you're doing 0. Okay. here is your putting yourself in the minds of these 18 officers? 19 20 Α. Absolutely. 21 You really can't --0. 22 Α. Sorry, Mike. I was talking over you. 23 You can't know what they're thinking. 0. 24 Right? I have to view it from the standpoint 25 Α. No.

of a reasonable officer. 1 2 Q. All right. So on 8 here, the second sentence: Officers should consider the known crime or 3 suspected crime involved. 4 Now, would you agree, or do you disagree, 5 that a suspected crime of DUI occurred? 6 A. As we talked about, that's one of the 7 possibilities that surely could come to your mind as an 8 9 officer, seeing a guy leave the bar and then stop in the road for 20 to 30 seconds. 10 11 That's a suspected crime. 0. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Then we consider the known crime, at least ο. the running of the stop sign, is felony eluding. Right? 14 I don't consider that -- that's a result of 15 Α. 16 the police stop and the increasing speed and the lights 17 and siren, that the guy keeps going. I don't really consider that the known crime. The known crime is the 18 violation. 19 20 0. Why isn't it a known crime? It was right in front of the officers. 21 22 Right. Again, this is my opinion, and part Α. 23 of it comes from Seattle. But just because someone runs from you doesn't mean you can chase them at all costs 24 and cause danger to the public. You have to look at, 25

1 really, what are you stopping this guy for? What did he 2 do? Well, let's go on. 3 0. He stopped in the middle of the road. Α. 4 That's why you're stopping him. It's as a result of the 5 police action of continuing to pursue that then the guy 6 engages in his felony eluding. 7 Let's go on, because I think we're maybe 8 0. talking past each other. You said: There was no crimes 9 committed by Mr. Sena prior to Officer Putnam's 10 11 initiation of the pursuit. 12 Yes. Α. We can all agree on that. 13 0. 14 Α. Yes. 15 But can we agree he was also being stopped Q. 16 for a reason, which was that he was at least reasonably 17 likely to be DUI? I think I differed with you on this a little 18 Α. bit previously. I think that's one possibility that you 19 certainly would consider. As I were to make this 20 21 traffic stop, I might think this guy might be drunk, but 22 then again, he might have dropped something on the floor 23 and he had to stop and pick it up before continuing on his way. There's any number of reasons, but you are 24 25 correct, DUI might be one of those possibilities I would

be examining upon making that traffic stop. 1 2 Q. So you then say: The officer engaged in the pursuit for only minor traffic violations, failing to 3 use turn signals. 4 5 Α. Yes. Well, that's how it started. Right? 6 Q. Yes. 7 Α. But within a minute or two it was no longer 8 0. only a minor traffic violation. Right? 9 Yes. At that point where he begins his 10 Α. 11 eluding and he's trying to get away from the police, 12 yes. 13 It goes to an even higher level of 0. Sure. suspicion for DUI, and eventually, not very quickly, --14 almost immediately, goes into felony eluding. Right? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 All right. So this is a little unfair to Q. 18 say that they engaged in the pursuit, in the sense of the entire pursuit, for only minor traffic violations. 19 20 Right? I think that's fair. You have to look 21 Α. No. 22 back at what was the reason, why are you trying to stop 23 this guy? What did he do? What could you testify to? The reason I stopped him is because he stopped in the 24 middle of the road. Right? You're not supposed to do 25

Oh, now he's not using his turn signal. Now I've 1 that. 2 got another reason to stop him. Those are the reasons that you're trying to stop this violator. 3 Again, I agree, DUI might be one of the 4 things you're considering at that point, particularly 5 leaving the bar. So those are all things you're 6 thinking of as you're trying to get this violator 7 stopped. 8 9 We've got a couple things going here. Sure, my experience as a DUI officer immediately leads me to 10 11 think he might be DUI, because I don't have probable 12 cause at that point. But it might be reasonable to think, this is one of the things that I might find when 13 I'm up at the window. 14 15 So as the pursuit continues, there is more 0. 16 reason to stop him, because he's running a risk to the 17 public. Right? 18 Α. No. I'd have to disagree. Because then now you're considering, what's the risk to the public with 19 the driving that he's doing right now, versus the risk 20 21 to the public that's going to come because I continued 22 to pursue. 23 I hear --0. You have to understand that balance, and I 24 Α. don't believe they did. 25

David T. Sweeney - July	23,	2021
-------------------------	-----	------

1 I know you say that, but what I'm focusing ο. 2 on is this sentence: They didn't pursue for only minor traffic violations. 3 They pursued for other reasons, especially 4 as the pursuit continued. Right? 5 I can say -- I'm in agreement with you --6 Α. again, we can't put myself right in their mind, but it 7 certainly seems apparent that they wanted to stop 8 Mr. Sena for his initial traffic violations, and then 9 certainly, as he continues his violations, now he's 10 11 eluding, he's trying to get away, that they now want to 12 stop him even more. I think that's probably a good answer or the best answer I can give you on that. I 13 agree with you. I can't completely go into their mind. 14 15 I can give you my opinion, but that's what seems to be 16 apparent. 17 All right. So if you can't get into their 0. mind, why do you say there's no evidence that the 18 officers compared the immediate need for capturing 19 Mr. Sena for committing minor traffic violations against 20 21 the risk of pursuing Mr. Sena at all costs? 22 Α. Because they kept going without a single 23 thought, you know how this might end up? How do you know that? 24 0. It never seems -- if it had entered their 25 Α.

Г

1	mind again, if I could go back and give them a scale
2	and say, okay, you have this traffic violation. Now, it
3	might end that the guy would stop. It might end in a
4	pursuit that results in death. What should you do? And
5	let them weigh that back and forth. Now, they don't
6	know it at the time, but boy, you've got to have that
7	mindset. You've got to think about the public you're
8	sworn to protect.
9	Q. How do you know they didn't do that?
10	A. Because they kept going. They kept going,
11	Mike. Now matter how fast he goes, they kept going.
12	Q. Well, Chief, he didn't get to high speeds
13	until he got to the bridge. Isn't that true?
14	MR. MORTIMER: Object. Vague and ambiguous.
15	Go ahead.
16	THE WITNESS: I think he was going faster
17	than those neighborhoods are designed for.
18	BY MR. KANE:
19	Q. That's probably true. You don't know what
20	was in their minds, do you?
21	A. I don't what?
22	Q. You don't know what was in their minds.
23	A. The officers?
24	Q. Yes.
25	A. No. I'm actually baffled. I really am.

Now, it was night. You've seen the videos. 1 0. 2 There wasn't much traffic, there wasn't much pedestrian traffic. Any reason to believe they didn't take that 3 into consideration? 4 Well, again, reading their depositions, I 5 Α. don't think they even saw -- most of the vehicular 6 traffic was on 16th, on the bridge. 7 0. All right. 8 9 I think I counted 11 cars. And they thought Α. there was only 1 or 2. One of the officers did. Yeah. 10 11 So it doesn't seem like they fully recognized how many 12 people were out and about at that time of night. 13 11 moving? Q. 14 That's as many as I counted. In the initial Α. neighborhood pursuit, I didn't see any -- I don't think 15 I saw -- I can't swear to it. I can look back at my 16 17 notes and see if I saw anyone prior. Most of the vehicular traffic was on 16th. I think that's fair to 18 19 say. Q. All right. So how do you know they didn't 20 take into account of the lower traffic? 21 22 Α. They said they did. They talked about 23 speeds and the time of night and that there's not many 24 people out, and therefore not much danger. But there were people out, there was danger. 25

We're not talking about Seattle here. We're 1 Q. 2 talking about Nampa. 3 Α. Agreed. And so how do you know there's more danger? 4 Q. Look at the end result. Obviously there was 5 Α. other people out. We know there was people out. I saw 6 them on the video, and unfortunately saw the people at 7 the end result. 8 9 Q. You can't base what happened to these unfortunate people on how many cars there are. There is 10 11 obviously some cars. Right? 12 I think that was my point, is that A. Yeah. the officers seemed to think because there's not many 13 people out here, therefore we can continue the pursuit. 14 They were not considering the safety needs of the people 15 that are out there. 16 17 Q. You say in this sentence, and I'll kind of 18 circle the area here, that: The officers now are pursuing him at all costs. 19 20 Not Mr. Sena getting away at all costs, like 21 you said before, but the officers pursuing at all costs. 22 Α. Right. 23 How do you get there? 0. How do you value a human life? What's the 24 А. cost of that? 25

That's the end result of Mr. Sena's 1 ο. 2 behavior, but --3 Α. Right. -- how do you know what the officers are 4 Q. thinking as they're pursuing him at all costs? 5 I think we've talked about this before. Α. 6 Ι can't say specifically what's in their mind, but it 7 seems to me the best way to answer that is that they did 8 not consider those costs. They didn't think about the 9 safety of others, they didn't think about those people 10 11 that might end, you know, in a tragic way in a crash. 12 So when I say all costs, it's like, we got to get this guy, we got to stop him. The part I'm still baffled by. 13 14 That reasoning doesn't resonate with me. Mу 15 mind is having a hard time processing why we would 16 continue to go after that guy for a traffic violation. 17 If you told me he was a felon and a danger to others because he robbed a bank, sure. If he was a homicide 18 suspect, sure. But all he was was a traffic violator. 19 Did he commit felony eluding when he ran 20 from the officers? I'd have to look at the statute. 21 22 You say he did. I'll take your word for it. But again, 23 what's his danger to society? The initial traffic stop is traffic violations. By continuing to pursue him, 24 he's now committing felony eluding. It's almost like 25

the officers are helping him in his effort to speed 1 2 faster and faster. Because of their actions, he's now engaging 3 in such a deadly force situation that he now basically 4 obliterates this car when he hits them, he's going so 5 fast with his truck. At all costs? Man, I wish they 6 had considered that, but they didn't. 7 Q. Well, let's speak about that. You have 8 9 reviewed the video, you've reviewed the police reports. You know that at the last red light before the bridge, 10 11 Mr. Sena ran that at very high speed. Correct? 12 Yes. Α. And you know that the officers stopped 13 ο. because there was an oncoming vehicle. Correct? 14 15 A. No --16 Crossing vehicle. I'm sorry. ο. 17 I can't say for sure. If I go back and look Α. 18 at it right now, I can give a definitive answer on that. But I'm looking at body-cam video and video on my 19 computer screen, so he not that's big. I can't give you 20 21 those details right now. 22 Q. I'm going to ask you to assume that that is 23 what happened. That when the officers came to the red light, they stopped. All right? 24 I'm fine with that assumption. 25 Α.

1 ο. All right. And I want you to assume that 2 Mr. Sena continued at high speed, and I want you to assume that he was in the process of running another red 3 light when he killed these poor people. All right? 4 Right. Yes. 5 Α. And I want you to also assume that by the 6 Q. time the officers got over the bridge, the accident was 7 over. Okay? 8 9 I think I heard them talking -- that I can Α. tell you a little bit about, because I did hear it on 10 11 the video. I think they said, Oh -- I can't remember 12 their exact words, but, Oh, looks like a crash, or, Stopped here, some comment like that. I think that over 13 the crest of that bridge, they didn't see the actual 14 15 collision. 16 So I want you to further assume that when 0. they saw Mr. Sena go over the hill, that bridge at high 17 18 speed, that they knew the chase was over. I can't say that. 19 Α. 20 0. I'm asking you to, because that's what the 21 testimony is going to be. 22 Α. Okay. 23 Would you agree that, for all intents and 0. purposes, by the time they got to the light at the 16th 24 Street bridge, and watched him drive off at high speed, 25

1 and stopped, the chase was terminated? 2 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical, assumes facts not in evidence. Go ahead. 3 THE WITNESS: No. I would disagree, based 4 on hearing the siren, lights, and the speed, they're 5 still assuming that the pursuit is active. 6 BY MR. KANE: 7 Q. But it's not active anymore. 8 They're 9 stopped. Right? MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Incomplete 10 11 hypothetical, assumes facts not in evidence, and 12 frankly, Mike, they don't stop, if you go watch the 13 video. MR. KANE: Well, they slow down to the point 14 15 of stopping. BY MR. KANE: 16 They didn't chase him through the red light. 17 0. Are you telling me the chase wasn't terminated? 18 I'm telling you the chase was not 19 А. Yes. terminated at that point. Until officers turn off 20 21 lights and sirens, you probably hear something on the 22 radio, We lost him, we don't know where he went, his 23 last known direction was this. We don't get that that I can hear. There was a lot of sirens going on, but that 24 25 seems apparent.

So as long as the lights are still on, the 1 Q. 2 pursuit doesn't stop? In my opinion, the officers were still 3 Α. pursuing. They did slow down, Sena got a big lead on 4 them over the bridge, but as far as I could tell, they 5 arrived seconds after. That pursuit's still going, as 6 far as I could tell. 7 Q. Do you know what speed they were going over 8 9 the bridge? No, not offhand. 10 Α. 11 So even if it isn't a stop because they 0. 12 still had their lights and sirens on, isn't the effect the same? They --13 14 Α. No. They came to a light, they didn't continue 15 Q. 16 through it. He takes off, he's now way ahead of them, 17 he's driving 70 miles an hour or more. Isn't the stop, for all intents and purposes, terminated? 18 19 Α. No. 20 MR. MORTIMER: Before you answer, I'm going 21 to object. Incomplete hypothetical, assumes facts not 22 in evidence. Go ahead. 23 THE WITNESS: No. The pursuits are still in effect from what I saw. They're still hoping to catch 24 that guy. You can tell from continuing in the pursuit. 25

Γ

1	A pursuit, you can be right on someone's bumper, you can		
2	be quite a ways away. The point is, someone's trying to		
3	get away from you and a police officer is still trying		
4	to catch up. Yes, it's still going.		
5	BY MR. KANE:		
6	Q. So was it reckless disregard for them to		
7	slow down at the red lights?		
8	A. No. I'm glad they slowed there.		
9	Q. And then after they were able to get safely		
10	through and continue, was that reckless disregard?		
11	A. I think that whole pursuit was reckless		
12	disregard, yes.		
13	Q. That wasn't my question.		
14	A. Your question was, is it still reckless at		
15	the bridge, past the light? Yes.		
16	Q. Slow down.		
17	A. I'm sorry. I was answering your question, I		
18	thought.		
19	Q. Let's try again. They're at the light,		
20	meaning my cops. And the guy keeps going, he's over the		
21	hill. They can't see him anymore. Was it reckless		
22	disregard to then later follow?		
23	A. Yes.		
24	Q. Why?		
25	A. Because this pursuit should never have taken		

place in the first place. Any part of this pursuit, 1 2 going after a traffic violator, anything that endangered the life of the public, based on a traffic violator, is 3 reckless disregard. Absolutely. 4 So I want to see if I can pin you down on 5 ο. If a guy, a police officer, is in a pursuit of a that. 6 felon, and it gets called off by the police supervisor, 7 and he stops, the guy then that is being pursued goes 8 over a hill and kills somebody, it's reckless disregard 9 because they first engaged in a pursuit? Is that what 10 11 you're saying? 12 That's a very strange way of looking at it. Α. So you're going to say -- let me make sure I understand 13 the question correctly. We're going into a hypothetical 14 pursuit. Not this pursuit? 15 16 Sure. ο. 17 In a hypothetical pursuit, you're saying the Α. officer stopped, turned off the lights, siren, the 18 pursuit's over, and the guy keeps going. 19 **Q**. It was terminated. It was terminated. 20 21 It was terminated. Okay. Right. So then Α. 22 you'd look at, why was the guy running from the police, 23 and was he trying to get away? Did the police cause the actions of this driver to continue to try to increase 24 speeds no matter what? And again, my words, at all 25

At all costs he keeps going, thinking, I've got 1 costs. 2 to run from the police, there's no way I'm stopping. You know what, I can't -- I'm trying, but I 3 can't define that on a purely hypothetical basis. 4 Again, you're going to have to look at the results of 5 this. Was it 10 seconds or 10 minutes? There's a big 6 difference and there's everywhere in between. So how do 7 we define that hypothetical situation? Certainly the 8 9 police own the part of that that we pursued this guy, and because of our efforts to stop him, he kept going. 10 11 I guess I'm almost out of the hypothetical. 12 Again, I'm back to our real facts that we're having here. I'll try to answer your question. This pursuit 13 shouldn't have happened. Anything beyond where we 14 15 realized, Hey, our guy's not stopping, this is 16 dangerous, shut it down. 17 Q. And you don't think that's what happened at that light? 18 I don't think they shut it down. 19 No. А. No. I think they're still involved in that pursuit. 20 21 But for all intents and purposes it was shut 0. 22 down, wasn't it? 23 I think it slowed temporarily because of the Α. light, but no, the pursuit's still going. 24 25 Q. Okay. Looking through the rest to see if I

have any questions. Most of the rest seems to be pretty 1 2 much the same as what we've already talked about. You were making assumptions about what my cops were 3 thinking. Right? 4 I tried to view it from the standpoint, 5 Α. again, of the reasonable officer, what's reasonable 6 versus what's unreasonable. And in my lengthy 7 supervisory career of what I would train someone on and 8 9 what I would find, I just said it, what's reasonable, what's unreasonable. 10 11 And if you're looking at 18 here on the 0. 12 screen, last sentence: Officer Putnam's emphasis and 13 almost complete reliance on the relatively minimal 14 amount of traffic for the basis of continuing was unreasonable and reckless. 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 And you understand that recklessness is a 0. mental state. Correct? 18 I do. 19 Α. You're putting yourself into Putnam's mind? 20 0. It's a mental state of mind combined with 21 Α. 22 actions. There, he's 30 miles an hour over. 23 Actually, well, let's go with that. 0. 24 Α. Okay. 25 That happens on 16th Street? Q.

1 Α. Yes. 2 The felony happened at 16th Street? Q. 3 Α. Right. Tell you what I'm going to do. I printed 4 Q. this damned statute, and now I can't find it. I want to 5 make sure we're on the same page. We've been at it for 6 a while. Let's take five minutes? 7 (A break was taken.) 8 BY MR. KANE: 9 I'm going to refer you to paragraph 19, and 10 ο. 11 I want to work through that with you. You say, again, 12 the original stop was for a very minor traffic violation. 13 14 A. Correct. 15 Even when the suspect fled he was only Q. committing a misdemeanor? 16 17 Α. Yes. Pursuant to Idaho Code 49-14042, this can be 18 0. upgraded to a felony if the suspect gets 30 miles per 19 hour over the posted speed limit, causes damage to the 20 21 property of another, or bodily injury to another, drives 22 his vehicle in a madder -- maybe manner there -- to 23 endanger or likely endanger the property of another or the person of another or leaves the state. 24 25 So you've quoted the whole statute.

