# **Deposition of David T. Sweeney**

# Richmond v. Spokane County, Washington

February 15, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



### David T. Sweeney

Page 1	Page 3
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1 VIDEOTAPED VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	2 DAVID T. SWEENEY
AT SPOKANE	3 EXAMINATION INDEX
ANDREW M. RICHMOND, a )	4 February 15, 2022 5 EXAMINATION BY PAGE
Washington Resident, )	6 Mr. Kitson
) Plaintiff, )	7 Ms. Barden 107
	8 Mr. Kitson 114
v. ) No. 2:21-cv-00129-SMJ	9 10 EXHIBIT INDEX
SPOKANE COUNTY.	11 EXHIBITS FOR IDENTIFICATION PAGE
WASHINGTON, a Washington )	12 1 DT Sweeney Report 14
State County, )	13 2 Collection of documents collected by 42
Defendant. )	Sergeant Hines in investigating Andrew 14 Richmond's claims of the ASU
	15 3 Recorded Interview of Deputy Dan Knight 51
VIDEOTAPED VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF	16 4 Washington Local Government Common 60
DAVID T. SWEENEY	Records Retention Schedule
	17 5 Memorandum (Confidential) 94
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON	18
9:29 A.M.	6 Spokane County Sheriff's Office, Spokane 95
9.29 A.WI.	19County SO Policy Manual207Recorded Interview of Deputy Louis115
(All participants appearing via videoconference.)	Acosta
	21
	22 23
DATE TAKEN: FEBRUARY 15, 2022	23 24
REPORTED BY: CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, RPR, CCR 2121	25
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES	1 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; FEBRUARY 15, 2022
<ul> <li>2 (All participants appearing via videoconference.)</li> <li>3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF:</li> </ul>	2 9:29 a.m.
4 HEATHER C. BARDEN	3 -000-
BARDEN & BARDEN	4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are on the record.
5 PO Box 8663 Spokane, Washington 99203	5 This is the deposition of David T. Sweeney
6 509.315.8089	6 in the matter of Andrew M. Richmond versus Spokane
heather@bardenandbarden.net	7 County Washington, Cause No. 2:21-CV-00129-SMJ, in the
8	8 United States District Court Eastern District of
FOR THE DEFENDANT: 9	9 Washington at Spokane and was noticed by Michael T.
9 MICHAEL T. KITSON	10 Kitson.
10 LANE POWELL PC	11 The time is now approximately 9:29 a.m. on 12 this 15th day of February, 2022, and we are convening
1420 Fifth Avenue 11 Suite 4200	<ul> <li>this 15th day of February, 2022, and we are convening</li> <li>via Zoom.</li> </ul>
Seattle, Washington 98111	14 My name is Jason Neuerberg from Buell
12 206.223.7000 Kitsonm@lanepowell.com	15 Realtime Reporting, LLC, located at 1325 Fourth Avenue,
13	16 Suite 1840 in Seattle, Washington 98101.
14 The videographer: Jason Neuerburg	17 Will counsel please identify themselves for
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg	17Will counsel please identify themselves for18the record.
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16	
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg	18 the record.
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16 17 18 19	18the record.19MS. BARDEN: I'm Heather Barden. I'm the
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16 17 18	18the record.19MS. BARDEN: I'm Heather Barden. I'm the20attorney that represents the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond.
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the record.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm Heather Barden. I'm the</li> <li>attorney that represents the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: Mike Kitson, representing the</li> <li>defendant, Spokane County.</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter may</li> </ul>
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	18the record.19MS. BARDEN: I'm Heather Barden. I'm the20attorney that represents the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond.21MR. KITSON: Mike Kitson, representing the22defendant, Spokane County.23THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter may24now swear in the witness.
The videographer: Jason Neuerburg 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	18the record.19MS. BARDEN: I'm Heather Barden. I'm the20attorney that represents the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond.21MR. KITSON: Mike Kitson, representing the22defendant, Spokane County.23THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter may

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5		Page 7
1	DAVID T. SWEENEY, witness herein, having been first	1	download.
2	duly sworn on oath, was examined	2	Do you have access to that here on your computer
3	and testified as follows:	3	today?
4	DIRECTEXAMINATION	4	A. Yes. Ms. Barden sent that to me. And I have
5	BY MR. KITSON:	5	not accessed those files, but I see a link here.
6	Q. Good morning, sir.	6	Q. Why don't you go ahead and access the link.
7	Could you please state and spell your full name	7	I'll direct you once you are there which documents to
8	for the record?	8	open and when to open them. But let's make sure you're
9	A. Sure. It's David T. Sweeney. D-a-v-i-d. T.	9	able to access the link.
10	And Sweeney is S-w-e-e-n-e-y.	10	A. Looks good. I see Sweeney deposition exhibits.
11	Q. Thank you.	11	Q. Okay. I believe it is labeled Documents A
12	Do you want me to refer to you as Lieutenant	12	through, I believe, F.
13	Sweeney? as Mr. Sweeney? David?	13	Do you see those in there?
14	How do you want me to refer to you today?	14	A. Yes, I do.
15	A. As far as I'm concerned, David and Mike are	15	Q. Okay. Today, I'm going to show you some of
16	fine, if you're good with that.	16	those exhibits and refer to them throughout the day.
17	Q. That works for me.	17	If at any point in time you want to pursue those
18	A. All right. Me too.	18	on your own on your computer, please feel free. I'm
19	Q. All right. David, a couple of just housekeeping	19	also happy to share them with you.
20	issues and ground rules today.	20	That being said, sometimes, you know, sharing on
21	First off, as I'm sure you're aware, having	21	the screen and me scrolling makes it hard for you to
22	testified before in other depositions, we need to make	22	to view everything that you might feel you need to
23	sure that any answer you provide today is audible. The	23	review.
24	court reporter can't pick up nods of the head or	24	So if at any point in time you feel a need to
25	nonverbal gestures. So please make sure to verbalize	25	pursue yourself, feel free.
1	Page 6	1	Page 8
1 2	all of your answers for me today. A. I will.	1 2	A. I assume I have not opened them yet, but I
3	THE WITNESS: And are you hearing me fine?	3	assume they have page numbers and paragraph numbers or line numbers we can refer to.
4	MR. KITSON: I do hear you fine.	4	Q. Well, they are all I mean, for example,
5	And, Jason, let us know if you have any	5	Document A, which we'll open in a second, is your
6	problems hearing us, and also, Crystal, as well.	6	report.
7	BY MR. KITSON:	7	I mean, they are various documents that you have
8	Q. I don't expect that we're going to be here for a	8	referred to or are relevant to the case.
9	real long time today, but if you do need a break at all	9	They should all be numbered in some way or
10	throughout today's deposition, feel free. Please let me	10	another. So I I'll help us stay on track with page
11	know as long as there is no question pending, we can	11	numbering as we go forward.
12	make that happen. I will likely need one before we're	12	A. Great. So just clarifying, are you going to be
13	done today myself.	13	sharing your screen or am I going to be opening these
14	A. Sounds fine.	14	documents individually. And then we'll we'll locate
15	Q. If you don't understand a question of mine for	15	together the passage that we want to talk about.
16	any reason, please let me know. I mean, you're the	16	Q. Sure. I will be sharing my screen with you when
17	expert in this field. I might bungle terms or, you	17	I want you to look at an exhibit.
18	know, ask you questions that are totally phrased	18	A. Okay.
19	confusing to you. Feel free to ask me to clarify. If	19	Q. That being said, if at any point in time you
20	not, I'll assume you understood the question.	20	say, look, I want to look at this exhibit on my own,
21	Does that work for you?	21	feel free to look at it open it up and look at it on
22	A. Sure.	22	your computer as well.
23	Q. Now, I sent Ms. Barden and her office a link	23	A. That makes sense.
24	last night to a location where there's some documents	24	Q. And, in particular, your report, if you need to
25	downloaded or documents that are available for you to	25	reference your report I won't be looking at your

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 11
1	report the whole day, but if you need to reference your	1	Q. And is that employee that was – was identified
2	report to refresh your recollection, feel free.	2	Sergeant Thurman?
3	A. Thank you.	3	A. Yes, it is.
4	Q. Yep.	4	Q. Okay. Did did that review of any of the
5	David, what is your current work address? Is	5	additional documents of the depositions and then the
6	that the address that is and when I say work address,	6	newspaper article in any way change or impact the
7	I mean for purposes of your consulting work and your	7	opinions as they are stated in your December 16th, 2021,
8	testimony here in this case for DT Sweeney Consulting,	8	report?
9	is the current address 4616 25th Avenue Northeast,	9	A. No.
10	No. 156?	10	Q. In preparation for your deposition today, did
11	A. Yes, it is.	11	you speak with anyone?
12	Q. What did you do to prepare for your deposition	12	A. I talked to Ms. Barden.
13	today?	13	Q. Okay. When did you and Ms. Barden speak?
14	A. Originally, Ms. Barden sent me a variety of	14	A. We spoke yesterday on the phone and quickly this
15	documents last year for me to review for the case. The	15	morning.
16	documents that I reviewed I listed at the top of my	16	Q. Okay. How long did you speak yesterday?
17	report, and then my opinions followed after that.	17	A. Probably around a half an hour, 45 minutes.
18	In preparation for today's deposition, I looked	18	Q. Okay. Other than speaking with Ms. Barden, did
19	over the more key documents, specifically ones I thought	19	you have any other conversations in preparation for
20	you might ask about or that I made opinions based on	20	today's deposition?
21	those documents.	21	A. No.
22	So I have not done as thorough of a job as I did	22	Q. You said you also spoke this morning.
23	last year in reviewing everything, because hopefully	23	How long did you speak this morning?
24	I've identified what I thought was most relevant for me	24	A. Five to ten minutes.
25	and my testimony and what the attorneys might ask about.	25	Q. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and ask you some
	Page 10		Page 12
1	So in preparation for today's deposition, I	1	questions about your CV.
2	looked over the original complaint; I looked over my	2	So if you'd like, you can go ahead and pull up
3	report. I skimmed over depositions from Mr. Richmond	3	Document A, which is your report, and it includes your
4	and the Sheriff, as well as an HR specialist. But I	4	CV.
5	didn't read them in great in a complete, thorough	5	A. All right.
6	manner, if that makes sense.	6	Q. And I'll go ahead and share my screen so that
7	Q. Okay. So if I'm hearing you correctly, since	7	you can follow along there.
8	authoring your report back in December, which is dated	8	Can you see my screen okay?
9	December 16th, 2021, there is some additional documents	9	A. Yeah, that looks fine.
10	that you were provided by Ms. Barden, including Andrew	10	Q. All right. So I'm going to start out by asking
11	Richmond's deposition and what was a 30(b)(6) deposition	11	you some about your educational background.
12	of the Sheriff and then the County's HR Director.	12	It looks like let me first ask you about your
13	Is that a fair summation of additional documents	13	undergraduate education. It looks like you went back to
14	you've reviewed?	14	school at some point and received your B.A. in Law
15	A. Yes, it is.	15	Societies and Justice from the University of Washington;
16	Q. Other than those deposition transcripts, are	16	is that accurate?
17	there any additional documents that you've reviewed that	17	A. I was. I was at Shoreline Community College
18	are not identified in your report?	18	when the Seattle Police Department hired me. And I
19	A. I reviewed a newspaper article. But I think	19	always told myself I would go back. So I finished my
20	I've also looked at that last year. So there was	20	A.A. at Shoreline. And at that time there was an
21	nothing new from the newspaper article.	21	automatic entry into the University of Washington. So I
22	Q. What was the what was the newspaper article	22	thought, I might as well continue on and finish the B.A.
23	about?	23	so, yeah, I was a late-in-life I was usually the
24	A. It was an interview with the Sheriff describing	24	oldest in my class, let's say.
25	the circumstances that led to him firing an employee.	25	Q. We I think we when I was in college, we
		1	

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13		Page 15
1	called them adult learners or ALs?	1	Q. You said you graduated number one in your class.
2	A. Right.	2	How many were there in your class?
3	Q. Right. So you graduated in '04.	3	A. I believe there was around 30. I had, I
4	Did did obtaining your degree at all change	4	believe, a 99 percent after the six months.
5	your your career trajectory?	5	Q. You say you aspire to leadership or to, I guess,
6	A. No. It wasn't required in the Seattle Police	6	higher positions.
7	Department that you have a degree for any position.	7	What are your aspirations in that way?
8	However, I think getting my degree in 2004	8	A. When I left the Seattle Police Department, I
9	certainly meant more to me than if I had done it in the	9	retired in March of 2021 and I'm currently the number
10	'80's after I finished high school. I think things	10	two in charge at a brand-new police department at Oregon
11	meant more to me as an adult. I think I had some	11	State University. They had never had a police
12	real-world experience. I had 16 or 17 years on the job	12	department before. They had a contract with the Oregon
13	at that point.	13	State Police.
14	So you combine that with as we talked about,	14	So I have signed on there and have been
15	adult education, and I think it gave me somewhat of a	15	instrumental in getting that police department up and
16	different outlook on life than if I were 20 or 21 years	16	running, training people, hiring, putting together,
17	old and still in school. I think it makes a difference	17	pretty much, a whole package to make sure that the
18	in how you look at things, maybe a more mature view.	18	employees and it's it's interesting because
19	Certainly, my eyes were different than than they	19	there's both police officers there and sergeants that I
20	would have been in the '80s as a young man. I	20	supervise, as well as security personnel.
21	definitely believe that.	21	So you have a wide variety of people at
22	Q. Thank you. And sorry. Just for the record,	22	different points in their life and different points in
23	we	23	their careers coming together to work at Oregon State
24	MR. KITSON: Crystal, we'll go ahead and	24	University and help get that police department started.
25	mark Document A as Exhibit 1 to the deposition.	25	I don't know if that will be my final outcome.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Page 14		Page 16
1	Page 14 (Exhibit 1 was marked.)	1	Page 16 As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to
1 2		1 2	5
	(Exhibit 1 was marked.)		As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to
2	(Exhibit 1 was marked.) BY MR. KITSON:	2	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU,
2 3	(Exhibit 1 was marked.) BY MR. KITSON: Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.	2 3	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that.
2 3 4	(Exhibit 1 was marked.) BY MR. KITSON: Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and	2 3 4	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined
2 3 4 5	(Exhibit 1 was marked.) BY MR. KITSON: Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year. A. Yes. Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police	2 3 4 5	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key
2 3 4 5 6	(Exhibit 1 was marked.) BY MR. KITSON: Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year. A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by</li> <li>Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that A. Our paths would not have crossed then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by</li> <li>Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that A. Our paths would not have crossed then. Q. No. But I'm glad to see that you were helping
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that A. Our paths would not have crossed then. Q. No. But I'm glad to see that you were helping keep the nice students at SPU safe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that A. Our paths would not have crossed then. Q. No. But I'm glad to see that you were helping keep the nice students at SPU safe. A. That's right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to hiring to discipline, investigations, traffic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that. And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time. Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that A. Our paths would not have crossed then. Q. No. But I'm glad to see that you were helping keep the nice students at SPU safe. A. That's right. Q. Yeah. The first experience that I wanted to ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>Mad so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to hiring to discipline, investigations, traffic management, political underpinnings of the job.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that.</li> <li>And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that</li> <li>A. Our paths would not have crossed then.</li> <li>Q. No. But I'm glad to see that you were helping keep the nice students at SPU safe.</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The first experience that I wanted to ask you specifically about is your mediation experience.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to hiring to discipline, investigations, traffic management, political underpinnings of the job.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that.</li> <li>And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that</li> <li>A. Our paths would not have crossed then.</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The first experience that I wanted to ask you specifically about is your mediation experience. Let me see here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by</li> <li>Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to hiring to discipline, investigations, traffic management, political underpinnings of the job.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Everything that makes a good police</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that.</li> <li>And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that</li> <li>A. Our paths would not have crossed then.</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The first experience that I wanted to ask you specifically about is your mediation experience.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>(Exhibit 1 was marked.)</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Your education section says you graduated number one at Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command last year.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is the Northwestern School of Police Staffing and Command?</li> <li>A. Did you say what is it?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. What is that?</li> <li>A. It's a six-month course developed by Northwestern University for police executives across the country. In my studies of successful police managers, I saw more and more of them that had that accreditation from Northwestern.</li> <li>And so I pursued it for myself and completed the six-month program in 2021, I believe in the spring. So it was quite extensive. And it really covers all aspects of upper police management from personnel to hiring to discipline, investigations, traffic management, political underpinnings of the job.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>As you can see in my CV there, I took the opportunity to enroll for my master's degree in public policy at OSU, and I'm currently about halfway through that.</li> <li>And upon completion of that, I have determined that that, again, having your master's is one of the key components of being a chief of police somewhere, and that might be my next career move. But I'm not committing at this time.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. Let's look at your come back to the case list. I'm going to go over your your employment experience, hopefully, fairly quickly here. Starting at your latter experience. At this point, you're a security officer at SPU. I attended SPU, but I graduated significantly later than when you were there, so that</li> <li>A. Our paths would not have crossed then.</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The first experience that I wanted to ask you specifically about is your mediation experience. Let me see here.</li> </ul>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

