1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	000
4	ESTATE OF WILLIAM HENNEFER,
5	JAH, JUH, WH, NH AND BIANCA HENNEFER,
6	Plaintiff, No. 22-cv-00389-TLN-CSK
7	vs.
8	YUBA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA OPERATOR OF THE YUBA COUNTY
9	SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF WENDEL ANDERSON, UNDERSHERIFF
10	NICHOLAS MORAWCZNSKI, CAPTAIN JOSEPH MILLION, LIEUTENANT
11	BRANDON SPEAR, DEPUTY TENG SAECHAO, DETECTIVE ROGER
12	TARWATER, DETECTIVE NATALIE MULLINS, DEPUTY RAYMON ELLIS,
13	DEPUTY TYLER ECK, DEPUTY
14	VALENTINO AGUIRRE, DEPUTY DALLAS THORPE, DEPUTY BRADON MALLORY AND DOES 1 -15,
15	Defendants. /
16	Detendants. /
17	REMOTE DEPOSITION OF EXPERT WITNESS:
18	DAVID SWEENEY
19	Wednesday, November 6, 2024
20	
21	FOCUS LITIGATION SOLUTIONS
22	400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450 Sacramento, CA 95814
23	916.228.4593 Focuslitigationsolutions.com
24	
25	STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY: CHRISTINE BEDARD, CSR #10709

1	BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice and
2	on Wednesday, November 6, 2024 at the hour of 8:57 AM
3	thereof, remotely before me CHRISTINE BEDARD, a Certified
4	Shorthand Reporter in and for the County of Nevada, State
5	of California, reporting remotely from Auburn, California
6	there appeared by Zoom videoconference:
7	DAVID SWEENEY
8	called as a witness by the Defendants; who, being by me
9	first remotely sworn, was examined and testified as is
10	hereinafter set forth.
11	000
12	REMOTE APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
14	LAW OFFICES OF PATRICK H. DWYER BY: PATRICK H. DWYER
15	P.O. Box 1705 Penn Valley, CA 95946
16	T: (530) 432.5407 Email: pdwyer@pdwyerlaw.com
17	Email. puwyel@puwyeliaw.com
18	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
19	PORTER SCOTT BY: MATTHEW GROSS
20	2180 Harvard Street, Suite 500 Sacramento, CA 9815
T: (916) 929.1481	
22	Email: mgross@porterscott.com
23	000
24	
25	

David Sweeney

1	INDEX	
2		Page
3	EXAMINATION BY MR. GROSS	4
4	EXAMINATION BY MR. DWYER	177
5	000	
6		
7	EXHIBIT INDEX	
8	Exhibit No. Description	Page identified
9	A Expert Report of David T. Sweeney dated August 30, 2024	98
10	B Rebuttal Report	98
11	C Policy 428	98
12	D Policy 404	98
13		
14	000	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
25		

1	DAVID SWEENEY,
2	having been first remotely sworn by the court
3	reporter, was examined and testified as follows:
4	
5	EXAMINATION BY MR. GROSS
6	MR. GROSS: Q. Good morning. Do you prefer
7	David? Mr. Sweeney?
8	A. David is fine.
9	Q. David.
10	A. Is Matt good for you?
11	Q. Yes. Yes, it is.
12	A. First names are good.
13	Q. So my name is Matt Gross. I am representing the
14	County of Yuba, the sheriff's department and the
15	individually named deputies in this civil lawsuit. And
16	we are here for your virtual deposition. You've been
17	retained as a police practices expert by Mr. Dwyer.
18	A. That is correct.
19	Q. Before we begin, you've had your deposition taken
20	before; correct?
21	A. Yes, I have.
22	Q. And are you generally aware of the admonitions
23	that attorneys go through before a deposition?
24	A. Yes. Don't speak too fast; give a little pause
25	before answering; physical gestures are not recognized by

- 1 the court reporter. Things like that.
- 2 O. Perfect. Perfect. I won't go through those.
- Need a break, let me know, and we can take one. I think
- 4 | we'll -- we're going to be here for a little bit. This
- 5 | won't be a short deposition. I have a few questions to
- 6 go through.
- 7 So let's just move -- move right into it. To
- 8 prepare for today's deposition, did you speak with anyone
- 9 other than Mr. Dwyer?
- 10 A. I did not.
- 11 Q. And beyond the documents referenced in your expert
- report, were there any other documents that you relied
- upon to prepare for this deposition?
- 14 A. No. I can't think of any.
- 15 Q. And we'll do this now. I want to introduce a copy
- of Exhibit A. I can screenshare it. I have a paper copy
- in front of me. But it's a document labeled, "Expert
- Report of David T. Sweeney, dated August 30th, 2024." Do
- 19 you have a copy of that report in front of you?
- 20 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And can you just tell me what that document is.
- 22 A. Yes. I was tasked by Mr. Dwyer to review a case,
- a police-practices case, in Yuba County. And he provided
- me with a number of evidentiary items, which I watched,
- 25 read, listened to.

And based on those evidentiary items, I then prepared a report detailing my opinions about the performance of the Yuba County Sheriff's Office. And that report that you're holding appears to be -- at least based on the first page, and I'm assuming the other pages were similar -- that would be my report and my opinions of what I discovered in reading the reports and reading the statements and reading the depositions.

All those evidentiary items that I reviewed, I detail at the front of the report just so we know what I was looking at in order to form these opinions. And then I gave my background and history as to why I should be viewed as an expert in these areas.

And then the rest of the report, there's some factual rehashing of the incident, followed by opinions that I made about what went right and went wrong during this incident.

- Q. And were there any documents that you asked for in preparation of your expert report that you were not provided?
- A. I don't believe so. There was one question we had on the drone video, and there might have been two copies of it. My copy did not have a time and date stamp in the corner. And, apparently, there is a video with the time and date stamp. That's the only thing I can think that I

- David Sweeney 1 was not provided. 2 And do you have any understanding as to why you 3 weren't provided that copy? 4 Α. No. 5 All right. And, approximately, how many hours did 6 it take you to prepare your report? 7 It seems like somewhere in the range of 25 to 30 8 I could look it up specifically if you wish, but I think that's a good estimation. 9 10 And that's -- that's fine. I don't need an exact 11 amount of time. You mentioned part of your report has 12 information regarding your CV, your background, who you 13 are as -- as a person. And I want to spend some time 14 talking about that. 15 How much time have you spent as a 16 police officer before you retired? 17
 - Almost 35 years. Α.
 - And how much time did you spend as a field patrol officer before you were promoted to a sergeant?
 - I was an officer from 1987 until 2001 when I was Α. promoted to sergeant.
 - My math tells me 14, maybe 15 years? 0.
- 23 Α. 14 years.

19

2.0

21

22

24 At -- during this deposition, I may use the phrase 25 "the incident," and I just want you and I to have an

- understanding that when I say "the incident," I'm referencing the allegations in the complaint regarding a January 25th, 2021, incident between Mr. William Hennefer and the Yuba County Sheriff's Department. Do you understand?
- A. Yes, I do.

- Q. At the time of the incident, do you know what the population of Yuba County was?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. And do you know who the day shift -- or can you tell me what the day shift patrol staffing was for Yuba County on the day of the incident?
- A. I could look it up. I was given that information I believe somewhere, but it might take me a few minutes to figure out where that was within the evidence.
- I do recall a document that explained how many people were on shift; how many people were assigned to the incident, but right off two top of my head, that was not one of the things -- I tried to spend a reasonable amount of time reviewing this case before I ended. That was one that I didn't pay close attention to.
- Q. Have you ever worked as a police officer or a supervisor in a rural area with a similar demographic as Yuba County?
 - A. No. The closest thing would be Corvallis, my last

1 year in policing. It was a rural area. But it was a 2 college campus, so I can't really compare the two. 3 Oregon State University is a rural college university. 4 They have horses, cows, lamas, pigs, things like that. 5 And then have a lot of property that extends beyond the individual campus there.

So I will say that those are familiar to me. They're similar, but, yet, most of my policing was done right there in the middle of campus, which is a campus environment. So I would say 95 percent of it was on campus and maybe 5 percent off campus. That would be the closest I would compare it to.

- Have you ever testified in a civil or criminal case in California?
- Α. I don't think so. Let me just look and review -quickly -- my report here. And I believe I detailed all the times that I testified at deposition. I've never been in a civil trial in California, I can tell you that right off the top of my head. And looking at my prior history of depositions, I do not see one in California.
- For your cases where you have been retained as an 0. expert, what percentage of those cases are civil cases?
 - 100 percent. Α.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And of those civil cases, what is the breakdown 0. where you've been retained by a plaintiff versus retained 1 by the defendant?

2.0

- A. It's going to be about, approximately, Matt, one-third defense cases and two-thirds plaintiff cases. I couldn't give you the exact percentage, but I think that's a pretty good estimation.
- Q. And it looks like in your report -- at least for the cases where you've been retained in the last four years -- those were all -- you were retained by the plaintiff?
- A. No. The depositions that I participated in were all plaintiff-involved depositions. Or in other words I was hired by Plaintiff's attorney to provide expert-witness testimony.

But as far as the cases that I was retained in the last four years, again, I think the approximate percentage would be one-third defense and two-thirds plaintiff.

- Q. All right. Can you tell me what the training term "learning domain" refers to in California?
- A. No, I can't do that. And I better not harbor a guess because I don't know for sure.
- Q. Do you know, approximately, how many learning domains there are for California POST academy -- for the California POST academy training manual?
 - A. I don't know.

1	Q. If you know, are there any rulings regarding law
2	enforcement practices in the Ninth Circuit or the
3	United States Supreme Court that mention the term "best
4	practices"?
5	A. I can't state for sure. I could harbor a guess,
6	but I I don't know for sure.
7	Q. And I I think you would agree that courts don't
8	refer to the phrase "best practice," but instead consider
9	the actions of law enforcement that are reasonable.
10	Would you agree with that statement?
11	A. That is a very common term when discussing the
12	Ninth Circuit, superior court. Yes, I would agree with
13	that.
14	Q. Would you also agree that a law enforcement
15	officer making an honest mistake does not constitute
16	negligence?
17	MR. DWYER: Objection. You're asking him to give
18	a legal conclusion or state a statement of law. He was
19	never retained for that. He's not an expert in law. So
20	you're asking him to give a legal opinion. So I object
21	on that basis.
22	If the witness feels competent to give a legal
23	opinion, go ahead. But he was not retained for that.
24	THE WITNESS: Yeah. That one really gave me

Can you ask the question one more time, Matt.

25

pause.

MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Would you agree that a law enforcement officer who makes an honest mistake during an incident, that does not constitute negligence?

MR. DWYER: Well, again, I would just restate my

MR. DWYER: Well, again, I would just restate my objection. You're asking him to give a legal opinion about your hypothetical, an honest mistake not constituting negligence. And he was not requested to prepare on that point; and so I don't see any basis for the question. Also, I don't see -- objection. I don't see any relevance to his report.

THE WITNESS: That's a difficult one, Matt. I -I don't really have a good answer for that. And, you
know, I would somewhat echo what Patrick said; that
establishing negligence has different connotations for
me, and I can't really hazard much of a guess there,
which, that's what it would be at that point. And I
better refrain from -- I generally refrain from guessing
in the middle of depositions.

MR. GROSS: Q. Can you explain to me what the term "codified law enforcement practices and standards of care" refers to?

- A. Generally that refers to a state establishing, through codified law, expectations of the police officers in their state.
 - Q. And what types of things would constitute a

1 codified law enforcement practice? Are you asking him to give examples? MR. DWYER: 3 MR. GROSS: Yes. 4 MR. DWYER: And is that with regards to a 5 particular state? Are you talking about California or some other state? 6 O. California. 7 MR. GROSS: 8 Α. As I read through some of the evidence in 9 preparation for today's deposition, I, once again, came 10 across the California POST manual on crisis intervention. 11 And at the beginning of that, it did talk about codified law enacted in -- I believe it was 2020 and 2021 12 13 regarding particular police activities that the 14 legislature wanted to be involved in. 15 In other words, they wanted to codify some of 16 the expectations they had for those police departments. 17 And so that -- that one certainly comes to 18 mind that police officers serve at the will of the 19 public, and they do that through a system of laws. 20 so, obviously, our legislators of different states, 21 including, of course, California and Washington, will 22 codify in the law some expectations of officers in 23 regards to pursuits; in regards to use of force; in 24 regards to deescalation techniques and things like that.

And that's what that manual kind of talked about at the

1	beginning there.
2	Q. Well, is is that California POST manual on
3	deescalation, is that a recommendation by POST such that
4	it be a codified law enforcement practice?
5	MR. DWYER: Counsel, I maybe I have an
6	objection. It lacks clarity. It's ambiguous. I don't
7	quite understand the question. Are you asking whether
8	the POST manual itself is a product of California
9	legislation or represents the legislation? I don't quite
10	understand the question.
11	MR. GROSS: Q. Whether the California POST manual
12	on deescalation is a codified law enforcement practice.
13	A. Just waiting to make sure if Patrick had any more
14	to say there.
15	MR. DWYER: Well, I'm not sure I fully understand
16	the question.
17	But, David, if you think you understand the
18	question, go ahead.
19	THE WITNESS: The way I understand your question,
20	Matt, is you're asking is the POST manual codified. In
21	other words, was it written by the state legislature in
22	order to govern and/or rule the actions of police
23	officers. I would say no.
24	I believe that the POST manual is created by the
25	California POST, which is known as the state police

1 training academy, responsible for dissemination of 2 information and training standards for police officers in 3 the state of California. 4 Can you tell me how many weeks the California POST Q. 5 accredited academy is? 6 Α. The --7 MR. DWYER: Go ahead. 8 THE WITNESS: Go ahead. 9 I didn't understand the question. MR. DWYER: 10 But, David, if you understood, go ahead and 11 answer. 12 THE WITNESS: From what I understand, it's around 13 nine months. 14 MR. GROSS: O. And can you tell me where officers 15 who graduate from the police academy go next for 16 training? 17 Α. The best information I have would be a guess. 18 I better not be quessing at that. I can tell you what 19 happens in Washington -- and I assume that California's 20 similar -- but I don't know for sure. So I don't know at 21 this point. 22 Do you know how long and how many phases the field 23 training program is in California? 24 Α. Again, I could relay Washington, but not 25 California.

1	Q.	Do you know which field training program
2		THE REPORTER: Counsel, "field training program"
3	what?	
4		MR. GROSS: Q. Model Yuba County uses.
5	Α.	I don't know.
6	Q.	Have you ever served as a field training officer?
7	Α.	Yes, I have.
8	Q.	For how long?
9	Α.	It seems like four, five years. I trained a
10	number	of student officers that came through the Seattle
11	Police	Academy.
12	Q.	Have you ever been a field training officer
13	superv	isor?
14	Α.	For a short period of time. I believe about
15	six mo	nths, yes.
16	Q.	What happened after the six months?
17	А.	I believe I transferred units, and you had to be a
18	patrol	supervisor within the precinct to fulfill that
19	role.	
20	Q.	And have you ever coordinated a field training
21	office	r program?
22	А.	No.
23	Q.	Your CV states that you taught "tactical
24	deescal	lation." What is that, and what is tactical about
25	i+2	

A. Tactical deescalation is the practice of inserting police officers into dynamic situations. The tactical part of them, of the training, specifies how the officers can safely accomplish their law enforcement objective. Combining that with the deescalation piece that says what options does the officer have in order to slow down the situation and still accomplish their law enforcement goal without the use of excessive or extraneous force.

So when you combine those two together, tactical deescalation is how do we get the job done and keep ourselves and our arrestees as safe as possible.

Using force as necessary, but trying to limit the situations that an officer might find themselves having to use force when possibly there were other options that they could have used prior to that scenario, which would have kept them out of a forced situation, but still allow them to make the arrest or take someone into custody for a mental health issue or whatever the case might be.

- Q. And just so I'm clear, when you're saying "force" in this situation, what do you mean by "force"?
- A. There's different levels of force that a police officer has that states allow officers to use force in certain situations. Quite often these force requirements are codified in the law. And if they're not codified in the law, they're spelled out in training and

in the different police manuals.

So force is steps taken by an officer using their training, their tactics and their equipment in order to protect themselves or protect someone else at the scene. There's different levels of force.

I'll let you ask that question if we want to get into different levels, but it's basically the tools and techniques that an officer is authorized by law in order to protect themselves and the people they work with. This includes citizens, other officers and even other suspects.

- Q. In your mind, what are the levels of force? How does that break down for you?
- A. The first level of force is, generally, our police presence. Which means you -- not always, but in general, you might arrive with a police car. You might be in uniform. You might have a badge on, a name tag, patches on your shoulders. Things that tell the public that you are a police officer, and that there are certain things that you're going to order them to do or not to do. So that physical presence.

We step up from there. Now we combine that with a verbal presence. So you know, I'm the police. I came in a police car; I'm dressed in a uniform, and I'm now going to use words that express, "Seattle Police.

Stop what you're doing. Get down on the ground." That's just an example.

So I've now given my visible presence. I've now used, possibly, some type of verbal technique or verbal persuasion in order to accomplish my law enforcement purpose.

From there, you might have come-along holds where let's say someone doesn't want to leave a place where they're not supposed to be. Very simple thing might be to just take them by the arm, escort them out of the situation, whatever it might be.

You're not going to do an arrest. You don't need to issue a citation or something like that. And sometimes that -- that easy come-along hold might be just a step up above your verbal presence and allow you to accomplish a law enforcement purpose.

From there you can get into more serious types of hold. Gooseneck wrist holds. You might have pressure points, fingers-interlocking holds. Different things like that where you're applying a little bit more force. I'm not just taking you by the arm right now, I'm now using some level of pain compliance in order to get you to comply.

Stepping up from that, we then get into some of the tools that are provided to police departments

across the nation. And it's been my experience that a lot of the departments have a lot of these different tools; so this won't be an exhaustive list or specific to any particular agency. But different tools that you might find might be things that protect the officers; could be a pepper spray can; could be a night stick; could be a bean bag launcher; might be a PR 24; you might have a Taser.

All of these things are tools that are given to the officer in order to protect themselves and assist them in getting the job done; getting their law enforcement objective accomplished.

And then finally, if you step beyond those tools, those weapons that we might call less lethal -- that's another kind of catchall phrase -- we then get into lethal weapons where you have pistols, rifles, shotguns. Things that are designed to have a lethal component with them wherein the officer has to defend their lives or the lives of another.

And the only appropriate tool sometimes when faced with life force might be that that gun, which, again, is a catchall term that covers the pistols, rifles and the shotguns. Those are the most common force tools and techniques that I'm familiar with.

O. Thank you for that. We'll be -- we'll be getting

- into that a bit later. Going back to your deescalation training, can you tell me when, where and who certified you in deescalation.
 - A. I can look it up. I didn't reference my training record in this report. I kind of gave a general overall. So if we want to maybe -- it's 9:26. I guess we just started. We could have a break and I could look that up if you wish.
 - Q. I just -- I put a star next to that. We can come back to that and look later on.
 - A. That sounds fine.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

- MR. DWYER: Matt, is it okay if he just provides
 the information to you later?
- MR. GROSS: Yeah. I don't need an answer right this second.
 - THE WITNESS: Should I write that down, or are you going to remind me later?
- MR. GROSS: O. Sure.
- A. And it was when I was certified in deescalation, was it?
- Q. Yeah. When you were certified and where and who certified you.
- A. When and where and who. Got it.
- Q. And some of these might also get lumped into this, this research. But do you know if you were certified as

an end-user or a instructor in tactical deescalation?

A. That was both.

- Q. How many hours was the course in tactical deescalation?
- A. Once a year the Seattle Police Department put on what is called Street Skills, and it's a four-day block of instruction that matched up to our work schedule.

 During Street Skills, there would have been training in deescalation techniques.

Now, I will say that I didn't receive this through, perhaps, the bulk of my career. And it became more and more important as deescalation became one of those words that you kept hearing over and over in law enforcement circles and professional publications regarding law enforcement or just reading about court cases and things like that.

The more involved that I got with the training cadre with the Seattle Police Department and the more involved I got in training others, it became very important, obviously, for me to go through that training first in order to then disseminate the information that I have to some of the police officers that are, in fact, people of all ranks coming through our -- our basic training.

Not -- let me take that back. Not basic

training. Let's go back and call it Street Skills.

Again, this is what we would do on a yearly basis to make sure that our -- our officers, our employees, our detectives, our sergeants are being trained in the expectations of the Seattle Police Department. So those

And, Matt, it became more and more apparent that this was a key component of our training in my later years. Let's say, years 28 through 35, perhaps.

Street Skills would encompass that tactical deescalation.

The more and more that we involved ourselves in training in this deescalation model and, again, using tactical deescalation, it doesn't mean we're going to withdraw from situations and not do anything. We still have to accomplish our purpose, but how can we do it through techniques of deescalation and keep ourselves and our potential arrestees safer?

That was the goal of it. And the Seattle

Police Department really started encouraging that. And
so it's a long way to answer your question. But the more
and more that we got involved with that, I myself, as a
trainer, obviously, became more and more involved.

And it really became kind of like a secondary language for us with the Seattle Police Department. And we incorporated it into any number of trainings. So if you had a mental health training class, you incorporate a

deescalation element into that. If you had weapon retention class, you might also incorporate deescalation.

If you had --

- Q. A domestic violence -- deescalation's coming up in a lot of other classes?
- A. That's correct. We also did it as a specific stand-alone class. But by that, we then incorporated it into any of the other trainings that we could find that it was applicable.

So when I would design field training scenarios for officers out in the field, then I tried to find where can I insert elements of potential deescalation where the officer then can successfully navigate the training course. And if they can do it, and they can talk the suspect into the back of their car rather than fight them into the back of their car, that was considered a definite win.

- Q. When you were doing the deescalation classes themselves, or maybe these street smart classes, were they in person or were they online webinar classes?
- A. In-person classes. We would sometimes start in the classroom, and there might be a short hour, maybe, an hour, maybe two hours of classroom instruction on technique or tactic, you know, what the training objective was for the day. And we'll incorporate our

police manual and how this applies to the training goal.

And then, generally, we'd go out in the field and then put those practices into effect and let the officers try out the techniques that we were training them to do in the classroom so they could try it out in a field setting.

- Q. Did you ever have to take a written test to demonstrate your understanding and competency in deescalation?
- A. I can't say for sure. I don't believe -- I don't remember one at this point that we had a written test on deescalation.
- Q. Do you know if you had to participate in graded reality-based tacticals where you had to deescalate people in a variety of scenarios to demonstrate competency?
- A. Yes. In that -- now, when you say "graded," I'm going to -- I'm going to add into that a little bit of pass/fail. We didn't give a letter grade that you might find in school. But if someone -- let's just keep it at that. It was generally pass/fail.
- Q. When you taught deescalation, was that in person or was that a online webinar?
- A. I can't even remember teaching online webinars in deescalation. So I'm going to say everything was in

	David Sweeney
1	person.
2	Q. And how many hours was your class?
3	A. Can you be more specific as to which class.
4	Q. On deescalation.
5	A. I could answer it this way. Tactical deescalation
6	was a day-long class. That I know for sure. The other
7	classes, if you're dealing with crisis-intervention
8	training or mental-health training or domestic-violence
9	response or traffic stops, field arrests, use of force,
10	we generally would incorporate elements of deescalation
11	almost without fail in every one of those classes.
12	So it's kind of a hard question to answer.
13	But technical deescalation was a day-long class, I can
14	definitely tell you that.
15	Q. And when you taught deescalation, were your
16	students other law enforcement officers?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. What agencies have you been hired as a private
19	contractor to teach deescalation?
20	A. Zero.
21	Q. Have you ever produced an instructor-level course

23

24

25

on deescalation?

Α.

I can't say that I produced one. No.

going to say zero on that. By and large I was operating

Focus Litigation Solutions

I -- I'm

1	Police Department. So I'm not going to claim to be the
2	original author of any of those, shall we say.
3	Q. Have you ever authored a deescalation training
4	manual?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Have you authored any peer-reviewed published
7	articles, books or manuals on deescalation?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Do you hold yourself out as a subject matter
10	expert in deescalation?
11	A. Yes, I do.
12	Q. Has any courts qualified you as a subject matter
13	expert in deescalation?
14	A. No.
15	Q. What is the end goal of deescalation?
16	A. The end goal is for the officer to accomplish
17	their law enforcement purpose without unnecessary use of
18	force.
19	Q. Would you agree with me that someone can be a
20	master in deescalation, but unless their audience agrees
21	to enter into a constructive conversation to deescalate,
22	the goal of deescalation cannot be accomplished?
23	MR. DWYER: Counsel, I'd like to object. It's
24	ambiguous. What do you mean by "audience"?
25	MR. GROSS: A suspect.

1	MR. DWYER: Okay.
2	MR. GROSS: But, I mean, sometimes they're not
3	suspects.
4	MR. DWYER: David, understand the question?
5	THE WITNESS: It's a mouthful.
6	MR. DWYER: If you would like him to break it down
7	or something, ask him. But if you're prepared to answer,
8	go ahead.
9	THE WITNESS: Yeah. If you could, Matt. I can
10	insert the word suspect. One more time and let me try it
11	again.
12	MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Would you agree with me
13	that someone can have taken every single course in
14	deescalation, they're a master in it
15	A. Okay. Police officer, in other words?
16	Q. Yeah. They have all the training in
17	deescalation
18	A. Right.
19	Q but it still requires the suspect to have a
20	constructive conversation with that police officer for
21	deescalation to work?
22	A. I'm going to disagree with that.
23	Q. Why?
24	A. There are elements of deescalation which don't
25	necessarily involve conversation. And I can give you

some examples if you'd like.

O. Please do.

A. One training scenario that I devised for officers was a suicidal subject at the end of a hall, and I would then bring a team of officers in, and I would tell them, "You're here for some type of disturbance and the individual's down the hall."

And it's -- the officers come in, and they start looking around. There they see the guy down at the end of the hall. I also, cleverly, put a big table right there by the entrance.

And if the officers had listened to my verbal training on deescalation, that placing barriers in between you and the suspect can act as a deterrent to the suspect attacking you, therefore reducing your requirement to use force on them, that is an element of deescalation. But it didn't require any conversation on the part of the officers and the suspect.

So they would come into the room, and I would tell my actor, I would say, "If they are working with you and you're feeling persuaded to drop the knife, go ahead and do that.

But if they start coming in, and they start yelling at you and just, you know, screaming at you and they're pointing guns at you" -- and again, the guy's

probably 15 or 20 feet away -- "then go ahead and start advancing on them."

But I said, "If the table's there, you got to stay on the other side of it." So, in other words, I tried to create a situation for the officers where they could end up being successful in this scenario, and remember the training that I had given them that sometimes an obstacle, a barrier, could be an effective deterrent to a suspect attacking you, and, therefore, you're not required to defend yourself.

In other words, the suspect might go home safely because he's not getting shot at that day.

- Q. In that situation, for the suspect to surrender without there being force used, doesn't the suspect still have to voluntarily submit to the officers' deescalation techniques? Verbal, I should say.
- A. Yes. I will agree with you on that. But I was answering the first question that was kind of like, in order to deescalate, must you have verbal conversation, and I would say no.

Another example of deescalation that I train is that sometimes calling additional officers to the scene or officers with specialties might be a form of deescalation. Because, again, you're taking actions; you're still accomplishing your law enforcement purpose,

- but by bringing an additional officer or two with you,
 maybe simply that show of force and the guy saying,
 "Okay, there's not only one of you, there's three of you.
 Okay, I give up," right?
 - That might be the goal of deescalation, too, by saying, "Hey, look. We got three people here. You're not going anywhere. We're not going to come down there and get you either because we don't want to hurt you."
 - So, again, it's kind of a two-part question.

 Your first question was: Does there have to be verbal?

 And I would say no.
 - But I will agree that many, many times, a deescalation component is, obviously, that verbal component where -- communicating with the suspect, we're telling them what we need them to do, but maybe we could do it in a conversational tone and accomplish our law enforcement purpose.
 - Q. And it also sounds like a show of force can be deescalation. Instead of one officer, you said there's three; was that correct?
 - A. I agree with that.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. In deescalation or use of force, are you familiar with the term "preclusion"?
- A. No, that wasn't a term we used.
 - O. Is there a similar term that the Seattle Police

Department used?

- A. You'd have to define it for me.
- Q. Anything that, sort of -- a person, condition or circumstance that prevents or obstructs an officer from safely and effectively using techniques that -- that's the definition I'm working with.
- A. That makes sense. So, in other words, are there things that might preclude the suspect from complying with the officer? And, yes, there are things that might preclude them from cooperating.
- Q. Would you agree with me that there is a difference between possessing a technique/tactic or weapon and having it available to use during an encounter with a resistant or threatening person?
 - A. That's a really wide-ranging question.
- MR. DWYER: David, if you need him to break it down, ask him that. If you're comfortable answering it, go ahead.
- THE WITNESS: Before I answer it, Matt, can you ask it one more time.
- MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Would you agree with me that there is a difference between possessing a technique/tactic weapon, and having it available to use during a encounter with a threatening person?
 - A. It's a difficult question to answer, but I can

think of scenarios, whether actually out on the street that I've been in or also in training where an officer might -- here's an example.

In SWAT, we had a lot of extra body armor.

Most officers don't have that, right? So let's say we went to a-man-with-a-gun call, and he's shooting out of his balcony at people down below. We might say that an officer has body armor, but all they have is that thin piece of Kevlar that covers their chest and their back.

But if we had SWAT officers there, they're much more heavily armored. So we would have not only the chest, we'd have the upper neck. We would have the shoulder. We have groin protection. So it's a difficult question to answer.

I can think of scenarios where officers have things available to them, tools and techniques. Some of the things that, you know, generally you mentioned. But sometimes maybe something is locked in a car, and maybe you're now hands-on with the suspect. You might say you have that tool, but you can't get to it for one reason or another.

I can think of scenarios like that. So it's a really wide-ranging question; so I hesitate to get into more detail without a more specific question.

I can think of examples where people can have

tools and techniques and use them, but I can think of examples where people have tools and techniques, and, for whatever reason, they don't use them, I guess is my best answer.

- Q. And would you agree that in order for a technique, a tactic or weapon to be available, the officer must be able to safely and effectively use or deploy it?
- A. Police departments give officers tools and tactics in training to get the job done. I've never seen a police department that doesn't do that in one form or another. There's different standards for different departments.
- So -- but, yes. They're given the tools and tactics and trained -- hopefully trained -- in the use of those. And then -- sorry. I don't know if I answered your question. Can you ask it one more time.
- Q. Yeah. Would you agree that in order for a technique, tactic or weapon to be available, an officer must be able to safely and effectively use or deploy that item?
- A. I can think of situations in general. I'm going to say yes. But I can also think of situations where an officer might not be able to safely use a tool or technique. But they either have used it anyway in, kind of, a violation of what that tool or technique was

1	designed to use for, or I I've seen situations
2	where officers have things available to them, but they
3	didn't use them. So, again, it's kind of a broad
4	question, but I'm trying my best to answer it.
5	Q. Would you also agree that during an encounter with
6	a resisting or threatening subject, if that person's
7	behavior is interfering with law enforcement action, that
8	then those law enforcement actions are no longer safe and
9	effective to use?
10	A. I would disagree with that.
11	MR. DWYER: Objection.
12	THE WITNESS: Sorry. Go ahead, Patrick.
13	MR. DWYER: I was going to say objection. It's
14	compound and ambiguous.
15	But if you feel you can answer, David, go ahead.
16	MR. GROSS: Q. Why would you disagree?
17	A. Again, the the hard thing about one of the
18	hard things about law enforcement is every situation's
19	different. You've probably heard that before, I'm sure,
20	with your experience and mine as well. And it's really
21	hard to state these 100 percent catch-all statements.
22	And I can think of scenarios that might run
23	opposite of that or not flow in easy line with that. And
24	if you want to hear a couple what-if's sorry. You're

going to have to ask the question one more time, Matt.

1	Q. I think we can we can move into some specific
2	examples. I think this will help with the
3	A. Okay.
4	Q the questions.
5	Would you agree that severe alcohol use or
6	drug use negatively affects an officer from constructive
7	talking with that person?
8	A. Not always. Having done 500 DUI arrests in my
9	career, I can tell you that I was actually able to gain
10	cooperation and conversation from 98 percent of them, I'm
11	going to say. So I'm going to disagree with the
12	statement.
13	I've also come across any number of people on
14	drugs. And different drugs affect different people
15	differently, right? So, again, it's kind of one of those
16	I can't agree with a blanket statement like that because
17	I can think of specific examples where people have still
18	been cooperative. Now, can it hamper the ability to
19	cooperate? Sure, but not always.
20	Q. And would you agree that no matter how good a
21	officer's negotiating skills are, it's going to be more
22	challenging with a person who was under the influence of
23	drugs or alcohol?
24	A. It can be, but, no, not always. I'm thinking of

people that weren't on drugs and alcohol and, oh, my

1	gosh. They created the worst fight you ever seen. So,
2	sure, it can be, but not always.
3	Q. In reviewing this particular incident, did you
4	find evidence that Mr. Hennefer was under the influence
5	of drugs?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And did you find that he also had alcohol in his
8	system?
9	A. No, I don't believe there was any evidence of
L O	alcohol use. I don't remember that from any of the
L1	officer's statements or any of the other evidence.
L2	Q. Do you have any reason to disagree with the
L3	pathology and toxicology findings by Dr. Reiber that
L4	Mr. Hennefer's cause of death was drug overdose?
L5	MR. DWYER: Objection. You're asking him to give
L6	an expert opinion about a medical issue.
L7	THE WITNESS: And my understanding is we listen to
L8	the objection, and then I answer the question anyway?
L9	MR. GROSS: Unless you're instructed not to
20	answer.
21	THE WITNESS: Understood.
22	MR. DWYER: Yeah. Mr. Sweeney, if you feel that
23	you are competent to give an answer about that medical
24	issue, go ahead. If you don't feel competent, so state.
25	THE WITNESS: Certainly that is out of the area of

1 my expertise. However, I did read the report that said 2 the cause of death was acute methamphetamine 3 intoxication, I believe was the word. 4 MR. GROSS: Q. Did you also find evidence from 5 Mr. Hennefer's family members that he was a long-time drug user? 6 7 MR. DWYER: Objection. States facts that haven't 8 been put into evidence and not put into the hypothetical. 9 Again, Mr. Sweeney, if you have specific factual 10 information you recall from documents reviewed, go ahead. 11 THE WITNESS: There were statements made by 12 officers that detailed both 911 calls and in-person 13 information by family members that Mr. Hennefer was under 14 the influence of narcotics, that he recently relapsed. And I'll leave it at that. 15 16 There were statements by the officers 17 relating -- well, that was the other thing I was going to 18 add. One, there were statements made by family members, 19 both in person and phone to officers at the scene or to 20 dispatch. And then there were also the general 21 observations of deputies at the scene that they believe 22 Mr. Hennefer was affected by the use of narcotics. 23 MR. GROSS: Q. And not only just affected by 24 narcotics on that day, but had a history of using drugs; 25 correct?

1	MR. DWYER: Objection. Again, you're asking him
2	whether what he knows about the history Mr. Hennefer,
3	and I believe he's answered that question.
4	Mr. Sweeney, do you have any further knowledge
5	that you've gained about Mr. Hennefer's history of using
6	narcotics? Go ahead.
7	THE WITNESS: Only the information from his family
8	that he did have that history and had relapsed.
9	MR. GROSS: Q. Would you agree that a person
10	experiencing mental health issues might present a serious
11	challenge to an officer attempting to deescalate that
12	person?
13	A. I have seen many people with mental health issues
14	that are difficult to deescalate. Yes. Not all, but
15	many.
16	Q. Have you been trained that a person who is
17	experiencing paranoia or schizophrenia might obstruct or
18	prevent even a well-trained officer from effectively
19	deescalating that person?
20	A. Some of the people you asked about my training
21	or real-world experience? Sorry.
22	Q. That have you been trained?
23	A. I've been trained that people and did you
24	did you say mental health or drugs? Are we on mental
25	health or drugs?

1	Q. Mental health issues?
2	A. Yeah. I've been trained that people with mental
3	health issues can certainly present challenges to
4	officers. However, many people can still be reasoned
5	with and persuaded, and so deescalation tactics can still
6	work. There is no cut and dry, 100 percent one way or
7	the other.
8	Q. Would you agree that a person who was delusional
9	could obstruct or prevent a well-trained officer from
10	effectively communicating and using deescalation
11	techniques?
12	MR. DWYER: Again, objection. Calling him to give
13	a hypothetical or speculative answer. If you want to ask
14	him about his particular experience, go ahead.
15	THE WITNESS: In my experience, yes. They might
16	present that difficulty, but not all the time.
17	MR. GROSS: Q. And you would agree, it doesn't
18	matter how good an officer's training is, if that suspect
19	is experiencing delusional thoughts, it's going to
20	interfere with the communications?
21	MR. DWYER: Objection. Again, assumes, you know,
22	a hypothetical. You're assuming that it did.
23	Mr. Sweeney, if you want to explain your
24	experience, go ahead.
25	THE WITNESS: I would disagree with the statement,

Matt. It certainly can, but not always. So it's kind of a similar answer to before, that it doesn't preclude deescalation from working. You can still talk to people and you can still persuade them.

I'm not going to say it happens all the time. It might not even happen the bulk of the time, but it doesn't -- it's not a blanket 100 percent that means that you can't talk to this person. It doesn't mean that.

MR. GROSS: Q. No. It just makes it more challenging than if you were trying to deescalate with me.

A. Sure. That I'll agree with. I mean, if someone's under the influence of narcotics in -- yeah, in general, I would agree that most of them would be more difficult to deescalate than you.

However, I'll go back to an earlier answer that I gave that some of the people that are the most difficult to deal with I don't believe had any signs of intoxication through alcohol or drugs.

So there is no blanket answer for that. It's a, you know -- I don't want to give the simple, easy answer. It depends. So I'm trying my best to answer your question, but I can certainly think of examples where people have been very difficult, more difficult because they're under the influence of some type of

1	substance, but it doesn't preclude you from still
2	communicating with them. But it can make things more
3	difficult.
4	Q. Now, did you find evidence in the discovery that
5	you were provided that family members told law
6	enforcement that Mr. Hennefer was delusional?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And did you find evidence in discovery from family
9	members that they stated Mr. Hennefer was suffering from
10	symptoms of mental illness?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Do you remember what mental illness symptoms
13	family members stated they believed Mr. Hennefer was
14	suffering from?
15	A. There was mention of schizophrenia.
16	Q. Have you been trained to recognize a person
17	presenting with possible bipolar disorder?
18	A. When I went through crisis intervention training,
19	we definitely discussed people that were bipolar. And of

And when I would train officers in the same arena, I would give them that same advice that was given to me: That you might not be able to diagnose something like schizophrenia or bipolar disorder or dissociative

course we were given the caveat that we are not medical

experts, nor are we trained to do diagnoses.

20

21

22

23

24

disorder or any of the other disorders.

It's most important that the officer recognize that there is something at play here which is making the situation difficult for this person. And could that be a foreign substance; could that be something in their mind. There are endless possibilities.

So in answer to your question, yes. But we were never a psychologist, a psychiatrist, anyone trained in medicine that could give a diagnosis on that, but certainly we learned about it.

- Q. And I -- I don't want to ask for your medical opinion here, but in that training, what was, kind of, your takeaway? What is bipolar disorder? What's your understanding of it?
- A. My understanding of it is that through one process or another, a person can go through definite highs during certain periods of time and definite lows.

So depending on where you find that person, whether they're at the manic stage or the slow and lethargic stage, those might be something that an officer -- again, an untrained person, but someone that's certainly going to come across people that are bipolar, suffering from that affliction, that this might be a reason why someone is behaving a certain way that they are.

1	That being said, there's also the difficulty
2	when you then insert a foreign substance, a narcotic into
3	that, or alcohol, and then how is that affecting the
4	person? Is that the cause of their mood swings, or is it
5	the the actual bipolar disorder or a combination
6	thereof?
7	So it's a long-winded answer to say that yes,
8	we've been trained in it; we talk about it; we recognize
9	it, but it's never something that I'm going to say, "Oh,
10	I know what's happening here."
11	You know, that's I would never
12	hazard such a type of guess as that. So that's about the
13	extent of my training.
14	Q. Would you agree that a person suffering from
15	bipolar disorder would obstruct or prevent even a
16	well-trained officer from effectively communicating with
17	that person in crisis?
18	MR. DWYER: Objection. I think that's been asked
19	and answered.
20	Mr. Sweeney, if you have anything further to add
21	to your answer you've just given, go ahead.
22	THE WITNESS: It would just be a repeat that it
23	might make things difficult, but not necessarily always.
24	MR. GROSS: Q. And would you agree that it
25	wouldn't matter how good that officer was at

1 communicating and negotiating if the person's bipolar 2 disorder was interfering with that communication; right? 3 MR. DWYER: Objection. I don't understand the Are you asking him whether or not it doesn't 4 question. 5 matter how well-trained the officer is? MR. GROSS: 6 Yes. 7 All right. So Mr. Sweeney, do you MR. DWYER: 8 understand the question? I think I have an answer for that. THE WITNESS: 10 In my experience, I've seen poorly-trained officers or 11 officers that don't incorporate their training into their 12 regular day practices. I've also seen highly-trained 13 officers that are very competent and incorporate their 14 training into their daily practices as they work with 15 people. 16 I've supervised hundreds of officers and 17 reviewed hundreds of cases of uses of force or mental 18 health calls or things like that. Certainly some 19 officers are better communicators than others. 2.0 And it's been my experience that those are the 21 type of officers I like seeing on a call, especially with 22 someone who is difficult to deal with. 23 Other officers, I know that is not their skill They might have many other skill sets but maybe 24 set. 25 that's not one of them.

So I think in answer to your question, Matt, there are -- you know, everyone has different abilities, skills, training and the ability and desire and willingness to follow that training. And also certainly experience. A 20-year vet, 25-year vet is a lot more experienced than someone who has been on the job a year.

So -- but, again, I have to state that just because one person's poorly trained or disregards their training and someone else is an expert and, you know, consistently talks people into the back of their car rather than fighting them into the back of their car, it doesn't always mean that that person is always going to be the more successful when dealing with someone that's difficult.

Because sometimes the person that's difficult has a say in who they like and who they don't like. And I've seen many times where we're working through negotiations, and the suspect says, "I'm not going to talk to you anymore," or, "I don't like that guy," and we sub someone else out, and someone else gets a great result.

So there's no cut-and-dry answers to any of these questions. I can think of examples both for and against. I could -- and I'll leave my answer at that.

MR. GROSS: We've been going a little over an

1	hour. Do we want to continue? Take a break?
2	THE WITNESS: I would love a short break.
3	MR. DWYER: Yeah. I think probably a five-minute
4	break would be good, Matt.
5	MR. GROSS: Let's go off the record.
6	MR. DWYER: Yes. Off the record.
7	(Recess taken.)
8	MR. GROSS: We are back on the record from a short
9	break.
10	Q. David, would you agree that an officer attempting
11	to deescalate with someone who is biased against law
12	enforcement could obstruct or prevent that officer from
13	effectively communicating with the suspect?
14	A. It might.
15	MR. DWYER: Objection. Hypothetical.
16	But, David, like I said, you could answer.
17	Go ahead.
18	THE WITNESS: It might.
19	MR. GROSS: Q. Would you agree that it wouldn't
20	matter how well-trained and experienced a negotiating
21	officer is, if a suspect has bias against law
22	enforcement, it's going to interfere with the
23	negotiations?
24	MR. DWYER: Objection. Bias against law
25	enforcement is a very ambiguous phrase

1 Maybe Counsel would like to explain what he 2 It could be many things. So from a means more. 3 political bias to a hatred, I don't know what you're 4 talking about. 5 MR. GROSS: Q. I am just -- David, I'll clarify. Bias against law enforcement could be they don't like law 6 7 enforcement; they hate law enforcement; they have issues 8 with authority. Those types of examples. 9 Okay. And then the question about -- I understand Α. 10 those people now. And then the question about them is 11 once again? 12 That even a well-trained officer trying to 13 negotiate with someone who has bias against law 14 enforcement, it's going to interfere with the negotiations? 15 16 Α. I will disagree with that. 17 And why? 0. 18 Because, again, the general consensus might be, Α. 19 yes, that that might be something that's going to 20 interfere or hamper communications between two parties --21 let's say between the police and someone they're trying 22 to deal with. But it doesn't have to be that impediment,

of the time, but it doesn't have to be. There's no --

It -- it can be. It might even be that most

23

24

25

is -- is my answer.

1	there's no clear-cut yes answer to that. Because there
2	are people that I've met that I might consider biased
3	against me, but we still got done what we needed to get
4	done, whatever it might be.
5	Q. Did you find evidence in discovery that
6	Mr. Hennefer had a dislike for law enforcement?
7	MR. DWYER: I will object. Just for
8	clarification, Matt, by "discovery," did you mean the
9	documents and things he reviewed?
10	MR. GROSS: Q. Yes.
11	A. What I remember was a term that he was afraid of
12	law enforcement.
13	Q. Do you recall in discovery that Mr. Hennefer had
14	been in a shootout or had been shot by law enforcement
15	previously?
16	A. That was the information that I saw within some of
17	the officer's statements.
18	Q. Do you think previously being shot by law
19	enforcement might make someone have a dislike for law
20	enforcement?
21	MR. DWYER: Objection. Asking for speculation.
22	You can answer, David.
23	THE WITNESS: It certainly might.
24	MR. GROSS: Q. And so during this incident, you
25	discovered information that Mr. Hennefer was under the

1	influence of methamphetamine; correct?
2	A. The cause of death in that I believe it was
3	a a doctor's death certificate of some sort, or maybe
4	it was just information given to the coroner, I can't
5	remember what it was immediately. I could certainly look
6	it up if you want to know which one it was exactly, but
7	they did indicate the cause of death was methamphetamine.
8	Q. And do you agree that he was under the influence
9	of methamphetamine during the stop with the
LO	sheriff's department?
L1	MR. DWYER: Objection. It calls again, it's
L2	asking him for a medical opinion. Are you
L3	MR. GROSS: No, this is not a medical opinion.
L4	MR. DWYER: Well, Mr. Sweeney other than what
L5	was in the medical what's in the record he reviewed?
L6	Is that what you're trying to get, Mr. Gross?
L7	MR. GROSS: Yes.
L8	MR. DWYER: It was stated in the records it was
L9	methamphetamine intoxication; so I'm not quite sure what
20	you're trying to get.
21	MR. GROSS: I'm looking for his law enforcement
22	experience, if he believes Mr. Hennefer was under the
23	influence of methamphetamine.
24	MR. DWYER: Is that based upon the events and what
2.5	happened at the incident scene?

1 If -- I just want to know his opinion. MR. GROSS: 2 Mr. Sweeney, if you think you can give MR. DWYER: 3 an opinion, go ahead. If you can't, don't. 4 THE WITNESS: No. I couldn't say specifically 5 what he would be under the influence of based on the 6 officers' statements about some of the physical 7 observations that they made, they thought he was under the influence of narcotics. 8 9 And, again, I think that's what most law 10 enforcement officers should stick to, is you making a --11 just a general observation. So I only know what was 12 reported in the officers' statements and in the 13 depositions. So I -- I have no specific information 14 other than that medical report as to what was the cause of the intoxication. 15 16 MR. GROSS: O. And -- and there was information 17 in discovery that Mr. Hennefer was experiencing 18 delusions; correct? 19 That was something that was within the reports and Α. 20 statements. Yes. 21 And there was information in discovery that Ο. 22 Mr. Hennefer was displaying mental-illness symptoms such 23 as paranoia; correct? 24 Α. That is correct.

And there was information in discovery that

25

Ο.

1	Mr. Hennefer disliked law enforcement; correct?
2	A. I think I answered that question previously by
3	stating that he was afraid of law enforcement.
4	MR. DWYER: Thank you, Mr. Sweeney. You took care
5	of my question of asked and answered took care of my
6	objection. I'm sorry.
7	MR. GROSS: Q. Would you agree that anyone or a
8	combination of all of these presentations could preclude
9	even the best negotiator from calming down Mr. Hennefer?
10	A. I would disagree.
11	Q. Why?
12	A. Once again, there is no 100-percent catchall
13	statement that's going to be able to accurately describe
14	100 percent of the suspects and 100 percent of the
15	officers who are called to deal with those suspects. So
16	put another way, you can still be successful. Does it
17	make it difficult, sure, but there is still a chance of
18	success.
19	Q. It doesn't make it easier; is that correct?
20	MR. DWYER: Again, are you asking as a generality
21	or specific example? My objection is it's ambiguous.
22	THE WITNESS: I can't think of any examples where
23	those particular characteristics that you just mentioned
24	would make it easier to negotiate with someone. I can't
25	think of a situation that would make it easier. So I'll

think of a situation that would make it easier.

So I'll

1	agree with that statement.
2	MR. GROSS: Q. Would distance and a person's
3	inability to hear communication with an officer
4	negatively impact deescalation and communication
5	attempts?
6	MR. DWYER: Counsel, can you clarify what you mean
7	by "distance." I'm trying to understand the question
8	better.
9	MR. GROSS: Q. David, you would agree that the
10	further a suspect is away from officers, that distance
11	can make it harder for the suspect to hear and follow
12	orders?
13	A. I would agree with that.
14	Q. In your review of this incident, do you recall
15	that Mr. Hennefer, at one point, drove his truck some
16	distance away and got stuck in a ditch next to the
17	roadway?
18	A. I do remember that.
19	Q. And do you recall, approximately, how far away
20	that was?
21	A. One deputy said it was 150 yards.
22	Q. Would you agree that trying to negotiate with
23	Mr. Hennefer who's approximately 150 yards away in his

truck is going to be challenging to deputies at the

24

25

scene?

1 A. I agree.

- Q. Would you agree that at that distance -- the use of a PA system from a patrol car -- can provide some assistance to law enforcement in trying to communicate with a suspect?
 - A. I agree.
- Q. It's easier to use the PA system than shout with your voice if someone's 150 yards away?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Would you also agree that it's still difficult using a PA system at 150 yards away if that person is under the influence of drugs?
- A. It certainly can be, but I'm not sure that drugs necessarily make it more difficult. I think it's kind of a -- a two-part question you have there. I think the distance certainly would make it difficult in the first place. I'm sure if you combine that with narcotic use, those are two impediments to effective communication.
- Q. Do you have any issues with the sheriff's department using the -- the PA system in the patrol car to try to communicate with Mr. Hennefer?
- A. No. I've used that many times at many different scenes -- or had one of my officers do it I think is probably more accurate. No, I've done it myself, too. So that's my answer. Yes, the PA system is appropriate.

1	Q. And communication is a core part of deescalation;
2	correct?
3	A. Yes, it is.
4	Q. And would you agree that deputies made repeated
5	attempts to communicate with Mr. Hennefer when he was
6	inside his truck once stuck in the ditch?
7	MR. DWYER: Thank you, Matt.
8	THE WITNESS: Yes. There were notations both in
9	their statements and in the depositions, I believe, where
10	officers discussed their communications with
11	Mr. Hennefer. So, yes.
12	MR. GROSS: Q. And those attempts, that's a
13	reasonable thing to do; correct?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. Did you review statements that Detective Natalie
16	Mullins tried to call Mr. Hennefer on two cell phones he
17	had on his body?
18	A. I did see those notations from her. Yes.
19	Q. And that Detective Mullins also had dispatch
20	attempt to call Mr. Hennefer as well?
21	A. That is correct.
22	Q. All right. And do you recall that no one was able
23	to no one from the sheriff's department was able to
24	communicate with Mr. Hennefer via those cell phones?
25	A. Correct.

1	Q. Do you have any criticisms of Detective Mullins'
2	attempt to go communicate with Mr. Hennefer via the
3	cell phones?
4	A. No.
5	Q. Would you agree that's also a reasonable thing to
6	do?
7	A. I would agree.
8	Q. Do you recall reviewing that, at some point,
9	Mr. Hennefer threw one of his phones into a flooded rice
10	field?
11	A. I did see the mention of that from some of the
12	deputies at the scene, I believe.
13	Q. Would you agree that disposing of a means of
14	communication, such as a cell phone, is not a rational
15	act?
16	A. I would agree with you on that. Most people would
17	not throw their cell phone into the rice patty.
18	Q. And we already established that once that first
19	cell phone was thrown out of the truck, Mr. Hennefer
20	didn't communicate on the other cell phone with
21	sheriff's department deputies; correct?
22	A. I don't believe at the point that he went down
23	the road from them in that 150 yards, I don't believe
24	there was any further phone communication with him.
25	Correct.

1	Q. What do you, sort of, make of Mr. Hennefer drives
2	down the roadway from deputies; he throws one phone out
3	the window; refuses to answer the other cell phone as
4	the as deputies are trying to communicate with
5	Mr. Hennefer?
6	MR. DWYER: Objection. Ambiguous. I'm not quite
7	sure what you're asking, Counsel.
8	THE WITNESS: What I make of it, that he was
9	behaving in a way that showed that he was impaired. I
10	agree with Deputy Eck's observations that he thought that
11	he was dealing with someone who had ingested narcotics.
12	I also can see the possibilities discussed by
13	his family as to his medical history. So we might have,
14	again, that combination effect of narcotics use and a
15	mental illness. I think that's my best answer on that.
16	MR. GROSS: Q. Would it be the rational thing for
17	a person experiencing a mental or a physical crisis to
18	ask for help from first responders?
19	MR. DWYER: Objection. You're asking him to
20	respond as a medical or psychiatric expert?
21	Go ahead, Mr. Sweeney, to the extent you have
22	personal experience.
23	THE WITNESS: I certainly don't have the medical
24	experience. In my professional experience as a
25	police officer and supervisor, it is uncommon for people

1 who have taken narcotics to ask law enforcement for help. 2 Because in the past, so many narcotics were 3 felonies. Society has now, kind of, eased up on some of 4 those restrictions, particularly in Washington State. 5 I'm not so much sure about California. Oregon eased up. And now they're going back -- let me just end my answer 6 7 there, that -- I'll end it there. 8 MR. GROSS: Q. And you would agree that at no 9 time did Mr. Hennefer ask for help from the 10 sheriff's department deputies who were at the scene? 11 Α. That is correct. I cannot remember anything of 12 him asking for help. Nothing comes to mind, so I'll 13 agree with that statement. 14 Have you been trained and certified in crisis intervention? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 And this might be one of those questions we need Ο. 18 to trail for lunch, but do you know when, where and who 19 trained you in crisis intervention? 2.0 I could give approximate answers on that. Α. 21 I will take your approximate answers. Ο. 22 The first time crisis intervention training Okay. Α. 23 I had was through the Seattle Police Department. It was

I'm going to say it was in the '90s.

held at Seattle Central Community College. We had a

24

25

classroom there.