I don't know if I've quoted it. That's a 1 Α. 2 bit of my interpretation. I'll read to you to. 3 0. I can look it up. 4 Α. I've got it right here: An operator who 5 0. violates the provisions of Subsection 1, which is 6 illegal, and while doing so, A, travels in excess of 7 30 miles per hour above the posted speed limit. 8 9 B, causes damage to the That's one. property of another or bodily injury to another. 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 C, drives his vehicle in a manner as to 0. 13 endanger or likely to endanger the property of another 14 or the person of another. 15 Α. Yes. We've already agreed that running the stop 16 Q. 17 sign, the very first stop sign, was driving in a manner as to endanger or likely endanger the property of 18 another or the person of another. Right? 19 I think we had a lot of back and forth on 20 Α. that. 21 22 ο. We did. 23 As I remember. Α. 24 But you also do agree, have agreed already, 0. that running a stop sign is a danger to the public? 25

1 I did agree on that point, yes. But to your Α. other point, I'm not sure we completely agreed on that. 2 Quickly, I just read you the statute. 3 0. 4 Α. Yes. Do you agree that running several stop signs 5 0. and a red light is endangering the public? 6 Yes, I do. 7 Α. Do you agree that the felony of eluding 8 Q. occurred when he began running stop signs? 9 Yeah. 10 Α. 11 That's all I need. 0. Okay. 12 MR. MORTIMER: Mike, if the witness can finish his answer. 13 BY MR. KANE: 14 I'll give him a chance, but let me follow it 15 0. up immediately with another question. Would you simply 16 17 agree that to say the felony did not occur until he got over 30 miles an hour is flat wrong? This paragraph is 18 19 wrong? 20 Α. My paragraph that I wrote? 21 Yeah. 0. 22 Α. So I wrote: Even when the suspect fled he 23 was only committing a misdemeanor. I think we just talked about the Idaho Code, 24 and that eluding is a misdemeanor, and it can be 25

David T. Sweene	y - July 23, 202´
-----------------	-------------------

upgraded to felony, and we also went over the different 1 2 conditions that makes it a felony. So in answer to your question, I think we get to felony level when he's going 3 over the bridge. I think you and I both agreed on that. 4 But you don't agree that by running the 5 0. various stop signs, and there was one red light before 6 this one, that it was felony eluding? 7 Α. By this definition that I'm reading here, 8 I'm going to go back to the actual law, which I just 9 pulled up, because I think that's the best way to look 10 11 at these things is actually -- again, my quick paragraph 12 summary there tries to put it into short form. I quess I could have quoted the full law. If we talk about 13 eluding: The person knew or should have know the 14 15 visual/audible signal given by the peace officer was 16 intended to bring the pursued vehicle to a stop. 17 If you violate Subsection 1, and if you do any of the following, then it's a felony. So again, A, 18 traveling in excess of 30 miles an hour above the posted 19 speed limit. 20 21 So yes, when he goes over the bridge, 22 apparently we show -- they show that he's 70 miles an 23 hour, so there we go. 24 B, causes a damage to property of another or bodily injury. Well, that doesn't happen until the end. 25

119

C, drives a vehicle in a manner as to 1 2 endanger or likely endanger the property of another or the person of another. 3 I could see that one as, some might 4 define -- and I'll get to my definition, some might 5 define that the way he was driving through the stop 6 signs and through the -- not using his signal and 7 speeding and things like that, might endanger or likely 8 9 to endanger. However, I do believe that I also have to 10 11 study this and look at the intent of the legislature 12 when they write it, and what they're saying is most of this stuff is misdemeanor, and we'll get to felony level 13 if we do this. So I think to endanger or likely 14 15 endanger the property of another or person of another, 16 we have to see some vehicles nearly struck, or a 17 pedestrian who starts to cross the crosswalk and jumps 18 out of the way as Sena drives through, or something like 19 that. 20 So I think, looking again, I'm going to go 21 with that interpretation. That again, looking at the 22 intent of this law. What are they trying to define? 23 They're moving it to felony level if you nearly hit someone or you do hit someone. That's where they're 24

judging this from a felony level as opposed to

25

120

misdemeanor level. That's my interpretation of it. 1 2 Q. So you reject the notion that running stop signs and a red light, all prior to this last red light, 3 you reject the notion that those are endangering the 4 public? 5 No. Again, looking at the law that we just Α. 6 read, I think, sure, running stop signs, always 7 dangerous. Speeding, always dangerous. Right? We 8 could also say just driving down the street even obeying 9 the law is dangerous. Right? Most collisions 10 11 occur near home. But by the judging of the law and the 12 way I read it -- and everyone might have their own 13 interpretation -- mine is, most of this stuff is 14 misdemeanor level until we get to these felony levels, 15 A, B, C, and D. C is certainly defined as now he's 16 hitting someone or likely to hit someone. 17 And I did see that prior to this eluding Particularly as we almost talk about two 18 piece. sections of this pursuit. Right? The pursuit through 19 the neighborhood where we're looking at stop signs, we 20 21 don't really see that many people or vehicles and things 22 like that, as opposed to the busy arterial when he gets 23 onto 16th, and now the speed really gets higher. I think that's where the felony occurs. 24 25

Q. You don't think -- all right. So you're not

prepared to admit that maybe you went a little over the 1 2 top in 19? Even though I just read you the statute? You're still not willing to concede? 3 Reading the statute, and now that I've Α. No. 4 done that, I've been over it two or three times, let's 5 look back at my paragraph: Again, the original stop was 6 for a very minor traffic violation. 7 Let me make it easy for you. 8 0. Okay. 9 Α. Go to the word "So." Do you see where my 10 ο. 11 little marker is? 12 Yes. Α. 13 Read that out loud. 0. 14 So the felony aspect, if applicable, would Α. 15 have only been for his high speeds on 16th Avenue South and the resulting crash and loss of life, manslaughter. 16 17 Now, you were sticking with this, that it is 0. only a felony on 16th Avenue South? 18 Agreed. And I think that was my earlier 19 Α. interpretation as I read the law, and now as I look at 20 21 what I've written here, I think they're in alignment, 22 absolutely. I'm in agreement with the law, the way it's 23 written, my interpretation of it, and my paragraph. The felony occurs when the high speeds occur and there's 24 people that are now in danger as shown by the crash. 25

I'm looking to see if there's any more I 1 ο. 2 want to visit with you about. We've already gone over a lot about what was in my officers' minds. I want to 3 focus you on 23. 4 Um-hum. 5 Α. Unfortunately -- do you see where my marker Q. 6 is? 7 Yes. 8 Α. 9 Only upon seeing the end result did he 0. consider that he should not have continued this 10 11 dangerous pursuit. 12 How do you know that? How do you know that? 13 To best answer that question, I think I Α. 14 would have to go back and examine the prior deposition testimony that I read, and then I think I could offer 15 you the best answer to your question. It's a valid 16 17 question, and I think in order to do that I need to look at the deposition and determine if there was something 18 in there that made me say, Okay, finally, upon realizing 19 that a crash has occurred, that there's a high level of 20 danger involved in this pursuit. 21 22 ο. You're not able to answer the question as 23 you sit here right now? 24 Not what we're looking at right here. А. Q. You can see that maybe it's a little unfair 25

editorialization? 1 2 I would wait to confirm that. If I read Α. 3 that report again, and I don't see anything in there, then --4 O. You'll let us know? 5 I think in answering your question, I might 6 Α. want to revisit that statement again. But I need to 7 look at that full thing in order to best answer your 8 9 question. Q. So the supervisor you speak about here, when 10 11 do you think they should have called this off, the 12 pursuit off? 13 A. It's a little hard to hear the radio traffic because of the sirens, so I would love to get an actual 14 copy of the radio traffic from dispatch. I think that's 15 16 the best way to hear the vocalizations, and who's 17 answered what and who's saying what. From what I could hear of this pursuit and the radio traffic, I did not 18 hear any supervisor call this off. 19 So again, if we look at my standard, what's 20 21 reasonable for these officers to do is to try to stop 22 Mr. Sena. Absolutely a valid traffic stop. But now 23 he's refusing to stop, and committing traffic violations. We've moved into the area of eluding, and 24 it seems clear that Mr. Sena's intent was to get away 25

from the officers. That's the point to call it off. 1 2 But you can't say when that would have been 0. as you sit here now? 3 I think to best answer that, I would want to 4 Α. look at the individual, you and I sit down, look at it 5 and go, Here's where I would say. I need to hear all 6 the radio, watch the video at the same time, try to put 7 those two together, and as we listen to it, I'd go, you 8 9 know what? This guy's not stopping. And if they haven't said it, my question would be, What's the 10 11 original crime? He's a traffic violator. Let him go. 12 So I can't say for a bright line where that is right now, but that's my reasoning that I would use in order 13 to determine where that point was. 14 Okay. A little bit later from that 15 0. 16 paragraph. And by the way, in here you're speaking 17 about Officer Poore's deposition, to kind of focus you little bit. 18 19 Α. Yes. You say: There is no indication that the 20 0. 21 officer considered the risk of the public because of the 22 pursuit, compared to the risk to the public if the 23 suspect was not apprehended. 24 Do you see that? 25 Yes. Α.

1 We've already talked about, these are your Q. 2 interpretations as to what was in his mind. But I want to go to the next: In other words, the suspect posed no 3 danger to the community. 4 Do you stand by that statement? 5 He's leaving the bar and he stops in Α. Yes. 6 the road, and then he doesn't use his turn signal. 7 And then he drives on. We have to evaluate, what's the --8 and then we start the pursuit -- sorry, we start the 9 traffic stop, which then leads to the pursuit. So then 10 11 you have to look at, what's the danger to the public 12 from that initial stop there? Did he rear-end anyone? Did anyone have to stop shortly behind him? Did his 13 signaling cause someone to drive erratically? So what's 14 the danger level of those initial infractions? 15 16 Extremely low or next to nothing. 17 Again, I couldn't see the traffic stop, I couldn't see the stopping in the road, but I didn't see 18 any danger to the public until the speeds increased and 19 now he's trying to get away from the officer. 20 21 Okay. I hear that. Obviously when he's 0. 22 sitting there in the road, stopped for 20 to 30 seconds, 23 we don't know -- or the officers don't know if he's asleep at the wheel, drunk out of his mind, 24 hallucinating. I understand that. I suppose we could 25

126

1 make an argument that being in the road, stopped, is a 2 danger to the public. But passing that, this paragraph here, 3 talking about the supervisor stepping in to call off the 4 pursuit, and the shift commander's responsibility for 5 the pursuit, in the context of the whole pursuit, not 6 just the first 10 seconds. Do you agree? There would 7 have been nothing to call off for him to sit in the 8 Right? 9 road. I agree with you on that. Calling off would 10 Α. 11 have occurred later when he has a vehicle not stopping 12 for him. So when you say the suspect posed no danger 13 0. to the community, you don't mean to say that never 14 15 during this pursuit was he posing a danger to the 16 community. Only when he was stopped in the road? 17 It's a really long question, but let me make А. sure I understand this correctly. 18 Do you want me to restate it? 19 Q. Possibly. I don't have any indication of 20 Α. 21 that. Was he a danger when he's eluding the officers? 22 I would say yes. Does that answer your question? 23 Q. Yeah, it does. So we have to take the, "posed no danger," in the context of just the initial 24 reason for the stop. Not the entire pursuit. Right? 25

1 Α. One more time on that question. 2 We have to take your language, "The suspect 0. posed no danger to the community," in context. What you 3 really mean to say, there was no danger to the community 4 when he was in the road, and that's the reason they lit 5 him up. Right? 6 In other words, the suspect posed no danger 7 Α. to the community and risk to the community was much 8 9 greater due to the pursuit. I'll stand by that statement. When he's 10 11 driving and he stops in the road, again, I haven't seen 12 it, but I saw no elements of danger present in that. Ι did see a traffic violation, yes. But the danger 13 element, I didn't see anything in the officer's report 14 15 that indicated something dangerous happened as he left that bar. I saw that a traffic violation occurred. 16 But 17 was there an element of danger? I didn't see it. 18 0. I get that. But again, this paragraph is in context of the entire pursuit. You aren't saying that 19 it posed no danger to the community at any time during 20 21 the pursuit, are you? 22 Α. It's hard to decipher your question, because 23 you're speaking in the negative. All right. Let me try it again. I'll make 24 Q. it easier. 25

Γ

-	
1	A. Okay.
2	Q. Are you saying the suspect posed no danger
3	to the community during this pursuit?
4	A. No. I'm not saying that.
5	Q. Thank you.
6	A. Agreed.
7	Q. You you've been a cop forever. You've
8	been involved in situations, like all cops, that are
9	probably that require split-second determinations.
10	And sometimes those determinations are the subject of
11	inquiry after the fact. Right?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Happens all the time.
14	A. It does.
15	Q. Every day out there on the street. Are you
16	telling me you're blaming my cops for the death of these
17	people?
18	A. They never considered what possibly could
19	happen as a result of pursuing this guy, my words, "at
20	all costs." Again, we talked about this before, but
21	let's try and answer your question. It seems like it
22	seems to me, and again, I've reviewed these for years
23	and years, that they never considered this might end
24	badly. And they only seemed to consider that, because
25	it's nighttime, we can pursue. It's much safer than

1 during the day. We can pursue this guy. 2 Yeah. It's a traffic violation, but we can pursue this. That's the thought process that, again, I 3 view this as, this is unreasonable. This is not the 4 way -- they forgot about protecting the public. What 5 are we protecting them from? Stuff like this. 6 These types of things should not happen. And unfortunately, 7 when you pursue at all costs, we're not considering the 8 There was no consideration of a possible loss of 9 costs. life if I keep going after this traffic violation. 10 11 So you're saying my cops killed Evan's 0. 12 clients? 13 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Go ahead. 14 15 THE WITNESS: No. They were killed, clearly, by Mr. Sena. 16 17 BY MR. KANE: 18 Q. Are you saying my cops are responsible for the deaths of these poor people? 19 Yes. Absolutely. Police officers have a 20 Α. 21 higher standard. And you have to understand that our 22 actions have consequences, and we can't do simply 23 everything that comes to mind in order to get a violator. You have to consider consequences. And as I 24 read those depositions and I saw this pursuit as best I 25

1 could, and I read the reports, there doesn't seem to be 2 any consideration that there's any consequence. The only thing I saw them talk about seemed 3 to be that, you know, it's night, there's not many 4 people out here. Unfortunately, that's a short-sighted 5 view of public safety. There are people out at night. 6 Clearly there were. We can see that there were as a 7 result of the crash. So seems like they never 8 considered that. I wish they had. 9 Q. So your last sentence here, 29: The deaths 10 11 of Mr. Zamudio and Ms. De La Fuente are prima facie 12 evidence that there were significant hazards to uninvolved motorists. 13 Would you agree that in any pursuit there is 14 always a chance of uninvolved motorists? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 0. Always. Officers realize that. There's always a 18 Α. chance. 19 20 0. And that's why every pursuit has to be 21 weighed, no matter where it is, what time of day, always 22 has to be weighed, because there's always a chance of 23 some poor innocent person being injured. Right? Right. You have to weigh the elements of 24 Α. 25 what you're trying to catch versus, what's the end

1 result that could happen if I engage in whatever actions 2 I'm doing? Yes. And you conclude that there was simply no 3 0. weighing, by either my cops or their supervisor. 4 In reading the depositions, I saw several 5 Α. references to, Well, it's nighttime and there's not many 6 people out here, and the roads, I think, are dry. 7 And that means we can pursue. 8 9 There's no consideration for anyone else that's out there. There are other people on the road at 10 11 that time. Clearly there are, and you see the result of 12 that. Well, there's more than the depositions. 13 ο. You had the videos, the reports --14 15 Α. Right. 16 -- reviews. From all that, you conclude ο. 17 there was never any weighing of the danger? 18 Α. Even when asked about the policy, no one ever talked about the danger to the public because of 19 the risk of a pursuit. There was no mention of it. And 20 21 I can only -- this is an assumption on my part -- but as 22 I read that I was like, how come no one recognizes these 23 things are dangerous? And the safety of others was never considered. They only kept coming back to, It's 24 25 safe at night, the roads are dry, there's not many

1 people, I can do this. 2 There wasn't that consideration of, Well, why am I doing this? You've got to consider, What's the 3 risk to the public if this person gets away? If it's a 4 traffic violator, let him go. If it's something 5 serious, you know, society will give leeway. Right? 6 Society doesn't want people killed over traffic 7 violators. They understand, though, that there are 8 9 risks that police officers undertake on a daily basis. You and I have discussed this, and those risks are 10 11 acceptable if the officer's actions are reasonable. 12 People say, Okay, I understand. But in this case, there was no consideration for those people. 13 Q. Would you say it never even crossed their 14 mind? 15 I didn't see --16 Α. 17 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Calls for pure 18 speculation. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I didn't see much 19 20 consideration in those deposition statements that I read 21 that it crossed their mind, no. And that's what I'm 22 bothered by. 23 BY MR. KANE: Q. Is it your opinion that they never 24 considered the danger to the public and realized that 25

1 they should terminate the pursuit? 2 Α. I think I remember reading about what we can pursue for, and it just seems like the department has a 3 philosophy of, We go after everyone. You know, you're 4 kind of asking for a summary of what I read. That was 5 my interpretation of what I was reading, that no one 6 considers that, because of my actions, someone might 7 die. 8 9 Q. Okay. Do you think Mr. Sena bears any responsibility in this? 10 11 А. Absolutely. 12 Can you put a percentage on it? 0. 13 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Calls for a legal 14 conclusion. Go ahead. 15 THE WITNESS: Now you're getting into my wife's -- she's an attorney. Her line of work is civil 16 17 defense and accidents and weighing, you know, money and balancing. I hesitate from a police officer's 18 standpoint to get into those negotiations that she's 19 involved in. So no. I can't really put a percentage on 20 21 it. Certainly he bears some responsibility here. 22 But I would say that an officer has a 23 responsibility to be above that. And you have to think for the other person, and think, Am I playing a part 24 here? Are my actions leading to this? Again, I said it 25

2there might be tragedy at the end of this. There's no3consideration of, What am I doing right now? What am I4going after? I'm going after a traffic violator. This5is not the crime of the century. And if it were, I'd6give you a lot of leeway for it, but not for a traffic7violator.8BY MR. KANE:9Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime10of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these11people. You're saying they never appreciated the12danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to13continue?14A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a15summary here of what I remember of their testimony in16these depositions. And my overall interpretation of17that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word18"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those19testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I20Think we could probably find some ideas that they had21Some consideration of danger.22But my only observation of this, though,23there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic24violator at all costs, and very little I won't go25into absolutes either very little consideration for	1	before, there seems to be no consideration that
going after? I'm going after a traffic violator. This is not the crime of the century. And if it were, I'd give you a lot of leeway for it, but not for a traffic violator. BY MR. KANE: Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	2	there might be tragedy at the end of this. There's no
 is not the crime of the century. And if it were, I'd give you a lot of leeway for it, but not for a traffic violator. BY MR. KANE: Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic violator at all costs, and very little I won't go 	3	consideration of, What am I doing right now? What am I
 give you a lot of leeway for it, but not for a traffic violator. BY MR. KANE: Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic violator at all costs, and very little I won't go 	4	going after? I'm going after a traffic violator. This
 violator. BY MR. KANE: Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic violator at all costs, and very little I won't go 	5	is not the crime of the century. And if it were, I'd
8 BY MR. KANE: 9 Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? 14 A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	6	give you a lot of leeway for it, but not for a traffic
 9 Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these people. You're saying they never appreciated the danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to continue? 14 A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a summary here of what I remember of their testimony in those depositions. And my overall interpretation of that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I think we could probably find some ideas that they had some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic yiolator at all costs, and very little I won't go 	7	violator.
10 of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these 11 people. You're saying they never appreciated the 12 danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to 13 continue? 14 A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a 15 summary here of what I remember of their testimony in 16 those depositions. And my overall interpretation of 17 that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word 18 "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those 19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	8	BY MR. KANE:
11 people. You're saying they never appreciated the 12 danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to 13 continue? 14 A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a 15 summary here of what I remember of their testimony in 16 those depositions. And my overall interpretation of 17 that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word 18 "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those 19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	9	Q. I agree it may not have started as the crime
12danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to13continue?14A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a15summary here of what I remember of their testimony in16those depositions. And my overall interpretation of17that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word18"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those19testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I20think we could probably find some ideas that they had21some consideration of danger.22But my only observation of this, though,23there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic24violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	10	of the century, but it certainly ended as one for these
13continue?14A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a15summary here of what I remember of their testimony in16those depositions. And my overall interpretation of17that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word18"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those19testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I20think we could probably find some ideas that they had21some consideration of danger.22But my only observation of this, though,23there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic24violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	11	people. You're saying they never appreciated the
14A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a15summary here of what I remember of their testimony in16those depositions. And my overall interpretation of17that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word18"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those19testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I20think we could probably find some ideas that they had21some consideration of danger.22But my only observation of this, though,23there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic24violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	12	danger, never appreciated the danger and chose to
15 summary here of what I remember of their testimony in 16 those depositions. And my overall interpretation of 17 that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word 18 "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those 19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	13	continue?
16those depositions. And my overall interpretation of17that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word18"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those19testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I20think we could probably find some ideas that they had21some consideration of danger.22But my only observation of this, though,23there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic24violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	14	A. Let's just say I'm going on kind of a
17 that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word 18 "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those 19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	15	summary here of what I remember of their testimony in
18 "never." Right? If we went back and looked at those 19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	16	those depositions. And my overall interpretation of
19 testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I 20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	17	that so you know, again, I hesitate to use the word
20 think we could probably find some ideas that they had 21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	18	"never." Right? If we went back and looked at those
21 some consideration of danger. 22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	19	testimonies and went over it with a fine-toothed comb, I
22 But my only observation of this, though, 23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	20	think we could probably find some ideas that they had
23 there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic 24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	21	some consideration of danger.
24 violator at all costs, and very little I won't go	22	But my only observation of this, though,
	23	there seemed to be more of an effort to get this traffic
25 into absolutes either very little consideration for	24	violator at all costs, and very little I won't go
	25	into absolutes either very little consideration for

1 the safety of the public that they're sworn to protect. 2 Q. So if Mr. Sena had stopped at that 16th Avenue light, these people would be alive today, would 3 they not? 4 5 MR. MORTIMER: Objection. Speculation. BY MR. KANE: 6 He killed them. Right? 7 ο. THE WITNESS: I believe I proceed with the 8 9 question, even though he has an objection? MR. MORTIMER: Go ahead. I apologize. 10 Go 11 ahead, yes. 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. If he'd stopped at the bottom, taking a guess here, but if he'd stopped going 13 up that hill, pulled over to the side of the road --14 15 some people do that -- yeah, I would say those people would still be alive. They would have made it through 16 17 the intersection. 18 BY MR. KANE: These cops were a quarter of a mile away 19 Q. when that fatal collision occurred. The difference 20 between two intersections is 4/10 of a mile. You're 21 22 telling me, in your opinion, even though they were that 23 far away, stopped at a light, they still killed Mr. Mortimer's clients? 24 I think I testified in the hearing today 25 Α.