			-
	Page 17		Page 19
1	for whom.	1	agreements are much more longstanding.
2	Are these usually part of the civil legal	2	Q. Sure. And so that position was volunteer? You
3	process or some other type of process?	3	would volunteer your time?
4	A. Mostly, these are workplace conflicts issues	4	A. Yes.
5	between employees. And it might be co-workers or it	5	Q. Okay. How many mediations do you estimate that
6	might be a supervisor or an employee. Sometimes you can	6	you've done?
7	have different groups. I also have experience mediating	7	A. Twenty-five, possibly.
8	union issues as well as landlord-tenant.	8	Q. I want to ask you about your time as a detective
9	So most of my experience is with the King County	9	sergeant in the Spokane PD Human Resources Department.
10	ADR. And I kind of gave that up when I took the job in	10	A. Seattle PD?
11	Oregon.	11	Q. I'm sorry. I said Spokane. Seattle PD. Yes.
12	And so I transferred in fact, interviewed as	12	A. Right.
13	was I don't want to say hired. Let's say appointed	13	Q. So tell me about that role.
14	to the Oregon Federal Executive Board, which fulfills	14	What was your role as a Detective Sergeant
15	the same function, and I have not mediated for them yet.	15	within the Human Resources Department?
16	However, back to King County. When different	16	A. I was the primary, in fact, the only EEO
17	organizations around King County were in need of	17	investigator for the Seattle Police Department.
18	mediation expertise, they would contact the King County	18	So when we have a complaint of harassment,
19	ADR. And they had a panel of volunteers, of which I was	19	discrimination, sexual harassment, bias, unfair I
20	one, and you would volunteer your services to sit down	20	don't want to say unfair labor practice. I didn't
21	as a neutral to hear both parties and help them express	21	really get into labor issues. Anything related to EEO,
22	their viewpoints and hopefully help them negotiate some	22	Equal Employment Opportunity, I was the investigator for
23	type of settlement.	23	the department.
24	It could be something as simple as an argument.	24	So my I considered myself a fact-gatherer. I
25	It could be a sexual harassment case. It could be a	25	would go to people, obtain information whether it be
	Page 18		Page 20
1	bias case; an unfair firing. So there's any number of	1	in an interview or some actual physical evidence I
2	things.	2	would then prepare reports on the information that I
3	But most of them were employee-related and	3	gathered, and then forward those, usually, to the chief
4	usually would take four to eight hours a couple of	4	of police or an assistant chief of police who then were
5	them took two days. But that's my experience there.	5	in the function of a fact-finder to make a ruling
6	Just helping primarily government employees, I will say,	6	again, this wasn't court, but within the department
7	from you would not mediate in Seattle a Seattle	7	as to what they believe happened.
8	case, because I was with the Seattle Police Department.	8	In general, I would not offer an opinion in my
9	Even though I might not work with someone in	9	writings. I generally remained I would like to say
10	another agency within Seattle, I would only mediate for,	10	that I remained neutral; that I presented the facts to
11	let's say, King County or Bellevue or, you know, a	11	the decision-makers of what I uncovered, what I found
12	landlord-tenant thing in Seattle that obviously the	12	during my investigation and allow them to have, then,
13	Seattle Police had nothing to do with.	13	some decision-making process as to what happened then.
14	So you want to be able to remove yourself from	14	And at that point, sometimes the chief or the
15	the situation and in order to be neutral that you don't	15	assistant chief might ask my opinion about what happened
16	have any vested interest in the outcome and help those	16	and what might be a successful resolution to the
17	parties achieve a hopefully, a settlement.	17	problem.
18	The best settlements come from the parties, I	18	And I would often rely on the victim statements
19	found. Generally, I can sit down pretty fast and figure	19	and what they wanted to see happen and possibly offer
20	out what the problem is. But if the solution comes from	20	some solutions to the command staff in order to achieve
		21	a successful outcome for the case.
21	me, it won't last.		
22	So my best goal is to help the parties recognize	22	Q. So in - in this lawsuit, you're aware that the
22 23	So my best goal is to help the parties recognize for yourselves what the solution might be and then	22 23	Q. So in in this lawsuit, you're aware that the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond, made a complaint that he
22 23 24	So my best goal is to help the parties recognize for yourselves what the solution might be and then propose alternatives to help them arrive at that	22 23 24	Q. So in in this lawsuit, you're aware that the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond, made a complaint that he felt that he was discriminated against in his selection
22 23	So my best goal is to help the parties recognize for yourselves what the solution might be and then	22 23	Q. So in in this lawsuit, you're aware that the plaintiff, Andrew Richmond, made a complaint that he