But that's about as close of a guess I can get without looking at the actual record.

I then had crisis intervention training again in the 2000s. That training was held at our Seattle Police training facility.

And the third time that I had crisis intervention training -- no, let me take that back. The second time was at Green River Community College. Yeah. Well, it -- it -- I think it was at Green River Community College and/or the State police academy. They're both south of Seattle. And I remember driving to attend those classes.

Both of those classes in the '90s and 2000s -- again, I don't have the exact dates, but those were taught by Seattle Police training officers. And I couldn't tell you immediately which particular officer or command staff member taught those.

The last crisis intervention training I took -- and, again, these are all 40-hour classes.

They're one-week long. I remember all of them, but those specific questions that you have, I'm not sure -- but the last one I took was in the 2020s. I was at Oregon State University, and the training was held through the Corvallis Police Department. That was the city where Oregon State University is located. And we had a variety

of instructors.

I think now looking back at all those classes, they had a variety of instructors. They might have had a lead-in, but every time you're getting a new person coming in and teaching you something new. Perhaps it's a police procedural response. Perhaps it's something about mental illness. Perhaps it's someone who has resources to help people with dealing with mental illness, substance abuse.

So all three of those classes is going to have a wide variety of people who come in and train them. But those are my best memories of when and where and the who.

- Q. Do you hold yourself as an expert in crisis intervention or hostage negotiation?
- A. I would say yes for crisis intervention based on my lengthy experience, the number of 40-hour classes I've had, and my role in training hundreds of Seattle Police Department employees in crisis intervention.

I do not hold myself to be an expert in hostage negotiation, although I worked closely with the hostage negotiation team in Seattle Police Department when I was working in the SWAT team from 2010 to 2014.

- Q. Have you ever been qualified in a state or federal court on the subject matter of crisis intervention?
 - A. No.

1	Q. Have you written or published any peer-reviewed
2	papers, manuals or books on crisis intervention?
3	A. No.
4	Q. Now, I saw from your CV that you were a SWAT
5	supervisor; correct?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And part of that, you oversaw hostage negotiators;
8	correct?
9	A. We worked in conjunction with them. I took advice
10	from them. I retained general incident command, unless
11	the lieutenant was on the scene and then he would take
12	over incident command.
13	But as the field supervisor, I worked very
14	closely with the hostage negotiation team. I don't I
15	might have even outranked them, but being that we were
16	separate units who worked in partnership, I don't know
17	that I could say I oversaw them. I would liken it more
18	to I worked with them.
19	Q. Have you been trained or certified as a hostage
20	negotiator?
21	A. No.
22	Q. Would you agree that supervising negotiations and
23	actually being directly involved as a negotiator are two
24	different skill sets?

I would agree with that.

25

Α.

- Q. Do you hold yourself as an expert in suicidality or suicide by cop?
- A. To the first one, suicidality, that sounds more like a medical prognosis or diagnosis that's beyond my expertise. That being said, I've had a lot of training on suicidal ideation in both a tactical response to suicidal ideation, as well as a crisis response to suicidal ideation. But I'm not going to hold myself to be an expert in that.

I think it would be more appropriate to say that I would be an expert in how we as law enforcement might respond to someone from a law enforcement perspective rather than that medical perspective. What was the second one you talked about?

Q. Suicide by cop.

2.0

A. Ah, suicide by cop. Once again, that is something I've received extensive training on; something that I'm aware of and that I've studied, and something that I've trained officers in the field on.

I think that it would be even more appropriate to say that that is a greater area of expertise for me than just suicidality; being that, when we're talking about suicide by cop, we're talking about someone taking actions in order to end their life, and they're going to provoke a response from law enforcement to assist them in

1	that endeavor, in that goal.
2	I have faced that situation out in the field.
3	I've faced it in training and I've trained others. So,
4	yes, I'm going to say that I'm an expert in police
5	response to suicide by cop.
6	Q. And have you been qualified as an expert in a
7	state or federal court on that subject matter?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Have you written or published any peer-reviewed
10	papers, manuals or books on that subject?
11	A. No.
12	Q. And have you been trained or certified as a
13	suicide investigator by an accredited institution?
14	A. No. I don't believe we have that designation
15	at least in the organizations I've worked for and I've
16	never heard of that in other law enforcement
17	organizations. In answer to your question, no, I have
18	not.
19	Q. Are you familiar with the acronym SRA?
20	MR. DWYER: Counsel, do you have any context what
21	you're talking about? What field or subject? There's
22	many, many acronyms with the same initials.
23	MR. GROSS: Q. David, are you familiar with the
24	acronym?

No, I'm not.

25

A.

1	Q. Suicide Risk Assessment. Are you familiar with
2	suicide risk assessment, SRA?
3	A. I do remember receiving training on the
4	circumstances and the mindset that might cause someone to
5	fall into suicidal ideation, but I don't remember it
6	under those particular initials SRA.
7	Q. Have you ever done a suicide risk assessment on a
8	case you worked where there was a suicide involved?
9	A. No.
10	Q. In your review of this incident, did you find any
11	evidence that Mr. Hennefer was suicidal?
12	A. Certainly the statements and deposition of
13	Deputy Eck reflected many times that Mr. Hennefer asked
14	him to shoot him. So, yes.
15	Q. Do you recall statements from family members that
16	they thought Mr. Hennefer was suicidal?
17	A. At this time, I don't remember the family stating
18	that he was suicidal. I would have to go back and look
19	through the evidence to absolutely answer that question.
20	But at this time, Matt, I don't remember anyone stating
21	that he was suicidal.
22	Q. In in the same vein, do you recall family
23	members telling deputies that Mr. Hennefer wanted to die?
24	He just wanted to say goodbye to his kids or that he
25	thought he was going to die?

1 There were some statements like that. Α. 2 Deputy Mullins obtained information about his children, 3 and that's quite often a common topic that law 4 enforcement might bring up to a person who is expressing 5 the desire to kill themselves: To try to have them remember those that they love; that would miss them if 6 7 they were to actually go through with the act. 8 So Deputy Mullins talked with the family 9 members and got information about the children and was presenting to him over the PA, but I don't believe she 10 11 ever got a response on that. But, yes, there was 12 information. I'm not sure that -- did that answer your question? 13 14 Ο. Yeah. 15 Α. Okay. 16 And on page 17 of your report, No. 11, you 17 documented that Mr. Hennefer said, "Shoot me. Shoot me. 18 I want to die." 19 Α. He -- sorry. Was there a question with Yes. 20 that? 21 I just wanted to confirm that's written there, and Ο. 22 you recall that information in documents you reviewed? 23 Yes, I do. That came from the Eck deposition. Α.

that had most of the communication with Mr. Hennefer --

And I do remember reading -- particularly with Deputy Eck

24

1	about his desire to die. And of course I wasn't there,
2	but referring to what Deputy Eck wrote, that was one of
3	the statements, "Shoot me. Shoot me. I want to die.
4	Shoot me."
5	Q. And you would agree that Mr. Hennefer's statements
6	there, that it's a clear indication that he's suicidal?
7	A. I think it has all the hallmarks of no, I'll
8	take that back. It doesn't have all the hallmarks. It
9	has it expresses a desire that law enforcement kill
10	him, but what it missed was the physical action in order
11	to force that confrontation.
12	So it doesn't have all the hallmarks, but it
13	certainly is a start in that progress of him asking law
14	enforcement to kill him. So in answer to your question,
15	that certainly sounds like the idea of suicide and that
16	he wants to die.
17	Q. Are you familiar with the term suicide by cop or
18	maybe the acronym SBC?
19	MR. DWYER: Asked and answered.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I am.
21	MR. GROSS: Q. And what is your understanding of
22	suicide by cop?
23	A. I kind of talked about this before, but it's the
24	idea that someone's chosen method of dying is at the

So they're going to force a

hands of law enforcement.

confrontation so that law enforcement is the one that kills them. And that's their chosen method of death.

And by provoking a response with law enforcement, the suicide by cop idea is that they'll have to shoot me and kill me. And so having faced this situation myself, there are expressed desires on the part of the person or actions on the part of the person which they hope then provokes that law enforcement response that they do draw a weapon, fire and kill the individual. And that's basically what suicide by cop is.

- Q. Have you had any formal training in suicide by cop?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And would you agree that suicide by cop in certain individuals are different in the way that they plan their suicide or final death act?
- A. As I mentioned before, a person expressing suicidal ideation might have different methods that they believe will help them be successful in killing themselves. One of those might be that if I can provoke a response from law enforcement, they will shoot me and kill me. So that -- that is one method that someone might express.

Someone else might express that they want to die by hanging, or express they want to die by taking

pills.	So it	's on	e of	those	method	ds tha	at mig	ht	- that
someone	might	expr	ess.	They	might	talk	about	it,	they
might no	ot. B	ut th	at's	their	idea,	that	law e	nfor	cement
will sho	oot me	and	kill	me.					
				. 1.		1.			

Q. Would you agree that suicide by cop-intent individuals are goal-oriented in their desire to provoke a shooting?

MR. DWYER: Objection. Again, you're asking him to opine as an expert in the psychology of suicide experts, and that's not really something he was retained to do and not in his field.

But to the extent you feel comfortable with that, Mr. Sweeney, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: It seems like the question that you're asking, Matt, is more kind of a general nature about being goal-oriented. What does goal-oriented mean and what steps is someone taking to achieve that goal?

And then so I could think of many examples of what that might be, both good and bad. And then you're trying to apply it to someone who's suicidal in a police-related environment, which, again, is my expertise, not necessarily being goal-oriented. It's a hard question to answer. I -- I'm -- I can't say for sure at this point.

MR. GROSS: Q. Are suicide by cop individuals

1	dangerous to law enforcement officers?
2	A. They certainly can be.
3	Q. And are they unpredictable?
4	A. They might be. Yes.
5	Q. And you documented in your report that
6	Mr. Hennefer was behaving erratically; correct?
7	A. My observations of course, as you know, I was
8	not at the scene, so they're based on observations made
9	by deputies at the scene. And if those deputies put
10	those words into reports, statements or they spoke them
11	in depositions, I certainly tried to reference those
12	statements.
13	I don't have that personal knowledge, but I
14	have what the evidence shows from the officers that were
15	at the scene.
16	Q. That evidence showed that at least Deputy Eck and
17	other deputies perceived Mr. Hennefer as behaving
18	erratically?
19	A. That is correct.
20	Q. Do people who are suspected of being under the
21	influence also act erratically?
22	A. Some do.
23	Q. And can those same people who are under the
24	influence also be unpredictable?
25	7 Some are

1	Q. It's just difficult to know what they're going to
2	do?
3	A. I'll agree with that.
4	Q. And would you agree it's very difficult to
5	deescalate with a person who's under the influence,
6	acting erratically and unpredictable?
7	A. We kind of talked about this in the last hour. It
8	certainly can be. Those things can be impediments to
9	effective communication or effective deescalation, but
10	it's certainly not 100 percent. It it doesn't it's
11	not an absolute.
12	So there are examples I can think of where
13	I've still been successful in my law enforcement
14	objective whatever that might be with people who
15	are under the influence. So it can be difficult, but
16	it's not 100 percent.
17	Q. In your training and experience, have suicide by
18	cop individuals injured or killed other law enforcement
19	officers to provoke a response?
20	A. And you said in my training and experience?
21	Q. Yes.
22	A. Okay. I don't believe I've ever been to a suicide
23	by cop where the subject expressing suicidal ideation, or
24	SBC as we've talked about, has successfully caused an

And I don't remember any case

25

officer to shoot them.

where an officer was hurt by a suicide by cop.

So in my experience, I'll say I'm not familiar with that. However, in my training, I will say I'm familiar, because I've been presented scenarios or articles or a -- training standards where I've been given examples of that happening. And certainly you can go to any of the police websites and search for that topic and find an example where an officer is talking about what happened with them, and how they got shot, or how they had to fire back, or what they would do differently.

So I do have some training, experience with that, but no real world experience of a subject being shot by police, SBC, or a subject shooting police that was SBC.

- Q. Would you agree research studies show a growing percentage of officer-involved shootings are being classified as SBC-related?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Would you agree that a suicide by cop-intent person who is under the influence of methamphetamine, has a dislike for law enforcement and is possibly delusional will present challenges to law enforcement attempting to communicate with that individual?
 - MR. DWYER: Objection. Asked and answered.

 Mr. Sweeney, if you have anything new to add,

go ahead. But I believe the question's been handled several times.

THE WITNESS: I would agree that someone with all of the things that you just mentioned, there could certainly present obstacles to law enforcement to deal with, yes.

MR. GROSS: Q. Would you agree that if a person was SBC-intent, their intent is that they don't want to deescalate, but they want to deliberately provoke law enforcement into shooting and killing them because that's their plan for suicide?

- A. I'm not sure I heard a question.
- Q. Would you agree with that statement? And I can repeat it.
 - A. Please.

- Q. Would you agree that an SBC-intent person -- would you agree that a person who is SBC-intent, their intention is not to deescalate, but their intention is to provoke a response for law enforcement to shoot and kill them completing their plan for suicide?
- A. That's an interesting question, because in some cases -- and, again, I don't have a lot of personal experience with this. I've been on some SBC calls, but thankfully they resolved successfully without anyone being hurt.

1	That being said, in the training that I
2	received or training manuals that I read or videos or
3	articles that I read online, sometimes someone who is SBC
4	is expressing a cry for help. Very similar to the person
5	that calls 911 and then takes the pills. They want to be
6	found. They don't want to die, but they don't know how
7	to get help. Or they want to cause a commotion or a stir
8	or to provoke a reaction from, let's say, a family or
9	roommate. So sometimes there are cases, in my, again,
10	training, that this could be a cry for help.
11	That being said, I think that oftentimes,
12	people are using SBC in order to end their life. I think
13	there is a goal there. But I don't think it's
14	100 percent.
15	Q. And in this case did you review information that a
16	red dot optic to a firearm was located in Mr. Hennefer's
17	truck?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And that there was a large knife also initially
20	found in Mr. Hennefer's truck; correct?
21	MR. DWYER: Objection to the characterization of
22	the knife as large. There was no physical description
23	given.
24	Go ahead, Mr. Sweeney, to the extent you know.

Yeah.

THE WITNESS:

There was a knife found on

1	the ground, is how I'll answer that question.
2	MR. GROSS: Q. There were also statements that
3	Deputy Eck observed when he stopped Mr. Hennefer
4	that there was the Bowie knife in the center console of
5	the truck; correct?
6	A. There were statements by Deputy Eck that he saw
7	the handle of what he thought was a knife. And I believe
8	he spoke to Deputy Saechao about it who was the acting
9	supervisor that day and he wrote something in his
10	statement that he thought it was a knife, but he wasn't
11	absolutely sure.
12	That being said, I think he was fairly
13	confident of what he saw. And when he was at the window
14	talking to Mr. Hennefer, he did see a knife near the
15	console, I believe, sticking down between the seat and
16	the console, and that's what he thought it was.
17	Q. And before Deputy Eck pulled his firearm, he made
18	repeated attempts with Mr. Hennefer to get him to calm
19	down; correct?
20	A. I don't remember
21	MR. DWYER: Objection.
22	THE WITNESS: those words.
23	MR. DWYER: Objection. You're characterizing, you
24	know, Mr. Hennefer's conduct.
25	Mr. Sweeney, to the extent you want to answer

- 1 the question and address it, address Mr. Hennefer's 2 conduct vis-a-vis Mr. -- Deputy Eck, go ahead. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't remember Deputy Eck stating 4 the words that he wanted Mr. Hennefer to calm down. 5 MR. GROSS: Q. Do you recall reading evidence that Deputy Eck spoke with Mr. Hennefer's wife and was at 6 7 the scene for 10 to 15 minutes before Mr. Hennefer 8 decided to attempt to leave; correct? 9 Α. That is correct. 10 And at one point, Mr. Hennefer eventually, against 11 Deputy Eck's direction, drives his truck towards 12 Deputy Eck; correct? 13 Not exactly. He said he drove it towards his 14 vehicle, but he wasn't in the vehicle at the time. 15 Deputy Eck was standing next to the truck as Ο. No. 16 Mr. Hennefer drove the truck forward? 17 That's what he said, yes. Α. 18 And that's what the -- that's what the evidence Ο. 19 shows. That's all you can rely on. 2.0 Α. Correct. 21 And at that point, Mr. Hennefer's decision to 0. 22 drive the truck forward, did that pose an immediate 23 threat to Deputy Eck's personal safety?
 - _____

Why not?

No.

Α.

Ο.

24

A. Again, only relying on what Deputy Eck wrote, he -- he didn't express anything about him being in fear for his life; being in fear of being injured. He said that Hennefer drove slowly and then, you know, of course jumping ahead -- I'll let you ask what happened later.

But, no, I don't remember he ever expressed anything about feeling like his personal safety was in danger from Mr. Hennefer driving.

- Q. And then Deputy Eck decided to draw his firearm; correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.0

- Q. And Mr. Hennefer's verbal response was to yell out "Shoot me. Shoot me. I want to die;" is that correct?
- A. I'd have to look back and make sure that was the immediate response. I do know that eventually -- at least according to Deputy Eck -- that those words were uttered. I'm not sure that that occurred at the immediate drawing of the firearm. I think it was pretty close to that.

But to answer your question with 100 percent surety, I would have to go back and look at the report and look at Deputy Eck's statement. So I believe those two came fairly close together about there's a possibility there was some other communication between the suicidal ideation.

- Q. And you're very critical of Deputy Eck for drawing his firearm -- and we'll get into that issue in a bit -- but is it -- is it fair to say that this was a critical juncture in the encounter between Mr. Hennefer and the deputies because things had significantly escalated at this point?
- A. I think that that is a pretty good summation between -- you've obviously read my report and you saw that I said until that happened, I was not critical of Deputy Eck's efforts. I thought that he made reasonable choices. I thought that he was trying to accomplish his law enforcement purpose, and I believe he had legal authority to be there and to investigate.

At the time he started drawing his firearm and displaying it to Mr. Hennefer in reaction, I think, to Mr. Hennefer driving the car, I think you're right. I think that's probably -- looking back at it, probably the key point where everything escalated and -- and went wrong with this encounter, so I would agree with that.

- Q. Your report seems to be lacking mention of Mr. Hennefer's obvious suicidal intent. It doesn't really pop up in any of your opinions within your report; is that correct?
 - MR. DWYER: Is there an actual question?
- MR. GROSS: Yeah.

1	MR. DWYER: I didn't hear a question. I heard
2	argument.
3	MR. GROSS: And then I said "is it correct."
4	MR. DWYER: Is what correct?
5	MR. GROSS: That his report doesn't discuss
6	Hennefer's suicidal intent.
7	MR. DWYER: This is Deputy Eck's report?
8	MR. GROSS: Mr. Sweeney's David's report.
9	MR. DWYER: Oh, okay. Go ahead, David.
10	THE WITNESS: No. I repeated what Deputy Eck
11	said, and I tried to be accurate in what he described;
12	what he heard; what he saw. And I think I did reflect
13	those sentiments that he expressed.
14	MR. GROSS: Q. So you didn't completely discount
15	Mr. Hennefer's suicidal remarks and provocative behavior
16	during the incident?
17	MR. DWYER: Objection. Asked and answered.
18	If you have anything further, Mr. Sweeney,
19	go ahead.
20	THE WITNESS: Nothing further. I didn't discount
21	it.
22	MR. GROSS: Q. How much did you consider
23	Mr. Hennefer's suicide by cop comments and behavior into
24	your final opinions within your expert report?
25	A. It was interesting to me that the idea his idea

1 of suicide by cop only came about when he had the firearm 2 drawn on him. So I certainly discuss that. There --3 there seemed to be a correlation, at least in time. 4 And, obviously, you're not an expert in forensic Q. 5 psychology or human behavior; correct? That is correct. 6 Α. 7 So we have no idea what Mr. Hennefer was thinking Ο. at the time of the incident; correct? 8 9 Α. I would almost always hesitate to state what 10 someone was thinking. That being said, there is 11 evidence, physical evidence, that Deputy Eck wrote in his 12 report that might give us some clues as to what 13 Mr. Hennefer was thinking. But, again, I -- as you know, 14 I can't put myself in his head. 15 Right. Ο. 16 But I can repeat what Deputy Eck said at the scene 17 and what he heard. 18 Exactly. We can only look at Mr. Hennefer's 19 behavior through the deputies who were interacting with 20 him because that's how law enforcement experts analyze 21 events. 22 Is this a question, Counsel? MR. DWYER: 23 MR. GROSS: Ο. Yes.

question the only way that an expert can analyze a

Okay. Let me make sure I understand. Is the

24

25

Α.

1 situation is based on the deputy's recall of the event? 2 Am I getting the flavor of the question? 3 Well, in this case, we can only analyze the events 4 as a law enforcement expert based on what deputies 5 perceived at the incident; correct? Objection. We don't know what the 6 MR. DWYER: 7 deputies actually perceived. We have a record of what 8 they say they perceived. So if you want to rephrase your 9 question. He has to evaluate the situation based on what 10 Deputy Eck and others reported in the incident report. 11 MR. GROSS: Well, we know what they perceived. 12 They testified to it. 13 But regardless of that baseless objection, David, 14 you can answer. 15 That's not the only thing. So it's a hard Α. 16 question to answer, but let me try. Certainly the 17 deputies in their statements, reports and depositions 18 expressed themselves as to what they saw, and sometimes 19 what they thought and what they felt. Not always, but 20 that's -- that's where I would get most of my 21 information, obviously, since I wasn't there, is based on 22 what the deputies wrote or what they said in a 23 deposition. 24 That being said, it's not the only method of

You can also look at the physical evidence,

25

analysis.

meaning, whether it's a map, a picture or a deputy describing their actions. And this is what I'm trying to get to.

So if a deputy is describing their actions, they might not tell you why. They might not say why they made a particular choice. So sometimes in those cases -- in fact, the very case that we're discussing today -- if a deputy doesn't tell me why, or even if they do tell me why, I still think it's within my realm of expertise to offer an opinion based on what the evidence showed happened. Does that make sense?

If I see that something happened -- let's use a real-world example. If Deputy Eck says that

Mr. Hennefer drove slowly back and forth on the road, he didn't really express anything of what he was feeling at that time. All that he said is that the guy's refusing to stop for me. I don't have much more opinion than that either; so I'm going to base it on what the evidence shows me.

And assuming that Deputy Eck is an honest individual, I assume that Mr. Hennefer drove his car -- or his truck back and forth on the road several times.

So I think in answer to your question, I can't base it solely on what a deputy feels or expresses. It's also based on what the evidence showed happened. Whether

that deputy expressed feelings or ideations with that, they may or may not.

- MR. GROSS: Q. As an expert, you don't want to be speculating; right?
- A. There's certain things you can speculate on. And sometimes I have speculated in reports about things that I don't have enough information on, and I might state that. I'll state something like, "I don't have enough information about whether it's A or B, but it's probably one of the two," right? I've written that in reports.

 "I don't know the specific answer to this," might be something that I would write.
 - O. Is there --

- A. Sometimes you do speculate. You do use your training and experience to say, "This is what I think happened, and this is why I think it happened."
- Q. Is there anything in your report with Mr. Hennefer that you speculated about?
- A. To answer that one, I think we'd have to go back and spend some time going through the report and looking at each and every opinion. So I'm -- I'm willing to do that, but I would require the time -- and I don't need a lot of time -- but I think that you and I would want to go back through the report page by page and look at each opinion and identify -- and then I could identify for you

1 if there was any speculations. 2 So at this point I'm not going to say that I 3 speculated on anything, but I certainly opined. trying to draw the difference between what's a 4 5 speculation, I guess, and what's an opinion. I think that's the difficulty I'm having with your question. 6 7 Okay. Let's take another break. Go MR. GROSS: 8 off the record. 9 MR. DWYER: That's fine, Counsel. 10 (Recess taken.) 11 MR. GROSS: O. David --12 Α. Yes. 13 -- do you have any criticism of the deputies who Ο. 14 may have considered Mr. Hennefer to be a threat to their 15 personal safety because he had immediate access to a 16 knife that they observed in the truck? 17 MR. DWYER: Objection. Assumes a lot of facts 18 that have not been established in time sequence at all at 19 the same time. When who observed a knife in the vehicle 20 at what time? When was the knife discarded from the 21 vehicle? Maybe Counsel could break the question down. 22 MR. GROSS: Q. Let's start with do you have any 23 criticisms of Deputy Eck, Deputy Aguirre, A-G-U-I-R-R-E, 24 Deputy Saechao, S-A-E-C-H-E-O, or Deputy Thorp, 25 T-H-O-R-P-E?

- 1 I remember all those four, and you're Α. 2 asking if I have any criticisms on what issue? 3 That they perceived a threat to their personal 4 safety because of the observation that Mr. Hennefer's in 5 the truck with access to the knife? It's kind of a multiple-part answer. 6 There's two Α. 7 parts to that. One is, yes, I recognize that there's a 8 knife in the vehicle. I -- I think Deputy Eck was 9 probably correct in his assumption as to what he saw. So 10 I think that the officers definitely have an officer 11 safety issue to be aware of. 12 But that's different than someone armed with a 13 knife that's now coming toward them. So that there is a 14 big difference between the two. One is a potential 15 safety hazard, whereas one is an actual safety hazard. 16 So it's kind of a two-part answer. 17 Are you familiar with red dot optical sights for 0. 18 firearms? 19 Α. I am familiar. I don't consider myself an expert, 20 but I've used them. I've shot with them. Yes. 21
 - Q. And would you agree that red dot sights they can be mounted on long guns but they can also be mounted on pistols?

23

A. They can be mounted on pistols. It's less common, but they can be. Yes.

David Sweeney
Q. And and would you agree that even though
Deputy Eck observed the red dot sight but didn't see a
firearm, it would be reasonable for deputies to consider
Mr. Hennefer has access to a firearm?
A. Deputy Eck wrote that he could not see a firearm.
And in the CAD records, it's noted as "UTL," meaning
unable to locate. I don't think that I would ever tell
an officer that there is no hazard present just because

I recognize that the presence of the red dot was appropriately noted by the officers at the scene.

Deputy Eck passed that information along to the other deputies, and it was a known topic of discussion for the officers at the scene. That's all appropriate.

you see the red dot. I'm not going to tell an officer

And I referenced that in my report.

And I also wrote that I recognize seeing the handle of the knife and the red dot optic are potential officer safety hazards that the team was aware of.

So in answer to your question, they knew it and they were aware of it, and they thought there was a potential for a weapon. And, yeah, I'm not into absolutes. If you see a red dot, there is the potential for a weapon. And I'm not going to state that there was no weapon present. You can never be 100 percent sure.

There have been people booked into jail that

2.0

- are armed even after a pat-down and the officer didn't locate the weapon that they've hidden on their person. So, right, you can never 100 percent state that someone is not armed. And, in fact, I would probably train officers never assume 100 percent that someone is not armed.
 - Q. And so the deputy's perception is that there's a red dot optic on the firearm but we don't see an actual firearm, it's still reasonable for them to believe there could be a firearm in this truck?
 - A. I think that is a reasonable, educated guess there might be a firearm. And I give them credit for that.

 And I wrote that in my report. I think that's reasonable based on what they saw, there might be.
 - Now, as to what chance there is, I don't know. But we can talk about that if you want to later. But as to the question that you asked, I think that they can, based on what they saw, think that there might be a firearm in that vehicle.
 - Q. And deputies at the scene made the decision to keep some distance between Mr. Hennefer and their police line; is that correct?
 - A. Yeah. We talked about that. Approximately 150 yards he drove down the road, and they stayed where they were based on what I read.

MR. DWYER: The question for Counsel, and also the witness, there were different times in the incident where deputies were near the car or at the car or at different distances.

So maybe we could clarify the question by

So maybe we could clarify the question by talking about whether we're talking about the initial part of the incident with just Deputy Eck, whether it's later with Deputy Eck, Aguirre and Saechao there. Or are we talking about later on when they moved down the road? Otherwise, we're going to have a very confused record.

MR. GROSS: Q. My question, David, was about once Mr. Hennefer drives his truck into the ditch, the sheriff's department doesn't move for a period of time to keep distance. You -- you saw evidence in the record of that?

A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. And one of the things the sheriff's department did was they requested a ballistic blanket and a ballistic shield at the scene. Did you see evidence of that?
 - A. I did.
- Q. And they also requested air support from CHP. Did you see information of that?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did you see information that the sheriff's department requested a drone as well to be at

1	the scene?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And the drone was there to provide constant visual
4	support for the team as they approached the truck; is
5	that your understanding?
6	A. Not entirely.
7	Q. Oh.
8	A. That was certainly one aspect of it, but I believe
9	they also used the drone as they stayed a distance
10	so they used it for observation prior to moving up.
11	Q. And would you agree that all of these actions that
12	we just talked about are consistent with deputies'
13	reasonable belief that Mr. Hennefer could be armed with a
14	firearm?
15	A. I think that you've changed my answer a little
16	bit. We didn't discuss reasonableness. We discussed is
17	there a possible situation where there could be a weapon
18	in that car, and I said I'm never going to say
19	100 percent.
20	Q. Okay. So going back, was it reasonable for
21	deputies to believe a firearm was in the truck?
22	MR. DWYER: Objection. Asked and answered.
23	Mr. Sweeney, go ahead and answer if you have
24	anything further to add to your prior answers.
25	THE WITNESS: And your question, Matt, was is it

reasonable to believe -- go ahead and ask it one more time, please.

MR. GROSS: Q. Is it reasonable that deputies believed Mr. Hennefer had a firearm in the truck based on the observations that there was a red dot optic inside the truck?

A. No.

- Q. Why is that not a reasonable belief by the Yuba County Sheriff's Department deputies?
- A. Because Deputy Eck had been at the vehicle. He spoke to Mr. Hennefer. They communicated back and forth. He, obviously, looked in the vehicle, and he described what he saw in that vehicle. He described Mr. Hennefer. He described the potential knife between the seat. He described seeing the red dot optic, but he could not see any weapon.

Now, it's possible there could be one there -I will give them that -- but I don't think it's
reasonable to say there's a weapon in that truck.
There -- it's true there was a red dot optic, but there's
another explanation as to what the purpose of the red dot
optic was.

Q. And so that's what I want to focus on; is why do you believe it wasn't reasonable for deputies to believe there was a firearm in the truck when they observed a red

dot optic on a firearm inside the truck?

2.0

A. I think it's reasonable to state -- just as I did -- I cannot 100 percent say that there's no weapon in that car. I can't say that. There might be, right? It was unreasonable because they never saw the weapon. There was never any threat of the weapon. There was never any discussion of the weapon. There was never any pointing of a weapon.

The deputies could state -- and I will agree with this -- that there is a potential for a weapon in that truck. I will not discount that. I -- I will -- I stated that in my report, and I state that here today in the deposition.

However, you also must look at the evidence that you're presented with and then decide, "What am I going to do based on the evidence that I have?" And that's where I found their decision unreasonable.

- Q. In -- I don't think I've heard it yet. Why is that belief unreasonable?
- A. Because they placed their safety above his safety and let him expire.
- Q. Isn't officer safety always the number one prerogative of law enforcement?
- A. It's an extremely important prerogative. I completely agree with you on that. And I preached

officer safety my whole career to anyone I've ever supervised or trained.

However, there are times when you look at the evidence that you're presented, and you decide, "We're going to take pathway A or pathway B. One of those might be that we're going to go up to the car," which they did. They overcame the fear or the threat that there was a weapon in that car. So they approached the car. The question is when did they approach?

So they -- or they chose pathway B, is, "We're going to wait back here. We're hanging out behind our cars. There might be a weapon in there." Yeah, there might be, but there's no evidence of that other than the red dot, right? But -- so the red dot is not a weapon. It can't harm you.

O. No.

- A. They've seen no weapon. Go ahead, Matt.
- Q. And the -- my question isn't about whether there could be or there couldn't be. It's about isn't a reasonable belief for Deputy Eck and the other deputies who were first responding to the scene to believe that Mr. Hennefer is armed based on the observation that there's a red dot optic?
- MR. DWYER: Objection.
- MR. GROSS: Q. And you said it's unreasonable.

1	So then my question is: Why do you believe that is
2	unreasonable?
3	MR. DWYER: He just answered that question,
4	Mr. Gross. So objection. Asked and answered.
5	Mr. Sweeney, do you have anything to add to your
6	previous answer on why it was unreasonable?
7	THE WITNESS: I think I was pretty thorough in
8	that I explained my answer to that. So I won't change
9	anything at this point. I could restate what I just
10	said, but that's it.
11	MR. GROSS: Q. Well and one of the things
12	and I don't think you answered that question, but one of
13	the things you said is, "Well, no one saw an actual
14	firearm." So is it your belief that it's only reasonable
15	if someone has a firearm if a deputy actually observes a
16	firearm?
17	MR. DWYER: Objection. Argumentative.
18	Mr. Sweeney, go ahead if you can.
19	THE WITNESS: No.
20	MR. GROSS: Q. Law enforcement can rely on
21	context clues. They don't need to see a firearm to
22	reasonably believe someone could be armed; correct?
23	A. There are times in law enforcement when you should
24	be evaluating all the clues that you're given, and that's
25	going to have an influence on the decisions that you

- make. Absolutely agree with you on that, Matt.
 - Q. And I think one of the statements in your report is that Mr. Hennefer said the -- the red dot optic was used for his tree trimming business?
 - A. I can't remember if that was information that the family actually relayed to law enforcement or if they asked about it. It was mentioned in the report, but I can't state at this time whether deputies knew -- they knew about the tree trimming business. But I don't know if they knew that red dot optics are used in tree trimming, you know, for measuring height and things like that. I don't know that for sure.

There's mention of it, and we could go back and look at it, and I -- I could tell you exactly. But off the top of my head, I know it's mentioned, but I'm not sure in what exact context.

- Q. Do you recall reading in the CAD report that dispatch reported to deputies that Mr. Hennefer had a prior encounter with the Nevada County Sheriff's Office? Do you recall reading about that?
 - A. I do.

- Q. And do you recall that dispatch reported that Mr. Hennefer made threats about purchasing a firearm and shooting up a hospital to get his son out?
 - A. There is the mention of that in the CAD I believe.

1 Yes.

2.0

- Q. So with this information that dispatch reports and Deputy Eck's observation that there's a red dot optic in the truck, why is it not reasonable for deputies to believe Mr. Hennefer has a firearm?
- A. I think there's certainly the possibility of it, right? I -- I don't discount that. I think that's certainly a possibility.

And when you see the red dot optic and you hear the threat, "I'm going to shoot up a hospital," I think those are reasonable -- those are reasonable -- those things aren't unreasonable. Those are bits of information that were presented to the deputies at the scene.

So they recognize those, and I recognize those too. However, we still don't have direct evidence that this individual is armed and that we must keep our distance. And, in fact, they eventually did decide to go up there. It's a question of when.

- Q. So is it your testimony that you need direct evidence of a firearm to reasonably believe that someone could be armed?
- 23 A. No.
- MR. DWYER: Objection. Argumentative. Asked and answered.

2.0

THE WITNESS: No. I won't go that far and state that you must have that. But as I look at the facts and circumstances here, I believe it was unreasonable to avoid any interaction with him because of a red dot optic.

There wasn't the direct evidence that they've seen a weapon in the car or even that he told them about a weapon, or "I'm going to get a gun and I'm going to force you to shoot me." He didn't say that. He just said, "Shoot me. Shoot me. Kill me." So that's the evidence that they're presented with.

- Q. Did you review evidence from Deputy Eck's testimony in his statement that Mr. Hennefer was, during the initial encounter, repeatedly noncompliant with his orders and kept moving his hands towards the steering wheel and reaching toward in the general vicinity of the knife?
- A. There was the discussion that he was reaching around in the vehicle. Yes.
- Q. And reaching towards the knife. He never grabbed the knife and brandished it, but he reached towards the knife and was told to stop?
- MR. DWYER: Objection, Counsel. I don't recall any such specific statement. I think we'd have to check -- actually look at the evidence on that because I

think your question assumes a fact not in evidence.

THE WITNESS: And I was going to say the same thing. I don't remember that specific description.

MR. GROSS: Q. Would Mr. Hennefer's noncompliance with Deputy Eck's command -- Deputy Eck's commands cause a reasonably-trained deputy to be more or less concerned for their officer safety?

- A. More concerned.
- Q. In deescalation situations, is it sometimes appropriate for officers to raise their voice to gain compliance?
- A. No.

2.0

- Q. Why is it not appropriate for an officer to raise their voice in order to gain compliance?
- A. The way I was trained, and the way I train others in deescalation, is that if you and I are having a conversation like we are today, we're not raising our voices with each other; we're discussing situations; we're talking back and forth.

And my goal is to deescalate you in order to convince you to do something: To leave; to put your hands behind your back; whatever the case might be. I think that's definitely deescalation.

My training that I received, and the training that I provide to others, is when you start raising your

1 voice, you're now issuing commands and it's harder for 2 someone to -- you've escalated the situation. 3 Now, it might be entirely appropriate. I've 4 raised my voice many times with people. There are times 5 when that's necessary and appropriate. At this point you've veered away from deescalation and you're into 6 7 command and control. Not saying it's wrong or right or 8 anything like that, but at that point you're not working 9 towards deescalation, you're working towards command and 10 control. 11 Ο. Does -- does that prior statement change when 12 there's concerns about officer safety? 13 Α. No. 14 MR. DWYER: Objection. Go ahead. Objection to 15 the question. 16 But if you understand the question, Mr. Sweeney, 17 go ahead. 18 THE WITNESS: T do. No. 19 MR. GROSS: Q. On page 14 of your report, you 20 make statements that Deputy Eck and Aguirre, their decision to draw their firearms was a violation of 21 22 Policy 428 when dealing with crisis intervention 23 incidents. My question is: What specifically did they 24 violate in Policy 428 by drawing their firearms?

MR. DWYER: Counsel, when you say "page 14,"

1	you're referring to page 14 in the lower right-hand
2	corner or page 14 by PDF number in I think it points
3	to the paragraph or section or a number.
4	MR. GROSS: Page 14 at the bottom.
5	MR. DWYER: Okay. And what paragraph are you
6	looking at?
7	MR. GROSS: The paragraph that's not numbered.
8	MR. DWYER: Begins "Up until this point"?
9	MR. GROSS: Yes.
10	MR. DWYER: All right. Thank you.
11	THE WITNESS: So I found where you're looking on
12	page 14. And then looking at the policy deescalation
13	policy, there is a section there that I need to find.
14	MR. DWYER: Matt, while he is looking to find the
15	section, do you want to go ahead and mark that as an
16	exhibit, the document?
17	MR. GROSS: Sure. Let's make that exhibit
18	we'll call that C. Exhibit ${ t A}$ and ${ t B}$ Exhibit ${ t A}$ will be
19	his report. Exhibit ${\tt B}$ will be the rebuttal report.
20	Exhibit C will be Policy 428 and Exhibit D will be 404.
21	(Exhibits A, B, C and D were
22	identified for the record.)
23	MR. GROSS: That's fine with me, Counsel.
24	Thank you.
25	THE WITNESS: So there's a few sections I found.

1	And then I think to be most accurate, I should also look
2	at the section in my report where I discuss this in more
3	detail.
4	But right off the top, page let's go to
5	Policy 428.6, Deescalation. Bullet point 3. "Be
6	patient, polite, calm, courteous and avoid overreacting."
7	Bullet point 4. "Speak and move slowly and in a
8	non-threatening manner." And then at the bottom of that
9	one still in 428.6 "Responding deputies generally
10	should not use stances or tactics that can be interpreted
11	as aggressive."
12	And the last bullet point there, "Argue, speak
13	with a raised voice or use threats to obtain compliance."
14	MR. GROSS: Q. Are there any other specific
15	policies within 428 that you believe were violated?
16	A. That's a big question. To do that, we would want
17	to go back to the report and look at, I believe, it's (e)
18	where I discuss the policies and what went right and what
19	went wrong.
20	MR. DWYER: Mr. Sweeney, can you give us the page
21	number in Exhibit 1 or excuse me, Exhibit A.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	MR. GROSS: Q. Looking at Exhibit A, pages 28
24	through 30, this is where there's more discussion on
25	the your opinions about the failure to follow relevant

1	policies.
2	A. Right.
3	Q. And specifically just focusing on the decision to
4	draw firearms and point them at Mr. Hennefer
5	A. Yes.
6	Q and in reviewing your report, what specific
7	policy violations do you believe occurred?
8	MR. DWYER: I do have to say an objection. He's
9	already answered that, but he may have some additional
10	because he just reviewed Policy 428 and cited sections to
11	you.
12	Mr. Sweeney, if you have additional policy
13	sections or information about either 428 or something
14	else that they violated, go ahead.
15	THE WITNESS: While I'm looking through the rest
16	of the policy well, that wouldn't be responsive to
17	your question, so let me back away from that. Let me
18	continue looking through the policy and what I wrote.
19	I think on page 29 of my report, item No. 7, "It
20	is apparent that deputies knew Hennefer was on drugs,
21	both from his behavior and from the family members'
22	intelligence. Deputy Eck threatened Mr. Hennefer
23	unnecessarily by pointing his gun at him.
24	"Eck's actions were excessive for someone who
25	was" suspecting of "suspected of committing two

was" suspecting of -- "suspected of committing two

misdemeanors.

2.0

"Mr. Hennefer's resulting requests for deputies to kill him shows that he was unable to understand commands or to appreciate the consequences of his actions or inactions.

"Mr. Hennefer's behavior and lack of movement meant that deputies had an opportunity to approach and get Medical help for Mr. Hennefer."

This goes to Policy 428. Because what the policy is designed to do is to show deputies examples of behaviors that would be recommended dealing with someone who is experiencing a mental health crisis, as Mr. Hennefer clearly was.

He was suicidal, we've discussed that. He was on drugs, we've discussed that. He had other mental health conditions that we've discussed. So you factor all these things together, and what I believe Policy 428 is trying to show you is you must take these things into consideration when you're deciding how you're going to handle someone.

And Deputy Eck decided that the best way to handle him was to point a gun at him and start shouting at him. And I believe it had the opposite effect rather than deescalating, as the policy is talking about. It escalated him. So that's the first one. Would be page

1 29, No. 7.

- Q. And Policy 428.5 titled "First Responders," the first sentence of that subsection of the policy states, "Safety is a priority for first responders." And that's correct -- or that's what the policy says.
 - MR. DWYER: Is there a question, Counsel?
- 7 MR. GROSS: Yeah.
 - MR. DWYER: You asked him to confirm what you just stated the policy to be?
 - MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Yeah. That that's what the policy says?
 - A. It does say that. 428.5. "Safety is a priority for first responders."
 - Q. So I guess my question is: Where did Deputy Eck violate Policy 428 by pulling his firearm?
 - A. I discussed that a few minutes ago with the idea of escalating him and practically -- I don't know this for sure. What I can state, the facts show that after he pulled his gun is when Mr. Hennefer started talking about wanting the deputies to kill him.
 - So, again, I can't state that that -- that one caused the other, but certainly Mr. Hennefer was escalated at that point, and he was not calmed by the actions of Deputy Eck. So it's the opposite of deescalation. It's escalation.

1	Q. And would part of your answer also be based on
2	what we discussed previously, that you believe it was
3	unreasonable for deputies to believe Mr. Hennefer was
4	armed?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you
7	A. The other one sorry, Matt. Are we still on the
8	question of going through Policy 428 and identifying
9	issues?
10	Q. I have one other question about Policy 428.
11	A. Okay.
12	Q. On on the next page, 428.6 about deescalation,
13	you reference that there were some bullet points that
14	during the initial encounter, Deputy Aguirre,
15	Deputy Eck they're pointing their firearms, that you
16	believe they violated portions of 428.6. Do you remember
17	stating that?
18	A. I do.
19	Q. But 428.6 states that deputies, "should generally"
20	and that "responding deputies generally should not." So
21	aren't these more guidelines and suggestions than actual
22	hard and fast rules?
23	A. It's an interesting question, and it occurs every
24	time you read policies that state what you will do and
25	what you won't do, and what you should do and what you

1 should not do.

So I can see an interpretation that the manual -- which came from Lexipol -- is talking about things that officers should do and things that they shouldn't do.

In -- in general -- I mean, we could go
through it line by line, but I'm in agreement with that.
The question comes down to the wording. For what purpose
do the command staff of Yuba County decide, "We're going
to put this in the manual, but it's just a 'should.'
It's a recommendation, but we're not going to hold you
accountable for it"?

That puts officers in difficult positions.

Any time you start getting into "should" and "should not," it renders the manual somewhat incomplete, because an officer is not told that they can or cannot. It just says "should" or "should not." So it's problematic on the part of Yuba County to leave the officers hanging.

Because if you read this the way I'm reading it, these are things that should be happening here. And if they are not, then we need to ask why they weren't or why they were. Whichever case you're looking at.

- O. So --
- A. So it's a common question that occurs in police manuals, and it's not recommended because it's hard to

- hold someone accountable for that. Yet, you can see the desire of the department to explain their expectation to the officers. So it's -- it's a complicated question and answer. But that's the best way I can answer that.
- Q. When you were at the Seattle Police Department, did they subscribe to Lexipol for policies?
 - A. No.

- Q. Did they have their own general orders?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you know if that's still the case today?
- A. As far as I know, it is. I haven't looked at the SPD manual in a couple years, though. So I'm not sure 100 percent is my best answer.
 - Q. What is your understanding of Lexipol?
- A. It's an organization designed to help law enforcement. Lexipol provides training particularly -- they're very heavy into the online videos. So you can go to Lexipol or PoliceOne, which, I believe, is published by Lexipol, and you can have videos and suggestions on how to handle a variety of different scenarios.

Probably their biggest contribution would be the Lexipol manual, which departments pay quite a bit of money for. But if you don't have the time or the ability or the desire to write your own police manual, Lexipol will send you one for a certain price. And I don't know

what the price is, but I know it's expensive. And then you can publish that as your own police or sheriff's department manual.

Some departments will alter the language that they get, but I believe that it's recommended you accept the policies as is, unless they come in violation with, perhaps, you have a local ordinance or a state law or something like that.

But Lexipol's pretty good about sending general enough policies that they're probably, as far as I know, the number one company to provide police manuals to the departments.

Q. In fact, I think the last number I saw was over 850 police agencies rely on Lexipol for the outline of their own policies. They subscribe to Lexipol for policies.

So you -- you seem critical that Yuba County has relied on Lexipol for Policy 428, because it has -- it makes references to "should generally" and "should not generally." But previously you also mentioned -- and I'd agree -- every law enforcement call-out is a different circumstance. Every suspect is different.

So isn't it reasonable that the policy has language that says, "We would generally like officers to do this," and "We would generally like to avoid officers

doing this, " because every circumstance is different?

A. That is certainly one explanation; that because of the wide variety of law enforcement response and the wide variety of people that you're going to come in contact with, there is no 100 percent absolute right way to do every single situation.

In fact, you can insert two officers in a situation, and one will handle it one way and it's fine, and one handles it one way, and that's fine too. So that's common enough.

So I think in answer to your question, I think that's the answer that I'm providing. That -- that that is one of the reasons why you have ideas of "should" and "should not." Even though they're problematic for the officer, I think the department's trying to express what they want to happen, but they realize there might be exceptions.

- Q. And it sounds like from your answer you're a little bit critical of that decision of having open language, "should" and "should not." Is that a fair reading?
- A. I think I've provided a reasonable explanation of why that language is there, because it's impossible to accurately describe all the situations law enforcement officers might find themselves in on a day-to-day basis.

So I think that we have the specific language of "should," and this one is "should generally." You can see that right there under 428.6.

I think at the same time, though, that the department is expressing how they want to see this handled, and they're also making a suggestion on how you're going to be the most successful. And escalating someone is usually not going to be as successful as deescalating them. It can result in more force being used, et cetera.

- Q. Would you agree that department policies are often more restrictive than state statutes or court rulings?
- A. It's my experience that a good police manual should try to mirror those state statutes that we discussed this morning. A good police manual also should rely on what the latest court case says.

Let's say about when you can search a vehicle.

Well, if you're going to write a vehicle search policy,

it might behoove the legal advisor to say, "Great.

Please send me the policy after you've written it. I'll

verify that it conforms with either state statute or case

law or both." So I believe that those two can go hand in

hand and should.

Now, there are many things in a police manual that are not codified in, let's say, state law or case

1 Case law is not going to get into an issue whether law. 2 an officer should be on time for roll call or not, right? 3 So there's many things in the manual that are 4 specific to law enforcement: Maybe uniform violations or 5 how to -- how to log your body-worn video, right? there's a lot of things -- it -- I'm trying to answer 6 7 your question. 8 There are a lot more things that you'll find 9 in a police manual that you won't find in case law or in 10 state statutes, I think is the best way I can answer 11 that. 12 And would you also agree that courts have said law 13 enforcement officers that violate a department policy --14 scratch that question. 15 Would you agree that courts say that law 16 enforcement officers don't need to strictly abide by a 17 department policy unless it creates an underlying constitutional violation? 18 19 MR. DWYER: Objection. You're asking him to, you 20 know -- first of all, object to the question that it's 21 trying to summarize a massive body of law in one 22 sentence, and it's not possible to do that. 23 And, two, you're asking Mr. Sweeney to answer a 24 question which is pretty impossible to even define. So I

don't think there's any way he can possibly answer it.

1	Mr. Sweeney, if you have something safe to say
2	about it, go ahead.
3	THE WITNESS: Matt, could you ask me one more
4	time.
5	MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Would you agree that the
6	courts have said that even if an officer violates a
7	department policy, it does not it does not become an
8	issue unless there's an underlying constitutional
9	violation that occurs?
10	MR. DWYER: Mr. Sweeney, if you have specific
11	knowledge of a case
12	THE WITNESS: I don't. Nothing comes to mind. I
13	don't think I can really answer that. I don't know at
14	this point.
15	MR. GROSS: And, Patrick, let's keep the speaking
16	objections to a minimum. Just legal objections.
17	MR. DWYER: My objection is that you're asking him
18	for a legal statement. And so I told him I told the
19	witness unless he has specific memory of specific case
20	law, he shouldn't be answering the question. I think
21	that's a very appropriate objection.
22	MR. GROSS: Then just, "Objection. Calls for a
23	legal conclusion." That's the objection.
24	MR. DWYER: Well
25	MR. GROSS: Q. David, have you ever taught the

laws of arrest, search and seizure to other law enforcement officers?

A. Yes.

- Q. In what setting have you taught other law enforcement officers? For instance, at the police academy, in-house training, as a private contractor or maybe as in an academic setting?
- A. For several years, many years, I was a member of the SPD training cadre. What that means is that you train Seattle Police employees in a variety of disciplines in both the classroom setting -- usually at our training facility is where those would take place -- and then we have additional locations where we then go and practice those lessons, let's say.

So I've not taught at the academy or in a strictly classroom setting like college. I think that answers the question. The training would be in-service training mostly for veteran officers.

Sometimes for rookie officers that arrive out of the academy we might have what we call POST LETA Academy, which means it's an academy for brand new officers that are just out of the academy. And that's a state academy. So now we're going to train them in some of the Seattle Police specific things that we want them to know about. So I think that's my best answer for

1 that.

- Q. Have you authored any peer-reviewed papers, articles or training manuals on the subject of arrest, search and seizure?
 - A. No.
- Q. And have you ever been qualified as an expert on the subject matter of arrest, search and seizure?
 - A. No.
- Q. Based upon, kind of, your general law enforcement education, background and experience, I want to ask some questions about the laws of search, seizures and arrest. Can you tell me the three basic types of encounters that a law enforcement officer might have with the public.
- A. Yes. One might be a consensual encounter. You're just meeting someone on the street. The person's free to leave. You're free to leave. And you're just having a casual personable encounter.

The second one might be a Terry stop. You have reason to believe that someone might have committed a crime, and you're allowed to detain that person for a reasonable amount of time while you investigate the circumstances.

And if you then proceed to the third level, which would be probable cause, if you believe it more likely than not that the individual did commit a certain

1	crime, probable cause then allows you to make a physical
2	arrest of that person.
3	Q. And you sort of covered this, but I want to give
4	you a chance to fully answer. What does reasonable
5	suspicion allow an officer to do?
6	MR. DWYER: Objection. "Reasonable suspicion" in
7	regards to what?
8	MR. GROSS: Q. If an officer has reasonable
9	suspicion.
10	MR. DWYER: Of what? Crime being committed? Or
11	reasonable suspicion that it's Sunday? Reasonable
12	suspicion of what, Counsel?
13	MR. GROSS: Patrick, did you think my question was
14	did a reasonable does an officer have reasonable
15	suspicion that it's Sunday? Really?
16	MR. DWYER: I don't know what you're asking, Matt.
17	So just define your question.
18	MR. GROSS: Q. David, did you understand my
19	question?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Okay. Thank you. Can you answer it?
22	A. In my experience, when a police officer talks
23	about reasonable suspicion, they're talking about certain
24	facts that they've come across that indicates a
25	nossibility someone might have been involved in a grime

You've not met the standard of probable cause, but you believe something might have happened. And I can give you a hundred examples of what that might be, but let's keep it in general terms.