Γ

1	that I Mr. Sena killed them, but their actions caused
2	his action, and they were unaware that what they were
3	doing has a chain reaction event. They pursued
4	unnecessarily, recklessly, with disregard for others'
5	safety. So there's a part that they in played this,
6	absolutely.
7	As police officers, we have to think. We
8	can't just say that it's all the defendant, it's all on
9	him. Right? Reasonableness says, you know what, what
10	I'm doing right now is pretty unsafe, and keep going and
11	keep going and keep going. Because we saw the end
12	result. That's why I said it's prima facie. It
13	verifies itself right then and there. By continuing
14	this pursuit, we look at the end result.
15	MR. KANE: That's all I have.
16	MR. MORTIMER: Nothing for me. Read and
17	sign, please.
18	COURT REPORTER: Do you each need a copy of
19	the transcript?
20	MR. MORTIMER: An electronic for me, please,
21	yes.
22	MR. KANE: Minuscript form for me, electric.
23	(Deposition concluded at 4:59 p.m.)
24	(Signature was requested.)
25	* * * *

1		
1	CERTIFICATE OF WITNESS	
2		
3	I, DAVID T. SWEENEY, being first duly sworn, depose and	
4	say:	
5	That I am the witness named in the foregoing	
6	deposition, consisting of pages 1 through 137; that I	
7	have read said deposition and know the contents thereof;	
8	that the questions contained therein were propounded to	
9	me; and that the answers contained therein are true and	
10	correct, except for any changes that I may have listed	
11	on the Change Sheet attached hereto.	
12	DATED this day of,	
13		
14		
15	DAVID T. SWEENEY	
16	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this	
17	day of,	
18		
19		
20	NAME OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
21		
22	RESIDING AT	
23		
24	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES	
25		

1	CHANGE SHEET FOR DAVID T. SWEENEY
2	Page Line Reason for Change
3	Reads
4	Should Read
5 6	Page Line Reason for Change
7	Reads
8	Should Read
9	Page Line Reason for Change
10	Reads
11	Should Read
12 13	Page Line Reason for Change
14	Reads
15	Should Read
16	Page Line Reason for Change
17	Reads
18	Should Read
19 20	Page Line Reason for Change
20	Reads
21	Should Read
23	
_0 24	Please use a separate sheet if you need more room.
25	WITNESS SIGNATURE

1 2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3	I, DIANA KILPATRICK, CSR No. 727, Certified
4	Shorthand Reporter, certify;
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
6	me at the time and place therein set forth, at which
7	time the witness was put under oath by me;
8	That the testimony and all objections made were
9	recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter
10	transcribed by me, or under my direction;
11	That the foregoing is a true and correct record
12	of all testimony given, to the best of my ability;
13	I further certify that I am not a relative or
14	employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially
15	interested in the action.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
17	6th day of August, 2021.
18	
19	Philpatrick
20	NICTUUM
21	DIANA KILPATRICK, CSR, RPR
22	Notary Public
23	Hailey, Idaho 83333
24	My Commission expires January 13, 2023
25	

Delafuente v. City of Nampa

City of Nampa		
	4:4,7	9
1	across (1)	1
/	70:17	1
/// (1)	act (1)	1
33:25	29:2	1
	acted (4)	1
	72:14;75:22;79:14;82:4	1
	Acting (3)	1
(1)	80:9,25;81:2	aga
138:12	action (10)	2
	26:20;38:3;40:15;43:24;	9
Α	50:6;54:11;97:4,6;100:6;	age
	137:2	5
abandoned (1)	actions (34)	ago
14:7	16:13,15;19:2;25:22;26:5,	1
abiding (1)	12;30:2;33:6,11;38:8,19; 39:3;42:23;45:7,11;46:17;	agr 1
47:23	49:5;50:1;54:11,16;55:19;	2
abilities (2)	61:24;73:7;94:21;97:6;	5
9:9;59:3	108:3;113:24;115:22;	7
ability (7)	130:22;132:1;133:11;134:7,	8
35:8;38:1;45:24;57:8,8,9,	25;137:1	9
10	activate (1)	1
able (7)	28:5	1
33:7;46:1;48:11;50:24; 71:16;112:9;123:22	activated (2)	1
above (3)	27:9,15	1
117:8;119:19;134:23	active (2)	Ag
above-listed (1)	110:6,8	9
96:16	actual (5)	1
absent (2)	26:13;67:10;109:14;	1
35:20;50:15	119:9;124:14	agr
absolute (2)	actually (19)	4
29:2;65:22	9:22;15:17;17:10;18:3,7;	1
Absolutely (17)	50:10;64:2,19,24;65:4;	ahe
37:10;38:13;42:8;45:13;	74:14;76:16;77:24;87:25;	3
47:8,15;50:5;56:5;61:25;	91:2;97:9;104:25;115:23;	6
92:10;98:20;113:4;122:22;	119:11	1
124:22;130:20;134:11;137:6	adjective (2) 82:21;83:24	1
absolutes (1)	Administration (1)	air
135:25	67:18	an 1
academy (1)	admit (1)	ala
6:25	122:1	4
accelerate (1)	admittedly (1)	ala
83:21	83:10	4
accelerating (2) 83:8;88:7	adopted (6)	alig
accept (2)	50:12,16;51:1,4,8;52:18	1
81:18;92:19	advance (1)	aliv
acceptable (1)	75:10	1
133:11	affidavit (3)	allo
accepted (1)	7:23;75:18;78:8	1
12:4	affirmative (1)	allo
access (4)	94:21	2
66:11;67:8;78:17;87:9	afternoon (1)	allo
accident (2)	62:22	2
22:6;109:7	Again (69)	4
accidental (1)	21:2;22:21,24;24:12;	1
22:19	31:15,18;36:8;37:5;38:24;	1
accidents (4)	40:4;41:16,19;43:3,20;44:1,	allo
21:25;22:4,18;134:17	12,22;46:18;48:14;49:4; 54:8;58:21;59:2,15;60:7;	2
account (2)	74:3;76:19;77:16;83:10,12,	allo 4
98:1;105:21	16,21;84:11,11;87:3,9;92:7;	alm
acknowledge (2)	10,21,07.11,11,07.0,7,72.7,	am

96:4:99:22:100:22:102:4: 103:7;104:1;105:5;107:22; 112:19;113:25;114:5,12; 115:6;116:11;119:11,18; 120:20,21;121:6;122:6; 124:3,7,20;126:17;128:11, 18,24;129:20,22;130:3; 134:25:135:17 ainst (7) 22:23:53:14:62:2:78:9: 91:4:96:11;103:20 encies (2) 50:16:51:1 o (2) 10:10;61:25 ree (46) 12:6;13:4;26:18,20;27:20; 28:9;32:1,15;34:16;56:1,5,8; 58:6;59:11;60:2;62:8;66:5; 70:4;73:10;80:23;81:16; 82:20,22;83:25;84:17;91:5; 94:10;95:14,21;96:12;99:5; 100:13,15;102:4;103:14; 109:23;117:24;118:1,5,8,17; 119:5;127:7,10;131:14; 135:9 greed (10) 91:7;97:23,24;106:3; 117:16,24;118:2;119:4; 122:19:129:6 reement (7) 4:12,13,17,18,20;103:6; 122:22 ead (23) 34:11,19,20;48:23;60:7,7; 66:18,19;68:25;75:3;76:2, 13;91:15;95:19;104:15; 110:3;111:16,22;130:14; 133:18;134:14;136:10,11 (4) 18:15;30:10;47:18;48:6 rmed (2) 41:17,18 rming (2) 42:10,11 gnment (1) 122:21 ve (2) 136:3,16 ow (4) 11:22;44:12;49:11;50:2 owance (1) 29:14 owed (18) 21:1,19;31:18;37:19; 44:11;50:20,23;55:24;59:12, 3,16,24;60:15;62:3;90:8,10, 13,19 owing (2) 29:5.9 ows (4) 40:8,10;60:3;61:23 almost (9)

10:2;12:12;43:11;50:9; 101:15;107:25;114:11; 115:13;121:18 alone (2) 56:4;78:11 along (3) 5:6;8:2;85:18 although (2) 4:21;82:20 always (16) 15:15;35:7;37:9;38:24; 40:11;45:6,10;87:14;90:21; 121:7,8;131:15,17,18,21,22 ambiguous (1) 104:14 among (1) 41:7 amongst (1) 46:19 amount (1) 115:14 analysis (5) 20:11,15;67:20;68:2;71:5 and/or (3) 14:13;25:17;27:10 answered (5) 64:12;76:2,5,13;124:17 anymore (4) 29:8;96:3;110:8;112:21 apart (1) 47:10 apologize (4) 8:13;62:18,21;136:10 apparent (5) 73:12,17;103:8,16;110:25 apparently (2) 37:18;119:22 appears (2) 42:22;52:4 applicable (1) 122:14 apply (2) 13:16;88:2 appreciated (2) 135:11,12 apprehend (2) 27:10;53:15 apprehended (1) 125:23 apprehending (1) 10:18 approach (1) 40:19 appropriate (1) 72:4 Approximately (5) 19:9;20:11;24:3;82:23; 84:17 area (4) 8:2;92:7;106:18;124:24 areas (1) 31:10 arena (1)

49:20 argue (2) 30:9:55:20 argument (1) 127:1 armed (1) 24:5 around (11) 10:6,19;13:18;14:23;38:7; 39:16:46:1:48:18,21:54:7; 72:24 arrangement (1) 4:11arrest (8) 9:6;15:20;22:24;55:6; 59:17;80:18;87:1;90:3 arresting (3) 11:5,12;14:1 arrests (1) 13:18 arrived (3) 23:12,24;111:6 arrow (1) 52:22 arterial (1) 121:22 articulable (2) 31:14,19 articulate (1) 38:2 aside (1) 41:8 asleep (1) 126:24 aspect (3) 16:11;58:18;122:14 assigned (1) 17:16 assignment (1) 12:2 assignments (1) 10:5 assist (2) 10:23;24:16 assistance (1) 4:22 assume (8) 7:4;9:14;60:24;108:22; 109:1,3,6,16 assumes (3) 110:3,11:111:21 assuming (1) 110:6 assumption (2) 108:25;132:21 assumptions (1) 115:3 Athay (1) 61:3 attached (1) 138:11 attempt (2) 91:12;96:11

attempted (1) 72:9 attempting (2) 55:6:78:24 attempts (2) 80:18:83:14 attend (3) 7:4;62:19,24 attended (1) 7:4 attention (1) 63:2 attitude (2) 20:4,7 attorney (1) 134:16 attorneys (1) 4:3 audible (2) 25:17;94:25 audio (2) 66:24:67:10 August (2) 7:16;52:21 authority (1) 47:20 authorized (8) 7:10;8:15;25:15;27:8; 55:4,10;62:3;79:23 automatically (1) 62:9 available (3) 40:7;62:22;76:18 Avenue (3) 122:15,18;136:3 average (1) 26:25 avoid (4) 43:24;73:4,18,19 aware (3) 18:25;38:6;60:20 away (31) 20:23;30:3;55:10;73:8; 75:8,10;78:24;83:13;85:12, 20;87:11,14;88:1,8,11; 89:10;93:17,20;94:8,21; 101:11;103:11;106:20; 112:2,3;113:23;124:25; 126:20;133:4;136:19,23 B back (34) 9:16;10:9;11:22;13:9,20; 14:20;16:21;23:19;31:17; 38:19;41:20;43:2;44:18; 62:13,20;65:23;69:4;70:13; 73:24;86:13;88:16;89:2; 101:22;104:1,5;105:16; 108:17;114:12;117:20; 119:9;122:6;123:14;132:24; 135:18

bad (2)

15:8:40:17 badgering (1) 76:12 badly (1) 129:24 baffled (5) 97:22,22;98:3;104:25; 107:13 balance (5) 32:11:33:3:53:19.21; 102:24 balancing (2) 53:13;134:18 ban (1) 37:1 bank (8) 21:4,7,8;33:9;38:6;46:20; 47:1;107:18 banned (1) 50:14 Bar (13) 65:8,9,13;92:3,11,17,21, 21;93:1;99:9;102:6;126:6; 128:16 bars (1) 65:14 base (1) 106:9 Based (15) 12:1;20:16;21:20;26:10, 12:32:5:39:3:45:3:46:17: 52:4:57:6:82:24:94:20: 110:4:113:3 basic (1) 18:13 basically (2) 14:10:108:4 basis (5) 70:16;74:22;114:4; 115:14:133:9 bearing (1) 60:24 bears (2) 134:9,21 beat (2) 9:3;68:13 became (19) 11:15;16:3,7;19:13;45:21; 72:12,19;73:12;75:1,19; 78:11;79:4,13;85:17,19,25; 86:3;87:7,10 become (6) 42:10;43:17;75:12,23; 76:9;87:6 becomes (5) 16:9;43:19,22;77:8;88:21 began (5) 82:8;85:3;86:5;89:7;118:9 begin (3) 5:2;9:5;28:9 beginning (2) 12:18:87:23 begins (3)

44:8;89:8;101:10 behavior (4) 32:12:38:21,21:107:2 behind (4) 47:16;50:5;87:18;126:13 belabor (1) 77:6 below (3) 28:16;56:1,8 benefit (3) 20:10,14;87:13 besides (1) 68:14 best (16) 20:2;42:13;60:16;76:14, 15;78:14,20;103:13;107:8; 119:10;123:13,16;124:8,16; 125:4;130:25 better (6) 18:22;34:16;52:12;53:3; 87:6:89:4 beyond (7) 12:21;58:24;68:10;78:2; 79:3;93:25;114:14 bias (2) 33:20;34:16 **big** (4) 18:10;108:20;111:4;114:6 bigger (2) 17:1:51:19 bit (16) 10:6;14:23;55:15;60:12; 63:8;72:1,18:82:21:83:11, 18;85:2;100:19;109:10; 117:2;125:15,18 blaming (1) 129:16 blanche (1) 55:9 blanket (4) 38:25;40:5;45:13;48:7 block (1) 77:19 blocks (3) 86:19;87:21;89:23 blow (1) 97:15 blowing (2) 78:25;88:7 bodily (3) 116:21;117:10;119:25 body-cam (1) 108:19 body-worn (6) 7:20;66:14,16;74:4;76:19, 22 bone (1) 66:4 bones (1) 53:2 **Both (9)** 17:21;26:23;27:14;28:8; 46:24;49:23;56:25;70:15;

119:4 **bothered** (1) 133:22 bottom (2) 52:22;136:13 boy (1) 104:6 brain (2) 29:12;54:8 brake (1) 48:2 brakes (1) 54:15 braking (1) 50:6 brand (3) 6:14,18;23:20 break (8) 41:2,5;63:13;72:18;82:10; 86:14;87:3;116:8 breath (1) 15:23 bridge (20) 73:6;82:16;83:25;84:19, 24;89:13,14;97:17;104:13; 105:7;108:10;109:7,14,17, 25;111:5,9;112:15;119:4,21 briefly (1) 7:12 bright (4) 40:5;43:21;58:3;125:12 bring (5) 55:23;59:6;60:11;63:18; 119:16 broadcast (1) 18:14broke (1) 46:23 brought (1) 69:7 building (1) 46:23 built (1) 6:12 bumper (1) 112:1 Bureau (1) 69:23 burglar (1) 47:2 burglary (1) 46:23 businesses (1) 24:6 busy (1) 121:22 С CAD (2) 66:22;67:7 call (29)

15:15,25;16:1,17;18:16,20; 21:22:23:21:30:21:44:9: 45:3,22;49:20;54:8;62:13; 73:1;78:2;84:2;85:20;89:18, 20;124:19;125:1;127:4,8 called (19) 11:8;21:16;22:1,12;23:5,6; 28:10;30:14;31:1;42:14; 43:5;47:11;49:15,19;65:3; 73:21;77:1;113:7;124:11 calling (6) 19:3;23:7;31:12;45:8; 63:15;127:10 calls (5) 7:23;62:10;130:13; 133:17;134:13 came (10) 12:23;20:2;23:12;29:4; 59:9;67:21;69:25;84:7; 108:23;111:15 camera (5) 66:16,21;74:4;76:19,22 can (86) 5:9;15:8;23:11;24:19,21, 22,24;25:14;28:2;33:10,13; 34:12;38:3,4,4,5,17;42:22; 48:23;49:2;54:6,7;55:13; 58:8;60:7,10,16;62:20; 63:18;68:19;69:6;70:16; 73:8,18;76:15,21,21,22; 77:24;78:20,23;79:6;80:18; 82:20.21:83:4.7.10:88:2: 89:4,15;90:19;91:5,16,20; 92:19;98:14;99:24;100:13, 15;103:6,13,15;105:16; 106:14;108:18;109:9; 110:24;111:25;112:1,1; 113:5:116:18:117:4:118:12. 25;123:25;129:25;130:1,2; 131:7;132:8,21;133:1;134:2, 12 Canvon (1) 7:18 capabilities (9) 46:2,6,7;56:18;57:1,4,10; 58:25;59:3 capable (2) 48:17,19 captain (1) 47:21 capture (2) 73:4.19 captured (1) 37:14 capturing (2) 38:5;103:19 car (12) 24:7;46:11;48:1,9,12,16, 24;50:6;67:11;76:20;91:4; 108:5 care (2) 28:4;97:12 career (10)

8:25;9:19;11:14;12:16; 16:7:17:5.9:34:21:47:5: 115:8 careless (1) 55:8 car-jacked (1) 24:7 carried (1) 35:19 carry (1) 32:20 cars (4) 65:25;105:9;106:10,11 carte (1) 55:9 Case (22) 8:3;13:6;34:23,25;35:1,7, 10,10;36:18;43:13;44:14; 51:10;60:23;61:2,4,8,25; 67:3;77:5;81:2;83:7;133:12 cases (14) 29:10;32:6;34:17;36:20; 38:3,9;51:12;60:20;61:9; 62:5;70:3,5,14;71:6 catch (4) 21:3;111:24;112:4;131:25 cause (14) 4:25;7:24;43:18;90:9,11, 14,18,20,22,25;99:25; 102:12;113:23;126:14 caused (3) 14:16;59:9;137:1 causes (3) 116:20;117:9;119:24 caveat (1) 23:3 caveats (1) 60:16 cease (1) 37:12 century (2) 135:5.10 certain (7) 27:25;31:10,25;37:19; 42:4;58:7;95:8 Certainly (15) 26:19;76:4;82:20,22; 84:23;88:5;91:5;92:1; 100:20;103:8,10;114:8; 121:15;134:21;135:10 certainty (1) 65:22 **CERTIFICATE (1)** 138:1 certified (3) 6:21;7:5;12:19 chain (1) 137:3 chance (5) 25:8;118:15;131:15,19,22 change (5) 13:6:16:3:19:24:71:16: 138:11

changed (2) 19:14:21:11 changes (2) 20:17:138:10 characterization (1) 95:17 charged (1) 37:20 chase (7) 56:25;99:24;109:18;110:1, 17,18,19 chasing (1) 57:11 chat (1) 4:22 check (2) 65:16;68:25 checking (1) 68:22 chief (11) 6:17;13:24;19:18;20:9,12; 32:25;47:22;52:9;63:15,16; 104:12 chief's (1) 20:16 chose (1) 135:12 circle (1) 106:18 circular (1) 85:13 circumstances (6) 13:5;32:1;54:4,7;58:8; 88:16 citation (1) 11:21 cite (1) 67:17 cities (1) 51:4 citizens (1) 53:10 city (10) 10:19;18:25;31:5,10; 39:14;50:18,22;64:3,23; 65:17 civil (1) 134:16 class (1) 16:2 classes (1) 7:3 classify (1) 84:3 clause (1) 89:21 clear (26) 43:22;62:16;65:20;72:12, 19;75:1,19,23;76:9;77:8,10; 78:11:79:4,13:85:11,17,19, 25;86:3,23;87:4,6,7,10;90:1; 124:25 clearer (1)

Min-U-Script®

5:14,22;10:23;11:18;