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21	Page 23
1	investigated by the Spokane County Sheriff's Office	1 within the Department had due process rights either by
2	Internal Affairs Unit; is that is that knowledge	2 virtue of the policies themselves or through collective
3	familiar to you?	3 bargaining that you were responsible in some ways for
4	A. Yes, it is.	4 helping, I guess, observe and make sure were preserved
5	Q. And Sergeant Tim Hines, who was the only person	5 through your investigation process; is that accurate?
6	in the Office of Professional Standards for Spokane	6 A. Yes, that is accurate.
7	County at the time, was the assigned investigator.	7 Q. Okay. Would that include things like were
8	Does that is that also accurate to your	8 you responsible for providing member notifications to
9	recollection?	<ul> <li>9 somebody against whom a complaint was made?</li> </ul>
10	A. Yes, it is.	10 A. Yes. That was part of my duties there to
11	Q. So – just so I have a better idea of what you	11 provide those notifications.
12	do and what your role was at Seattle Police Department,	12 Q. Okay. And I'm assuming you are familiar with
13	would your role be similar to what Tim Hines' role was	13 the Loudermill process, for example?
14	in conducting an investigation related to Andrew	14 A. Yes, I am.
15	Richmond's claims for discrimination?	15 Q. And was part of your role to make sure that
16	A. I read	16 that the Loudermill process was observed within the
17	MS. BARDEN: I'm going to just a moment.	17 department with regards to when potential discipline was
18	Thank you.	18 taken against an employee?
19	I just want to state my objection to form.	19 A. That's correct. I was aware of those timelines
20	Go ahead.	and the timeline to notify an employee as well as the
21	THE WITNESS: I read his investigation last	21 timeline to finish an investigation. And then, of
22	year, and it seemed like our positions would be very	22 course, I have to leave time for command staff to review
23	similar to what I did earlier in my career.	23 my investigation in order to then make decisions in a
24	BY MR. KITSON:	24 timely manner.
25	Q. Okay. So when you were at SPD in this position	25 Q. Sure. Do you have any estimate or can you
	Page 22	Page 24
1	Page 22 for about five years, were your investigations conducted	Page 24 1 estimate for me during that five-year period how many
1 2	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of	
	for about five years, were your investigations conducted	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> </ol>
2	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> </ol>
2 3	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the	<ol> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well.	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense.	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees.	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints related to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints related to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even though those roles were mimicked and patterned after	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints related to</li> <li>perceived retaliation?</li> <li>A. I did have some retaliation complaints. The</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even though those roles were mimicked and patterned after roles established by the City of Seattle.	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints. The</li> <li>facts escape me at this point, but I remember talking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even though those roles were mimicked and patterned after roles established by the City of Seattle. Does that make sense?	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints. The</li> <li>facts escape me at this point, but I remember talking</li> <li>with employees and warning them and I would say, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even though those roles were mimicked and patterned after roles established by the City of Seattle. Does that make sense? <b>Q. Yeah, that does.</b>	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints. The</li> <li>facts escape me at this point, but I remember talking</li> <li>with employees and warning them and I would say, you</li> <li>know, sometimes bad stuff happens in the workplace. But</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for about five years, were your investigations conducted under Sheriff excuse me, SPD policies or City of Seattle policies or both? A. I would say both. Because we had our internal policies which were in our Seattle Police Manual. We also had some contract language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. And there was also the City of Seattle Human Resources, which I didn't interact with very much but, yet, there were rules in place for the City of Seattle that I had to follow as well. Now, the rules that I followed were primarily laid down by the Police Department. And those rules tried to mimic or follow everything that the City did in their role as an overall HR department, if that makes sense. Because we were so large, we probably had 1300 to 1400 sworn and maybe 5- or 600 civilian employees. Because we were so large, we kind of had our own Human Resources Department, our own EEO investigator, even though those roles were mimicked and patterned after roles established by the City of Seattle. Does that make sense?	<ul> <li>estimate for me during that five-year period how many</li> <li>EEO investigations you performed?</li> <li>A. I believe it's in my report. And I estimated</li> <li>that I did 40 EEO investigations.</li> <li>Q. What experience do you have during that period</li> <li>of time conducting investigations to allegations that</li> <li>you would say are similar to the allegations that</li> <li>Mr. Richmond has made in this case?</li> <li>A. The allegations made by Mr. Richmond were very</li> <li>familiar to me in the form that they were presented. It</li> <li>would be very common for me to sit down with an employee</li> <li>who felt that they had received unfair treatment based</li> <li>on a particular protected class. Sometimes it was based</li> <li>on their race. So that type of complaint was very</li> <li>familiar to me.</li> <li>Q. What about complaints of retaliation. You</li> <li>mentioned complaints related to race-based treatment.</li> <li>Did you investigate complaints. The</li> <li>facts escape me at this point, but I remember talking</li> <li>with employees and warning them and I would say, you</li> </ul>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<ul> <li>would come in conjunction, let's say a memo, HR memo I would read to them about retailation. Then I would kind of talk to them on theread to the whole thing.</li> <li>It would say I have seen cases where relatively minor misconduct could have been handled simply by the department. But an employee chose to retailate against someone that made a complaint and it made things far worse.</li> <li>It was kind of similar to my parents. When I did something wong when I was a youngsler. I got in more trouble for lying than I did for the original event. Usual kind of similar to my parents. When I did something wong when I was a youngsler. I got in more trouble for lying than I did for the original event. I would kind a far the advice with people that retailation can really cause what could be a simple is use to become much more serious for them in their career.</li> <li>There were some retailation points that I handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave that piece of advice. I think most of them happened outside my purview. but then they ended up being something that I investigated in conjunction with another investigation with related charges, if that makes sense.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Stroll up on your CV here. Your CV Indicates that since 2017 you've had</li> <li>A rest, this.</li> <li>A. Yes, this.</li> <li>A. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you these member of that LC?</li> <li>A. In the sole mamber.</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>Page 26</li> <li>Your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting?</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>A. No, I do no</li></ul>		Page 25		Page 27
2         would read to them about retailation. Then I would kind thing.         1         Is that the only publication still that you have -that's tarihoutd to you?           3         I would say I have seen cases where relatively minor misconduct could have been handled simply by the department. But an employee chose to retailate against someone that made a complaint and it made things far worse.         0         A. The put out by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers           4         This's correct.         0         0. And the Defense News, is that - that's a cirrihual defense bar publication, is that if this' general.           5         It was kind of similar to my parents. When I did something wrong when I was a youngster, I got in more trouble for lying cases what ould be a simple issue to become much more serious for them in their career.         0         0. Do you know WDTL?           1         0         0. do (not with member and them hate flave career.         0. Do you know WDTL?           1         1         1         0. Do you know WDTL?           2         0. Okay. Seroll up on your CV here.         0         0. Joh great to become that piece of advice. I think most of them hapenged outside my purkey. I that site 2017 you've had           2         Your CV indicates that sine 2017 you've had         1         A. Let's op busy.           2         Your CV indicates that sine against makes sense.         1         A. Let's op busy.           2         Your CV indicates that a sine against makes se	1	would come in conjunction, let's say a memo, HR memo l	1	the Defense News last fall.
3       of talk to them on the record. I would record the whole         4       thing.         4       thing.         5       I would say I have seen cases where relatively         6       minor misconduct could have been handled simply by the         7       dia Someone that made a complaint and it made things far         8       someone that made a complaint and it made things far         9       worse.         10       It was kind of similar to my parents. When I         11       did Something worse when I was syoungster. [ got in         12       more trouble for lying than I did for the original         12       event. I would kind of share that advice with people         14       that relatiation can really cause what could be a simple         15       career.         16       worse.         17       There were some relatiation points that I         18       handled. But I don't remember any of them happened         19       outside my purview, but then they endout up bing         11       something that i investigated in conjunction with         21       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've head         11       base sense.         12       your consulting work?         13       A. Let's got Louy.			1	
4       thing, minor misconduc could have been handled simply by the department. But an employee chose to retailize agained someone that made a complaint and it made things far worse.       A. That's correct.         0       Lix was kind of similar to my parents. When I did something wrong when I was a yougster. I got in more trouble for king the case what ould be a simple issue to become much more serious for them in their career.       A. Do you knew WDTL?         11       that relation can retailation can retailate agained career.       A. Do you knew WDTL?         12       A. Do you knew WDTL?         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people that piece of advice. I think most of them happened outside my purview, but then they end but poing something that I investigated in conjunction with a another investigated in conjunction with a another investigated in conjunction with that piece of advice. I think most of them happened outside my purview, but then they end dup being something that I investigated in conjunction with a another investigated in conjunction with that correct?       A. Or you son as a sonsultant, are your to sole - is that - is that LL Something where you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       Immediate age of your so here's you listed - that or most?       Page 28         14       A. In the side member.       A. In the sole members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       Immediate member or that LLC?         15       A. In the sole members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       Immediate member or and that so here's you is task on a nonally your associate with any other profeesionals or people, in general,				
5       Q. And the Defense News; is thatthat's a         6       minor misconduct could have been handled simply by the         7       diad some bent made a complaint and it made things far         8       works.         10       It was kind of similar to my parents. When I         11       diad something wrong when I was a youngster. If got in         12       more trouble for lying than I did for the original         12       event. I would kind of share that advice with people         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people         14       that retaliation can really cause what could be a simple         15       G. Oh, Terma were some retaliation points that I         16       career.       A. I will.         17       A. I will.       A. I will.         18       another investigation in conjunction with related charger. I that retalistion conjunction with related charger. I that sees ense.       A. I will.         19       your consulting waters, DT Sweeney Consulting. LLC; is that ubs of you about your list of cases.       Page 26         19       your work as a consultant, are you work?       Q. Yeah. I mit to alk to moto associate with any other your reads. I not hards part of my – a         10       A. I will.       There is one here and the maters a consultant, are you your consulting work?         20				
<ul> <li>minor misconduct could have been handled simply by the dependence. But no maployee chose to retailate again part of the second to the</li></ul>		5		
7       department. But an employee chose to retailise against someone that made a complaint and it made things far worse.       7       general.         10       It was kind of similar to my parents. When I did something worsy when I was a youngster, I got in more trouble for lying than I did for the original event. I would kind of share that advice with papele that retailation can really cause what could be a simple issue to become much more serious for them in their career.       A. If by out out by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         11       A. May wile is the Executive Director.       C. Oh, great. Okay. So it's the Washington - okay.         12       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         13       A. If's put out by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         14       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         15       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         14       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         15       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         16       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         16       A. How you to by Washington Defense Trial Lawyers         17       A. How you to be chairing the intersection and bing a very bor Joh of L.         18       A. How will well. Tell the theoret and the part of the mather gave and bria yeary poor Joh of t.         19       another investigation with related charges, if that that LC?         10				
a       someone that made a complaint and it made things far       a       A       It was kind of similar to my parents. When I         11       did something wrong when I was a youngster, I got in       C       On, great. Ckay. So it's the Washington –         11       did something wrong when I was a youngster, I got in       C       On, great. Ckay. So it's the Washington –         12       more trubble for lying than I did for the original       A       D's you know WDTL?         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people       A       M. Wite is the Executive Director.         14       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       that piece of advice. I think most of them happened       O, h, I - I know your wife fairly well. Tell her         16       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       that piece of advice. I think most of them thappened       So betweeney poor bod it.         17       There were some retailation points that I       A. Let's get busy.       C       New ite base and         18       another investigated in coinjunction with       A. Let's get busy.       C       Yeah.         18       an din terms of your work as a consultant, are       your -       A. I think it is down from there.         19       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting. LLC; is       The task toury contusin, too, is there's two lists.				
<ul> <li>worse.</li> <li>worse.</li> <li>twosk kind of similar to my parents. When I</li> <li>did something wrong when I was a youngster, I got in</li> <li>more trouble for lying than I did for the original</li> <li>event. I would kind of share that advice with people</li> <li>that retaliation can really cause what could be a simple</li> <li>issue to become much more serious for them in their</li> <li>career.</li> <li>There were some retaliation points that I</li> <li>handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave</li> <li>that piece of advice. I think most of them in heir</li> <li>and ther investigated in conjunction with</li> <li>and being a very poor job of it.</li> <li>A. Let's get busy.</li> <li>C. Vaah.</li> <li>C. Vaah.</li> <li>C. Vaah.</li> <li>C. Yeah.</li> <li>So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a</li> <li>little bit nee.</li> <li>wour to souting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; Is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, Itis.</li> <li>Q. Yeak. It is that LCS comething where</li> <li>you the sole – sint at is that LCS comething where</li> <li>you don't work with or associate with any other</li> <li>professionals or poople, in general, as part of that</li> <li>Q. How much would you estimate annually you make</li> <li>from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?</li> <li>A. No, Ido not.</li> <li>A. No, Ido no</li></ul>				5
10       It was kind of similar to my parents. When I       10       0. Oh, great. Okay. So it's the Washington –         11       did something wrong when I was a youngster, I got in       11       okay.         12       event. I would kind of share that advice with people       0. I do. Yeah, Tm a member.         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people       0. I do. Yeah, Tm a member.         14       that refailation can really cause what could be a simple       1.       0. I do. Yeah, Tm a member.         15       issue to become much more serious for them in their       C. Oh, I – I know your wife fairly well. Tell her         16       There were some retailation points that I       1.       A. Uwill.         17       There were some retailation points that I       1.       3.       A. Uwill.         18       and boing a very poor job of it.       3.       A. Livill.         19       ga other investigated in conjunction with       2.       A. Livill.         21       ga other investigated in conjunction with       2.       A. Livill.         22       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       20       Yeah.         23       Oa. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       2         24       A. And in terms of your work as a consultant				
11       did something wrong when I was a youngster. I got in         12       more trouble for lying than I did for the original         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people         14       that retaliation can really cause what could be a simple         15       issue to become much more serious for them in their         16       career.       A. My wife is the Executive Director.         17       There were some retaliation points that I         18       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave         19       that piece of advice. I think most of them happened         10       outside my purview, but then they ended up being         20       something that I investigated in conjunction with         21       another investigation with related charges, if that         22       more consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is         24       Q. Okay. Scroil up on your Wr kas a consultant, are         24       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting where         25       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting Ware         3       A. It m the sole member.         4       Do you- sol assume – but I'll just ask         3       you - you dort work with or associate with any other         3       A. Do nout.         4				
12       more trouble for lying than 1 did for the original       12       A. Do you know VDTL?         13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people       13       0. I do. Yeah, I'm a member.         14       that retailation can really cause what could be a simple       13       0. I do. Yeah, I'm a member.         14       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       14       A. Iwill.         15       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       14       A. Iwill.         16       bandled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       14       A. Iwill.         16       bandled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       14       A. Iwill.         17       There were some retailation points that I       a. Iwill.       A. Iwill.         18       handles. But I don't member any of them after I gave       a. Iwill bit intervestigation with related charges, if that         18       somether investigation with related charges, if that       a. Business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is       1         19       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of         19       your assume - but I'lijust ask       90 you as other members or are you the sole member of       1         11       hand in terms of your work as a consultany				
13       event. I would kind of share that advice with people         14       that retallation can really cause what could be a simple         15       issue to become much more serious for them in their         16       career.         17       There were some retailation points that I         18       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave         19       that piece of advice. I think most of them happened         10       outside my purview, but then they ended up being         21       something that I investigated in conjunction with         22       another investigated in conjunction with         23       A. Kay, Scroll up on your CV here.         24       Q. Okay, Scroll up on your CV here.         25       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had         26       Your Consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is         26       that correct?         3       A. In time sole member.         4       A. In the sole member.         5       your - sol assume - but I'l just ask         9       your - sol assume - but I'l just ask         9       your - sol assume - but I'l just ask         9       your - sol assume - but I'l just ask         9       your - sol assume - but I'l just ask				•
14       A. My while is the Executive Director.         15       issue to become much more serious for them in their         16       issue to become much more serious for them in their         17       There were some retalization points that I         18       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave         19       that piece of advice. I think most of them happened         20       outside my purview, but then they ended up being         21       something that I investigated in conjunction with         22       another investigation with related charges, if that         23       makes sense.         24       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.         25       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had         Fage 26         Page 26         Yeage 26         Page 28         1         your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is         1         Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had         Page 26         A res, itis.         A res, itis.         A res, itis.         A res, itis.         A lithic to retrect?			1	-
<ul> <li>issue to become much more serious for them in their career.</li> <li>issue to become much more serious for them in their career.</li> <li>There were some retailation points that 1</li> <li>handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave that piece of advice. It hink most of them happened outside my purview, but then they ended up being something that I investigated in conjunction with another investigated in conjunction with another investigated in conjunction with another investigated in another investigated in conjunction with another makes sense.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.</li> <li>Your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Nes, it is.</li> <li>Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you the sole member of that LLC?</li> <li>G. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask you - you don't work with or associate with any other give is one here and then there's one at the end.</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your consulting work?</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your consulting work?</li> <li>G. No, I do not.</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your cosulting work?</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your cosulting work?</li> <li>G. How much would you estimate annually you make from your sens to have inclused berease.</li> <li>There is one here</li></ul>				
16       career.       16       hi.         17       There were some retailation points that 1       handled. But I don't remember any of them happened       0.         10       outside my purview, but then they ended up being       supposed to be chairing the labor and employment section         11       handled. But I don't remember any of them happened       outside my purview, but then they ended up being         11       makes sense.       0.         12       something that I investigated in conjunction with       a. Let's get busy.         12       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.       20         12       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       25         Page 26         Page 26         Page 28         your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?         A. Yes, it is.         A. Yes, it is.         Qui have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?         you roosulting work as a consultant, are you have other members.         Q. Do you = sol assume – but I'l just ask you = you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?       2         3       A. How much would you estimate annually you make from your cossulting work?       3 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>•</th>				•
17       There were some retaliation points that I       17       A. I will.         18       handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave       18       G. She's probably mad at me because I was - I'm         19       something that I investigated in conjunction with       and doing a very poor job of it.       3         20       something that I investigated in conjunction with       A. Let's get busy.       C. Veah.         21       another investigated in conjunction with       A. Let's get busy.       C. Veah.         21       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a         22       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       The sole memesk you, I'm going to direct you about your list         23       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of         24       your have other members or are you the sole member of       1       I'm the sole member.       3         3       A. I'm the sole member.       0. Do you - sol assume - but I'l just ask       9       There is one here and then there's one at the end.         3       A. No, I do not.       3       A. No, I do not.       3       A. Yes.         3       A. How in the would guess tast year I might have made       3       A. Yes.			1	
<ul> <li>handled. But I don't remember any of them after I gave that piece of advice. I think most of them happened outside my purview, but then they ended up being something that I investigated in conjunction with another investigation with related charges, if that makes sense.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here. Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had</li> <li>Page 26</li> <li>your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you the sole – is that – is that LLC something where you the sole – is that – is that LLC something where you the sole – is that – is that LLC something where you use other members.</li> <li>Q. Doyou – so I assume – but I'II just ask you – you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>A. Business seems to have increased business.</li> <li>From your consulting work 2D Sweeney Consulting?</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>A. No, I do not.</li> <li>A. Business seems to have increased business.</li> <li>Twould guess last year I might have made</li> <li>S20,000. Inonesity don't know, because I haven't done my taxes yest. But I would guess it was around \$20,000</li> <li>last year. Probably leas in years prior to that.</li> <li>G. Okay, Before I forget, one – you indicated that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the</li> </ul>			1	
19       that piece of advice. I think most of them happened outside my purview, but then they ended up being       19       supposed to be chairing the labor and employment section and doing a very poor job of t.         20       something that linevestigated in conjunction with another investigation with related charges, if that makes sense.       A. Let's get busy.         21       A. Colkay. Scroll up on your CV here. Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       20       Yeah.         22       Your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       3       A. Yes, it is.       3       So let me ask you, 'm going to switch gears a         24       Qur consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       1       Your -       A. Te's, it is.       3       A. It'm the sole members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. I'm the sole member.       Q. Yeah.       3       A. I'm the sole member.       4       C. Yeak, Up here - here we go.         9       Qu ou - you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that to sub the wold you estimate annually you make from your consulting work?       7       C. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.         11       Q. How much would you estimate annually you make from your consulting work?       1       A. No, I do not.       3       So I that' to alk' to you about a co			1	
20       outside my purview, but then they ended up being something that I investigated in conjunction with makes sense.       20       and doing a very poor job of it.         21       another investigated in conjunction with makes sense.       A.       A.       A.         23       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here. Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       20       and doing a very poor job of it.         24       Q. Yeah.       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a little bit here. I want to talk to you about your list of cases.         25       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. Yes, tis.       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. I'think it is down from there.       2       2       A.       I'think it is down from there.         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       1       I'm profesionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?       2       1       I'm there's two lists.         7       A. Bo, indo not.       3       A. No, I do not.       3				
21       something that I investigated in conjunction with another investigation with related charges, if that makes sense.       21       A. Let's get busy.         23       another investigation with related charges, if that makes sense.       22       Q. Yeah.         24       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here. Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       22       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a little bit here. I want to talk to you about your list of cases.         25       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. Yes, it is.       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. Tim the sole member.       2       So here's your listed -         9       Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask you - you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?       3       1         14       A. No, I do not.       11       2       So lust for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of you're indicated here a case list identifying cases you've been involved in in the last four years.         15       A. Business seems to have increased business. I would guess last year. Tinght have m			1	
22       another investigation with related charges, if that       22       Q. Yeah.         23       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.       23       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a         25       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.       24       Q. Yeah.         26       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       25       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a         26       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       25       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a         27       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       26       Page 28         28       Your crosulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of         29       Your has of your work as a consultant, are       3       A. I think it is down from there.       4         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are       4       A. Oh, okay. Right.       7         7       that LLC?       8       Iittle bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.       7         9       O. bo you - so I assume - but I'll just ask       9       Your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case         10       professionals or popole, in general, as part of that       10       So just for frame or fereence, I'm on page 3 of       Your report. And on page 3 you				
23       makes sense.       23       So let me ask you, I'm going to switch gears a         24       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here.       24       little bit here. I want to talk to you about your list         25       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       25       of cases.         Page 26         1       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of         2       you consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, where       3       A. Yes, it is.       3         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are       4       Q. Yeah. Up here - here we go.       So here's your listed         5       you the sole - is that - is that LLC something where       5       So here's you listed         6       you - you dort' work with or associate with any other       7       A. The he sole member.       7         9       Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask       9       There is one here and then there's one at the end.         9       your consulting work?       11       So just for fame of reference, I'm on page 3 of         14       A. How much would you estimate annually you make       16       A. Yees.         15       G. Business seems to have increased business.       16       One identified in C is a 2017 cas				
24       Q. Okay. Scroll up on your CV here. Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       24       little bit here. I want to talk to you about your list of cases.         25       Page 26       Page 28         1       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -         3       A. Yes, it is.       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         8       A. I'm the sole member.       6       Q. Yeah. Up here - here we go. So here's your listed         9       Q. bo you - so I assume - but I'll just ask you - you don't work with or associate with any other       7       G. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask you report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case         10       your - you don't work at DT Sweeney Consulting?       1       A. No, I do not.         14       A. How much would you estimate annually you make       16       A. Yes.         15       I would guess last year I might have made       16       A. Yes.         16       A. No, I do not.       16       A. Yes.         17       year. I started advertising in some of the expert       16       One identiffed in C is a 2017 case where you offered ex				
25       Your CV indicates that since 2017 you've had       25       of cases.         21       your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your         3       A. Yes, it is.       1       I'm going to direct you to the third page of your         3       A. Yes, it is.       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?       3       A. I'm the sole member.         9       Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask       9       There's two lists. And that's part of my - a         11       professionals or people, in general, as part of that       10       So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of         12       usiness seems to have really picked up last       14       A. Yes.         13       A. No, I do not.       11         14       Q. How much would you estimate annually you make       16       A. So l want to ask you about a couple of these.         17       year. I started advertising in some of the expert       16       A. I'm was adomestiz work thawe made         18       Websites and that seems to have increased business.       19       Can you expound for me on what that case         19       I would guess last year I might			-	
Page 26Page 261your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?1I'm going to direct you to the third page of your -3A. Yes, it is.3A. I think it is down from there.4Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?3A. I think it is down from there.6you - you have other members.6A. I'm the sole member.67Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask you - you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my - a11your -you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?7A. No, I do not.13A. No, I do not.10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of your report. And on page 3 you've been involved in in the last four years.14A. No, I do not.14A. Yes.15G. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last websites and that seems to have increased business.1617Iwould guess last year I might have made \$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,000212O. Okay. Before I forget, one - you indicated that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the22Wastey ene publication from 2021, kind of the22Wastey ene publication from				
1your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is that correct?1I'm going to direct you to the third page of your3A. Yes, it is.3A. Ithink it is down from there.4Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are you the sole - is that is that LLC smething where you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?3A. I think it is down from there.6you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?6A. I think it is down from there.7hat LLC?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my - a8A. I'm the sole member.8Iittle bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.9Q. Doy ou - so I assume - but I'll just ask you - you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that consulting work?914Q. How much would you estimate annually you make from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?1016A. Business seems to have really picked up last websites and that seems to have increased business.1617widg uess last year I might have made 191719Iwould guess last year I might have made 191920\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done 101021my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,000 212122last year. Probably less in years prior to that.2323Q. Okay. Before I forget, one - you indicated that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the2424that you have	23			
2       that correct?       2       your         3       A. Yes, it is.       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are       5       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         5       you the sole is that is that LLC something where       5       So here's your listed         6       you have other members or are you the sole member of       6       A. Oh, okay. Right.         7       that LLC?       7       Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my - a         8       A. I'm the sole member.       8       Iittle bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.         9       Q. Do you sol assume but I'll just ask       9       There is one here and then there's one at the end.         10       your you don't work with or associate with any other       10       So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of         11       professionals or people, in general, as part of that       11       your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case         12       consulting work?       13       last four years.       14         14       Q. How much would you estimate annually you make       14       A. Yes.       15         15       from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?       15       Q. So I wan		Page 26		Page 28
2       that correct?       2       your         3       A. Yes, it is.       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         4       Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are       5       3       A. Ithink it is down from there.         5       you the sole is that is that LLC something where       5       So here's your listed         6       you have other members or are you the sole member of       6       A. Oh, okay. Right.         7       that LLC?       7       Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my - a         8       A. I'm the sole member.       8       Iittle bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.         9       Q. Do you sol assume but I'll just ask       9       There is one here and then there's one at the end.         10       your you don't work with or associate with any other       10       So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of         11       professionals or people, in general, as part of that       11       your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case         12       consulting work?       13       last four years.       14         14       Q. How much would you estimate annually you make       14       A. Yes.       15         15       from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?       15       Q. So I wan	1	your consulting business, DT Sweeney Consulting, LLC; is	1	I'm going to direct you to the third page of
4Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are4Q. Yeah. Up here – here we go.5you the sole is that is that LLC something where5So here's your listed6you have other members or are you the sole member of6A. Oh, okay. Right.7that LLC?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my - a8A. I'm the sole member.8little bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.9Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask9There is one here and then there's one at the end.10you you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15for myour consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the	2		2	
5you the sole is that is that LLC something where you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?5So here's your listed6you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?7A. Oh, okay. Right.7that LLC?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my a8A. I'm the sole member.889Q. Do you so I assume but I'll just ask you you don't work with or associate with any other910you you don't work with or associate with any other professionals or people, in general, as part of that1112consulting work?1213A. No, I do not.1314Q. How much would you estimate annually you make1415from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?1516A. Business seems to have really picked up last1617year. I started advertising in some of the expert1718websites and that seems to have increased business.1819I would guess last year I might have made1920\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done2021kat year. Probably less in years prior to that.2122last year. Probably less in years prior to that.2223Q. Okay. Before I forget, one - you indicated2324that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the2424that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24	3	A. Yes, it is.	3	A. I think it is down from there.
6you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?6A. Oh, okay. Right.7that LLC?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my – a8A. I'm the sole member.8little bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.9Q. Do you – so I assume – but I'll just ask9There is one here and then there's one at the end.10you – you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20A. It was a domestic violence case. And the21last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22su	4	Q. And in terms of your work as a consultant, are	4	Q. Yeah. Up here here we go.
6you have other members or are you the sole member of that LLC?6A. Oh, okay. Right.7that LLC?7Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my – a8A. I'm the sole member.8little bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.9Q. Do you – so I assume – but I'll just ask9There is one here and then there's one at the end.10you – you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20A. It was a domestic violence case. And the21last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22su	5	you the sole is that is that LLC something where	5	So here's your listed
8A. I'm the sole member.8little bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.9Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask9There is one here and then there's one at the end.10you you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from	6	you have other members or are you the sole member of	6	A. Oh, okay. Right.
9Q. Do you - so I assume - but I'll just ask9There is one here and then there's one at the end.10you you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one - you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	7	that LLC?	7	Q. There's two lists. And that's part of my a
10you you don't work with or associate with any other10So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	8	A. I'm the sole member.	8	little bit of my confusion, too, is there's two lists.
11professionals or people, in general, as part of that11your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?14A. Yes.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	9	Q. Do you so I assume but I'll just ask	9	There is one here and then there's one at the end.
12consulting work?12list identifying cases you've been involved in in the13A. No, I do not.13last four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?14A. Yes.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.19I would guess last year I might have made1920\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done19Can you expound for me on what that case21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one - you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	10	you you don't work with or associate with any other	10	So just for frame of reference, I'm on page 3 of
13A. No, I do not.13Iast four years.14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make13Iast four years.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?14A. Yes.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.19I would guess last year I might have made1920\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done19Can you expound for me on what that case21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	11			your report. And on page 3 you've indicated here a case
14Q. How much would you estimate annually you make14A. Yes.15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	12	consulting work?	12	list identifying cases you've been involved in in the
15from your consulting work at DT Sweeney Consulting?15Q. So I want to ask you about a couple of these.16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and	13	A. No, I do not.	13	last four years.
16A. Business seems to have really picked up last16One identified in C is a 2017 case where you17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and			1	
17year. I started advertising in some of the expert17offered expert opinion and/or reports on a Pierce County18websites and that seems to have increased business.18Sheriff liability case.19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and			15	
18       websites and that seems to have increased business.       18       Sheriff liability case.         19       I would guess last year I might have made       19       Can you expound for me on what that case         20       \$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done       19       Can you expound for me on what that case         21       my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,000       21       A. It was a domestic violence case. And the         22       last year. Probably less in years prior to that.       22       suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his         23       Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated       23       wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like         24       that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the       24       Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and				-
19I would guess last year I might have made19Can you expound for me on what that case20\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done20involved?21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and				
<ul> <li>\$20,000. I honestly don't know, because I haven't done</li> <li>my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,000</li> <li>last year. Probably less in years prior to that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated</li> <li>that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the</li> <li>Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and</li> </ul>			1	-
21my taxes yet. But I would guess it was around \$20,00021A. It was a domestic violence case. And the22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and			1	
22last year. Probably less in years prior to that.22suspect had, I believe, a no-contact order against his23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
23Q. Okay. Before I forget, one you indicated23wife. He had made threats to her. And it seems like24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and			1	
24that you have one publication from 2021, kind of the24Pierce County deputies went to his house to knock and				
			1	
25 need for police de-escalation, which was published in 25 possibly make an arrest. But they didn't have a warrant			1	
	25	need for police de-escalation, which was published in	25	possibly make an arrest. But they didn't have a warrant