There are certain facts and circumstances that have been known to the officer that leads them to believe there might be a crime afoot. And that allows you to investigate that crime. And if someone's there, and you have a reasonable suspicion that they might have been involved in that, you can detain them for a reasonable amount of time while you investigate.

And at the end of your investigation -- again, the law does not specify what that exact time limit is and every situation is different, but it has to be reasonable -- you are then going to make a determination "I have probable cause to arrest you for the crime," and then the officer can do whatever it is what is in their purview.

In general, we're talking about handcuffs and placed in the back of a police car, let's say. If they don't meet the probable cause standard, they still have some facts, they can't prove it, they don't believe they've met the -- the definition of probable cause, perhaps then they might write a report.

Perhaps they came across some broken windows

2.0

and they found someone nearby, but they didn't find
anything else to prove that this guy did it, but they
might still write a report or field contact report to
indicate, "Hey, I found this suspicious situation, and I
found this individual, but I can't prove that he or she
was the one who broke the window, but I'm just going to
write a report on it because who knows, there might be
more information that comes in later that can allow me to
tie this person to the crime." Let's say a fingerprint
maybe, and you test the fingerprint, and you go, "Oh, it
was the guy, " and, therefore, you could then have your
probable cause.

- Q. What does the term "subjective standard of proof" mean to you?
- A. It's not a common term that I've used before.

 But -- so I -- I guess I'll leave it at that. It's not a commonly-used phrase. Those are common words, and I could hazard a guess. But it's not a phrase that I am used to using in police work.
- Q. What does the term "objective standard of proof" mean to you?
- A. Objectivity is where something is more -- subjective refers to feelings and decisions made based on your guesses, hunches, information known to you.
 - Objective means -- means less subjectivity

almost. It's kind of related, but somewhat opposite at
the same time. It means that something's been a
certain standard has been put into effect, whether it's
written down or whether it's common knowledge or or
something, but it's very objective; meaning, you've
removed that level of subjectivity from your assessment

- Q. Does reasonable suspicion require a subjective or objective standard of proof?
 - A. That is a subjective standard.

- Q. Do educated guesses count as reasonable suspicion?
- A. That's an interesting question.

MR. DWYER: Before you answer, I want to state my objection. I have no idea where this question is going. It doesn't seem to be at all relevant to anything in the lawsuit.

But -- so if the question could focus on something that happened at the incident or something that the expert's report is about, that would be very helpful to the witness. Otherwise, I'd advise the witness not to speculate. We're here to discuss his reports about a specific incident.

THE WITNESS: One more time with the question, Matt, please.

MR. GROSS: Q. Do educated guesses count when an officer's trying to determine that they have reasonable

suspicion?

MR. DWYER: Same objection. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: One thing that comes to mind is that courts will give some deference to an officer's experience. And let's say an officer has worked 10 years in narcotics and they see a particular action on the street based on their experience -- sorry, my dog has entered the frame. You need to go out -- the courts will give deference to an officer's experience.

And I was stating the example of a narcotics detective who's done that job for 10 years has a lot of experience, and the Court will give some recognition, more so than the brand new officer who thinks they saw something, but they don't really know because they've not really come across that in their experience.

So I'm not going to state that the detective in this hypothetical situation is -- is guessing. They have to still rely on facts. But maybe there's inferences that these facts lead them to believe they've now met the reasonable suspicion standard or the probable cause standard. Whatever -- whatever the case might be.

So are those educated guesses? I would -- I would hesitate to say that an officer is ever guessing, but sometimes your experience can give you hunches and ideas that maybe an inexperienced officer wouldn't have.

You still have to rely on facts in order to proceed wherever we are in that chain, whether it's reasonable suspicion or probable cause. So, again, I'm not going to state that an officer is just going to guess, because a guess is not going to hold up in court -- as you know -- but it might lead you to continue to investigate something that a brand new officer might not.

MR. GROSS: Q. And you mentioned for a bit probable cause. What does "probable cause" refer to? Can you explain that.

MR. DWYER: Objection. For the record, I have no idea why we're having this discussion. We're here to review the expert's opinions about the incident. This question has been -- so far been going on for about a half hour, and has nothing to do with the incident. So I object to it.

Go ahead, Mr. Sweeney.

THE WITNESS: It's a subjective standard that an officer needs in order to make an arrest or to apply for a warrant. So it's basically stating that, based on your training and experience, you believe that more likely than not that a crime has occurred.

The courts do not require the officer to prove the case out on the street, but they have to meet the

1 probable cause standard if they're going to make an 2 arrest or apply for a warrant. And to a reasonable 3 officer, that means more likely than not that a 4 particular crime has occurred, and you can then take 5 action based on that crime. MR. GROSS: O. And I think you answered this, 6 7 that the probable cause is a subjective standard? 8 Α. Yes, it is. What is the difference between what an officer can 9 Ο. 10 do when they have probable cause versus reasonable 11 suspicion? 12 We kind of talked about this. 13 I was going to continue my objection MR. DWYER: 14 to this line of questioning. It's totally irrelevant. 15 Go ahead, Mr. Sweeney. 16 THE WITNESS: When you have reasonable suspicion, 17 it allows you to detain someone for a reasonable amount 18 of time to investigate whether a crime has occurred. 19 You've not met the probable cause standard at that point, 20 but you think something might have happened. 21 Again, I talked about a crime is afoot, we might 22 The difference between that and probable cause is 23 you've now accumulated enough facts that you use your 24 training and experience and your subjectivity to state

now I have enough facts that it seems more likely than

1 not that this person did commit this crime. 2 And if you believe that they did, it allows you 3 to then take whatever next step is appropriate for the crime; whether that be a citation, a warning, an arrest, 4 5 whatever is appropriate for that level of crime. MR. GROSS: O. What circumstances or reasonable 6 7 beliefs does an officer need to conduct a Terry search? MR. DWYER: We've been over this Terry search 8 9 subject earlier. So asked and answered. My other 10 objection is this line of questioning has nothing to do 11 with the reason we're here today. 12 Go ahead, Mr. Sweeney. 13 THE WITNESS: So I've not heard of a Terry search 14 particularly, but I have heard of searching during a 15 Terry stop. Is that what you're talking about? 16 MR. GROSS: Q. Yeah. Let's -- searching during a 17 Terry stop --18 Okay. Α. 19 -- what circumstances are reasonable, at least 20 does an officer need? 21 An officer needs to state objective facts that Α. 22 lead them to believe there's a possibility of a weapon. 23 And, in general, that means a pat-down of the outer 24 clothing and the pockets. In general, it's not for going

into pockets and pulling out small items.

As you touch, as you feel, as you pat down, you have to use your training and experience to say, "I believe that I felt the handle of a gun in his pocket."

Or you see a particular suspicious bulge or something like that.

So these facts might be enough for an officer to then state why they needed to do a search. And, again, it's probably not a search, Matt. It's probably going to be a pat-down at that point. You can search incident to arrest, but I think I'll stop my answer there because it's really a pat-down, and you have to base it on your training and experience.

And there also might be other factors: A number of suspects present, high crime in the area.

Maybe this particular crime involves an extreme threat of violence.

Let's say, you came across a dead body, and there's someone near there and maybe there's some facts that lead you to believe this might be the person that killed that person. Well, the Court's going to give you more leeway in your pat-down to make sure that you're safe. And if you're alone, they might give you the ability to even handcuff while there's investigation of the serious crime.

But if you're stopping a jaywalker, you're

1	probably it's going to be hard to justify that that
2	pat-down during that Terry stop, per se. In fact, I
3	would hesitate to say a jaywalker is probably not worthy
4	of a Terry shop. But make it something simple like a
5	shoplift or something.
6	MR. GROSS: Thank you. Let's go off the record.
7	(Lunch recess taken.)
8	MR. GROSS: We are back on the record after a
9	lunch break. David, hopefully you had an enjoyable break
10	and got some food to eat for lunch.
11	Q. I wanted to continue with the line of questioning
12	regarding law enforcement's responsibilities during
13	traffic stops and what's required.
14	A. Sure.
15	Q. I just wanted to confirm that you don't have any
16	criticism of Deputy Eck for the initial detention
17	regarding Mr. Hennefer being potentially trespassing and
18	driving under the influence.
19	A. No. In fact, I wrote that in my report.
20	Q. And you made before the break you made
21	reference that Mr. Hennefer had committed two misdemeanor
22	crimes. Were those the ones you were referencing:
23	Trespassing and driving under the influence?
24	A. Yes. And "committed," I don't think I wrote that.
25	I think I wrote something about the deputy had a

- reasonable suspicion or probably, you know -- it's possible that he could have had probable cause, too. I didn't really opine one way or the other, but I did believe he had the right to stop Mr. Hennefer.
- Q. Based on your law enforcement education, your training and experience, can you tell us how a peace officer takes someone into custody? In other words, arrests them.
- A. Sure. The most common thing to do is to tell someone they're under arrest, "Put your hands behind your back," and you place handcuffs on the wrists, and then you generally transport them. You might be going to jail, or you might be going back to the police station. Depends on your level of investigation, what the crime is.
- Q. Did Deputy Eck ever inform Mr. Hennefer that he was being detained or not free to leave?
- A. He did write that in his report, that, yes, he told him he was not free to leave, and that he was under investigation for driving while under the influence.
- Q. Do you remember at what point in the traffic stop this occurred? When Deputy Eck said this?
- A. I don't know exactly, but my impression of his statement was that this occurred shortly before

 Mr. Hennefer decided to drive away and Deputy Eck drew

his pistol -- drew his gun. So it was somewhat later in the stop.

- I -- I think he even wrote initially that he was going to release him to a family member, which seems fine, other than the fact that I think he properly recognized, "Oh, wait a sec. This is a public roadway, and this guy's driving while he's on drugs." So I think he certainly had enough cause to at least stop and investigate that potential crime as well.
- Q. Did you review any documents or statements from Deputy Eck that showed Mr. Hennefer voluntarily submitted to the detention?
- A. Well, when you talk about "detention," yes.

 Initially he was understanding that -- that he was not leaving. And it appears from the report that they had a conversation at the vehicle; that Hennefer called a family member; he called an attorney; he began recording the deputy with his phone.

I think that was when some of the other people arrived, so that might have been after he tried to drive away. I'm not exactly sure without looking. So, yeah.

So I think initially he cooperated with the detention. And, again, "detention," I'm saying just the stop, right? He positioned his car to stop Hennefer's truck. So I'm not saying detention was an arrest at that

point. It hadn't been attempted.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. At what point during the traffic stop did Mr. Hennefer stop complying with the detention?
- A. When he started to put his truck in drive and drove northbound, if -- if my directions are correct, I believe that's right. He drove northbound in reverse, I believe, judging by the picture.

So he drove backwards up the road. And then he was driving backwards and forwards, and that went on several times. But in answer to your question, it's when he put his car in gear and drove away from the officer.

- Q. Did Deputy Eck ever tell Mr. Hennefer that he was being arrested?
- A. I don't remember that phrase. I remember he -- him saying something about being detained while he investigated for driving while under the influence.
- Q. And -- and did you read any statements from Deputy Eck or other deputies that Mr. Hennefer voluntarily submitted to a formal arrest?
- A. No.
- Q. And none of the deputies at the scene were able to physically arrest Mr. Hennefer; correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. One of the issues was they were never able to get close enough to him to arrest him; correct?

1	A. Incorrect. They never tried.
2	Q. What do you mean by "they never tried"?
3	A. They didn't move up to his vehicle; particularly
4	after it became stuck in the ditch. Not until 4:30,
5	1630, after he died. That was the only time they
6	approached.
7	Q. Do you have any evidence that Mr. Hennefer was in
8	the formal custody, care or control of the deputies?
9	A. Custody, no. He had not been arrested. Care, I
10	think there were plenty of discussions about that they
11	wanted to get him help, but I wouldn't say he was under
12	their care. And what was the third one?
13	Q. Control.
14	A. Control. I believe that Deputy Eck told
15	Mr. Hennefer that he was not free to leave and to stop
16	his vehicle, but he did not. So I would say that that
17	was verbal control only. He didn't have hands on him.
18	He didn't prevent him from putting the vehicle in gear.
19	So I'll say that he was not in their control as well.
20	Q. Would you agree that Mr. Hennefer was continually
21	verbally resistant to the detention and arrest?
22	A. No.
23	Q. Why not?
24	A. You said "continually," and I from what I read,

this was not a continual process.

25

There were times

- certainly when he refused to exit the vehicle; where he refused to come out from behind the car door, and various explanations were given as to why he would not do that, but I wouldn't say it was continual.
- Q. Up until the point that he drove the car into the ditch, would that be fair to say that he was verbally resistant?
- A. Yes. It's more of a general statement without the word "continual." Yes, I would agree with that.
- Q. Up until the point that he drove his truck into the ditch, was he physically resistant to the detention and arrest?
- MR. DWYER: Objection. There's nothing in the record saying that they were attempting to arrest him. They detained him. So there's nothing in the evidence that I've seen that there's actually an arrest. They detained him. So maybe you could rephrase the question, Counsel.
- MR. GROSS: Q. David, would you agree that the records show Mr. Hennefer was physically resistant to the detention up to the point of driving his truck into the ditch?
- 23 A. No.

- Q. Why not?
 - A. There were verbal commands given to him, and he

disobeyed some of those commands. But there was no hands-on effort made by the deputies. So he was not physically resistant to them.

- Q. So he was -- he was physically resistant to their verbal commands in that he didn't comply, but he didn't -- well, he moved away from deputies. He drove away from them. Is that not physically resistant?
- A. When I think of resistance, I'm more akin to the idea of resisting arrest. So when you use the word "resistance," certainly I've talked about how he refused their verbal orders. But as far as resistant, I would not consider him a resistant suspect.

There were no hands-on efforts, and,
therefore, no -- some of the things you normally see in
resisting arrest: Twisting, pushing, refusing to put
your hands behind your back. Those are the type of
things that I, generally, would consider resistant.

- Q. I'm not asking for a legal opinion here. I'm just asking for your training and experience as a law enforcement officer. Can you think of any codified law enforcement practice regarding law enforcement efforts, responsibilities to provide life-saving measures to someone that is not in their formal custody, care or control?
 - A. So the comment about a legal conclusion didn't

1	refer to the prior question. This is in reference to the
2	current question?
3	Q. Yes. And I'm not looking for a legal conclusion.
4	I'm looking for just your experience in law enforcement.
5	A. Now I understand. With that caveat in mind, can
6	you ask the question one more time.
7	Q. Yeah. Can you think of any codified law
8	enforcement practices requiring law enforcement officers
9	to provide life-saving measures to someone who is not in
10	law enforcement's custody, care or control?
11	A. I'm going to say that "codified" moves to that
12	definition that you and I talked about earlier this
13	morning. "Codifying" meaning something that's written
14	down in the law, that's enacted by legislature, and I
15	cannot think of anything.
16	Q. Do you intend to offer opinions that the
17	sheriff's department and its deputies had a duty or
18	obligation to provide immediate medical care to
19	Mr. Hennefer?
20	MR. DWYER: Again, you're asking for a legal
21	opinion. So, one, that's not an accurate statement of
22	law. And, two, you're asking him to give a legal opinion
23	about an inaccurate statement of the law. Maybe you
24	could break it down for him as a law enforcement officer.

MR. GROSS:

Q.

David, as a law enforcement

_	
1	officer so we're not talking about legal opinions,
2	just in your training and experience do you intend to
3	offer any opinions that the sheriff's department deputies
4	needed to provide immediate medical care to Mr. Hennefer?
5	A. No.
6	Q. I want to skip ahead to your rebuttal report.
7	Exhibit B
8	A. Sure.
9	Q and work through some of this.
LO	On page 4 on the bottom of Exhibit B,
L1	underneath the first opinion, you wrote that, "Deputy Eck
L2	knew Mr. Hennefer's state of mind." How can you opine
L3	that Deputy Eck knew Mr. Hennefer's state of mind?
L4	A. I'm only going by his descriptions of
L5	Mr. Hennefer's mind being confused, erratic, prone to
L6	delusion and not fully comp fully comprehending his
L7	surroundings, the deputies' orders, even where he was at.
L8	So there were several statements made by
L9	Deputy Eck referring to some of the behaviors exhibited
20	by Mr. Hennefer.
21	And the general theory was, apparently, backed
22	up by the family, that he was suffering from mental
23	health issues, and he had relapsed and was using
24	narcotics. And that this behavior really reflected his

state of mind and directed -- maybe not directed, it

1 certainly influenced his behaviors on that day. 2 So when -- when you say Deputy Eck knew Ο. 3 Mr. Hennefer's state of mind, what you meant was you're 4 basing that off of what Deputy Eck personally observed 5 and what other family members and deputies at the scene communicated to Deputy Eck? 6 7 Α. Correct. 8 O. Because it would be impossible for Deputy Eck to know what's in Mr. Hennefer's state of mind? 9 10 I think given the prior explanation I gave, I can 11 see the point of the question, and he's not going to know 12 his exact state of mind or what he's thinking at the 13 immediate time period. 14 But I think he properly referred to his 15 observations, and he wrote down those observations in his 16 report in his statement. 17 And I think those observations really point to 18 why Mr. Hennefer behaved in some of the ways that he did, 19 because he was affected by mental healthness [sic] and/or 20 the use of narcotics. 21 In -- underneath the second bolded at the section Ο. 22 at the bottom of page 4, you open up and say, "To rebut, 23 law enforcement has a duty to the public to render aid and help people." What is the basis for this opinion? 24

It really goes back to why most of us get into law

25

Α.

enforcement in the first place. We want to help people. There might be other corollary theories of why people get into law enforcement, you know. But for me, I could certainly tell you it's one of the most important -- it really got me started in my career. I just wanted to help people. I wanted to help the good people, and I wanted to arrest the bad people that were hurting the good people.

So I always viewed myself as kind of the sheepdog. You know, guarding the flock and keeping away the wolf from the door.

And then when you get into law enforcement and go through the academy and you work with a field training officer and you go through training and you go through your experiences in your career, and then you realize, "This is really our duty out here. This is why we're here. We're here to help people."

And although -- maybe not all, but I would wager a large proportion of our responsibilities here in law enforcement really come down to helping people, and that's what we do.

- Q. And so when you say that, that's sort of your subjective opinion, is that you want to help people. That's why you're in law enforcement?
 - A. It's certainly subjective based on what I said

right there. But if you want, we could pull up the police officers code of ethics, and I think you'll find some language in there that's very similar to that.

I think if you and I want to spend time and go through the Yuba County Sheriff's Office manual, I think we would find some language very similar to that.

- Q. Further on in -- in that opinion, about four sentences down, you write, "Yuba County Sheriff's Department deputies caused a negative interaction for Mr. Hennefer, eventually causing him to drive into a ditch, incapacitating his vehicle." How did the sheriff's department cause Mr. Hennefer to crash his truck into a ditch?
- A. When Deputy Eck unnecessarily pulled his gun on a misdemeanor suspect that he would have no business ever using that gun on, he caused unnecessary fear. He made Mr. Hennefer's already present fear of law enforcement -- he made it worse.

And Mr. Hennefer decided -- and again, we've talked about that his judgment is impaired, whether by mental illness or substance abuse or both -- based with that, Mr. Hennefer decided that his best way out initially was to ask the deputy to kill him. And that eventually he drove down the road, as we talked about, 150 yards, and he got the vehicle stuck.

Q. Well, "eventually" was 50 minutes later
according to the CAD report that Mr. Hennefer drove
his truck into the ditch. So I how was Deputy Eck's
action 50 minutes before pulling his firearm the cause of
Mr. Hennefer driving his truck into the ditch?

A. As I explained in the report, he was on the right track with Mr. Hennefer initially, and he made it a lot more complicated by escalating Mr. Hennefer rather than deescalating him.

And when he pulled his gun, and he started shouting at him; and he calls for code 3 officers to respond; and they get there in a hurry and they start shouting at him; and they start pulling guns; and the K9 dog gets there; and the dog starts barking, I think it was probably more than Mr. Hennefer's mind could deal with at that time.

And, again, I'm not offering a medical opinion here, just based on what I'm seeing of the situation, the evidence that I read. And I think Mr. Hennefer was somewhat confused by the situation, and clearly did not want to obey the deputies' orders.

But, again, we add on maybe another
misdemeanor charge for refusing to stop, and he drove
down the road and he came back towards the deputies, and
he drove down the road and he came back -- I can't

remember how many times -- but he did that several times, and eventually got his truck stuck.

It seemed clear that after he was faced with deputies that were escalating him rather than deescalating him, his mind made the choice, or he made the choice, "This is what I'm going to do. I'm going to tell them to kill me." That didn't work. "Well, I'm just going to drive down the road."

You know, I can't really imagine too much more in his mind. I'm not going to try to -- I'm going the try to rely on the evidence, what it showed me. And what it showed me was a person refusing to stop for the officers. A person that said, "Put the guns away. Put the dog away." I think at one time he even told his wife on the phone, "If they could just put the guns down, I'll cooperate."

But instead, they decided to keep guns up and continue with the shouting and the yelling and the dog barking. And it sounds like a pretty chaotic, hectic situation. And, again, I can't put myself in his mind, but based on the evidence, he drove down the road, drove away and got stuck in the ditch.

Q. Couldn't it also be just as likely that the methamphetamine in Mr. Hennefer's system was the cause for him driving off the road and getting the truck stuck

in the ditch?

MR. DWYER: Objection to the extent that it's asking the witness to give a medical opinion. I mean, if the witness has the ability to opine as to the effect of methamphetamine on mental judgment, he can.

THE WITNESS: In my prior experience as a DUI officer -- as I said, I've done probably 500 DUI arrests, most of those were alcohol. Some were for narcotics. A smaller proportion I will definitely say -- it's my experience and my training that use of narcotics similar to the use of alcohol can definitely affect the ability to drive. It can cause you to drive worse than if you were sober.

MR. GROSS: Q. In the next sentence on page 4 of your report, you write, "Yuba County Sheriff's deputies did not see that the knife had been thrown out of the vehicle by Mr. Hennefer." What's the basis for your opinion that the knife had been thrown out of the truck?

A. The evidence showed the picture of a knife in the middle of the roadway from the vehicle. I saw no mention of this in anyone's report or statement. And so that statement is based on that evidence of the picture of the knife in the road and that no one mentioned, "Hey, he threw the knife out."

O. Isn't that an assumption? I mean, there's no

- evidence as to when the photograph was taken; where the knife is in relationship to the truck. It seems to me that's an assumption that, during this encounter,

 Mr. Hennefer threw the knife out of the truck.
 - A. And the question is?

- Q. Isn't your statement in your report that sheriff's deputies did not see the knife being thrown out of the vehicle an assumption based on the evidence in the record?
- A. Somewhat. Based on your prior statement, there were -- was a statement by deputies who -- and I can't remember who it was. I think it was Eck, but it might have been another deputy. I could look it up -- but a deputy did state in their statement how they moved around the scene, and they took pictures of the clothes, they took pictures of the knife in the road and took pictures of the vehicle.
- So that evidence was there. That tells me that the knife had been thrown out and was in the middle of the road.
- Q. In the next sentence of your report you write,
 "They did not know that the red dot sight was being used
 for viewing trees." And the "they" in that sentence is
 the sheriff's department deputies. What information do
 you have to make that opinion?

1 As I read that statement -- I can see the point 2 that I'm making an assumption there -- they did not know 3 that the red dot sight was being used for viewing trees. 4 Now, I could have raised that different. A 5 better way to write that would be, "No sheriff's office -- officer or sheriff's deputy wrote 6 7 anything in their statement about the red dot sight being 8 used for viewing trees." That would have been a more 9 accurate statement. 10 Did you see a picture of the red dot optic in the 11 discovery documents you received? 12 Α. No. 13 So you don't know whether it has a magnification Ο. 14 setting or not? 15 Α. No. 16 I'll represent to you that it's just a simple red 17 dot optic to a firearm with no magnification. It just 18 provides a little -- I don't know what type of red dot 19 for a firearm. But do you know what practical purpose a 20 red dot optic would serve for a tree service? 21 Having never been involved in tree topping, I Α. 22 learned from one of the family members that you use the 23 red dot sights when you're in the tree business. 24 other words, you're looking up at the trees and sighting

But that was new information to me.

25

them.

really been involved in that before.

Q. If the -- if the red dot optic doesn't provide any magnification and it doesn't do any distance measurements, do you know any purpose for why you would use a red dot optic in the tree business?

MR. DWYER: Well, it's fine to ask him that. But, again, his expert report is on the police events at the incident. He's not an expert in tree surgery. I mean, I can offer you an explanation why, but I won't bother. There's an obvious one.

But that was something the family tried to explain to the officers, and they didn't pick up on it or pay attention to it. But to the extent he wants to give his lay opinions about uses of a red dot for tree surgery, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I really don't know. As I said, not my line of work, and I didn't know much about it. I still don't.

MR. GROSS: Q. And that's because you're a law enforcement officer just as these deputies were at the scene. They see a red dot optic, they're going to assume it's related to a firearm and not related to a tree business. Would that be a reasonable assumption?

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Now, do you -- did you review photographs of the

scene, sort of, the surrounding landscape?

A. Yes. I reviewed the photographs that

Attorney Dwyer sent to me. And also you asked a question
this morning did I look at any other sources, and I
didn't mention that I went to Bing maps, and I used the
ability to follow the route of the mapping vehicle, and I
moved it down that road to the point whereas, to my best
guess, where this incident took place.

So with that, I kind of looked around the area, and I did observe it in that way. So in answer to your question, I used Bing maps, but primarily I used the photographs that were provided in discovery.

- Q. And from -- from reviewing the photographs that you were provided and doing a street view of the area, how would you describe that surrounding area where this incident occurred?
- A. It's very rural, apparently used for growing rice, which, the only thing I know about that is rice plants grow in water, but that's really the extent of my knowledge. It was not heavily populated. I didn't see a lot of buildings in the area or homes along the areas.

Looking at the overhead map, I see a few houses and things possibly where the complainant lived. But other than that, obviously very rural, wide open. You could see the ditch alongside the road. You could

1	see the road. It's compact, but it's not fully asphalted
2	or cemented. It's more of an unpaved road.
3	Q. And from your review of the photographs and the
4	Bing map, did you see any trees in the surrounding area?
5	A. Not in the immediate area. In fact, possibly not
6	even beyond that. I'll say no at this point. But I
7	think there's still a possibility there was, but I'd have
8	to look at the distance and check the photos again. I'm
9	open to look at them now if you want. But I don't
10	remember trees right offhand, at least not alongside the
11	ditch.
12	Q. So when Mr. Hennefer and his wife told Deputy Eck
13	and the other initial responding deputies that
14	Mr. Hennefer's a contractor, he's there to provide tree
15	trimming services for PG&E and Deputy Eck doesn't observe
16	any trees in the surrounding area, isn't it
17	MR. DWYER: Objection. That misstates the
18	testimony. That's not what the testimony was, Counsel.
19	MR. GROSS: Q. Isn't it a reasonable assumption
20	that a officer would suspect that person isn't out there
21	for tree trimming?
22	MR. DWYER: I'll just continue my objection.
23	Misstates the testimony.
24	You can answer to the best you can, Mr. Sweeney.
25	THE WITNESS: I remember something about the

complainant discussing the issue of trespassing with

Deputy Eck. And there was something mentioned -- and,

again, I'm happy to look it up, but I thought there was

something mentioned that he actually got out of his

vehicle and started working around a tree or doing

something and maybe clearing some brush or something.

Again, I'd have to look at it to figure out what

Again, I'd have to look at it to figure out what it was exactly, but I thought there was some statement by Deputy Eck that Mr. Hennefer had actually tried to do some tree work, and the complainant, the property owner, said, "No, stop, please."

MR. GROSS: Q. I'd be interested to know what tree Mr. Hennefer was trying to work on, because I don't recall seeing any trees in the surrounding area.

A. Let me --

MR. DWYER: Excuse me. That's not a question, so you don't need to respond. David, are you there?

THE WITNESS: I'm here. I'm -- yeah. I was waiting for a question. Or, Matt, you could -- you could, I guess, ask that one again. I found something here.

MR. GROSS: Q. Do you know if Mr. Hennefer was actually around any trees prior to or when Deputy Eck arrived?

A. On County 000-0004, which is page 4 of 24 -- so

1 it's the report we're looking at here -- and in this 2 report, Deputy Eck is describing the circumstances that 3 were told to him by the property owner. 4 And down about one, two, three, four, five, 5 six, seven, eight, nine -- "The phone call was ended, and 6 William stated to Leno that he was going to leave. 7 However, William started to become more and more 8 distracted by wanting to work and trim trees around a 9 power line pole." So that was what my memory was telling 10 me; that there was some actual attempt. 11 So I don't know what trees those are. 12 know, we'd have to ask Deputy Eck, but it must have been 13 more of an interaction between the complainant and 14 Mr. Hennefer. So we're now third or fourth down the line. 15 16 So the complainant's reporting this to the officer who 17 puts it in the statement, and then I read it and then 18 read it back to you. 19 Yeah. Well, is that also an action that 20 Mr. Hennefer's actually doing that or just that the 21 reporting party is stating Mr. Hennefer's trying to do 22 this? 23 It's unclear because of the word "wanting." Α.

Objection. You're asking the

MR. DWYER: Yeah.

witness to speculate.

24

THE WITNESS: It's unclear because of the word "wanting." He's saying, "No, I want to work on this."

Or sometimes people say he wants to do that because the individual's there doing it. So I don't know. He didn't describe him climbing a tree or power line pole or anything.

Anyway, that's what I took it for. I just read the sentence there, and it appeared to me that

Mr. Hennefer had been distracted and wants to work on trimming trees around the power line poles. So I don't know exactly his -- his maneuvers or motions there. I don't think anyone does other than possibly the initial complainant.

MR. GROSS: Q. On page 5 of your rebuttal report at the very end, the last paragraph, you talk about how you believe the sheriff's department waited too long to develop a plan to approach the vehicle. Is that a fair generalization of that paragraph?

A. Yes, it is.

- Q. At what point in time are you critical of the sheriff's department not approaching Mr. Hennefer's vehicle?
- A. You and I discussed before the officer safety issues, which I recognize, and I would have the same officer safety concerns. If someone was in a vehicle,

and there was a knife between the seats and a red dot optic I believe on the dash, but let's say the red dot optic is in the car, I recognize the officer safety concerns there.

And I'll give YCSD some leeway and some room to maneuver around that and to recognize, to allow them to recognize, "Hey, we have an officer safety concern here." When Mr. Hennefer backed down the road and got stuck in the ditch, he alleviated that concern in large part, and here's why:

When you have a suspect that you believe has committed a crime and they're still mobile in a vehicle, that's a more difficult situation to deal with than someone that is stuck in a particular place.

Now, he could have gone out of the car, and he could have walked or ran or whatever. But they had the means to chase him down and stop him. But that didn't happen. So let's just deal with what did happen.

What happened was, he got his vehicle stuck.

And I can appreciate some of the recommendations and actions taken by Deputy Saechao who was the acting day-shift commander, and he said, "Let's get CHP,"

California Highway Patrol, "up in the air, and let's get a visual on this situation."

And, again, this occurs, oh, around -- I think

CHP first did their first pass -- well, they got called at 14:38, according to the record. And then they initially do their first pass at 14:54; so 2:54.

So I'll give them some leeway on, "Let's wait and let's -- let's get the CHP plane up in the air.

Let's get a visual on this." And this goes on for a while. And the plane circles. The engine's on, the wipers are on. At 15:07, he's still in the driver's seat. At 15:08, they can only see him through the window. At 15:09, he's still sitting in the driver's seat.

When the plane is circling, they're reporting these visuals of the subject, and he's not moving. And you combine that with all the knowledge they had with his heart issues, with his drug use, with his anxiety, and certainly the difficult life situation this individual found himself in, when you see he's now in the vehicle; he's stuck; he's not getting out; he's not running away, and he's staying in one place, and the CHP is saying he's not moving, I don't see any reason why you can't move up at that point and interact with him and attempt an arrest or a medical intervention.

Whatever you want to do there, there's any number of ways you can handle that. But the idea is not to let him expire. And that's why they waited too long.

Why do we have to have the vehicle watched for an hour, hour and 20, hour 30 before we finally go, "Okay, I guess it's time to move up." Why wait that long?

I think even Deputy Eck wrote, "We waited several hours to finally" -- you know, he might have overstated it, but it probably felt like that. It probably felt like several hours, and this guy's still out in the middle of the field stuck in his truck, and he's not moving. And they waited too long. They should have gone up sooner. Give the plane a couple passes, and -- and then, yeah, he's not moving.

And, boy, you combine that with all the things, and you have -- you have the CNT negotiator saying, "I think he's suffering from medical distress," and still you don't go?

You know, we have a duty to do something about that. We have a duty to help people, and it didn't happen in this case. And they waited too long. So there's a long answer to your question. But that's what I mean when I say they waited too long to help.

- Q. Well, are you aware that Officer in Charge Saechao, when he requested CHP, he was looking for a helicopter to arrive but the only available unit was a airplane?
 - A. Yes, I believe I did read something about that.

1 And are you aware that airplanes can't hover. Ο. 2 They have to make circles around? 3 That is correct. And I believe he wrote that in 4 his statement too. 5 And do you know how much CHP Air Unit 21 was able 6 to visually see Mr. Hennefer as it made a pass? 7 So they -- they watched him from 15:05 until to --I think their last broadcast was 16:24. And then the 8 9 team moved up and they were cleared at 16:30. had around an hour 15, hour 20. I could do the exact 10 11 math. 12 What -- what time did the deputies -- when they 13 are approximately 150 yards away, what time did they 14 first begin moving up towards Mr. Hennefer's truck? 15 Α. Around 16:30. Maybe a little bit sooner. There's 16 some indications from Captain Million that medical's with 17 them and advised to make an approach. Air 21 responds 18 back at 16:24, "The wiper's going off." Captain Million 19 makes references there's still no movement. 20 And at 16:26 is when they deployed the less lethal, which was the undersheriff. So that 16:26 to 21 22 16:30 is probably the four minutes where they're up at 23 the vehicle trying to get in, trying to see in. And all

First, so we know the CHP air unit is making

those steps I'll let you ask me about if you want.

24

25

Ο.

1	circles around the plaintiff. But do you know how
2	long each time a circle is made, how long Air 21 is
3	able to visually see Mr. Hennefer before they can't see
4	him anymore?
5	A. No.
6	Q. And so the issue that arises with that is that the
7	sheriff's department doesn't have a constant visual
8	observation of Mr. Hennefer; correct?
9	A. I that's not entirely correct. I think what
10	you mean is CHP.
11	Q. The
12	A. The deputies at the scene had constant visual, at
13	least of the truck. I don't think they could really see
14	in to Mr. Hennefer that well, but I think you mean CHP?
15	Q. Yes. CHP couldn't constantly see Mr. Hennefer
16	because they're in a plane making circles; so they're not
17	able to constantly provide that information down to the
18	ground units?
19	MR. DWYER: Well, objection. We don't know how
20	much they could see or not.
21	MR. GROSS: Q. Exactly. Exactly. We don't know.
22	MR. DWYER: Well, you know they were able to
23	report down each time they circled there was no movement.
24	So. obviously, they wouldn't make a report like that

unless they could make a report like that.

1 So CHP was making a report "no movement" every 2 time they circled the truck. That is established by the 3 CAD record. I think that's our guideline. But that's 4 the facts we have. 5 MR. GROSS: Q. And so with that, David, since we don't know how long CHP Air 21 is able to see 6 Mr. Hennefer each time it does a circle; correct? 7 8 Α. Not entirely. And is it reasonable for the sheriff's department 9 Ο. 10 to want to have a visual direct line of sight on 11 Mr. Hennefer before approaching the vehicle? 12 Α. No. 13 Ο. Why not? 14 Until the drone operator got there, they didn't 15 have the resources to maintain what you called that 16 direct line of sight 100 percent of the time. 17 already discussed and acknowledged that the plane is 18 going to be doing loops around, laps around, whatever --19 circles, whatever you want to call them. 2.0 And there are times -- I will agree with you, 21 at least based on the evidence I read -- that the plane 22 operator is not in 100 percent line of sight with 23 Mr. Hennefer. 24 But why is that unreasonable not to move up? 25 Because of all the other medical factors you have that

- he's probably in distress; so let's move up and help him.

 There's no officer safety concerns, but we can mitigate

 those, or we can deal with those, or they should have.

 That's my opinion.
 - Q. Are you aware that the sheriff's department sent a sniper several hundred yards away to try to gauge a different vantage point to look into the truck?
 - A. No, I am not aware of that.
 - Q. And are you aware that the sniper -- and the spotter who got sent with the sniper -- they were also unable to see inside the truck? Is that unreasonable for the sheriff's department to send a sniper over to the next rice field to try to gain a different line of sight into Mr. Hennefer's truck?
 - A. Is that unreasonable? Was that your question?
 - O. Yeah. Is that unreasonable?
- 17 A. No.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

- Q. Are you aware that the sheriff's department approached Mr. Hennefer's truck sooner than 4:26 or 16:26 hours?
- MR. DWYER: I'm sorry. I'm not sure if I heard
 that correctly. Is he aware that they tried to approach
 the vehicle before 16:26?
- MR. GROSS: O. Correct.
 - A. There's an -- I'm going to say no. I'm not really

- David Sweeney 1 I'm going to say no at this point. aware of that. No. 2 Are you aware that the sheriff's department Ο. 3 deployed a noise distractionary device -- or also known 4 as a flashbang -- to try to see if they could get 5 Hennefer to move or wake up? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Was it reasonable for sheriff's deputies to Ο. 8 believe that Mr. Hennefer might be sleeping or in a 9 drug-induced state, passed out in the vehicle, and so they're going to use a noise distractionary device to try 10 11 to see, "Can we wake him up"? 12 That is reasonable. Α. 13 Are you aware the sheriff's department attempted Ο. 14 to use less-lethal bean bag rounds to break out the back 15 windows of the truck to try to see inside the truck? 16 Α. I am aware of that. 17 Is that reasonable for the sheriff's department to Ο. 18 use less-lethal bean bags to try to break windows so they 19 can visually see Mr. Hennefer inside the truck? 2.0 Yes, that the reasonable. Α.
- Q. Now, do you ever receive training or responded to a call where there's a barricaded subject?
 - A. Yes.

24

25

Q. And have you responded to a call or received training where the barricaded subject was under the

1 influence of drugs or alcohol? Α. Yes. 3 And have you received training or responded to a Ο. 4 call where that barricaded subject under the influence of 5 drug or alcohol passes out? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And what has your training or experience been in Ο. those situations where a barricaded subject under the 8 influence of alcohol or drugs passes out? 9 10 What's my experience with that, or what have I 11 done in the past; is that your question? 12 Yeah. What have you done? Ο. 13 There's a variety of things that you might do: Α. 14 You might wait them out. Two: You might use other forms of persuasion, which could be wooden dowels on the 15 16 door, breaking out windows of the house, knocking on the 17 window. I'm trying to think what else. 18 The hard part of your question is barricaded, 19 because that implies someone that has taken definitive 20 steps to keep you out. So there are ways to defeat 21 barricades, and we could go into that if you want to. 22 You have to weigh the need to arrest the subject versus 23 the danger caused by you entering the premises to 24 physically do that.

In general in SWAT, if we have a true

- barricaded person, we would prefer them to come out of the house on their own. Put their hands up in the air, "Turn around, get down on the ground." That's more preferable than going into the house and going after them.
 - Q. Are you aware of law enforcement training creating your own exigent circumstances?
 - A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. Can you tell me what that means.
- A. It's the theory that an officer is faced with a variety of different circumstances, as we've talked about today. Every call is different; every individual is different. When you create your own exigency, it, generally, refers to an officer placing themselves into the dangerous -- this is the most common one:

An officer moves up to a vehicle and stands in front or behind it. And then when the driver drives forward or backwards, theoretically into the officer, they decide that they have to fire their gun in self-defense.

We had a situation like that in Seattle, and they ended up firing at the officer because they created their own exigency. Why did you place yourself in that situation?

Stand at the side of the vehicle and

- accomplished your law enforcement purpose that way, whether it's an arrest or stop or traffic stop or reasonable suspicion or whatever it might be. So that's been my experience with that.
- Q. Wouldn't it be reasonable for the deputies at the scene of the Yuba County Sheriff's Department to want to continue to negotiate with Mr. Hennefer and try to resolve things peacefully without creating their own exigency about approaching the truck?
- A. That's a difficult question to answer because we're talking about different time periods and different facts during all the circumstances that we've discussed today.
- So, really, around the -- my answer is yes and no. But if you want to be more definitive on certain time periods or certain actions that were taken, I might be able to narrow it down for you.
- Q. I guess, let's breakdown the "Yes" portion and the "No" portion for you.
- Starting with the "Yes," where was their, sort of, concern that the sheriff's department might create their own exigency? And with the "No," they're not going to create their own exigency.
- A. Deputy Saechao talked about Hennefer driving back and forth. And he was very smart. And he told the

officers, "If he drives past us, we're not going to start shooting," was basically what he's telling them. We're not going to take action at that point. We'll get air patrol, air support, and we'll follow him that way.

In other words, we're not going to create our own exigency and say our lives were in danger because we tried to step in front of his vehicle and stop it from moving. So that's a great example of Saechao saying, "Hey, let's not create our own exigency here."

- Q. And so at what point does your answer become, no, the sheriff's department wouldn't have created their own exigency? Is that after the truck goes into the ditch? After the CHP air unit arrives? At what point does your answer become no?
- A. Concerning the fact that Deputy Eck had been interacting with Mr. Hennefer for quite some time at the window; having conversations with him; not in fear for his life; not really expressed any fear of the red dot. He noted it was there. He was more worried about the knife and the reaching.

When -- I think you hit the nail on the head there. When he drives away and gets stuck in the ditch, there's your opportunity. Because I talked about earlier how, if you could limit the movement of a vehicle, you've taken away much of the problem. Now he can't drive away

from you. Now he can't run anyone over. Now he can't hurt an innocent victim with his vehicle.

So that took care of a large part of the problem when he's now stuck in the ditch. So I would say let's have a few passes from the air vehicle. We combine that with our knowledge of his medical history given by the family; our knowledge that he's on drugs and now he's not moving for several minutes, that's the time when we need to be moving up and taking action.

Because what exigency have you created for yourself at that point? None. You can move up to the vehicle, peer inside, and you can do this from a distance. And you could take a vehicle with you, you know, to give yourself some cover and look in that vehicle and go, "Yup. Sure enough, he's not moving."

And when you get, oh, 30 yards away, launch your flashbang right there and see if you get a response from him. It's super loud. I will guarantee if he's awake, he will flinch or jump or sit up with a startle or something like that.

And if he doesn't, that should create an even greater sense for you, "Wow, there's really something wrong here. Come on. Let's move up and let's see if we can help this guy because clearly there's a problem here that's greater than someone just sleeping."

1 Let's go off the record. MR. GROSS: 2 (Recess taken.) 3 MR. GROSS: David, we're back here from a Ο. break and we're looking at Exhibit A, which is a copy of 4 5 your expert report that you prepared for this case. And I wanted to ask you about opinion No. 2, specifically the 6 7 third sentence. 8 In it you write, "There was a 'loss of key 9 intelligence information from family and deputies and a 10 lack of urgency to formulate a plan and then act on that 11 plan.'" 12 My first question is: What was the loss of key 13 intelligence information that you're referencing? 14 There were a couple times referenced in the Α. 15 discovery materials that family members tried to 16 interject themselves into the situation. One of the 17 times was when the -- I believe the sister and, perhaps, 18 the brother-in-law -- don't quote me on that -- two 19 family members arrived behind deputies who were arriving at the scene. 20 And there was some confusion at the scene. 21 22 And they were yelling, and they were told to get back and 23 to stay out of the way. And if not, they would be made 24 to stay out of the way or, you know -- I think, 25 essentially, kind of threatened with arrest. I don't

know if anyone said that particular word, but "You need to get the heck out of here," and so they did that; they backed away.

Now, eventually, HNT, I think, got in touch with those people, but it seemed like they didn't get a clear picture of what Mr. Hennefer was experiencing.

We talked about the lack of information about the red dot sight and what that's for. And there wasn't a really clear investigation -- that I could tell -- of what purpose was Mr. Hennefer trying to fulfill there. He expressed the idea that he had been hired for a job to clear trees near power poles and things like that, and he even gave a company name. But I don't -- didn't see much information that Deputy Eck really tried to confirm this, or that anyone really made much of an investigation of this.

So that was one of the first things that I think about when we lose key intelligence, it's the information provided by family members.

The second one was the family member who called 911, and the dispatcher spoke to them for a couple minutes; seemed to get impatient with them; didn't really want to talk to them anymore. And I could look at the exact language, but it was something about, "I'm hanging up. We're not talking anymore."

And that was the end of that idea of getting more, again, intelligence from family members that might have helped them get a clear picture of who they're dealing with, and some of the issues that he was facing in his life. Particularly in regards to his health, his mental health, his drug use.

- Q. In regards to the first portion about Deputy Eck not investigating information further, didn't he also speak on the phone with Mr. Hennefer's wife?
 - A. Yes, he did.

- Q. And didn't he use that information to determine, "I'll hold Mr. Hennefer at the scene and let her come pick him up"?
- A. He did mention something in his report that that was his plan, was to release Hennefer to the family member. And I think you're right. I think it was the wife.
- Q. What other investigation or information are you suggesting Deputy Eck should have done?
- A. I think that he should have followed more along the lines of what Deputy Mullins eventually came to do, and that's to gather that key intelligence from the family members. And she learned more about his situation. She -- she did talk to people on the phone. She did try to call in to Mr. Hennefer, and that didn't

1 work.

2.0

But that information, if relayed to command staff, might have spurred some action from them. Just because of the threat that he's got heart issues and he's got drug abuse and he's got some mental health issues, all those things, if there had been a central clearing house -- and we sometimes call that's what an incident commander does.

You're taking information from a variety of sources -- possibly Deputy Eck or possibly Deputy Mullins or family members -- and you're getting sources of information that come to you as the incident commander, and then you can use this as intelligence to help you make decisions on what to do.

- Q. You also mentioned that Mr. Hennefer's sister was at the scene and trying to communicate and not allowed to approach the police line. Do you recall learning that she stood on top of her car and attempted to wave down Mr. Hennefer?
 - A. Yes, I did read something about that.
- Q. And that she was, at times, yelling and trying to get his attention?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you agree that that would interfere with the sheriff's department ongoing incident in trying to

deescalate the situation with Mr. Hennefer when his sister is behind them shouting and yelling on top of her car?

A. We discussed before how I had worked with hostage negotiation, but I've never been trained in hostage negotiation. I know enough about the basics, but it's my understanding from people that do work HNT is that family can be very useful at the scene, but they also can be a disruption. And the job of the negotiator is to walk that fine line between those two.

So you might want the family there to help obtain information that could help you form a solution to a problem. But in general, the general recommendation is that you do not allow family to then move up where they physically insert themselves into the scenario.

And, you know, in response to your question, that might also include yelling. If -- if there's a number of deputies there yelling at him at the place and now you bring family members and they're yelling too, I imagine that that would make a chaotic situation even more chaotic.

- Q. Are you at all critical of the sheriff department's decision to not let family members communicate directly with Mr. Hennefer?
 - A. No, I'm not going to be critical of that. I think

that goes to my last statement; that you might want them there, but you might not want them right there. In other words, right where the situation is.

Sometimes you might have them at the command post. I don't generally recommend that. I recommend that you keep them accessible where you can reach them if necessary. Somewhere near, somewhere close where you can have that communication.

There have been times when family members have been used to help persuade someone to, let's say, come out of a building or car or something like that. But, in general, it's my experience that that is not the norm. In general, we want that family there for intel, for intelligence, but we might not want them inserting themselves physically into the scenario.

- Q. And isn't it true that Detective Mullins took in information from family members at the scene?
 - A. Yes, she did.
- Q. And she took in information from family members that called in on the phone?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. And isn't it true that she also then relayed that information to her superiors?
 - A. There was that reference that she wrote in her statement about relaying descriptions of his medical

condition to command staff. Yes.

- Q. And that was reasonable for her to take in that information as the crisis negotiator and then share that information with the -- her superiors at the scene?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. Underneath opinion 3 on the same page, you state that there was confusion about making a decision to approach the truck until 16:20 PM. And I just wanted to clarify because before I think you had mentioned 16:26 PM, and I just didn't know what -- what time you're stating that the deputies are approaching the truck.
- A. There are a couple references. And at 16:20, I see, from the Ellis report, Deputies Zepeda, Thorpe, McGuire, Ellis and Undersheriff Morawcznski approached.

And for the court reporter, that's $\label{eq:moreover} \text{M-O-R-A-W-C-Z-N-S-K-I.}$

So we have that indication at 16:20. At 16:26, there starts to be some indications from Captain Million that there's still no movement, and that they're deploying less-lethal.

So I don't think there's confusion on my part. There's just these different entries that we have different things going on at different times. So I can't tell you to the exact minute who's moving what and where, but I can give you, kind of, some general feelings -- no,

not feelings -- some general information from the data
I'm looking at as to moving up.

And here's another example: At 16:22. Medic

And here's another example: At 16:22, Medical is with him and advised to make an approach. So, again, we have a variety of movements between 16:20. And then finally, 16:30, where Air 21 is -- can clear. And that's apparently when they find Mr. Hennefer deceased.

- Q. I want to take you to page 24 of your report.

 It's the opinions under letter D, "The YCSD failed to timely summon medical assistance."
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Looking at opinion 3, at what point would it have been proper to allow medical personnel to treat Hennefer?
- A. After moving up to the vehicle and checking on his condition.
 - Q. And isn't that what happened here?
- A. Yes, but too late.
 - Q. So you're not suggesting that the sheriff's department should have just let medical personnel go in front of law enforcement to the truck?
 - A. We generally recommend against that. We prefer to make sure that the scene is safe, and then to allow those medical personnel to do their job.
 - Q. And why is it that, generally? You want to make sure a scene is safe before letting medical personnel

approach?

A. Most medical personnel, other than SWAT medics, are not trained to defend themselves. At least from the department. They are not issued equipment to defend themselves, and that's not their job. So we take on that responsibility.

We have the power of arrest. We have the power to use force if necessary. And when you work with your fire department or your aide personnel or your ambulance personnel, in general we'll move up and make the scene safe and then bring them in.

Sometimes they can fall right behind us.

Other times you can just say, "Hey, wait right here. Let us check this situation, and then we'll signal you to come on up." You could do it over the radio, or you could do it in person. You could have them there with you, but I think that answers your question.

Q. And you say that, "Proper procedure would have been to allow medical personnel to treat him and get him to the hospital with deputies to make initial contact in order to ensure that medical personnel were safe."

But how could the sheriff's department have permitted medical personnel to do this when Hennefer wasn't compliant?

A. Using team tactics, training; to move up, evaluate

the situation and determine his condition, as least as far as, you know, our sheriff's department personnel are medically trained, which usually is definitely not as much as fire department, ambulance and an aide car.

But you can at least move up to see if they're conscious; if they have a heartbeat; do the initial assessment, and then you can report back to the medical personnel what you found and ask them to get there.

That's why I said let law enforcement make the initial contact, and then allow the medical personnel in to do their job.

- Q. Underneath opinion 5 you state that, "Officer safety is always a paramount concern, but there's circumstances when officers 'must consider placing their safety in jeopardy to protect the innocent.'" But would you agree here there weren't any innocent bystanders that needed to be protected; correct?
 - A. I agree with you.
- Q. There wasn't a threat to the public at large by needing to act quicker; correct?
 - A. I agree.

Q. And in the next sentence you write that, "There's an expectation that peace officers will step into harm's way" to -- "on behalf of those endangered by violent crime." Was -- was Mr. Hennefer engaged in violent crime

1 that deputies needed to step in immediately?

- A. No.
- Q. Are you aware of the phrase "the fatal funnel"?
- 4 A. Yes.

- Q. And can you describe for me your understanding of the fatal funnel.
- A. When you're conducting a building search and you're moving down a hallway -- whether in a team of two, four, five, whatever your contact team is -- the fatal funnel is where you're going to a room, and if you stand right in front of that doorway, you've now silhouetted yourself and made yourself visible to anyone inside the room who might want to do you harm. So you're standing in the fatal funnel there.

Now, there are ways to mitigate that to where you don't have to stand in the fatal funnel. So I'll let you ask the question. I'll stop it there. But that's what the fatal funnel is, is standing in the middle of the doorway while you're searching a building and opening yourself up to a lot.

- Q. What are ways that you can mitigate being in the fatal funnel?
- A. In general, we train to have, at minimum, two officers going in that room. One will break left and address any threats on the right side; one will break

right and address any threats on the right side.

By separating, you've reduced the ability of -- let's say there was someone dangerous with a gun that really wanted to kill a police officer or two, you've now separated their attention, and they can't -- at least easily without training -- acquire and shoot at two different targets that have now entered the room.

Now you have an officer breaking right, you have an officer breaking left, and they will address any threats that are present that fall within their area of responsibility. And you've separated the two officers, so that you can't fire off a quick burst of shots right at the middle of that door where the officers were because they're not standing there anymore. They came into the room and they went right and left.

- Q. Can the concepts of the fatal funnel be applied to -- can they be applied outside of a building?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Could they apply in circumstances here where you have a narrow, single lane dirt road with flooded rice fields on either side?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it reasonable for officers to be concerned about the fatal funnel here at the incident because they have a narrow roadway with a single way to approach

Mr. Hennefer and the vehicle?