90:12 Clearly (4) 46:25;130:16;131:7; 132:11 click (1) 68:11 clients (2) 130:12;136:24 close (2) 79:10:83:19 closer (1) 84:1 Code (2) 116:18;118:24 codes (2) 8:1.14 coincides (1) 25:6 collectively (1) 56:10 Collision (12) 8:3,3;20:22;22:3;23:5,15, 17;24:17,19;35:3;109:15; 136:20 collisions (7) 16:20,20,22;23:11,18; 34:22;121:10 comb (1) 135:19 combined (3) 83:4;90:23;115:21 coming (6) 32:22;34:15;40:14;93:1; 96:4:132:24 command (1) 32:9 Commander (10) 5:22,23;6:7;16:4;17:7,22, 25:24:12:44:15:52:1 commander's (1) 127:5 comment (1) 109:13 **COMMISSION (1)** 138:24 commit (1) 107:20 committed (6) 29:16;33:6;90:6;97:18; 98:5;100:10 committing (8) 82:8;85:3;86:5;103:20; 107:25;116:16;118:23; 124:23 common (4) 15:5;47:23,24;51:1 commonly (1) 17:24 communities (2) 32:23:34:18 community (9) 126:4;127:14,16;128:3,4, 8,8,20;129:3

compare (1) 83:9 compared (3) 96:19:103:19:125:22 complete (5) 96:16,23;97:19;98:7; 115:13 completed (1) 7:24 completely (3) 12:8;103:14;118:2 component (1) 27:24 computer (1) 108:20 concede (1) 122:3 concern (3) 54:18;59:9,21 concerned (4) 13:20;53:16;56:17;58:18 concerning (4) 54:17,21;56:15;58:4 concerns (6) 53:5;57:13,16;58:19;59:7; 62:7 conclude (2) 132:3.16 concluded (1) 137:23 conclusion (3) 62:11:130:14:134:14 conditions (10) 39:7.11:41:9:42:6:44:24: 56:19,21;65:16,21;119:2 conducting (1) 12:15 configuring (1) 68:6 confirm (1) 124:2 confused (2) 69:12;87:16 conscious (1) 85:22 consent (1) 4:10 consequence (1) 131:2 consequences (3) 80:1:130:22,24 consider (16) 33:1,4;38:9;44:14:56:25: 57:8;99:3,13,15,18;100:20; 107:9;123:10;129:24; 130:24;133:3 consideration (12) 96:17;105:4;130:9;131:2; 132:9;133:2,13,20;135:1,3, 21,25 considerations (2) 46:9:98:1 considered (12)

27:15;52:7;55:15;56:3,10; 108:7:125:21:129:18.23: 131:9;132:24;133:25 considering (5) 20:12;102:5,19;106:15; 130:8 considers (1) 134:7 consisting (1) 138:6 constitutes (1) 8:19 contained (2) 138:8,9 contents (1) 138:7 context (5) 45:18;127:6,24;128:3,19 continue (25) 21:19;27:6;28:10;31:11, 18;45:4;47:14;49:12;72:20; 73:13:75:21.24:76:10:80:14: 82:1;85:3,23;88:18;89:10; 106:14;107:16;111:15; 112:10;113:24;135:13 continued (5) 21:19;102:21;103:5; 109:2;123:10 continues (3) 29:10:102:15:103:10 continuing (10) 27:25:37:11:44:3:72:11: 100:6,23;107:24;111:25; 115:14:137:13 continuous (1) 28:8 contract (2) 6:15.16 contradict (2) 65:13,15 control (1) 47:25 conversation (1) 52:14 **cop** (5) 9:25;49:20;61:20;80:17; 129:7 cops (12) 59:25;79:14;80:20;81:4; 112:20;115:3;129:8,16; 130:11,18;132:4;136:19 copy (2) 124:15:137:18 corner (1) 88:8 correctly (4) 22:10;95:4;113:14;127:18 cost (4) 20:10,14;73:7;106:25 **costs** (28) 32:11,15;48:8;72:14,21, 21;73:3,14;75:21,25;76:10; 79:14;97:2;99:24;103:21;

David T. Sweeney July 23, 2021

106:19,20,21;107:5,9,12; 108:6:114:1.1:129:20:130:8. 9:135:24 counsel (2) 4:10:25:7 count (1) 96:4 counted (2) 105:9,14 country (2) 70:18;90:18 County (2) 7:18:61:3 couple (12) 11:25;12:5;14:9;15:4,7; 17:6;24:7;25:9;30:5;83:18; 87:21;102:9 course (3) 15:20;37:17;41:4 COURT (6) 4:3;38:15;73:11;75:17; 78:9:137:18 courts (2) 21:2;61:10 cover (1) 69:10 covered (1) 67:12 **COVID-19**(1) 7:2 coworkers (1) 18:17 crash (13) 13:15:22:15.19:23:21: 24:1;25:6;48:25;107:11; 109:12;122:16,25;123:20; 131:8 crashed (1) 82:23 crashes (4) 67:21,22;68:3;71:6 created (2) 19:21;66:11 creates (1) 26:12 crest (2) 82:19;109:14 crests (1) 83:1 crime (22) 8:20;18:10;19:6;26:21; 33:4,6,14;41:24;43:4;56:14; 85:21;99:3,4,6,11,13,18,18, 20;125:11;135:5,9 crimes (2) 21:20;100:9 criminals (1) 21:2 critical (1) 54:2 cross (1) 120:17 crossed (2)

133:14,21 Crossing (1) 108:16 crosswalk (1) 120:17 cues (1) 18:21 culture (2) 32:2,5 curious (2) 10:7;69:4 curtailed (1) 19:22 curve (1) 83:1 CV (2) 9:17;14:23 D daily (2) 70:16;133:9 damage (3) 116:20;117:9;119:24 damned (1) 116:5 danger (48) 20:13;29:22;30:1;37:13, 24;44:13;47:7;58:14;70:20, 23;86:24,25;90:1,2;97:19, 21;99:25;105:24,25;106:4; 107:17,23;117:25;122:25; 123:21;126:4,11,15,19; 127:2,13,15,21,24;128:3,4,7, 12,13,17,20;129:2;132:17, 19;133:25;135:12,12,21 dangerous (27) 19:19;21:1,21;22:17,24; 33:16;71:10,22;80:13,14,17, 18.20:82:1.8:85:3:86:5: 94:12:97:24:98:9:114:16: 121:8.8.10:123:11:128:15: 132:23 Dangers (5) 67:15;86:20;89:23;96:18, 20 data (1) 71:7 date (1) 76:17 DATED (1) 138:12 dates (1) 71:6 daughter (1) 5:19 Dave (1) 4:18 DAVID (6) 4:1,23;5:24;6:3;138:3,15 day (11) 9:22:15:15:39:19:47:11; 68:20;73:24;129:15;130:1;

131:21:138:12,17 days (1) 9:16 day-to-day (1) 16:25 **De (2)** 82:5;131:11 deadly (1) 108:4 dealing (1) 70:24 deals (1) 61:8 death (5) 53:12;81:12,17;104:4; 129:16 deaths (3) 68:5;130:19;131:10 **December** (2) 6:17,17 decide (1) 40:15 deciding (3) 46:13;54:1;56:10 decipher (1) 128:22 decision (10) 35:15;39:3;40:8;48:4; 54:2,6,14;75:13;77:4;85:22 decisions (1) 14:16 declaration (1) 63:18 declarations (1) 6:5 dedicated (1) 13:25 deeper (1) 71:7 defendant (1) 137:8 defense (1) 134:17 define (9) 43:20;76:24;78:3;79:18; 114:4,8;120:5,6,22 defined (4) 79:20;94:7;95:8;121:15 defines (1) 27:7 definite (2) 89:17;94:6 **Definitely** (2) 43:16;69:24 definition (9) 25:14;26:4,8;80:7;81:15, 24;84:8;119:8;120:5 **Definitions** (1) 25:13 definitive (1) 108:18 deliberately (1) 94:11

Department (23) 6:10,12,15,19;7:19,21,22; 8:5,6;12:4;14:5,14;16:22; 24:21,25;51:17;53:18;58:16; 62:2;69:22;75:22;90:14; 134:3 departments (1) 47:23 **Department's (1)** 58:5 depending (1) 19:5 depose (1) 138:3 **DEPOSITION (14)** 4:1,9;7:14,24,25;63:25; 98:10;123:14,18;125:17; 133:20;137:23;138:6,7 depositions (5) 105:5;130:25;132:5,13; 135:16 deps (1) 5:3 Deputy (1) 63:16 derelict (1) 49:9 describe (1) 87:22 described (1) 70:12 description (2) 18:13:93:2 desert (1) 39:15 designed (1) 104:17 despite (2) 36:24.25 detail (2) 6:6;9:2 details (2) 68:7;108:21 detecting (3) 10:17,22;12:14 detention (2) 55:6;59:17 determination (1) 37:3 determinations (2) 129:9,10 determine (6) 8:19;47:13;49:16;90:24; 123:18;125:14 determined (2) 19:18;30:1 developed (1) 11:18 diagram (1) 64:9 Diana (1) 26:1 die (2)

70:7:134:8 differed (1) 100:18 difference (4) 32:14;37:6;114:7;136:20 differences (2) 61:22.22 different (17) 10:4;13:4;14:13;17:15; 23:13:34:25:39:17:40:19: 44:11;46:20;52:11;62:4; 71:14,15;75:4;80:11;119:1 differentiate (2) 68:2,21 differently (1) 84:5 difficult (2) 49:22;54:3 direct (1) 19:2 directing (1) 11:3 direction (2) 40:19;110:23 directly (2) 24:18;45:25 dirt (1) 64:2 disagree (7) 61:16;92:25;95:25;96:1; 99:5:102:18:110:4 discipline (4) 35:21,23;37:4;38:15 discourage (2) 58:11,15 discouraged (4) 58:1,4,8:90:15 discuss (1) 59:19 discussed (3) 30:24:90:15:133:10 discussing (1) 84:23 disobeyed (1) 35:24 disobeying (1) 35:25 dispatch (3) 66:23;67:9;124:15 dispatcher (1) 18:15 disregard (27) 15:19;38:22;61:9;72:15; 75:22;79:15,19,20;80:1,4,8, 23;81:14,25;82:4;86:3; 88:21;89:1,6,11;112:6,10,12, 22;113:4,9;137:4 division (1) 12:3 document (7) 64:1;66:23,24,25;67:7,24; 69:15 documents (2)

M & M Court Reporting Service (208)345-9611(ph) (800)234-9611 (208)-345-8800(fax)

7:13;8:12 domestic (1) 81:22 done (7) 9:11;16:10;33:22;34:4; 55:23;58:10;122:5 door (1) 79:9 doubt (3) 65:20;71:9;87:13 down (32) 20:14;28:16;29:8;36:13, 14;37:11;43:7;44:1;46:3; 52:21;54:23;57:21;65:4; 72:18;77:23;82:10;84:8,16, 16;86:14,17;87:3;110:14: 111:4;112:7,16;113:5; 114:16,19,22;121:9;125:5 downtown (1) 39:16 drag(1) 48:18 dramatic (2) 83:23.24 dramatically (5) 82:8,14,21;83:2,12 **DRE (4)** 12:12,12,17,19 drive (9) 28:7:29:11,12:33:13; 78:24;79:24;97:15;109:25; 126:14 driver (21) 11:17.20.24:13:23:21:21: 25:17,19;27:10;30:12;31:12, 15,21;36:17,21;42:22;48:23; 57:1;79:23,25;97:6;113:24 drivers (11) 10:18,22;11:5,13;13:18; 14:1;29:11,14:30:3:32:3; 39:24 driver's (1) 57:7 drives (5) 116:21;117:12;120:1,18; 126:8 driving (31) 9:7;13:17;21:6;29:10,22; 30:4,15,18,20;32:24;33:21; 36:6;39:19;43:13;46:6;48:1, 19:50:6:57:2,9,10:59:3:71:9; 83:5.5:102:20:111:17: 117:17;120:6;121:9;128:11 dropped (1) 100:22 drove (4) 12:25;64:4,16,17 Drug (1) 12:17 drunk (22) 10:18;11:5,13,17,20,24; 13:18,23;14:1;29:11,14;

36:17,21;39:24;92:11; 100:21:126:24 dry (5) 58:16;65:21;66:4;132:7,25 due (7) 7:2;20:18;28:4,7,11;79:24; 128:9 **DUI (58)** 10:11,14,22;11:8,16,16; 12:2,7,7,12,20;13:5,9;14:3,8, 19;15:2,11,18;17:7,10; 28:25;29:5,9;30:6;34:17; 35:21;36:17;39:22;41:24; 59:12;60:1;71:6,9,18;90:12; 91:5,10,22,23;92:5,8,17,20; 93:1,4,7,11,14,18,21;99:6; 100:17,25;101:14;102:4,10, 11 **DUIs (12)** 12:14;14:11;15:4,7,19; 16:5;29:3,21;31:25;65:14; 90:18:92:8 duly (2) 4:24;138:3 during (18) 10:5,13,21;17:9,17;21:25; 22:4;23:17;41:9;49:13; 65:17;71:6;84:21;96:19; 127:15;128:20;129:3;130:1 duties (3) 7:8;15:11;49:9 duty (8) 10:17,25;11:4;16:3;46:16; 53:15;61:14;79:24 Е earlier (10) 11:14;25:7;30:24;32:7; 46:11:64:4:75:7:81:21:85:1: 122:19 early (3) 14:24;47:5;71:19 Earth (2) 65:3,6 easier (4) 5:6;17:3;61:18;128:25 Eastern (2) 51:3,5 easy (2) 76:24;122:8 editorialization (1) 124:1 effect (8) 4:9;26:14;29:8,18,21; 52:21;111:12,24 effective (2) 20:5,8 efficient (2) 11:19.23 effort (3) 27:9;108:1;135:23

94:22:114:10 egregious (1) 38:21 either (3) 21:16;132:4;135:25 electric (1) 137:22 electronic (1) 137:20 element (4) 70:20,23;128:14,17 elements (2) 128:12:131:24 else (9) 4:17,19,21;11:22;40:20; 54:18;57:19;71:16;132:9 elude (3) 42:23;44:9;94:22 eluder (1) 96:11 eluding (33) 8:19;25:13,14;26:4,9,16, 21;27:10;31:6;43:19,23; 94:4,5,9,18;95:2,3,25;96:5; 99:14;100:7;101:11,15; 103:11;107:20,25;118:8,25; 119:7,14;121:17;124:24; 127:21 emanate (1) 65:14 **Emergency** (8) 8:15:10:24:25:16:27:8: 28:5,8;62:19;79:23 emphasis (4) 13:21;14:2;18:10;115:12 employment (1) 7:1 encourage (1) 15:18 end (19) 14:16;47:11;81:9,10,12; 103:23;104:3,3;106:5,8; 107:1,11;119:25;123:9; 129:23;131:25;135:2; 137:11,14 endanger (13) 95:6;116:23,23;117:13,13, 18,18;120:2,2,8,9,14,15 endangered (1) 113:2 endangering (5) 95:12,15,21;118:6;121:4 ended (8) 6:16;20:21;22:14;23:15; 24:8,10,19;135:10 ending (1) 22:2 enforce (1) 15:2 enforcement (23) 6:24;7:5,10;8:25;9:19; 10:11,14;12:9,13,21;15:11; 17:4,8,11;19:23;32:12;33:7,

14;38:3,9;47:23;53:11;70:16 enforcement's (1) 53:15 engage (7) 21:5,6;28:10,11;38:2;98:4; 132:1 engaged (7) 21:14:28:6:33:15:43:21: 101:2,18;113:10 engages (1) 100:7 engaging (4) 30:4,15;97:23;108:3 enough (2) 83:19:95:24 entered (1) 103:25 entire (4) 9:19;101:19;127:25; 128:19 entries (1) 38:5 equal (1) 32:10 equate (1) 97:3 equation (1) 97:21 equipment (1) 28:5 equivalency (1) 6:25 erratic (2) 9:8:13:1 erratically (1) 126:14 escape (3) 31:24;87:1;90:3 escapes (1) 98:15 especially (5) 46:17;70:17;88:23;98:10; 103:4 essence (1) 53:16 evade (2) 55:6;59:17 evaluate (8) 35:12;54:6,11,16;55:18; 77:3,9;126:8 Evan (4) 4:16;60:23;63:5;66:25 Evan's (1) 130:11 evasive (3) 25:22;26:5,19 even (42) 17:23;26:12;29:8,18; 30:10;31:6;37:20;42:3,14; 43:10;46:19,22;48:6,22; 57:3,6;70:2,20,21,22,24; 71:22;72:12;75:19;80:14; 85:9;87:18,21;89:19;90:12;

Min-U-Script®

31:14,21;32:2,24;33:21;

efforts (2)

M & M Court Reporting Service (208)345-9611(ph) (800)234-9611 (208)-345-8800(fax)

101:13;103:12;105:6; 111:11:116:15:118:22: 121:9;122:2;132:18;133:14; 136:9.22 event (1) 137:3 events (1) 11:2 eventually (2) 73:6:101:14 everyone (3) 62:22;121:12;134:4 everywhere (2) 90:17:114:7 evidence (5) 103:18;110:3,11;111:22; 131:12 exact (4) 76:25;77:2,12;109:12 exactly (7) 20:19;26:17;37:16;39:12; 57:5;58:10;93:7 exam (1) 49:1 **EXAMINATION (1)** 5:12 examine (1) 123:14 examining (2) 40:13:101:1 example (5) 15:8;41:11,13;48:14;62:5 examples (1) 17:6 except (1) 138:10 exception (1) 29:16 excess (2) 117:7;119:19 execute (1) 46:4 Exercise (1) 28:4 Exhibit (5) 26:1,2;51:14,18;67:25 exhibits (2) 91:9,9 exited (1) 66:17 exits (1) 64:19 expand (1) 93:23 expected (1) 41:8 experience (5) 15:6;35:8;49:25;92:7; 102:10 Expert (2) 12:18;36:17 expertise (2) 11:12,19

expired (1) 67:1 **EXPIRES**(1) 138:24 explain (2) 49:2;89:16 expose (1) 53:10 Extended (2) 57:23,24 extensively (2) 52:3,7 extra (1) 81:20 extreme (3) 48:14,15;49:1 extremely (2) 81:11;126:16 F faced (2) 14:11;77:3 facie (2) 131:11;137:12 fact (5) 35:8;36:19;47:4;65:8; 129:11 factor (6) 42:8;43:14,16,17;45:15,22 factors (17) 29:25;39:6;40:2,13;41:7, 15:42:4:43:3:44:2.5:45:3: 47:13;55:14,17;56:2,9,16 facts (15) 31:14,19;35:12;37:2,9; 38:2,7;39:2;40:6;75:13;77:3; 110:3,11;111:21;114:12 failed (1) 68:3 failing (3) 42:17:69:24:101:3 fair (5) 12:20;17:8;47:14;101:21; 105:18 fairly (2) 62:20;84:3 falls (1) 40:23 familiar (7) 14:15;31:3;51:5,22;60:19; 64:2.4 far (6) 7:1;13:20;82:24;111:5,7; 136:23 fast (8) 29:12;30:7;49:7;73:6; 82:16;98:5;104:11;108:6 faster (6) 45:23;97:14,14;104:16; 108:2.2 fatal (3) 67:22;71:6;136:20

fatalities (1) 70:8 **FBI** (1) 69:24 feel (1) 66:7 feeling (1) 40:17 felon (8) 44:8,14:48:11:62:1:96:3: 98:15;107:17;113:7 felonies (10) 21:12,18;37:18,19;42:1; 44:16,17,20;46:19,24 felons (1) 22:24 felony (40) 21:20;26:23;44:8,10,12, 22;45:5,18;46:18,19;48:6,8; 50:15;95:6,13,25;96:11; 97:24:99:14:100:7:101:15: 107:20.25:116:2.19:118:8. 17;119:1,2,3,7,18;120:13,23, 25;121:14,24;122:14,18,24 few (2) 23:11;84:12 fictitious (1) 49:5 field (2) 12:15:90:23 finally (2) 50:10:123:19 find (12) 5:6;15:23;20:9;48:12; 53:3;55:24;56:15;95:10; 102:13;115:9;116:5;135:20 fine (9) 5:8,24;6:6;9:4;26:15; 54:19.20:69:19:108:25 fine-toothed (1) 135:19 finish (1) 118:13 firearm (1) 24:5 **First (23)** 4:24;6:25;9:22;17:20; 18:8;20:2;41:23;51:10; 52:25;67:3;72:3;73:20; 74:18;85:8;86:11;88:24; 92:15:93:13:113:1.10; 117:17;127:7;138:3 fishtailing (1) 65:25 five (1) 116:7 five-lane (1) 30:25 flat (2) 37:1:118:18 fled (2) 116:15:118:22 flee (9)

David T. Sweeney July 23, 2021

43:25;72:9,14,21;73:14; 75:21,24;76:10;79:13 fleeing (3) 53:11;55:7;62:1 flesh (1) 53:2 floor (1) 100:22 fo (1) 19:5 focus (3) 48:22;123:4;125:17 focusing (1) 103:1 follow (7) 31:11;33:13;35:4;64:13; 87:20;112:22;118:15 following (5) 25:20;28:20;42:16;56:9; 119:18 follows (2) 4:25;55:14 foot (1) 48:2 footage (4) 7:18,19,20;66:12 forbidden (1) 29:2 force (4) 4:8;34:22;97:3;108:4 foregoing (2) 79:22:138:5 forever (1) 129:7 forget (2) 25:23;61:5 forgot (1) 130:5 form (5) 15:23:17:14:91:13; 119:12;137:22 forth (2) 104:5;117:20 found (2) 53:24;62:7 frankly (1) 110:12 freeway (5) 50:21,23;64:17,18,24 frequent (1) 19:13 friends (1) 14:10 front (4) 8:11;45:25;48:13;99:21 Fuente (2) 82:6;131:11 full (4) 69:19,19;119:13;124:8 fully (1) 105:11 fully-commissioned (1) 6:23