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29	Page 31
1	and he didn't come to the door, so they left. And then	1 Q. Prior to this case, have you been retained by
2	I believe the next day he ended up killing his wife.	2 had you ever been retained by Heather Barden or her law
3	Q. Okay.	3 firm?
4	A. That's what I remember about the case. So	4 A. No, I have not.
5	Q. Obviously, not a not a not an	5 Q. And I understand you've got a little bit of a
6	HR-related	6 variable rate structure.
7	A. No. not an HR case.	7 But is it accurate that you charge \$300 per hour
8	Q not an HR-type-related case.	8 for most of the work that you performed in this case?
9	A. No, it was a police liability case.	9 A. That is correct.
10	Q. Okay. The case specified in at item E is a	10 Q. How much have you billed to date for this case?
11	2020 case where it says, "Expert opinion provided for	11 A. I could look it up, if you want.
12	lawsuit versus Kent Police, failure to take appropriate	12 Q. That would be great.
13	action."	13 A. So we've estimated 2.5 hours for the deposition
14	Was that an HR- or EEO-related case?	14 today. And the previous invoice was for \$2700. It
15	A. No.	15 involved five hours of case review, one-hour phone call,
16	Q. Are there any cases on this list that are what	16 and three hours for writing the final expert opinion.
17	we call HR-related or any way related to harassment,	17 Q. When were you first contacted by Ms. Barden
18	discrimination, or retaliation?	18 regarding this matter?
19	A. No. The only one that we mentioned for	19 A. Let me just do a quick search here.
20	harassment would be B, but that was two civilians that	20 The first email I'm seeing is December 10th of
21	got in an argument with each other and one brandished a	21 <b>2021</b> .
22	firearm. So the charge was harassment. But it's a	22 Q. Do you know how she identified you as a
23	different kind of harassment. So, no, other than no,	23 potential expert?
24	there are no other cases.	A. Not off the top of my head, no.
25	Q. Okay. And is this case list under G on page 3	25 MS. BARDEN: Just hold on. Objection to
	Page 30	Daga 22
-	_	Page 32
1	of your report, is this current and up-to-date?	1 form.
2	of your report, is this current and up-to-date? A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.	1 form. 2 BY MR. KITSON:
2 3	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely.</li> <li>But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate as to recent work.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> <li>together. That I had information that would be of</li> <li>assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> <li>together. That I had information that would be of</li> <li>assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,</li> <li>your your work on the case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a client of hers that felt that he had been treated unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an investigator and some of my work as an expert witness. And we basically determined that we could work together. That I had information that would be of assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know, your your work on the case?</li> <li>A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> <li>together. That I had information that would be of</li> <li>assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,</li> <li>your your work on the case?</li> <li>A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a</li> <li>variety of documents to review that she had collected</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> <li>together. That I had information that would be of</li> <li>assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,</li> <li>your your work on the case?</li> <li>A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a</li> <li>variety of documents to review that she had collected</li> <li>and some that she had written, the complaint obviously.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Are there any cases where you've been retained</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>form.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. When you initially – I'll strike that.</li> <li>Did you have an initial conversation with</li> <li>Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. What were you told about the case when you were</li> <li>asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?</li> <li>A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a</li> <li>client of hers that felt that he had been treated</li> <li>unfairly due to his race.</li> <li>We talked about my past experience as an</li> <li>investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.</li> <li>And we basically determined that we could work</li> <li>together. That I had information that would be of</li> <li>assistance in the case.</li> <li>Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,</li> <li>your your work on the case?</li> <li>A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a</li> <li>variety of documents to review that she had collected</li> <li>and some that she had written, the complaint obviously.</li> <li>And I was asked to review that information and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Are there any cases where you've been retained as an expert to opine on any issues similar to those</li> </ul>	1form.2BY MR. KITSON:3Q. When you initially I'll strike that.4Did you have an initial conversation with5Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?6A. Yes, I did.7Q. What were you told about the case when you were8asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?9A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a10client of hers that felt that he had been treated11unfairly due to his race.12We talked about my past experience as an13investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.14And we basically determined that we could work15together. That I had information that would be of16assistance in the case.17Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,18your your work on the case?19A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a20variety of documents to review that she had collected21and some that she had written, the complaint obviously.22And I was asked to review that information and23create a report for her that listed some of my opinions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one.</li> <li>There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Are there any cases where you've been retained as an expert to opine on any issues similar to those presented in this case?</li> </ul>	1form.2BY MR. KITSON:3Q. When you initially I'll strike that.4Did you have an initial conversation with5Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?6A. Yes, I did.7Q. What were you told about the case when you were8asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?9A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a10client of hers that felt that he had been treated11unfairly due to his race.12We talked about my past experience as an13investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.14And we basically determined that we could work15together. That I had information that would be of16assistance in the case.17Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,18your your work on the case?19A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a20variety of documents to review that she had collected21and some that she had written, the complaint obviously.22And I was asked to review that information and23create a report for her that listed some of my opinions24about the case, as well as my CV, which we discussed,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of your report, is this current and up-to-date?</li> <li>A. How far down does it go? I can see down to L.</li> <li>Q. It goes down to L. L is the last one.</li> <li>A. Okay. L is the last one. There might be one or two more since then. And</li> <li>I think there's one that was a report and an opinion and now might be a deposition. That's that seems likely. But, overall, I would say it's fairly accurate</li> <li>as to recent work.</li> <li>Q. Does the case that you just mentioned that's not</li> <li>listed here where you've given a deposition, did that relate at all to complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation?</li> <li>A. No, it did not.</li> <li>Q. So fair to say that most of your expert work has related to your expertise outside of the context of, you know, HR or EEO type of issues?</li> <li>A. Correct. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Are there any cases where you've been retained as an expert to opine on any issues similar to those</li> </ul>	1form.2BY MR. KITSON:3Q. When you initially I'll strike that.4Did you have an initial conversation with5Ms. Barden about this case before you were retained?6A. Yes, I did.7Q. What were you told about the case when you were8asked to potentially work as as an expert witness?9A. We talked about a harassment complaint from a10client of hers that felt that he had been treated11unfairly due to his race.12We talked about my past experience as an13investigator and some of my work as an expert witness.14And we basically determined that we could work15together. That I had information that would be of16assistance in the case.17Q. What were you asked to do in terms of, you know,18your your work on the case?19A. After the initial phone call, Heather sent me a20variety of documents to review that she had collected21and some that she had written, the complaint obviously.22And I was asked to review that information and23create a report for her that listed some of my opinions

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

	Page 33		Page 35
1	I think that was pretty much the extent of it.	1	documents you've identified; correct?
2	Q. There are there's let's see, in your	2	A. That's correct, as best as I remember. I could
3	report there's opinions A through E; so, essentially,	3	potentially look in my collection of documents and try
4	five different areas where you've offered opinions.	4	to compare these, but I believe that this was pretty
5	Were those areas issues that Ms. Barden	5	much everything.
6	specifically asked you to address in your report or are	6	And the reason, if there's any hesitation on my
7	those opinions something that you came up with on your	7	part, is that some of these documents were large scans
8	own volition?	8	of different information all put together in one
9	A. Certainly in our discussions on the phone, she	9	document.
10	outlined the case that she had. The facts that she had	10	But I believe that everything that you see there
11	gathered and certainly the evidence that she felt was	11	was everything that I was provided.
12	most helpful to her client to and then provided me,	12	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you a couple questions
13	again, with all of that documentation that I'm sure are	13	about what each of these categories of documents are and
14	in the exhibits here that we might be discussing here	14	it might be useful for you and you may need to look at
15	today.	15	your file to answer.
16	After that, when I write my report, it's largely	16	A. All right.
17	without counsel's assistance. In other words, I I	17	Q. Number 7 in your list here is Spokane County
18	review the information there. You can see I spent some	18	Sheriff's Office Internal Affair Report No. 2019-0014,
19	time with it and went through it fairly thoroughly.	19	written by Sergeant Hines, Office of Professional
20	And then when it comes to my report and my	20	Standards.
21	opinions, I have to state things that I believe that I	21	And No. 8 is Spokane County Sheriff's Office IA
22	can testify in court about; that I can maintain some	22	reports 2019-0023 and 2019-0014.
23	independent knowledge about.	23	So specifically with regards to Sergeant Hines'
24	Independent meaning that I don't necessarily	24	reports, I will represent to you that there is a report
25	want to say that I take a side.	25	that he wrote that is approximately 20-something or
	Page 34		Page 36
1	Ideally, I would think that my opinions would be	1	close to 30, maybe, pages long, but then there's also a
2	factual. They are based on my experience and my	2	file that contains hundreds of pages of documents,
3	training. And when I write these opinions down, I know	3	including transcription of recorded interviews, you
4	that they could end up in court; they could end up in	4	know, Loudermill notices, all of the investigation
5	the deposition. But they have to be things that I can	5	documents that he created as part of his investigation.
6	testify to that I feel strongly about. So my report is	6	Did you review just Sergeant Hines' report or
7	my own.	7	additional records that were part of the investigative
8	Q. At any point, did so my understanding is that	8	file?
9	Ms. Barden sent you an initial set of documents.	9	A. I remember reading the full investigation
10	At any point in time did you request any	10	report. You and I talked earlier about was it similar
11	additional documents from Ms. Barden in order to	11	to previous work that I have done, and it is similar.
12	formulate your opinions?	12	When you put together a case file, it can be a
13	A. I don't recall asking for anything else. I	13	three-ring binder full of information in paper form,
14	think I received everything I needed.	14	mostly electronic now. But back in my day, we pretty
15	Q. Let's go ahead and look at the first page of	15	much had three-ring binders. So that case file is not
16	your report.	16	something that you would prepare and give to a chief.
17	A. Are you able to make that a little bigger?	17	You would present a summary that highlights key
18	Q. Sure.	18	information. You don't want them reading 300 pages of
19	A. That's better.	19	material. You want them reading a 20-page report. And
20	Q. Yep. This is Exhibit 1 of your deposition,	20	even then, that's a lot. So but that's what you want
21	which is your report.	21	them reading. And I think that's what you're referring
22	And you specifically state here on the first	22	to.
23	page the documents that you were provided that formed	23	So yes, I did read both the memos as well as the
24	the basis of your opinion in this lawsuit. And it's	24	full investigation file.
25	I guess it's 1 through 11. And those are the only	25	Q. Okay. Well, when you say you read the full

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37		Page 39
1	investigation file, I guess I want to make sure I	1	numbers in the bottom right-hand corner of the documents
2	understand.	2	that you're referencing?
3	So within that file, there are transcripts of	3	A. There are. Like, the page I'm on right now is
4	various recorded interviews.	4	"Richmond 0139."
5	Did you review any of the transcripts of	5	Q. Could you just give me a start and end number
6	recorded interviews conducted by Sergeant Hines?	6	for those Bates numbers for that document that you are
7	A. I remember reading transcribed interviews, yes.	7	referencing?
8	Q. Do you recall sorry. Go ahead.	8	A. I will. The first page that I see is a case
9	A. Go ahead.	9	finding notice and it shows "Richmond 0016." The very
10	Q. No, go ahead.	10	last page is an email from Tim Hines no. It is an
11	A. You first.	11	email to Tim Hines and it is entitled "Richmond 0384."
12	Q. Do you recall with any specificity which	12	Q. And that Bates number, it doesn't have an
13	recorded interviews you reviewed?	13	additional specification of is it SC Richmond or is
14	A. There was definitely an interview with Deputy	14	it just Richmond?
15	Richmond. There was an interview with you know, to	15	A. I only see Richmond and then the number.
16	be sure, I should probably pull these up so I make sure	16	Q. Okay. Gotcha.
17	I'm looking at the right thing.	17	So in that range of documents, did you closely
18	Q. Sure. If you want to look at your file to	18	review every document or did you do something else?
19	determine	19	A. To the best of my recollection, I did not read
20	A. I'm going to do that right here.	20	all 343 pages. What I was looking for was material that
21	Q. Okay.	21	would be most relevant to what I was being asked to
22	A. So I just pulled up a 343-page document, and it	22	review, which was the investigation document itself.
23	referred to the case numbers that you mentioned. And	23	So I paid close attention to the interviews and
24	I'm betting that this is a scan, and I cannot search it	24	the findings. But I didn't read every single Human
25	individually.	25	Resources document. There was a large personnel file.
			5 1
	Page 38		Page 40
1	So, obviously, you don't want me going	1	So I I didn't read everything in that. I kind of
2	through 343 pages right now, but I do have right at the	2	scanned through that, if that makes sense.
3	beginning of this a summary report. And let me make	3	MR. KITSON: So, Heather, to short-circuit
4	sure it's by the right author that I think it is. Oh,	4	me having me to go through all the documents in detail,
5	no, it's not. It's by Lieutenant Jones.	5	I would ask that we get a copy either from David
6	Q. I believe that would have been related to IA	6	directly or from you of exactly what was provided.
7	No. 2019-0023, which was a separate report related to	7	
		1 '	Without Bates numbers related to these documents, I just
8	investigation into allegations against Sergeant Bloomer?	8	Without Bates numbers related to these documents, I just can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying
8 9	investigation into allegations against Sergeant Bloomer? A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?	1	
		8	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying
9	A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?	8 9 10 11	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that, Heather, as part of this process.
9 10	A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages? <b>Q. Likely, no.</b>	8 9 10 11 12	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,
9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But,</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that, Heather, as part of this process.
9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But,</li> <li>like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that, Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates
9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But,</li> <li>like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles</li> <li>to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that, Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received.
9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report.</li> <li>So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave.</li> <li>Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that, Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure. BY MR. KITSON:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave.</li> <li>Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report.</li> <li>So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave.</li> <li>Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report.</li> <li>So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> <li>Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines. I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this document.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report.</li> <li>So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> <li>Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this document.</li> <li>I've got Standards of Conduct.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane County Sheriff's Office policies and procedures in</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this document.</li> <li>I've got Standards of Conduct.</li> <li>Here's an interview of Deputy Richmond conducted</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane County Sheriff's Office policies and procedures in preparing your report?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave. Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines. I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this document. I've got Standards of Conduct. Here's an interview of Deputy Richmond conducted by Sergeant Hines.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> <li>Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane County Sheriff's Office policies and procedures in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I do remember MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to the form. Just because we didn't even have those when he</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I agree. But would it be 343 pages?</li> <li>Q. Likely, no.</li> <li>A. Again, I'm only part way through this. But, like, I'm seeing a memorandum from Undersheriff Knowles to Sergeant Thurman that he's on paid admin leave.</li> <li>Here's a memo from Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>I think what I'm looking at is what I referred to earlier might have been a three-ring binder at some point. So this is a lot of material. Let me see if I can quickly scan and get to any interviews in this document.</li> <li>I've got Standards of Conduct.</li> <li>Here's an interview of Deputy Richmond conducted by Sergeant Hines.</li> <li>Do you want me to keep going through this?</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>can't tell which versions of the documents he's saying that he relied upon for his report. So we'd ask that you facilitate that,</li> <li>Heather, as part of this process. MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I can provide the Bates numbers for you for the documents that he received. MR. KITSON: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I think there was some duplication too.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Yeah. Did you review any Sheriff's</li> <li>Office policies and procedures as part of your Spokane County Sheriff's Office policies and procedures in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I do remember MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to the</li> </ul>