2.0

A. I think it's something to be aware of, but the threat to the officers is reduced because of a couple things: One is that Eck has already been up to the vehicle. He's already talked to Mr. Hennefer, and he's already looked inside the vehicle. He's not received any direct threat that Mr. Hennefer intended to harm him or anyone else.

And so I'm going to agree with you somewhat that we need to be careful. We can still use our officer safety techniques; move up as a team. There's different methods to do that as safely as possible. One of the best ways would be to have a vehicle moving in front of you, so that you can use that vehicle as cover and move up in that way.

- Q. Would a ballistic shield or a ballistic blanket help alleviate an officer's concern in this instance with approaching Mr. Hennefer's vehicle with the concept of the fatal funnel?
- A. It would certainly help. I don't know if it would completely alleviate, but, yes, it would help.
- Q. Are you aware that the sheriff's department ran the RAP, R-A-P, RAP sheet of Mr. Hennefer during the incident?
 - A. Yes. That was noted in the report and I believe

1	in a statement.
2	Q. And are you aware of what information was provided
3	as a result of that RAP sheet being run?
4	A. There was a couple codes that came back and if
5	you want, I'll be happy to look those up but I don't
6	remember the numbers right off the top of my head.
7	Q. One of them was Penal Code Section 245(a). Do you
8	know what Penal Code Section 245(a) is?
9	A. I believe it is assault.
10	Q. And I think it's assault with a deadly weapon.
11	A. Sorry. I'm just waiting for a question there.
12	Q. Oh, is Penal Code Section 245(a), to your
13	understanding, assault with a deadly weapon?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Is is it reasonable for officers to be
16	concerned about officer safety when they learn that a
17	suspect has a prior charge of assault with a deadly
18	weapon?
19	A. It adds to the facts that you know. So, yes, it
20	adds to your officer safety concern.
21	Let me rephrase that. This would have added
22	to the deputies' officer safety concerns at the time.
23	O. But your opinion is even with that information as

sheriff's department to wait the time they did between

well, it was still unreasonable for the

24

1	the truck going into the ditch and approaching the
2	vehicle?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. I think you've testified previously, David, that
5	you've interacted with suspects who have been under the
6	influence of methamphetamine?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. What type of physical characteristics or behaviors
9	do people who are under the influence of methamphetamine
10	generally exhibit?
11	A. In my experience, methamphetamine use is generally
12	accompanied by nervousness and fidgety behavior, quick
13	talking. It seems to certainly activate the central
14	nervous system to speed things along, speed things up
15	and and I'll leave it at that.
16	Q. Does it create aggression in people who take it?
17	A. I believe it can, but it's also been my experience
18	that some people on meth are not aggressive. So I think
19	there's the possibility of that, but not always.
20	Q. And sometimes people on methamphetamine become
21	violent; correct?
22	MR. DWYER: Are you asking him to give a
23	professional medical opinion or based on his experience?
24	MR. GROSS: Q. Based on his experience.
25	A. Based on my experience, some people do become

1	violent.
2	Q. And some people don't react violently; correct?
3	A. That is correct.
4	Q. Is it reasonable for the sheriff's department to
5	want to be careful in approaching Mr. Hennefer when
6	family members have reported that he's used
7	methamphetamine, and methamphetamine can lead to
8	aggressive or violent behavior in some people?
9	A. I think that sheriff's deputies should always
10	beware of things that could affect their safety, their
11	officer safety at a scene. So, yes, they should be aware
12	of that.
13	Q. Are you critical that Officer Saechao requested a
14	K9 unit to the scene?
15	A. No.
16	Q. Are you critical that the K9 was deployed during
17	the scene?
18	A. No.
19	Q. Going back to page 12 of your report, opinion No.
20	10, you're critical about Officer Saechao not requesting
21	that the other deputies at the scene put away their guns.
22	MR. DWYER: Counsel, let me just I don't see
23	your citation. Are you looking at page 10 of the report?
24	MR. GROSS: Page 12, opinion No. 10.
25	MR. DWYER: I'm sorry. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Just waiting for a question on that.

MR. GROSS: Q. Yes. So page 12, opinion No. 10, why are you critical that -- about Officer Saechao not requesting the other deputies put away their guns?

A. Saechao was the acting supervisor for the watch that day. He responded to the scene, and clearly is -- at least initially -- the officer in charge. So he's got the seniority, and he's been placed in this acting role as the day shift supervisor.

When you are placed in the role as a supervisor, it's your job to control the actions of the deputies or officers that you're supervising.

Deputy Saechao wrote in his statement all the things that he did in order to deescalate the situation.

And in fact, I think he did a good job: He put his hands out; he tried to talk to him; he tried to persuade Mr. Hennefer. Yet, at the same time, he's got the younger, more inexperienced officers at the scene with their guns out and they're yelling at Mr. Hennefer, and escalating him rather than deescalating him.

So my criticism of him would not be his own actions, which I felt were proper and could have helped alleviate this situation, but he failed to recognize his duty as a supervisor is to also control the actions of the deputies on the scene.

And it would have been proper for him to say, "Hey, guys. Let's back away from here a little bit. Why don't you guys holster up. Let's try to talk to him and negotiate with him and see if we can calm him down that way."

In fact, that was one of the recommendations from the family at the scene. They said that

Mr. Hennefer said, "If they could just put the guns away,

I'll talk to them." And again, he hadn't done anything at that point that required guns to be pointed at him.

He's a misdemeanor suspect.

So I initially appreciated Deputy Saechao's response, and I could see that he had some training and experience. He just failed to control the actions of the deputies that he was supervising.

- Q. Well, do you know why Deputy Saechao felt comfortable not drawing his firearm and trying to communicate with Mr. Hennefer?
- A. I imagine that he was trying to follow Policy 428, which talks about deescalating someone and not escalating them; not threatening them unnecessarily. And, again, I'm making a bit of a guess here, but that's really what that sounds like. That he recognizes, "Let's see if we can calm this situation down. And let's -- let's be reasonable here."

2.0

And so I have -- in honesty -- a little bit of a guess there, and I can't really place myself in his mind, but that's what it seems to be, in my experience.

When someone comes up to the scene and uses calm language and open stance and talks to someone trying to use persuasion rather than yelling at them, in general, that officer will be more successful.

There's certainly times for yelling and taking

There's certainly times for yelling and taking action and nothing stops you from escalating a situation.

But once you have, it's much harder to deescalate after that.

Q. Well, I believe he also testified that he felt comfortable not drawing his firearm because he knew that he had lethal and less-lethal cover behind him. So he didn't need to draw his own firearm because he had that cover from other deputies at the scene.

Is that a -- a reasonable explanation for why Deputy Saechao wouldn't draw his firearm, is because he knows he has cover behind him?

A. To definitively answer that question, I would have to go back to his statement and look at it and read it.

I'm not doubting what you're saying, but I'm not exactly sure at this point.

MR. GROSS: David, I don't have any further questions for you.

1	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Matt.
2	MR. DWYER: David, I do have questions for you.
3	Why don't we take a five-minute break; just a short
4	break, and we'll get back together, like, 3:30. I should
5	be done hopefully within 20 or 30 minutes.
6	THE WITNESS: That sounds fine.
7	MR. DWYER: Thank you.
8	(Recess taken.)
9	MR. DWYER: There's no real good way to go through
10	these questions. I'm going to go through them in reverse
11	order starting with the last subject.
12	
13	EXAMINATION BY MR. DWYER
14	MR. DWYER: Q. Mr. Sweeney, recalling the
15	questions and your testimony about the actions of
16	Deputy Saechao, do you recall testimony by Mr. Hennefer's
17	sister, Tara Hennefer, that Deputy Saechao also had his
18	gun pulled out pointed at Mr. Hennefer, contrary to
19	Deputy Saechao
20	THE REPORTER: Counsel, can you repeat that. You
21	broke up a little bit there.
22	THE WITNESS: I agree.
23	MR. DWYER: Madam Reporter, do you need me to
24	repeat that?
25	THE REPORTER: Yes.

1	MR. DWYER: Q. Mr. Sweeney, do you recall
2	testimony by Tara Hennefer that conflicted the statements
3	by Deputy Saechao about what he was doing when she
4	arrived at the incident scene? And particularly that
5	Deputy Saechao also had his gun out pointed at
6	Mr. Hennefer and was also yelling commands at
7	Mr. Hennefer.
8	A. From what I remember of her statement, she said
9	that all the officers at the scene had their guns out and
10	were yelling at Mr. Hennefer.
11	Q. And so if a jury might find Deputy Saechao's
12	testimony convincing and accepted Tara Hennefer's
13	assuming Tara Hennefer's testimony is what actually
14	occurred, would that be an indication that Deputy Saechao
15	also acted incorrectly in his response to Mr. Hennefer?
16	A. Just waiting for the question.
17	Q. Did you not hear me?
18	A. Did I hear you. I didn't hear a question.
19	Q. All right. Would Tara Hennefer's testimony
20	assuming it is accepted by the jury as being the accurate
21	testimony would that indicate that Deputy Saechao
22	acted unreasonably by keeping his gun pointed at

that participating in the guns-out response to a

It would certainly add to that argument -- yes --

Mr. Hennefer and yelling commands at him?

23

24

25

Α.

- 1 misdemeanor subject would, in my view, be unreasonable.
 - Q. With regard to the K9 that was at the incident scene, do you recall reading in either the incident report or in some of the testimony about the K9s barking?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And do you recall that being a concern of Mr. Hennefer? He was concerned about the dog, and he was made nervous by the dog?
- A. Yes, I do remember him stating that. I believe someone that was on the phone, which I believe was his wife, and she was trying to relay that to officers at the scene, possibly through 911.
- Q. Okay. A few minutes ago Mr. Gross asked you whether or not you thought there was a problem with Deputy Saechao having asked the K9 unit to come to the incident scene, and you responded no, you thought that was an appropriate direction by Deputy Saechao; is that correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Was there something further that Deputy Saechao should have done to keep the K9 from barking at Mr. Hennefer?
 - A. Yes. You could keep the dog in the car until you actually need it for an arrest-type situation where it would be appropriate to deploy a police K9.

1	Q. Looking at page 24 of your report, item No. 5
2	let me get there.
3	A. All right. Go ahead.
4	Q. That paragraph talks about, you know, officers
5	a peace officer's obligation to protect members of the
6	public; is that correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And would you consider Mr. Hennefer a member of
9	the public?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And when you wrote this paragraph No. 5, you also
12	had in mind that there was a duty on the part of the
13	Yuba County Sheriff's Department to to try and come to
14	the aide and/or protect Mr. Hennefer, or at least try to
15	prevent harm to him to the extent that they could; is
16	that correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. There was some discussion earlier on about the
19	barricaded suspects. Do you recall that?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And I think you talked about SWAT teams and
22	dealing with harricaded suspects in a house. My question

A. No.

when he was in his vehicle?

to you is:

23

24

25

Was Mr. Hennefer "barricaded" in the same way

1	Q. Would you consider Mr. Hennefer to have been a
2	barricaded suspect at any time during the incident?
3	A. No.
4	Q. There was some discussion earlier about deputies
5	creating an exigency and that police generally try to
6	have a policy and train and go through training so they
7	don't create their own exigencies whereby either other
8	officers, other members of the public might be hurt. Do
9	you recall that discussion?
10	A. I do.
11	Q. Do you think Deputy Eck and the other officers
12	that pulled their guns on Mr. Hennefer and started
13	yelling commands at him, in effect, created an exigency
14	when they did that?
15	A. No. They weren't taking an action that put them
16	in such harm's way that they then had to use force
17	because of where they put themselves or what actions they
18	took. So I'll say no.
19	Q. Okay. So you're differentiating exigency from
20	your other opinion that the actions of the deputies in
21	having their firearms pointed at Mr. Hennefer was
22	unreasonable and in violation of Policy 428. Two
23	different things: Exigency and not abiding by 428; is
24	that correct?
25	A. Correct. I don't believe that the deputies there

Correct.

Α.

I don't believe that the deputies there

1 at the scene created a dangerous situation where they 2 would then be forced to defend themselves. 3 I just wanted to clarify that for the record. 4 Thank you. 5 Mr. Gross asked you a series of questions about the deployment of less-lethal when the Yuba County 6 7 sheriffs finally did make its approach to the vehicle. 8 And there were not particular times stated by Mr. Gross 9 or referred by Mr. Gross as to when that occurred. And I 10 just want to have you look at the CAD detail, if you can. 11 Can you tell me what was the timestamp for when the flashbang grenade was deployed? 12 13 16:26 Deputy Saechao made an entry deploying 14 less-lethal. Now, that could be the bean bag shotgun, too, which would also be considered less-lethal. So let 15 16 me continue to look at this. 17 What I'm looking at right now is the timeline. 18 And that's the only thing I see right now between 16:20 19 hours and 16:30 hours. So it -- at least in this, it 20 doesn't say what that less-lethal is. So that could 21 easily refer to the bean bag shotgun and trying to break 22 out the rear windows. 23 Let me bring up the actual CAD, which might be 24 a little bit harder to find.

Well, actually, I think my question is going to

25

Q.

- be -- where I'm going is -- you don't need to do that. I was just trying to establish that the less-lethal deployment by the Yuba County Sheriff's Department occurred in the 16:20, 16:30 time frame; correct?
 - A. I would agree with that.
- Q. And earlier you had been asked some questions about when you might have recommended when to first approach the vehicle. And you had mentioned that the -- that the deputies could have deployed less lethal upon approach to the vehicle. In other words -- in other words -- let me go back and reframe the question.

What I'm trying to get at here is, I understand your testimony is that it's your opinion that Yuba County Sheriff's Department could have approached the vehicle much earlier than 14:20 [sic]?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. And it's my understanding that it's your opinion that they could have approached the vehicle, you know, certainly within one or two circles of the CHP 21 airplane reporting no movement in the vehicle?
 - A. That would be reasonable.
- 22 Q. Okay.

A. Wait for a couple passes; you know that he's stuck; you don't see him exiting the vehicle and running away or anything like that and get that intel from the

airplane operator. And if it appears that now we've gone around twice now and he's still not moving, that might be a good time to move up.

And, again, there's good methods and bad methods of doing that, but move up to that vehicle and do your due diligence and check and see if there's some aid that's needed by the individual.

Q. And I just want to make sure I understand when you say -- well, Mr. Gross asked you a number of questions today about deputies' concern for their own safety. And you've indicated of course that is a significant factor that goes into any incident like this.

But with regard to actually making an approach upon the vehicle after CHP Air 21 had circled a couple times and reported no movement, weren't the same methods that were deployed an hour, almost an hour and a half later, could they not have been deployed, approximately, 3:05, 3:10 range with having the deputies move up to Mr. Hennefer's truck and a cruiser get 30, 40 yards away, maybe fire a less-lethal round or flashbang grenade or something like that to again ensure their safety?

A. Absolutely. The point I was trying to get across is that, at some point, YCSD needed to move up to that vehicle and check on him. And you could pick your time frame.

I think a reasonable time would be after the CHP airplane has circled a couple times. I think that's a great time to move up. When you know about his medical history, his use of drugs and that he's now not moving, behind the wheel, or you could wait an hour and a half, or you could wait three hours, or you could wait six hours.

Nothing changed between the first couple passes of the airplane that says he's not moving. And, again, this is, in theory, moving up six hours later. There was no change.

And, again, let's put it back in the realistic standpoint here. There's nothing that changed between 15:05 and 16:20. So why was it unsafe at 15:05 hours but it's safe now at 16:20? Nothing changed. You still have to go up to the vehicle. So why not do it when someone might actually use your help?

Q. And my question was specifically directed to -- to that the deputies had the same options for additional safety measures to protect themselves at 3:05, 30:10 [sic] as they did at an hour and 20 minutes later.

I was speaking in regular time so that, you know, between 15:00 hours and, you know, 16:20 hours and between 3:00 and 4:00. Do you understand?

A. I do. The only thing I would need to check is

1 when did that ballistic blanket arrive. That might have 2 been something that changed between moving up when I 3 thought it was reasonable and when they did. 4 Oh, 15:20, Deputy Zepeda's en route with the 5 shield. Might be a little late at that point, because at 6 15:18, Air 21 says there's no change or movement for the 7 last four orbits. 8 So now they've got at this point, one, two, 9 three, four, five, six -- six initial entries from 10 Air 21. And I won't name all the times, but they run 11 between 15:05 hours and 15:12. And then, again, at 12 15:18, we have four more orbits. So they kind of lumped 13 several orbits into one. 14 In other words, what they're doing is, they're 15 not seeing any change. And they're saying, "We don't 16 need to announce this every time. We've done four 17 passes," and at 15:18, they then announce to YCSD, "We're 18 still not seeing any movement. We've gone four more 19 times since the last time we told you."

So if you continually wait for every last bit of safety equipment until you've decided it's safe to move up, your opportunity might have passed. I don't know when he died. I'm not an expert in that.

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I would say this: That the sooner you moved up, the better chance they had of saving his life

as opposed to waiting. And that's why I'm concerned that we're going to wait all the way until at least 16:20 or 16:26, depending on what entries we're looking at this.

But if we can't move until we have a shield, there's still things you can do: You have a car with an engine block; you could move two cars up; you could have people walk behind it. I did not know about the sniper, but that's something definitely an overwatch that -- that and the drone, you have those two pieces of intel that could tell you if there's a threat to your safety. And that's your time to withdraw or to take necessary steps to use reasonable force.

So it's a long-winded answer, but you're never going to make a law enforcement scene 100 percent safe.

There is no such thing. You cannot achieve that. You can, however, take steps to keep yourself reasonably safe and still accomplish your law enforcement purpose.

In this case, to move up and help someone that possibly overdosed or possibly passed out or possibly died because of health issues, heart issues, use of narcotics.

Q. Would it be fair to say that the report by

Detective Mullins, who is doing the negotiations, her

report to Captain Million, and possibly other officers at

the scene, that she was concerned about medical distress,

wouldn't that create some urgency to move in to check on Mr. Hennefer?

A. It should have created urgency, and apparently it didn't. And in the deposition Sheriff Anderson said, "Hey, that's just one opinion from one deputy at the scene." Well, that's kind of a short-sided response, because this is your primary communicator and your primary collector of information about Mr. Hennefer and his condition. And why have a negotiator and ignore what they say and chalk it up to, Hey, that's just one deputies opinion?

No one knew. She's all out on her own on this. She's out on an island. I don't know why he's saying that. I thought it was very short-sided.

- Q. It's my understanding of the incident report that, at the initial phase of the incident, that Deputy Eck, Aguirre, Thorpe and Saechao kept their guns pointed at Mr. Hennefer, and they kept them pointed at him until he actually backed up and started backing down the roadway from them to where he ultimately got stuck in the ditch; is that correct? Is that your understanding?
 - A. Yes, as far as I understand.
- Q. I'm going to jump to another topic, which was to Policy 428. And you and Mr. Gross had a discussion about the language of 428 and whether there was -- the language

- was mandatory or permissive. In other words it shall do the following things or shall not do these things, and/or should generally do or not do these things. Do you remember that discussion?
- A. I do.

- Q. The question arose in my mind, Policy 428 is a written policy document; correct?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. But it's not -- it doesn't substitute for actual field training, does it?
- A. No.
 - Q. So doesn't it make sense that the way you minimize the -- any ambiguity or learn how and when to follow the policy is by doing field training exercises so that deputies can act out through a scenario with an actor so that they can understand what the policy is trying to tell them about what they should or should not generally do?
 - A. Just waiting for a question.
 - Q. So my question to you is: Would it be fair to say that the absence of field scenario training -- as reported elsewhere in your report -- leads Policy 428 rather barren and leads deputies confused as to what they should do because they've not actually been trained on what it means; they've not had to act it out?

MR. GROSS: Objection. Calls for speculation.

Object to the form.

- MR. DWYER: Q. Do you understand my question, Mr. Sweeney, or do you need me to rephrase?
- A. No, I understand it. I -- I don't think I could definitively say that the deputies are confused by the policy.
- Q. Confused was probably not a good word. Would you say that in order for them to actually understand the policy, and an ability to implement the policy, field training is necessary?
- A. It has been my experience in the Seattle Police

 Department as a multi-tier member of the training cadre,

 that adult learners, specifically police officers that I

 have the most familiarity with, it's one thing to explain

 a policy to them. I've done it 100 times in roll call,

 and I generally try to pull a training topic and talk

 about it that day. But it's just for discussion sake,

 and it's designed to get conversation flowing.

But if you really want someone to be able to look at a policy and figure out why it's there, it also helps to have two things: One: Someone of supervisory rank, whether it's a sergeant or lieutenant or captain to reinforce the ideas that are contained within that policy.

So, example, 428, it would be one thing for the officer just to read the policy, and then to -- you hope that they understand it or you just hope that they then employ the various wording within the policy out on the street.

But if you really want them to do well with the policy, I suggest that you train them in a classroom and then say, "Great. Now that we understand this, here is management's perspective on this. This is why we have this language here. These are our expectations of what you should and should not do. We, cannot, obviously cover every situation out in the street, but let's now go out in the field and we'll do some scenario training."

And this is really where you get to see police officers, sheriff's deputies put those practices into action. And you can show them that by taking steps A, B and C, you're giving yourself a greater chance of being successful with the outcome.

Likewise, if you consider that you need to do steps D, E and F, and you ventured down this path, this leads to difficulties for you. Either you've placed yourself in an unsafe situation, or you're now required to use force against someone that maybe if you would have done something else, you wouldn't have had to use force against them. Or maybe now they've hurt or killed an

officer.

Or maybe you've now turned what was something small and could be handled by a couple officers now into a day-long call-out with 20 different officers and command staff and something small became super complicated.

I'm giving you, obviously, some for instances there, but the main idea that I'm trying to get across is we teach these policies in the classroom, but then we put them into action and commit them to muscle memory by taking them out in the street and give them scenario training so they practice what they learned. That's how you commit something to memory.

And then when they find themselves in a real life situation, they say, "Hey, I've been through this before. I trained in this policy. I trained in this scenario, and I know something that might work or something that might not work." It goes both ways.

And that's my expectation of field-scenario training. It really helps you put those practices into effect, and it can help an officer become much more successful than simply reading a policy.

Q. And is it your opinion that the absence of field-scenario training as discussed in the various documents and depositions in this case was a factor in

the -- the actions by Deputy Eck and the other deputies that originally arrived on the scene that did not follow Policy 428? They pulled their guns. They yelled commands.

In other words, do you connect the absence of field-scenario training with what actually happened in the field with Deputy Eck, Deputy Aguirre, Deputy Thorpe, Deputy Saechao?

A. I do. Because if you look at what happened in the scene and how they decided to initially handle that and where it started to go wrong, and then what made it worse, now what if we had given somewhat of a similar training scenario.

Obviously you can't design a training scenario that covers 100 percent of the things an officer, deputy may uncover out in the field. However, you can help them learn a skill and be able to practice that skill and to put those skills to use out in the field.

And that's why you need that field training that really emphasizes the department's expectations; what does the manual say, and this is what we expect out of you.

Q. Let me look over my list of questions. I have a few left. Let me try to pick the ones that are significant here.

With regard to your experience and expertise and dealing with persons with suicidal ideation, is it -- I don't want to say typical -- or is it appropriate in a circumstance where you're -- an officer is facing or interacting with a person who has expressed suicidal ideation to pull their weapon and point it at them? And if you need to elucidate that a little bit, please go ahead.

A. There are situations -- and I can think of them in real life, and I can think of them also in training -- where someone is expressing suicidal ideation, but the method that they've chosen or the tool that they've chosen or the design that they've chosen to end their life now places the officer in danger.

There are reasonable actions that we train officers to keep themselves safe. And now if we get to a situation where I have a team of officers dealing with someone that is holding a gun to their head -- and I can think, we've done this in training and it's been in real life -- a person sitting in a park on a park bench and they got a gun held to their head, or I remember one holding under the neck, and whether we designed it and trained it or whether we actually see this in the field in real life, I do not want any officer killed because they were not prepared to use deadly force in that

1 situation.

2.0

If someone's going to arm themselves and they are prepared to take their own life, I think it's very reasonable to consider that they might also do one of two things: Either take you with them, meaning shoot at you; or, two: To present the weapon in your direction, and then we get into the suicide by cop that we discussed earlier.

So neither one of those scenarios is ideal.

In fact, they're very difficult and hard for any officer to deal with, having to use lethal force against someone that's threatening their own life.

But in the situation like that, there are methods that an officer must take to protect themselves. And if that means pulling out your weapon just in case the subject decides that you're next and you have to defend your life, I'm not going to ever deny an opportunity for an officer to save their own life or that of their partner.

Q. Thank you. That's helpful.

And could we then just briefly extrapolate the principles or conflicts you just enunciated with the situation with Mr. Hennefer at the beginning of the incident in this case.

It's my understanding that he never threatened

any of the deputies. He never used a weapon or anything to assault any of the deputies. And he drove the vehicle slowly forwards and backwards, but not in a manner to try and strike an officer.

In that situation where they hear him express a suicidal ideation like "Just shoot me," was that an appropriate place where they could -- they should pull they're guns out to protect themselves? If not, how was that different from what you just described?

A. That would not be an appropriate time to you pull your gun and point it at the subject. As I explained several times in the report, that was an inappropriate overreaction to the facts that the officer was given.

Deputy Eck was up at the vehicle, and now

Mr. Hennefer's refusing to get out of the vehicle. He's

refusing to obey the commands. I understand that.

And there are reasonable officer safety concerns. And Matt and I discussed this earlier. I do not at all deny that the officer saw the red dot sight within the vehicle. I also do not deny that there was, potentially, a knife between the seat and the console.

But I also have to rely on the idea that
Mr. Hennefer was actually fairly passive. And what I
mean by that is, he made no active aggressive moves
towards the officers. He didn't pull the knife and then

try to threaten the officer in order to force the suicide by cop. He didn't say anything about, "I'm going to now attach my red dot sight to this gun I've got, and I'm going to take you out."

There was discussion of him reaching around the vehicle. I fully recognize the officer safety concerns there. In general we do not want someone reaching around in a vehicle. But if what you're reaching around for is a knife, that's a lot easier to deal with than someone reaching around and pulling out a gun. Knives can be dealt with at a distance.

And you have the advantage as an officer.

You're armed with a firearm, and you just maintain your safe distance. And if someone gets out of a car with a knife in their hand, I'm going to address them. I'm going to tell them to drop the knife.

This is not a time for deescalation. This is a time for command and control, which I discussed earlier. This is a time for pull out my weapon and pointing at the subject or have it at the low ready. And warning them if they come closer to me, I will use lethal force to stop them. Or if they come close to my partner I'm going to protect my partner or member of the public.

So that's, obviously, a time we need to give the warning and tell someone the consequences of

violating that.

It was interesting to me in reading

Deputy Eck's report and statement and his deposition that
he was aware of the red dot sight, but by far the knife
seemed to be his biggest concern. I know that he looked
in that vehicle. He said that he did. He noted what he
observed. He was unable to locate any other weapon. So
I think the knife is the biggest concern for him.

So if someone's just sitting in a vehicle and they're just driving away -- so we have a couple misdemeanors here. We have, potentially, the initial trespassing, technically a crime but probably not something that someone's going to be arrested for. I agree with let's just release him to the family member.

We also have the misdemeanor of, potentially, DUI on drugs. That's a little more serious because you potentially have a threat to the public if you're driving while you're on drugs. But, again, it's a misdemeanor.

So what is he protecting himself against there? I still don't know to this day. He correctly notes that the vehicle drives slowly up and down the street.

And let me get back to these what I call passive actions by Mr. Hennefer. He's not trying to run an officer over; he's not spinning his tires; he's not

speeding at high speed; he's not ramming through the vehicle. He obviously seemed confused and affected by use of drugs and/or his mental health.

Consequently, he drives slowly up and down the driveway until he gets -- or up and down the road until he gets stuck. To me, pulling a weapon in that case is an officer overreacting. It's an officer that found someone disobeying their orders, but if you've been up to the vehicle already and you've spent time with him; you've talked to him face to face; you even handed a cell phone back and forth as you talked to someone on the other line; you walked alongside the vehicle.

You mentioned that as the vehicle's going up and down, clearly the officer safety considerations weren't high enough to require someone to now yell and scream and point guns at someone.

I think it clearly made the situation worse for Mr. Hennefer and really rendered him unable or unwilling to comply further. That's, kind of, my assessment of the officer safety concern and the improper pulling of the weapon and using it to threaten Mr. Hennefer.

You can't shoot someone for committing a misdemeanor. And he never stated that his life was in danger and that he would then use lethal force in order

to protect it.

- Q. Simple question: Was the mere presence of a knife in the truck a criminal violation? In other words, is it against the law to have a knife in the truck?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. I just want to clarify. Early on in your testimony you were asked some questions about your own personal experience with situations somewhat akin to that with Mr. Hennefer where you're dealing with -- you one-on-one, dealing with persons who are intoxicated and/or have mental health issues.

And I just wanted to clarify for the record.

Do you actually have personal instances where you successfully deescalated and talked down a person who was intoxicated and/or mentally ill?

- A. Yes. Plenty of personal examples.
- Q. Are there any of the dos and don'ts in Policy 428 that you recall offhand that were methods or techniques that you employed in those personal circumstances where you did talk down or resolve peacefully a person who was intoxicated or mentally ill?
- A. Yes. There were several things that I looked at in that policy that I have found personally to help me or a team that I'm in command of be successful and -- and gain a good outcome. And for me, a good outcome means

you still accomplish your law enforcement purpose and you didn't have to hurt anybody to do it and no officer got hurt.

- Q. Do you recall any of those particular dos and don'ts that you thought were really -- stand out in your mind as being most important to your interactions with the people you described?
- A. Sure. There's plenty of them here. I like the definition of a person in crisis. 428.1.1. "A person whose level of distress or mental health symptoms have exceeded the person's internal ability to manage his or her behavior or emotions."

This clearly applied to Mr. Hennefer. He fell right into this scenario, both because of his use of narcotics and his mental illness.

So it's good to recognize someone that might be suffering from being in crisis. And it helps me remember many of the people that I've dealt with. And we always have a saying in police work that to us it's just another day. It's just another call. But this person that you're dealing with, this might be the worst day of their life. And it always behooves me to remember that.

So I like that definition in 428.1.1.

Let's move on. 428.3. The signs of mental illness or person in crisis. I won't read all those, but

just know that in 3, it's been my personal experience and my training experience that I can see all of these categories, A through J, at one point or another in scenarios that I've been a part of, whether in real life or in training. And it's good for officers to keep those ideas in mind.

428.4, this is one of the biggest changes. I talked about going to crisis intervention training three times in my career. Three 40-hour classes. And this is the biggest change I saw between my two earlier classes with the Seattle Police Department and my last class that I went to with the Oregon State Police Department.

It became apparent to me that the Corvallis

Police Department did a great job working with community

resources to provide those people an opportunity to come

and meet with police officers and to kind of outline some

of the difficulties and issues that people in crisis can

experience and how officers can help them.

Not only that, we actually had people who were suffering currently from mental health issues, and they came and talked to us about what worked for them in dealing with law enforcement and what didn't work.

And those were good things for me to keep in mind. So I can appreciate that part of the policy, that you want to collaborate with mental health professionals

to develop that education response protocol. That's excellent language.

Certainly 428.5, I think it's really important to recognize that people under the influence of alcohol or drugs may appear very similar to someone who's in a mental health crisis. Which one is it? Sometimes we don't know, and quite often, frankly, it's a combination of both of them.

I wish that 428.5 (a) was more prominently featured, particularly with Deputy Eck. But, frankly, a lot of the deputies at the scene to recognize that do we have a mental health crisis here? Is this why he's behaving a certain way? Is this why he's refusing my order to get out of the car? Is this why he's driving up and down the road?

And if you reframe those things and you move away from, "Oh, this guy's disobeying me. I get to pull my gun," and you realize, "Oh, wait a second. What we have is some type of mental health crisis," and then later you learn about the narcotics use, those go hand in hand. And if you keep that in mind, that might help you be more successful and possibly avoid escalating rather than deescalating, which I've talked about several times today.

I appreciate (b) there. To get backup

deputies and specialized resources. I actually thought that Deputy Saechao did a good job with that. What I wish that he had done better is the second part of (b) using conflict resolution and deescalation techniques to stabilize the incident as appropriate with Mr. Hennefer.

But I wish that he had recognized that it's going to be difficult for him to get through, to reach Mr. Hennefer to communicate with him on a one-on-one basis when the subject's worried about guns and dogs, right? Which one's more important to him at that time? Probably the guns and dogs, and you're not going to get a lot of cooperation when his mind is focused on, "I'm going to get shot" or "I'm going to get bit."

(d), Matt and I talked about getting the RAP sheet, but I didn't see any mention in any of the deputies' statements that they attempted to determine if Mr. Hennefer was the registered owner of a firearm. That would have been something that might have been helpful for them to know.

We talked about (e) before. Again, it's telling you -- it's telling the officer, remember, that their mental and emotional state and potential inability to understand commands or to appreciate the consequences of his or her action or inaction as perceived by the deputy, it's important for deputies to take this into

account and remember that.

That might be why someone is not cooperating with you. It might be intentional, but it might be because they can't understand your commands.

(h), clearly I wish that Deputy Eck and the other responding deputies, and, in fact, command staff had determined the nature of any crime. If everyone could just back up a second, calm things down and realize, "Wait a sec. We're dealing with a misdemeanor subject here. Do we really need everyone pointing guns at him? Yelling at him? Dogs barking? Are we creating a situation and making it worse when we're dealing with a couple misdemeanors?"

When we get into Section 428.6, clearly the description of deescalation I like. I can identify with most all of these bullet points here. I won't read them all, but I think that this section really captures the idea of what things might be successful for an officer to successfully negotiate these circumstances. Someone in crisis, especially when they're combined with drug and alcohol use.

And Matt and I discussed this generally. And I think you and I even touched on it too. Yes, that is somewhat problematic language. Might an officer say, "Now, I don't have to do any of these things because look

at these words up here. It just says, I should generally do this. It doesn't say that I have to."

If an officer relies on that language, they're really selling themselves and the public short. They're going to find themselves in situations where they're more unsuccessful than they are successful, because I believe it's my experience, it's my training, that these things that you see here in 428.6, if they had been used more effectively during this scenario, we might have seen a successful outcome.

- Q. Thank you. Do you have anything further?
- A. I -- you know, I'm not going to get into as much detail. I can tell it's probably time to wrap this up, but let's just say I -- I -- I think this is a really well-written policy other than some of the "shoulds" rather than "shall."

But that being said, I like the section on supervisor responsibilities. And then it's really important to follow up after these events to make sure that we recognize what we could do better in the future. That's how you help officers learn: Create a good after-action report and discuss it with everyone who was there at the scene and say, "Okay. Here's what we did right on this. But let's be critical of ourselves so we can do it better next time. Here's what we did wrong."

And I'm of the mind that this can help a department become more successful in dealing with people in crisis.

Q. Do you recall in these after reviews that there

- Q. Do you recall in these after reviews that there was testimony that no after-action report was prepared about this incident?
- A. I do remember that. Deputy Mullins prepared an after-action report, but it's part of her role as the crisis negotiator. What this is talking about is helping everyone at the scene get better by doing this after-action report. Involve more people in it, not just the negotiator.
- Q. So my question is: Do you think the Yuba County Sheriff's Department should have done a more complete, more thorough after-action report after this incident?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. All right. And last question: Is it your opinion that had the deputies that responded to the incident scene been more properly trained in Policy 428, in particular more classroom and field scenario training, that there's a good likelihood that Mr. Hennefer would be alive today?
- A. Yes, I do believe that. I thought that their training records -- particularly the newer officers that were first on the scene -- really showed deficiencies in

1	the amount of training that they've received.
2	You can't just rely on, "Well, he went to the
3	academy a few years ago. They should be good to go."
4	No. You should keep up with your training every year and
5	incorporate that field training to really help the adult
6	learner put those practices into action so that they can
7	help them make better choices next time.
8	MR. DWYER: Mr. Sweeney, thank you. I have no
9	further questions. Mr. Gross?
10	MR. GROSS: Nothing else.
11	MR. DWYER: Thank you so much for coming today.
12	Thank you, Matt.
13	MR. GROSS: We can go off the record.
14	THE REPORTER: Can I just ask you guys on the
15	record if you want transcripts.
16	MR. GROSS: I'll take one.
17	MR. DWYER: Yes. I just need the electronic PDF.
18	No indexes. No nothing. Bare bones. And I'm in no
19	hurry. We need it by the end of December, something like
20	that. There's no hurry.
21	THE REPORTER: Electronic okay for you?
22	MR. GROSS: Yes. And then I'll have my assistant
23	send over the exhibits.
24	(The deposition concluded at 4:26 PM.)
25	000

1	DECLARATION
2	
3	
4	I, David Sweeney, do hereby declare under
5	penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing
6	transcript of my deposition; that I have made such
7	corrections as noted herein in ink, initialed by me, or
8	attached hereto; that my testimony as contained herein as
9	corrected is true and correct.
10	
11	EXECUTED thisday of
12	, at, (State)
13	(City) (State)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	DAVID SWEENEY
20	DITVID SWEEKET
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	DEPONENT'S CORRECTION SHEET
2	To add testimony, indicate "Add" and print the exact words
3	you wish to add. To delete testimony, indicate "Delete"
4	and print the exact words you wish to delete.
5	
6	Deposition of: David Sweeney
7	Deposition Date: November 6, 2024
8	
9	I, David Sweeney, have the following changes to my
10	deposition transcript:
11	PAGE LINE CHANGE (Add/Delete)
12	/
13	/
14	/
15	/
16	/
17	/
18	/
19	/
20	/
21	/
22	/
23	/
24	//
25	

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA]
2	COUNTY OF NEVADA]
3	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
4	Reporter in the State of California, hereby certify that
5	the witness (if applicable) in the foregoing deposition
6	was by me remotely sworn to testify to the truth, the
7	whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the
8	within-entitled cause; that said proceeding was taken at
9	the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of
10	said witness was reported by me, a disinterested person,
11	and was thereafter transcribed under my direction into
12	typewriting; that the foregoing is a full, complete, and
13	true record of the said testimony; and that the
14	witness(if applicable) was informed of his/her
15	opportunity to read and, if necessary, correct said
16	deposition and to subscribe the same.
17	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
18	attorney for either or any of the parties in the
19	foregoing proceedings and caption named, or in any way
20	interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
21	caption.
22	
23	Dated this 13th day of November, 2024
24	Blain.
25	CHRISTINE BEDARD, CSR NO. 10709

David Sweeney

1	FOCUS LITIGATION SOLUTIONS
2	400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450 Sacramento, CA 95814
_	916.228.4593
3	Focuslitigationsolutions.com
4	
5	D. J. J. J. 12 . 0004
6	Date: November 13, 2024
7	DT Sweeney Consulting 4616 25th Avenue NE, Suite 156 Seattle, WA98105
8	
9	Case: Hennefer vs. Yuba County Deposition of DAVID SWEENEY
10	Deposition taken: November 6, 2024
	Dear DAVID SWEENEY,
11	Please be advised the original transcript of
12	your deposition is ready for your review.
13	You may either call my office to make
14	arrangements with me to read and sign the original transcript, or you may contact your attorney or the
15	attorney who arranged for you to be present at your deposition. If they have ordered a copy of the
16	transcript, you may review their copy and make corrections by indicating on a separate sheet of paper
17	the page and line number and the word or words you wish to correct. Please then sign your correction sheet at the bottom and return it to the above address.
18	che boccom ana recarn re co che above adaress.
19	As this is a civil action, you have 35 days from the date of this letter to read, correct, if
20	necessary and sign your transcript. It will then be sealed and sent to the examining attorney pursuant to the
21	applicable law.
22	Sincerely,
23	Christine Bedard
24	Certified Shorthand Reporter #10709
∠ ' ±	cc: All Counsel
25	

WORD INDEX

<0> 000-0004 142:25

000-0004 142:25 <1> **1** 1:14 99:21 **10** 75:7 117:5, 11 173:20, 23, 24 174:2 **100** 9:23 35:21 40:6 41:7 52:14 70:10, 16 73:14 76:20 85:24 86:3, 5 88:19 90:3 105:13 107:5 150:16, *22* 187:*14* 190:*16* 193:15 **100-percent** 52:*12* **10709** 1:25 211:25 212:23 **11** 65:*16* **12** 173:19, 24 174:2 **13** 212:*3* **13th** 211:23 **14** 7:22, 23 97:19, 25 98:1, 2, 4, 12 **14:20** 183:*15* **14:38** 146:2 **14:54** 146:*3* **1450** 1:21 212:1 **15** 1:14 7:22 30:1 75:7 148:10 **15:00** 185:23

15:05 148:7 185:*14* 186:*11*

15:07 146:8 **15:08** 146:9

15:09 146:*10*

15:12 186:*11*

15:18 186:6, *12*, *17*

15:20 186:*4*

150 53:21, 23 54:8, 11 56:23 86:24

133:25 148:13

156 212:7

16:20 164:8, *12*, *17* 165:5 182:*18* 183:4 185:*14*, *15*, *23* 187:2

16:22 165:*3*

16:24 148:8, *18*

16:26 148:20, 21 151:19, 23 164:10, 18 182:13 187:3 **16:30** 148:9, 15, 22 165:6 182:19 183:4 **1630** 126:5 **17** 65:16 **1705** 2:15 **177** 3:4 **1987** 7:20

<2>
2 158:6

2:54 146:3

20 30:1 147:2
148:10 177:5 185:21
192:4

2000s 59:4, 13

2001 7:20
2010 60:22

2014 60:22 **2020** 13:*12* **2020s** 59:22

2021 8:3 13:12 **2024** 1:19 2:2 3:9 5:18 210:7 211:23

212:3, 9

20-year 46:5 **21** 148:5 17

21 148:5, 17 149:2 150:6 165:6 183:19 184:14 186:6, 10

2180 2:20

22-cv-00389-TLN-

CSK 1:6 **24** 20:7 142:25

165:8 180:*1*

245(a 171:7, 8, 12

25 7:7

25th 8:*3* 212:7 **25-year** 46:*5*

28 23:9 99:23

29 100:19 102:1

<3>

3 99:5 134:11 164:6 165:12 202:1

3:00 185:24

3:05 184:*18* 185:*20*

3:10 184:*18* **3:30** 177:*4*

30 3:9 7:7 99:24 147:2 157:16 177:5 184:19

30:10 185:20 **30th** 5:18

35 7:17 23:9 212:17

<4>

4 3:3 99:7 130:10 131:22 136:14 142:25

4:00 185:24

4:26 151:*19* 208:*24*

4:30 126:*4* **40** 184:*19*

400 1:2*1* 212:*1*

404 3:*12* 98:*20*

40-hour 59:*19* 60:*16* 202:*9*

428 3:11 97:22, 24 98:20 99:15 100:10, 13 101:9, 17 102:15

103:8, 10 106:18 175:19 181:22, 23

188:24, 25 189:6, 22 191:1 193:3 200:17

207:*19*

428.1.1 201:9, 23

428.3 201:24 **428.4** 202:7

428.5 102:2, *12* 203:*3*. *9*

428.6 99:5, 9 103:12, 16, 19 108:3 205:14

206:8 **432.5407** 2:*16*

432.3407 2:10 **4616** 212:7

< 5 >

5 9:11 144:14 167:12 180:1, 11

50 134:1, 4

500 2:20 36:8 136:7 **530** 2:16

< 6 >

6 1:19 2:2 210:7 212:9

<7> 7 100:19 102:1

<8> 8:57 2:2 850 106:14

< 9 > 9:26 21:6
90s 58:25 59:13
911 38:12 73:5
159:21 179:12
916 2:21
916.228.4593 1:22
212:2
929.1481 2:21
95 9:10
95814 1:22 212:2
95946 2:15
98 3:4, 10, 11, 12
36:10

9815 2:20

< A > **abide** 109:16 **abiding** 181:23 abilities 46:2 **ability** 36:18 46:3 105:23 121:23 136:4, 11 140:6 169:2 190:10 201:11 **able** 34:7, 19, 23 36:9 42:2*4* 52:*13* 55:22, 23 125:21, 24 148:5 149:3, 17, 22 150:6 155:17 190:20 193:17 **absence** 189:21 192:23 193:5

absolute 70:11 107:5 absolutely 64:19 74:11 93:1 184:22 absolutes 85:22 abuse 60:9 133:21 161:5 academic 111:7 academy 10:23, 24

15:*1*, *5*, *15* 16:*11*

59:10 111:6, 15, 20,

21, *22*, *23* 132:*13* 208:3 **accept** 106:5 accepted 178:12, 20 access 83:15 84:5 85:4 accessible 163:6 accompanied 172:12 accomplish 17:4, 7 19:5, 16 23:14 27:16 31:16 77:11 187:17 201:*1* accomplished 20:12 27:22 155:1 accomplishing 30:25 account 205:1 accountable 104:12 105:*1* accredited 15:5 63:13 accumulated 119:23 accurate 54:24 78:11 99:1 129:21 138:9 178:20 accurately 52:13 107:24 achieve 68:17 187:15 acknowledged 150:17 acquire 169:6 acronvm 63:19, 24 66:18 acronyms 63:22 act 29:14 56:15 65:7 67:16 69:21 158:10 167:20 189:15, 25 acted 178:15, 22 **acting** 70:6 74:8 145:21 174:5, 8 action 35:7 66:10 117:6 119:5 134:4 143:19 156:3 157:9 161:*3* 176:9 181:*15* 191:16 192:10 204:24 208:6 212:17 actions 11:9 14:22 30:24 35:8 62:24 67:7 81:2, 4 88:11 100:24 101:4 102:24 145:21 155:16

174:11, 22, 24 175:14 177:15 181:17, 20 193:*1* 194:*15* 198:*24* **activate** 172:*13* active 196:24 activities 13:13 actor 29:20 189:15 actual 44:5 59:2 77:24 84:15 86:8 92:13 103:21 143:10 182:23 189:9 **acute** 38:2 add 25:18 38:18 44:20 71:25 88:24 92:5 134:22 178:24 210:2, 3 **Add/Delete** 210:11 added 171:21 additional 30:22 31:1 100:9, 12 111:13 185:19 address 75:1 168:25 169:1, 9 197:15 212:17 adds 171:19, 20 admonitions 4:22 adult 190:14 208:5 advancing 30:2 advantage 197:12 **advice** 42:23 61:9 **advise** 116:19 advised 148:17 165:4 212:9 **advisor** 108:19 **affect** 36:14 136:11 173:10 affliction 43:23 **afoot** 114:7 119:21 **afraid** 49:11 52:3 after-action 206:22 207:5, 8, 11, 15 agencies 26:18 106:14 agency 20:4 aggression 172:16 aggressive 99:11 172:18 173:8 196:24 **ago** 102:16 179:13 208:3

agree 11:7, 10, 12, 14 12:1 27:19 28:12 30:17 31:12, 21 32:11, 21 34:5, 17 35:5 36:5, 16, 20 39:9 40:8, 17 41:12, 14 44:14, 24 47:10, 19 50:8 52:7 53:1, 9, 13, 22 54:1, 2, 6, 10 55:4 56:5, 7, 13, 16 57:10 58:8, 13 61:22, 25 66:5 67:14 68:5 70:3, 4 71:15, 19 72:3, 7, 13, 16, 17 77:19 84:21 85:1 88:11 90:9, 25 93:1 106:21 108:11 109:12, 15 110:5 126:20 127:9, 19 150:20 161:24 167:16, 18, 21 170:9 177:22 183:5 198:14 agreement 104:7 **agrees** 27:20 **AGUIRRE** 1:*13* 83:23 87:8 97:20 103:14 188:17 193:7 **A-G-U-I-R-R-E** 83:23 **Ah** 62:16 **ahead** 11:23 14:18 15:7, 8, 10 28:8 29:21 30:1 32:18 35:12, 15 37:24 38:10 39:6 40:14.24 44:21 47:17 51:3 57:21 68:13 72:1 73:24 75:2 76:5 78:9, *19* 88:23 89:1 91:17 92:18 97:14, 17 98:15 100:14 110:2 117:2 118:18 119:15 120:12 130:6 139:15 180:3 194:8 **aid** 131:23 184:6 **aide** 166:9 167:4 180:14 air 87:21 145:23 146:5 148:5, 17, 25 149:2 150:6 154:2

165:6 184:*14* 186:6, 10 **airplane** 147:24 183:20 184:*1* 185:2, airplanes 148:1 akin 128:8 200:8 **alcohol** 36:5, 23, 25 37:7, 10 41:19 44:3 136:8, 11 153:1, 5, 9 203:4 205:21 alive 207:22 allegations 8:2 **alleviate** 170:17.21 174:23 alleviated 145:9 allow 17:16, 22 19:15 113:5 115:8 145:6 162:*14* 165:*13*, 22 166:19 167:10 **allowed** 112:20 161:16 **allows** 113:1 114:7 119:17 120:2 alongside 140:25 141:10 199:12 **alter** 106:4 a-man-with-a-gun 33:6 **ambiguity** 189:*13* ambiguous 14:6 27:24 35:14 47:25 52:21 57:6 **ambulance** 166:*10* 167:4 amount 7:11 8:20 112:21 114:11 119:17 208:1 analysis 80:25 analyze 79:20, 25 80:3 and/or 14:22 59:10 131:19 180:14 189:2 199:3 200:11.15 ANDERSON 1:9 188:4 announce 186:16, 17 answer 12:12 15:11 21:14 23:19 26:5, 12 28:7 32:19, 25 33:14

156:*3*, *4*, *13* 157:*5*

34:4 35:4, 15 37:18, 20, 23 40:13 41:2, 16, 20, 22 43:7 44:7, 21 45:9 46:1, 24 47:16 48:23 49:1, 22 54:25 57:3, 15 58:6 63:17 64:19 65:12 66:14 68:23 74:1, 25 76:20 80:14, 16 81:23 82:11, 19 84:6, 16 85:19 88:15, 23 92:6, 8 103:*1* 105:*4*, *13* 107:11, 12, 18 109:6, 10. 23. 25 110:13 111:25 113:4, 21 116:12 121:10 125:10 140:10 141:24 147:19 155:10, 14 156:10, 14 176:20 187:13 **answered** 34:15 39:3 44:19 52:2, 5 66:19 71:24 78:17 88:22 92:3, 4, 12 94:25 100:9 119:6 120:9 answering 4:25 30:18 32:17 110:20 answers 46:22 58:20. 21 88:24 111:17 166:17 **anxiety** 146:15 anybody 201:2 **anymore** 46:19 149:4 159:23, 25 169:*14* anyone's 136:21 anyway 34:24 37:18 144:7 apparent 23:7 100:20 202:13 apparently 6:24 130:21 140:17 165:7 188:*3* **appear** 203:5 **APPEARANCES** 2:12 **appeared** 2:6 144:8 **appears** 6:4 124:15 184:*1*

applicable 24:9 211:5, 14 212:20 **applied** 169:16, 17 201:13 applies 25:1 **apply** 68:20 118:20 119:2 169:19 **applying** 19:20 appreciate 101:4 145:20 202:24 203:25 204:23 appreciated 175:12 **approach** 91:9 101:7 144:17 148:17 151:22 161:17 164:8 165:*4* 166:*1* 169:25 182:7 183:8, 10 184:*13* approached 88:4 91:8 126:6 151:19 164:14 183:14, 18 approaching 144:21 150:11 155:9 164:11 170:18 172:1 173:5 appropriate 20:20 54:25 62:10, 20 85:15 96:10, 13 97:3, *5* 110:2*1* 120:3, *5* 179:17, 25 194:3 196:7, 10 204:5 appropriately 85:12 approximate 10:15 58:20, 21 approximately 7:5 10:2, 22 53:19, 23 86:23 148:13 184:17 **area** 8:23 9:1 37:25 62:21 121:14 140:10, 14, 15, 21 141:4, 5, 16 142:14 169:10 areas 6:13 140:21 arena 42:23 **Argue** 99:12 argument 78:2 178:24 **Argumentative** 92:17 94:24 **arises** 149:6

arm 19:10, 21 195:2

armed 84:12 86:1, 4, *6* 88:*13* 91:22 92:22 94:17, 22 103:4 197:13 **armor** 33:4, 8 armored 33:11 arose 189:6 **arranged** 212:*14* arrangements 212:13 **arrest** 17:17 19:12 111:*1* 112:*3*, *7*, *11* 113:2 114:16 118:20 119:2 120:4 121:10 123:10 124:25 125:*19*, *22*, *25* 126:*21* 127:12, 14, 16 128:9, *15* 132:7 146:2*1* 153:22 155:2 158:25 166:7 **arrested** 125:*13* 126:9 198:*13* arrestees 17:11 23:16 arrests 26:9 36:8 123:8 136:7 arrest-type 179:24 **arrive** 18:16 111:19 147:23 186:*1* **arrived** 124:20 142:24 158:19 178:4 193:2 **arrives** 156:13 **arriving** 158:19 **articles** 27:7 71:5 73:3 112:3 **asked** 6:18 39:20 44:18 52:5 64:13 66:19 71:24 78:17 86:17 88:22 92:4 93:7 94:24 102:8 120:9 140:*3* 179:*13*, *15* 182:5 183:6 184:9 200:7 asking 11:17, 20 12:5 13:2 14:7, 20 37:15 39:1 45:4 49:21 50:12 52:20 57:7, 19 58:12 66:13 68:8, *15* 84:2 109:*19*, *23* 110:*17* 113:*16*