M & M Court Reporting Service (208)345-9611(ph) (800)234-9611 (208)-345-8800(fax) (147) event - fully-commissioned

fun (1) 11:2 further (2) 4:6;109:16 G game (1) 18:22 gas(2)48:2;83:15 gave (3) 17:5;20:16;41:13 Gaze (1) 12:15 general (6) 21:16;43:5;51:21;52:2; 80:20;81:25 generalization (1) 41:16 Generally (4) 19:3;27:5;34:24;50:21 generate (1) 18:15 geography (1) 64:11 Getaway (3) 65:8,9,13 gets (8) 65:4:75:11:94:5:113:7; 116:19;121:22,23;133:4 given (3) 41:14;47:22;119:15 glad (1) 112:8 goal (1) 62:21 goes (12) 47:17:54:10,10,13:82:4; 88:23:98:4:101:13.15: 104:11:113:8:119:21 good(7)14:5;25:12;33:14;36:14; 40:11;53:17;103:12 Google (6) 8:1;64:8;65:1,3,6;66:7 granted (2) 47:21:58:2 Great (6) 7:7,12;8:24;14:2;15:21; 46:16 greater (8) 21:9;30:19;46:22,25; 61:23;70:9;84:23;128:9 greatest (3) 47:16;50:4,7 greatly (2) 86:24;90:2 gross (3) 26:24;27:3;30:19 ground (1) 9:3

66:3 guard (1) 9:25 guess (17) 15:25;20:2;23:21,23; 27:13;33:20;44:7;52:25; 57:6;60:16;67:20;68:19,20; 71:1;114:11;119:12;136:13 guesses (1) 93:23 guidance (3) 20:16;49:25;53:13 guidances (2) 37:15,23 guide (1) 15:16 guidelines (3) 16:18;20:17;35:4 guy (39) 30:11;44:4;46:16;50:5; 59:25;72:25;75:1;77:10,11; 85:21:87:21;88:6,15;90:19; 91:9;92:10;93:22;97:1,12, 18;98:12;99:9,17;100:1,6, 21;101:23;104:3;107:13,16; 111:25;112:20;113:6,8,19, 22;114:9;129:19;130:1 guys (1) 88:25 guv's(3)93:19:114:15:125:9 Η half (4) 50:9;53:20;63:10;77:21 hallucinating (1) 126:25 hand (3) 13:21:25:16:47:18 handle (3) 11:21;16:22;63:5 hands (1) 16:10 hang (3) 72:24;75:15;79:11 hangs (1) 58:16 happen (13) 19:12;21:12;40:3;42:22; 48:13:50:18:62:14:70:16: 98:14;119:25;129:19;130:7; 132:1 happened (11) 35:9;60:2;81:3,6;89:12; 106:9;108:23;114:14,17; 116:2;128:15 happening (2) 43:8,11 happens (3) 98:12;115:25;129:13 happy (4) 5:5;27:23;68:23;86:15

hard (8) 10:10:42:12:43:7:74:7: 83:11:107:15:124:13:128:22 harm (2) 44:3;58:1 hate (1) 33:20 hazards (1) 131:12 head (4) 27:22;36:10;77:9,13 hear (24) 18:24;32:13;34:3;36:16; 42:15;43:12;50:18;67:11; 77:24;78:6,6;79:10;83:4,8; 102:23;109:10;110:21,24; 124:13,16,18,19;125:6; 126:21 heard (2) 14:9;109:9 hearing (10) 7:17;36:24;38:15;44:7; 48:5;74:20;85:15;91:17; 110:5;136:25 hears (1) 49:8 hearsay (1) 14:17 heart (1) 36:9 heavily (2) 16:11:18:1 hell (1) 76:5 help (1) 24:15 helpful (1) 66:8 helping (1) 108:1 helps (1) 44:21 here's (3) 89:20;93:7;125:6 hereto (1) 138:11 hesitant (1) 35:6 hesitate (2) 134:18;135:17 Hev (7) 15:7,22;18:16;30:10; 35:11;55:22;114:15 **HGN** (1) 12:15 high (8) 104:12;108:11;109:2,17, 25;122:15,24;123:20 higher (7) 27:3,4;32:10;46:2;101:13; 121:23:130:21 highest (1)

highly (1) 71:10 high-speed (1) 21:6 Highway (6) 13:15;30:24,25;48:18; 67:17;69:23 hill (5) 82:19;109:17;112:21; 113:9;136:14 hinted (1) 15:10 hired (2) 6:17:7:3 hit (8) 23:20;54:15;62:1;83:15; 91:2;120:23,24;121:16 hits (1) 108:5 hitting (1) 121:16 Hmm (1) 68:18 hold (1) 21:2 home (1) 121:11 homicide (2) 81:21;107:18 honest (1) 36:15 hope (7)12:6;17:1;28:1;44:5;50:7; 63:15.17 hopefully (3) 18:21;38:23;62:13 hoping (1) 111:24 Horizontal (1) 12:15 horrible (1) 13:14 hour (24) 30:23,25;48:10,17,20; 49:6;50:9;53:20;63:3,10; 82:23;84:18,21,24;85:9; 95:9;97:17;111:17;115:22; 116:20;117:8;118:18; 119:19,23 hours (2) 11:25,25 house (2) 33:10,10 human (1) 106:24 hypothetical (8) 110:3,11;111:21;113:14, 17;114:4,8,11 Ι IA (1)

guarantee (1)

82:15

8:4

Idaho (20) 7:17:8:1.3.14.18:27:3.18. 20:51:7.10.11:60:19.21; 61:19;63:16;79:21;94:18; 95:2;116:18;118:24 idea (2) 10:13:32:8 ideas (1) 135:20 illegal (3) 91:4;96:10;117:7 images (1) 8:2 immediate (1) 103:19 immediately (6) 27:10;31:2;55:14;101:15; 102:10;118:16 immoral (1) 91:4 important (3) 35:7:37:9:69:3 impression (1) 9:18 inadequate (1) 52:15 inappropriate (2) 32:6:36:18 in-car(6) 7:18,19:66:12,14,21:74:5 Incident (4) 8:6:38:18.25:47:25 include (2) 70:11:91:22 included (1) 73:5 including (2) 8:4:82:5 **Incomplete** (3) 110:2,10:111:21 increase (3) 82:14:87:23:113:24 increased (6) 26:19;82:7;83:1;86:19; 89:23;126:19 Increases (2) 25:21;26:4 increasing (5) 42:24;73:16;83:11;94:23; 99:16 Indeed (1) 91:2 independent (2) 58:1;61:11 indicate (2) 4:12,15 indicated (1) 128:15 indication (2) 125:20;127:20 indicator (1) 88:5 individual (9)

35:1:40:24:45:2:47:13: 49:6.14:74:22:82:1:125:5 individually (1) 56:9 individuals (2) 9:6:94:14 influence (1) 71:10 information (4) 18:14;23:3;25:4;96:16 informational (1) 69:11 informative (1) 13:19 infractions (1) 126:15 inherent (3) 44:13;96:18,20 inherently (2) 19:19;33:16 initial (11) 18:10:74:6:82:17:88:16: 96:6;103:9;105:14;107:23; 126:12,15;127:24 initially (2) 67:2;74:5 Initiate (7) 55:3,4,20;56:11;59:15; 72:4.8 initiation (1) 100:11 iniure (1) 30:18 injured (2) 46:21;131:23 injures (1) 20:22 iniury (4) 53:12;116:21;117:10; 119:25 innocent (2) 53:10:131:23 in-person (1) 4:9 inquiry (1) 129:11 insert (1) 46:18 inspired (1) 13:15 insult (1) 63:21 intended (1) 119:16 intent (7) 30:18;80:9,25;81:2; 120:11,22;124:25 intentionally (1) 22:17 intents (4) 9:18;109:23;111:18; 114:21 interacted (1)

16:8 interest (2) 21:8,9 interested (1) 13:17 interesting (2) 6:20:16:6 interfere (1) 5:5 interior (2) 66:16;76:20 interpret (1) 55:13 interpretation (8) 117:2;120:21;121:1,13; 122:20,23;134:6;135:16 interpretations (1) 126:2 intersection (1) 136:17 intersections (1) 136:21 into (28) 9:3;15:17;22:22;25:23; 46:23;50:22;56:12;59:18,20; 60:8;64:2;68:7;71:7;78:9; 97:3;98:1;101:15;103:14,17; 105:4,21;113:14;115:20; 119:12;124:24;134:15,19; 135:25 intoxicated (1) 87:17 investigate (2) 15:19:23:24 investigating (3) 10:18;11:12;43:4 involve (2) 70:5.8 involved (15) 16:11:18:1,17:23:4,16; 24:17;40:15;46:8;67:15; 74:6;99:4;114:20;123:21; 129:8;134:20 involving (5) 22:6;23:10;36:21;57:25; 69:22 irresponsible (1) 50:3 issue (11) 11:21;13:13;16:18;36:1,8, 12;37:3,4;58:9;59:16;60:4 issues (7) 20:18;25:16;52:1;53:5; 59:18.19:60:8 J jack (1) 46:11 job (5) 9:13,25;16:15;36:14;46:14 jobs (2) 71:15.16

David T. Sweeney July 23, 2021

joins (1) 76:23 Joseph (1) 7:17 judge (2) 38:19:79:6 judgement (1) 59:20 judging (2) 120:25:121:11 judgment (4) 37:25;60:8;75:18;78:9 July (3) 65:17;66:3;72:12 jump (2) 5:7;10:6 jumping (1) 14:22 jumps (1) 120:17 jurisdiction (1) 51:7 jurisdictions (1) 50:12 Justice (2) 69:22,23 justifiable (1) 19:4 justification (1) 28:17 Κ **KANE (44)** 4:20,20;5:1,8,11,13;25:3, 25;26:3;34:1,8,14;41:6; 118:14:130:17:133:23:

51:15;61:6,7;62:14,24;63:3, 5,10,12,14;68:1;75:14;76:4, 7;78:5;91:18;95:18;104:18; 110:7.14.16:112:5:116:9: 135:8:136:6.18:137:15.22 keep (11) 27:9;48:23;63:15;81:13; 83:20,22;98:14;130:10; 137:10,11,11 keeps (4) 99:17;112:20;113:19; 114:1 kept (6) 103:22;104:10,10,11; 114:10:132:24 kill (1) 70:6 killed (9) 13:23;46:21;109:4;130:11, 15;133:7;136:7,23;137:1 kills (2) 20:22;113:9 kind (31) 6:20;13:15,16;14:18,20, 22;16:2,10,25;29:25;37:6; 38:24;39:17;41:16;42:24;

Min-U-Script®

City of Numpu	r
44 19 21 60 25 64 12 60 11	56 24 25 124 25
44:18,21;60:25;64:13;69:11;	56:24,25;134:25
70:13;74:5,7;81:20;82:3;	leads (2)
85:13;94:20;106:17;125:17;	102:10;126:10
134:5;135:14	learn (1)
kinds (2)	13:16
68:3;91:11	learned (2)
knew (4)	34:24;66:7
11:18;92:9;109:18;119:14	least (14) 9:2,6;17:10;28:9;36:25;
knowing (5) 31:6;80:16;81:25;93:13;	37:19;43:9;61:2;68:21;
97:5	71:19;81:25;82:17;99:13;
knowledge (9)	100:16
61:11;64:9,10;65:7,9,12;	leave (6)
68:21;80:10;91:23	10:19;62:21;63:6;68:19;
known (12)	87:12;99:9
11:15;12:24;56:13;80:12;	leaves (1)
96:18,19;99:3,13,18,18,20;	116:24
110:23	leaving (3)
knows (3)	92:17;102:6;126:6
74:1;87:24;88:6	led (1)
	12:1
L	leeway (5)
	61:23;81:20;87:12;133:6;
La (2)	135:6
82:6;131:11	left (7)
lack (7)	14:13;47:12;54:15;92:3,4,
52:11;53:3;96:16,22,23;	11;128:15
97:19;98:7	legal (7)
land (1)	26:8;39:22;62:11;80:3,7;
44:19	130:13;134:13
language (5)	legislature (1) 120:11
20:15;55:21,24;69:10; 128:2	legitimate (1)
	12:8
larger (1) 63:19	lengthy (1)
last (15)	115:7
6:2,3;14:9;35:2;53:20;	less (5)
65:21;67:2;69:8;78:23;	19:13,13;31:10;51:5;63:4
89:21;108:10;110:23;	letter (2)
115:12;121:3;131:10	8:10;57:20
late (1)	letting (2)
13:10	86:25;90:2
later (7)	level (15)
23:12,24;30:10;86:2;	8:19;9:2;19:5;33:5;70:22;
112:22;125:15;127:11	95:13;101:13;119:3;120:1
law (39)	23,25;121:1,14;123:20;
6:23;7:5,10;8:25;9:19;	126:15
12:9;17:4;20:21;21:7;26:11,	levels (3)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14;	17:15;46:20;121:14
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10,	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23;	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13;	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20,	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1)	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22,
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1)	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22,
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2 lawsuits (1)	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 lieutenants (2)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2 lawsuits (1) 38:16	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 lieutenants (2) 19:23;24:17
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2 lawsuits (1) 38:16 layout (1) 64:3 lead (1)	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 lieutenants (2) 19:23;24:17 life (5) 20:18;106:24;113:3; 122:16;130:10
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2 lawsuits (1) 38:16 layout (1) 64:3 lead (1) 111:4	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 lieutenants (2) 19:23;24:17 life (5) 20:18;106:24;113:3; 122:16;130:10 light (19)
11,13;27:13;32:12;33:7,14; 38:3,8;40:8,10;47:23;53:10, 14,15;60:19;61:15,22,23; 70:16;94:18;95:5;119:9,13; 120:22;121:6,10,11;122:20, 22 laws (1) 15:2 lawsuits (1) 38:16 layout (1) 64:3 lead (1)	17:15;46:20;121:14 Lexipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 liable (1) 49:4 Lieutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 lieutenants (2) 19:23;24:17 life (5) 20:18;106:24;113:3; 122:16;130:10

56:24,25:134:25 ads (2) 102:10:126:10 arn (1) 13:16 arned (2) 34:24;66:7 ast (14) 9:2,6;17:10;28:9;36:25; 37:19:43:9:61:2:68:21; 71:19;81:25;82:17;99:13; 100:16 ave (6) 10:19;62:21;63:6;68:19; 87:12;99:9 aves (1) 116:24 aving (3) 92:17;102:6;126:6 d (1) 12:1 eway (5) 61:23;81:20;87:12;133:6; 135:6 ft (7) 14:13;47:12;54:15;92:3,4, 11;128:15 gal (7) 26:8;39:22;62:11;80:3,7; 130:13:134:13 gislature (1) 120:11 pitimate (1) 12:8 ngthy (1) 115:7 ss (5) 19:13,13;31:10;51:5;63:4 tter (2) 8:10:57:20 tting (2) 86:25:90:2 vel (15) 8:19;9:2;19:5;33:5;70:22; 95:13;101:13;119:3;120:13, 23,25;121:1,14;123:20; 126:15 vels (3) 17:15;46:20;121:14 exipol (6) 51:22;52:2,4,7,14,23 ble (1) 49:4 eutenant (10) 5:24,25;16:8,12,24;17:22, 23;24:13;44:15;47:21 eutenants (2) 19:23;24:17 e (5) 20:18:106:24:113:3; 122:16:130:10 ght (19)

109:4.24;110:17;111:15; 112:15.19:114:18.24:118:6: 119:6;121:3,3;136:3,23 lights (22) 25:16;27:8,14,20;28:8; 36:2,3,7;42:15,21;43:7;47:3, 6;72:9;74:14;99:16;110:5, 21;111:1,12;112:7;113:18 light's (1) 88:9 likely (10) 35:25;36:11;100:17; 116:23;117:13,18;120:2,8, 14:121:16 limit (6) 29:13;30:23;95:9;116:20; 117:8;119:20 limited (1) 7:2 limits (1) 28:1 line (10) 9:18,18;17:9;36:8;40:5; 43:21;56:17;58:3;125:12; 134:16 line-of-duty (1) 68:5 lines (1) 85:18 link(7)68:11,15,16;69:7,16;70:1; 78:16 list (1)28:21listed (1) 138:10 listen (8) 18:4,8;37:2,9;42:18;48:4; 77:23:125:8 listening (1) 18:22 lists (1) 74:14 lit (1) 128:5 little (23) 10:6;14:23;52:22;53:16; 54:21;55:8;58:18;65:10; 72:18;83:10,18;85:2;100:18; 101:17;109:10;122:1,11; 123:25;124:13;125:15,18; 135:24.25 living (2) 71:12,13 locality (1) 64:11 locations (1) 64:7 long (7) 29:5:59:5.5:91:14:98:5: 111:1;127:17 longer (7) 46:3;53:1;54:10,12;63:8;

88:23:101:8 long-time (1) 14:19 look (51) 5:18,20;12:21;13:6;27:23; 35:1;38:19;39:2;40:6;41:19; 43:3;54:20;57:23;58:20; 65:23:68:11:69:7:71:7: 73:24;74:8,21,22,23;75:12; 76:21;77:24;88:14,16;89:2; 90:14;96:5;99:25;101:21; 105:16;106:5;107:21; 108:17;113:22;114:5;117:4; 119:10;120:11;122:6,20; 123:17;124:8,20;125:5,5; 126:11;137:14 looked (5) 8:18,23;67:4;68:5;135:18 looking (28) 6:5,11;8:12;16:13;18:17; 31:17;36:20;41:20,22;50:13, 25;57:18;68:16;69:25;70:17; 76:16;77:16;79:21;108:19; 113:12;114:25;115:11; 120:20,21;121:6,20;123:1,24 looks (3) 6:11;28:22;109:12 lose (1)33:17 losing (1) 80:6 loss(2)122:16:130:9 lost (2)48:20;110:22 lot (22) 11:4;17:3;24:8;26:10; 29:11;30:24;32:8,9;34:21; 39:15;46:7,13;53:2,19; 64:10:69:21:76:20:92:7; 110:24;117:20;123:3;135:6 loud (2)13:4;122:13 love (1) 124:14 low (2) 70:20;126:16 lower (1) 105:21 LT (2) 18:21;31:21 Μ madder (1) 116:22 main (1) 32:7

Mainly (1)

86:18

makes (1)

119:2

making (7)

37:2;48:3;58:25;78:25; 85:22:101:1:115:3 Man (1) 108:6 maneuver (1) 83:18 maneuvers (1) 75:9 manner (6) 4:11;9:8;116:22;117:12, 17;120:1 manslaughter (1) 122:16 Manual (4) 24:25,25;35:4;90:15 many (19) 14:4;17:18;19:9;24:3; 31:4;39:13;51:1;61:25; 63:24;71:14;105:11,14,23; 106:10,13;121:21;131:4; 132:6,25 Map (3) 65:1;66:7,9 Maps (1) 64:8 March (3) 6:18;9:21,21 marked (6) 26:1,2;51:14,17;66:10; 67:25 marker (2) 122:11:123:6 Mary (3) 5:15,17,20 match (2) 19:20;68:15 matches (1) 68:16 matter (8) 21:21;81:3,6;97:12,13; 104:11;113:25;131:21 may (7) 4:21;15:10;19:8,8;52:13; 135:9;138:10 maybe (15) 10:6;20:10;23:12,20; 31:17;36:5;55:13;57:6;77:1, 1;90:22;100:8;116:22;122:1; 123:25 mean (17) 8:9;22:6;33:10,14;45:8; 48:6,10;61:14,20;62:9,25; 64:16;72:21;85:5;99:24; 127:14;128:4 Meaning (5) 20:19;26:25;30:17;39:11; 112:20 means (5) 18:4;37:17;73:3;79:19; 132:8 media (1) 13:22