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

	Page 41		Page 43
1	MR. KITSON: I don't know the timing of	1	My question for you is whether or not these ASU
2	everything when you provided it to him and when you	2	documents are something that you reviewed as part of
3	didn't but	3	your or in preparation for for rendering your
4	MS. BARDEN: I didn't provide it to him	4	opinions in this case.
5	because I didn't have it. I can tell you that.	5	And if it is easier, again, you're welcome to
6	MR. KITSON: Well, you've had time since	6	A. Let me let me try that.
7	then. So I'll just ask it this way.	7	Would this be part of the IA investigative
8	MS. BARDEN: Okay.	8	report?
9	BY MR. KITSON:	9	Q. Yeah. I'll represent that these documents were
10	Q. Have you reviewed any policies and procedures as	10	collected as part of that investigative process.
11	part of your work in review in providing your	11	I don't know whether those are documents that
12	opinions in this case?	12	were provided to you by Ms. Barden or not.
13	A. It seems to me that there were bits and pieces	13	A. Well, if I go to the large document again that
14	of some parts [sic] and procedures interspersed	14	we talked about previously, the 343 page one, I'm
15	throughout the number of documents that I received.	15	betting that I will find what it is you're looking on,
16	That's what I remember the most.	16	which means that I would have reviewed it.
17	Q. In let me	17	Q. Okay. Do you let me ask it more broadly.
18	A. I could look through the titles if you want.	18	Do you remember, as part of your review, looking
19	That might help.	19	at documents related to the 2018 Air Support Unit
20	Q. That's okay. I'll ask you specific questions as	20	selection process that Mr. Richmond claims he was
21	we go through this stuff.	21	discriminated against in?
22	A. Okay.	22	A. Yes, I do remember that.
23	Q. Did you ask Ms. Barden at any point for access	23	Q. Okay. I'm going to go through a couple of the
24	to policies that you didn't have as you were, you know,	24	documents here with you.
25	forming your opinions that are stated in your report?	25	The first
	Page 42		Page 44
1	A. No.	1	A. I think I can look at your screen, because
2	MR. KITSON: All right. We've been going	2	I'm sure I have this, but it's going to take me a while
3	for an hour. I'm going to jump into your opinions here.	3	to find.
4	Let's take a break. Probably the one and only break	4	Q. Okay. This first page is it says, "Spokane
5	here today. And we'll come back on record in just five	5	Regional Air Support Unit Tactical Flight Officer
6	minutes.	6	Opening."
7	Does that work for everybody?	7	A. Can you make it a little larger?
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the	8	Q. Yep.
9	record. The time is now 10:27 a.m.	9	A. Thanks.
10	(A break was taken.)	10	Q. It lays out or, essentially, advertises this
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the	11	position within the Sheriff's Office.
12	record. The time now is 10:35 a.m.	12	It talks about, basically, what will be required
13	MR. KITSON: All right. David, I'm going to	13	of applicants; what type of skills successful applicants
14	direct you to I'm going to I'm going to open up	14	would need. It lists preferred skills for the position,
15	Document B. We'll share Document B, as in boy.	15	including things like strong geographic orientation,
16	THE WITNESS: All right.	16	strong patrol skills, and a number of bullet-pointed
17	(Exhibit 2 was marked.)	17	items here.
18	BY MR. KITSON:	18	And then it gives a deadline. It says,
19	Q. This is Exhibit 2 to your deposition today.	19	"Applicants must submit a letter of interest, résumé,
20	And this document is a 36-page document, which	20	and supervisor's endorsement form to Deputy Dan Knight
21	I'll represent is a collection of records that were	21	via their chain of command by no later than 1/23/18.
22	collected by Sergeant Hines in investigating Andrew	22	Final applicants are tentatively scheduled for oral
23	Richmond's claims related to the ASU unit. I'm	23	boards on 2/7/18."
24	going just scroll through here and you're welcome to	24	My question for you, David, is this, I guess,
25	open this up.	25	type of advertisement internal advertisement common
		1	

	Page 45	Page 47
1	for these type of specialty positions in your	1 Richmond's letter of interest. And also his résumé.
2	experience?	2 And finally, this is for another applicant named
3	A. Yes. This is a very common application	3 Deputy Ennis, and his supervisor approval and rating, as
4	notification to tell people if you want to get into the	4 well as an email expressing an interest in the position
5	specialized unit, we are looking to add people to our	5 and his résumé.
6	cadre.	6 So to your knowledge, are those those are the
7	And, again, as you pointed out, it's going to	7 documents I guess, strike that.
8	give some recommended skills that they want to see and a	8 As you reviewed this and as you looked at the
9	notification of an interview.	9 notice, applicants were required to submit a letter of
10	Q. Okay. This second page here is titled "Tactical	10 interest, their résumé/CV, and could also provide
11	Flight Officer Oral Examination Questions 2018."	11 letters of recommendation, but also had to have a
12	And proceeding from there, there is a list of	12 supervisor recommendation; correct?
13	questions for over two pages, numbered 1 through 11.	13 A. Correct.
14	Are is this list of questions something that	14 Q. And is that also fairly standard in terms of law
15	you recall reviewing as part of your I guess, as you	15 enforcement applications for these types of specialty
16	formulate your opinions in this case?	16 positions?
17	A. I remember reviewing the ASU position	17 A. Yes, that's very common.
18	announcement. I do not remember reading all of these	18 Q. Okay. And, obviously, we have these documents,
19	questions at this time.	19 so they were archived as part of the process; correct?
20	Q. Okay. Is it fairly standard, if you know, to	20 A. Yes. As far as I understand it, they were
21	have a set of questions that is used for these oral	archived and able then to be retrieved for our purposes
22	boards that is that is that is utilized for each	22 for today.
23	of the applicants by the board that is doing the	<b>Q.</b> Okay. There's some additional documents here
24	interviewing?	24 from emails between Sergeant Hines and others related
25	A. That's a very common procedure.	25 to his investigation.
	- 11	Dama 40
	Page 46	Page 48
1	Page 46 Q. Excuse me.	1       I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of
1 2		
	Q. Excuse me.	1 I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of
2	<ul><li>Q. Excuse me.</li><li>A. Bless you.</li></ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 31
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Excuse me.</li><li>A. Bless you.</li><li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will</li></ul>	<ol> <li>I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of</li> <li>this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 31</li> <li>and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.</li> <li>There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick</li> <li>Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of</li> <li>this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 31</li> <li>and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.</li> <li>There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick</li> <li>Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,</li> <li>February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of</li> <li>this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 31</li> <li>and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.</li> <li>There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick</li> <li>Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,</li> <li>February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.</li> <li>Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of</li> <li>this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 31</li> <li>and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.</li> <li>There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick</li> <li>Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,</li> <li>February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.</li> <li>Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,</li> <li>Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO</li> <li>Oral Boards held today:</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply.</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton.</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton. Here's Krystal Bitzer's letter of interest and</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection20or the ranking by the committee?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton. Here's Krystal Bitzer's letter of interest and résumé. Here is a letter of recommendation from</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection20or the ranking by the committee?21A. My best recollection is that this was part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton. Here's Krystal Bitzer's letter of interest and résumé. Here is a letter of recommendation from somebody related to Deputy Bitzer, as well as her</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection20or the ranking by the committee?21A. My best recollection is that this was part of22the packet that was sent to me by Heather. And I do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you.</li> <li>The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton. Here's Krystal Bitzer's letter of interest and résumé. Here is a letter of recommendation from somebody related to Deputy Bitzer, as well as her supervisor approval and rating.</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection20or the ranking by the committee?21A. My best recollection is that this was part of22the packet that was sent to me by Heather. And I do23remember reviewing the ASU application position for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Excuse me.</li> <li>A. Bless you. The panel or the primary hiring authority will write the questions ahead of time. And then generally it's been my experience the panel will ask different questions. And each panelist gets a different question. And it just gets everyone involved. And you ask the questions of the applicants and allow them to answer the questions.</li> <li>Q. Sure. Okay. So following this list of questions there is a collection of of submitted materials from those who were who decided to apply. So are you familiar with the fact that there were four applicants for this position?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So I'm going to scroll through this for you. Here is a copy of Corporal Jeff Welton's letter of interest as well as his résumé. Here is a supervisor approval form with a rating related to Corporal Welton. Here's Krystal Bitzer's letter of interest and résumé. Here is a letter of recommendation from somebody related to Deputy Bitzer, as well as her</li> </ul>	1I'm going to direct you to page 32, though, of2this packet of documents. And on page 32 sorry. 313and 32 here 32, Bates stamped 48321 and 322.4There's an email here from Sergeant Patrick5Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis on Wednesday,6February 7th, 2018 at 7:28 p.m.7Sergeant Bloomer says, "Undersheriff Ellis,8Below is the initial applicant rankings from our TFO9Oral Boards held today:10"1. Welton11"2. Bitzer12"3. Richmond13"4. Ennis14"Please advise which two are selected for the15current openings."16Did I read that correctly?17A. Yes.18Q. Do you recall reviewing this email from Sergeant19Bloomer to Undersheriff Ellis regarding the selection20or the ranking by the committee?21A. My best recollection is that this was part of22the packet that was sent to me by Heather. And I do

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

		1	
	Page 49		Page 51
1	But I know that I in order to make things	1	they interviewed the subjects, and some internal
2	manageable, I'm not going to read every single	2	thoughts about the subjects that they felt were best.
3	Q. Sure. Yeah.	3	It could include things that they felt a
4	A word and every page of every document. Some	4	candidate did well as well as things that they feel they
5	things I'm going to scan.	5	didn't do too well in. As well as, possibly, an
6	And this was one that I probably scanned. You	6	evaluation of their résumé.
7	know, this was the selection process. And I remember	7	In other words, you might say this candidate
8	seeing the ranking. But I also remember seeing the	8	seems to lack experience or education. It depends on
9	ranking elsewhere too. So I'm not sure if I'm	9	what the job requirements are or what's been posted.
10	remembering it from this email or I believe I also	10	But those rankings from the internal candidates
11	read it somewhere else. I think probably in response to	11	seem to be missing.
12	the complaint, if I remember correctly.	12	Q. I'm going to refer you now to Document D, as in
13	Q. Okay. So this email goes out from Bloomer to	13	dog. And we'll mark this as Exhibit 3 to the
14	Ellis at 7:28 p.m. on February 7th.	14	deposition.
15	And then if we go up to the next email in the	15	(Exhibit 3 was marked.)
16	chain here, it's from Dave Ellis to Pat Bloomer on	16	BY MR. KITSON:
17	February 8th, 2018, at 1:52 p.m.	17	Q. This is a recorded interview of Deputy Dan
18	And Ellis says, "Welton and Bitzer are approved,	18	Knight conducted by Sergeant Hines on June 4th, 2019.
19	thanks."	19	I'll represent that Deputy Knight was the
20	Did I read that correctly?	20	deputy who was in charge of the Air Support Unit at this
21	A. Yes, you did.	21	time supervised by Sergeant Pat Bloomer.
22	Q. And do you understand that Dick Ellis was	22	Do you recall, specifically, if you reviewed
23	Undersheriff at the time who was who had oversight or	23	Deputy Knight's recorded interview?
24	it was within his span of control to oversee the ASU?	24	A. At this time, I can't say that I read this word
25	A. Yes, I do remember that.	25	for word. This might have been a document that I
	Page 50		Page 52
1	Q. So just to get our timeline straight here, based	1	scanned.
2	on this initial packet we see here that the oral boards	2	I I'm leaning that way, but I can't tell you
3	were scheduled for February 7th. And then on	3	for sure.
4	February 7th, same day that the oral boards were	4	Q. Okay. I'm going to I'm going to point you to
5			
	scheduled, Pat Bloomer sent an email saying here's what	5	some of the of the specific areas of testimony that I
6	the rankings were from the boards. And the next day	5 6	some of the of the specific areas of testimony that I want to ask you about here.
6 7		1	
	the rankings were from the boards. And the next day	6	want to ask you about here.
7	the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?	6 7	want to ask you about here. So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH,"
7 8	the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct? A. That is correct.	6 7 8	want to ask you about here. So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our
7 8 9	<ul><li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day</li><li>those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li><li>A. That is correct.</li><li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your</li></ul>	6 7 8 9	want to ask you about here. So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?
7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10	want to ask you about here. So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct? A. Correct.
7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH,"</li> <li>and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our</li> <li>transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how</li> <li>were the candidates scored or rated during the oral</li> <li>board interview?"</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH,"</li> <li>and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our</li> <li>transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how</li> <li>were the candidates scored or rated during the oral</li> <li>board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH,"</li> <li>and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our</li> <li>transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how</li> <li>were the candidates scored or rated during the oral</li> <li>board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form,</li> <li>there's no rating really. Each person just ends up</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH,"</li> <li>and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our</li> <li>transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how</li> <li>were the candidates scored or rated during the oral</li> <li>board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form,</li> <li>there's no rating really. Each person just ends up</li> <li>making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documentation showing</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be." Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documentation showing the rankings and selection, what documents, in your</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> <li>Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documents, in your opinion, if any, should also be a part of the archive</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> <li>Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> <li>And Deputy Knight says, "No, uh-huh (no).</li> <li>That literally that's what you get and you write notes</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documents, in your opinion, if any, should also be a part of the archive that are not here?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?" <ul> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> <li>Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> <li>And Deputy Knight says, "No, uh-huh (no).</li> </ul> </li> <li>That literally that's what you get and you write notes on it. The raters get those notes, and we write notes."</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documents, in your opinion, if any, should also be a part of the archive that are not here?</li> <li>A. You should have notes from the internal</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?"</li> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> <li>Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> <li>And Deputy Knight says, "No, uh-huh (no).</li> <li>That literally that's what you get and you write notes on it. The raters get those notes, and we write notes."</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the rankings were from the boards. And the next day those were approved by Undersheriff Ellis; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that a fairly standard process in your experience in terms of how selection goes for a specialty unit; meaning, oral boards are conducted, materials are review, the group submits a ranking that then somebody in the command staff has ultimate oversight or authority to approve or deny?</li> <li>A. That is very common, sometimes by email or sometimes by phone.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Other than the documents that we've looked at in this packet so the notice, application materials, as well as the questions that were asked during the oral boards and then documents, in your opinion, if any, should also be a part of the archive that are not here?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>want to ask you about here.</li> <li>So Tim Hines, Sergeant Hines is denoted by "TH," and Dan Knight, Deputy Knight, is "DK" in our transcript; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Tim Hines asks Deputy Knight, "So, how were the candidates scored or rated during the oral board interview?" <ul> <li>Deputy Knight says, "If you look at that form, there's no rating really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At the end, we all personally rate those people in order and then we come together as a group and decide what that order is gonna be."</li> <li>Sergeant Hines then asks, "Okay. So, there was no score sheet used?"</li> <li>And Deputy Knight says, "No, uh-huh (no).</li> </ul> </li> <li>That literally that's what you get and you write notes on it. The raters get those notes, and we write notes."</li> </ul>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