128:18, 19 129:20, 22 136:3 143:24 172:22 aspect 88:8 asphalted 141:1 assault 171:9, 10, 13, *17* 196:2 **Assessment** 64:1, 2, 7 116:6 167:7 199:20 assigned 8:17 assist 20:10 62:25 assistance 54:4 165:10 assistant 208:22 assume 15:19 81:21 86:5 139:21 assumes 40:21 83:17 96:1 **assuming** 6:5 40:22 81:20 178:13, 20 assumption 84:9 136:25 137:3, 8 138:2 139:23 141:19 **attach** 197:3 attached 209:8 **attacking** 29:15 30:9 **attempt** 55:20 56:2 75:8 143:10 146:21 attempted 125:1 152:13 161:18 204:16 attempting 39:11 47:10 71:22 127:14 attempts 53:5 55:5, 12 74:18 attend 59:11 attention 8:21 139:13 161:22 169:5 **attorney** 10:12 124:17 140:3 211:18 212:14, 20 attorneys 4:23 Auburn 2:5 audience 27:20, 24 August 3:9 5:18 author 27:2 **authored** 27:3, 6 112:2 **authority** 48:8 77:13 authorized 18:8

available 32:13, 23 33:16 34:6, 18 35:2 147:23 Avenue 212:7 avoid 95:4 99:6 106:25 203:22 awake 157:19 aware 4:22 62:18 84:11 85:18, 20 147:21 148:1 151:5, 8, 9, 18, 22 152:1, 2, 13, 16 154:6 168:3 170:2, 22 171:2 173:11 198:4 200:5

< B > back 21:1, 10 22:25 23:1 24:15, 16 33:9 41:16 46:10, 11 47:8 58:6 59:7 60:2 64:18 66:8 71:10 76:14, 21 77:17 81:14, 22 82:19, 24 88:20 89:11 91:11 93:13 96:19, 22 99:17 100:17 114:20 122:8 123:11.13 128:16 131:25 134:24, 25 143:18 148:18 152:14 155:24 158:3, 22 167:7 171:4 173:19 175:2 176:2*1* 177:4 183:11 185:12 198:23 199:11 205:8 **backed** 130:21 145:8 159:3 188:19 background 6:12 7:12 112:10 **backing** 188:19 **backup** 203:25 **backwards** 125:8, 9 154:18 196:3 **bad** 68:19 132:7 184:4 **badge** 18:17 bag 20:7 152:14 182:14, 21 bags 152:18

balcony 33:7

ballistic 87:18 170:*16* 186:*1* **Bare** 208:18 **barking** 134:14 135:*19* 179:*4*, *21* 205:11 **barren** 189:23 barricaded 152:22, *25* 153:*4*, *8*, *18* 154:*1* 180:19, 22, 23 181:2 barricades 153:21 barrier 30:8 **barriers** 29:13 base 81:18, 24 121:*11* **based** 6:1, 5 50:24 51:5 60:15 69:8 80:1, 4, 9, 21 81:10, 25 86:14, 18, 25 89:4 90:16 91:22 103:1 112:9 115:23 117:7 118:21 119:5 123:5 132:25 133:21 134:18 135:21 136:22 137:8, 10 150:21 172:23, 24, 25 **baseless** 80:*13* basic 22:23, 25 112:12 **basically** 18:7 67:10 118:21 156:2 **basics** 162:6 **basing** 131:4 **basis** 11:21 12:8 23:2 107:25 131:24 136:17 204:9 bean 20:7 152:14, 18 182:*14*, *21* **BEDARD** 1:25 2:3 211:25 212:23 **began** 124:*17* beginning 13:11 14:1 195:23 **Begins** 98:8 **behalf** 167:24 **behaved** 131:18 **behaving** 43:24 57:9 69:6, 17 203:13

behavior 35:7 78:15,

23 79:5, 19 100:21

101:6 130:24 172:12 173:8 201:12 **behaviors** 101:*11* 130:19 131:1 172:8 **behoove** 108:19 **behooves** 201:22 **belief** 88:13 89:8 90:19 91:20 92:14 **beliefs** 120:7 **believe** 6:21 8:14 9:16 13:12 14:24 16:14, 17 25:10 37:9 38:3, 21 39:3 41:18 50:2 55:9 56:12, 22, 23 63:14 65:10 67:19 70:22 72:1 74:7, 15 76:22 77:12 86:9 88:8, 21 89:1. *24* 91:2*1* 92:*1*, 22 93:25 94:5, 21 95:3 99:15, 17 100:7 101:17, 23 103:2, 3, *16* 105:*18* 106:*5* 108:22 112:19, 24 114:2, 6, 22 117:19 118:22 120:2, 22 121:3, 19 123:4 125:6, 7 126:14 144:16 145:2, 11 147:25 148:3 152:8 158:17 170:25 171:9 172:17 176:12 179:9. *10* 181:25 206:6 207:23 **believed** 42:13 89:4 believes 50:22 bench 194:20 **best** 11:3, 8 15:17 34:3 35:4 41:22 52:9 57:15 60:12 101:21 105:4, 13 109:10 111:25 133:22 140:7 141:24 170:13 **better** 10:20 12:17 15:18 45:19 53:8 138:5 186:25 204:*3* 206:20, 25 207:10 208:7 **beware** 173:10

beyond 5:11 9:5 20:13 62:4 141:6 BIANCA 1:4 bias 47:21, 24 48:3, 6. 13 **biased** 47:11 49:2 big 29:10 84:14 99:16 biggest 105:21 198:5, 8 202:7, 10 **Bing** 140:5, 11 141:4 **bipolar** 42:17, 19, 25 43:13, 22 44:5, 15 45:*1* **bit** 5:4 19:20 21:1 25:18 77:2 88:16 105:22 107:19 118:9 148:15 175:2, 22 176:*1* 177:2*1* 182:2*4* 186:20 194:7 204:13 bits 94:12 blanket 36:16 41:7, 20 87:18 170:16 186:*1* **block** 22:6 187:6 **body** 33:4, 8 55:17 109:21 121:17 **body-worn** 109:5 **bolded** 131:21 **bones** 208:18 **booked** 85:25 books 27:7 61:2 63:10 **bother** 139:9 **bottom** 98:4 99:8 130:10 131:22 212:17 **Bowie** 74:4 Box 2:15 **bov** 147:12 **BRADON** 1:14 **brand** 111:21 117:13 118:7 brandished 95:21 **BRANDON** 1:11 **break** 5:3 18:13 21:7 28:6 32:16 47:1, 2, 4, 9 83:7, 21 122:9, 20 129:24 152:14, 18 158:4

168:24, 25 177:3, 4 182:21
breakdown 9:24 155:18
breaking 153: <i>16</i> 169:8, <i>9</i>
briefly 195:21
bring 29:5 65:4
162: <i>19</i> 166: <i>11</i>
182: <i>23</i>
bringing 31: <i>1</i>
broad 35:3
broadcast 148:8
broke 115:6 177:21
broken 114:25
brother-in-law 158:18
brush 142:6
building 163:11
168:7, <i>19</i> 169: <i>17</i>
buildings 140:21
bulge 121:4
bulk 22:11 41:6
Bullet 99:5, 7, 12
103:13 205:16
burst 169:12
business 93:4, 9
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5,
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5,
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C >
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10,
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7,
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4 California's 15:19
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4 California's 15:19 call 20:14 23:1 33:6
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4 California's 15:19 call 20:14 23:1 33:6 45:21 55:16, 20
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4 California's 15:19 call 20:14 23:1 33:6 45:21 55:16, 20 98:18 109:2 111:20
business 93:4, 9 133:15 138:23 139:5, 23 bystanders 167:16 < C > CA 1:22 2:15, 20 212:2 CAD 85:6 93:17, 25 134:2 150:3 182:10, 23 cadre 22:18 111:9 190:13 CALIFORNIA 1:2, 8 2:5 9:14, 18, 20 10:19, 23, 24 13:5, 7, 10, 21 14:2, 8, 11, 25 15:3, 4, 23, 25 58:5 145:23 211:1, 4 California's 15:19 call 20:14 23:1 33:6 45:21 55:16, 20

160:25 161:7 190: <i>16</i>
198:23 201:20
212:13
called 2:8 22:6
52:15 124:16, 17
146: <i>1</i> 150: <i>15</i> 159:2 <i>1</i>
163:20
calling 30:22 40:12
call-out 106:21 192:4
calls 38:12 45:18
50:11 72:23 73:5
110:22 134: <i>11</i> 190: <i>1</i>
calm 74:18 75:4
99:6 175:4, 24 176:4
205:8
calmed 102:23
calming 52:9
campus 9:2, 6, 9, 11
Capitol 1:21 212:1
CAPTAIN 1:10
148:16, 18 164:19
187:24 190:23
caption 211:19, 21
captures 205:17
car 18:16, 24 24:15,
16 33:18 46:10, 11
54:3, 21 77:16 81:21
87:3 88:18 90:4
91:6, 8 95:7 114:20
124:24 125:11 127:2,
5 145:3, 15 161:18
162:3 163:11 167:4
179:23 187:5 197:14
203:14
care 12:21 52:4, 5
126:8, 9, 12 128:23
129:10, 18 130:4
157:3
career 22:11 36:9
91:1 132:5, 15 202:9
careful 170:10 173:5
cars 91: <i>12</i> 187: <i>6</i>
case 5:22, 23 8:20
9:14 17:18 64:8
70:25 73:15 80:3
81:7 96:22 104:22
81:7 96:22 104:22
81:7 96:22 104:22 105:10 108:16, 21, 25
81:7 96:22 104:22
81:7 96:22 104:22 105:10 108:16, 21, 25 109:1, 9 110:11, 19

192:25 195:*15*, 24 199:6 212:7 cases 9:21, 22, 24 10:3, 7, 14 22:16 45:17 72:22 73:9 81:6 casual 112:*17* catchall 20:15, 22 52:12 **catch-all** 35:21 categories 202:3 cause 37:14 38:2 44:*4* 50:2, 7 51:*14* 64:4 73:7 96:5 112:2*4* 113:*1* 114:*1*, *16*, *21*, *23* 115:*12* 117:20 118:3, 10 119:1, 7, 10, 19, 22 123:2 124:8 133:12 134:4 135:24 136:12 211:8, 20 caused 70:24 102:22 133:9, 16 153:23 **causing** 133:10 caveat 42:20 129:5 **cc** 212:23 cell 55:16, 24 56:3, *14*, *17*, *19*, *20* 57:*3* 199:10 cemented 141:2 **center** 74:*4* **Central** 58:24 161:6 172:13 **certain** 17:23 18:19 43:17, 24 67:14 82:5 105:25 112:25 113:23 114:5 116:3 155:*15*, *16* 203:*13* certainly 13:17 37:25 40:*3* 41:*1*, 23 43:10, 22 45:18 46:4 49:23 50:5 54:13, 16 57:23 64:12 66:13, *15* 69:2, *11* 70:8, *10* 71:6 72:5 79:2 80:16 83:3 88:8 94:6, 8 102:22 107:2 124:8 127:1 128:10 131:1 132:4, 25 146:16 170:20

172:*13* 176:8 178:*24* 183:19 203:3 certificate 50:3 **Certified** 2:3 21:2, 19, 21, 22, 25 58:14 61:19 63:12 211:3 212:23 **certify** 211:4, 17 cetera 108:10 **chain** 118:2 **chalk** 188:10 challenge 39:11 challenges 40:3 71:22 challenging 36:22 41:10 53:24 **chance** 52:17 86:15 113:4 186:25 191:17 **change** 92:8 97:11 185:*11* 186:*6*, *15* 202:10 210:11 **changed** 88:15 185:8, *13*, *15* 186:2 **changes** 202:7 210:9 **chaotic** 135:19 162:20, 21 characteristics 52:23 172:8 characterization 73:21 characterizing 74:23 **charge** 134:23 147:21 171:17 174:7 **chase** 145:17 **check** 95:25 141:8 166:*14* 184:*6*, *24* 185:25 188:*1* **checking** 165:*14* chest 33:9, 12 **children** 65:2, 9 **choice** 81:6 135:5, 6 **choices** 77:11 208:7 **chose** 91:10 **chosen** 66:24 67:2 194:12, 13 **CHP** 87:21 145:22 146:1, 5, 19 147:22 148:5, 25 149:10, 14, 15 150:1, 6 156:13 183:19 184:14 185:2

CHRISTINE 1:25 2:3 211:25 212:23 **circle** 149:2 150:7 circled 149:23 150:2 184:*14* 185:2 circles 22:14 146:7 148:2 149:1.16 150:19 183:19 **circling** 146:*12* Circuit 11:2, 12 circumstance 32:4 106:22 107:*1* 194:*4* circumstances 64:4 95:3 112:22 114:5 120:6, 19 143:2 154:7, 11 155:12 167:14 169:19 200:19 205:19 **citation** 19:13 120:4 173:23 **cited** 100:10 **citizens** 18:10 city 59:24 209:12 civil 4:15 9:13, 18, 22, 24 212:17 **claim** 27:1 clarification 49:8 **clarify** 48:5 53:6 87:5 164:9 182:3 200:6, 12 clarity 14:6 class 23:25 24:2, 7 26:2, 3, 6, 13 202:11 classes 24:5, 18, 19, 20, 21 26:7, 11 59:12, 13, 19 60:2, 10, 16 202:9, 10 classified 71:17 **classroom** 24:22, 23 25:5 58:25 111:11, 16 191:7 192:9 207:20 clear 17:19 66:6 135:3 159:6, 9, 12 160:3 165:6 clear-cut 49:1 cleared 148:9 **clearing** 142:6 161:6 **clearly** 101:13 134:20 157:24 174:6

199:14, 17 201:13 205:5, 14 cleverly 29:10 climbing 144:5 close 8:21 59:1 76:19, 23 125:25 163:7 197:22 closely 60:20 61:14 closer 197:21 closest 8:25 9:12 **clothes** 137:*15* **clothing** 120:24 clues 79:12 92:21, 24 **CNT** 147:13 **code** 133:2 134:11 171:7, 8, 12 codes 171:4 **codified** 12:20, 23 13:1, 11 14:4, 12, 20 17:24, 25 108:25 128:20 129:7, 11 codify 13:15, 22 **Codifying** 129:*13* collaborate 202:25 collector 188:8 **college** 9:2, 3 58:24 59:8. 10 111:16 combination 44:5 52:8 57:14 203:7 **combine** 17:9 18:22 54:17 146:14 147:12 157:5 **combined** 205:20 Combining 17:5 come 21:9 29:8, 19 31:7 36:13 43:22 60:11 106:6 107:4 113:24 117:15 127:2 132:20 154:*1* 157:23 160:12 161:12 163:10 166:15 179:15 180:13 197:21, 22 202:15 **come-along** 19:7, 14 comes 13:17 58:12 104:8 110:12 115:8 117:3 176:4 comfortable 32:17 68:12 175:17 176:13

coming 22:23 24:4 29:23 60:5 84:13 208:11 **command** 59:17 61:10, 12 96:5 97:7, 9 104:9 161:2 163:4 164:*1* 192:*5* 197:*18* 200:24 205:6 commander 145:22 161:8, 12 commands 96:5 97:*1* 101:*4* 127:25 128:*1*, *5* 178:*6*, *23* 181:*13* 193:*4* 196:*16* 204:23 205:4 **comment** 128:25 **comments** 78:23 **commit** 112:25 120:*1* 192:*10*, *13* **committed** 112:*19* 113:10 122:21, 24 145:12 committing 100:25 199:23 **common** 11:*11* 20:23 65:3 84:24 104:24 107:10 115:*15*, *17* 116:*4* 123:9 154:15 commonly-used 115:*17* commotion 73:7 communicate 54:4, 21 55:5, 24 56:2, 20 57:4 71:23 161:16 162:24 175:18 204:8 communicated 89:11 131:6 communicating 31:14 40:10 42:2 44:16 45:1 47:13 communication 45:2 53:3, 4 54:18 55:1 56:14. 24 65:25 70:9 76:24 163:8 communications 40:20 48:20 55:10 communicator 188:7 communicators 45:19

Community 58:24 59:8, 9 202:14 **comp** 130:16 **compact** 141:*1* **company** 106:11 159:13 compare 9:2, 12 **competency** 25:8, 16 competent 11:22 37:23, 24 45:13 complainant 140:23 142:1, 10 143:13 144:13 complainant's 143:16 complaint 8:2 **complete** 207:14 211:12 completely 78:14 90:25 170:21 completing 72:20 compliance 19:22 96:11.14 99:13 **compliant** 166:24 complicated 105:3 134:8 192:6 **comply** 19:23 128:5 199:19 complying 32:8 125:3 component 20:18 23:8 31:13, 14 **compound** 35:14 comprehending 130:16 **concept** 170:18 **concepts** 169:16 **concern** 145:7, 9 155:21 167:13 170:17 171:20 179:6 184:10 198:5, 8 199:20 **concerned** 96:6, 8 169:23 171:16 179:7 187:*1*. 25 **Concerning** 156:*15* concerns 97:12 144:25 145:4 151:2 171:22 196:18 197:7 **concluded** 208:24

conclusion 11:18 110:23 128:25 129:3 **condition** 32:*3* 164:*1* 165:15 167:1 188:9 conditions 101:16 **conduct** 74:24 75:2 120:7 conducting 168:7 confident 74:13 **confirm** 65:21 102:8 122:15 159:14 **conflict** 204:*4* conflicted 178:2 conflicts 195:22 **conforms** 108:21 confrontation 66:11 67:1 **confused** 87:10 130:15 134:20 189:23 190:6, 8 199:2 **confusion** 158:21 164:7, *21* conjunction 61:9 **connect** 193:5 connotations 12:14 conscious 167:6 consensual 112:14 consensus 48:18 consequences 101:4 197:25 204:23 Consequently 199:4 **consider** 11:8 49:2 78:22 84:19 85:3 128:12, 17 167:14 180:8 181:*1* 191:*19* 195:4 consideration 101:19 considerations 199:14 considered 24:17 83:14 182:15 consistent 88:12 consistently 46:10 console 74:4, 15, 16 196:21 **constant** 88:*3* 149:7, 12 **constantly** 149:15, 17 constitute 11:15

12:3, 25 constituting 12:7 constitutional 109:18 110:8 constructive 27:21 28:20 36:6 Consulting 212:3 **contact** 107:4 115:3 166:20 167:10 168:9 212:14 contained 190:24 209:8 context 63:20 92:21 93:16 **continual** 126:25 127:4, 9 continually 126:20, 24 186:20 continue 47:1 100:18 118:6 119:13 122:11 135:18 141:22 155:7 182:16 contractor 26:19 111:6 141:14 **contrary** 177:18 contribution 105:21 **control** 97:7, 10 126:8, 13, 14, 17, 19 128:24 129:10 174:11, 24 175:14 197:18 conversation 27:21 28:20, 25 29:17 30:19 36:10 96:17 124:16 190:19 conversational 31:16 conversations 156:17 **convince** 96:21 convincing 178:12 cooperate 36:19 135:16 cooperated 124:22 cooperating 32:10 205:2 cooperation 36:10 204:12 cooperative 36:18 coordinated 16:20 **cop** 62:2, 15, 16, 23 63:5 66:17, 22 67:4,

10, 12, 14 68:25 70:18, 23 71:1 78:23 79:1 195:7 197:2 **copies** 6:22 **cop-intent** 68:5 71:19 copy 5:15, 16, 19 6:23 7:3 158:4 212:15 core 55:1 **corner** 6:24 98:2 corollary 132:2 coroner 50:4 correct 4:18, 20 24:6 31:20 38:25 50:1 51:18, 23, 24 52:1, 19 54:9 55:2, 13, 14, 21, 25 56:21, 25 58:11 61:5, 8 69:6, 19 73:20 74:5, 19 75:8, 9, 12, 20 76:10, 11, 13 77:23 78:3, 4 79:5, 6, 8 80:5 84:9 86:22 92:22 102:5 125:5, 22, 23, 25 131:7 148:3 149:8, 9 150:7 151:24 163:21 164:5 167:17, 20 172:21 173:2, 3 179:18 180:6, 16 181:24, 25 183:4, 16 188:21 189:7 209:9 211:*15* 212:17, 19 corrected 209:9 **CORRECTION** 210:1 212:17 corrections 209:7 212:16 correctly 151:22 198:20 correlation 79:3 **Corvallis** 8:25 59:24 202:13 COUNSEL 2:12 14:5 16:2 27:23 48:1 53:6 57:7 63:20 79:22 83:9, 21 87:1 95:23 97:25 98:23 102:6 113:12 127:18 141:18

173:22 177:20 211:17 212:23 **count** 116:10, 24 **COUNTY** 1:8 2:4 4:14 5:23 6:3 8:4, 8, 12, 24 16:4 89:9 93:19 104:9, 18 106:17 133:5, 8 136:15 142:25 155:6 180:13 182:6 183:3, *14* 207:*13* 211:2 212:7 **couple** 35:24 105:12 147:10 158:14 159:2*1* 164:*1*2 170:*3* 171:*4* 183:2*3* 184:*14* 185:2, 8 192:3 198:10 205:13 course 13:21 22:3 24:14 26:21 28:13 42:20 66:1 69:7 76:4 184:11 **COURT** 1:1 4:2 5:1 11:3, 12 22:15 60:24 63:7 108:12, 16 117:12 118:6 164:15 courteous 99:6 courts 11:7 27:12 109:12, 15 110:6 117:4, 8 118:24 Court's 121:20 **cover** 157:14 170:14 176:14, 16, 19 191:12 **covered** 113:*3* covers 20:22 33:9 193:15 cows 9:4 **crash** 133:12 create 30:5 154:13 155:2*1*, 2*3* 156:5, 9 157:21 172:16 181:7 188:1 206:21 created 14:24 37:1 154:22 156:11 157:*10* 181:*13* 182:*1* 188:3 creates 109:17 **creating** 154:6 155:8

181:5 205:11 **credit** 86:12 **crime** 112:20 113:1, 10, 25 114:7, 8, 16 115:9 118:23 119:4, *5*, *18*, *21* 120:*1*, *4*, *5* 121:14, 15, 24 123:14 124:9 145:12 167:25 198:12 205:7 **crimes** 122:22 **criminal** 9:13 200:3 crisis 13:10 42:18 44:17 57:17 58:14, 19, 22 59:3, 6, 18 60:13, 15, 18, 24 61:2 62:7 97:22 101:12 164:3 201:9, 17, 25 202:8, 17 203:6, 12, 19 205:20 207:3, 9 crisis-intervention 26:7 critical 77:1, 3, 9 106:17 107:19 144:20 162:22, 25 173:13, 16, 20 174:3 206:24 **criticism** 83:*13* 122:16 174:21 **criticisms** 56:*1* 83:23 84:2 **cruiser** 184:19 **cry** 73:4, 10 **CSR** 1:25 211:25 current 129:2 currently 202:20 **custody** 17:17 123:7 126:8, 9 128:23 129:10 **cut** 40:6 cut-and-dry 46:22 CV 7:12 16:23 61:4

<D>
daily 45:14

DALLAS 1:14

danger 76:8 153:23

156:6 194:14 199:25

dangerous 69:1

154:15 169:3 182:1

dash 145:2 **data** 165:1 date 6:23, 25 210:7 212:3, 19 **dated** 3:9 5:18 211:23 dates 59:14 **DAVID** 1:18 2:7 3:4 4:1, 7, 8, 9 5:18 14:17 15:10 28:4 32:16 35:15 47:10, 16 48:5 49:22 53:9 63:23 78:9 80:13 83:11 87:11 110:25 113:18 122:9 127:19 129:25 142:17 150:5 158:3 172:4 176:24 177:2 209:4, 19 210:6, 9 212:9 **David's** 78:8 day 8:10, 11, 12 24:25 30:12 38:24 45:*12* 74:9 131:*1* 174:6, 9 190:18 198:20 201:20, 21 211:23 day-long 26:6, 13 192:4 days 212:17 **day-shift** 145:22 day-to-day 107:25 **dead** 121:17 **deadly** 171:10, 13, 17 194:25 **deal** 41:18 45:22 48:22 52:15 72:5 134:15 145:13, 18 151:3 195:11 197:10 **dealing** 26:7 46:13 57:11 60:8 97:22 101:11 160:4 180:22 194:2, 17 200:9, 10 201:21 202:22 205:9, 12 207:2 dealt 197:11 201:18 **Dear** 212:9 death 37:14 38:2 50:2, 3, 7 67:2, 16

deceased 165:7

December 208:19

decide 90:15 91:4 94:18 104:9 154:19 **decided** 75:8 76:9 101:21 123:25 133:19, 22 135:17 186:21 193:10 **decides** 195:16 **deciding** 101:19 **decision** 75:21 86:20 90:17 97:21 100:3 107:19 162:23 164:7 decisions 92:25 115:23 161:14 **declare** 209:4 deescalate 25:14 27:21 30:19 39:11, *14* 41:*10*, *15* 47:*11* 70:5 72:9, 18 96:20 162:*1* 174:*14* 176:*10* deescalated 200:14 deescalating 39:19 101:24 108:9 134:9 135:5 174:20 175:20 203:23 deescalation 13:24 14:3, 12 16:24 17:1, 5, 10 21:1, 3, 19 22:1, 4, 9, 12 23:6, 11, 12, 15 24:1, 2, 13, 18 25:9, 12, 22, 25 26:4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 19, 22 27:3, 7, 10, 13, 15, 20, 22 28:14, 17, 21, 24 29:13, 17 30:15, 21, 24 31:5, 13, 19, 22 40:5, 10 41:3 53:4 55:1 70:9 96:9, 16, *23* 97:6, 9 98:*12* 99:5 102:25 103:12 197:17 204:4 205:15 deescalation's 24:4 **defeat** 153:20 **defend** 20:18 30:10 166:3, 4 182:2 195:*17* defendant 10:1 **Defendants** 1:14 2:8, 18 **defense** 10:3, 16

deference 117:4, 9 deficiencies 207:25 define 32:2 109:24 113:17 **definite** 24:17 43:16, definitely 26:14 42:19 84:10 96:23 136:9, 11 167:3 187:8 definition 32:6 114:23 129:12 201:9, 23 definitive 153:19 155:*15* definitively 176:20 190:6 **delete** 210:3, 4 deliberately 72:9 **delusion** 130:16 **delusional** 40:8, 19 42:6 71:21 delusions 51:18 demographic 8:23 **demonstrate** 25:8, 15 denv 195:17 196:19, 20 **DEPARTMENT** 1:9 4:14 8:4 22:5, 18 23:5, 18, 23 27:1 32:1 34:10 50:10 54:20 55:23 56:21 58:10, 23 59:24 60:18, 21 87:13, 17, 25 89:9 105:2, 5 106:3 108:5, 11 109:13, 17 110:7 129:17 130:3 133:9, *12* 137:24 144:16, 21 149:7 150:9 151:5, *12, 18* 152:2, *13, 17* 155:6, 21 156:11 161:25 165:19 166:4, 9, 22 167:2, 4 170:22 171:25 173:4 180:*13* 183:*3*, *14* 190:*13* 202:11, 12, 14 207:2, 14

departments 13:16 19:25 20:2 34:8, 12 105:22 106:4, 12 department's 107:15 162:23 193:20 depending 43:18 187:3 depends 41:22 123:14 **deploy** 34:7, 19 179:25 **deployed** 148:20 152:3 173:16 182:12 183:9 184:16, 17 deploying 164:20 182:*13* deployment 182:6 183:*3* **DEPONENT'S** 210:1 **DEPOSITION** 1:17 4:16, 19, 23 5:5, 8, 13 7:24 9:17 13:9 64:12 65:23 80:23 90:13 188:4 198:3 208:24 209:6 210:6, 7, 10 211:5, 16 212:9, 12.15 **depositions** 6:8 9:20 10:10, 11 12:18 51:13 55:9 69:11 80:17 192:25 **deputies** 4:15 38:21 53:24 55:4 56:12, 21 57:2, 4 58:10 64:23 69:9, 17 77:5 79:19 80:4, 7, 17, 22 83:13 85:3, 14 86:20 87:3 88:12, 21 89:3, 9, 24 90:9 91:20 93:8, 18 94:4, 13 99:9 100:20 101:2, 7, 10 102:20 103:3, 19, 20 125:18, 21 126:8 128:2, 6 129:17 130:3, 17 131:5 133:9 134:21, 24 135:4 136:*15* 137:7, 11, 24 139:20 141:13 148:12 149:12 152:7 155:5 158:9, 19 162:18

164:11, 13 166:20 168:*1* 171:22 173:9, 21 174:4, 12, 25 175:15 176:16 181:4, 20, 25 183:9 184:10, 18 185:19 188:11 189:15, 23 190:6 191:*15* 193:*1* 196:*1*, 2 203:11 204:1, 16, 25 205:6 207:18 **DEPUTY** 1:11, 12, 13, 14 53:21 57:10 64:13 65:2, 8, 24 66:2 69:16 74:3, 6, 8, 17 75:2, 3, 6, 11, 12, 15, 23 76:1, 9, 16, 22 77:1, 10 78:7, 10 79:11, 16 80:10 81:1, 4, 8, 13, 20, 24 82:1 83:23, 24 84:8 85:2, 5, 13 87:7, 8 89:10 91:20 92:15 94:3 95:12 96:5, 6 97:20 100:22 101:21 102:14, 24 103:14, 15 122:16, 25 123:16, 22, 25 124:11, 18 125:12, 18 126:14 130:11, 13, 19 131:2, 4, 6, 8 133:14, 23 134:3 137:13, 14 138:6 141:12, 15 142:2, 9, 23 143:2, 12 145:21 147:4 155:24 156:15 159:14 160:7, 19, 21 161:10 174:13 175:12, 16 176:18 177:16, 17, 19 178:3, *5*, *11*, *14*, *21* 179:*15*, *17*, *20* 181:*11* 182:*13* 186:4 188:5, 16 193:1, 7, 8, 15 196:14 198:3 203:10 204:2, 25 205:5 207:7 **deputy's** 80:1 86:7 describe 52:13 107:24 140:15 144:5 168:5

described 78:11 89:12, 13, 14, 15 196:9 201:7 describing 81:2, 4 143:2 **Description** 3:4 73:22 96:3 205:15 descriptions 130:14 163:25 design 24:10 193:14 194:13 designation 63:14 **designed** 20:17 35:1 101:10 105:15 190:19 194:22 desire 46:3 65:5 66:1, 9 68:6 105:2, desires 67:6 **detail** 6:10 33:24 99:3 182:10 206:13 **detailed** 9:16 38:12 detailing 6:2 **detain** 112:20 114:10 119:17 **detained** 123:17 125:15 127:15, 17 **DETECTIVE** 1:11, 12 55:15, 19 56:1 117:11, 16 163:16 187:23 detectives 23:4 detention 122:16 124:12, 13, 23, 25 125:3 126:21 127:11, 21 determination 114:15 determine 116:25 160:11 167:1 204:16 determined 205:7 **deterrent** 29:14 30:9 **develop** 144:17 203:1 device 152:3, 10 devised 29:3 diagnose 42:24 diagnoses 42:21 diagnosis 43:9 62:4 **die** 64:23, 25 65:18 66:1, 3, 16 67:25 73:6 76:13

died 126:5 186:23 187:20 **difference** 32:11, 22 83:4 84:14 119:9, 22 **different** 12:*14* 13:20 17:21 18:1, 5, 7 19:19 20:2, 4 34:11 35:19 36:14 46:2 54:22 61:24 67:15, 18 84:12 87:2, *3* 105:20 106:21, 22 107:1 114:14 138:4 151:7, 13 154:11, 12, 13 155:11 164:22, 23 169:7 170:*11* 181:*23* 192:4 196:9 differentiating 181:19 differently 36:15 71:10 **difficult** 12:11 32:25 33:13 39:14 41:14, 18. 24 42:3 43:4 44:23 45:22 46:14, 15 52:17 54:10, 14, *16* 70:1, 4, 15 104:13 145:13 146:16 155:10 195:10 204:7 difficulties 191:21 202:17 **difficulty** 40:16 44:1 83:6 diligence 184:6 **direct** 94:16, 20 95:6 150:10, 16 170:7 **directed** 130:25 185:18 direction 75:11 179:17 195:6 211:11 directions 125:5 directly 61:23 162:24 **dirt** 169:20 disagree 28:22 35:10, 16 36:11 37:12 40:25 48:16 52:10 discarded 83:20 disciplines 111:11 **discount** 78:14, 20 90:11 94:7 **discovered** 6:7 49:25

discovery 42:4, 8 49:5, 8, 13 51:17, 21, 25 138:11 140:12 158:*15* **discuss** 78:5 79:2 88:16 99:2, 18 116:20 206:22 discussed 42:19 55:10 57:12 88:16 101:14, 15, 16 102:16 103:2 108:15 144:23 150:17 155:12 162:4 192:24 195:7 196:18 197:18 205:22 discussing 11:11 81:7 96:18 142:1 discussion 85:14 90:7 95:18 99:24 118:13 180:18 181:4, 9 188:24 189:4 190:18 197:5 discussions 126:10 disinterested 211:10 **dislike** 49:6, 19 71:21 disliked 52:1 disobeved 128:1 disobeying 199:8 203:17 **disorder** 42:17, 25 43:1, 13 44:5, 15 45:2 disorders 43:1 dispatch 38:20 55:19 93:18, 22 94:2 dispatcher 159:21 displaying 51:22 77:15 disposing 56:13 disregards 46:8 disruption 162:9 disseminate 22:21 dissemination 15:1 dissociative 42:25 distance 53:2, 7, 10, 16 54:2, 16 86:21 87:14 88:9 94:18 139:*3* 141:*8* 157:*13* 197:11, 14 distances 87:4

distracted 143:8 144:9 distractionary 152:3, **distress** 147:14 151:*1* 187:25 201:*10* **DISTRICT** 1:1, 2 disturbance 29:6 ditch 53:16 55:6 87:12 126:4 127:6, *11*, 22 133:*11*, *13* 134:3, 5 135:22 136:*1* 140:25 141:*11* 145:9 156:12, 22 157:*4* 172:*1* 188:*20* doctor's 50:3 **document** 5:17, 21 8:16 98:16 189:7 documented 65:17 69:5 **documents** 5:11, 12 6:18 38:10 49:9 65:22 124:10 138:11 192:25 **dog** 117:7 134:14 135:14, 18 179:7, 8, 23 dogs 204:9, 11 205:11 **doing** 19:1 24:18 107:1 140:14 142:5 143:20 144:4 150:18 178:*3* 184:*5* 186:*14* 187:23 189:14 207:10 **domain** 10:19 **domains** 10:23 domestic 24:4 domestic-violence 26:8 don'ts 200:17 201:5 door 127:2 132:11 153:16 169:13 doorway 168:11, 19 dos 200:17 201:4 **dot** 73:16 84:17, 21 85:2, 9, 11, 17, 22 86:8 89:5, 15, 20, 21 90:1 91:14, 23 93:3, 10 94:3, 9 95:4

137:22 138:3, 7, 10, *17*, *18*, *20*, *23* 139:2, *5*, 14, 21 145:1, 2 156:18 159:8 196:19 197:3 198:4 **doubting** 176:22 dowels 153:15 **Dr** 37:13 **draw** 67:9 76:9 83:4 97:21 100:4 176:15, 18 drawing 76:18 77:1, 14 97:24 175:17 176:13 **drawn** 79:2 dressed 18:24 drew 123:25 124:1 drive 75:22 123:25 124:20 125:4 133:11 135:8 136:12 156:25 driver 154:17 driver's 146:8. 10 drives 57:1 75:11 87:12 154:17 156:1. 22 198:21 199:4 drivewav 199:5 **driving** 59:11 76:8 77:16 122:18, 23 123:20 124:7 125:9, 16 127:21 134:5 135:25 155:24 198:10.17 203:14 **drone** 6:22 87:25 88:3. 9 150:14 187:9 **drop** 29:21 197:16 drove 53:15 75:13, 16 76:4 81:14, 21 86:24 125:5, 6, 8, 11 127:5, 10 128:6 133:24 134:2, 23, 25 135:21 196:2 drug 36:6 37:14 38:6 146:15 153:5 160:6 161:5 205:20 drug-induced 152:9 **drugs** 36:14, 23, 25 37:5 38:24 39:24, 25 41:19 54:12, 13 100:20 101:15 124:7 153:1, 9 157:7 185:4

198:*16*, *18* 199:*3* 203:5 **drv** 40:6 **DT** 212:3 **due** 184:6 **DUI** 36:8 136:6, 7 198:16 **duty** 129:17 131:23 132:16 147:16, 17 174:24 180:12 **DWYER** 2:14 3:4 4:17 5:9, 22 11:17 12:4 13:2, 4 14:5, 15 15:7.9 21:12 27:23 28:1, 4, 6 32:16 35:11, 13 37:15, 22 38:7 39:1 40:12, 21 44:18 45:3, 7 47:3, 6, 15, 24 49:7, 21 50:11, 14, 18, 24 51:2 52:4, 20 53:6 55:7 57:6, 19 63:20 66:19 68:8 71:24 73:21 74:21, 23 77:24 78:1, 4, 7, 9, 17 79:22 80:6 83:9, 17 87:1 88:22 91:24 92:3, 17 94:24 95:23 97:14, 25 98:5, 8, 10, 14 99:20 100:8 102:6, 8 109:19 110:10, 17, 24 113:6, 10.16 116:12 117:2 118:12 119:13 120:8 127:13 129:20 136:2 139:6 140:3 141:17, 22 142:16 143:24 149:*19*, 22 151:2*1* 172:22 173:22, 25 177:2, 7, 9, 13, 14, 23 178:*1* 190:*3* 208:*8*, 11, 17 dying 66:24 dynamic 17:2

<E>earlier 41:16 120:9 129:12 156:23 180:18 181:4 183:6, 15 195:8 196:18

197:19 202:10 **Early** 200:6 eased 58:3, 5 easier 52:19, 24, 25 54:7 197:9 easily 169:6 182:21 EASTERN 1:2 easv 19:14 35:23 41:21 eat 122:10 **echo** 12:*13* **ECK** 1:13 64:13 65:23, 24 66:2 69:16 74:3, 6, 17 75:2, 3, 6, 12, 15 76:1, 9, 16 77:1 78:10 79:11, 16 80:10 81:13, 20 83:23 84:8 85:2, 5, 13 87:7, 8 89:10 91:20 97:20 100:22 101:21 102:14, 24 103:15 122:16 123:16, 22, 25 124:11 125:12, 18 126:14 130:11, 13, 19 131:2, 4, 6, 8 133:14 137:12 141:12, 15 142:2, 9, *23* 143:2, *12* 147:4 156:15 159:14 160:7, 19 161:10 170:4 181:11 188:16 193:1, 7 196:14 203:10 205:5 Eck's 57:10 75:11, 23 76:22 77:10 78:7 94:3 95:12 96:5 100:24 134:3 198:3 educated 86:11 116:10, 24 117:22 education 112:10 123:5 203:*1* **effect** 25:3 57:14 101:23 116:3 136:4 181:*13* 192:2*1* **effective** 30:8 35:9 54:18 70:9 **effectively** 32:5 34:7, 19 39:18 40:10 44:16 47:13 206:9 **effort** 128:2

efforts 77:10 128:13, 21 **eight** 143:5 either 31:8 34:24 81:18 100:13 108:21 169:2*1* 179:*3* 181:7 191:2*1* 195:5 211:*18* 212:13 **electronic** 208:17, 21 **element** 24:1 29:16 elements 24:12 26:10 28:24 **ELLIS** 1:12 164:13, 14 elucidate 194:7 **Email** 2:16, 21 emotional 204:22 **emotions** 201:*12* emphasizes 193:20 **emplov** 191:4 **employed** 200:19 employees 23:3 60:18 111:10 en 186:4 **enacted** 13:12 129:14 encompass 23:6 encounter 32:13, 24 35:5 77:4, 19 93:19 95:14 103:14 112:14, *17* 137:*3* encounters 112:12 encouraging 23:18 endangered 167:24 endeavor 63:1 **ended** 8:20 143:5 154:22 endless 43:6 **end-user** 22:*1* enforcement 11:2, 9, *14* 12:2, 20 13:*1* 14:4, 12 17:4, 7 19:6, 16 20:12 22:14.15 26:16 27:17 30:25 31:17 35:7, 8, 18 42:6 47:12, 22, 25 48:6, 7, 14 49:6, 12, 14, 19, 20 50:21 51:10 52:1, 3 54:4 58:1 62:11, 12, 25 63:16 65:4 66:9, 14,

25 67:1, 4, 8, 21 68:3 69:1 70:13, 18 71:21, 22 72:5, 10, 19 77:12 79:20 80:4 90:23 92:20, 23 93:6 105:16 106:21 107:3, 24 109:4, 13, 16 111:2, 5 112:9, 13 123:5 128:20, 21 129:4, 8, 24, 25 131:23 132:1, 3, 12, 20, 24 133:17 139:20 154:6 155:*1* 165:20 167:9 187:14, 17 201:1 202:22 enforcement's 122:12 129:10 **engaged** 167:25 **engine** 187:6 **engine's** 146:7 enjoyable 122:9 ensure 166:21 184:21 enter 27:21 **entered** 117:8 169:7 **entering** 153:23 **entirely** 88:6 97:3 149:9 150:8 entrance 29:11 entries 164:22 186:9 187:3 entry 182:13 enunciated 195:22 environment 9:10 68:21 equipment 18:3 166:*4* 186:2*1* **erratic** 130:15 **erratically** 69:6, 18, 21 70:6 **escalated** 77:5, 18 97:2 101:25 102:23 escalating 102:17 108:7 134:8 135:4 174:20 175:20 176:9 203:22 escalation 102:25 **escort** 19:10 especially 45:21

essentially 158:25 establish 183:2 established 26:25 56:18 83:18 150:2 **establishing** 12:*14*, *22* **ESTATE** 1:4 **estimation** 7:9 10:5 et 108:10 **ethics** 133:2 **evaluate** 80:9 166:25 evaluating 92:24 **event** 80:1 events 50:24 79:21 80:3 139:7 206:19 eventually 75:10 76:15 94:18 133:10, 24 134:1 135:2 159:4 160:21 **evidence** 8:15 13:8 37:4, 9, 11 38:4, 8 42:4, 8 49:5 64:11, 19 69:14, 16 75:5, 18 79:11 80:25 81:10, 18, 25 87:14, 19 90:14, 16 91:4, 13 94:16, 21 95:6, 11, 12, 25 96:1 126:7 127:15 134:19 135:11, 21 136:19, 22 137:1, 8, 18 150:21 evidentiary 5:24 6:1, **exact** 7:10 10:4 59:14 93:16 114:13 131:12 148:10 159:24 164:24 210:2, **exactly** 50:6 75:13 79:18 93:14 123:23 124:21 142:8 144:11 149:21 176:22 **EXAMINATION** 3:3. 4 4:5 177:13 **examined** 2:9 4:3 examining 212:20 **example** 19:2 30:21 33:3 52:21 71:8 81:13 117:10 156:8 165:*3* 191:*1*

205:20

examples 13:2 29:1 33:25 34:2 36:2, 17 41:23 46:23 48:8 52:22 68:18 70:12 71:6 101:10 114:3 200:16 **exceeded** 201:11 excellent 203:2 exceptions 107:17 excessive 17:8 100:24 **excuse** 99:21 142:16 **EXECUTED** 209:11 **exercises** 189:*14* exhaustive 20:3 **Exhibit** 3:4 5:16 98:16, 17, 18, 19, 20 99:21, 23 130:7, 10 158:4 172:10 **exhibited** 130:19 **Exhibits** 98:21 208:23 exigencies 181:7 exigency 154:13, 23 155:9, 22, 23 156:6, 9, *12* 157:*10* 181:*5*, *13*, 19, 23 exigent 154:7 **exit** 127:1 **exiting** 183:24 **expect** 193:21 expectation 105:2 167:23 192:19 expectations 12:23 13:16, 22 23:5 191:10 193:20 expensive 106:1 experience 20:1 35:20 39:21 40:14, *15, 24* 45:*10, 20* 46:*5* 50:22 57:22, 24 60:16 70:17, 20 71:2, 11, 12 72:23 82:15 108:13 112:10 113:22 117:5, 7, 9, 12, *15*, *24* 118:22 119:24 121:2, 12 123:6 128:19 129:4 130:2 136:6, 10 153:7, 10 155:4 163:12 172:11, *17*, *23*, *24*, *25* 175:*14*

176:*3* 190:*12* 194:*1* 200:8 202:1, 2, 18 206:7 experienced 46:6 47:20 experiences 132:15 experiencing 39:10, 17 40:19 51:17 57:17 101:12 159:6 **EXPERT** 1:17 3:4 4:17 5:11, 17 6:13, 19 9:22 11:19 27:10, 13 37:16 46:9 57:20 60:13, 19 62:1, 9, 11 63:4, 6 68:9 78:24 79:4, 25 80:4 82:3 84:19 112:6 139:7, 8 158:5 186:23 **expertise** 38:1 62:5, *21* 68:22 81:9 194:*1* **experts** 42:21 68:10 79:20 **expert's** 116:18 118:14 expert-witness 10:13 **expire** 90:21 146:25 **explain** 12:19 40:23 48:*1* 105:2 118:*11* 139:12 190:15 **explained** 8:16 92:8 134:6 196:11 explanation 89:21 107:2, 22 131:10 139:9 176:17 explanations 127:3 express 18:25 67:23, 24, 25 68:2 76:2 81:15 107:15 196:5 **expressed** 67:6 76:6 78:13 80:18 82:1 156:18 159:11 194:5 **expresses** 66:9 81:24 expressing 65:4 67:17 70:23 73:4 108:5 194:11 extends 9:5 extensive 62:17 **extent** 44:13 57:21

68:12 73:24 74:25

136:2 139:13 140:19 180:15 **extra** 33:4 extraneous 17:8 extrapolate 195:21 **extreme** 121:*15* extremely 90:24 < F > face 199:10 **faced** 20:21 63:2, 3 67:5 135:3 154:10 **facility** 59:5 111:12 **facing** 160:4 194:4 fact 22:22 81:7 86:4 94:18 96:1 106:13 107:7 122:2, 19 124:5 141:5 156:15 174:15 175:6 195:10 205:6 **factor** 101:16 184:11 192:25 **factors** 121:13 150:25 facts 38:7 83:17 95:2 102:18 113:24 114:5, 22 117:18, 19 118:*1* 119:23, 25 120:21 121:6, 18 150:4 155:12 171:19 196:*13* **factual** 6:15 38:9 **fail** 26:11 **failed** 165:9 174:23 175:14 **failure** 99:25 **fair** 77:3 107:20 127:6 144:17 187:22 189:20 **fairly** 74:12 76:23 196:23 **fall** 64:5 166:12 169:10 **familiar** 9:7 20:24 31:22 63:19, 23 64:1 66:17 71:2, 4 84:17, 19 **familiarity** 190:*15* family 38:5, 13, 18

57:13 64:15, 17, 22 65:8 73:8 93:6 100:21 124:4, 17 130:22 131:5 138:22 139:*11* 157:*7* 158:9, 15, 19 159:19, 20 160:2, 15, 23 161:11 162:7, 11, 14, 19, 23 163:9, 13, 17, 19 173:6 175:7 198:14 **far** 10:14 53:19 95:1 105:11 106:10 118:15 128:11 167:2 188:22 198:4 **fast** 4:24 103:22 **fatal** 168:3, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 22 169:16, 24 170:19 **fear** 76:2, 3 91:7 133:16, 17 156:17, 18 **featured** 203:10 **federal** 60:23 63:7 feel 35:15 37:22, 24 68:*12* 121:*1* **feeling** 29:21 76:7 81:15 **feelings** 82:*1* 115:23 164:25 165:1 feels 11:22 81:24 **feet** 30:1 **fell** 201:13 felonies 58:3 **felt** 80:19 121:3 147:6, 7 174:22 175:16 176:12 **fidgety** 172:12 **field** 7:18 15:22 16:1, 2, 6, 12, 20 24:10, 11 25:2, 6 26:9 56:10 61:13 62:19 63:2, 21 68:11 115:3 132:13 147:8 151:13 189:10, 14, 21 190:10 191:13 193:7, 16, 18, 19 194:23 207:20 208:5 **fields** 169:21 field-scenario 192:19, 24 193:6

39:7 42:5, 8, 13

fight 24:16 37:1 **fighting** 46:11 **figure** 8:15 142:7 190:21 **final** 67:16 78:24 finally 20:13 147:2, 5 165:6 182:7 **find** 17:13 20:5 24:8, 12 25:20 37:4, 7 38:4 42:4, 8 43:18 49:5 64:10 71:8 98:13, 14 107:25 109:8, 9 115:1 133:2, 6 165:7 178:11 182:24 192:14 206:5 **findings** 37:13 **fine** 4:8 7:10 21:11 83:9 98:23 107:8, 9 124:5 139:6 162:10 177:6 **fingerprint** 115:9, 10 fingers-interlocking 19:19 **fire** 67:9 71:10 154:19 166:9 167:4 169:12 184:20 **firearm** 73:16 74:17 76:9, 18 77:2, 14 79:1 85:3, 4, 5 86:8, 9, 10, 12, 19 88:14, 21 89:4, 25 90:1 92:14, *15*, *16*, *21* 93:23 94:5, *21* 102:*15* 134:*4* 138:17, 19 139:22 175:17 176:13, 15, 18 197:13 204:17 **firearms** 84:18 97:21, 24 100:4 103:15 181:21 **firing** 154:22 **first** 2:9 4:2, 12 6:5 18:14 22:21 30:18 31:10 54:16 56:18 57:18 58:22 62:3 91:21 101:25 102:2, 3, 4, 13 109:20 130:11 132:1 146:1, *3* 148:*14*, *25* 158:*12* 159:17 160:7 183:7 185:8 207:25

five 16:9 143:4 168:9 186:9 **five-minute** 47:3 177:3 flashbang 152:4 157:17 182:12 184:20 **flavor** 80:2 **flinch** 157:19 **flock** 132:10 **flooded** 56:9 169:20 **flow** 35:23 **flowing** 190:*19* **FOCUS** 1:21 89:23 116:*16* 212:*1* **focused** 204:12 **focusing** 100:*3* **Focuslitigationsolution s.com** 1:23 212:3 **follow** 46:4 53:11 99:25 140:6 156:4 175:19 189:13 193:2 206:19 **followed** 6:15 160:20 following 189:2 210:9 follows 4:3 **food** 122:10 **force** 13:23 17:8, 12, *14*, *19*, *20*, *21*, *23* 18:2, 5, 12, 14 19:20 20:21, 23 26:9 27:18 29:16 30:14 31:2, 18, 22 45:17 66:11, 25 95:9 108:9 166:8 181:16 187:12 191:23, 24 194:25 195:11 197:1, 22 199:25 **forced** 17:16 182:2 foregoing 209:5 211:5, 12, 19 **foreign** 43:5 44:2 forensic 79:4 **form** 6:11 30:23 34:10 162:12 190:2 **formal** 67:11 125:19 126:8 128:23 **forms** 153:15 **formulate** 158:10

forth 2:10 81:14, 22 89:11 96:19 155:25 199:11 forward 75:16, 22 154:18 forwards 125:9 196:3 **found** 73:6, 20, 25 90:17 98:11, 25 115:1, 4, 5 142:20 146:17 167:8 199:7 200:23 **four** 10:8, 15 16:9 84:1 133:7 143:4 148:22 168:9 186:7, 9, 12, 16, 18 four-day 22:6 **fourth** 143:15 **frame** 117:8 183:4 184:25 frankly 203:7, 10 free 112:15, 16 123:17, 19 126:15 **front** 5:17, 19 6:10 154:17 156:7 165:20 168:11 170:13 **fulfill** 16:18 159:10 **full** 211:*12* **fully** 14:15 113:4 130:16 141:1 197:6 **funnel** 168:3, 6, 10, 14, 16, 18, 22 169:16, 24 170:19 **further** 39:4 44:20 53:10 56:24 78:18, 20 88:24 133:7 160:8 176:24 179:20 199:19 206:11 208:9 211:17 **future** 206:20 < G > gain 36:9 96:10, 14 151:13 200:25

gained 39:5 **gather** 160:22 **gauge** 151:6 gear 125:11 126:18 **general** 18:15 21:5 34:21 38:20 41:13

48:18 51:11 61:10 68:15 95:16 104:6 105:8 106:10 112:9 114:4, 19 120:23, 24 127:8 130:2*1* 153:25 162:13 163:12, 13 164:25 165:*1* 166:*10* 168:23 176:6 197:7 generality 52:20 generalization 144:18 generally 4:22 12:17, 22 18:14 25:2, 21 26:10 33:17 99:9 103:19, 20 106:19, 20, *24*, *25* 108:2 123:*12* 128:17 154:14 163:5 165:21, 24 172:10, 11 181:5 189:3, 17 190:*17* 205:22 206:*1* gestures 4:25 **getting** 20:11, 25 30:12 60:4 80:2 104:14 135:25 146:18 160:1 161:11 204:14 give 4:24 10:4 11:17, 20, 22 12:5 13:2 25:19 28:25 31:4 34:8 37:15, 23 40:12 41:21 42:23 43:9 51:2 58:20 79:12 86:12 89:18 99:20 113:3 114:3 117:4, 9, 12, 24 121:20, 22 129:22 136:3 139:13 145:5 146:4 147:10 157:14 164:25 172:22 192:11 197:24 **given** 8:13 19:3 20:9 30:7 34:13 42:20, 23 44:21 50:4 71:5 73:23 92:24 127:3, 25 131:10 157:6 193:12 196:13 **giving** 191:17 192:7 **go** 4:23 5:2, 6 11:23 14:18 15:7, 8, 10, 15 22:20 23:1 25:2 28:8 29:21 30:1, 11