11:16:14:19 memory (1) 69:24 memos (1) 16:18 mental (2) 115:18.21 mention (4) 57:12;58:21;59:2;132:20 mentioned (2) 20:9;22:1 mere (8) 86:25;90:3,5;91:21,24; 93:24;96:2,12 merely (1) 32:14 merits (1) 40:24 Michael (1) 7:17 mid-2000s (1) 20:3 middle (4) 5:7;39:15;100:4;101:25 midnight (1) 93:1 might (63) 11:25;13:22;14:17;15:18; 19:2,5;21:2,13,15,18;22:25; 30:23;31:17;34:23;38:17; 42:18:43:13:47:4:49:3: 53:21;54:14;61:25;68:6; 69:21;77:11,16,17,18,20; 81:12;83:6;84:1;89:19; 90:15;91:12;92:7,8,10,25; 93:3,5,20;98:8;100:21,21,22, 25;102:4,11,12,13;103:23; 104:3.3:107:11:120:4.5.8: 121:12;124:6;129:23;134:7; 135:2 Mike (9) 4:20;56:6,8:62:16;78:1; 98:22;104:11;110:12;118:12 mile (4) 77:21;95:8;136:19,21 miles (19) 30:23,24;48:9,17,19;49:6; 82:23;84:18,21,23;85:9; 97:17;111:17;115:22; 116:19;117:8;118:18; 119:19,22 mind (18) 46:8;49:15;71:9;98:2; 99:8;103:7,14,18;104:1; 107:7,15;115:20,21;126:2, 24;130:23;133:15,21 minds (4) 98:18;104:20,22;123:3 mindset (1) 104:7 mine (2) 97:9:121:13 minimal (1)

115:13 minor (11) 20:20;23:22;33:14;70:21; 101:3,9,19;103:2,20;116:12; 122:7 Minuscript (1) 137:22 minute (6) 45:4;62:13;86:15;88:9,24; 101:8 minutes (4) 25:9;84:12;114:6;116:7 **Mischaracterizes (1)** 33:23 misdemeanor (18) 21:22;26:23,24;27:1; 28:23;29:15,17;37:1;44:19; 71:18,23;95:3;116:16; 118:23,25;120:13;121:1,14 misdemeanors (2) 27:3:57:25 missed (2) 16:10:19:9 Misstates (2) 75:2;95:17 mistake (3) 36:9,10;87:25 moderate (2) 84:2.4 moment (12) 12:22;24:22;37:7;49:20; 62:21:76:25:77:12:78:4: 82:25;88:12,20;89:17 momentarily (1) 84:15 money (1) 134:17 monitor (2) 17:16;19:10 monitored (1) 17:23 monitoring (13) 18:1,4,20,23;19:1;22:5,14: 23:7,9,11,14,14;24:9 months (1) 7:1 moon (1) 65:21 more (40) 9:13;13:16;16:5,9;17:24, 25;26:12,25;34:13;35:25; 36:11;45:21;50:11;53:2,21; 54:10,13;61:17;66:9;68:7, 10,24;69:11,18;80:24;82:8; 83:7;85:3,18;86:5;95:20; 96:12;102:15;103:12;106:4; 111:17;123:1;128:1;132:13; 135:23 morning (1) 10:20 **MORTIMER (31)** 4:16,16;5:3,9;33:23;34:5, 11;61:5;62:10,16;63:6,11;

75:2;76:1,6,11;91:13,15; 95:16:104:14:110:2.10: 111:20;118:12;130:13; 133:17:134:13:136:5.10: 137:16,20 Mortimer's (1) 136:24 most (16) 14:12;17:4;18:23;32:19; 47:22:50:16:63:16:64:9; 65:14;70:21;105:6,17;115:1; 120:12;121:10,13 mostly (1) 67:12 motion (2) 75:18;78:9 motivate (1) 15:16 motivator (1) 13:17 motor (2) 54:2:83:4 motorists (2) 131:13.15 mouth (1) 47:10 move (6) 5:6;16:24;54:19;57:19,21; 86:17 moved (1) 124:24 moving (3) 28:1:105:13:120:23 much (16) 11:21;17:9;21:9;25:11; 42:1,15;48:22;67:5;97:20; 105:2,2,24;115:2;128:8; 129:25:133:19 musing (1) 58:13 must (3) 54:2:55:14:70:4 myself (5) 13:16;19:23;59:16;60:8; 103:7 Ν

N18-36876(1) 8:7 name (7) 4:13;6:1,2,3;11:6;91:11; 138:20 named (1) 138:5 Nampa (30) 7:19,21,22;8:5,5;24:23; 25:6;26:17;50:10;51:17; 52:17;53:18;58:5;64:3,11, 13.22.25:65:14.17:66:3: 72:14;73:13;75:21;79:14; 90:14;94:7;96:7,10;106:2 narrows (1)

member (2)

45:25 National (2) 67:17:69:22 near (1) 121:11 nearly (2) 120:16.23 need (24) 21:3;31:13,18;41:2;53:7; 54:6;60:10;62:19,20;68:13; 73:24;74:11;76:16;77:22; 78:6;79:10;89:2,3;103:19; 118:11;123:17;124:7;125:6; 137:18 needed (3) 10:24;24:16;30:10 needs (4) 32:11;33:1;81:19;106:15 negative (1) 128:23 negligence (4) 30:19;60:22;61:15;80:12 negligent (2) 61:20:62:9 negotiations (1) 134:19 neighborhood (5) 31:1;84:13,22;105:15; 121:20 neighborhoods (2) 97:15:104:17 nervous (1) 87:17 Nevada (1) 39:15 nevertheless (1) 39:21 new (4) 6:14,18;23:20;35:10 news (2) 13:22:39:1 next (4) 69:1;96:15;126:3,16 night (15) 10:20;13:19;14:1,11;31:9; 39:19;65:17,21;78:23;105:1, 12,23;131:4,6;132:25 nighttime (2) 129:25;132:6 nobody (1) 4:17 non-university (1) 7:8 North (2) 11:13;24:9 NOTARY (1) 138:20 notes (3) 54:21;57:18;105:17 notice (1) 35:11 noticed (1) 52:25

notion (2) 121:2.4 number (7) 10:4;33:17;42:21;46:2; 70:15:71:6:100:24 numbers (2) 20:14;69:24 Nystagmus (1) 12:16 0 obeying (1) 121:9 object (7) 5:5,7;76:11;91:13;95:16; 104:14;111:21 **Objection** (14) 33:23;34:3,5;62:10;75:2; 76:1,12;110:2,10;130:13; 133:17;134:13;136:5,9 objections (3) 4:11;5:4,10 obliterates (1) 108:5 observation (1) 135:22 observations (1) 90:23 observe (1) 38:1 obstinate (1) 60:14 obvious (1) 39:10 **Obviously** (7) 60:17;70:4,19;80:3;106:5, 11;126:21 occupant (1) 70:9 occur (7) 19:25;37:18;38:18;77:15; 118:17;121:11;122:24 occurred (8) 84:24;89:14;99:6;118:9; 123:20;127:11;128:16; 136:20 occurring (1) 54:14 occurs (4) 76:23;77:12;121:24; 122:24 odor (2) 90:23;93:10 off (46) 19:4;21:16,23;22:1,12; 23:5,6,8;27:22;28:10;30:14, 21;31:2,12;42:14;43:5;44:9; 45:8,22;47:11;49:15,19; 55:19;63:12;64:19;73:21; 77:1;78:2;83:16,20;84:19; 85:20:89:18.20:109:25: 110:20;111:16;113:7,18;

124:11,12,19;125:1;127:4,8, often (3) 10 offender (3) 20:23;40:9;59:3 offer (4) 11:12;67:4;73:23;123:15 offhand (1) 111:10 office (4) 30:10;45:22;66:20;79:10 Officer (113) 5:23;6:21;7:9,18,20,20,23, 24;8:6;10:11,15,25;11:16, 17:12:7,21:13:14:15:6,14; 16:19;17:8,10;18:9,14;19:3, 6;21:13,17;22:7,8,11,21; 23:4,20;25:15;27:7;28:11; 30:3,9;31:13;33:7,16;36:5; 37:20;38:9,11,22;40:7,12; 41:7;42:3,15;43:18,25; 44:11;45:6,10;47:11,12,13, 15;48:19;49:2,14;50:2; 55:22,22;57:3;58:16;62:1,8; 71:14;72:8;73:4,9,12;74:4, 13,19;75:10;76:22;77:14; 79:7;82:6;87:8,10,18;89:19; 91:17;93:3,4;94:22,23,25; 96:17,17;97:5,11;99:1,9; 100:10;101:2;102:10;112:3; 113:6,18;115:6,12;119:15; 125:17,21;126:20;134:22 officer' (1) 76:21 officers (80) 10:16;11:3;13:6;14:12,18; 15:11,17;16:9,14;19:21; 24:8;28:6,17,19;29:9;30:6,8; 32:9;33:17;35:2,21;37:12, 23,25;44:25;46:12;50:2; 53:11,13,22;55:4,9;58:15; 59:20;66:13;68:7;76:9;77:5, 7;78:11;79:5;83:13,21; 85:10;87:5,12,20;89:8;90:8, 10,13,17;92:13;94:8;96:8; 98:19;99:3,21;103:19; 104:23;105:10;106:13,18, 21;107:4,21;108:1,13,23; 109:7;110:20;111:3;124:21; 125:1;126:23;127:21; 130:20;131:18;133:9;137:7 officers' (1) 123:3 officer's (13) 18:1;25:19;38:19;39:3; 43:21;46:8;56:22;61:24; 65:23;66:2;128:14;133:11; 134:18 offices (2) 42:23;50:19 official (1) 16:1 officially (1) 51:16

19:12;26:11;50:18 OJ (1) 71:3 Once (1) 79:13 oncoming (1) 108:14 one (73) 4:19,21;8:10;13:6;14:3,10, 18;15:11;17:4,14;18:15,20; 23:5,19,22;24:4,19,23;25:24; 28:19;29:16;30:7,8;31:17, 22,23;34:12;35:21;39:7; 43:9;44:5;45:15,24;46:25; 47:17;48:18;50:11;54:17; 57:8;59:14;60:25;61:2,4,17; 62:13;65:13;66:9,14,14; 74:1;77:12,19;86:19;88:5; 89:22;93:3,4;95:20;99:7; 100:19,25;102:4,13;105:10; 117:9;119:6,7;120:4;128:1; 132:18,22;134:6;135:10 one-officer (1) 68:8 one-page (1) 69:15 ones (6) 8:23;10:7;21:19;47:16; 56:24,24 **Only (41)** 14:17;21:12,17;23:18; 24:4,18:37:18:42:1:43:24; 44:16,20;59:8;64:7;65:10; 66:16;67:11;69:15;74:4; 79:6;84:17;90:6,18;92:24; 94:14;97:7;101:3,9,19; 103:2:105:10:116:15: 118:23;122:15,18;123:9; 127:16;129:24;131:3; 132:21,24;135:22 on-screen (1) 50:13 onto (2) 96:15;121:23 open (1) 79:9 opening (1) 7:3 operating (2) 25:15:27:7 operation (3) 11:24;16:25;59:1 operations (2) 17:22;24:13 operator (1) 117:5 opined (1) 36:16 opinion (17) 67:5;72:3,7;73:10,20,23; 74:1,18;75:23;78:1;88:25; 93:6;99:22;103:15;111:3;

133:24;136:22 opinions (2) 74:9;77:22 opportunities (1) 71:15 opportunity (2) 15:16;47:10 opposed (3) 97:20;120:25;121:22 ops (1) 17:23 order (22) 8:19;11:9;18:15;21:7; 30:3;33:7;35:14,24,25;40:9; 42:23;55:18;75:9;78:14; 83:13,22;84:10;94:21; 123:17;124:8;125:13;130:23 Oregon (12) 6:7,9,16,19,24;7:6,11; 9:22;32:20;35:19;43:10;52:8 original (3) 116:12;122:6;125:11 others (12) 8:17,21;15:9,16;20:16; 34:22;38:18;80:2;89:11; 107:10,17;132:23 others' (2) 35:9:137:4 ourselves (1) 11:8 out (39) 11:23:13:4:16:25:20:2.25: 24:10:29:4:33:3:35:3:46:12, 24;48:11;52:11;57:19;58:16; 64:20;68:22,25;70:13;80:17; 82:18;89:18;93:1;105:12,24, 25;106:6,6,14,16;114:11; 120:18;122:13;126:24; 129:15;131:5,6;132:7,10 outright (1) 58:7 outweighed (2) 86:24;90:2 outweighs (2) 37:13,24 over (45) 6:6;7:13;8:13;10:10; 18:14;19:10,13;30:9;31:5; 32:20;35:19;42:20;73:6; 82:15;84:17,19,21,23;85:1; 87:14;95:9;97:17;98:22; 109:7,8,13,17,18;111:5,8; 112:20;113:9,19;115:22; 116:20;118:18;119:1,4,21; 122:1,5;123:2;133:7;135:19; 136:14 overall (1) 135:16 overriding (1) 45:22 overturned (1) 29:19 own (6)

40:23:49:15:57:8:88:2: 114:9:121:12 Р pace (1)27:9 page (4) 37:12:53:8:62:6:116:6 pages (1) 138:6 parades (1) 11:2 paragraph (13) 67:15;69:8;71:25;96:15; 116:10;118:18,20;119:11; 122:6,23;125:16;127:3; 128:18 park (1) 87:17 parking (1) 22:22 part (16) 11:14;12:8;32:19;38:22; 43:19;64:23;85:1;87:25; 96:5;99:22;107:13;113:1; 114:9;132:21;134:24;137:5 participating (1) 4:3 particular (4) 37:16:57:14:66:6:69:25 particularly (3) 31:9;102:5;121:18 parties (1) 4:10passing (1) 127:3 password (1) 67:1 past (3) 78:21:100:9:112:15 Patrol (17) 5:22;6:7;10:23;11:11,14; 13:14;14:20,24;15:13;17:6, 10,21,24;23:4;50:19,20;68:8 patrols (1) 68:8 PD (6) 9:20;20:5;32:2;72:14; 73:13:79:14 peace (1) 119:15 pedestrian (2) 105:2;120:17 pedestrians (2) 39:13,21 penalty (3) 27:4,4;95:2 pending (1) 62:15 people (38) 15:7;24:6,7;32:8;33:1; 39:16,18;42:19;70:5,12;

87:14:105:12,24,25:106:6,6, 7,10,14,15;107:10;109:4; 121:21;122:25;129:17; 130:19;131:5,6;132:7,10; 133:1,7,12,13;135:11;136:3, 15.15 per (2) 116:19:117:8 perceive (1) 46:1 percent (1) 66:4 percentage (2) 134:12,20 Perfect (1) 7:12 performance (2) 34:23;56:18 perhaps (1) 39:10 period (7) 10:5,13;17:17;19:10; 31:16,23;32:18 permission (1) 48:7 person (14) 33:6;43:22,23;56:23; 57:10;116:24;117:14,19; 119:14;120:3,15;131:23; 133:4;134:24 persons (3) 28:7.12:79:25 philosophical (2) 58:9.12 philosophy (1) 134:4 photographs (1) 65:4 physically (3) 4:4:48:13:49:3 pick (3) 44:8:47:10:100:23 picture (1) 17:1 piece (1) 121:18 **pin (3)** 22:22;36:13;113:5 pinned (1) 36:14 **PIT** (1) 83:18 place (7) 35:20;46:21;53:19;60:1; 87:16;113:1,1 placed (1) 47:20 plain (1) 33:22 play (1) 73:25 played (1) 137:5

playing (1) 134:24 Please (8) 4:12,15;6:1;76:8;79:18; 85:5:137:17.20 pm (1) 137:23 point (47) 7:5;12:16;16:12,17;24:13; 39:5:40:1.21:43:6.9.11:48:5: 57:5;67:5;68:20;70:1;73:17; 75:7,12;76:23;77:6,25;78:1, 21,21;79:1,2;82:17;84:20; 89:10,18;90:7,24;91:24; 93:19;94:3;101:10;102:5,12; 106:12;110:14,20;112:2; 118:1,2;125:1,14 points (1) 25:21 Police (68) 6:8,9,14,16,18,21;7:8,19, 21,22;8:5,6,16;12:3;14:5; 16:7,22;20:7,24;24:21,24,25; 25:15;26:10;27:8;40:12,15; 51:17;52:1;53:18;54:8,11; 58:2,5,25;60:19,21;61:10,14; 65:10,23;67:15;71:13;74:2, 13;75:22;78:15;79:23;82:12; 83:9;87:18;90:14;94:7; 99:16:100:6:101:11:108:9: 112:3;113:6,7,22,23;114:2,9; 130:20;133:9;134:18;137:7 policies (10) 26:10;50:12,25;52:2;58:3; 60:20,21;61:10,10,22 Policy (66) 7:21,22;14:16;19:14,22; 20:17:21:11:24:21:25:5: 26:16;27:6,14;29:4,7,21; 30:13:32:17.20:35:3.16.18; 36:24,25;37:16;41:22,25,25; 51:4,8,17;52:10,11,17;53:1, 2,4,13,24;55:8,20;57:17; 58:18,19;59:5,6,10,10,11,13, 24;60:3,6,9;61:14,14,19,24; 62:2,7,8;91:4;94:7,19;95:11; 96:11;132:18 Poor (4) 72:14;109:4;130:19; 131:23 Poore (9) 7:18;8:1;66:13,20;73:13; 74:6,19;75:21;76:22 Poore's (3) 83:4;96:17;125:17 portion (1) 70:10 posed (7) 126:3;127:13,24;128:3,7, 20;129:2 poses (1) 97:20 posing (1)

127:15 position (1) 49:24 positions (1) 63:16 possibilities (2) 99:8;100:25 possibility (3) 93:14,21;100:19 possible (3) 31:6;41:3;130:9 possibly (4) 17:22;22:22;127:20; 129:18 posted (3) 116:20;117:8;119:19 potential (2) 60:1;91:9 power (1) 9:6 powers (1) 7:8practice (1) 33:15 Precinct (10) 11:13,15,16;14:24;15:3, 17,21;23:13;24:9,10 preliminary (1) 7:16 preparation (1) 7:15 prepare (1) 7:13 prepared (1) 122:1 present (3) 4:5,14;128:12 presented (3) 35:14;38:7;39:2 presume (1) 9:7 pretty (9) 11:21;17:9;25:10;41:25; 48:15;50:14;82:18;115:1; 137:10 previously (1) 100:19 prima (2) 131:11;137:12 primarily (3) 8:14;20:12;52:9 primary (7) 8:23;10:17,21,25;11:4; 53:12:66:15 print (1) 69:19 printed (2) 95:10;116:4 prior (8) 9:24;37:2;82:25;100:10; 105:17;121:3,17;123:14 Pro (1) 8.4

proactivity (1) 11:11 probable (9) 7:23;90:9,10,13,18,19,21, 25;102:11 probably (12) 21:22;30:25;36:7;48:22; 65:13;67:1;83:17;103:12; 104:19;110:21;129:9;135:20 problem (9) 12:8;13:9,11,25;16:19; 31:1;54:5,25;59:4 proceed (1) 136:8 proceeding (3) 4:4,5,6 proceeds (1) 27:9 process (9) 11:24;37:5,7;38:14,15,16; 77:13;109:3;130:3 processing (2) 29:12;107:15 producers (1) 52:11 program (2) 12:17;14:8 progress (1) 16:7 prohibit (3) 58:7,11,13 prohibited (2) 58:4:90:16 promoted (1) 15:6 pronounced (1) 72:22 proper (1) 16:14 property (10) 9:7:94:15:116:21.23: 117:10,13,18;119:24;120:2, 15 proportion (1) 50:4 propounded (1) 138:8 protect (7) 33:2;46:14,17;79:25;96:9; 104:8;136:1 protected (1) 81:19 protecting (3) 56:14;130:5,6 provide (1) 53:13 provided (1) 71:14 provisions (3) 79:22,25;117:6 public (53) 19:20;20:13,23,24;29:6,

37:13,24:44:13:46:15,17: 47:7:53:14:56:14:79:16: 82:5;86:24;90:2;94:12;95:6, 13.15.21:96:9.18.20:97:20. 25;99:25;102:17,19,21; 104:7;113:3;117:25;118:6; 121:5;125:21,22;126:11,19; 127:2;130:5;131:6;132:19; 133:4,25;136:1;138:20 Puget (2) 50:16;51:1 pull (4) 15:17;42:20;67:13;87:14 pulled (4) 25:5;69:9;119:10;136:14 pure (1) 133:17 purely (2) 62:10;114:4 Purpose (3) 53:9,12;64:6 purposes (4) 9:19;109:24;111:18; 114:21 pursuant (2) 70:19;116:18 pursue (41) 21:1;28:17;29:2,9;32:2,11; 37:19;40:9;41:14;44:12; 46:14:48:8,11:49:6,16; 50:20:54:1:55:10:56:23; 59:25;72:9,11;78:21;81:3; 82:1:90:8.10.13:97:1.3.13: 100:6;102:22;103:2;107:24; 129:25;130:1,3,8;132:8; 134:3 pursued (9) 70:5,9,12;81:6;103:4; 113:8;114:9;119:16;137:3 pursuing (24) 18:9,11;20:20;21:3;32:14, 14;34:17;35:21;36:17;37:1; 43:6;44:13;59:12;77:10; 80:14;85:21;88:15;89:10; 103:21;106:19,21;107:5; 111:4;129:19 pursuit (143) 8:2,4;18:2,25;19:4,4,7,14, 19;20:21,24;21:6,14,15; 22:5;23:5,6,9,17,21;24:1,8, 10,21;27:7,15;28:6,10,19; 30:14,21;31:12,20;32:17; 33:12;35:2,15;37:12,13; 40:1,2,24;41:9;43:18;44:4, 22;45:5,13;46:9,10;47:4,12; 49:5,14;50:18,22;55:3,5,23; 56:11,19,20,24;57:16;58:1; 59:15;60:15;64:9,14;66:10, 20;70:22,25;71:1;73:22; 74:7,19;76:23;77:4,8;78:18; 79:2;81:16;82:7;84:2;85:10, 20,23;86:12,18;88:3,18; 89:22;96:19;97:21;98:4;