	Page 53	Page 55
1	"Uh-huh (no). No, the only time I've done	1 Q. Okay. I'm going to move us to page 5 here of
2	numerical scores was when we were testing mechanics."	2 the same transcript.
3	And Tim Hines says, "Okay. And so the raters	3 And Sergeant Hines says, "Okay. So, my
4	would write notes on the question sheet"	4 understanding is that ultimately the ratings or the
5	And Deputy Knight said, "uh-huh (yes)."	5 ranking of the four candidates were Welton was number
6	There's some interruption here.	6 one, Bitzer was number two, Richmond, number three, and
7	Moving down, Sergeant Hines asked, "Were those	7 Ennis, number four?"
8	question sheets with the comments kept?"	8 Deputy Knight says, "That was the ultimate
9	And Deputy Knight says, "Since I've been	9 result. That's correct."
10	involved in this thing since 2010 or whatever, 2008,	10 Sergeant Hines then says, "Okay. And so my
11	whenever it was, they've never been kept. They've been	11 question is what all went in, what all was taken into
12	destroyed usually. We make our notes, make our	12 the consideration in those rankings? Obviously the oral
13	recommendations, those things get thrown way."	13 board performance"
14	Tim Hines says, "Okay. So that's" and then	14 Deputy Knight says, "Uh-huh (yes)."
15	Deputy Knight interrupts and says, "That's pretty	15 Sergeant Hines then says, " was involved, but
16	standard what we've done."	16 did you also take into consideration other things like
17	So I know I read you a lot there, but did I	17 their résumé, their supervisor recommendation score,
18	generally read everything correctly?	18 their experience"
19	A. Yes, you did.	19 Deputy Knight said, "Personal experiences, sure.
20	Q. Okay. So according to Deputy Knight who was on	20 Yep. All of that came into it, yeah."
21	the oral boards and was the supervisor at the time,	21 So Sergeant Hines then says, "Okay. So, the
22	there were no scoring sheets there's no formal	22 ranking, the numerical ranking that I just mentioned
23	scoring rubric; correct?	23 took into consideration all of those different things as
24	A. That's what he said, yes.	<sup>24</sup> opposed to just their performance on the oral board?"
25	Q. Okay. So what I understand from this interview	25 Deputy Knight said, "Correct."
	Page 54	Page 56
1	is that the oral board participants, meaning those who	1 "The position" then Sergeant Hines says, "The
2	were conducting the interview, were provided a list of	2 position that they came out in, was that ranking your
3	questions that they asked. And on that list of	3 personal choice?"
4	questions, they wrote their notes if they chose to do	4 Deputy Knight said, "The way it ended up is the
5	SO.	5 way I had documented my choices. That's correct."
6	Is that your understanding as well from this	6 And then he goes on to say, "I picked Welton,
7	transcript?	7 then Bitzer, then Drew, then Matt."
8	A. Can you go back up a little bit?	8 And Hines says, "Okay."
9	Q. Sure.	9 And Deputy Knight says, "That wasn't unanimous
10	A. Prior page? So right there.	10 though."
11	"If you look at that form, there's no rating	11 Sergeant Hines says, "Okay. Do you know why it
12	really. Each person just ends up making some notes. At	12 wasn't unanimous or who"
13	the end, we all personally rate those people in an order	13And Deputy Knight interrupts, "Yeah. Jeff put
14	and then we come together as a group and decide what	14 Drew second."
15	that order is gonna be."	15 And Hines says, "Okay."
16	So yes, according to Deputy Knight's interview	16And Deputy Knight says, "Welton was number one
17	here, the way they do it, you just write your own notes	17 for everybody. Jeff Thurman was the holdout of putting
18	and then they decide who is progressing forward in the	18         Richmond second. The other three of us had Bitzer as
19	interview process or in the selection process.	19 second but majority rule so Jeff lost."
20	Q. And according to Deputy Knight, he says well,	20 That was a mouthful but did I generally read
21	going back to 2008 or 2010, we've always we've always	21 that correctly?
22	just, we've destroyed our notes.	A. Yes, you did.
23	That's what he testified to or what he said in	23 Q. Okay. So based on Deputy Knight's interview, he
24	his interview; correct?	24 said the the group took into account the résumés,
25	A. Yes.	25 supervisor recommendation score, experience, all of

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

	Page 57		Page 59
1	those things, in addition to the oral board, when they	1	appears were taken on the questions that were handed out
2	made their selection; correct?	2	to the the oral board participants, meaning those who
3	A. Yes.	3	were asking the questions, it's your opinion that those
4	Q. And according to Deputy Knight, the group the	4	should have been saved as part of the archive?
5	consensus ranking was Welton, Bitzer, Richmond, and then	5	A. That is my opinion, yes.
6	Ennis; correct?	6	Q. And you're basing that opinion on your
7	A. Yes.	7	understanding of the Washington State Archives
8	Q. And that would match up with the email that we	8	CORE requirements. And I'll we'll just refer to them
9	just looked at that Sergeant Bloomer sent to	9	for purposes of your deposition as the CORE
10	Undersheriff Ellis where he says, here is how the group	10	requirements.
11	ranked people; correct?	11	It's your is your opinion based solely on
12	MS. BARDEN: Hold on just a second. Object	12	those Washington State Archives CORE requirements?
13	to form.	13	<ol> <li>I would say it's based on the CORE requirements,</li> </ol>
14	Go ahead.	14	but I'm also relying on my experience with both Seattle
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, that would match up to	15	and Oregon State University having participated in
16	the email.	16	interview panels and been a panelist and writing
17	BY MR. KITSON:	17	questions, that upon completion of the interview process
18	Q. Okay. And according to Deputy Knight, Thurman	18	the notes of the panelist are collected.
19	was a holdout, meaning he he ranked Richmond second,	19	And in both cases in Seattle and Oregon State
20	whereas the other three had Bitzer as second. So	20	University, we felt best practice was to collect those
21	majority won out.	21	notes and give them to an HR specialist to retain in
22	And according to this, Jeff Thurman Jeff	22	order to comply with and Oregon has similar laws to
23	Thurman's, I guess, ranking did not win the day; is that	23	Washington. I don't know what the retention period is,
24	accurate?	24	but there is a similar law in Oregon regarding
25	A. Yes, it is.	25	retention.
	Page 58		Page 60
1		1	
1	Q. Okay. So is this is this a fairly standard		So we give those results to the HR specialist,
2	description of a process for selection for a specialty	2	who then retains them for a certain period of time. And
3 4	unit within an agency like the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?	4	then the records are destroyed.
5		5	MR. KITSON: I'm going to pull up Document C.
6	<ul> <li>A. Yes. It's very common that the interview panelists won't always agree one hundred percent.</li> </ul>	6	And I'll represent that this is the
7	So there's some give-and-take and some	7	"Washington Local Government Common Records Retention
8	back-and-forth at the end of the process in order to	8	Schedule" or CORE.
9	arrive at the final candidate list.	9	And we're going to mark this as Exhibit 4 to
10	Q. Okay.	10	your deposition today.
11	A. Or majority rules here. That's another method	11	(Exhibit 4 was marked.)
12	mentioned here.	12	BY MR. KITSON:
13	Q. Okay. So I'm going to refer back to your report	13	Q. Is this the document that you're referring to
14	and your opinions. I'm going to first look at Opinion A	14	when you refer to the CORE or record retention CORE
15	here. The last two sentences you state: "In this case,	15	schedule in your report?
16	the internal ranking documents based on the interview	16	A. Yes, it is.
17	panels for ASU were destroyed. In my opinion,	17	Q. Okay. And I'm going to move us all the way to
18	destroying these records does not allow the Plaintiff	18	page 142.
19	full access to the results of the interview process."	19	A. A little larger, please.
20	What ranking documents are you referring to	20	Q. Sure. Is that better?
21	there in that portion of your opinion?	21	A. Thank you.
22	A. The internal notes from the candidates regarding	22	Q. In your opinion in Opinion A, you refer, I
23	the qualifications and results of the oral board	23	believe, to this section, which is Section GS50-04B-22,
24	interview of the candidates.	24	which is the section related to recruitment and hiring.
25	Q. So it's your opinion that the notes which it	25	Is that correct? Is that in your in Opinion

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

	Page 61		Page 63
1	A, is this the section that you're referring to?	1	Q. This section says that the under the
2	A. Yes, it is. The numbers match up. This was the	2	description of records, it lists a number of different
3	document I looked at.	3	types of records that are to be retained for three years
4	Q. Was this a document that was provided to you by	4	after the position is filled or the recruitment effort
5	Ms. Barden?	5	is terminated.
6	A. No. it was not.	6	The first bullet point is for employment
7	Q. Okay. What is your experience, if any, related	7	requisitions. So position specifications, needs
8	to these Local Government Common Record Retention	8	analysis and authorizations, requests to fill, desired
9	Schedule?	9	qualifications, et cetera.
10	A. When I was an internal investigator and an EEO	10	In this case would you agree we have that?
11	investigator and as a police manager with Seattle Police	11	We have the notice of posting related to the
12	Department, I had specific training classes on records	12	position; correct?
13	retention.	13	A. Correct. We do have that advertisement that you
14	I was not the one retaining the records, but it	14	are talking about, or that notice, yes.
15	was important that I knew that the standards existed and	15	Q. Okay. And then down a couple points we have two
16	not to destroy records and to make sure that we kept	16	bullet points for the third one, job announcements and
17	those records for a certain period of time.	17	postings. We have the job announcement and posting
18	And in whether I worked for internal affairs	18	related to this position; correct?
19	or whether I worked with human resources as the EEO	19	A. Yes.
20	specialist, after periods of time I would go in and	20	Q. The next bullet point is applications, résumés,
21	destroy records if they had met the guidelines outlined	21	test results, and background checks of successful
22	in CORE.	22	applicants, including applicants screened but not
23	So I was basically following my training that we	23	interviewed.
24	kept everything for a certain period of time. Three	24	So we have applications. We have the résumés.
25	years is very common. Some things are more sensitive	25	Correct?
	Page 62		Page 64
1	and you get a five-year retention. Some things you	1	A. One correction there. You said "successful"
2	never get rid of in any case. And then I would destroy	2	applicants and this says "unsuccessful."
3	those documents.	3	Q. I'm sorry. You are correct.
4	So I was using my training and experience to	4	So you're supposed to say if this applies,
5	find the CORE requirements that pertained to this HR	5	you are supposed to save the materials for both those
6	recruiting and hiring for the ASU position.	6	who are successful and those who are unsuccessful;
7	Q. When was the last time you received training	7	correct?
8	related to CORE?	8	A. Correct.
9	A. It probably would have been in the late 2000s.	9	Q. Okay. And here we have the applicant materials;
10	I don't remember anything between late 2010 and now.	10	correct? So the applications and the résumés
11	Q. Looking back at this this section that you've	11	correct? for each of the four applicants.
12	cited, do you know that this section it talks about	12	A. Are you on bullet point five?
13	records relating to process of recruiting, interviewing,	13	Q. No. I'm still on four. So I just want to make
14	selecting, and hiring of employees.	14	sure that so we looked at there were four
15	Do you know if this applies to only employees	15	applicants here: Welton, Bitzer, Richmond, and Ennis,
16	who are applicants to a new position or also to internal	16	and we have the materials that they submitted as part of
17	positions such as the ASU unit?	17	that process; correct?
18	A. The way I read this and the way I've been	18	A. Yes.
19	trained, is that this applies in this case. It does	19	Q. And there weren't any test results? This wasn't
20 21	apply for an internal job posting where you are giving	20	a position where there was actually testing; correct?
I 21	employees an opportunity to apply for a position that	21	So that wouldn't be applicable here.
	you're going to keep these records in second-records		
22	you're going to keep those records in accordance with	22	MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to the
22 23	what's written here.	23	form.
22			

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

	Page 65		Page 67
1	define test results.	1	your knowledge and your ability to then communicate that
2	Could that be the results of the oral board	2	information back to a panel.
3	interview that that might be part of your process of	3	So in that way, it is absolutely a test.
4	testing someone to see if they are going to be	4	If we're thinking back to school children
5	successful in the position.	5	sitting down with a piece of paper and a pencil and a
6	Although, I do see a bullet point later	6	No. 2 pencil, that's another type of test. A Scantron
7	later with interview questions and tests.	7	is another type of test. An oral board. A writing
8	So I think the results of that would be	8	essay. These are all tests that can be used to
9	applicable, yes.	9	determine when someone is suitable for a position.
10	BY MR. KITSON:	10	So yes, it is absolutely a test.
11	Q. There wasn't a test; correct?	11	Q. So going down here, there's also a bullet point
12	l mean, there was no, like applicants didn't	12	of screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.
13	have to sit down for, like, a civil service exam or	13	You would agree that we have the screening,
14	anything like that as part of this process; correct?	14	scoring, and ranking criteria in terms of documentation
15	A. Again, I think it depends on your definition of	15	that is part of the archive that we've reviewed as part
16	test.	16	of Exhibit 2; correct?
17	Having taken and given a lot of oral boards,	17	MS. BARDEN: Objection to form.
18	there's some studying that goes on and you have to know	18	THE WITNESS: Sorry. I think that is
19	your material. Whether you are going to write it down	19	lacking at this point.
20	on a paper form, on a computer, or if you are going to	20	I believe that what you and I discussed
21	give an oral presentation. It's very similar that you	21	earlier, we looked at an email where the undersheriff is
22	need to know what you're talking about. You need to be	22	notified of the ranking order and the two that the panel
23	able to answer questions, you need to be smart about	23	would like to see considered to move forward in the
24	your subject matter, and you need to do well in the	24	process and the Undersheriff agreed.
25	scoring of those answers.	25	However, I think what you're missing, unless
	Page 66		Page 68
1		1	
1 2	So to me, it's all related. It's I would	1	there was something I missed, is where is the screening, scoring, and selection criteria. We did see the
3	call it a test, absolutely. Q. I mean, here there's a distinction between	3	ranking. I agree with you there.
4	interview questions and tests.	4	BY MR. KITSON:
5	You would agree that what we have here is a list	5	Q. Well, if you if you if we go back to
6	of interview questions; correct? Not a test.	6	Deputy Knight's testimony, which we examined a few
7	A. I'm going to define test as the ability to	7	minutes ago, Deputy Knight said we interviewed them, we
8	regurgitate information that you have stored in your	8	looked at the application materials that they submitted,
9	brain. Again, whether you are doing it on paper or	9	and then we as a group came up with the ranking. There
10	computer or orally, it's all a test of your knowledge	10	was not there's not a scoring there's not a box
11	and your ability to relate that information and to	11	checked. There is not like, this isn't a
12	communicate it. It's all about communication. And,	12	position where they didn't fill out those rankings.
13	again, whether written or oral, to me, it's all related.	13	We have that testimony where Deputy Knight described
14	Q. Okay. So in your opinion, any time well,	14	that process.
15	strike that.	15	So my question for you is I mean, let me just
16	In your opinion, any time there's an interview,	16	ask it this way. Other than the notes that were
17	that's the same thing as a test for purposes	17	specified that were taken on the test questions, is
18	MS. BARDEN: Objection to form. That was	18	there anything that you can point to that in your
19	not the testimony. Sorry.	19	opinion should have been saved but were not as part of
20	MR. KITSON: I'll state it again.	20	this process?
	-		
21	BY MR. KITSON:	21	A. I think you've highlighted the thing that's
21 22	BY MR. KITSON: Q. So I understand your opinion correctly, under	22	missing is how did they score those candidates in order
21 22 23	BY MR. KITSON: Q. So I understand your opinion correctly, under these CORE guidelines, you don't make a distinction	22 23	missing is how did they score those candidates in order to arrive at those rankings.
21 22 23 24	BY MR. KITSON: Q. So I understand your opinion correctly, under these CORE guidelines, you don't make a distinction between an interview and a test; correct?	22 23 24	missing is how did they score those candidates in order to arrive at those rankings. <b>Q. Was there anything that would require them to</b>
21 22 23	BY MR. KITSON: Q. So I understand your opinion correctly, under these CORE guidelines, you don't make a distinction	22 23	missing is how did they score those candidates in order to arrive at those rankings.