32:18 35:12, 15 37:24 38:10 39:6 40:14, 24 41:16 43:16 44:21 47:5, 17 51:3 56:2 57:21 64:18 65:7 68:13 71:6 72:1 73:24 75:2 76:21 78:9, 19 82:19, 24 83:7 88:23 89:1 91:6, 17 92:18 93:13 94:18 95:1 97:14, 17 98:15 99:4, *17* 100:*14* 104:*6* 105:17 108:22 110:2 111:13 115:10 117:2, 8 118:*18* 119:*15* 120:12 122:6 132:13, *14* 133:4 139:*15* 147:2, *15* 153:21 157:15 158:1 165:20 176:21 177:9, 10 180:*3* 181:*6* 183:*11* 185:16 191:12 193:11 194:8 203:20 208:3, 13 **goal** 17:7 23:17 25:1 27:15, 16, 22 31:5 63:1 68:17 73:13 96:20 **goal-oriented** 68:6. 16, 22 goes 101:9 131:25 146:6 156:*1*2 163:*1* 184:12 192:18 going 5:4 10:2 18:20, 25 19:12 21:1, 17 23:12 25:18, 25 26:24 27:1 28:22 31:7 34:21 35:13, 25 36:11, 21 38:17 40:19 41:5 43:22 44:9 46:12, 18, 25 47:22 48:14, 19 52:13 53:24 58:6, 25 60:10 62:8, 24 63:4 64:25 66:25 70:1 81:18 82:20 83:2 85:9, 23 87:10 88:18, 20 90:16 91:5, 6, 11 92:25 94:10 95:8

96:2 101:19 103:8 104:9, 11 107:4 108:7, 8, 18 109:1 111:23 114:15 115:6 116:13 117:16 118:4, *5, 15* 119:*1, 13* 120:24 121:9, 20 122:1 123:12, 13 124:4 129:11 130:14 131:11 135:6, 8, 10 139:2*1* 143:6 148:*1*8 150:*18* 151:*25* 152:*1*. *10* 154:*4* 155:22 156:*1*, *3*, *5* 162:25 164:23 168:10, 24 170:9 172:1 173:19 177:*10* 182:*25* 183:*1* 187:2, *14* 188:23 195:2, 17 197:2, 4, 15, *16*, *23* 198:*13* 199:*13* 202:8 204:7, 11, 13 206:5, 12 **Good** 4:6, 10, 12 7:9 10:5 12:12 36:20 40:18 44:25 47:4 68:19 77:7 106:9 108:13, 15 132:6, 8 174:15 177:9 184:3, 4 190:8 200:25 201:16 202:5, 23 204:2 206:21 207:21 208:3 **goodbye** 64:24 Gooseneck 19:18 **gosh** 37:1 **govern** 14:22 **grabbed** 95:20 **grade** 25:19 graded 25:13, 17 graduate 15:15 great 46:20 108:19 156:8 185:3 191:8 202:14 greater 62:21 157:22, *25* 191:*17* Green 59:8, 9 grenade 182:12 184:20 **groin** 33:13

GROSS 2:19 3:3 4:5, 6, 13 12:1, 19 13:3, 7 14:11 15:14 16:4 21:14, 18 27:25 28:2, 12 32:21 35:16 37:19 38:4, 23 39:9 40:17 41:9 44:24 45:6 46:25 47:5, 8, *19* 48:5 49:*10*, *24* 50:13, 16, 17, 21 51:1, 16 52:7 53:2, 9 55:12 57:16 58:8 63:23 66:21 68:25 72:7 74:2 75:5 77:25 78:3, 5, 8, 14, 22 79:23 80:11 82:3 83:7, 11, 22 87:11 89:3 91:25 92:4, 11, 20 96:4 97:19 98:4, 7, 9, 17, 23 99:14, 23 102:7, 10 110:5, 15, 22, 25 113:8, 13, 18 116:24 118:9 119:6 120:6, 16 122:6, 8 127:19 129:25 136:14 139:19 141:19 142:12, 22 144:14 149:21 150:5 151:24 158:1, 3 172:24 173:24 174:2 176:24 179:*13* 182:5, 8, 9 184:9 188:24 190:1 208:9, 10, 13, 16, 22 **ground** 19:1 74:1 149:18 154:3 **grow** 140:19 **growing** 71:15 140:17 guarantee 157:18 **guarding** 132:10 guess 10:21 11:5 12:15 15:17 21:6 34:3 44:12 59:1 83:5 86:11 102:14 115:16, 18 118:5 140:8 142:20 147:2 155:18 175:22 176:2 **guesses** 115:24 116:10, 24 117:22

guessing 12:17 15:18 117:17, 23 guideline 150:3 guidelines 103:21 **gun** 20:21 95:8 100:23 101:22 102:19 121:3 124:1 133:14, 16 134:10 154:19 169:3 177:18 178:5, 22 194:18, 21 196:11 197:3, 11 203:18 guns 29:25 84:22 134:13 135:13, 15, 17 173:21 174:4, 19 175:8, 10 178:9 181:*12* 188:*17* 193:*3* 196:8 199:16 204:9, 11 205:10 **guns-out** 178:25 **guy** 29:9 31:2 46:19 115:2, 11 157:24 guys 175:2, 3 208:14 guy's 29:25 81:16 124:7 147:7 203:17 <H> **half** 118:16 184:16 185:5 **hall** 29:4, 7, 10 **hallmarks** 66:7, 8, 12 **hallway** 168:8 hamper 36:18 48:20 **hand** 108:22, 23 197:15 203:20, 21 **handcuff** 121:23 **handcuffs** 114:*19* 123:11 **handed** 199:10 **handle** 74:7 85:17 101:20, 22 105:20 107:8 121:3 146:24 193:10 **handled** 72:1 108:6 192:3 **handles** 107:9 **hands** 66:25 95:15 96:22 123:10 126:17 128:16 154:2 174:16

hands-on 33:19 128:2, 13 **hanging** 67:25 91:11 104:18 159:24 **happen** 41:6 107:16 145:18 147:18 **happened** 16:*16* 50:25 71:9 76:5 77:9 81:11, 12, 25 82:16 114:2 116:17 119:20 145:19 165:16 193:6, 9 happening 44:10 71:6 104:20 **happens** 15:19 41:5 **happy** 142:3 171:5 **harbor** 10:20 11:5 hard 26:12 35:17, 18, 21 68:23 80:15 103:22 104:25 122:1 153:18 195:10 **harder** 53:11 97:1 176:10 182:24 **harm** 91:15 168:13 170:7 180:*15* **harm's** 167:23 181:16 Harvard 2:20 **hate** 48:7 **hatred** 48:*3* **hazard** 12:15 44:12 84:15 85:8 115:18 **hazards** 85:18 **head** 8:18 9:19 79:14 93:15 156:21 171:6 194:*18*, *21* **health** 17:18 23:25 39:10, 13, 24, 25 40:1, 3 45:18 101:12, 16 130:23 160:5, 6 161:5 187:20 199:3 200:11 201:10 202:20, 25 203:6, 12, 19 healthness 131:19 hear 35:24 53:3, 11 78:*1* 94:*10* 178:*17*, 18 196:5 **heard** 35:19 63:16 72:12 78:1, 12 79:17

90:18 120:13, 14 151:2*1* **hearing** 22:*13* **heart** 146:15 161:4 187:20 heartbeat 167:6 **heavily** 33:11 140:20 heavy 105:17 heck 159:2 hectic 135:19 **height** 93:11 **held** 58:24 59:4, 23 194:21 helicopter 147:23 **help** 36:2 57:18 58:1, 9, 12 60:8 67:19 73:4, 7, 10 101:8 105:15 126:11 131:24 132:1, 6, 17, 23 147:17, 20 151:1 157:2*4* 161:*13* 162:11. 12 163:10 170:17, 20, 21 185:17 187:18 192:21 193:16 200:23 202:18 203:21 206:21 207:1 208:5, **helped** 160:3 174:22 **helpful** 116:*18* 195:20 204:18 **helping** 132:20 207:9 **helps** 190:22 192:20 201:17 **HENNEFER** 1:4, 5 8:3 37:4 38:13, 22 39:2 42:6, 9, 13 49:6, *13*, *25* 50:22 51:*17*, 22 52:1, 9 53:15, 23 54:21 55:5, 11, 16, 20, 24 56:2, 9, 19 57:1, 5 58:9 64:11, 13, 16, 23 65:17, 25 69:6, 17 74:3, 14, 18 75:4, 7, 10, 16 76:4, 8 77:4, *15, 16* 79:7, *13* 81:*14*, 21 82:17 83:14 85:4 86:21 87:12 88:13 89:4, 11, 13 91:22 93:3, 18, 23 94:5

95:13 100:4, 20, 22 101:8, 13 102:19, 22 103:3 122:17, 21 123:4, 16, 25 124:11, 16 125:3, 12, 18, 22 126:7, 15, 20 127:20 129:19 130:4, 20 131:18 133:10, 12, 19, 22 134:2, 5, 7, 8, 19 136:17 137:4 141:12 142:9, *13*, 22 143:*14* 144:9 145:8 148:6 149:3, 8, 14, 15 150:7, 11. 23 152:5, 8, 19 155:7, 24 156:16 159:6, 10 160:12, 15, *25* 161:*19* 162:*1*, *24* 165:7, *13* 166:23 167:25 170:*1*, 5, 7, 23 173:5 174:17, 19 175:8, 18 177:17, 18 178:2, 6, 7, 10, 15, 23 179:7, 22 180:8, 14, 23 181:1, 12, 21 188:2, *8*, *18* 195:23 196:23 198:24 199:18, 22 200:9 201:13 204:5, 8, 17 207:21 212:7 Hennefer's 37:14 38:5 39:5 66:5 73:16, 20 74:24 75:1, 6, 21 76:12 77:21 78:6, 15, 23 79:18 84:4 96:4 101:2, 6 124:24 130:12, 13, 15 131:3, 9 133:17 134:15 135:24 141:14 143:20, 21 144:21 148:14 151:14, 19 160:9 161:15 170:18 177:16 178:12, 13, 19 184:19 196:15 hereinafter 2:10 **hereto** 209:8 **hesitate** 33:23 79:9 117:23 122:3 **Hey** 31:6 115:4 136:23 145:7 156:9

166:13 175:2 188:5, 10 192:15 **hidden** 86:2 **high** 121:14 199:1, highly-trained 45:12 highs 43:16 **Highway** 145:23 **hired** 10:12 26:18 159:*11* his/her 211:14 **history** 6:12 9:20 38:24 39:2, 5, 8 57:13 157:6 185:4 **hit** 156:21 **HNT** 159:4 162:7 **hold** 19:14, 18 27:9 60:13, 19 62:1, 8 104:11 105:1 118:5 160:12 **holding** 6:4 194:18, **holds** 19:7, 18, 19 **holster** 175:3 **home** 30:11 homes 140:21 **honest** 11:15 12:2, 6 81:20 **honesty** 176:1 **hope** 67:8 191:3 **hopefully** 34:14 122:9 177:5 horses 9:4 **hospital** 93:24 94:10 166:20 hostage 60:14, 20, 21 61:7, 14, 19 162:4, 5 hour 2:2 24:22, 23 47:*1* 70:*7* 118:*16* 147:1, 2 148:10 184:*16* 185:*5*, *21* hours 7:5, 8 22:3 24:23 26:2 147:5, 7 151:20 182:19 185:6. 7, 10, 14, 23 186:11 house 153:16 154:2, 4 161:7 180:22 houses 140:23 hover 148:1 **human** 79:5

hunches 115:24 117:24 hundred 114:3 151:6 hundreds 45:16, 17 60:17 hurry 134:12 208:19, 20 hurt 31:8 71:1 72:25 157:2 181:8 191:25 201:2, 3 hurting 132:7 hypothetical 12:6 38:8 40:13, 22 47:15 117:17

< I > idea 66:15, 24 67:4 68:3 78:25 79:7 102:16 116:13 118:13 128:9 146:24 159:11 160:1 192:8 196:22 205:18 **ideal** 195:9 ideas 107:13 117:25 190:24 202:6 **ideation** 62:6, 7, 8 64:5 67:18 70:23 76:25 194:2, 6, 11 196:6 ideations 82:1 **identified** 3:4 98:22 identify 82:25 205:15 identifying 103:8 **ignore** 188:9 ill 200:15, 21 illness 42:10, 12 57:15 60:7, 8 133:21 201:15, 25 imagine 135:9 162:20 175:19 immediate 75:22 76:15, 18 83:15 129:18 130:4 131:13 141:5 immediately 50:5 59:16 168:1 **impact** 53:4 impaired 57:9

133:20

impatient 159:22 impediment 48:22 impediments 54:18 70:8 **implement** 190:10 **implies** 153:19 **important** 22:12, 20 43:2 90:24 132:4 201:6 203:3 204:10, 25 206:19 impossible 107:23 109:24 131:8 impression 123:23 **improper** 199:20 **inability** 53:3 204:22 inaccurate 129:23 **inaction** 204:24 inactions 101:5 inappropriate 196:12 incapacitating 133:11 incident 6:15, 17 7:25 8:1, 3, 7, 12, 18 12:3 37:3 49:24 50:25 53:14 61:10. 12 64:10 78:16 79:8 80:5, 10 87:2, 7 116:17, 21 118:14, 16 121:10 139:8 140:8, *16* 161:7, *12*, *25* 169:24 170:24 178:4 179:2, 3, 16 181:2 184:12 188:15, 16 195:24 204:5 207:6, 15.18 incidents 97:23 **include** 162:*17* **includes** 18:10 including 13:21 incomplete 104:15 incorporate 23:25 24:2, 25 26:10 45:11, 13 208:5 incorporated 23:24 24:7 Incorrect 126:1 incorrectly 178:15 indexes 208:18 **indicate** 50:7 115:4

178:21 210:2, 3

indicated 184:11 **indicates** 113:24 **indicating** 212:*16* indication 66:6 164:17 178:14 indications 148:16 164:18 **individual** 9:6 67:9 71:23 81:21 94:17 112:25 115:5 146:16 154:12 184:7 individually 4:15 individuals 67:15 68:6, 25 70:18 individual's 29:7 144:4 inexperienced 117:25 174:18 **inferences** 117:*18* **influence** 36:22 37:4 38:14 41:13, 25 50:1, 8, 23 51:5, 8 54:12 69:21, 24 70:5, 15 71:20 92:25 122:18. 23 123:20 125:16 153:1, 4, 9 172:6, 9 203:4 influenced 131:1 **inform** 123:16 information 7:128:13 15:2, 17 21:13 22:21 38:10, 13 39:7 49:16, 25 50:4 51:13, 16, 21, 25 65:2, 9, 12, 22 73:15 80:21 82:7, 9 85:13 87:22, 24 93:5 94:2, 13 100:13 115:8, 24 137:24 138:25 149:17 158:9, 13 159:7, 14, 19 160:8, 11, 18 161:2, 9, 12 162:12 163:17, 19, *23* 164:*3*, *4* 165:*1* 171:2, 23 188:8 **informed** 211:*14* ingested 57:11 **in-house** 111:6 initial 87:6 95:14 103:14 122:16 141:13 144:12

166:20 167:6, 10 186:9 188:*16* 198:*11* initialed 209:7 initially 73:19 124:3, *14*, *22* 133:23 134:7 146:3 174:7 175:12 193:10 initials 63:22 64:6 **injured** 70:18 76:3 ink 209:7 innocent 157:2 167:15, 16 **In-person** 24:21 38:12 insert 24:12 28:10 44:2 107:7 162:15 **inserting** 17:1 163:14 **in-service** 111:17 inside 55:6 89:5 90:1 151:11 152:15, *19* 157:*12* 168:*12* 170:6 instance 111:5 170:17 instances 192:7 200:13 institution 63:13 instructed 37:19 instruction 22:7 24:23 instructor 22:1 instructor-level 26:21 **instructors** 60:1, 3 intel 163:13 183:25 187:9 intelligence 100:22 158:9, 13 159:18 160:2, 22 161:13 163:14 intend 129:16 130:2 intended 170:7 intent 72:8 77:21 78:6 intention 72:18 intentional 205:3 **interact** 146:21 interacted 172:5 interacting 79:19 156:16 194:5

interaction 95:4 133:10 143:13 interactions 201:6 interested 142:12 211:20 interesting 72:21 78:25 103:23 116:*11* 198:2 interfere 40:20 47:22 48:14, 20 161:24 **interfering** 35:7 45:2 **interject** 158:*16* **internal** 201:11 interpretation 104:2 interpreted 99:10 intervention 13:10 42:18 58:15, 19, 22 59:3, 7, 18 60:14, 15, 18, 24 61:2 97:22 146:22 202:8 intoxicated 200:10. 15, 21 intoxication 38:3 41:19 50:19 51:15 introduce 5:15 investigate 77:13 112:21 114:8, 11 118:7 119:18 124:9 investigated 125:16 investigating 160:8 investigation 114:12 121:23 123:14, 20 159:9. *15* 160:*18* investigator 63:13 involve 28:25 207:11 **involved** 13:14 22:17, 19 23:10, 20, 21 61:23 64:8 113:25 114:10 138:21 139:1 **involves** 121:15 **irrelevant** 119:*14* **island** 188:*13* **issue** 17:18 19:13 37:16, 24 77:2 84:2, *11* 109:*1* 110:8 142:1 149:6 **issued** 166:4

issues 39:10, 13 40:1, 3 48:7 54:19 103:9 125:24 130:23 144:24 146:15 160:4 161:4, 5 187:20 200:11 202:17, 20 issuing 97:1 item 34:20 100:19 180:1 items 5:24 6:1, 9 120:25 its 129:17 182:7

< J > **JAH** 1:4 iail 85:25 123:13 January 8:3 jaywalker 121:25 122:3 **jeopardy** 167:15 **job** 17:10 20:11 34:9 46:6 117:11 159:11 162:9 165:23 166:5 167:11 174:11, *15* 202:*14* 204:2 **JOSEPH** 1:10 **judging** 125:7 **judgment** 133:20 136:5 JUH 1:4 jump 157:19 188:23 **jumping** 76:5 juncture 77:4 jury 178:11, 20

< K >
K9 134:13 173:14,
16 179:2, 15, 21, 25
K9s 179:4
keep 17:11 23:15
25:20 86:21 87:14
94:17 110:15 114:4
135:17 153:20 163:6
179:21, 23 187:16
194:16 202:5, 23
203:21 208:4
keeping 132:10
178:22

justify 122:1

kept 17:16 22:13 95:15 188:17, 18 Kevlar 33:9 key 23:8 77:18 158:8, *12* 159:*18* 160:22 kids 64:24 **kill** 65:5 66:9, 14 67:5, 9, 22 68:4 72:19 95:10 101:3 102:20 133:23 135:7 169:4 killed 70:18 121:20 191:25 194:24 **killing** 67:19 72:10 **kills** 67:2 kind 13:25 20:15 21:5 23:22 26:12 30:18 31:9 34:24 35:3 36:15 41:1 43:12 54:14 58:3 66:23 68:15 70:7 84:6, 16 112:9 116:1 119:12 132:9 140:9 158:25 164:25 186:12 188:6 199:19 202:16 **knew** 85:19 93:8, 9, *10* 100:20 130:*12*, *13* 131:2 176:13 188:12 **knife** 29:21 73:19, 22, 25 74:4, 7, 10, 14 83:16, 19, 20 84:5, 8, 13 85:17 89:14 95:17, 20, 21, 22 136:16, 18, 19, 23, 24 137:2, 4, 7, 16, 19 145:*1* 156:20 196:2*1*, 25 197:9, 15, 16 198:4, 8 200:2, 4 **Knives** 197:11 **knocking** 153:16 **know** 5:3 6:10 8:7, *10* 10:21, 22, 25 11:1, 6 12:13 15:20, 22 16:*1*, *5* 18:23 21:25 24:24 25:13 26:6 29:24 33:17 34:15 40:21 41:21 44:10, 11 45:23 46:2, 9

48:3 50:6 51:1, 11 58:18 61:16 69:7 70:1 71:18 73:6, 24 74:24 76:4, 15 79:13 80:6, 11 82:11 86:15 93:9, 11, 12, 15 102:17 105:10, 11, 25 106:1, 11 109:20 110:13 111:25 113:16 117:14 118:6 123:*1*, *23* 131:9, *11* 132:3, 10 135:9 137:22 138:2, 13, 18, 19 139:4, 16, 17 140:18 142:12, 22 143:11, 12 144:4, 11 147:5, 16 148:5, 25 149:1, 19, 21, 22 150:6 157:14 158:24 159:*1* 162:6, *16* 164:10 167:2 170:20 171:8, 19 175:16 180:*4* 183:*18*, *23* 185:3, 23 186:23 187:7 188:*13* 192:*17* 198:5, 20 202:1 203:7 204:19 206:12 knowledge 39:4 69:13 110:11 116:4 140:20 146:14 157:6, known 14:25 85:14 114:6 115:24 152:3 knows 39:2 115:7 176:19

<L>
labeled 5:17
lack 101:6 158:10
159:7
lacking 77:20
lacks 14:6
lamas 9:4
landscape 140:1
lane 169:20
language 23:23
106:4, 24 107:20, 23
108:1 133:3, 6
159:24 176:4 188:25

191:10 203:2 205:24 206:3 **laps** 150:18 large 26:24 73:19, 22 132:19 145:9 157:3 167:19 **late** 165:17 186:5 latest 108:16 launch 157:16 launcher 20:7 **LAW** 2:14 11:1, 9, 14, 18, 19 12:1, 20, 23 13:1, 12, 22 14:4, 12 17:4, 7, 24, 25 18:8 19:5, 16 20:11 22:13, 15 26:16 27:17 30:25 31:16 35:7, 8, 18 42:5 47:11, 21, 24 48:6, 7, 13 49:6, 12, 14, 18, 19 50:21 51:9 52:*1*, *3* 54:*4* 58:*1* 62:11, 12, 25 63:16 65:3 66:9, 13, 25 67:1, 3, 8, 21 68:3 69:1 70:13, 18 71:21, 22 72:5, 9, 19 77:12 79:20 80:4 90:23 92:20, 23 93:6 105:15 106:7, 21 107:3, 24 108:22, 25 109:1, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21 110:20 111:1,4 112:9, 13 114:13 122:12 123:5 128:19, 20, 21 129:4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25 131:23, 25 132:3, 12, 20, 24 133:17 139:19 154:6 155:*1* 165:20 167:9 187:14, 17 200:4 201:1 202:22 212:20 laws 13:19 111:1 112:11 **lawsuit** 4:15 116:15 **lay** 139:*14* **lead** 117:19 118:6 120:22 121:19 173:7 **lead-in** 60:4

leads 114:6 189:22, *23* 191:2*1* **learn** 171:16 189:13 193:17 203:20 206:21 **learned** 43:10 138:22 160:23 192:12 learner 208:6 learners 190:14 **learning** 10:19, 23 161:17 **leave** 19:8 38:15 46:24 75:8 96:21 104:18 112:16 115:16 123:17, 19 126:15 143:6 172:15 **leaving** 124:15 leeway 121:21 145:5 146:4 **left** 168:24 169:9, 15 193:24 **legal** 11:18, 20, 22 12:5 77:12 108:19 110:16, 18, 23 128:18, 25 129:3, 20, 22 130:*1* legislation 14:9 legislators 13:20 legislature 13:14 14:21 129:14 **lengthy** 60:16 **Leno** 143:6 **less-lethal** 152:14. 18 164:20 176:14 182:6, *14*, *15*, *20* 183:2 184:20 **lessons** 111:*14* **LETA** 111:20 **lethal** 20:14, 16, 17 148:21 176:14 183:9 195:11 197:21 199:25 lethargic 43:20 letter 25:19 165:9 212:19 **letting** 165:25 **level** 18:14 19:22 112:23 116:6 120:5

123:14 201:10

levels 17:21 18:5, 7, **Lexipol** 104:3 105:6, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22, 24 106:14, 15, 18 Lexipol's 106:9 LIEUTENANT 1:10 61:11 190:23 **life** 20:21 62:24 73:12 76:3 146:16 156:18 160:5 186:25 192:15 194:10, 14, 20, 24 195:3, 12, 17, 18 199:24 201:22 202:4 life-saving 128:22 129:9 likelihood 207:21 **liken** 61:17 **Likewise** 191:*19* **limit** 17:12 114:13 156:24 line 35:23 86:22 104:7 119:14 120:10 122:11 139:17 143:9. *15* 144:5, *10* 150:*10*, 16, 22 151:13 161:17 162:10 199:12 210:11 212:16 **lines** 160:21 **list** 20:3 193:23 **listen** 37:17 **listened** 5:25 29:12 LITIGATION 1:21 212:1 **little** 4:24 5:4 19:20 25:18 46:25 88:15 107:19 138:18 148:*15* 175:2 176:*1* 177:21 182:24 186:5 194:7 198:16 **lived** 140:23 lives 20:19 156:6 local 106:7 **locate** 85:7 86:2 198:7 **located** 59:25 73:16 **locations** 111:*13* **locked** 33:18 **log** 109:5

long 15:22 16:8 23:19 59:20 84:22 144:16 146:25 147:3, 9, 18, 19, 20 149:2 150:6 **longer** 35:8 long-time 38:5 long-winded 44:7 187:13 look 7:8 8:13 9:15 21:4, 7, 10 31:6 50:5 64:18 76:14, 21, 22 79:18 80:25 82:24 90:14 91:3 93:14 95:2, 25 99:1, 17 137:13 140:4 141:8, 9 142:3, 7 151:7 157:14 159:23 171:5 176:21 182:10, 16 190:21 193:9, 23 205:25 looked 89:12 105:11 140:9 170:6 198:5 200:22 **looking** 6:11 9:19 29:9 50:21 59:2 60:2 77:17 82:20 98:6, 11, 12, 14 99:23 100:15, 18 104:22 124:21 129:3, 4 138:24 140:22 143:*1* 147:22 158:4 165:2. *12* 173:23 180:*1* 182:17 187:3 **looks** 10:6 **loops** 150:18 lose 159:18 loss 158:8, 12 **lot** 9:5 20:2 24:5 33:4 46:5 62:5 72:22 82:23 83:17 109:6, 8 117:11 134:7 140:21 168:20 197:9 203:11 204:12 **loud** 157:18 **love** 47:2 65:6 low 197:20 **lower** 98:1 lows 43:17 **lumped** 21:24 186:12

lunch 58:18 122:7, 9, 10 < M > **Madam** 177:23 magnification 138:13, *17* 139:*3* main 192:8 maintain 150:15 197:13 **making** 11:15 43:3 51:10 108:6 138:2 148:25 149:*16* 150:*1* 164:7 175:22 184:13 205:12 Mall 1:21 212:1 MALLORY 1:14 manage 201:11 management's 191:9 mandatory 189:1 maneuver 145:6 maneuvers 144:11 manic 43:19 manner 99:8 196:3 manual 10:24 13:10, 25 14:2, 8, 11, 20, 24 25:1 27:4 104:3, 10, *15* 105:*12*, 22, 24 106:3 108:13, 15, 24 109:3, 9 133:5 193:21 manuals 18:1 27:7 61:2 63:10 73:2 104:25 106:11 112:3 map 81:1 140:22 141:4 **mapping** 140:6 maps 140:5, 11 mark 98:15 massive 109:21 master 27:20 28:14 matched 22:7 **materials** 158:15 math 7:22 148:11 Matt 4:10, 13 10:2 11:25 12:11 14:20 21:12 23:7 28:9 32:19 35:25 41:1 46:1 47:4 49:8 55:7 64:20 68:15 88:25

91:17 93:1 98:14 103:7 110:*3* 113:*16* 116:23 121:8 142:19 177:1 196:18 204:14 205:22 208:12 matter 27:9, 12 36:20 40:18 44:25 45:5 47:20 60:24 63:7 112:7 MATTHEW 2:19 **McGuire** 164:14 mean 17:20 23:12 27:24 28:2 41:8, 12 46:12 49:8 53:6 68:*16* 104:*6* 115:*14*, *21* 126:2 136:*3*, *25* 139:8 147:20 149:10, 14 196:24 meaning 81:1 85:6 116:5 129:13 195:5 means 18:15 41:7 48:2 56:*13* 111:9, *21* 115:25 116:2 119:3 120:23 145:17 154:9 189:25 195:*15* 200:25 meant 101:7 131:3 measurements 139:4 measures 128:22 129:9 185:20 measuring 93:11 medical 37:16, 23 42:20 43:11 50:12, 13, 15 51:14 57:13, 20, 23 62:4, 13 101:8 129:18 130:4 134:17 136:3 146:22 147:14 150:25 157:6 163:25 165:3, 10, 13, 19, 23, 25 166:2, 19, 21, 23 167:7, 10 172:23 185:3 187:25 medically 167:3 **medical's** 148:16 medicine 43:9 **medics** 166:2 meet 114:21 118:25 202:16

meeting 112:15

member 59:17 111:8 124:4, 17 159:20 160:*16* 180:*8* 190:*13* 197:23 198:14 members 38:5, 13, 18 42:5, 9, 13 64:15, 23 65:9 100:21 131:5 138:22 158:15, 19 159:19 160:2, 23 161:11 162:19, 23 163:9, 17, 19 173:6 180:5 181:8 **memories** 60:12 memory 110:19 143:9 192:*10*, *13* mental 17:18 23:25 39:10, 13, 24 40:1, 2 42:10, 12 45:17 57:15, 17 60:7, 8 101:12, 15 130:22 131:19 133:21 136:5 160:6 161:5 199:3 200:11 201:10, 15, 24 202:20, 25 203:6, 12, 19 204:22 mental-health 26:8 mental-illness 51:22 mentally 200:15, 21 mention 11:3 42:15 56:11 77:20 93:13, 25 136:20 140:5 160:14 204:15 mentioned 7:11 33:17 52:23 67:17 72:4 93:7, 15 106:20 118:9 136:23 142:2. 4 161:15 164:9 183:8 199:*13* mere 200:2 met 49:2 114:1, 23 117:19 119:19 meth 172:18 methamphetamine 38:2 50:1, 7, 9, 19, 23 71:20 135:24 136:5 172:6, 9, 11, 20 173:7 method 66:24 67:2, 22 80:24 194:12

methods 67:18 68:1 170:12 184:4, 5, 15 195:14 200:18 mgross@porterscott.co m 2:21 middle 9:9 12:18 136:20 137:19 147:8 168:18 169:13 **MILLION** 1:10 148:16, 18 164:19 187:24 mind 13:18 18:12 43:5 58:12 110:12 117:3 129:5 130:12. 13, 15, 25 131:3, 9, 12 134:15 135:5, 10, 20 176:*3* 180:*12* 189:*6* 201:6 202:6, 24 203:21 204:12 207:1 mindset 64:4 mine 35:20 minimize 189:12 **minimum** 110:16 168:23 **minute** 164:24 minutes 8:14 75:7 102:16 134:1,4 148:22 157:8 159:22 177:5 179:*13* 185:*21* mirror 108:14 misdemeanor 122:21 133:15 134:23 175:*11* 179:*1* 198:*15*, 18 199:24 205:9 misdemeanors 101:1 198:11 205:13 missed 66:10 misstates 141:17, 23 mistake 11:15 12:2, 6 mitigate 151:2 168:*15*, *21* **mobile** 145:12 **Model** 16:4 23:11 money 105:23 months 15:13 16:15, 16 mood 44:4 MORAWCZNSKI 1:10 164:14

M-O-R-A-W-C-Z-N-S-**K-I** 164:16 morning 4:6 108:15 129:13 140:4 motions 144:11 mounted 84:22, 24 mouthful 28:5 move 5:7 36:1 87:13 99:7 126:3 146:20 147:3 150:24 151:*1* 152:5 157:*11*, 23 162:14 166:10, 25 167:5 170:11, 14 184:3, 5, 18, 23 185:3 186:22 187:4, 6, 18 188:*1* 201:24 203:16 moved 87:9 128:6 137:14 140:7 148:9 186:25 movement 101:6 148:*19* 149:*23* 150:*1* 156:24 164:19 183:20 184:15 186:6. 18 movements 165:5 moves 129:11 154:16 196:24 moving 88:10 95:15 146:13, 20 147:9, 11 148:14 156:8 157:8, 9, 15 164:24 165:2, *14* 168:8 170:*13* 184:2 185:*4*, *9*, *10* 186:2 **MULLINS** 1:*12* 55:16. 19 56:1 65:2. 8 160:21 161:10 163:16 187:23 207:7 multiple-part 84:6 **multi-tier** 190:13 muscle 192:10 < N >nail 156:21

<N>
nail 156:21
name 4:13 18:17
159:13 186:10
named 4:15 211:19,
20
names 4:12
narcotic 44:2 54:17

narcotics 38:14, 22, 24 39:6 41:*13* 51:8 57:11, 14 58:1, 2 117:6, 10 130:24 131:20 136:8, 10 187:21 201:15 203:20 narrow 155:17 169:20, 25 **NATALIE** 1:*12* 55:15 **nation** 20:1 **nature** 68:15 205:7 navigate 24:14 **NE** 212:7 near 74:14 87:3 121:18 159:12 163:7 **nearby** 115:1 necessarily 28:25 44:23 54:14 68:22 necessary 17:12 97:5 163:7 166:8 187:11 190:11 211:15 212:19 **neck** 33:12 194:22 **Need** 5:3 7:10 19:13 21:14 31:15 32:16 58:17 82:22 92:21 94:20 98:13 104:21 109:16 117:8 120:7, 20 142:17 153:22 157:9 159:*1* 170:10 176:15 177:2*3* 179:2*4* 183:*1* 185:25 186:16 190:4 191:19 193:19 194:7 197:24 205:10 208:17, 19 **needed** 49:3 121:7 130:4 167:17 168:1 184:7, 23 **needing** 167:20 needs 118:20 120:21 negative 133:9 **negatively** 36:6 53:4 negligence 11:16 12:3, 7, 14 negotiate 48:13

52:24 53:22 155:7

175:4 205:19

negotiating 36:21 45:1 47:20 **negotiation** 60:14, 20, 21 61:14 162:5, 6 negotiations 46:18 47:23 48:15 61:22 187:23 negotiator 52:9 61:20. 23 147:13 162:9 164:3 188:9 207:9, 12 negotiators 61:7 neither 195:9 nervous 172:14 179:8 nervousness 172:12 **Nevada** 2:4 93:19 211:2 **never** 9:17 11:19 34:9 43:8 44:9, 11 63:16 85:24 86:3, 5 88:18 90:5, 6, 7 95:20 125:24 126:*1*, 2 138:21, 25 162:5 187:*13* 195:*25* 196:*1* 199:24 **new** 60:4, 5 71:25 111:21 117:13 118:7 138:25 newer 207:24 **NH** 1:4 NICHOLAS 1:10 **night** 20:6 **nine** 15:13 143:5 Ninth 11:2, 12 noise 152:3, 10 noncompliance 96:4 noncompliant 95:14 non-threatening 99:8 norm 163:12 **normally** 128:14 **northbound** 125:5, 6 **notations** 55:8, 18 **noted** 85:6. 12 156:19 170:25 198:6 209:7 notes 198:21 Notice 2:1

November 1:19 2:2 210:7 211:23 212:3, 9 number 5:24 16:10 23:24 36:13 60:16 90:22 98:2, 3 99:21 106:11, 13 121:14 146:24 162:18 184:9 212:16 numbered 98:7 numbers 171:6

o0o 1:3 2:11, 23 3:14 **obev** 134:21 196:16 **object** 11:20 27:23 49:7 109:20 118:17 190:2 **Objection** 11:17 12:5, 9 14:6 35:11, 13 37:15, 18 38:7 39:1 40:12, 21 44:18 45:3 47:15, 24 49:21 50:11 52:6, 21 57:6, 19 68:8 71:24 73:21 74:21, 23 78:17 80:6, *13* 83:*17* 88:22 91:24 92:4, 17 94:24 95:23 97:14 100:8 109:19 110:17, 21, 22, *23* 113:6 116:*13* 117:2 118:*12* 119:*13* 120:10 127:13 136:2 141:17, 22 143:24 149:19 190:1 objections 110:16 **objective** 17:4 20:12 24:25 70:14 115:20, 25 116:5, 8 120:21 Objectivity 115:22 obligation 129:18 180:5 observation 51:11 84:4 88:10 91:22 94:3 149:8 observations 38:21 51:7 57:10 69:7, 8 89:5 131:15, 17

observe 140:10 141:15 **observed** 74:3 83:16, 19 85:2 89:25 131:4 198:7 **observes** 92:15 obstacle 30:8 obstacles 72:5 **obstruct** 39:17 40:9 44:15 47:12 obstructs 32:4 **obtain** 99:13 162:12 obtained 65:2 **obvious** 77:21 139:10 obviously 13:20 22:20 23:21 31:13 77:8 79:4 80:21 89:12 140:24 149:24 191:*11* 192:*7* 193:*14* 197:24 199:2 **occurred** 76:17 100:7 118:23 119:4. 18 123:22, 24 140:16 178:*14* 182:9 183:*4* occurs 103:23 104:24 110:9 145:25 **offer** 81:10 129:16 130:3 139:9 **offering** 134:17 **offhand** 141:10 200:18 **Office** 6:*3* 93:*19* 133:5 138:6 212:*13* officer 7:16, 19, 20 8:22 11:15 12:2 16:6, 12, 21 17:6, 13, 22 18:2, 8, 19 20:10, *18* 24:*13* 27:*16* 28:15, 20 31:1, 19 32:4, 9 33:2, 8 34:6, 18, 23 36:6 39:11, 18 40:9 43:2, 21 44:16, 25 45:5 47:10, 12, 21 48:12 53:3 57:25 59:16 70:25 71:1, 8 84:10 85:8, 9, 18 86:1 90:22 91:1 96:7, 13 97:12 104:16 107:15 109:2 110:6 112:13 113:5,

8, *14*, *22* 114:*6*, *17* 117:5, 13, 23, 25 118:4, 7, 20, 24 119:3, 9 120:7, 20, 21 121:6 123:7 125:11 128:20 129:24 130:*1* 132:*14* 136:7 138:6 139:20 141:20 143:16 144:23, 25 145:3, 7 147:21 151:2 154:10, *14*, *16*, *18*, *22* 167:*12* 169:4, 8, 9 170:10 171:16, 20, 22 173:11, *13*, *20* 174:*3*, *7* 176:*7* 191:2 192:*1*, 21 193:15 194:4, 14, 24 195:10, 14, 18 196:4, 13, 17, 19 197:1, 6, 12 198:25 199:7, 14, 20 201:2 204:21 205:18, 24 206:3 officer-involved 71:16 officers 12:23 13:18, 22 14:23 15:2, 14 16:10 17:2, 3, 22 18:10 20:5 22:22 23:3 24:11 25:4 26:16 29:3, 5, 8, 12, *18* 30:5, *15*, 22, 23 33:5, 10, 15 34:8 35:2 38:12, 16, 19 40:4 42:22 45:10, 11, *13*, *16*, *19*, *21*, *23* 51:6, 10, 12 52:15 53:10 54:23 55:10 59:15 62:19 69:1, 14 70:19 84:10 85:12, 15 86:5 96:10 104:4, 13, 18 105:3 106:24, 25 107:7, 25 109:13, 16 111:2, 5, 18, 19, 22 129:8 133:2 134:11 135:13 139:12 156:1 167:14. 23 168:24 169:11, 13, 23 170:3 171:15 174:12, 18 178:9 179:11 180:4 181:8, 11 187:24 190:14 191:15 192:3, *4* 194:*16*, *17* 196:*25*

202:5, 16, 18 206:21 207:24 **officer's** 36:21 37:11 40:18 49:17 116:25 117:4, 9 170:17 180:5 OFFICES 2:14 oftentimes 73:11 **oh** 36:25 44:9 78:9 88:7 115:10 124:6 145:25 157:16 171:12 186:4 203:17, 18 okay 21:12 28:1, 15 31:3, 4 36:3 48:9 58:22 65:15 70:22 78:9 79:24 83:7 84:1 88:20 98:5 103:11 113:21 120:18 147:2 179:13 181:19 183:22 206:23 208:21 once 13:9 22:5 48:11 52:12 55:6 56:18 62:16 87:11 176:10 one-on-one 200:10 204:8 ones 122:22 193:24 one's 204:10 **one-third** 10:3, 16 one-week 59:20 **ongoing** 161:25 online 24:20 25:23, 24 73:3 105:17 **oOo** 3:4 208:25 **open** 107:19 131:22 140:24 141:9 176:5 **opening** 168:19 operating 26:24 **OPERATOR** 1:8 150:14, 22 184:1 **opine** 68:9 123:*3* 130:12 136:4 **opined** 83:*3* **opinion** 11:20, 23 12:5 37:16 43:12 50:12, 13 51:1, 3 81:10, 17 82:21, 25 83:5 128:18 129:21,

22 130:11 131:24 132:23 133:7 134:17 136:3, 18 137:25 151:4 158:6 164:6 165:12 167:12 171:23 172:23 173:19, 24 174:2 181:20 183:13, 17 188:5, 11 192:23 207:17 **opinions** 6:2, 6, 11, 15 77:22 78:24 99:25 118:14 129:16 130:1, 3 139:14 165:9 opportunity 101:7 156:23 186:22 195:18 202:15 211:15 **opposed** 187:1 **opposite** 35:23 101:23 102:24 116:1 optic 73:16 85:17 86:8 89:5, 15, 20, 22 90:1 91:23 93:3 94:3, 9 95:5 138:10, 17, 20 139:2, 5, 21 145:2, 3 **optical** 84:17 optics 93:10 options 17:6, 14 185:19 **orbits** 186:7, 12, 13 order 6:11 14:22 17:6 18:4, 9, 20 19:5, 22 20:10 22:21 30:19 34:5, 17 62:24 66:10 73:12 96:14, *20* 118:*1*, *20* 166:*21* 174:14 177:11 190:9 197:1 199:25 203:14 **ordered** 212:*15* orders 53:12 95:15 105:8 128:11 130:17 134:21 199:8 ordinance 106:7 **Oregon** 9:3 58:5 59:22, 25 202:12 organization 105:15 organizations 63:15, 17

original 27:2 212:9, 13 originally 193:2 outcome 191:18 200:25 206:10 211:20 outer 120:23 **outline** 106:14 202:16 outranked 61:15 **outside** 169:17 overall 21:5 overcame 91:7 overdose 37:14 overdosed 187:19 overhead 140:22 overreacting 99:6 199:7 overreaction 196:13 oversaw 61:7, 17 overstated 147:6 overwatch 187:8 owner 142:10 143:3 204:17

< P > **P.O** 2:15 **PA** 54:3, 7, 11, 20, 25 65:10 **Page** 3:2, 4 6:5 65:16 82:24 97:19, 25 98:1, 2, 4, 12 99:4, 20 100:19 101:25 103:12 130:10 131:22 136:14 142:25 144:14 164:6 165:8 173:19, 23, 24 174:2 180:*1* 210:*11* 212:16 pages 6:5 99:23 **pain** 19:22 paper 5:16 212:16 **papers** 61:2 63:10 112:2 paragraph 98:3, 5, 7 144:15, 18 180:4, 11 **paramount** 167:*13* paranoia 39:17 51:23 park 194:20

part 7:11 17:3 29:18 55:1 61:7 67:6, 7 87:7 103:*1* 104:18 145:10 153:18 157:3 164:21 180:12 202:4, 24 204:3 207:8 participate 25:13 participated 10:10 participating 178:25 **particular** 13:5, 13 20:4 37:3 40:14 52:23 59:16 64:6 81:6 117:6 119:4 121:4, 15 145:14 159:*1* 182:8 201:*4* 207:20 particularly 58:4 65:24 105:16 120:14 126:3 160:5 178:4 203:10 207:24 parties 48:20 211:18 **partner** 195:19 197:22. 23 partnership 61:16 **parts** 84:7 party 143:21 pass 146:1, 3 148:6 pass/fail 25:19, 21 **passed** 85:13 152:9 186:22 187:19 passes 147:10 153:5, 9 157:5 183:23 185:9 186:17 **passive** 196:23 198:24 pat 121:1 **patches** 18:17 **pat-down** 86:1 120:23 121:9, 11, 21 122:2 **path** 191:20 pathology 37:13 pathway 91:5, 10 patient 99:6 PATRICK 2:14

12:13 14:13 35:12

110:15 113:13

patrol 7:18 8:11 16:18 54:3, 21 145:23 156:4 patty 56:17 pause 4:24 11:25 **pay** 8:21 105:22 139:*13* **PDF** 98:2 208:17 pdwyer@pdwyerlaw.c om 2:16 **peace** 123:6 167:23 180:5 peacefully 155:8 200:20 peer 157:12 peer-reviewed 27:6 61:*1* 63:9 112:2 **Penal** 171:7, 8, 12 penalty 209:5 **Penn** 2:15 **people** 8:17 18:9 22:23 25:15 31:6 33:7, 25 34:2 36:13, *14*, *17*, *25* 39:*13*, *20*, 23 40:2, 4 41:3, 17, 24 42:19 43:22 45:15 46:10 48:10 49:2 56:16 57:25 60:8, 11 69:20, 23 70:14 73:12 85:25 97:4 107:4 124:19 131:24 132:1, 2, 6, 7, *8*, *17*, *20*, *23* 144:*3* 147:17 159:5 160:24 162:7 172:9, 16, 18, 20, 25 173:2, 8 187:7 201:7, 18 202:15, 17, 19 203:4 207:2, 11 pepper 20:6 **perceived** 69:17 80:5, 7, 8, 11 84:3 204:24 **percent** 9:10, 11, 23 35:21 36:10 40:6 41:7 52:14 70:10, 16 73:14 76:20 85:24 86:3, 5 88:19 90:3 105:13 107:5 150:16, *22* 187:*14* 193:*15* percentage 9:22

10:4, 16 71:16 perception 86:7 Perfect 5:2 **performance** 6:3 **period** 16:14 87:13 131:*13* **periods** 43:17 155:11, 16 perjury 209:5 permissive 189:1 **permitted** 166:23 **person** 7:13 24:20 25:22 26:1 32:3, 14, 24 36:7, 22 38:19 39:9, 12, 16, 19 40:8 41:8 42:16 43:4, 16, 18, 21 44:4, 14, 17 46:12, 15 54:11 57:17 60:4 65:4 67:7, 17 70:5 71:20 72:7, 16, 17 73:4 86:2 112:20 113:2 115:9 120:*1* 121:*19*, 20 135:12, 13 141:20 154:*1* 166:*16* 194:*5*, 20 200:14, 20 201:9, 20. 25 211:10 personable 112:17 personal 57:22 69:13 72:22 75:23 76:7 83:*15* 84:*3* 200:8, 13, 16, 19 202:1 personally 131:4 200:23 **personnel** 165:13, 20, 23, 25 166:2, 9, 10, 19, 21, 23 167:2, 8, 10 persons 194:2 200:10 person's 35:6 45:1 46:8 53:2 112:15 201:11 perspective 62:13 191:9 persuade 41:4 163:10 174:17 persuaded 29:21 40:5 persuasion 19:5

153:15 176:6 **PG&E** 141:15 **phase** 188:*16* **phases** 15:22 **phone** 38:19 56:14, 17, 19, 20, 24 57:2, 3 124:18 135:15 143:5 160:9, 24 163:20 179:*10* 199:*11* phones 55:16, 24 56:3, 9 photograph 137:1 photographs 139:25 140:2, 12, 13 141:3 **photos** 141:8 **phrase** 7:24 11:8 20:15 47:25 115:17, 18 125:14 168:3 physical 4:25 18:21 51:6 57:17 66:10 73:22 79:11 80:25 113:1 172:8 physically 125:22 127:11, 20 128:3, 4, 7 153:24 162:15 163:15 **pick** 139:12 160:13 184:24 193:24 **picture** 81:1 125:7 136:19, 22 138:10 159:6 160:3 **pictures** 137:15, 16 **piece** 17:5 33:9 **pieces** 187:9 **pigs** 9:4 **pills** 68:1 73:5 **pistol** 124:1 pistols 20:16, 22 84:23, 24 **place** 19:8 54:17 111:12 123:11 132:1 140:8 145:14 146:19 154:23 162:18 176:2 196:7 211:9 **placed** 90:20 114:20 174:8, *10* 191:21 **places** 194:14 **placing** 29:13 154:14 167:14

Plaintiff 1:6 9:25 10:3, 9, 17 149:1 plaintiff-involved 10:11 PLAINTIFFS 2:13 Plaintiff's 10:12 **plan** 67:15 72:11, 20 144:17 158:10, 11 160:*15* **plane** 146:5, 7, 12 147:10 149:16 150:17, 21 **plants** 140:18 **plav** 43:3 **Please** 29:2 72:15 89:2 108:20 116:23 142:11 194:7 212:9, 17 **plenty** 126:10 200:16 201:8 **PM** 164:8, 10 208:24 **pocket** 121:3 pockets 120:24, 25 point 12:8, 16 15:21 25:11 53:15 56:8, 22 68:24 75:10, 21 77:6, 18 83:2 92:9 97:5, 8 98:8 99:5, 7, 12 100:4 101:22 102:23 110:14 119:19 121:9 123:21 125:1, 2 127:5, 10, 21 131:11, *17* 138:*1* 140:*7* 141:6 144:20 146:21 151:7 152:*1* 156:*3*, 10. 13 157:11 165:12 175:10 176:23 184:22, 23 186:5, 8 194:6 196:11 199:16 202:3 **pointed** 175:10 177:18 178:5, 22 181:21 188:17, 18 **pointing** 29:25 90:8 100:23 103:15 197:20 205:10 **points** 19:19 98:2 103:13 205:16 **pole** 143:9 144:5

poles 144:10 159:12

police 4:17 7:16 8:22 12:23 13:13, 16, *18* 14:22, 25 15:2, *15* 16:11 17:2, 22 18:1, 14, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25 19:25 22:5, 18, 22 23:5, 18, 23 25:1 27:1 28:15, 20 31:25 34:8. 10 48:21 57:25 58:23 59:5, 10, 15, 24 60:6, 17, 21 63:4 71:7, 13 86:21 104:24 105:5, 24 106:2, 11, 14 108:13, *15*, *24* 109:9 111:5, 10, 24 113:22 114:20 115:19 123:13 133:2 139:7 161:17 169:4 179:25 181:5 190:*12*, *14* 191:*14* 201:*19* 202:11, 12, 14, 16 **PoliceOne** 105:18 police-practices 5:23 police-related 68:21 **policies** 99:15, 18 100:1 103:24 105:6 106:6, 10, 15, 16 108:11 192:9 **policing** 9:1, 8 **Policy** 3:11, 12 97:22, 24 98:12, 13, 20 99:5 100:7, 10, 12, *16*, *18* 101:9, *10*, *17*, 24 102:2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15 103:8, 10 106:18, *23* 108:*18*, *20* 109:*13*, *17* 110:7 175:*19* 181:6, 22 188:24 189:6, 7, 14, 16, 22 190:7, 10, 16, 21, 25 191:2, 4, 7 192:16, 22 193:3 200:17, 23 202:24 206:15 207:19 polite 99:6 political 48:3 **poorly** 46:8 poorly-trained 45:10 **pop** 77:22

populated 140:20 population 8:8 **PORTER** 2:19 **portion** 155:18, 19 160:7 **portions** 103:*16* pose 75:22 positioned 124:24 **positions** 104:*13* **possessing** 32:12, 22 possibilities 43:6 57:12 possibility 76:24 94:6, 8 113:25 120:22 141:7 172:19 **possible** 17:11 42:17 88:17 89:17 109:22 123:2 170:12 possibly 17:14 19:4 71:21 109:25 140:23 141:5 144:12 161:10 179:12 187:19, 24 203:22 **POST** 10:23, 24 13:10 14:2, 3, 8, 11, 20, 24, 25 15:4 111:20 163:5 potential 23:16 24:12 84:14 85:17, 21, 22 89:14 90:10 124:9 204:22 potentially 122:17 196:21 198:11, 15, 17 power 143:9 144:5, 10 159:12 166:7, 8 **PR** 20:7 practical 138:19 practically 102:17 **practice** 11:8 13:1 14:4, 12 17:1 111:14 128:21 192:12 193:17 practices 4:17 11:2, 4 12:20 25:3 45:12, *14* 129:8 191:*15* 192:20 208:6 preached 90:25 **precinct** 16:18 **preclude** 32:8, 10

41:2 42:1 52:8 preclusion 31:23 **prefer** 4:6 154:1 165:2*1* preferable 154:4 **premises** 153:23 preparation 6:19 13:9 **prepare** 5:8, 13 7:6 12:8 **prepared** 6:2 28:7 158:5 194:25 195:3 207:5, 7 **prerogative** 90:23, 24 presence 18:15, 21, 23 19:3, 15 85:11 200:2 present 39:10 40:3, 16 71:22 72:5 85:8, 24 121:14 133:17 169:*10* 195:*6* 212:*14* presentations 52:8 presented 71:4 90:15 91:4 94:13 95:11 presenting 42:17 65:10 **pressure** 19:*18* **pretty** 10:5 76:18 77:7 92:7 106:9 109:24 135:19 **prevent** 39:18 40:9 44:15 47:12 126:18 180:15 prevents 32:4 previous 92:6 **previously** 49:15, 18 52:2 103:2 106:20 172:4 **price** 105:25 106:1 **primarily** 140:11 **primary** 188:7, 8 principles 195:22 **print** 210:2, 4 **prior** 9:19 17:15 88:10, 24 93:19 97:11 129:1 131:10 136:6 137:10 142:23 171:17

priority 102:4, 12 **private** 26:18 111:6 **probable** 112:24 113:1 114:1, 16, 21, *23* 115:*12* 117:*20* 118:3, 10 119:1, 7, 10, 19, 22 123:2 **probably** 30:1 35:19 47:3 54:24 77:17 82:9 84:9 86:4 105:21 106:10 121:8 122:1, 3 123:1 134:15 136:7 147:6, 7 148:22 151:1 190:8 198:12 204:11 206:13 **problem** 156:25 157:4, 24 162:13 179:*14* problematic 104:17 107:14 205:24 procedural 60:6 **procedure** 166:*18* **proceed** 112:23 118:2 proceeding 211:8 proceedings 211:19 **process** 43:15 126:25 **produced** 26:21, 23 product 14:8 professional 22:14 57:24 172:23 professionals 202:25 prognosis 62:4 **program** 15:23 16:1, 2.21 **progress** 66:13 prominently 203:9 **promoted** 7:19, 21 **prone** 130:15 **proof** 115:13, 20 116:8 **proper** 165:13 166:18 174:22 175:1 properly 124:5 131:14 207:19 **property** 9:5 142:10 143:3 **proportion** 132:*19*