David T. Sweeney July 23, 2021

100:11;101:3,18,19;102:15; 103:5:104:4:105:15:106:14: 110:6;111:2,25;112:1,11,25; 113:1,6,10,15,15,17;114:13, 20;121:19,19;123:11,21; 124:12,18;125:22;126:9,10; 127:5,6,6,15,25;128:9,19,21; 129:3;130:25;131:14,20; 132:20;134:1;137:14 pursuit-related (4) 67:21,22;68:3;70:8 pursuits (25) 7:22;17:17;19:9,18,21,21; 20:5,7;21:12;22:14;28:22; 32:23;33:21;34:23;38:4; 45:18;50:14;53:10;54:12; 57:23,24;67:16;68:17;77:1; 111:23 pursuit's (8) 42:14;43:5,8,10,25;111:6; 113:19:114:24 put (14) 13:3;14:20;47:9;60:16; 67:24;73:7;78:8;84:5;91:24; 103:7;119:12;125:7;134:12, 20Putnam (17) 7:20,21,24,25;66:13,15; 72:4,8,14;73:5,12;74:4,13, 19:75:21:82:6:83:19 Putnam's (4) 96:17:100:10:115:12.20 putting (2) 98:18:115:20

Q

qualify (1) 11:9 quarter (2) 65:21;136:19 quick (3) 18:13:78:25:119:11 quickly (10) 19:2;54:3,6,14;62:20,25; 69:7;83:21;101:14;118:3 quite (4) 50:18;63:8;70:3;112:2 quote (2) 29:6;85:17 quoted (5) 69:8,10;116:25;117:1; 119:13

R

radio (9) 18:4;66:23;67:9;77:23; 110:22;124:13,15,18;125:7 ran (8) 67:20;75:1;85:8,16;86:20, 20;107:20;108:11 range (1)

Min-U-Script®

23;30:1;31:10;32:11;33:16;

82:18 rank (3) 32:10,10:47:22 rather (1) 10:7reaction (1) 137:3 read (28) 6:12;7:15;9:17;14:6; 27:18:55:11:59:9:60:5: 69:19;76:21;82:24;98:10; 117:3;118:3;121:7,12;122:2, 13,20;123:15;124:2;130:25; 131:1;132:22;133:20;134:5; 137:16:138:7 reading (8) 37:17;73:2;105:5;119:8; 122:4;132:5;134:2,6 reads (1) 56:21 ready (2) 59:19:63:17 real (1) 114:12 realize (5) 60:1;87:18;88:11;89:8; 131:18 realized (4) 22:13;79:9;114:15;133:25 realizing (1) 123:19 really (34) 14:15;20:18;29:11;36:10; 42:14;43:8;48:22;52:12; 58:9;61:8;64:5,6;67:4;69:3, 4,6;76:19;84:1;86:15;88:6,7; 91:14;92:20;97:22;98:2,21; 99:17;100:1;104:25;121:21, 23:127:17:128:4:134:20 rear-end (1) 126:12 reason (15) 25:5;26:15;30:21;42:13; 52:13;61:16;96:6;100:16; 101:22,24;102:2,16;105:3; 127:25;128:5 reasonable (40) 25:18;33:11;38:10,10,20; 39:4;40:10,16,18;45:7;49:3, 7;55:5,18;72:8;77:14;79:7; 87:20;90:25;91:5;92:1,5,6, 10,13,23,25;93:4,6,8,10,14, 18;99:1;102:12;115:6.6.9; 124:21;133:11 reasonableness (7) 38:20;53:21,22;54:9,9; 55:18;137:9 reasonably (3) 48:11;56:13;100:16 reasoning (3) 38:1;107:14;125:13 reasons (6)

100:24;102:2;103:4 reassigned (1) 14:12 recent (1) 15:5 reckless (32) 30:4,8,15;32:12;38:22; 43:13;61:8;72:15;75:22; 79:15,19,20;80:1,3,8,23; 81:14,24;82:4;86:2;88:21; 89:1,6,11;112:6,10,11,14,21; 113:4,9;115:15 recklessly (1) 137:4 recklessness (1) 115:17 recognition (4) 12:7,13,18;98:9 recognize (4) 48:21;58:14;63:22,25 recognized (1) 105:11 recognizes (1) 132:22 reconvene (1) 63:7 record (5) 4:13;6:1,7;39:11;63:12 red (13) 47:3,6;74:14;83:1;108:10, 23:109:3:110:17:112:7; 118:6:119:6:121:3.3 reduced (1) 45:24 reengage (1) 62:23 refer (2) 53:8:116:10 referee (1) 34:9 references (1) 132:6 refused (2) 26:20;73:3 refuses (2) 25:22;26:5 refusing (7) 42:17;43:23,24;71:2; 73:18;94:24;124:23 regard (3) 28:7.11:79:24 regarding (1) 60:21 regular (1) 17:11 reinstate (1) 76:12 reject (2) 121:2,4 related (1) 4:24 relation (1) 56:19

relatively (2) 23:22;115:13 relevant (3) 8:1.8.14 reliance (1) 115:13 relieve (1) 79:22 rely (3) 35:8:78:15.17 relying (1) 74:5 remember (20) 8:22;13:14;15:4,7;20:1; 22:2,10;23:4;25:10;29:18; 30:5;35:24;65:24,24;68:4; 69:25;109:11;117:23;134:2; 135:15 remembering (1) 95:4 remotely (3) 4:6,7,25 render (2) 75:13;77:3 repeat (1) 59:15 Report (14) 8:3;65:11,23;69:9,19,20, 25;74:13;76:21;78:15,17; 87:8;124:3;128:14 **REPORTER** (2) 4:3:137:18 reporting (2) 4:6.12 reports (5) 8:6;82:12;108:9;131:1; 132:14 requested (1) 137:24 requesting (1) 12:1 require (2) 63:2;129:9 requirement (1) 36:3 requires (1) 6:24 research (1) 69:21 reserve (2) 5:4,10 **RESIDING** (1) 138:22 resonate (1) 107:14 resource (1) 15:21 response (2) 7:23;25:19 responsibilities (3) 10:14.23:49:11 responsibility (13) 10:21;17:11;24:14;45:6;

47:16,19:49:18,23:50:7; 127:5:134:10.21.23 responsible (7) 11:1;24:18;45:11;50:1; 52:9;97:5;130:18 rest (2) 114:25:115:1 restate (1) 127:19 restrictive (1) 26:12 result (18) 35:23;38:17;81:9,10,17; 98:16;99:15;100:5;106:5,8; 107:1;123:9;129:19;131:8; 132:1,11;137:12,14 resulting (1) 122:16 results (2) 104:4;114:5 rethink (1) 40:18 retired (2) 9:21:14:13 revealed (1) 96:16 review (13) 8:5;16:9,12;25:8;35:9; 37:5,7;38:14;66:12,23;67:9; 74:15:96:15 reviewed (10) 7:13:25:9:35:2:52:18: 61:1:66:22:67:2:108:9.9: 129:22 reviewing (1) 34:22 reviews (2) 34:23;132:16 revisit (1) 124:7 Rich (1) 61:3 right (155) 5:21,25;6:13;9:11,13;11:6; 12:14;14:7,25;17:13,19; 20:4,11;23:1,25;24:1,24; 25:1,12,12;27:16,22,24;29:3, 15,18,25;32:18;35:13,22; 36:20,23;37:4,17,21;39:19; 40:16;41:12,14;42:2,8; 46:20;47:7;49:21;51:13; 52:6,20,21;54:15;55:3,4,16, 24;56:1,4,5,8;58:12,13;60:3; 66:14;67:13;68:10;69:5,9; 70:2,10;71:4,21,23;75:8,13; 77:17;78:10,16;79:8;80:5, 18;81:14;82:3,13,20;84:4, 14;86:1;87:9,14;89:21; 90:19;91:8;92:22;93:16,24, 25;94:5,10,17;96:2,3;98:24; 99:2,14,20,22;101:6,9,15,17, 20,25;102:17,20;103:5,7,17; 105:8,20;106:11,22;107:3;

19:19;87:15;91:11;

108:18,21,24;109:1,4,5; 110:9;112:1;113:21;115:4;	sa
116:3;117:5,19;121:8,10,19,	sa
25;123:23,24;125:12;127:9,	
25;128:6,24;129:11;131:23, 24;132:15;133:6;135:3,18;	sa
136:7;137:9,10,13	
risk (23)	
19:20;20:22,24;21:5;29:6;	
37:12,21,24;44:13;45:15; 46:22,25;53:11;57:25;	sa
102:16,19,20;103:21;125:21,	
22;128:8;132:20;133:4	
risks (6) 45:12;49:15;96:18,19;	
133:9,10	sa
road (19)	
39:14,22;92:4,12,16;97:2; 99:10;100:4;101:25;126:7,	
18,22;127:1,9,16;128:5,11;	
132:10;136:14	
roads (2) 132:7,25	sa
robbed (1)	
107:18	
robber (7)	
21:4,7,8;33:9;38:6;46:20; 47:1	sc
robbery (1)	
81:22	sc
roll (1) 15:15	sc
room (6)	
4:5,14,17,19,21;42:20	sc
route (3) 8:2;64:13;66:10	
rule (1)	S
29:17	G
rules (1) 4:9	5
rumor (1)	sc
14:18	
run (5) 73:21;74:15,18;88:24;	S
114:2	5
running (25)	
42:25;47:2,6;73:5,16;86:9, 18;87:23;88:4;91:10;93:22;	
94:10,11,23;99:14;102:16;	
109:3;113:22;117:16,25;	
118:5,9;119:5;121:2,7 run-on (1)	
82:3	
runs (5)	S
11:2;82:25;93:16;94:1; 99:23	60
99.25 Ryan (1)	se
7:25	se
S	1
	se
safe (1)	

afely (1) 112:9 afer (1) 129:25 afety (19) 20:18;28:7,12;33:1;44:2; 53:14;67:17;69:23;79:15,24; 80:2:82:4:89:11:106:15: 107:10;131:6;132:23;136:1; 137:5 ame (18) 4:8;22:9;33:12;34:5; 37:11;46:10,13;54:1;62:6; 77:2,5,25;79:8,12;111:13; 115:2;116:6;125:7 aw (23) 13:24;39:1;64:8;65:10; 66:16,17;78:24,25;83:3; 98:16;105:6,16,17;106:6,7; 109:17;111:24;128:12,16; 130:25;131:3;132:5;137:11 aying (20) 13:24;21:23;34:2;41:24; 43:15;49:18;74:21;88:22,25; 89:6;113:11,17;120:12; 124:17;128:19;129:2,4; 130:11,18;135:11 cale (1) 104:1 cared (3) 29:12:42:20:87:16 cenario (1) 30:13 cene (7) 16:15;23:12;24:11,14; 36:6;92:3,11 cope(2)53:9;64:20 cratch (1) 87:6 creen (7) 5:15,16;25:2;28:1;54:23; 108:20;115:12 eattle (43) 6:22;9:16,20;10:1,19;12:3; 13:10,15,20;14:7;20:5; 21:11;24:5,21,24;25:14; 26:11,16;28:18,23;30:23; 31:3,7,16;32:2;35:18;36:24; 39:16,18;41:20,21;42:13; 43:9;44:11,22;45:19;46:12; 53:2;62:1;71:13;96:4;99:23; 106:1 eattle's (2) 14:11;19:14 econd (4) 66:20;75:15;79:11;99:2 econds (6) 92:16;99:10;111:6;114:6; 126:22;127:7 ection (8) 29:4;53:25;54:1;57:14,20; 59:14;84:22;95:7

sections (4) 60:6,9,11;121:19 security (1) 9:25 seeing (6) 13:14;57:18;73:16;83:20; 99:9:123:9 seem (7)15:4;53:18;78:2;80:6; 98:9;105:11;131:1 Seemed (11) 32:12;60:24;72:22;73:2, 17;83:14;85:11;106:13; 129:24;131:3;135:23 Seems (20) 20:2;32:25;55:8,11;56:25; 58:15;67:2;77:10;103:8,15, 25;107:8;110:25;115:1; 124:25;129:21,22;131:8; 134:3;135:1 Sena (41) 7:17;26:17;72:9,11,22,23, 23,24;73:1,2,17;74:1;75:8; 77:8;78:24;82:7,11;83:10; 84:6;85:19;86:25;87:11; 90:3;95:14,22;96:20;100:10; 103:9,20,21;106:20;108:11; 109:2,17;111:4;120:18; 124:22;130:16;134:9;136:2; 137:1 S-e-n-a (1) 73:1 Sena's (3) 89:9;107:1;124:25 send (3) 16:19,21,23 sense (4) 80:21;81:25;98:6;101:18 senses (1) 40:14 sent (3) 25:7:60:23:66:25 sentence (11) 56:3;72:4;79:9,12;82:3; 89:24;99:3;103:2;106:17; 115:12;131:10 separate (1) 12:3 Sergeant (15) 10:17;14:24;15:5,14,15, 22;16:15;17:6,21,25;18:18, 18,21;23:14;47:21 sergeants (6) 16:9;18:23;19:23;23:6; 24:17;32:9 series (2) 55:14;56:2 serious (3) 53:12;57:25;133:6 serve (1) 33:2 set (1) 15:8

several (8) 11:15;17:18;29:16;45:24; 83:14;87:15;118:5;132:5 severe (1) 14:11 severely (1) 19:22 Shall (6) 7:15;28:6;56:2,10;79:22, 25 sharing (2) 25:1;50:14 Sheet (1) 138:11 shift (1) 127:5 shoot (3) 24:7;33:10;47:1 shooting (1) 70:13 shootings (1) 38:4 short (2) 39:1;119:12 shortage (1) 14:11 shorten (1) 52:13 shortly (1) 126:13 short-sighted (2) 55:11:131:5 shot (3)46:12.21:62:1 shoulder (1) 62:2 show (6) 11:11;15:7;76:20;97:11; 119:22.22 shown (1) 122:25 shut (6) 29:8;43:6;44:1;114:16,19, 21 side (1) 136:14 sidewalks (1) 39:14 sign (22) 23:20;73:20;74:18;75:1; 85:8,16:86:11,14,14,20,20; 88:24;91:10;93:17;94:1,11, 11;99:14;117:17,17,25; 137:17 signal (7) 25:17,19;94:25;102:1; 119:15;120:7;126:7 signaling (1) 126:14 signals (1) 101:4 signature (2) 64:1:137:24

132:25

signed (1) 78:8 significant (3) 32:13;65:14;131:12 significantly (1) 53:1 signs (29) 18:21;29:13;36:7;42:25; 43:12;47:3,7;48:21;73:5,16; 74:14:78:25:85:7:86:7.9.18; 87:24;88:4,7;93:10;94:24; 97:16;118:5,9;119:6;120:7; 121:3.7.20 similar (5) 50:13,17;51:2;59:4;71:5 simply (6) 31:11;32:24;34:18; 118:16;130:22;132:3 Simpson (1) 71:3 single (2) 70:24:103:22 siren (14) 25:16;27:9,14,21;28:8; 35:5;36:2,4;42:16,21;67:12; 99:17;110:5;113:18 sirens (6) 43:7;72:8;110:21,24; 111:12;124:14 sit (8) 74:17;77:23;78:10;89:12; 123:23:125:3.5:127:8 sitting (2) 76:16:126:22 situation (3) 38:7;108:4;114:8 situations (1) 129:8 slightest (1) 48:24 slightly (1) 84:5 slow (9) 46:3;54:23;84:8,16,16; 110:14;111:4;112:7,16 slowed (2) 112:8;114:23 slowly (2) 29:11,22 slow-moving (1) 30:12 small (4) 27:24;31:16,23;57:20 snippet (1) 39:1 sobriety (2) 12:15;90:24 societal (2) 21:8,9 society (7) 21:4;46:25;81:18,19; 107:23:133:6.7 solely (1)

28:19 solve (1) 33:4 somebody (3) 22:22;91:11;113:9 somebody's (1) 81:17 somehow (1) 52:14 someone (23) 13:23;20:22;29:10;36:1; 42:16:43:20:46:21,23:55:22; 63:25;81:19;97:3;98:4,5,13; 99:23;115:8;120:24,24; 121:16,16;126:14;134:7 someone's (7) 55:10,17;59:17;81:12; 88:11;112:1,2 sometime (2) 6:25;85:25 sometimes (11) 16:18;19:2;22:17;48:6; 50:17,23;54:8;58:2;61:23; 87:13:129:10 somewhat (2) 38:12;58:12 soon (3) 7:3;22:13;74:25 sorry (14) 8:11;22:12;26:1;34:19; 41:2;44:15;56:6;62:12; 66:18:87:6:98:22:108:16: 112:17;126:9 sort (1) 31:24 Sound (3) 50:16;51:1;61:1 sounds (5) 35:19;48:5;49:9;53:17; 83:6 South (2) 122:15,18 space (1) 22:22 speak (6) 8:24;31:25;60:20;61:9; 108:8;124:10 speaking (3) 39:6;125:16;128:23 special (5) 11:6;12:11;13:9,11,21 specific (2) 31:19:53:8 specifically (6) 50:20;55:21;60:6;68:10; 77:15:107:7 speculation (2) 133:18;136:5 sped (1) 30:14 speed (43) 25:22;26:5,19;29:13;30:2, 23;33:13;41:1,9;42:7,11,15,

25;43:3,14;44:5;45:16,21; 46:3:73:15:82:14:83:12.14: 84:2,7,11,15,16;94:23;95:9; 97:16:99:16:108:1.11:109:2. 18,25;110:5;111:8;116:20; 117:8;119:20;121:23 speeding (11) 31:11:73:5:79:1:82:11.22; 83:20;85:7;86:7,8;120:8; 121:8 speeds (18) 18:12;43:12;56:19;58:24; 70:20;82:8,15;83:2,23; 84:21,23;87:23;104:12; 105:23;113:25;122:15,24; 126:19 spell (1) 6:1 spelled (1) 6:3 spend (1) 64:24 spent (2) 34:21;53:20 split-second (1) 129:9 spoke (1) 42:6 spoken (2) 84:1:87:4 sporting (1) 11:2 squad (9) 10:16;11:8,17;12:2,7; 13:25;14:3;15:17;16:21 Stacy (1) 61:5 staff (3) 7:3;9:13;32:10 staffing (1) 11:2 stages (1) 71:19 stand (3) 47:18;126:5;128:10 standard (8) 9:8;38:24;54:9;77:14; 80:11;88:2;124:20;130:21 standards (4) 38:12;47:24;50:17;51:2 standing (1) 56:3 standpoint (9) 16:12;32:22;45:11;58:5; 59:10;79:7;98:25;115:5; 134:19 stands (1) 40:23 start (8) 20:6:21:14:55:19:72:3; 73:16:88:14:126:9.9 started (5) 14:3;67:3;86:17;101:6;

135:9

starting (4) 6:14,18;9:22;53:17 starts (2) 91:8:120:17 **State (23)** 6:7,9,16,19,24;7:11,17; 9:23:26:9.11.11.13:43:10: 50:19,20;52:8;61:22,23; 62:3;79:19;115:18,21; 116:24 stated (2) 28:22;63:24 statement (5) 5:2;38:25;124:7;126:5; 128:10 statements (1) 133:20 states (1) 32:23 stating (1) 4:12 statistics (3) 69:22,23;70:17 statute (7) 27:18;107:21;116:5,25; 118:3;122:2,4 statutes (3) 8:8,18;79:21 stav (1) 44:16 Steering (1) 50:5 step (1) 18:22 stepping (2) 16:25;127:4 steps (2) 94:7.8 sticking (2) 93:24;122:17 still (44) 29:17;33:11;35:12;37:18; 38:14,14,15,16;43:4;44:18; 47:19;48:3;49:4,22;50:1,20; 54:1,7,16;58:8;60:4;62:22; 71:2,22;93:21;94:2;97:17; 98:3;107:13;110:6;111:1,3, 6,12,23,24;112:3,4,14; 114:20,24;122:3;136:16,23 stipulate (1) 5:9 stipulated (1) 5:11 stipulations (1) 5:2 stole (1) 46:24 stood (1) 57:19 stop (127) 9:9;21:7;22:17;23:20; 25:18,22;26:5,20;33:5,8;