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

	Page 69		Page 71
1	The way I hear Deputy Knight's, I guess,	1	if they had already pre-decided. Again, I'm going
2	testimony in his interview – let me know if you think	2	hypothetically here. What if they had already
3	differently is he said there wasn't scoring. We each	3	pre-decided who their favorite was or their two
4	went around and talked about how we viewed the	4	favorites. And anyone else, it doesn't matter how well
5	applicants in terms of their candidacy and we came up	5	they scored, they have already pre-decided that someone
6	with a consensus list.	6	else is going to get the position.
7	When you say scoring, I'm not sure what you're		You're you're denying the ability of that
8	talking about. That doesn't seem to be something to me	8	person that didn't get the position to to say, wait a
9	that they did as part of this process.	9	second, I would like some proof.
10	A. In my opinion, we should have the notes that	10	These are government records. Where are they?
11	everyone took in order to basically do what we're doing	11	The law says they need to be kept. I would like to
12	today or in a court of law where we now look back and	12	examine them. And that's lacking in this case.
13	let's say someone is contesting the results of an	13	Q. You would agree that there was no requirement
14	interview process. Other than an internal email, how do	14	that any of the folks who were conducting the interviews
15	we then discern what everyone felt were the strengths	15	take notes; correct?
16	and weaknesses of the candidates' answers? We don't	16	MS. BARDEN: Object to form.
17	have any idea at this point because no one kept a record	17	THE WITNESS: I think if you look back again
18	of that. That's what's missing.	18	at CORE and in my training and experience and the way
19	Q. Sorry. Go ahead.	19	I'm reading it right now, that that all this material
20	A. I was pretty much done.	20	needs to be retained.
21	But that's what we're missing is how do we know	21	And I think the law
22	how well each person answered.	22	BY MR. KITSON:
23	How would you you know, hypothetically, how	23	Q. I'm going to stop you because that wasn't my
24	would you prove, wait a second, I answered those	24	question.
25	questions spot on. There wasn't a single information	25	My question is
23		25	
	Page 70		Page 72
1	there's no way that someone could have answered better	1	A. I thought it was. Sorry.
2	than me. I'm just giving a hypothetical here.	2	
3		4	Q. My question is not whether I understand your
	Well, how do we prove that? How do we show, no,	3	Q. My question is not whether I understand your position on their retention.
4	Well, how do we prove that? How do we show, no, actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look		
4 5	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look	3	position on their retention.
	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety	3 4	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any
5	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better	3 4 5	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from
5 6	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they	3 4 5 6	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were
5 6 7	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better	3 4 5 6 7	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?
5 6 7 8	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have	3 4 5 6 7 8	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct?
5 6 7 8 9	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct? They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on
5 6 7 8 9 10	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct? They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct? They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection. We don't know who did or didn't take notes;
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct? They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection. We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	position on their retention. But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes? They don't have to take notes; correct? They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection. We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct? A. At this point, we do not.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final results.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us whether they were somehow predisposed or biased against</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final results. Which is absolutely true. That is the way it	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us whether they were somehow predisposed or biased against somebody; right?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final results. Which is absolutely true. That is the way it happens. There is this discussion. It's give and take	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us whether they were somehow predisposed or biased against somebody; right?</li> <li>I mean, people that are taking notes don't</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final results. Which is absolutely true. That is the way it happens. There is this discussion. It's give and take that I mentioned earlier, back and forth, where the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us whether they were somehow predisposed or biased against somebody; right?</li> <li>I mean, people that are taking notes don't usually write something that's that revealing about the</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actually, if you look at this candidate's answers, look here, they talked about this aspect and this safety protocol and this patrol procedure and they had a better answer than you. And in this question, look here, they answered better than you in this question, too. So we don't have that information. All we have is this this ranking that occurs at the end. So how are we to tell with what criteria did the panelists come up with their final ranking? I agree we have the final ranking, but we don't have any information about how they arrived at that decision. We just have Deputy Knight, like you and I discussed, with his interview talking about, yeah, you know, after it was done, we came up with our final results. Which is absolutely true. That is the way it happens. There is this discussion. It's give and take that I mentioned earlier, back and forth, where the panelists then arrive at the final selection process.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>position on their retention.</li> <li>But my question for you is are you aware of any policy or procedure within the Sheriff's Office or from elsewhere that would require that the folks that were conducting the interviews take notes?</li> <li>They don't have to take notes; correct?</li> <li>They can sit and conduct interviews and rely on their own recollection.</li> <li>We don't know who did or didn't take notes; correct?</li> <li>A. At this point, we do not.</li> <li>Q. And there is nothing that you can point me to that says they were required to take notes?</li> <li>A. No, I can't point to anything that says they were required to take notes.</li> <li>Q. And a person's notes likely wouldn't show us whether they were somehow predisposed or biased against somebody; right?</li> <li>I mean, people that are taking notes don't usually write something that's that revealing about the way that they think; correct?</li> </ul>

	Page 73	Page 75
1	doing a lot of these tests and interviewing a lot of	1 Isn't that fitting within the records retention
2	people that after you've listen to four people back to	2 schedule here related to transitory notes or transitory
3	back to back to back it is going to be helpful to you to	3 records?
4	have some notes as to how well they answered the	4 MS. BARDEN: Objection to form.
5	questions. Because then you are going to have a	5 Go ahead.
6	discussion with those other panelists which occurred	6 THE WITNESS: I would disagree with you
7	at this time. They did talk about that.	7 there. Specifically because they bold this, where not
8	And I agree with you. I don't know that	8 covered by a more specific records series, which again,
9	there's anything that required them to write anything	9 I think would refer us back to personnel selection,
10	down. But I don't think you are doing a good thorough	10 candidate selection, testing process that you and I
11	job if you don't. Because then how do you come back to	11 discussed earlier.
12	the group and then say, look at the answer to Question	12 BY MR. KITSON:
13	2. And here's where I think the candidate did really	13 Q. So go ahead. Sorry. Don't mean to interrupt
14	well or here's where I don't think they did well. Maybe	14 <b>you.</b>
15	you can do it off memory. Maybe they have better	15 A. That's okay. From what I remember, this
16	memories than I do. But my experience is that by taking	16 training and having participated in brainstorming
17	notes, you've helped refer yourself and others, as well	17 sessions like this, is let's say there's a problem and
18	as keep a record as to how well they did on the	18 you want to address some different solutions as to how
19	questions.	19 to solve that problem. It might be a crime problem. It
20	And were they thorough, were they accurate,	20 might be a computer issue or something like that.
21	or were they really lacking in their communication	And so you're there with a work group and people
22	skills or their ability to recall information or ability	are throwing out ideas and discussing possibilities and
23	to process a lot of information.	things. Nothing has been decided on and that's really
24	BY MR. KITSON:	24 what the section that you brought up refers to.
25	Q. Okay. I'm directing to and this is, again,	25 These are things that might help us move in a
	Page 74	Page 76
1		
1		1 direction It's it's collection of ideas and
	in Exhibit 4. This is Section 6, which relates to	1 direction. It's it's a collection of ideas and
2	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory	2 suggestions, but it's not official department records.
2 3	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."	<ol> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> </ol>
2 3 4	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records." Are you familiar with the concept of transitory	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records." Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?	<ol> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> </ol>
2 3 4	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records." Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE? A. Yes, I am.	<ul> <li>2 suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>3 It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>4 something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>5 brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>6 human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records." Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE? A. Yes, I am. Q. So these are records created or received by the	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records." Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE? A. Yes, I am. Q. So these are records created or received by the	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>notes that's specifically specified in this recruitment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>notes that's specifically specified in this recruitment</li> <li>section?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>notes that's specifically specified in this recruitment</li> <li>section?</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> <li>We have a group of people who are brainstorming and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>notes that's specifically specified in this recruitment</li> <li>section?</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> <li>screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> <li>We have a group of people who are brainstorming and collaborating about how to rank a group of candidates.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> <li>screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.</li> <li>That bullet point seems to specifically refer back to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> <li>We have a group of people who are brainstorming and collaborating about how to rank a group of candidates. They came up with their ranking, they advised the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>action?</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> <li>screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.</li> <li>That bullet point seems to specifically refer back to</li> <li>how do you arrive at your final ranking?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> <li>We have a group of people who are brainstorming and collaborating about how to rank a group of candidates. They came up with their ranking, they advised the undersheriff of that ranking, and then they got rid of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>notes that's specifically specified in this recruitment</li> <li>section?</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> <li>screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.</li> <li>That bullet point seems to specifically refer back to</li> <li>how do you arrive at your final ranking?</li> <li>What information did you rely on and how did you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>"Records with Minimal Retention Value or Transitory Records."</li> <li>Are you familiar with the concept of transitory records under CORE?</li> <li>A. Yes, I am.</li> <li>Q. So these are records created or received by the agency which are typically of short-term or temporary informational value; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And down here at the second section, Section 2, it talks about Brainstorming and Collaborating. And it says, "Records generated as part of informal exchanges of ideas/brainstorming/collaboration processes, where not covered by a more specific records series."</li> <li>And it "Includes, but is not limited to, notes" And in that case it is retained until no longer needed for agency business and then destroyed. So here, wouldn't you say that's what we have?</li> <li>We have a group of people who are brainstorming and collaborating about how to rank a group of candidates. They came up with their ranking, they advised the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestions, but it's not official department records.</li> <li>It's not official department process, but it is</li> <li>something that might lead to that. It's that</li> <li>brainstorming session of problem solving that, you know,</li> <li>human beings engage in and sometimes a variety of</li> <li>meetings in order to arrive at a solution.</li> <li>So I would disagree with you at that point, that</li> <li>especially where it says where it's not covered by</li> <li>something else.</li> <li>I think it would mean that it's referring you</li> <li>back to that personnel section that we reviewed. In</li> <li>fact, that's on the screen right now.</li> <li>Q. And so I don't see anywhere in that section that</li> <li>you are relying upon, the recruitment section, that has</li> <li>interview notes.</li> <li>Is there anywhere in here that says interview</li> <li>action?</li> <li>A. I think that would be covered under the</li> <li>screening, scoring, ranking, and selection criteria.</li> <li>That bullet point seems to specifically refer back to</li> <li>how do you arrive at your final ranking?</li> </ul>

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

	Page 77		Page 79
1	order to achieve the results that you and I looked at on	1	went through the process?
2	that email.	2	I don't think so. I've never found that
3	Q. If those who are taking interview or	3	I've never worried about that, nor have I found anyone
4	conducting interviews know that their notes are going to	4	else that ever worried because of a PDR that their
5	be subject to the Public Records Act and can be	5	evaluation of a coworker is now going to become
6	requested by anybody in the process.	6	available to that coworker through a disclosure request.
7	So, for example, these folks know that Deputy	7	I've not found that.
8	Ennis or Deputy Richmond or Deputy Bitzer or Corporal	8	BY MR. KITSON:
9	Welton could request their interview notes at any time,	9	Q. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1. I'm moving
10	wouldn't that have a chilling effect on their desire to	10	to Opinion B.
11	take truthful notes?	11	You write: "In my opinion, if Deputy Bitzer was
12	So, for example, if I really don't think that	12	provided a list of questions ahead of the ASU
13	Deputy Bitzer did a good job in her interview, am I	13	interviews, this would not uphold industry standards of
14	really going to be critical of her in my notes when I	14	fairness in hiring."
15	know that my own colleague could make a records request	15	Correct?
16	for those very same notes at any point in time?	16	A. Yes.
17	MS. BARDEN: Objection to form.	17	Q. Now, am I correct in understanding that you have
18	THE WITNESS: It's an interesting question.	18	not you're not making any finding as to or
19	It's been my experience, largely backed up	19	offering opinion as to whether Bitzer was provided
20	by many years of doing this in two different large	20	questions or not. You're saying that if, in fact, she
21	organizations, the people that serve as interview	21	was, that it would be unfair or out of industry
22	panelists are there generally for the right reason,	22	standards in your opinion.
23	because they want to make their place of work better.	23	Is that accurate?
24	And they want to get the best people to work with the	24	A. It is accurate if you combine it with the next
25	most creative, the most collaborative, the most	25	line there. I kind of further define it. It's okay to
	Page 78		Page 80
1	professional whatever criteria they are looking for.	1	provide it as long as everyone is provided the same
2	That they probably a lot of them probably work in	2	information. But if you are giving one candidate an
3	that unit or they are a supervisor that might oversee	3	advantage and denying that opportunity to the others,
4	that unit. And, generally, the desire is to get good	4	that would be improper.
5	quality people in there to make your unit better, to	5	Q. Do you have any understanding one way or another
6	make the department better, to make the city or county	6	as to whether or not Deputy Bitzer was actually provided
7	better.	7	a list of questions ahead of her interview for the unit?
8	So I think that's the general purpose that	8	A. No, I don't. And that's why I put the if in
9	people volunteer it is generally volunteers. You can	9	there. In the review of the materials that I had there
10	be voluntold, but generally volunteer to work in these	10	wasn't enough information at that time for me to render
11	environments. And they want to do the right thing and	11	a credible opinion to as to whether she was or was
12	they want to do a good job.	12	not provided a list of questions ahead of time. That's
13	It's been I can't think of a single time	13	why I couched it a bit. I did put the if in there, and
14	where I came out of an interview panel whether I'm	14	then I further clarified.
15	the hiring manager or just an interview panelist	15	If it was under this guideline where everyone
16	where I felt why was so and so here? They don't care	16	gets the questions, that's fine. You know, some
17	about this process. They didn't do any rankings. They	17	interviews happen that way.
18	didn't ask good questions. They appeared to be dozing	18	But if ahead of time someone has an unfair
19	off or not paying attention.	19	advantage over others, that would be that would be
20	I've never found that. I found that people	20	unfair.
21	generally want to be there and they want their workplace	21	Q. Do you have any specific recollection of
22	a better place to work.	22	reviewing Deputy Bitzer's interview transcript from her
		1	
23	So now to your question: Are they concerned	23	interview either of her interviews with Sergeant
24	that their coworker will come and see the results of	24	Hines?
			-

	Page 81	Page 83
1	Q. Do you have a recollection of what Bitzer said	1 Hey, how was your interview process when you applied
2	is that she spoke with another Deputy who she identified	2 for let's say the ASU. And, again, a bit
3	as Deputy Acosta before her interview about what to	3 hypothetical here because I don't remember this
4	expect during the ASU selection process?	4 interview specifically but if she did that with this
5	MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.	5 deputy, I don't necessarily have a problem with that,
6	That's not what it says.	6 unless Acosta had private information that only the
7	BY MR. KITSON:	7 panelists knew. If he knew he or she. If he or she
8	Q. Go ahead, if you can.	<ul> <li>knew the questions ahead of time or that the unit had</li> </ul>
9	A. I don't remember that name specifically at this	9 discussed what questions they want to see asked by the
10	point. I remember and this is kind of a general	10 panel, there you could get into a gray area or even
11	description.	11 possibly a misconduct issue. But I didn't and let's
12	To get more specific, we might want to get and	12 get back to the short answer. I didn't see that in this
13	find that actual interview. But I do remember her	13 case.
14	mentioning something about talking with the process with	14 So that's why I couched it my answer with an
15	someone and finding out some information about how the	15 if. I don't think it was up to me to decide whether she
16	interview would go.	16 was or not at that point. I didn't have enough
17	Kind of kind of what you were talking about.	17 information to make that opinion. But if she was given
18	But I don't remember if that's the person that she	18 an advantage that the others were not, it it could be
19	talked to or not.	19 problematic.
20	And based on what I read, I couldn't come to an	Q. So would it be an unfair advantage if she had
21	absolute determination that she was given an advantage	gone to Deputy Acosta who wasn't one of the people who
22	or not, based on the information that I had.	22 was conducting the interviews, and said, Hey, let me
23	Q. Do you have any recollection of reviewing an	23 what should I expect?
24	interview of a Deputy Acosta at this part of the	And he said, Look, you should be able to answer
25	process?	questions about why you want to be on the unit or about,
	-	
	Page 82	Page 84
1	A. At this point, I do not remember that interview.	1 you know, your commitment to callouts and be able to
2	Q. Okay. If Deputy Bitzer had gone to another	2 explain, like, what types of things you've done to
3	deputy who was already on the unit and said, hey, what	3 prepare yourself for the position.
4	can I expect during the process as I try to get this	4 Would that type of, I guess, information or
5	position, would there be anything improper about that?	5 provision of that type of information by Deputy Acosta
6	For her to go to somebody and ask that question.	6 be inappropriate or unfair in any way?
7	A. I have a short answer and a long answer to that.	7 A. No, I don't believe so.
8	The short answer is no, unless and here's the	8 Q. I'm going to go back to Exhibit 2. And looking
9	longer answer. Unless that person has somehow that	9 back at Exhibit 2, pages 2 and 3, which are the Tactical
10	they have information to give to them that others don't	10 Flight Officer oral examination questions.
11	have.	11         If I remember correctly, you testified earlier
12	In other words, I'm not going to fault Deputy	12 that you weren't sure that you'd you'd reviewed this
13	Bitzer for using some initiative. And you want to	13 specific list of questions; is that accurate?
14	know this is very common, especially in police	A. My best recollection is that I might have
15	departments when people want to get into specialty	skimmed these questions, but I didn't really commit them
1 1 0	units, there's there's usually an interview process.	16 to memory or write anything down about them. So I kind
16		
17	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite	17 of remember looking at this but, again, that might be
17 18	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there.	18 one of the documents that I scanned more than actually
17 18 19	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close	<ul><li>18 one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li><li>19 read.</li></ul>
17 18 19 20	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than	<ol> <li>one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>read.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> </ol>
17 18 19 20 21	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than they do sometimes their own families.	<ol> <li>one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>read.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> <li>review this because I want to ask you questions about</li> </ol>
17 18 19 20 21 22	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than they do sometimes their own families. So there's going to be that I don't have a	<ol> <li>one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>read.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> <li>review this because I want to ask you questions about</li> <li>it, so I'm going to let you read it. You can either</li> </ol>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than they do sometimes their own families. So there's going to be that I don't have a problem if someone wants to go and get some background	<ul> <li>18 one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>19 read.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> <li>21 review this because I want to ask you questions about</li> <li>22 it, so I'm going to let you read it. You can either</li> <li>23 read it here on your screen or you can pull it up</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than they do sometimes their own families. So there's going to be that I don't have a problem if someone wants to go and get some background information.	<ul> <li>18 one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>19 read.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> <li>21 review this because I want to ask you questions about</li> <li>22 it, so I'm going to let you read it. You can either</li> <li>23 read it here on your screen or you can pull it up</li> <li>24 yourself.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And there's going to be recommendations made, quite often, by the people that work there. Because they sometimes work in very close quarters and they might see more of these people than they do sometimes their own families. So there's going to be that I don't have a problem if someone wants to go and get some background	<ul> <li>18 one of the documents that I scanned more than actually</li> <li>19 read.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. I'm going to give you a second just to</li> <li>21 review this because I want to ask you questions about</li> <li>22 it, so I'm going to let you read it. You can either</li> <li>23 read it here on your screen or you can pull it up</li> </ul>