136:9

protect 18:4, 9 20:5, 10 167:15 180:5, 14 185:20 195:*14* 196:8 197:23 200:1 **protected** 167:17 protecting 198:19 protection 33:13 protocol 203:1 prove 114:22 115:2, 5 118:24 **provide** 10:12 54:3 88:3 96:25 106:11 128:22 129:9, 18 130:4 139:2 141:14 149:17 202:15 **provided** 5:23 6:20 7:1, 3 19:25 42:5 107:22 140:12, 14 159:19 171:2 **provides** 21:12 105:16 138:18 **providing** 107:*12* provocative 78:15 **provoke** 62:25 67:20 68:6 70:19 72:9, 19 73:8 provokes 67:8 provoking 67:3 psychiatric 57:20 psychiatrist 43:8 psychologist 43:8 **psychology** 68:9 79:5 **public** 13:19 18:18 112:13 124:6 131:23 167:19 180:6, 9 181:8 197:23 198:17 206:4 publications 22:14 publish 106:2 **published** 27:6 61:1 63:9 105:18 **pull** 133:1 190:17 194:6 196:7, *10*, *25* 197:19 203:17 **pulled** 74:17 102:19 133:14 134:10 177:18 181:12 193:3 **pulling** 102:15 120:25 134:4, 13

195:15 197:10 199:6, 21 purchasing 93:23 **purpose** 19:6, 16 23:14 27:17 30:25 31:17 77:12 89:21 104:8 138:19 139:4 155:1 159:10 187:17 201:*1* **pursuant** 2:1 212:20 pursuits 13:23 **purview** 114:18 **pushing** 128:15 **put** 21:9 22:5 25:3 29:10 38:8 52:16 69:9 79:14 96:21 104:10 116:3 123:10 125:4, 11 128:15 135:13, 15, 20 154:2 173:2*1* 174:4, *16* 175:8 181:*15*, *17* 185:12 191:15 192:9. 20 193:18 208:6 **puts** 104:13 143:17 **putting** 126:18

< Q > qualified 27:12 60:23 63:6 112:6 **question** 6:21 11:25 12:9 14:7, 10, 16, 18, 19 15:9 18:6 23:19 26:12 28:4 30:18 31:9, 10 32:15, 25 33:14, 23, 24 34:16 35:4, 25 37:18 39:3 41:23 43:7 45:4, 8 46:1 48:9, 10 52:2, 5 53:7 54:15 63:17 64:19 65:13.19 66:14 68:14, 23 72:12, 21 74:1 75:1 76:20 77:24 78:1 79:22, 25 80:2, 9, 16 81:23 83:6, 21 85:19 86:17 87:1, 5, 11 88:25 91:9, 18 92:1, 3, 12 94:19 96:1 97:15, 16, 23 99:16 100:17 102:6, 14

103:8, 10, 23 104:8, 24 105:3 107:11 109:7, 14, 20, 24 110:20 111:17 113:13, 17, 19 116:11, *13*, *16*, *22* 118:*15* 125:10 127:17 129:1, 2, 6 131:11 137:5 140:3, 11 142:16, 19 147:19 151:15 153:11, 18 155:10 158:12 162:16 166:17 168:17 171:11 174:1 176:20 178:16, 18 180:22 182:25 183:11 185:18 189:6, 19, 20 190:3 200:2 207:13, 17 questioning 119:14 120:10 122:11 **questions** 5:5 36:4 46:23 58:17 59:21 112:11 176:25 177:2. *10, 15* 182:5 183:6 184:9 193:23 200:7 208:9 question's 72:1 quick 169:12 172:12 **quicker** 167:20 **quickly** 9:16 **quite** 14:7, 9 17:23 50:19 57:6 65:3 105:22 156:16 203:7 quote 158:18

<R>
radio 166:15
raise 96:10, 13
raised 97:4 99:13
138:4
raising 96:17, 25
ramming 199:1
ran 145:16 170:22
range 7:7 184:18
rank 190:23
ranks 22:23
RAP 170:23 171:3
204:14

R-A-P 170:23 rational 56:14 57:16 **RAYMON** 1:12 reach 163:6 204:7 reached 95:21 reaching 95:16, 18, 20 156:20 197:5, 8, 9, 10 react 173:2 **reaction** 73:8 77:15 **read** 5:25 13:8 38:1 73:2, 3 77:8 86:25 103:24 104:19 125:17 126:24 134:19 138:1 143:17, *18* 144:7 147:25 150:21 161:20 176:21 191:2 201:25 205:16 209:5 211:15 212:13, 19 **reading** 6:7, 8 22:15 65:24 75:5 93:17, 20 104:19 107:21 179:3 192:22 198:2 **ready** 197:20 212:12 **real** 71:12 177:9 192:14 194:10, 19, 24 202:4 realistic 185:12 reality-based 25:14 **realize** 107:16 132:15 203:18 205:9 **really** 9:2 11:24 12:12, 15 23:18, 22 32:15 33:23 35:20 68:10 77:22 81:15 110:13 113:15 117:14, 15 121:11 123:3 130:24 131:17, 25 132:5, 16, 20 135:9 139:1, 16 140:19 149:13 151:25 155:14 156:18 157:22 159:9, 14, 15, 22 169:4 175:22 176:2 190:20 191:6, 14 192:20 193:20 199:18 201:5 203:3 205:10, 17

206:4, 14, 18 207:25 208:5 **realm** 81:9 real-world 39:21 81:13 rear 182:22 **reason** 33:20 34:3 37:12 43:24 112:19 120:11 146:20 reasonable 8:19 11:9 55:13 56:5 77:10 85:3 86:9, 11, 13 88:13, 20 89:1, 3, 8, 19, 24 90:2 91:20 92:14 94:4, 11 106:23 107:22 112:21 113:4, 6, 8, 11, *14*, *23* 114:9, *10*, *15* 116:7, 10, 25 117:20 118:3 119:2, 10, 16, *17* 120:6, *19* 123:*1* 139:23 141:19 150:9 152:7, 12, 17, 20 155:3, 5 164:2 169:23 171:15 173:4 175:25 176:17 183:2*1* 185:*1* 186:*3* 187:12 194:15 195:4 196:17 reasonableness 88:16 reasonably 92:22 94:21 187:16 reasonably-trained 96:6 reasoned 40:4 reasons 107:13 **rebut** 131:22 **Rebuttal** 3:10 98:19 130:6 144:14 recall 8:16 38:10 49:13 53:14, 19 55:22 56:8 64:15, 22 65:22 75:5 80:1 93:17, 20, 22 95:23 142:14 161:17 177:16 178:1 179:3, 6 180:19 181:9 200:18 201:4 207:4 recalling 177:14 receive 22:10 152:21

received 62:17 73:2 96:24 138:11 152:24 153:*3* 170:*6* 208:*1* receiving 64:3 **Recess** 47:7 83:10 122:7 158:2 177:8 recognition 117:12 recognize 42:16 43:2 44:8 84:7 85:11, 16 94:15 144:24 145:3, 6, 7 174:23 197:6 201:16 203:4, 11 206:20 recognized 4:25 124:6 204:6 recognizes 175:23 recommend 163:5 165:2*1* recommendation 14:3 104:11 162:13 recommendations 145:20 175:6 recommended 101:11 104:25 106:5 183:7 record 21:5 47:5, 6, 8 50:15 59:2 80:7 83:8 87:10, 14 98:22 118:12 122:6, 8 127:14 137:9 146:2 150:*3* 158:*1* 182:*3* 200:12 208:13, 15 211:13 **recording** 124:*17* records 50:18 85:6 127:20 207:24 **red** 73:16 84:17.21 85:2, 9, 11, 17, 22 86:8 89:5, 15, 20, 21, *25* 91:*14*, *23* 93:*3*, *10* 94:3, 9 95:4 137:22 138:3, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20, 23 139:2, 5, 14, 21 145:1, 2 156:18 159:8 196:19 197:3 198:4 **reduced** 169:2 170:3 reducing 29:15 refer 11:8 118:10 129:*1* 182:21

reference 21:4 69:11 103:13 122:21 129:1 163:24 referenced 5:11 85:*10* 158:*14* **references** 106:*19* 148:19 164:12 referencing 8:2 122:22 158:*13* **referred** 131:14 182:9 **referring** 66:2 98:1 130:19 **refers** 10:19 12:21, *22* 115:*23* 154:*14* **reflect** 78:12 reflected 64:13 130:24 **refrain** 12:*17* **reframe** 183:11 203:16 **refused** 127:1. 2 128:10 refuses 57:3 **refusing** 81:*16* 128:15 134:23 135:12 196:15, 16 203:13 **regard** 179:2 184:13 194:*1* **regarding** 7:12 8:2 11:1 13:13 22:15 122:12, 17 128:21 regardless 80:13 regards 13:4, 23, 24 113:7 160:5, 7 registered 204:17 regular 45:12 185:22 rehashing 6:15 **Reiber** 37:13 **reinforce** 190:24 **relapsed** 38:14 39:8 130:23 **related** 116:1 139:22 relating 38:17 relationship 137:2 relay 15:24 179:11 **relaved** 93:6 161:2 163:22 **relaying** 163:25

release 124:4 160:15 198:14 relevance 12:10 relevant 99:25 116:14 **relied** 5:12 106:18 **relies** 206:3 **rely** 75:19 92:20 106:14 108:16 117:18 118:1 135:11 196:22 208:2 **relying** 76:*1* **remarks** 78:15 remember 25:11.24 30:7 37:10 42:12 49:11 50:5 53:18 58:11 59:11, 20 64:3, 5, 17, 20 65:6, 24 70:25 74:20 75:3 76:6 84:*1* 93:5 96:*3* 103:16 123:21 125:14 135:1 137:12 141:10, 25 171:6 178:8 179:9 189:4 194:21 201:18, 22 204:21 205:1 207:7 REMEMBERED 2:1 remind 21:17 **REMOTE** 1:17 2:12 **remotely** 2:3, 5, 9 4:2 211:6 **removed** 116:6 render 131:23 **rendered** 199:18 **renders** 104:15 repeat 44:22 72:14 79:16 177:20, 24 **repeated** 55:4 74:18 78:10 repeatedly 95:14 rephrase 80:8 127:17 171:21 190:4 **Report** 3:4, 10 5:12, 18, 19 6:2, 4, 6, 10, 14, 19 7:6, 11 9:16 10:6 12:*10* 21:*5* 38:*1* 51:14 65:16 69:5 76:21 77:8, 20, 22 78:5, 7, 8, 24 79:12 80:10 82:17, 20, 24

85:10 86:13 90:12 93:2, 7, 17 97:19 98:19 99:2, 17 100:6, 19 114:24 115:3, 7 116:18 122:19 123:18 124:15 130:6 131:16 134:2, 6 136:15, 21 137:6, 21 139:7 143:*1*. 2 144:14 149:23, 24, 25 150:*1* 158:*5* 160:*14* 164:13 165:8 167:7 170:25 173:19, 23 179:*4* 180:*1* 187:22. *24* 188:*15* 189:*22* 196:12 198:3 206:22 207:5, 8, 11, 15 **REPORTED** 1:25 51:12 80:10 93:18. *22* 173:6 184:*15* 189:22 211:10 **Reporter** 2:4 4:3 5:*1* 16:2 164:*15* 177:20, 23, 25 208:14. *21* 211:*4* 212:*23* **reporting** 2:5 143:16, 21 146:12 183:20 **reports** 6:7 51:19 69:10 80:17 82:6, 10 94:2 116:20 **represent** 138:*16* representing 4:13 represents 14:9 requested 12:7 87:18, 21, 25 147:22 173:*13* requesting 173:20 174:4 requests 101:2 require 29:17 82:22 116:7 118:24 199:*15* required 30:10 122:13 175:10 191:22 requirement 29:16 requirements 17:24 requires 28:19 requiring 129:8 research 21:25 71:15 resistance 128:8, 10

resistant 32:14 126:21 127:7, 11, 20 128:3, 4, 7, 11, 12, 17 resisting 35:6 128:9, 15 resolution 204:4 resolve 155:8 200:20 resolved 72:24 resources 60:7 150:15 202:15 204:1 **respond** 57:20 62:12 134:12 142:17 responded 152:21, 24 153:*3* 174:*6* 179:*16* 207:18 responders 57:18 102:2, 4, 13 responding 91:21 99:9 103:20 141:13 205:6 **responds** 148:*17* response 26:9 60:6 62:6, 7, 25 63:5 65:11 67:3, 8, 21 70:19 72:19 76:12, *15* 107:*3* 157:*17* 162:16 175:13 178:*15*, *25* 188:*6* 203:1 responsibilities 122:12 128:22 132:19 206:18 responsibility 166:6 169:11 responsible 15:1 responsive 100:16 rest 6:14 100:15 restate 12:4 92:9 restrictions 58:4 restrictive 108:12 result 46:21 108:9 171:3 resulting 101:2 **retained** 4:17 9:21, 25 10:7, 8, 14 11:19, 23 61:10 68:10 retention 24:2 retired 7:16 return 212:17 reverse 125:6 177:10

review 5:22 9:15 53:14 55:15 64:10 73:15 95:12 118:14 124:10 139:25 141:3 212:12, 15 **reviewed** 6:9 38:10 45:17 49:9 50:15 65:22 100:10 140:2 **reviewing** 8:20 37:3 56:8 100:6 140:*13* reviews 207:4 rice 56:9. 17 140:17. *18* 151:*13* 169:20 rifles 20:16, 22 **right** 5:7 6:16 7:5 8:18 9:9, 19 10:18 19:21 21:14 28:18 29:10 31:4 33:5 36:15 45:2, 7 55:22 77:16 79:15 82:4, 10 86:*3* 90:*4* 91:*14* 94:7 97:7 98:10 99:4, 18 100:2 107:5 108:3 109:2, 5 123:4 124:2*4* 125:6 133:*1* 134:6 141:10 157:17 160:16 163:2, 3 166:12, 13 168:11, 25 169:1, 8, 12, 15 171:6 178:19 180:3 182:17, 18 201:14 204:10 206:24 207:17 right-hand 98:1 **Risk** 64:1, 2, 7 **River** 59:8, 9 road 56:23 81:14, 22 86:24 87:9 125:8 133:24 134:24, 25 135:8, *21*, *25* 136:23 137:16, 20 140:7, 25 141:1, 2 145:8 169:20 199:5 203:15 roadway 53:17 57:2 124:6 136:20 169:25 188:19 **ROGER** 1:11 **role** 16:19 60:17 174:8, 10 207:8 **roll** 109:2 190:16 **rookie** 111:*19*

room 29:19 145:5 168:10, 13, 24 169:7, 15 roommate 73:9 **round** 184:20 rounds 152:14 route 140:6 186:4 rule 14:22 rules 103:22 **rulings** 11:1 108:12 **run** 35:22 157:1 171:3 186:10 198:24 **running** 146:18 183:24 rural 8:23 9:1, 3 140:17, 24

< S > Sacramento 1:22 2:20 212:2 **SAECHAO** 1:*11* 74:8 83:24 87:8 145:21 147:22 155:24 156:8 173:*13*. 20 174:3, 5, 13 175:16 176:18 177:16, 17, 19 178:3, *5*, *14*, *21* 179:*15*, *17*, *20* 182:*13* 188:*17* 193:8 204:2 **Saechao's** 175:12 178:11 **S-A-E-C-H-E-O** 83:24 **safe** 17:11 35:8 110:*I* 121:22 165:22, *25* 166:*11*, *21* 185:*15* 186:21 187:14, 16 194:*16* 197:*14* safely 17:4 30:12 32:5 34:7, 19, 23 170:12 safer 23:16 safety 75:23 76:7 83:15 84:4, 11, 15 85:*18* 90:*20*, *22* 91:*1* 96:7 97:12 102:4, 12 144:23, 25 145:3, 7 151:2 167:*13*, *15*

170:11 171:16, 20, 22

173:10, 11 184:10, 21

185:20 186:2*1* 187:10 196:17 197:6 199:14, 20 sake 190:18 save 195:18 saving 186:25 saw 49:16 61:4 74:6, 13 77:8 78:12 80:18 84:9 86:14, 18 87:14 89:13 90:5 92:13 106:13 117:13 136:20 196:19 202:10 saying 17:19 31:2, 6 97:7 124:23, 25 125:15 127:14 144:2 146:19 147:14 156:8 176:22 186:15 188:14 201:19 says 17:5 46:18 81:13 102:5, 11 104:17 106:24 108:16 185:9 186:6 206:1 **SBC** 66:18 70:24 71:13, 14 72:23 73:3, 12 **SBC-intent** 72:8, 16, 17 SBC-related 71:17 scenario 17:15 29:3 30:6 162:15 163:15 189:*15*, *21* 191:*13* 192:11, 17 193:13, 14 201:14 206:9 207:20 scenarios 24:11 25:15 33:1, 15, 22 35:22 71:4 105:20 195:9 202:4 scene 18:5 30:23 38:19, 21 50:25 53:25 56:12 58:10 61:11 69:8, 9, 15 75:7 79:16 85:12, 15 86:20 87:19 88:1 91:21 94:14 125:21 131:5 137:*15* 139:2*1* 140:1 149:12 155:6

166:11 173:11, 14, 17, 21 174:6, 18, 25 175:7 176:4, 16 178:4, 9 179:3, 12, 16 182:*1* 187:*14*, 25 188:6 193:2, 10 203:11 206:23 207:10, 19, 25 scenes 54:23 schedule 22:7 schizophrenia 39:17 42:15, 25 **school** 25:20 **SCOTT** 2:19 **scratch** 109:14 scream 199:16 screaming 29:24 screenshare 5:16 **se** 122:2 **sealed** 212:20 search 71:7 108:17. 18 111:1 112:4, 7, 11 120:7, 8, 13 121:7, 8, 9 168:7 searching 120:14, 16 168:*19* seat 74:15 89:14 146:9, *11* 196:21 seats 145:1 **Seattle** 16:10 18:25 22:5, 18 23:5, 17, 23 26:25 31:25 58:23, 24 59:4, 11, 15 60:17, 21 105:5 111:10, 24 154:21 190:12 202:11 212:7 sec 124:6 205:9 **second** 21:15 59:8 62:14 112:18 131:21 159:20 203:18 204:3 205:8 secondary 23:22 **section** 98:3, 13, 15 99:2 131:21 171:7, 8, *12* 205:*14*, *17* 206:*17* sections 98:25 100:10, 13 see 9:20 12:8, 9, 10

164:4 165:22, 25

158:20, 21 160:12

161:16 162:8 163:17

29:9 55:18 56:11

57:12 74:14 81:12
85:2, 5, 9, 22 86:8
87:19, 22, 24 89:15
92:21 94:9 104:2
105: <i>1</i> 108: <i>3</i> , <i>5</i> 117: <i>6</i>
121: <i>4</i> 128: <i>14</i> 131: <i>11</i>
136: <i>16</i> 137: <i>7</i> 138: <i>1</i> ,
<i>10</i> 139:2 <i>1</i> 140:20, 22
<i>25</i> 141: <i>1</i> , <i>4</i> 146:9, <i>17</i>
20 148:6, 23 149:3,
<i>13, 15, 20</i> 150:6
151:11 152:4, 11, 15,
<i>19</i> 157: <i>17</i> , <i>23</i> 159: <i>13</i>
164:13 167:5 173:22
175:4, 13, 23 182:18
183·24 184·6 191·14
183:24 184:6 191:14 194:23 202:2 204:15
206:8
200.0
seeing 45:21 85:16 89:15 134:18 142:14
89:13 134:18 142:14
186:15, 18
seen 34:9 35:1 37:1
39:13 45:10, 12
46: <i>17</i> 91: <i>17</i> 95: <i>7</i>
127:16 206:9
seizure 111: <i>1</i> 112: <i>4</i> ,
7
seizures 112: <i>11</i>
self-defense 154:20
selling 206:4
send 105:25 108:20
151:12 208:23
sending 106:9
seniority 174:8
sense 32:7 81:11
157:22 189:12
sent 140:3 151:5, 10
212:20
sentence 102:3
109:22 136: <i>14</i>
137:21, 23 144:8
158:7 167:22
sentences 133:8
sentiments 78:13
separate 61:16
212:16
separated 169:5, 11
separating 169:2
sequence 83:18
-

sergeant 7:19, 21 190:23 sergeants 23:4 **series** 182:5 serious 19:17 39:10 121:24 198:16 **serve** 13:18 138:20 **served** 16:6 **service** 138:20 **services** 141:*15* set 2:10 45:24 sets 45:24 61:24 setting 25:6 111:4, 7, 11.16 138:14 seven 143:5 **severe** 36:5 **share** 164:*3* **sheepdog** 132:*10* **sheet** 170:23 171:3 204:15 210:1 212:16. 17 SHERIFF 1:9 162:22 188:4 sheriffs 182:7 SHERIFF'S 1:9 4:14 6:3 8:4 50:10 54:20 55:23 56:21 58:10 87:13, 17, 25 89:9 93:19 106:2 129:17 130:3 133:5, 9, 12 136:15 137:6, *24* 138:6 144:*16*, *21* 149:7 150:9 151:5, 12, 18 152:2, 7, 13, 17 155:6, 21 156:11 161:25 165:19 166:22 167:2 170:22 171:25 173:4, 9 180:*13* 183:*3*, *14* 191:15 207:14 **shield** 87:19 170:16 186:5 187:4 **shift** 8:10, 11, 17 174:9 **shoot** 64:14 65:17 66:3, 4 67:5, 21 68:4 70:25 72:19 76:13 94:10 95:9, 10 169:6 195:5 196:6 199:23

shooting 33:6 68:7 71:13 72:10 93:24 156:2 shootings 71:16 **shootout** 49:*14* **shop** 122:4 shoplift 122:5 **short** 5:5 16:14 24:22 47:2, 8 177:3 206:4 **Shorthand** 2:4 211:3 212:23 **shortly** 123:24 **short-sided** 188:6. 14 **shot** 30:12 49:14, 18 71:9, 13 84:20 204:13 **shotgun** 182:14, 21 **shotguns** 20:17, 23 **shots** 169:12 **shoulder** 33:*13* shoulders 18:18 **shoulds** 206:15 **shout** 54:7 **shouting** 101:22 134:11, 13 135:18 162:2 **show** 31:2, 18 71:15 101:10, 18 102:18 127:20 191:16 **showed** 57:9 69:16 81:10. 25 124:11 135:11, 12 136:19 207:25 shows 69:14 75:19 81:19 101:3 sic 131:19 183:15 185:2*1* **side** 30:4 154:25 168:25 169:*1*, 21 **sight** 85:2 137:22 138:3, 7 150:10, 16, 22 151:13 159:8 196:19 197:3 198:4 **sighting** 138:24 sights 84:17, 21 138:23 sign 212:13, 17, 19 **signal** 166:14

significant 184:11 193:25 significantly 77:5 signs 41:18 201:24 silhouetted 168:11 similar 6:6 8:23 9:8 15:20 31:25 41:2 73:4 133:3, 6 136:10 193:12 203:5 **simple** 19:9 41:21 122:4 138:16 200:2 **simply** 31:2 192:22 Sincerely 212:20 **single** 28:13 107:6 169:20, 25 sister 158:17 161:15 162:2 177:17 sit 157:19 sitting 146:10 194:20 198:9 **situation** 17:7, 16, 20 19:11 30:5, 13 43:4 52:25 63:2 67:6 80:1, 9 88:17 97:2 107:6, 8 114:14 115:4 117:17 134:18, 20 135:20 145:13, 24 146:16 154:21, 24 158:*16* 160:*24* 162:*1*, 20 163:3 166:14 167:*1* 174:*14*, *23* 175:24 176:9 179:24 182:1 191:12, 22 192:15 194:17 195:1, 13, 23 196:5 199:17 205:12 situations 17:2, 13, 23 23:13 34:21, 22 35:1 96:9, 18 107:24 153:8 194:9 200:8 206:5 situation's 35:18 six 16:15, 16 143:5 185:7, 10 186:9 skill 45:23, 24 61:24 193:17 **Skills** 22:6, 8 23:1, 6 36:21 46:3 193:18 **skip** 130:6

sleeping 152:8 157:25 **slow** 17:6 43:19 **slowly** 76:4 81:14 99:7 196:*3* 198:2*1* 199:4 **small** 120:25 192:3, 5 smaller 136:9 **smart** 24:19 155:25 **sniper** 151:6, 9, 10, *12* 187:7 **sober** 136:*13* **Society** 58:*3* **solely** 81:24 **solution** 162:*12* **SOLUTIONS** 1:21 212:1 **someone's** 41:*12* 54:8 66:24 114:8 195:2 198:9, 13 something's 116:2 **somewhat** 12:*13* 104:*15* 116:*1* 124:*1* 134:20 137:10 170:9 193:12 200:8 205:24 son 93:24 sooner 147:10 148:15 151:19 186:24 **sorry** 34:15 35:12, 24 39:21 52:6 65:19 103:7 117:7 151:2*1* 171:11 173:25 **sort** 32:3 50:3 57:1 113:*3* 132:22 140:*1* 155:20 sounds 21:11 31:18 62:3 66:15 107:18 135:19 175:23 177:6 **sources** 140:4 161:10, 11 **south** 59:11 **SPD** 105:12 111:9 speak 4:24 5:8 99:7, *12* 160:9 **speaking** 110:*15* 185:22 **SPEAR** 1:11 specialized 204:1 specialties 30:23

specific 20:*3* 24:*6* 26:3 33:24 36:1, 17 38:9 51:*13* 52:*21* 59:21 82:11 95:24 96:3 99:14 100:6 108:*1* 109:*4* 110:*10*, *19* 111:24 116:21 specifically 7:8 51:4 97:23 100:3 158:6 185:18 190:14 specifies 17:3 **specify** 114:*13* **speculate** 82:5, 14 116:20 143:25 **speculated** 82:6, 18 83:3 speculating 82:4 speculation 49:21 83:5 190:*1* speculations 83:1 speculative 40:13 **speed** 172:14 199:1 **speeding** 199:*1* **spelled** 17:25 **spend** 7:13, 18 8:19 82:20 133:4 **spent** 7:15 199:9 **spinning** 198:25 **spoke** 69:10 74:8 75:6 89:11 159:21 **spotter** 151:10 **spray** 20:6 **spurred** 161:*3* **SRA** 63:19 64:2, 6 stabilize 204:5 staff 59:17 104:9 161:*3* 164:*1* 192:*5* 205:6 staffing 8:11 stage 43:19, 20 stamp 6:23, 25 **stance** 176:5 **stances** 99:10 **Stand** 154:25 168:10, 16 201:5 stand-alone 24:7 **standard** 114:1, 21 115:13, 20 116:3, 8, 9 117:20, 21 118:19 119:1, 7, 19

standards 12:20 15:2 26:25 34:11 71:5 **standing** 75:15 168:13, 18 169:14 **standpoint** 185:*13* stands 154:16 star 21:9 start 24:21 29:9, 23 30:1 66:13 83:22 96:25 101:22 104:14 134:12, 13 156:1 **started** 21:7 23:18 77:14 102:19 125:4 132:5 134:10 142:5 143:7 181:12 188:19 193:11 **Starting** 155:20 177:*11* **startle** 157:19 starts 134:14 164:18 **State** 2:4 9:3 11:5. *18* 12:22, 24 13:5, 6 14:21. 25 15:3 35:21 37:24 46:7 58:4 59:10, 22, 25 60:23 63:7 79:9 82:7, 8 85:23 86:3 90:2, 9, *12* 93:8 95:*1* 102:*18*, 21 103:24 106:7 108:12, 14, 21, 25 109:10 111:23 116:12 117:16 118:4 119:24 120:21 121:7 130:12, 13, 25 131:3, 9, 12 137:14 152:9 164:6 167:12 202:12 204:22 209:12 211:1, **stated** 42:9, 13 50:18 90:12 102:9 143:6 182:8 199:24 211:9 **statement** 11:10, 18 36:12, 16 40:25 52:13 53:1 58:13 72:13 74:10 76:22 95:13, 24 97:11 110:18 123:24 127:8 129:21, 23 131:16 136:21, 22 137:6, 10,

11, 14 138:1, 7, 9 142:8 143:17 148:4 163:*1*, 25 171:*1* 174:*13* 176:*21* 178:*8* 198:3 **statements** 6:8 35:21 37:11 38:11, 16, 18 49:17 51:6, 12, 20 55:9, 15 64:12, 15 65:1 66:3, 5 69:10, 12 74:2, 6 80:17 93:2 97:20 124:10 125:17 130:18 178:2 204:16 **STATES** 1:1 11:3 13:20 16:23 17:22 38:7 102:*3* 103:*19* stating 52:3 64:17, 20 75:3 103:17 117:10 118:21 143:21 164:11 179:9 **station** 123:13 **statute** 108:21 statutes 108:12.14 109:10 stay 30:4 158:23, 24 **stayed** 86:24 88:9 **staving** 146:19 **steering** 95:*15* **STENOGRAPHICAL LY** 1:25 step 18:22 19:15 20:13 120:3 156:7 167:2*3* 168:*1* **Stepping** 19:24 steps 18:2 68:17 148:24 153:20 187:11, 16 191:16, 20 stick 20:6 51:10 **sticking** 74:15 stir 73:7 **stood** 161:18 **Stop** 19:*1* 50:*9* 81:17 95:22 112:18 120:15, 17 121:10 122:2 123:4, 21 124:2, 8, 24 125:2, 3 126:15 134:23 135:12 142:11

145:17 155:2 156:7
168:17 197:22
stopped 74:3
stopping 121:25
stops 26:9 122:13
176:9
Street 2:20 22:6, 8
23:1, 6 24:19 33:1
112:15 117:7 118:25
140:14 191:5, 12
192:11 198:22
strictly 109:16
111:16
strike 196:4
stuck 53:16 55:6
126:4 133:25 135:2,
22 25 145.9 14 19
146:18 147:8 156:22
157:4 183:24 188:20
199:6
student 16:10
students 26:16
studied 62:18
studies 71:15
sub 46:20
subject 27:9, 12 29:4
35:6 60:24 63:7, 10,
21 70:23 71:12, 13
112:3, 7 120:9
146: <i>13</i> 152:22, 25
153:4, 8, 22 177:11
179: <i>1</i> 195: <i>16</i> 196: <i>11</i>
197:20 205:10
subjective 115:13, 23
116:7, 9 118: <i>1</i> 9
119:7 132:23, 25
subjectivity 115:25
116:6 119:24
subject's 204:9
submit 30:15
submitted 124: <i>11</i>
125:19
subscribe 105:6
106: <i>15</i> 211: <i>16</i>
subsection 102:3
substance 42: <i>1</i> 43: <i>5</i>
44:2 60:9 133:2 <i>1</i>
substitute 189:9
success 52:18

successful 30:6 46:13 52:16 67:19 70:13 108:7, 8 176:7 191:18 192:22 200:24 203:22 205:18 206:6, 10 207:2 successfully 24:13 70:24 72:24 200:14 205:19 **suffering** 42:9, 14 43:23 44:14 130:22 147:14 201:17 202:20 suggest 191:7 suggesting 160:19 165:18 suggestion 108:6 suggestions 103:21 105:19 **suicidal** 29:4 62:6, 7, 8 64:5, 11, 16, 18, 21 66:6 67:18 68:20 70:23 76:25 77:21 78:6, *15* 101:*14* 194:2, 5, 11 196:6 **suicidality** 62:1, 3, 22 **suicide** 62:2, 15, 16, 23 63:5, 13 64:1, 2, 7, 8 66:15, 17, 22 67:4, 10, 11, 14, 16 68:5, 9, 25 70:17, 22 71:1, 19 72:11, 20 78:23 79:1 195:7 197:*1* **Suite** 1:21 2:20 212:1. 7 **summarize** 109:21 summation 77:7 **summon** 165:10 **Sunday** 113:11, 15 **super** 157:18 192:5 **superior** 11:*12* **superiors** 163:23 164:4 supervised 45:16 91:2 supervising 61:22 174:12 175:15 supervisor 8:23

13 74:9 174:5, 9, *11*, 24 206:18 supervisory 190:22 **support** 87:21 88:4 156:4 supposed 19:9 **Supreme** 11:*3* **sure** 10:21 11:5, 6 14:13. 15 15:20 21:18 23:3 25:10 26:6 35:19 36:19 37:2 41:12 50:19 52:17 54:13, 17 57:7 58:5 59:21 65:12 68:24 72:12 74:11 76:14, 17 79:24 85:24 93:12, 16 98:17 102:18 105:12 121:2*1* 122:*14* 123:9 124:21 130:8 151:21 157:15 165:22, 25 176:23 184:8 201:8 206:19 surety 76:21 **surgery** 139:8, 15 surrender 30:13 surrounding 140:1, *15* 141:4, *16* 142:*14* surroundings 130:17 **suspect** 24:15 27:25 28:10, 19 29:14, 15, 18 30:9, 11, 13, 14 31:14 32:8 33:19 40:18 46:18 47:13, 21 53:10, 11 54:5 106:22 128:12 133:15 141:20 145:11 171:17 175:11 181:2 suspected 69:20 100:25 suspecting 100:25 **suspects** 18:11 28:3 52:14, 15 121:14 172:5 180:19, 22 **suspicion** 113:5, 6, 9, *11*, *12*, *15*, *23* 114:9 116:7, 10 117:1, 20 118:3 119:11, 16 123:1 155:3

suspicious 115:4 121:4 **SWAT** 33:4, 10 60:22 61:4 153:25 166:2 180:2*1* **SWEENEY** 1:18 2:7 3:4 4:1, 7 5:18 37:22 38:9 39:4 40:23 44:20 45:7 50:14 51:2 52:4 57:21 68:13 71:25 73:24 74:25 78:18 88:23 92:5, 18 97:16 99:20 100:12 109:23 110:1, 10 118:18 119:15 120:12 141:24 177:*14* 178:*1* 190:4 208:8 209:4, 19 210:6, 9 212:3, 9 Sweeney's 78:8 swings 44:*4* sworn 2:9 4:2 211:6 symptoms 42:10, 12 51:22 201:10 **system** 13:19 37:8 54:3, 7, 11, 20, 25 135:24 172:14

<T> table 29:10 **table's** 30:3 tactic 24:24 34:6, 18 tactical 16:23, 24 17:1, 2, 10 22:1, 3 23:6, 12 26:5 62:6 tacticals 25:14 tactics 18:3 34:8, 14 40:5 99:10 166:25 tag 18:17 take 5:3 7:6 8:14 17:17 19:10 22:25 25:7 47:1 58:21 59:7 61:11 66:8 83:7 91:5 101:18 111:*12* 119:*4* 120:*3* 156:3 157:13 164:2 165:8 166:5 172:*16* 177:*3* 187:*11*, *16* 195:3, 5, 14 197:4

16:13, 18 57:25 61:5,

204:25 208:16 **takeaway** 43:*13* taken 4:19 18:2 28:13 47:7 58:1 83:*10* 122:*7* 137:*1* 145:21 153:19 155:16 156:25 158:2 177:8 211:8 212:9 takes 73:5 123:7 talk 13:11 24:15 41:3, 8 44:8 46:19 68:2 86:16 124:13 144:15 159:23 160:24 174:16 175:3. 9 190:17 200:20 talked 13:25 62:14 65:8 66:23 70:7, 24 86:23 88:12 119:12, 21 128:10 129:12 133:20, 24 154:11 155:24 156:23 159:7 170:5 180:2*1* 199:10. 11 200:14 202:8, 21 203:23 204:14, 20 **talking** 7:14 13:5 36:7 48:4 62:22, 23 63:21 71:8 74:14 87:6, 9 96:19 101:24 102:19 104:3 113:23 114:19 120:15 130:1 155:11 159:25 172:13 207:9 talks 46:10 113:22 175:20 176:5 180:4 **Tara** 177:17 178:2, 12, 13, 19 targets 169:7 **TARWATER** 1:*12* **Taser** 20:8 tasked 5:22 taught 16:23 25:22 26:15 59:15, 17 110:25 111:4, 15 **teach** 26:19 192:9 teaching 25:24 60:5 team 29:5 60:21, 22 61:14 85:18 88:4 148:9 166:25 168:8, 9 170:11 194:17

200:24 teams 180:21 technical 26:13 technically 198:12 technique 19:4 24:24 34:5, 18, 24, 25 technique/tactic 32:12, 23 techniques 13:24 18:8 20:24 22:9 23:15 25:4 30:16 32:5 33:16 34:1, 2 40:11 170:11 200:18 204:4 **tell** 5:21 8:11 9:18 10:18 15:4, 14, 18 18:18 21:2 26:14 29:5, 20 36:9 59:16 81:5, 8 85:7, 9 93:14 112:12 123:6, 9 125:12 132:4 135:7 154:9 159:9 164:24 182:11 187:10 189:*17* 197:*16*, *25* 206:13 **telling** 31:*15* 64:*23* 143:9 156:2 204:21 tells 7:22 137:18 **TENG** 1:11 term 10:18 11:3, 11 12:20 20:22 31:23, 24, 25 49:11 66:17 115:13, 15, 20 terms 114:4 **Terry** 112:18 120:7, 8, 13, 15, 17 122:2, 4 test 25:7, 11 115:10 **testified** 2:9 4:*3* 9:13, 17 80:12 172:4 176:12 testify 211:6 **testimony** 10:*13* 94:20 95:13 141:18, 23 177:15, 16 178:2, 12, 13, 19, 21 179:4 183:*13* 200:7 207:*5* 209:8 210:2, 3 211:9, 13 **Thank** 20:25 52:4 55:7 98:10, 24

113:21 122:6 173:25 177:1, 7 182:4 195:20 206:11 208:8, 11, 12 thankfully 72:24 theoretically 154:18 theories 132:2 theory 130:21 154:10 185:10 **thereof** 2:3 44:6 thin 33:8 thing 6:25 8:25 19:9 35:17 38:17 55:13 56:5 57:16 80:15 96:3 117:3 123:9 140:18 182:18 185:25 187:15 190:*15* 191:*1* **Things** 5:1 8:19 9:4 12:25 13:24 18:18, 19 19:19 20:5, 9, 17 22:16 32:8, 9 33:16, 17 35:2, 18 42:2 44:23 45:18 48:2 49:9 70:8 72:4 77:5 82:5, 6 87:17 92:11, 13 93:11 94:12 101:17, 18 104:4, 20 108:24 109:3, 6, 8 111:24 128:14, 17 140:23 147:13 153:13 155:8 159:12. *17* 161:6 164:23 170:4 172:14 173:10 174:13 181:23 187:5 189:2, 3 190:22 193:15 195:5 200:22 202:23 203:16 205:8, *18, 25* 206:7 think 5:3, 14 6:25 7:9 9:15 10:4, 15 11:7 14:17 33:1, 15, 22, 25 34:1, 21, 22 35:22 36:1, 2, 17 41:23 44:18 45:9 46:1, 23 47:3 49:18 51:2, 9 52:2, 22, 25 54:14, 15, 23 57:15 59:9 60:2 62:10, 20 66:7 68:18 70:12

73:11, 12, 13 74:12 76:18 77:7, 15, 16, 17 78:*12* 81:*9*, *23* 82:*15*, 16, 19, 23 83:5 84:8, 10 85:7 86:11, 13, 17, 18 88:15 89:18 90:2, 18 92:7, 12 93:2 94:6, 7, 11 95:24 96:1, 23 98:2 99:1 100:19 106:13 107:11, 15, 22 108:1, *4* 109:10, 25 110:13, 20 111:16, 25 113:13 119:6, 20 121:10 122:24, 25 124:3, 5, 7, 19, 22 126:10 128:8, 20 129:7, 15 131:10, 14, 17 133:2, 4, 5 134:14, 19 135:14 137:12 141:7 144:12 145:25 147:4, *14* 148:8 149:9, 13, 14 150:*3* 153:*17* 156:*21* 158:24 159:4, 18 160:16, 20 162:25 164:9, 21 166:17 170:2 171:10 172:4, *18* 173:9 174:*15* 180:21 181:11 182:25 185:1, 2 190:5 194:9, 10, 19 195:*3* 198:*8* 199:*17* 203:3 205:17, 23 206:14 207:13 thinking 36:24 79:7, 10. 13 131:12 thinks 117:13 **third** 59:6 112:23 126:12 143:15 158:7 this day 209:11 thorough 92:7 207:15 **Thorp** 83:24 **THORPE** 1:14 164:13 188:17 193:7 **T-H-O-R-P-E** 83:25 **thought** 51:7 57:10 64:16, 25 74:7, 10, 16 77:10, 11 80:19

85:20 142:3, 8 179:14, 16 186:3 188:*14* 201:*5* 204:*1* 207:23 **thoughts** 40:19 threat 75:23 83:14 84:3 90:6 91:7 94:10 121:15 161:4 167:19 170:3, 7 187:10 198:17 **threaten** 197:*1* 199:2*1* threatened 100:22 158:25 195:25 threatening 32:14, 24 35:6 175:21 195:12 threats 93:23 99:13 168:25 169:1, 10 three 31:3, 6, 20 60:10 112:12 143:4 185:6 186:9 202:8, 9 threw 56:9 136:24 137:4 throw 56:17 thrown 56:19 136:16, 18 137:7, 19 **throws** 57:2 **tie** 115:9 time 6:23, 24 7:11, 13, 15, 18 8:7, 20 11:25 16:14 28:10 32:20 34:16 35:25 40:16 41:5, 6 43:17 48:25 58:9, 22 59:6, 8 60:4 64:17, 20 75:14 77:14 79:3, 8 81:16 82:20, 22, 23 83:18, 19, 20 87:13 89:2 93:8 103:24 104:14 105:23 108:4 109:2 110:4 112:21 114:11, 13 116:2, 22 119:18 126:5 129:6 131:13 133:4 134:16 135:14 144:20 147:3 148:12, 13 149:2, 23 150:2, 7, 16 155:11, 16 156:16 157:8 164:10 171:22, 25 174:17 181:2 183:4

184:*3*, *25* 185:*1*, *3*, *22* 186:16, 19 187:11 196:10 197:17, 18, 19, 24 199:9 204:10 206:13, 25 208:7 211:9 **timeline** 182:*17* timely 165:10 times 9:17 31:12 46:17 54:22 64:13 72:2 81:22 87:2 91:3 92:23 97:4 125:10 126:25 135:1 150:20 158:14, 17 161:2*1* 163:9 164:2*3* 166:13 176:8 182:8 184:*15* 185:2 186:*10*, *19* 190:*16* 196:*12* 202:9 203:23 **timestamp** 182:*11* tires 198:25 titled 102:2 today 81:7 90:12 96:17 105:10 120:11 154:12 155:13 184:10 203:24 207:22 208:11 todav's 5:8 13:9 **told** 42:5 95:7, 22 104:16 110:18 123:19 126:14 135:14 141:12 143:3 155:25 158:22 186:19 tone 31:16 tool 20:20 33:20 34:23, 25 194:12 tools 18:7 19:25 20:3, 4, 9, 14, 23 33:16 34:1, 2, 8, 13 top 8:18 9:19 93:15 99:4 161:18 162:2 171:6 topic 65:3 71:7 85:14 188:23 190:17 **topping** 138:21 **totally** 119:*14* touch 121:1 159:4 **touched** 205:23

toxicology 37:13 **track** 134:7 **traffic** 26:9 122:*13* 123:21 125:2 155:2 trail 58:18 train 30:21 42:22 60:11 86:4 96:15 111:10, 23 168:23 181:6 191:7 194:*15* **trained** 16:9 23:4 34:14 39:16, 22, 23 40:2 42:16, 21 43:8 44:8 46:8 58:14, 19 61:19 62:19 63:3, 12 91:2 96:15 162:5 166:3 167:3 189:24 192:16 194:23 207:19 trainer 23:21 **training** 10:18, 24 15:1, 2, 16, 23 16:1, 2, 6, 12, 20 17:3, 25 18:*3* 21:2, *4* 22:8, *17*, 19, 20, 24 23:1, 8, 11, 25 24:10, 14, 24 25:1, 4 26:8, 25 27:3 28:16 29:3, 13 30:7 33:2 34:9 39:20 40:18 42:18 43:12 44:13 45:11, 14 46:3, *4*, 9 58:22 59:*3*, *4*, 5, 7, 15, 18, 23 60:17 62:5, 17 63:3 64:3 67:11 70:17, 20 71:3, 5, 11 73:1, 2, 10 82:15 96:24 105:16 111:6, 9, 12, 17, 18 112:3 118:22 119:24 121:2, 12 123:6 128:*19* 130:2 132:*13*. *14* 136:*10* 152:*21*, *25* 153:3, 7 154:6 166:25 169:6 175:*13* 181:6 189:*10*, *14*, *21* 190:11, 13, 17 191:13 192:12, 20, 24 193:6, *13, 14, 19* 194:*10, 19* 202:2, 5, 8 206:7 207:20, 24 208:1, 4, 5

trainings 23:24 24:8 transcribed 211:11 transcript 209:6 210:10 212:9, 14, 15, 19 transcripts 208:15 transferred 16:17 **transport** 123:*12* **treat** 165:13 166:19 tree 93:4, 9, 10 138:20, 21, 23 139:5, 8, 14, 22 141:14, 21 142:5, 10, 13 144:5 trees 137:23 138:3, 8, 24 141:4, 10, 16 142:14, 23 143:8, 11 144:10 159:12 trespassing 122:17, 23 142:1 198:12 **trial** 9:18 **tried** 8:19 24:11 30:5 55:16 69:11 78:*11* 124:20 126:*1*, 2 139:11 142:9 151:22 156:7 158:*15* 159:14 174:16 trim 143:8 **trimming** 93:4, 9, 11 141:15, 21 144:10 truck 53:15, 24 55:6 56:19 73:17, 20 74:5 75:11, 15, 16, 22 81:22 83:16 84:5 86:10 87:12 88:4, 21 89:4, 6, 19, 25 90:1, 11 94:4 124:25 125:4 127:10, 21 133:13 134:3, 5 135:2, 25 136:18 137:2, 4 147:8 148:14 149:13 150:2 151:7, 11, 14, 19 152:15, 19 155:9 156:12 164:8, 11 165:20 172:*1* 184:*19* 200:3, 4 true 89:20 153:25 163:16, 22 209:9 211:13 truth 211:6, 7

try 25:4, 5 28:10 54:21 65:5 80:16 108:14 135:10, 11 151:6, 13 152:4, 10, *15, 18* 155:7 160:25 175:3 180:13, 14 181:5 190:17 193:24 196:*3* 197:*1* trying 17:12 35:4 41:10, 22 48:12, 21 50:16, 20 53:7, 22 54:4 57:4 68:20 77:11 81:2 83:4 101:18 107:15 109:6. *21* 116:25 142:*13* 143:21 148:23 153:17 159:10 161:*16*, *21*, *25* 175:*17*, *19* 176:5 179:*11* 182:2*1* 183:2, *12* 184:22 189:*16* 192:8 198:24 **Turn** 154:3 turned 192:2 twice 184:2 **Twisting** 128:*15* two 6:22 8:18 9:2 17:9 24:23 31:*1* 48:20 54:18 55:16 61:23 76:23 82:10 84:6, 14 100:25 107:7 108:22 109:23 122:21 129:22 143:4 153:14 158:18 162:10 168:8, 23 169:4, 7, 11 181:22 183:19 186:8 187:6, 9 190:22 195:4, 6 202:10 **two-part** 31:9 54:15 84:16 two-thirds 10:3, 16 **TYLER** 1:13 **type** 19:4 29:6 41:25 44:12 45:21 128:16 138:18 172:8 203:19 **types** 12:25 19:17 48:8 112:12

typewriting 211:12 typical 194:3

<U> ultimately 188:20 **unable** 85:7 101:*3* 151:11 198:7 199:18 unclear 143:23 144:1 **uncommon** 57:25 **uncover** 193:16 underlying 109:17 110:8 underneath 130:11 131:21 164:6 167:12 UNDERSHERIFF 1:9 148:21 164:14 undersigned 211:3 **understand** 8:5 14:7, 10, 15, 17, 19 15:9, 12 28:4 45:3, 8 48:9 53:7 79:24 97:16 101:3 113:18 129:5 183:13 184:8 185:24 188:22 189:*16* 190:*3*. 5, 9 191:3, 8 196:*16* 204:23 205:4 understanding 7:2 8:1 25:8 37:17 43:14, 15 66:21 88:5 105:14 124:14 162:7 168:5 171:*13* 183:*17* 188:*15*, *21* 195:*25* understood 15:10 37:21 **uniform** 18:17, 24 109:4 unit 147:23 148:5, *25* 156:*13* 173:*14* 179:15 **UNITED** 1:1 11:3 units 16:17 61:16 149:18 **University** 9:3 59:23, 25 unnecessarily 100:23 133:14 175:21

unnecessary 27:17

unpaved 141:2

133:16

unpredictable 69:3. 24 70:6 unreasonable 90:5, *17*, *19* 91:25 92:2, *6* 94:12 95:3 103:3 150:24 151:11, 15, 16 171:24 179:*1* 181:22 unreasonably 178:22 **unsafe** 185:14 191:22 unsuccessful 206:6 untrained 43:21 **unwilling** 199:19 **upper** 33:12 **urgency** 158:10 188:*1*, *3* use 7:24 13:23 17:8, *14*, 22 18:25 26:9 27:17 29:16 31:22 32:13, 23 34:1, 3, 7, 14, 19, 23 35:1, 3, 9 36:5, 6 37:10 38:22 54:2, 7, 17 57:14 81:12 82:14 99:10, *13* 119:23 121:2 128:9 131:20 136:10, 11 138:22 139:5 146:15 152:10, 14, 18 153:14 160:6, 11 161:13 166:8 170:10, *14* 172:*11* 176:*5* 181:*16* 185:*4*, *17* 187:12, 20 191:23, 24 193:18 194:25 195:11 197:21 199:3, *25* 201:*14* 203:*20* 205:21 **useful** 162:8 user 38:6 uses 16:4 45:17 139:14 176:4 **usually** 108:8 111:11 167:3 UTL 85:6 **uttered** 76:17 < V >

VALENTINO 1:13

Valley 2:15

vantage 151:7

variety 25:15 59:25 60:3, 11 105:20 107:3, 4 111:10 153:13 154:11 161:9 165:5 various 127:2 191:4 192:24 veered 97:6 **vehicle** 75:14 83:19, 21 84:8 86:19 89:10, 12, 13 95:19 108:17, 18 124:16 126:3, 16, 18 127:1 133:11, 25 136:17, 20 137:8, 17 140:6 142:5 144:17, 22, 25 145:12, 19 146:17 147:1 148:23 150:11 151:23 152:9 154:16, 25 156:7, 24 157:2, 5, 12, 13, 15 165:*14* 170:*1*, *5*, *6*, *13*, 14, 18 172:2 180:24 182:7 183:8, *10*, *15*, 18, 20, 24 184:5, 14, 24 185:16 196:2, 14, 15, 20 197:6, 8 198:6, 9, 21 199:2, 9, 12 **vehicle's** 199:*13* vein 64:22 **ventured** 191:20 **verbal** 18:23 19:4, 5, 15 29:12 30:16, 19 31:10, 13 76:12 126:17 127:25 128:5, verbally 126:21 127:6 **verify** 108:21 versus 9:25 119:10 153:22 vet 46:5 veteran 111:18 **vicinity** 95:16 **victim** 157:2 **video** 6:22, 24 109:5 videoconference 2:6 **videos** 73:2 105:17, view 140:14 179:1 **viewed** 6:13 132:9

viewing 137:23 138:3, 8 **violate** 97:24 102:15 109:13 **violated** 99:15 100:14 103:16 violates 110:6 violating 198:1 violation 34:25 97:21 106:6 109:18 110:9 181:22 200:3 violations 100:7 109:4 violence 24:4 121:16 violent 167:24, 25 172:21 173:1, 8 violently 173:2 **virtual** 4:16 vis-a-vis 75:2 **visible** 19:*3* 168:*12* **visual** 88:3 145:24 146:6 149:7, 12 150:10 **visually** 148:6 149:3 152:19 visuals 146:13 voice 54:8 96:10, 14 97:1,4 99:13 **voices** 96:18 voluntarily 30:15 124:11 125:19 vs 1:7 212:7

< W > **WA98105** 212:7 wager 132:19 wait 91:11 124:6 146:4 147:3 153:14 166:*13* 171:25 183:23 185:5, 6 186:20 187:2 203:18 205:9 waited 144:16 146:25 147:4, 9, 18, 20 **waiting** 14:*13* 142:19 171:11 174:1 178:16 187:1 189:19 wake 152:5, 11 **walk** 162:9 187:7

walked 145:16 199:12 want 5:15 7:13, 25 18:6 19:8 21:6 31:8 35:24 40:13, 23 41:21 43:11 47:1 50:6 51:1 65:18 66:3 67:24, 25 72:8, 9 73:5, 6, 7 74:25 76:13 80:8 82:3, 23 86:16 89:23 98:15 99:16 107:16 108:5 111:24 112:10 113:3 116:12 130:6 132:1. *23* 133:*1*, *4* 134:*21* 141:9 144:2 146:23 148:24 150:10, 19 153:2*1* 155:6, *15* 159:23 162:11 163:1, 2, 13, 14 165:8, 24 168:*13* 171:*5* 173:*5* 182:10 184:8 190:20 191:6 194:3, 24 197:7 200:6 202:25 208:15 wanted 13:14, 15 64:23, 24 65:21 75:4 122:11, 15 126:11 132:5, 6, 7 158:6 164:8 169:4 182:3 200:12 wanting 102:20 143:8, 23 144:2 wants 66:16 139:13 144:3, 9 **warning** 120:*4* 197:21, 25 warrant 118:21 119:2 Washington 13:21 15:19, 24 58:4 watch 174:5 watched 5:24 147:1 148:7 water 140:19 wave 161:18 way 14:19 23:19 26:5 40:6 43:24 52:16 57:9 67:15