36:7;42:17,20,25;43:12,18, 22.23:46:3:47:2.6:48:13: 64:5;70:21;71:2;72:5,13,20; 73:3,5,16,18,20;74:14,18; 75:1,20,24;77:4,9,11;78:12, 25;79:2;85:7,8,16;86:7,9,11, 14,14,18,20,20;87:14,23; 88:3,4,7,10,18,19,24;89:9; 90:17,19;91:4,8,10,12,17; 92:14,15;93:8,13,17;94:1,11, 11,24,24;96:6,11;97:2,16; 99:9,14,16:100:21,23:101:1, 22;102:2,3,16;103:8,12; 104:3;107:13,23;110:12; 111:2,11,17;114:10;116:12; 117:16,17,25;118:5,9;119:6, 16;120:6;121:2,7,20;122:6; 124:21,22,23;126:10,12,13, 17;127:25 stopped (26) 11:17;13:17;74:19;77:7, 19;92:4,11,16;100:4,15; 101:24,24;102:8;108:13,24; 109:13;110:1,9;113:18; 126:22;127:1,16;136:2,12, 13,23 stopping (14) 21:8,9;44:4;71:12;73:19; 88:20;100:1,5;110:15;114:2, 15:125:9:126:18:127:11 stops (4) 30:6;113:8;126:6;128:11 storage (1) 46:23 stories (1) 13:22 straight (1) 48:24 straightaway (1) 84:25 straight-shot (1) 48:18 strange (1) 113:12 street (14) 11:23;29:13;30:22;48:21; 73:6;80:17;82:15;84:18,24; 109:25;115:25;116:2;121:9; 129:15 streets (4) 39:14,19;65:4;66:1 strictly (1) 59:10 strip (1) 48:19 struck (2) 22:20;120:16 studied (2) 52:3,6 study (1) 120:11 stuff (4)

130:6 stupid (1) 22:13 subject (2) 97:20;129:10 subjective (4) 38:12;77:17,22;93:2 SUBSCRIBED (1) 138:16 subsection (3) 58:22;117:6;119:17 suggesting (1) 38:13 summary (5) 75:18;78:9;119:12;134:5; 135:15 Sunday (1) 75:17 supervise (2) 15:20;63:2 supervising (1) 16:16 supervision (1) 49:25 supervisor (18) 16:14;21:17;45:8;47:20, 24;49:8,10,18;63:1;77:18, 20;82:6;89:19;113:7;124:10, 19;127:4;132:4 supervisor's (1) 49:23 supervisory (2) 47:25:115:8 supplements (1) 8:4 suppose (2) 16:6:126:25 supposed (3) 62:14;88:12;101:25 supposedly (1) 49:24 Sure (31) 5:11;9:1;10:8;12:24;14:6; 37:6;39:18;42:5;47:6;50:24; 53:17;60:17;66:10;70:21; 75:16;76:5;84:25;92:9,9,21; 101:13;102:9;107:18,19; 108:17;113:13,16;116:6; 118:2;121:7;127:18 surely (1) 99:8 surface (1) 37:1 surroundings (1) 87:19 suspect (21) 22:18;24:5;37:14;46:11, 23;55:6;57:4;62:20;81:22, 22,23;107:19;116:15,19; 118:22;125:23;126:3; 127:13;128:2,7;129:2 suspected (5)

suspect's (1) 56:23 suspicion (17) 91:1,5;92:1,5,6,9,10,13,23; 93:1,4,7,8,11,15,18;101:14 SWAT (3) 22:16,21;38:5 swear (1) 105:16 swearing (1) 47:18 **SWEENEY (8)** 4:1,18,23;5:15,17;6:3; 138:3,15 S-w-e-e-n-e-y (1) 6:4 sworn (8) 4:7,24;5:25;33:2;104:8; 136:1;138:3,16 Т tactical (1) 46:9 tactics (2) 22:23;40:18 talk (18) 10:6;18:3;38:3,4,4,5;39:6; 45:21;46:5;56:22;60:9,25; 67:14:80:16:83:17:119:13: 121:18:131:3 talked (30) 11:5;12:17;14:9,20;17:24; 32:8;36:3;42:24;43:2;46:10; 55:16;56:13;58:20;59:4,14, 16;60:5;68:4;71:18;75:6; 81:20;92:3;99:7;105:22; 107:6;115:2;118:24;126:1; 129:20:132:19 talking (31) 8:13,15,20;19:3;23:7; 30:13;31:15,24;39:25;44:1, 10,16;53:20;54:12;55:21; 61:9;64:7;67:3,6,6;70:4; 75:5;81:21;83:23;90:25; 98:22;100:9;106:1,2;109:9; 127:4 talks (2) 28:4;69:18 tape (1) 77:23 task (1) 37:25 technically (1) 21:14 telling (6) 14:18;31:20;110:18,19; 129:16;136:22 telltale (1) 93:9 temporarily (1) 114:23 term (11)

20:10;22:19;33:20;35:6; 42:10;52:12;53:3,21;80:3; 91:21:93:7 termed (2) 14:17;22:18 Terminate (3) 57:20;88:13;134:1 terminated (14) 82:7;85:10,17;86:12,19, 21;89:22;110:1,18,20; 111:18;113:20,20,21 test (2) 15:24:90:24 testified (2) 4:25:136:25 testify (1) 101:23 testimonies (1) 135:19 testimony (7) 4:8;33:24;75:3;98:11; 109:21;123:15;135:15 tests (1) 12:15 theoretically (1) 81:17 therefore (2) 105:24;106:14 therein (2) 138:8,9 thereof (1) 138:7 Thinking (10) 13:4;36:9,10;46:10;97:11; 98:23;102:7;107:5;114:1; 115:4 though (9) 22:20;51:20;71:22;80:15; 122:2;133:8;135:22;136:9, 22 thought (11) 8:12;31:14;32:5;41:13; 57:11;77:12;85:15;103:23; 105:9;112:18;130:3 thousands (1) 13:18 threat (1) 39:22 threatening (2) 24:6,6 three (3) 18:17;71:19;122:5 throw (1) 74:8 thus (1) 58:25 ticket (2) 15:24;98:13 times (10) 28:11:31:4,9:38:6:39:19; 42:19;63:24;83:11,19;122:5 tipping (2) 40:1.21

Min-U-Script®

67:14;120:13;121:13;

56:14;59:12;99:4,6,11

22;19:20;22:14;24:8;25:12;

Title (3) 8:15:69:13:79:21 today (4) 76:17;81:21;136:3,25 together (4) 68:6;73:25;74:9;125:8 told (8) 55:22;61:13;74:25;76:25; 95:5,12,24;107:17 took (7) 25:9;26:19;53:19;54:21; 55:19;73:4;84:18 top (3) 25:12;27:22;122:2 tort (1) 60:21 total (1) 93:13 totality (2) 13:5;88:15 totally (1) 17:5 touched (2) 32:7;38:24 town (1) 64:20 traffic (94) 8:1,14;10:16,25;11:1,3,3; 12:2;13:25;16:21;18:4; 21:10,15:31:6:33:12:39:7, 11;40:2;41:8;42:6;44:24; 45:15:67:17:69:23:70:21.25: 71:1;72:5;80:15;85:3;86:6, 25;87:14;88:10;90:3,5,6; 91:21,24;92:6,13,24;93:8,13, 25;94:2;96:3,12,21;97:7,13, 18;98:5,13;100:21;101:1,3,9, 19;103:3,9,20;104:2;105:2,3, 7,18,21;107:16,19,23,24; 113:2,3;115:14;116:12; 122:7;124:13,15,18,22,23; 125:11:126:10,17:128:13, 16;130:2,10;133:5,7;135:4,6, 23 tragedy (1) 135:2 tragic (1) 107:11 train (5) 15:11,16,18;16:20;115:8 trained (1) 12:21 training (13) 12:12,14;16:1,11,17,23; 19:22;20:15;36:1,8,12;37:3; 49:25 training-intensive (1) 16:5 transcript (4) 7:16,25,25;137:19 traveling (1) 119:19 travels (1)

117:7 Travis (1) 8:1 treated (1) 61:10 tried (4) 49:17;83:18;89:16;115:5 tries (2) 93:17;119:12 troubling (1) 55:25 truck (2) 83:20:108:6 true (5) 45:10;98:17;104:13,19; 138:9 truth (2) 4:24;47:19 try (21) 24:20;30:9;40:19;47:9; 49:1;60:10;61:18;73:4;75:9; 83:13,15;87:13;89:9;94:21; 112:19;113:24;114:13; 124:21;125:7;128:24;129:21 trying (53) 20:1;22:24;30:4,6;33:4,5; 35:17;36:6,13,15;40:15; 42:12;43:21;44:6;49:22; 50:8;54:20;55:10;56:23; 59:15,17;60:7,14,14;68:20; 74:23:75:8:76:15:77:6: 78:19:85:11.19:87:11.22: 88:1.8.10.11.17:93:20:96:8: 101:11,22;102:3,7;103:11; 112:2,3;113:23;114:3; 120:22;126:20;131:25 turn (11) 46:4;48:3,24;83:15;84:7, 10.11:101:4:102:1:110:20: 126:7 turned (1) 113:18 turning (1) 84:22 turns (2) 42:15;79:1 twice (2) 59:6,6 twisting (1) 84:21 two (17) 8:23;18:16;20:25;22:20; 23:18:31:18:68:6:71:19: 75:4;86:19;89:22;97:2; 101:8;121:18;122:5;125:8; 136:21 two-officer (1) 68:8 two-week (1) 6:25 type (4) 38:2;54:11;66:1;68:9 types (2)

29:10:130:7 Typically (1) 5:3 U uh-oh(2)18:21;40:17 ultimately (1) 52:8 Um-hum (1) 123:5 unaware (4) 84:20;87:19,25;137:2 unawareness (1) 98:8 under (6) 4:9;26:16;30:13;37:19; 54:3;71:10 underline (1) 69:1 Understood (2) 34:10;75:6 undertake (1) 133:9 unequal (1) 97:21 unfair (2) 101:17;123:25 unfortunate (2) 81:11:106:10 unfortunately (4) 106:7;123:6;130:7;131:5 uninvolved (2) 131:13,15 unit (2)11:7;14:5 units (1) 14:13 University (7) 6:8,9,19:9:7,23:43:10:52:8 unless (4) 29:15;47:11;49:14,19 unmute (1) 5:7 unnecessarily (1) 137:4 unpredictable (1) 54:3 unreasonable (10) 48:12:49:10:75:12:78:3: 80:11;96:10;115:7,10,15; 130:4 unsafe (2) 59:1;137:10 unsafely (1) 88:8 unusual (3) 13:1;28:14;35:20 unwise (1) 34:24 up (51) 5:5;7:3;8:18;18:18,19,19,

27:23:30:14:31:11:33:10: 46:21:47:1,12:49:14,19: 54:23;55:23;59:6,9;60:11; 63:19;67:13,21;68:13;69:7, 9,25;74:8;83:14,22,25;84:11, 15,16;90:22;93:9;94:8; 100:23;102:14;103:23; 112:4;117:4;118:16;119:10; 128:6;136:14 upgraded (2) 116:19;119:1 upon (5) 32:5;90:24;101:1;123:9,19 upped (1) 94:6 use (21) 15:15;20:10;22:16,23,25; 28:8;33:20;34:15,22,24; 35:5,6;36:2,3;49:1;65:6; 83:12;101:4;125:13;126:7; 135:17 used (5) 6:15;22:12;36:1;41:11; 56:18 useful (1) 66:9 using (7) 22:21;37:25;49:5;52:7; 55:17;102:1;120:7 usual (2) 9:8:13:13 utilize (2) 52:9:54:7 V

V18002134 (1) 8:4 V6 (1) 83:6 V8 (1) 83:6 Vague (1) 104:14 valid (2) 123:16;124:22 Valley (1) 80:2 value (1) 106:24 valve (1) 31:25 various (2) 74:14;119:6 vehicle (47) 7:22;8:3;12:22,23,25; 17:16;18:11,13;22:21;25:16, 18;27:8;30:2;46:2,7;53:10; 54:2;55:7;56:22,23;57:1,4,7, 9;58:25;66:17,17,21;68:16; 70:9;72:13,20;73:15,19; 76:18;78:25;79:23;83:9,15;

M & M Court Reporting Service (208)345-9611(ph) (800)234-9611 (208)-345-8800(fax)

91:12;108:14,16;116:22; 117:12:119:16:120:1:127:11 Vehicles (11) 8:16;9:9;22:17,20,25; 39:13,22,22;56:18;120:16; 121:21 vehicular (2) 105:6,18 verifies (1) 137:13 versus (10) 20:23;36:9;37:7;44:4; 61:3,22,24;102:20;115:7; 131:25 video (34) 4:15;5:3;7:18,19,20;66:15, 21;73:24;74:5,8,22;75:7; 76:16,18;77:16,25;78:18,18, 23;82:11,17,18;83:3;86:13; 89:3,3,17;106:7;108:9,19,19; 109:11:110:13:125:7 videos (2) 105:1;132:14 view (8) 17:1;52:14;77:13;82:17; 98:25;115:5;130:4;131:6 viewpoint (1) 83:7 violate (3) 21:7:62:8:119:17 violated (1) 61:15 violates (1) 117:6 violating (1) 61:19 violation (21) 21:15;61:13;70:25;71:2; 88:17;90:6;92:6,24;97:13, 18:98:6:99:19:101:9:104:2: 107:16;116:13;122:7; 128:13,16:130:2,10 violations (12) 20:21;82:9;85:4;86:6; 101:3,19;103:3,9,10,20; 107:24;124:24 violator (32) 21:10;33:5,18;43:22;46:5; 60:10;80:15;81:3,13;86:25; 90:3,5;91:17,21,25;93:25; 94:2:96:3,13,21:97:8:102:3, 7;107:19;113:2,3;125:11; 130:24;133:5;135:4,7,24 violators (4) 53:11,15;57:24;133:8 violence (2) 57:25;81:22 vision (1) 45:25 visit (1) 123:2 visual (2)

visual/audible (1) 119:15 vocalizations (1) 124:16 voice (2) 25:16;80:6 voluntarily (5) 72:13,20;75:20,24;78:12 vs (1) 7:17 W Wait (2) 23:19;124:2 waiting (1) 34:3 waive (1) 4:11 walk (2) 17:19:18:6 wall (1) 22:23 Washington (8) 26:9,21;27:4,13;50:12,19; 51:3.6 watch (8) 15:12;16:4;17:7,22,25; 24:12;110:12;125:7 watched (3) 78:23;89:17;109:25 way (30) 13:4;15:25;16:16;17:4; 20:25;22:25;25:10;35:12; 51:19;55:13;59:5;60:16; 73:7;74:10;75:5;80:9; 100:24;107:8,11;111:16; 113:12;114:2;119:10;120:6, 18;121:12;122:22;124:16; 125:16:130:5 ways (1) 112:2 weapon (1) 62:19 weather (2) 65:16;66:1 weaving (2) 91:10;92:12 weeds (1) 72:1 weigh (6) 42:4;45:12;47:13;49:15; 104:5;131:24 weighed (3) 52:10;131:21,22 weighing (9) 37:20;40:13;53:22;60:9; 87:5;93:3;132:4,17;134:17 welfare (2) 79:15:82:5 well-known (3) 67:16:92:17,20

39:5 weren't (3) 10:11;22:18,19 West (2) 14:24:15:2 wet (3) 65:25,25;66:1 whack (1) 20:25 what's (31) 18:9,12;20:22;31:20; 38:10,20;40:1;41:23;45:25; 48:4;55:18;88:15,16;98:2, 11,13;102:19;106:24;107:7, 23;115:6,7,9,10;124:20; 125:10;126:8,11,14;131:25; 133:3 wheel (4) 47:17;48:24;50:5;126:24 whole (6) 78:18;79:10;89:3;112:11; 116:25;127:6 who's (2) 124:16.17 wife's (1) 134:16 willing (3) 37:2;47:1;122:3 window (5) 46:12:70:13:90:22:93:9: 102:14 wish (2)108:6:131:9 wishes (1) 6:19 within (7) 6:25;11:24;31:16;35:16; 86:19;89:22;101:8 without (6) 28:17;31:12;50:24;71:1; 77:16:103:22 witness (25) 4:7,18;34:6,12;62:12,18; 63:1,4,8;75:4;76:3,14;91:14, 16;104:16;110:4;111:23; 118:12;130:15;133:19; 134:15;136:8,12;138:1,5 woman (1) 91:9 woo-hoo (1) 45:8 word (9) 20:6;34:15,16;66:2;83:12; 87:4;107:22;122:10;135:17 words (12) 16:4;18:9;34:25;47:9; 97:7,9,10;109:12;113:25; 126:3;128:7;129:19 work (14) 4:22;10:19,20;12:2;15:14; 18:7:24:22:33:2:34:22:35:9: 69:5;83:20;116:11;134:16

11:14:12:4 working (3) 11:1:20:1:78:17 worst (2) 98:12,13 wow (1) 88:6 write (2) 59:6;120:12 written (2) 122:21,23 wrong (10) 12:12;32:24;33:22;34:18; 35:11;44:8;47:17;53:3; 118:18,19 wrote (4) 87:8,10;118:20,22

Y

year (4) 25:6;33:17;64:5;67:3 years (12) 10:3,10;11:15;12:5;14:4; 19:10,14;23:19;61:25;71:16; 129:22,23 yep (1) 55:9 yield (2) 25:18;42:17

Ζ

Zamudio (2) 82:5;131:11 zone (1) 84:6

1

1(7) 25:13:26:1,2:105:10; 117:6;119:17;138:6 10 (3) 114:6,6;127:7 11 (2) 105:9,13 13.031-POL (1) 25:13 137 (1) 138:6 14 (2) 65:17;72:12 140 (4) 48:9,17,19;49:6 14th (1) 66:3 15th (1) 9:21 16th (12) 73:6;82:15;84:24;105:7, 18;109:24;115:25;116:2; 121:23;122:15,18;136:2

25:17;94:25

worked (2)

well-taken (1)

18 (2)	30-mile-an-hour (1)	82:23;97:16;111:17;
7:1;115:11	84:6	119:22
19 (2)	313 (2)	2
116:10;122:2	7:21;51:17	8
1988 (1)	313.1 (1)	
23:20	53:9	8 (1)
1996 (1)	313.1.2 (1)	99:2
67:21	55:1	87 (1)
	313.2 (1)	10:2
2	95:11	10.2
	313.2.1 (2)	9
2 (5)	54:22;55:2	,
		00 (1)
46:2;51:14,18;71:15;	313.2.3 (1)	90 (1)
105:10	58:21	66:4
2/3 (1)	314 (1)	90s (1)
70:8	7:22	13:10
2:15 (1)	34 (2)	96 (1)
63:11	10:3;23:19	69:10
20 (4)	35 (5)	98 (1)
10:10;92:16;99:10;126:22	30:21,23,24,25;85:9	10:10
2000s (1)		99 (3)
14:24	4	10:10;13:15;30:24
2001 (2)	•	10.10,13.13,30.21
15:6;19:11	4 (4)	
2012 (3)	11:25;37:12;42:3;79:22	
68:17;69:9,12	4/10 (1)	
2013 (3)	136:21	
68:17;69:10,12	4:00 (1)	
2015 (3)	10:20	
16:8;67:21;69:11	4:59 (1)	
2017 (5)	137:23	
25:5;26:16;37:16;52:21;	40 (3)	
65:17	19:11;22:1;77:1	
2018 (2)	49-1404 (1)	
7:16;72:12	95:17	
2019 (1)	49-14042 (1)	
16:4	116:18	
2021 (2)	49-623 (2)	
9:21;10:2	8:15;79:21	
212 (1)	0.13,79.21	
18:20	5	
23 (1)		
123:4	5 (1)	
	67:15	
25 (5)		
31:22;41:11,17;42:9;84:6	50 (5)	
29 (1)	30:20;84:18,21,23;85:1	
131:10	500 (1)	
2-minute (1)	13:18	
41:2		
•	6	
3		
	6 (3)	
3 (4)	10:16;11:25;71:25	
25:21;46:5;67:25;71:16	6,000 (2)	
3:15 (1)	67:22;70:3	
63:7		
3:30 (1)	7	
63:7		
30 (15)	7 (1)	
19:11;21:25;31:22;41:11,	7:16	
17;42:9;77:1;92:16;99:10;	7:00 (1)	
115:22;116:19;117:8;	10:19	
118:18;119:19;126:22	70 (4)	
	/ · · (+ /	