79:25 96:15 101:21

104:19 105:4 107:5, 8, 9 109:10, 25 123:3 133:22 138:5 140:10 155:*1* 156:*4* 158:23, 24 167:24 169:25 170:15 175:5 177:9 180:23 181:16 187:2 189:12 203:13 211:19 ways 131:18 146:24 153:20 168:*15*, 21 170:13 192:18 weapon 24:1 32:12, 23 34:6, 18 67:9 85:21, 23, 24 86:2 88:17 89:16, 19 90:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 91:8, 12, *14, 17* 95:7, 8 120:22 171:10, 13, 18 194:6 195:6, *15* 196:*1* 197:19 198:7 199:6, 21 weapons 20:14, 16 webinar 24:20 25:23 webinars 25:24 websites 71:7 **Wednesday** 1:19 2:2 weeks 15:4 weigh 153:22 Well 12:4 14:2. 15 35:20 38:17 50:14 55:20 59:9 62:7 80:3, 11 87:25 92:11, *13* 100:*16* 108:*18* 110:24 121:20 124:9, *13* 126:*19* 128:*6* 134:1 135:7 139:6 143:*19* 146:*1* 147:*21* 149:14, 19, 22 171:24 175:16 176:12 182:25 184:9 188:6 191:6 208:2 well-trained 39:18 40:9 44:16 45:5 47:20 48:12 **well-written** 206:*15* WENDEL 1:9 went 6:16 33:6 42:18 56:22 77:18 99:18, 19 125:9

140:5 169:15 202:12 208:2 we're 5:4 23:12 31:7, 14 46:17 62:22, 23 81:7 87:6, 10 91:4, 6, 10, 11 96:17, 18, 19 104:9, 11 111:23 114:19 116:20 118:13 120:11 130:1 132:16, *17* 143:*1*, *15* 155:*11* 156:*1*, 2, 5 158:*3*, 4 159:25 186:17 187:2, 3 205:9, 12 we've 44:8 46:25 70:24 101:14, 15, 16 120:8 133:19 150:16 154:11 155:12 184:1 186:16, 18 194:19 **WH** 1:4 **what-if's** 35:24 wheel 95:16 185:5 Whichever 104:22 wide 60:11 107:3 140:24 wide-ranging 32:15 33:23 wife 75:6 135:14 141:12 160:9, 17 179:11 **WILLIAM** 1:4 8:3 143:6, 7 willing 82:21 willingness 46:4 win 24:17 window 57:3 74:13 115:6 146:10 153:17 156:17 **windows** 114:25 152:15, 18 153:16 182:22 **wipers** 146:8 wiper's 148:18 wish 7:8 21:8 203:9 204:3, 6 205:5 210:3, 4 212:16 **withdraw** 23:13 187:11 within-entitled 211:8

WITNESS 1:17 2:8
11:22, 24 12: <i>11</i>
14:19 15:8, 12 21:16
28:5, 9 32:19 35:12
37:17, 21, 25 38:11
39:7 40:15, 25 44:22
45:9 47:2, 18 49:23
51:4 52:22 55:8
57:8, 23 66:20 68:14
72:3 73:25 74:22
75:3 78:10, 20 87:2
88:25 92:7, 19 95:1
96:2 97:18 98:11, 25
99:22 100: <i>15</i> 110: <i>3</i> ,
<i>12, 19</i> 116: <i>19, 22</i>
117: <i>3</i> 118: <i>19</i> 119: <i>16</i> 120: <i>13</i> 136: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i> , <i>6</i>
120:13 136:3, 4, 6
139:16 141:25
142:18 143:25 144:1
174:1 177:1, 6, 22
211:5, 10
witness(if 211:14
wolf 132:11
wooden 153:15
word 28:10 38:3
127:9 128:9 143:23
144: <i>1</i> 159: <i>1</i> 190:8
212: <i>16</i>
wording 104:8 191:4
words 10:11 13:15
14:2 <i>1</i> 18:25 22: <i>13</i>
28:15 30:4, 11 32:7
69:10 74:22 75:4
76:16 115:17 123:7
138:24 156:5 163:3
183:10, 11 186:14
189: <i>1</i> 193: <i>5</i> 200: <i>3</i>
206:1 210:2, 4
212:16
work 18:9 22:7
28:21 40:6 45:14
115:19 130:9 132:13
135:7 139:17 142:10,
<i>13</i> 143:8 144:2, 9
161: <i>1</i> 162:7 166:8
192: <i>17</i> , <i>18</i> 201: <i>19</i>
202:22
worked 8:22 60:20
61:9, 13, 16, 18 63:15
•

```
64:8 117:5 162:4
202:21
working 29:20 32:6
41:3 46:17 60:22
97:8, 9 142:5 202:14
world 71:12
worried 156:19
204:9
worse 133:18 136:12
193:12 199:17
205:12
worst 37:1 201:21
worthy 122:3
Wow 157:22
wrap 206:13
wrist 19:18
wrists 123:11
write 21:16 82:12
105:24 108:18
114:24 115:3, 7
123:18 133:8 136:15
137:21 138:5 158:8
167:22
written 14:21 25:7.
11 61:1 63:9 65:21
82:10 108:20 116:4
129:13 189:7
wrong 6:16 77:19
97:7 99:19 157:23
193:11 206:25
wrote 66:2 74:9
76:1 79:11 80:22
85:5, 16 86:13
100:18 122:19, 24, 25
124:3 130:11 131:15
138:6 147:4 148:3
163:24 174:13
180:11
< Y >
yards 53:21, 23 54:8,
```

11 56:23 86:24

157:16 184:19 **YCSD** 145:5 165:9 184:23 186:17 **Yeah** 11:24 12:1 21:14, 21 28:9, 12, 16 32:21 34:17 37:22 40:2 41:13 47:3

133:25 148:13 151:6

```
59:8 65:14 73:25
77:25 85:21 86:23
91:12 102:7, 10
110:5 120:16 124:21
129:7 142:18 143:19,
24 147:11 151:16
153:12
vear 9:1 22:5 46:6
208:4 209:12
yearly 23:2
years 7:17, 22, 23
10:8, 15 16:9 23:9
105:12 111:8 117:5,
11 208:3
yell 76:12 199:15
velled 193:3
yelling 29:24 135:18
158:22 161:21 162:2,
17, 18, 19 174:19
176:6, 8 178:6, 10, 23
181:13 205:11
vounger 174:18
YUBA 1:8 4:14
5:23 6:3 8:4, 8, 12,
24 16:4 89:9 104:9,
18 106:17 133:5, 8
136:15 155:6 180:13
182:6 183:3, 14
207:13 212:7
Yup 157:15
< Z >
Zepeda 164:13
Zepeda's 186:4
Zero 26:20, 24
Zoom 2:6
```

WORD LIST	2014 (1)	50 (2)	accountable (2)
	2020 (1)	500 (3)	accredited (2)
< 0 >	2020s (1)	530 (1)	accumulated (1)
000-0004 (<i>1</i>)	2021 (2)		accurate (6)
	2024 (8)	<6>	accurately (2)
<1>	20-year (1)	6 (4)	achieve (2)
1 (2)	21 (9)		acknowledged (1)
10 (7)	2180 (1)	<7>	acquire (1)
100 (22)	22-cv-00389-TLN-	7 (2)	acronym (3)
100-percent (1)	CSK (1)		acronyms (1)
10709 (3)	24 (4)	<8>	act (9)
11 (<i>l</i>)	245(a (3)	8:57 (1)	acted (2)
12 (3)	25 (1)	850 (<i>I</i>)	acting (5)
13 (<i>l</i>)	25th (2)		action (16)
13th (1)	25-year (1)	<9>	actions (24)
14 (8)	28 (2)	9:26 (1)	activate (1)
14:20 (<i>I</i>)	29 (2)	90s (2)	active (1)
14:38 (<i>I</i>)		911 (4)	activities (1)
14:54 (<i>I</i>)	<3>	916 (1)	actor (2)
1450 (2)	3 (5)	916.228.4593 (2)	actual (10)
15 (5)	3:00 (1)	929.1481 (1)	acute (1)
15:00 (1)	3:05 (2)	95 (<i>l</i>)	add (11)
15:05 (4)	3:10 (1)	95814 (2)	Add/Delete (1)
15:07 (I)	3:30 (1)	95946 (1)	added (1)
15:08 (I)	30 (7)	98 (5)	additional (6)
15:09 (<i>I</i>)	30:10 (<i>I</i>)	9815 (1)	address (7)
15:12 (<i>I</i>)	30th (1)	7010 (1)	adds (2)
15:18 (3)	35 (3)	< A >	admonitions (1)
15:20 (<i>I</i>)		abide (1)	adult (2)
150 (8)	<4>	abiding (1)	advancing (1)
156 (<i>l</i>)	4 (6)	abilities (1)	advantage (1)
16:20 (10)	4:00 (1)	ability (10)	advice (2)
16:22 (<i>I</i>)	4:26 (2)	able (18)	advise (1)
16:24 (2)	4:30 (1)	absence (3)	advised (3)
16:26 (8)	40 (1)	absolute (2)	advisor (1)
16:30 (6)	400 (2)	absolutely (4)	affect (3)
1630 (<i>I</i>)	404 (2)	absolutes (1)	affliction (1)
17 (<i>l</i>)	40-hour (3)	abuse (3)	afoot (2)
1705 (1)	428 (24)	academic (1)	afraid (2)
177 (<i>l</i>)	428.1.1 (2)	academy (16)	after-action (5)
1987 (<i>I</i>)	428.3 (1)	accept (1)	agencies (2)
	428.4 (1)	accepted (2)	agency (1)
< 2 >	428.5 (4)	access (3)	aggression (1)
2 (1)	428.6 (8)	accessible (1)	aggressive (4)
2:54 (1)	432.5407 (1)	accompanied (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{aggressive} & (7) \\ \mathbf{ago} & (3) \end{array}$
20 (6)	4616 (<i>I</i>)	accomplish (10)	agree (83)
2000s (2)		accomplished (3)	agreement (1)
2001 (<i>I</i>)	<5>	accomplishing (1)	agrees (1)
2010 (<i>I</i>)	5 (5)	account (1)	AGUIRRE (7)
、 /			

A-G-U-I-R-R-E (1)	appreciate (5)	attacking (2)	basis (7)
A-G-C-I-R-R-E (1) Ah (1)	appreciated (1)	attempt (5)	bean (5)
ahead (44)	1	attempt (3)	BEDARD (4)
	approach (14)	1	1 /
aid (2)	approached (7)	attempting (4)	began (1)
aide (3)	approaching (7)	attempts (4)	beginning (3)
air (17)	appropriate (18)	attend (1)	Begins (1)
airplane (5)	appropriately (1)	attention (4)	behalf (1)
airplanes (1)	approximate (3)	attorney (7)	behaved (1)
akin (2)	approximately (8)	attorneys (1)	behaving (5)
alcohol (14)	area (14)	Auburn (1)	behavior (11)
alive (1)	areas (2)	audience (2)	behaviors (4)
allegations (1)	arena (1)	August (2)	behoove (1)
alleviate (3)	Argue (1)	author (1)	behooves (1)
alleviated (1)	argument (2)	authored (3)	belief (5)
allow (11)	Argumentative (2)	authority (2)	beliefs (1)
allowed (2)	arises (1)	authorized (1)	believe (82)
allows (4)	arm (3)	available (7)	believed (2)
alongside (3)	armed (11)	Avenue (1)	believes (1)
alter (1)	armor (2)	avoid (4)	bench (1)
a-man-with-a-gun (1)	armored (1)	awake (1)	best (18)
ambiguity (I)	arose (1)	aware (24)	better (12)
ambiguous (6)	arranged (1)		beware (1)
ambulance (2)	arrangements (1)	< B >	beyond (5)
amount (6)	arrest (29)	back (57)	BIANCA (1)
analysis (1)	arrested (3)	backed (4)	bias (5)
analyze (3)	arrestees (2)	background (3)	biased (2)
and/or (8)	arrests (4)	backing (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{biased} & (2) \\ \mathbf{big} & (3) \end{array}$
ANDERSON (2)	arrest-type (1)	backup (1)	biggest (5)
announce (2)	arrive (4)	backwards (4)	Bing (3)
answer (83)	arrived (5)	bad (3)	bipolar (8)
answered (16)	arrives (1)	badge (1)	bit (18)
answering (4)	arriving (1)	bag (4)	bits (1)
0 \ /	0 \ /	0 \ /	` ′
answers (6)	articles (4)	bags (1)	blanket (6)
anxiety (1)	asked (22)	balcony (1)	block (2)
anybody (1)	asking (30)	ballistic (5)	body (5)
anymore (5)	aspect (1)	Bare (1)	body-worn (1)
anyone's (1)	asphalted (1)	barking (5)	bolded (1)
anyway (3)	assault (5)	barren (1)	bones (1)
apparent (3)	Assessment (6)	barricaded (10)	booked (1)
apparently (5)	assigned (1)	barricades (1)	books (3)
appear (1)	assist (2)	barrier (1)	bother (1)
APPEARANCES (1)	assistance (2)	barriers (1)	bottom (5)
appeared (2)	assistant (1)	base (3)	Bowie (1)
appears (3)	assume (4)	based (36)	Box (1)
applicable (4)	assumes (3)	baseless (1)	boy (1)
applied (3)	assuming (5)	basic (3)	BRADON (1)
applies (1)	assumption (7)	basically (4)	brand (3)
apply (4)	attach (1)	basics (1)	brandished (1)
applying (1)	attached (1)	basing (1)	BRANDON (1)
•			

break (23)	catch-all (1)	citation (3)	comments (1)
breakdown (2)	categories (1)	cited (1)	comments (1)
breaking (3)	cause (33)	citizens (1)	commit (4)
briefly (1)	caused (5)	city (2)	committing (2)
bring (5)	causing (1)	civil (6)	committing (2)
bringing (1)	causing (1) caveat (2)	claim (1)	commonly-used (1)
	caveat (2) cc (1)	clarification (1)	commony-used (1)
broad (1) broadcast (1)	cell (9)	clarify (7)	` '
broke (2)	cemented (1)	```	communicate (12)
broken (1)	` ′	clarity (1)	communicated (2)
brother-in-law (1)	center (1) Central (3)	class (8) classes (15)	communicating (6) communication (11)
brush (1)	certain (14)	classified (1)	communications (3)
` /	1 1	` '	
building (4)	certainly (44)	classroom (9)	communicator (1)
buildings (1)	certificate (1)	clear (8)	communicators (1)
bulge (1)	Certified (11)	clear-cut (1)	Community (4)
bulk (2)	certify (2)	cleared (1)	comp (1)
Bullet (5)	cetera (1)	clearing (2)	compact (1)
burst (1)	chain (1)	clearly (9)	company (2)
business (6)	chalk (1)	cleverly (1)	compare (2)
bystanders (1)	challenge (1)	climbing (1)	competency (2)
	challenges (2)	close (7)	competent (4)
<c></c>	challenging (3)	closely (2)	complainant (5)
CA (4)	chance (5)	closer (1)	complainant's (1)
CAD (7)	change (7)	closest (2)	complaint (1)
cadre (3)	changed (5)	clothes (1)	complete (2)
CALIFORNIA (26)	changes (2)	clothing (1)	completely (3)
California's (1)	chaotic (3)	clues (3)	completing (1)
call (21)	characteristics (2)	CNT (1)	compliance (4)
called (9)	characterization (1)	code (5)	compliant (1)
calling (2)	characterizing (1)	codes (1)	complicated (3)
call-out (2)	charge (4)	codified (13)	comply (3)
calls (8)	chase (1)	codify (2)	complying (2)
calm (7)	check (7)	Codifying (1)	component (4)
calmed (1)	checking (1)	collaborate (1)	compound (1)
calming (1)	chest (2)	collector (1)	comprehending (1)
campus (6)	children (2)	college (6)	concept (1)
Capitol (2)	choice (3)	combination (4)	concepts (1)
CAPTAIN (6)	choices (2)	combine (6)	concern (11)
caption (2)	chose (1)	combined (1)	concerned (7)
captures (1)	chosen (5)	Combining (1)	Concerning (1)
car (34)	CHP (17)	come (24)	concerns (7)
care (11)	CHRISTINE (4)	come-along (2)	concluded (1)
career (6)	circle (2)	comes (7)	conclusion (4)
careful (2)	circled (4)	comfortable (4)	condition (5)
cars (2)	circles (7)	coming (6)	conditions (1)
case (30)	circling (1)	command (14)	conduct (3)
cases (13)	Circuit (2)	commander (3)	conducting (1)
casual (1)	circumstance (4)	commands (13)	confident (1)
catchall (3)	circumstances (14)	comment (1)	confirm (4)

	1	1	1
conflict (1)	coordinated (1)	cut (1)	define (3)
conflicted (1)	cop (19)	cut-and-dry (1)	definite (3)
conflicts (1)	copies (1)	CV (3)	definitely (8)
conforms (1)	cop-intent (2)		definition (5)
confrontation (2)	copy (8)	< D >	definitive (2)
confused (7)	core (1)	daily (1)	definitively (2)
confusion (3)	corner (2)	\mathbf{DALLAS} (1)	delete (3)
conjunction (1)	corollary (1)	danger (5)	deliberately (1)
connect (1)	coroner (1)	dangerous (4)	delusion (1)
connotations (1)	correct (75)	dash (1)	delusional (4)
conscious (1)	corrected (1)	data (1)	delusions (1)
consensual (1)	CORRECTION (2)	date (5)	demographic (1)
consensus (1)	corrections (2)	dated (3)	demonstrate (2)
consequences (3)	correctly (2)	dates (1)	deny (3)
Consequently (1)	correlation (1)	DAVID (40)	DEPARTMENT (69)
consider (12)	Corvallis (3)	David's (1)	departments (8)
consideration (1)	COUNSEL (23)	day (16)	department's (3)
considerations (1)	count (2)	day-long (3)	depending (2)
considered (3)	COUNTY (28)	days (I)	depends (2)
consistent (I)	couple (15)	day-shift (1)	deploy (3)
consistently (1)	course (10)	day-to-day (1)	deployed (7)
console (4)	COURT (13)	dead (1)	deploying (2)
constant (3)	courteous (1)	deadly (4)	deployment (2)
constantly (2)	courts (8)	deal (11)	DEPONENT'S (1)
constitute (3)	Court's (1)	dealing (17)	DEPOSITION (27)
constituting (1)	cover (6)	dealt (2)	depositions (10)
constitutional (2)	covered (1)	Dear (1)	deputies (103)
constructive (3)	covers (3)	death (7)	DEPUTY (141)
Consulting (1)	cows (1)	deceased (1)	deputy's (2)
contact (6)	$\operatorname{crash}^{(I)}$	December (1)	describe (5)
contained (2)	create (11)	decide (5)	described (7)
context (3)	created (8)	decided (9)	describing (3)
continual (3)	creates (1)	decides (1)	Description (4)
continually (3)	creating (4)	deciding (1)	descriptions (2)
continue (9)	credit (1)	decision (8)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{design} & (3) \\ \mathbf{design} & (3) \end{array}$
contractor (3)	crime (26)	decisions (3)	designation (1)
contractor (3)	crimes (1)	declare (1)	designed (6)
contribution (1)	criminal (2)	deescalate (15)	desire (7)
control (13)	crisis (30)	deescalated (1)	desires (1)
conversation (9)	crisis-intervention (1)	deescalating (8)	detail (5)
conversational (1)	critical (13)	deescalation (71)	detailed (2)
conversationa (1)	criticism (3)	deescalation's (1)	detailing (1)
conversations (1)	criticisms (3)	defeat (1)	detain (3)
convince (1)	cruiser (1)	defend (6)	detained (4)
O , ,	` '	defendant (1)	DETECTIVE (9)
cooperate (2)	cry (2) CSR (2)	Defendants (3)	detectives (1)
cooperated (1)		defense (2)	detention (10)
cooperating (2)	current (1)	` ′	` ′
cooperation (2)	currently (1)	deference (2)	determination (1)
cooperative (1)	custody (6)	deficiencies (1)	determine (4)

$\mathbf{determined} (I)$	dissemination (1)	DUI (4)	end-user (1)
deterrent (2)	dissociative (1)	duty (7)	enforcement (105)
develop (2)	distance (15)	DWYER (120)	enforcement's (2)
device (2)	distances (1)	dying (1)	engaged (1)
devised (1)	distracted (2)	dynamic (1)	engine (1)
diagnose (1)	distractionary (2)		engine's (1)
diagnoses (1)	distress (4)	< E >	enjoyable (1)
diagnosis (2)	DISTRICT (2)	earlier (12)	ensure (2)
die (10)	disturbance (1)	Early (\hat{I})	enter (1)
$\mathbf{died} (3)$	ditch (21)	eased (2)	entered (2)
difference (6)	doctor's (1)	easier (5)	entering (1)
different (43)	document (5)	easily (2)	entirely (4)
differentiating (1)	documented (2)	EASTERN (1)	entrance (1)
differently (2)	documents (9)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{easy} & (3) \end{array}$	entries (3)
difficult (27)	dog (8)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	entry (1)
difficulties (2)	dogs(3)	echo (1)	enunciated (1)
difficulty (3)	doing (14)	ECK (77)	environment (2)
diligence (1)	domain (1)	Eck's (13)	equipment (3)
direct (6)	domains (1)	educated (4)	erratic (1)
directed (3)	domanis (1) domestic (1)	education (3)	erratically (4)
direction (4)	domestic-violence (1)	effect (7)	escalated (5)
direction (4)	don'ts (2)	effective (5)	escalating (8)
• •	` '	. ,	escalating (8) escalation (1)
directly (2)	door (4)	effectively (8)	` '
dirt (1)	doorway (2)	effort (1)	escort (1)
disagree (8)	dos (2)	efforts (3)	especially (2)
discarded (1)	$\det (41)$	eight (1)	essentially (1)
disciplines (1)	doubting (1)	either (12)	establish (1)
discount (4)	dowels (1)	electronic (2)	established (4)
discovered (2)	Dr (1)	element (2)	establishing (2)
discovery (11)	draw (7)	elements (3)	ESTATE (1)
discuss (7)	drawing (6)	ELLIS (3)	estimation (2)
discussed (19)	drawn (1)	elucidate (1)	et (1)
discussing (4)	dressed (1)	Email (2)	ethics (1)
discussion (12)	drew (2)	emotional (1)	evaluate (2)
discussions (1)	drive (9)	emotions (1)	evaluating (1)
disinterested (1)	driver (1)	emphasizes (1)	event (1)
dislike (3)	driver's (2)	employ (1)	events (5)
disliked (1)	drives (8)	employed (1)	eventually (9)
disobeyed (1)	driveway (1)	employees (3)	evidence (46)
disobeying (2)	driving (16)	en (1)	evidentiary (3)
disorder (7)	drone (6)	enacted (2)	exact (11)
disorders (1)	drop (2)	encompass (1)	exactly (11)
dispatch (5)	drove (21)	encounter (11)	EXAMINATION (4)
dispatcher (1)	drug (8)	encounters (1)	examined (2)
displaying (2)	drug-induced (1)	encouraging (1)	examining (1)
disposing (I)	drugs (22)	endangered (1)	example (10)
disregards (1)	$\operatorname{dry}^{\circ}(1)$	endeavor (1)	examples (16)
disruption (1)	$ \mathbf{DT} (1) $	ended (3)	exceeded (1)
disseminate (1)	due (1)	endless (1)	excellent (1)
` '		, ,	

exceptions (1)	facing (2)	five (4)	gather (1)
excessive (2)	fact (16)	five-minute (2)	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{gauge} & (1) \end{array}$
excuse (2)	factor (3)	flashbang (4)	gear (2)
EXECUTED (1)	factors (2)	flavor (I)	general (31)
exercises (1)	facts (19)	flinch (1)	generality (1)
exhaustive (1)	factual (2)	flock (1)	generalization (1)
Exhibit (16)	fail (1)	flooded (2)	generally (30)
exhibited (1)	failed (3)	flow (1)	gestures (1)
Exhibits (2)	failure (1)	flowing (1)	getting (12)
exigencies (1)	fair (6)	FOCUS (4)	give (42)
exigency (13)	fairly (3)	focused (1)	given (18)
exigent (1)	fall (3)	focusing (1)	giving (2)
exit (1)	familiar (11)	Focuslitigation solution	go (95)
exiting (1)	familiarity (1)	s.com (2)	goal (11)
	1	` ′	O
expect (1)	family (43)	follow (9)	goal-oriented (4)
expectation (3)	far (10)	followed (2)	goes (7)
expectations (6)	fast (2)	following (2)	going (138)
expensive (1)	fatal (10)	follows (1)	Good (31)
experience (58)	fear (7)	food (1)	goodbye (1)
experienced (2)	featured (1)	force (38)	Gooseneck (1)
experiences (1)	federal (2)	forced (2)	$\mathbf{gosh} (1)$
experiencing (7)	feel (5)	foregoing (4)	govern (1)
EXPERT (33)	feeling (3)	foreign (2)	grabbed (1)
expertise (6)	feelings (4)	forensic (1)	grade (1)
experts (3)	feels (2)	form (5)	graded (2)
expert's (2)	feet (1)	formal (4)	graduate (1)
expert-witness (1)	fell (1)	forms (1)	great (6)
expire (2)	felonies (1)	formulate (1)	greater (4)
explain (7)	felt (7)	forth (7)	Green (2)
explained (4)	fidgety (1)	forward (3)	grenade (2)
explanation (6)	field (34)	forwards (2)	groin (1)
explanations (1)	fields (1)	found (14)	GROSS (124)
express (9)	field-scenario (3)	four (13)	ground (4)
expressed (8)	fight (2)	four-day (1)	\mathbf{grow} (1)
expresses (2)	fighting (1)	fourth (1)	growing (2)
expressing (6)	figure (3)	frame (3)	guarantee (1)
extends (1)	final (2)	frankly (2)	guarding (1)
extensive (1)	finally (5)	free (5)	guess (21)
extent (9)	find (27)	front (8)	guesses (4)
extra (1)	findings (1)	fulfill (2)	guessing (4)
extraneous (1)	fine (11)	full (1)	guideline (1)
extrapolate (1)	fingerprint (2)	fully (6)	guidelines (1)
extreme (1)	fingers-interlocking	funnel (10)	gun (21)
extremely (1)	(I)	further (<i>15</i>)	guns (20)
	fire (7)	future (1)	guns-out (1)
< F >	firearm (38)		guy (6)
face (2)	firearms (6)	<g></g>	guys (3)
faced (6)	firing (1)	gain (5)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{guy} \mathbf{s} & (5) \\ \mathbf{guy's} & (5) \end{array}$
facility (2)	first (33)	gained (1)	
(2)	(33)	541174 (1)	

<h></h>	helping (2)	ideation (11)	inexperienced (2)
half (3)	helps (3)	ideations (1)	inferences (1)
hall (3)	HENNEFER (182)	identified (2)	influence (27)
hallmarks (3)	Hennefer's (45)	identify (3)	influenced (1)
hallway (1)	hereinafter (1)	identifying (1)	inform (1)
hamper (2)	hereto (1)	ignore (1)	information (57)
hand (5)	hesitate (4)	ill (2)	informed (1)
handcuff (1)	Hey (10)	illness (8)	ingested (1)
handcuffs (2)	hidden (1)	imagine (3)	in-house (1)
handed (1)	high (3)	immediate (8)	initial (12)
handle (9)	highly-trained (1)	immediately (3)	initialed (1)
handled (3)	highs (1)	impact (1)	initially (10)
handles (1)	Highway (1)	impaired (2)	initials (2)
hands (8)	hired (3)	impatient (1)	injured (2)
hands-on (3)	his/her (1)	impediment (1)	$\int \mathbf{ink} (1)$
hanging (4)	history (9)	impediments (2)	innocent (3)
happen (5)	hit (I)	implement (1)	In-person (2)
happened (17)	HNT (2)	implies (1)	insert (5)
happening (3)	hold (11)	important (10)	inserting (2)
happens (2)	holding (3)	impossible (3)	in-service (1)
happy (2)	holds (3)	impression (1)	inside (9)
harbor (2)	holster (1)	improper (1)	instance (2)
hard (11)	home (1)	inability (2)	instances (2)
harder (4)	homes (1)	inaccurate (1)	institution (1)
harm (4)	honest (4)	inaction (I)	instructed (1)
harm's (2)	honesty (1)	inactions (1)	instruction (2)
Harvard (1)	hope (3)	inappropriate (1)	instructor (1)
hate (1)	hopefully (3)	incapacitating (1)	instructor-level (1)
hatred (1)	horses (1)	incident (48)	instructors (2)
hazard (6)	hospital (3)	incidents (1)	intel (3)
hazards (I)	hostage (8)	include (1)	intelligence (8)
head (8)	hour (15)	includes (1)	intend (2)
health (24)	hours (17)	including (1)	intended (1)
healthness (1)	house (5)	incomplete (1)	intent (3)
hear (9)	houses (1)	incorporate (7)	intention (2)
heard (10)	hover (1)	incorporated (2)	intentional (1)
hearing (1)	human (1)	Incorrect (1)	interact (1)
heart (3)	hunches (2)	incorrectly (1)	interacted (1)
heartbeat (1)	hundred (2)	indexes (1)	interacting (3)
heavily (2)	hundreds (3)	indicate (5)	interaction (3)
heavy (1)	hurry (3)	indicated (1)	interactions (1)
heck (1)	hurt (8)	indicates (1)	interested (2)
hectic (1)	hurting (1)	indicating (1)	interesting (5)
height (1)	hypothetical (6)	indication (3)	interfere (5)
held (4)		indications (2)	interfering (2)
helicopter (1)	< I >	individual (10)	interject (1)
help (41)	idea (17)	individually (1)	internal (1)
helped (2)	ideal (1)	individuals (4)	interpretation (1)
helpful (3)	ideas (4)	individual's (2)	interpreted (1)

intervention (16)	killed (4)	Leno (1)	lower (1)
intoxicated (3)	killing (2)	less-lethal (10)	lows (1)
intoxication (4)	kills (1)	lessons (1)	lumped (2)
introduce (1)	kind (30)	LETA (1)	lunch (4)
investigate (7)	knew (10)	lethal (9)	Tunen (1)
investigated (1)	knife (41)	lethargic (1)	< M >
investigating (1)	Knives (1)	letter (3)	Madam (1)
investigation (7)	knocking (1)	letting (1)	magnification (3)
investigator (1)	know (123)	level (7)	main (1)
involve (2)	knowledge (8)	levels (4)	maintain (2)
involved (12)	known (5)	Lexipol (11)	making (12)
involves (1)	\mathbf{knows} (3)	Lexipol's (1)	Mall (2)
irrelevant (1)	1110 (15 (6)	LIEUTENANT (3)	MALLORY (1)
island (1)	<l></l>	life (20)	manage (1)
issue (11)	labeled (1)	life-saving (2)	management's (1)
issued (1)	lack (3)	likelihood (1)	mandatory (1)
issues (19)	lacking (1)	liken (1)	maneuver (1)
issuing (1)	lacks (1)	Likewise (1)	maneuvers (1)
item (3)	lamas (1)	limit (3)	manic (1)
items (4)	landscape (1)	line (21)	manner (2)
its (2)	lane (1)	lines (I)	manual (24)
113 (2)	language (16)	list (2)	manuals (8)
< J >	laps (1)	listen (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{manuals} & (3) \\ \mathbf{map} & (3) \end{array}$
JAH (1)	large (7)	listened (2)	mapping (1)
jail (2)	late (2)	LITIGATION (2)	maps (2)
January (1)	latest (1)	little (16)	mark (1)
jaywalker (2)	launch (1)	lived (1)	massive (1)
jeopardy (1)	launcher (1)	lives (3)	master (2)
job (14)	LAW (130)	local (1)	matched (1)
JOSEPH (1)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	locate (3)	materials (1)
judging (1)	laws (3)	located (2)	math (2)
judgment (2)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	locations (1)	Matt (33)
JUH (1)	lead (5)	locked (1)	matter (10)
jump (2)	lead-in (1)	log (I)	MATTHEW (1)
jump (2) jumping (1)	leads (4)	long (15)	McGuire (1)
juncture (1)	learn (5)	longer (1)	mean (21)
jury (2)	learned (4)	long-time (1)	meaning (5)
justify (1)	learner (1)	long-winded (2)	means (16)
justify (1)	learners (1)	look (39)	meant (2)
< K >	learning (3)	looked (6)	measurements (1)
K9 (7)	leave (14)	looking (30)	measures (3)
$\mathbf{K9s}$ (1)	leaving (1)	looks (1)	measuring (1)
keep (19)	leeway (3)	loops (1)	medical (38)
keeping (2)	left (4)	lose (1)	medically (1)
kept (5)	legal (15)	loss (2)	medical's (1)
Kevlar (1)	legislation (2)	lot (19)	medicine (1)
key (6)	legislators (1)	loud (1)	medics (1)
kids (1)	legislature (3)	love (2)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
kill (14)	lengthy (1)	low (1)	meeting (1)
***** (11)		1011 (1)	meeting (1)

member (10)
members (26)
memories (1)
memory (4)
mental (34)
mental-health (1)
mental-illness (1)
mentally (2)
mention (10)
mentioned (16)
mere (1)
met (5)
meth (1)
methamphetamine
(15)
$\mathbf{method} (5)$
methods (8)
mgross@porterscott.co
m (1)
middle (7)
MILLION (5)
mind (27)
mindset (1)
* *
mine (1)
minimize (1)
minimum (2)
minute (1)
minutes (11)
mirror (1)
misdemeanor (9)
misdemeanors (3)
missed (1)
misstates (2)
mistake (3)
mitigate (3)
mobile (1)
Model (2)
money (1)
months (3)
mood (1)
MORAWCZNSKI (2)
M-O-R-A-W-C-Z-N-S-
K-I (1)
morning (4)
motions (1)
mounted (3)
mouthful (1)
move (31)
moved (6)

movement (10)
movements (1)
moves (3)
moving (21)
MULLINS (11)
multiple-part (1)
multi-tier (1)
muscle (1)
muscic (1)
< N >
nail (1)
name (4)
named (3)
names (1)
narcotic (2)
narcotics (19)
narrow (3) NATALIE (2)
NATALIE (2)
nation (1)
nature (2)
navigate (1)
NE (1)
near (5)
nearby (1)
necessarily (4) necessary (8)
necessary (8)
neck (2)
Need (35)
needed (7)
needing (1)
needs (2)
negative (1)
negatively (2)
negligence (4)
negotiate (6)
negotiating (3)
negotiation (6)
negotiations (5)
negotiator (9)
negotiators (1)
neither (1)
nervous (2)
nervousness (1)
Nevada (3)
never (26)
new (7)
newer (1)
NH (1)
NICHOLAS (1)

night (1)
nine (2)
Ninth (2)
noise (2)
noncompliance (1)
noncompliant (1)
non-threatening (1)
norm (1)
normally (1) northbound (2) notations (2)
northbound (2)
notations (2)
noted (6)
notes (1)
Notice (1)
November (6)
number (16)
numbered (1)
numbers (1)
0
<0>
000 (4)
obey (2)
object (6)
Objection (58)
objections (2)
objective (9)
Objectivity (1)
obligation (2)
observation (6)
observations (9)
observe (2)
observed (7)
observes (1) obstacle (1)
obstacle (1)
obstacles (1)
obstruct (4)
obstructs (1)
obtain (2)
obtained (1)
obvious (2)
obviously (15)
occurred (11)
occurs (4)
offer (4)
offering (1)
offhand (2)
Office (5)
officer (147)
officer-involved (1)
` /

officers (109)
officer's (9)
OFFICES (1)
oftentimes (1)
` /
oh (12)
okay (25)
once (9)
one-on-one (2)
ones (2)
one's (1)
one-third (2)
one-week (1)
ongoing (1)
online (5)
oOo (2)
open (5)
opening (1)
operating (1)
OPERATOR (4)
opine (4)
opined (1)
opinion (42)
opinions (12)
opinions (13)
opportunity (6)
opposed (1)
opposite (4)
optic (21)
optical (1)
optics (1)
options (3)
orbits (3)
order (27)
ordered (1)
orders (7)
ordinance (1)
Oregon (5)
organization (1)
organizations (2)
original (3)
originally (1)
originally (1) outcome (5)
outer (1)
outline (2)
outranked (1)
outside (1)
overall (1)
overcame (1)
overdose (1)
overdosed (1)

overhead (1) overreacting (2) overreaction (1)
overreacting (2) overreaction (1)
overreaction (1)
OVERSAW (/)
oversaw (2) overstated (1)
overwatch (1)
owner (3)
Owner (3)
< P >
P.O (1)
PA (6)
Page (31)
pages (2)
pain (1)
paper (2)
papers (3)
paragraph (7)
paramount (1)
paranoia (2)
park (2)
part (19)
participate (1)
participated (1)
participating (1)
particular (18)
particularly (9)
parties (2)
partner (3)
partnership (1)
parts (1)
party (1)
$\mathbf{pass} (3)$
pass/fail (2)
passed (4)
passes (7)
passive (2)
passive (2) pat (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1) PATRICK (7)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1) PATRICK (7) patrol (7)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1) PATRICK (7) patrol (7) patty (1)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1) PATRICK (7) patrol (7) patty (1) pause (2)
passive (2) pat (1) patches (1) pat-down (6) path (1) pathology (1) pathway (3) patient (1) PATRICK (7) patrol (7) patty (1)

pdwyer@pdwyerlaw.c
om (1)
peace (3)
peacefully (2)
peer (1)
peer-reviewed (4)
Penal (3)
penalty (1)
Penn (1)
people (70)
pepper (1)
perceived (7)
percent (24)
percentage (4)
perception (1)
Perfect (2)
performance (1)
period (3)
periods (3)
perjury (1)
permissive (1)
permitted (1)
person (60)
personable (1)
personal (12)
personally (2)
personnel (13)
persons (2)
person's (6)
perspective (3)
persuade (3)
persuaded (2)
persuasion (3)
PG&E (1)
phase (1)
phases (1)
phone (16)
phones (4)
photograph (1)
photographs (5)
photos (1)
phrase (8)
physical (10)
physically (9)
pick (4)
picture (7)
pictures (3)
piece (2)
pieces (1)

possibility (7)
possible (7)
possibly (15)
POST (13)
potential (10)
potentially (5)
power (6)
PR (1)
practical (1)
practically (1)
practice (9)
practices (11)
preached (1)
precinct (1)
preclude (5)
preclusion (1)
prefer (3)
preferable (1)
premises (1)
preparation (2)
prepare (4)
prepared (7)
prerogative (2)
presence (7)
present (12)
presentations (1)
presented (5)
presenting (2)
pressure (1)
pretty (7)
prevent (6)
prevents (1)
previous (1)
previously (6)
price (2)
primarily (1)
primary (2)
principles (1)
print (2)
prior (12)
priority (2)
private (2)
probable (17)
probably (26)
problem (5)
problematic (3)
procedural (1)
procedurar (1)
procedure (1)

proceeding (1)	put (33)	reasonably-trained	reinforce (1)
proceedings (1)	put (33) puts (2)	(1)	relapsed (3)
_	1 = ' ' '	\ '	related (3)
process (2)	putting (1)	reasoned (1)	` '
produced (2)	405	reasons (1)	relating (1)
product (1)	<q></q>	rebut (1)	relationship (1)
professional (3)	qualified (4)	Rebuttal (4)	relay (2)
professionals (1)	question (136)	recall (27)	relayed (3)
prognosis (1)	questioning (3)	recalling (1)	relaying (1)
program (4)	questions (16)	receive (2)	release (3)
progress (1)	question's (1)	received (8)	relevance (1)
prominently (1)	quick (2)	receiving (1)	relevant (2)
promoted (2)	quicker (1)	Recess (5)	relied (2)
prone (1)	quickly (1)	recognition (1)	relies (1)
proof (3)	quite (9)	recognize (18)	rely (9)
proper (4)	quote (1)	recognized (3)	relying (1)
properly (3)		recognizes (1)	remarks (1)
property (3)	< R >	recommend (3)	remember (42)
proportion (2)	radio (1)	recommendation (3)	$ \mathbf{REMEMBERED} (1)$
protect (13)	raise (2)	recommendations (2)	remind (1)
protected (1)	raised (3)	recommended (4)	REMOTE (2)
protecting (1)	raising (2)	record (24)	remotely (5)
protection (1)	ramming (1)	recording (1)	removed (1)
protocol (1)	ran (2)	records (4)	render (1)
prove (4)	range (2)	red (41)	rendered (1)
provide (13)	rank (1)	reduced (2)	renders (1)
provided (11)	ranks (1)	reducing (1)	repeat (5)
provides (3)	\mathbf{RAP} (4)	refer (4)	repeated (3)
providing (1)	$\mathbf{R-A-P}(1)$	reference (6)	repeatedly (1)
provocative (1)	rational (2)	referenced (3)	rephrase (4)
provoke (7)	RAYMON (1)	references (3)	Report (92)
provokes (1)	reach (2)	referencing (3)	REPORTED (9)
provoking (1)	reached (1)	referred (2)	Reporter (12)
psychiatric (1)	reaching (8)	referring (3)	reporting (5)
psychiatrist (1)	react (1)	refers (5)	reports (8)
psychologist (1)	reaction (2)	reflect (1)	represent (1)
psychology (2)	read (27)	reflected (2)	representing (1)
public (12)	reading (13)	refrain (2)	represents (1)
publications (1)	ready (2)	reframe (2)	requested (6)
publish (1)	real (7)	refused (3)	requesting (2)
published (4)	realistic (1)	refuses (1)	requests (1)
pull (8)	reality-based (1)	refusing (7)	require (5)
pulled (7)	realize (4)	regard (3)	required (4)
pulling (8)	really (55)	regarding (8)	requirement (1)
			1 -
purchasing (1)	realm (1)	regardless (1)	requirements (1)
purpose (15)	real-world (2)	regards (7)	requires (1)
pursuant (2)	rear (1)	registered (1)	requiring (1)
pursuits (1)	reason (7)	regular (2)	research (2)
purview (1)	reasonable (70)	rehashing (1)	resistance (2)
pushing (1)	reasonableness (1)	Reiber (1)	resistant (11)
	reasonably (3)		

	l •• (2)		
resisting (3)	rulings (2)	seen (11)	shotgun (2)
resolution (1)	run (5)	seizure (3)	shotguns (2)
resolve (2)	running (2)	seizures (1)	shots (1)
resolved (1)	rural (5)	self-defense (1)	shoulder (1)
resources (4)		selling (1)	shoulders (1)
respond (4)	< S >	send (4)	shoulds (1)
responded (6)	Sacramento (3)	sending (1)	shout (1)
responders (4)	SAECHAO (29)	seniority (1)	shouting (5)
responding (5)	Saechao's (2)	sense (4)	show (8)
responds (1)	S-A-E-C-H-E-O (1)	sent (4)	showed (9)
response (22)	safe (14)	sentence (8)	shows (4)
responsibilities (4)	safely (7)	sentences (1)	sic (3)
responsibility (2)	safer (1)	sentiments (1)	side (5)
responsible (1)	safety (38)	separate (2)	sight (12)
responsive (1)	sake (1)	separated (2)	sighting (1)
rest (2)	save (1)	separating (I)	sights (3)
restate (2)	saving (1)	sequence (1)	sign (3)
restrictions (1)	saw (19)	sergeant (3)	signal (1)
restrictive (1)	saying (16)	sergeants (1)	significant (2)
result (3)	says (11)	series (1)	significantly (1)
resulting (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{SBC} & (7) \\ \mathbf{SBC} & (7) \end{array}$	serious (4)	signs (2)
retained (11)	SBC-intent (3)	serve (2)	silhouetted (1)
retention (1)	SBC-ment (3) SBC-related (1)	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	similar (12)
retired (1)	scenario (15)	service (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{simnar} & (12) \\ \mathbf{simple} & (5) \end{array}$
` '	` '	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	
return (1)	scenarios (10)	` '	simply (2)
reverse (2)	scene (64)	set (2)	Sincerely (1)
review (13)	scenes (1)	sets (2)	single (4)
reviewed (8)	schedule (1)	setting (6)	sister (4)
reviewing (5)	schizophrenia (3)	seven (1)	sit (1)
reviews (1)	school (1)	severe (1)	sitting (3)
rice (6)	SCOTT (1)	share (1)	situation (50)
rifles (2)	scratch (1)	sheepdog (1)	situations (14)
right (62)	scream (1)	sheet (6)	situation's (1)
right-hand (1)	screaming (1)	SHERIFF (3)	six (7)
Risk (3)	screenshare (1)	sheriffs (1)	skill (5)
River (2)	se (1)	SHERIFF'S (52)	Skills (7)
road (23)	sealed (1)	shield (4)	\mathbf{skip} (1)
roadway (6)	search (14)	shift (4)	sleeping (2)
\mathbf{ROGER} (1)	searching (3)	shoot (21)	slow (2)
role (5)	seat (5)	shooting (6)	slowly (6)
roll (2)	seats (1)	shootings (I)	small (3)
rookie (1)	Seattle (23)	shootout (1)	smaller (1)
room (7)	sec (2)	shop (1)	smart (2)
roommate (1)	second (9)	shoplift (1)	sniper (5)
round (1)	secondary (1)	short (7)	sober (1)
rounds (1)	section (11)	Shorthand (3)	Society (1)
route (2)	sections (3)	shortly (1)	solely (1)
rule (1)	see (72)	short-sided (2)	solution (1)
rules (1)	seeing (7)	shot (7)	SOLUTIONS (2)
` '	6 V /		(1)

someone's (7)	standpoint (1)	subscribe (3)	
something's (1)	stands (1)	subsection (1)	< T >
somewhat (10)	star (1)	substance (5)	table (1)
son (1)	start (13)	substitute (1)	table's (1)
sooner (4)	started (12)	success (1)	tactic (3)
sorry (11)	Starting (2)	successful (16)	tactical (11)
	startle (1)	successful (10) successfully (5)	tacticals (1)
sort (7)	` ′		` ′
sounds (8)	starts (2)	suffering (8)	tactics (6)
sources (3)	State (61)	suggest (1)	tag (1)
south (1)	stated (9)	suggesting (2)	take (33)
SPD (2)	statement (39)	suggestion (1)	takeaway (1)
speak (5)	statements (29)	suggestions (2)	taken (16)
speaking (2)	STATES (8)	suicidal (22)	takes (2)
$\mathbf{SPEAR} (1)$	stating (10)	suicidality (3)	talk (17)
specialized (1)	station (1)	suicide (31)	talked (28)
specialties (1)	statute (1)	Suite (4)	talking (24)
specific (22)	statutes (3)	summarize (1)	talks (5)
specifically (7)	stay (3)	summation (1)	Tara (5)
specifies (1)	stayed (2)	summon (1)	targets (1)
specify (1)	staying (1)	Sunday (2)	TARWATER (1)
speculate (4)	steering (1)	super (2)	Taser (1)
speculated (3)	STENOGRAPHICAL	superior (1)	tasked (1)
speculating (1)	LY (1)	superiors (2)	taught (8)
speculation (3)	step (7)	supervised (2)	teach (2)
speculations (1)	Stepping (1)	supervising (3)	teaching (2)
speculative (1)	steps (8)	supervisor (12)	team (13)
speed (3)	stick (2)	supervisory (1)	teams (1)
speeding (1)	sticking (1)	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{support} & (3) \\ \mathbf{support} & (3) \end{array}$	technical (1)
spelled (1)	stir (1)	supposed (1)	technically (1)
spend (5)	stood (1)	Supreme (1)	technique (6)
spent (2)	Stop (27)	sure (47)	technique/tactic (2)
•		$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	_ ` ` ′
spinning (1)	stopped (1)	-	techniques (15)
spoke (5)	stopping (1)	surgery (2)	tell (35)
spotter (1)	stops (3)	surrender (1)	telling (6)
$\operatorname{spray} (1)$	Street (15)	surrounding (5)	tells (2)
spurred (1)	strictly (2)	surroundings (1)	TENG (1)
$\mathbf{SRA} (3)$	strike (1)	suspect (29)	term (13)
stabilize (1)	stuck (17)	suspected (2)	terms (1)
staff (6)	student (1)	suspecting (1)	Terry (8)
staffing (1)	students (1)	suspects (8)	test (3)
stage (2)	studied (1)	suspicion (17)	testified (7)
stamp (2)	studies (1)	suspicious (2)	testify (1)
stance (1)	\mathbf{sub} (1)	SWAT (7)	testimony (22)
stances (1)	subject (26)	SWEENEY (45)	Thank (16)
Stand (4)	subjective (8)	Sweeney's (1)	thankfully (1)
stand-alone (1)	subjectivity (3)	swings (1)	theoretically (1)
standard (13)	subject's (1)	sworn (3)	theories (1)
standards (5)	submit (1)	symptoms (4)	theory (3)
standing (4)	submitted (2)	system (9)	thereof (2)
-			

thin (1)	train (11)	uniform (3)	viewing (3)
thing (18)	trained (29)	unit (6)	violate (3)
Things (73)	trainer (1)	UNITED (2)	violated (3)
think (167)	training (126)	units (3)	violates (1)
thinking (5)	trainings (2)	University (4)	violating (1)
thinks (1)	transcribed (1)	unnecessarily (3)	violating (7)
* *	` ´	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` ′
third (5)	transcript (6)	unnecessary (2)	violations (2)
this	transcripts (1)	unpaved (1)	violence (2)
$\mathbf{day} (1)$	transferred (1)	unpredictable (3)	violent (5)
thorough (2)	transport (1)	unreasonable (16)	violently (1)
Thorp (1)	treat (2)	unreasonably (1)	virtual (1)
THORPE (4)	tree (16)	unsafe (2)	vis-a-vis (1)
$\mathbf{T}\text{-}\mathbf{H}\text{-}\mathbf{O}\text{-}\mathbf{R}\text{-}\mathbf{P}\text{-}\mathbf{E} (1)$	trees (13)	unsuccessful (1)	visible (2)
thought (20)	trespassing (4)	untrained (1)	visual (6)
thoughts (1)	trial (1)	unwilling (I)	visually (3)
threat (13)	tried (17)	upper (1)	visuals (1)
threaten (2)	trim (1)	urgency (3)	voice (6)
threatened (3)	trimming (6)	use (70)	voices (1)
threatening (5)	truck (57)	useful (1)	voluntarily (3)
threats (5)	true (6)	user (1)	vs (2)
three (10)	truth (3)	uses (4)	, ,
threw (3)	try (25)	usually (3)	< W >
throw (1)	trying (41)	UTL (1)	WA98105 (1)
thrown (5)	Turn (\hat{I})	uttered (1)	wager (1)
throws (1)	turned (1)	,	wait (15)
tie (1)	twice (1)	< V >	waited (6)
time (96)	Twisting (1)	VALENTINO (1)	waiting (7)
timeline (1)	two (38)	Valley (1)	wake (2)
timely (1)	two (30) two-part (3)	vantage (1)	walk (2)
times (33)	two-thirds (2)	variety (12)	walk (2) walked (2)
times (33) timestamp (1)	TYLER (1)	various (3)	want (75)
tires (1)	type (9)	various (3) veered (1)	wanted (17)
titled (1)	types (4)	vecicu (1) vehicle (77)	wanted (17) wanting (4)
today (11)	types (4) typewriting (1)	vehicle's (1)	wanting (4) wants (4)
today's (2)	typical (1)	veine (1)	warning (3)
told (14)	typical (1)	ventured (1)	warrant (2)
tone (1)	<u></u>	ventured (1) verbal (14)	Washington (4)
* /		` ′	
tool (5)	ultimately (1)	verbally (2)	watch (1)
tools (12)	unable (5)	verify (1)	watched (3)
top (7)	unclear (2)	versus (3)	water (1)
topic (5)	uncommon (1)	vet (2)	wave (1)
topping (1)	uncover (1)	veteran (1)	way (38)
totally (1)	underlying (2)	vicinity (1)	ways (7)
touch (2)	underneath (4)	victim (1)	weapon (37)
touched (1)	UNDERSHERIFF (3)	video (3)	weapons (2)
toxicology (1)	undersigned (1)	videoconference (1)	webinar (2)
track (1)	understand (31)	videos (3)	webinars (1)
traffic (5)	understanding (17)	view (2)	websites (1)
trail (1)	understood (2)	viewed (2)	Wednesday (2)

		<u> </u>
weeks (1)	wrote (21)	
• *	wrote (21)	
weigh (1)		
Well (39)	< Y >	
well-trained (6)	yards (11)	
well-written (1)	$\mathbf{YCSD} (4)$	
WENDEL (1)	Yeah (33)	
went (13)	year (5)	
we're (42)	yearly (1)	
we've (15)	years (14)	
\mathbf{WH} (1)	yell (2)	
what-if's (1)	yelled (1)	
wheel (2)	yelling (16)	
Whichever (1)	younger (1)	
wide (4)	YUBA (24)	
wide-ranging (2)	Yup (1)	
wife (6)		
WILLIAM (4)	< Z >	
willing (1)	Zepeda (1)	
willingness (1)	Zepeda's (1)	
win (1)	Zero (2)	
window (6)	\mathbf{Zoom} (1)	
windows (5)		
wipers (1)		
wiper's (1)		
wish (9)		
withdraw (2)		
within-entitled (1)		
WITNESS (73)		
witness(if (1)		
wolf (1)		
wooden (1)		
word (9)		
wording (2)		
words (28)		
work (22)		
worked (11)		
* *		
working (9)		
world (1)		
worried (2)		
worse (5)		
worst (2)		
worthy (1)		
Wow (1)		
wrap (1)		
wrist (1)		
wrists (1)		
write (14)		
written (11)		
wrong (7)		