	Page 85	Page 87
1	then you can let me know when to move down.	1 small department, there are going to be some positions
2	A. Yeah. Let's just leave it up right here.	2 that that are very desirable that you're going to get
3	You can move down to six. Okay. Stop there.	<sup>3</sup> a large number of candidates applying to.
4	Okay. Let's go down to nine. And that looks	4 Even in a small department at let's say you
5	like all. Okay. All right, Mike.	5 might be the only detective in that department, that
6	BY MR. KITSON:	6 might that's probably a pretty desirable position.
7	Q. So would you agree that other than Questions 6	7 You are going to get daytime hours. You get to work in
8	and 7, which are very specific type of hypothetical	<ul> <li>8 plain clothes. You get your own car. Those are very</li> <li>9 desirable.</li> </ul>
9 10	questions, that the remaining questions are all the types of questions that an applicant could have	
11	reasonably expected to be asked in this type of oral	10In this case, I would think that the Air Support11Unit would be a very desirable position within the
12	board?	12 Sheriff's Office there.
13	A. Let me just see the second page, quickly.	13 You're going to get those callouts, which means
14	Yeah. I agree with you. Those two are very	14 the overtime pay. So you're going to be responding to
15	specific tactical exercises to think on your feet. And	15 important incidents. And you get to get let's say a
16	the others, I would say, are of a more general nature of	16 bird's eye view, for lack of a better term, of what's
17	your suitability for the position. How have you	17 going on. And you're going to get a lot of great
18	prepared yourself? And then how are you going to	18 training that comes with that.
19	respond to some of the conflicts, let's say, that could	19 And from there you might be able to parlay that
20	occur as an ASU member? Whether it is with your pilot	20 experience into other positions. In other words, when
21	or officers on the ground. Or it looked like there was	an interview is taking place, you want to see that
22	a question about a county official and your suitability	22 someone has tried some different things in the
23	of being called out.	department, that they have specialized, that they have
24	So yes, I would say those are actually very good	applied themselves, and that they have a good wealth of
25	questions and some that most any officer could be	25 experience.
	Page 86	Page 88
	rage oo	
1	our acted to another if you ware to increte actinte on Air	
1	expected to answer if you were trying to get into an Air	1 And everyone comes from different positions.
2	Support Unit.	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> </ol>
2 3	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> </ol>
2 3 4	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> </ol>
2 3	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't	<ol> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> </ul>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you.	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Give me a moment to object. THE WITNESS: Sorry. BY MR. KITSON:	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Give me a moment to object. THE WITNESS: Sorry. BY MR. KITSON: Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Give me a moment to object. THE WITNESS: Sorry. BY MR. KITSON:	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Support Unit. Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants? A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Give me a moment to object. THE WITNESS: Sorry. BY MR. KITSON: Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> <li>Opinion C.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> <li>Opinion C.</li> <li>You say that the Air Support Unit is a desirable</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> <li>Field Training Officers. And we had to entice people</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you. MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form. Give me a moment to object. THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> <li>Opinion C. You say that the Air Support Unit is a desirable position.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> <li>Field Training Officers. And we had to entice people</li> <li>with overtime in order to get them to sign up. I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you. <ul> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MR. KITSON: <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Opinion C. <ul> <li>You say that the Air Support Unit is a desirable position.</li> <li>What do you mean when you say that?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> <li>Field Training Officers. And we had to entice people</li> <li>with overtime in order to get them to sign up. I was</li> <li>never in charge with the unit, but having served as an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you. <ul> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MR. KITSON: <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Opinion C. <ul> <li>You say that the Air Support Unit is a desirable position.</li> <li>What do you mean when you say that?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> <li>Field Training Officers. And we had to entice people</li> <li>with overtime in order to get them to sign up. I was</li> <li>never in charge with the unit, but having served as an</li> <li>FTO and supervised a large number of FTOs when I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Support Unit.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that if Deputy Bitzer had gone to somebody like Deputy Acosta, who was not part of the process, and he said, you know, Look, you'll be asked to provide you will probably be asked to provide some of this general type of information; that, again, wouldn't be tipping her off or giving her unfair advantage over other applicants?</li> <li>A. I would agree with you. <ul> <li>MS. BARDEN: I'm going to object to form.</li> <li>Give me a moment to object.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MR. KITSON: <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to document oops. I think I just accidently got rid of my Document A. Hold on.</li> <li>Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, again.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Opinion C. <ul> <li>You say that the Air Support Unit is a desirable position.</li> <li>What do you mean when you say that?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And everyone comes from different positions.</li> <li>But now you're you bring in a a list of candidates</li> <li>and one person has only done one job their whole career</li> <li>and someone else has, you know, every two, three, or</li> <li>five years. They have moved around. They have tried</li> <li>something different. They have volunteered. They have</li> <li>put themselves out there. And they picked up new skills</li> <li>and abilities that came with that. So I would think</li> <li>that this ASU position would be a very desirable</li> <li>position to have for those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I know you were an FTO or Field Training</li> <li>Officer; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I was.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that being a Field Training</li> <li>Officer is a desirable position within an agency like</li> <li>the Spokane County Sheriff's Office?</li> <li>A. That's a difficult question to answer, because</li> <li>I'm basing that on my experience in Seattle.</li> <li>And, actually, we have a hard time recruiting</li> <li>Field Training Officers. And we had to entice people</li> <li>with overtime in order to get them to sign up. I was</li> <li>never in charge with the unit, but having served as an</li> <li>FTO and supervised a large number of FTOs when I was</li> </ul>

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

	Page 89		Page 91
1	position. So I can't really say whether it is for the	1 c	different support from different units. You're getting,
2	Sheriff's Office or not. I think there are some things		you know, additional funding and oversight. And rather
3	that we could have improved in our FTO program in		han working on one small problem, you might take that
4	Seattle that would have made it more desirable.		and work it into a large operation. Maybe what is just
5	I think most people that wanted to do it, were		viewed as a burglary is actually now a whole crime ring
6	there for the right reasons. But we definitely needed		of burglars operating under, you know, centralized
7	more people there was good people that worked in SPD		eadership that now go out into the neighbors. And it
8	that did not put themselves out there as Field Training		night lead to a pawn operation and a sting.
9	Officers. So I can't really say whether it is for the	9	Yeah, I'm very familiar with things like this.
10	Sheriff's Office or not.	10 A	And there's there's a lot of advantages to having
11	Q. Are you aware within the Spokane County		hese types of multi-agency responses.
12	Sheriff's Office, at least when Andrew Richmond was	12	Q. Is selection to a task force like that generally
13	there, that if you were an FTO, as a deputy, you would	13 \	viewed as desirable?
14	not have to serve or work as a detective or a corporal	14	A. I would say, yes. Because, again, you're going
15	in order to become a sergeant within the patrol unit.	15 t	o have some advantages. You're going to get some
16	You could essentially kind of skip that step in the	16 s	specialized training. You might get your own car. You
17	rankings as a result of having served as an FTO?	17 r	night feel like you're making a bigger difference than
18	A. I was not aware of that.	18 j	ust being a patrol officer; that you now respond with
19	Q. Would that be a significant benefit to, you	19 <b>c</b>	other agents from all those different agencies that you
20	know, folks who or deputies who wanted to advance, to	20 r	mentioned and it's gonna give you some notoriety and
21	be able to work as an FTO and skip that, I guess that	21 s	some credibility within the department.
22	training or that ranking, if they wanted to become a	22	Q. Were you aware that Andrew Richmond was offered
23	patrol sergeant?		a position on the Safe Streets Task Force in July of
24	A. I could see that being an advantage for some	24 2	2019?
25	people, yes.	25	A. I did read that. And I'm trying to remember
	Page 90		
			Page 92
1		1 1	Page 92
1	Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected		et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly
2	Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?	2 v	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes.
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li><li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the</li></ul>	2 v 3	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li><li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li></ul>	2 v 3 4 <b>E</b>	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 <b>E</b> 5	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 <b>E</b> 5 6 <b>a</b>	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 \$	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 \$	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 5 9 0 10 11 12 9 13 0 14 0	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, the</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c 14 c 15 16 t 17 a	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c 14 c 15 16 t 17 a	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially,</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 5 9 0 10 11 12 9 13 14 0 15 16 t 17 2 18 2 19 19 19	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c 14 c 15 16 t 17 a 18 a 19 20 i	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and information shared, and in light of the fact he was one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang activity and drug trafficking in the Spokane County area.</li> <li>Is that type of task force something that is</li> </ul>	2 v 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 c 10 11 12 y 13 c 14 c 15 16 t 17 a 18 a 19 20 i 21 c	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and information shared, and in light of the fact he was one of only two black officers at the time, is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang activity and drug trafficking in the Spokane County area.</li> <li>Is that type of task force something that is commonplace in in law enforcement agencies?</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 5 9 C 10 11 12 Y 13 C 14 C 15 16 t 17 2 18 2 19 20 i 21 C 22 U	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and information shared, and in light of the fact he was one of only two black officers at the time, is it understandable for you that these sergeants would not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang activity and drug trafficking in the Spokane County area.</li> <li>Is that type of task force something that is commonplace in in law enforcement agencies?</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 a 7 F 8 s 9 C 10 11 12 y 13 C 14 C 15 16 t 17 a 18 a 19 20 i 21 C 22 L 23 F	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and information shared, and in light of the fact he was one of only two black officers at the time, is it understandable for you that these sergeants would not have reported up the chain of command?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Did you know that Andrew Richmond was selected to be a Field Training Officer?</li> <li>A. I was aware of that. I saw that in the materials I reviewed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And not just I should say, he was selected and served as an FTO.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Spokane</li> <li>Regional Safe Streets Task Force?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I remember reading it in the documents here. And I can guess what it is, but I don't have any independent knowledge of it.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So I'll represent that it's it's a multi-agency task force with members of the FBI, the Spokane Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, the Spokane Valley Police Department, Border Patrol, the Department of Corrections, with the essentially, the tasked with working together to address gang activity and drug trafficking in the Spokane County area.</li> <li>Is that type of task force something that is commonplace in in law enforcement agencies?</li> </ul>	2 V 3 4 E 5 6 2 7 F 8 5 9 C 10 11 12 Y 13 C 14 C 15 16 t 17 2 18 2 19 20 i 21 C 22 U	et's just say I read that and I can't remember exactly where. But I did read that, yes. Q. Let's look at Opinion D in your report, in Exhibit 1. And in this section you've essentially rendered an opinion that the three sergeants to whom Deputy Richmond reported Sergeant Thurman's conduct to should have reported it up through the chain of command; correct? A. Yes. Q. And are you aware from the documentation that you reviewed that Andrew Richmond, in fact, asked each of these three sergeants not to report it up the chain of command? A. There was discussion about that in the interview that I read I'm seeming to remember the internal affairs investigation that he had requested some anonymity for his report, yes. Q. Given Mr. Richmond's reticence, status, and information shared, and in light of the fact he was one of only two black officers at the time, is it understandable for you that these sergeants would not

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

	Page 93	Page 95
1	They failed in their duties as supervisors and they	1 Is Document E which we're going to mark as
2	failed the County and they failed the Sheriff.	2 Exhibit 5 to your deposition is this the memorandum
3	BY MR. KITSON:	3 that you were referencing in your opinions?
4	Q. Are you aware that the sergeants received	4 And let me know if you want me to scroll through
5	sheriff's level counseling due to their failure to	5 it.
6	disclose up the chain of command?	6 A. I think I've read enough. I do recognize that
7	A. I was not aware of that outcome. Through the	7 document and that's the one I'm talking about, yes.
8	article that I mentioned earlier, I saw that the Sheriff	8 Q. Okay. And this is a memo that's dated June 13rd
9	mentioned that they should have reported it up the chain	9 from the Sheriff to leadership within the Sheriff's
10	of command and they didn't.	10 Office regarding, you know, the outcome of the
11	So I could only guess at that point whether	11 investigation and Sergeant Thurman's discharge
12	there was an outcome. But the information just related	12 generally; correct?
13	to me, I was not aware of.	13 A. Yes, it is.
14	Q. Would you agree that sheriff's level counseling	14 Q. Okay. I'm going to open Document F, which will
15	was an appropriate corrective action by the Sheriff	15 <b>be Exhibit 6 to your deposition.</b>
16	towards these three sergeants?	16 (Exhibit 6 was marked.)
17	A. That's hard to offer an opinion on, because I	17 BY MR. KITSON:
18	I don't know how serious that relates within the	18 Q. This is Policy 340, the Standards of Conduct
19	Sheriff's Office.	19 policy.
20	In other words, what weight does that carry with	20 It outlines, essentially, the Sheriff's Office
21	Spokane County? I I guess I can't really say at	disciplinary policy as well as, you know, identifying
22	this at this point in time.	22 conduct that can result in discipline.
23	I can tell you this, from what you're telling	23 It talks about discrimination as grounds for
24	me, they didn't receive any time off. So that tells me	discipline and outlines, essentially, the disciplinary
25	that it's at the lower end of discipline. Which	25 process. I know I'm scrolling through this quickly.
	Page 94	Page 96
1	counseling is generally considered in fact, some	1 I'm happy to let you look at any portion of it that you
2	agencies don't even consider counseling to be	2 want, but I'm going to ask you about a specific section
3	discipline.	3 at the end.
4	So I can't say for sure. But from what you're	4 My first question, though, is this a policy that
5	telling me, this looks like the lighter end in fact,	5 you recall reviewing?
6	I'm gonna the more I think about it, I'm going to say	6 A. I don't recall reviewing many, if any, policies
7	that this is not discipline. However, it is something	7 and procedures on this case.
8	that's going to be reflected in those employee's	8 Q. Okay. This on the last page, page 12 of
9	personnel files and could potentially affect them in	9 Exhibit 6, is a Section 340.10, Posting of Disciplinary
10	as far as, you know, future promotions or transfers,	10 Action.
11	assignment, that type of thing.	11 And it says, "Internal disclosure of
12	Was it appropriate or not? I can't really say.	12administrative disciplinary action will occur only when
13	I guess it depends on how it's used, and I can't	13there has been a sustained finding and the discipline
14	really say. I'm back to my very first original answer	14 imposed is equal to or greater than 40 hours without
15	to your question. Not knowing enough about the internal	15 <b>pay."</b>
16	workings of the Sheriff's Office and and how these	16 And, well, let me let me stop there.
17	types of things are viewed.	17 <b>Obviously, Sergeant Thurman was discharged, so</b>
18	(Exhibit 5 was marked.)	18 his discipline was greater than 40 hours; correct?
19	BY MR. KITSON:	19 A. Yes.
20	Q. I'm moving now to I guess, I'm going to go	20 Q. So would you agree that based on this policy,
21	back here. I'm going to talk to you here about your	21 there was some kind of internal disclosure, a notice of 22 disciplinary action that under the Sheriff's Office
22 23	Opinion E. And here you discuss a June 13th memo that was	22disciplinary action that under the Sheriff's Office23policies was required to occur following Sergeant
23 24	read at roll call and you say it "was not a proper	23 policies was required to occur following Sergeant 24 Thurman's dismissal?
24	release of information."	25 MS. BARDEN: Objection to form.
2.5		

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

	Page 97		Page 99
1	THE WITNESS: I'm focusing in on "will	1	that he made inappropriate comments at an ASU meeting
2	occur" in the first line there. So when I read will	2	relating to Deputy Krystal Bitzer; correct?
3	occur, it means an affirmative action. It means	3	A. That is correct.
4	something that will happen.	4	Q. And it also indicates that the level of
5	So this policy outlines something it	5	discipline imposed so demotion from sergeant to
6	almost sounds like a must. It almost sounds like this	6	ranking deputy and then termination effective 6/13/19.
7	is an absolute.	7	And then it directs Division Commanders and
8	But I think there is also the possibility	8	Lieutenants and Supervisors to inform employees of their
9	that the way this is written, if if the sheriff	9	findings and conclusions of the internal investigation
10	chooses to I think there is a bit of a choice here.	10	so that unnecessary and inappropriate rumors may be
11	And it is specifying, I may or may not release this, but	11	avoided.
12	the only time it will occur is if it's sustained and	12	The contents of this notice shall be deemed as
13	it's more than 40 hours without pay. That's kind of the	13	confidential for internal use only, and any release of
14	way I read this.	14	the information contained herein shall be made through
15	BY MR. KITSON:	15	the Sheriff; correct?
16	Q. It goes on to say, "Any disclosure will include	16	A. That is correct.
17	the name of the deputy or employee being disciplined. A	17	Q. So my question for you is in light of this
18	summary of all violations that the employee is being	18	policy that we've looked at in Exhibit 6 that talks
19	disciplined for." And "The discipline imposed."	19	about posting a disciplinary action, what about this
20	Correct?	20	posting is improper or inconsistent with the Sheriff's
21	A. Yes.	21	Office's own policies?
22	Q. And then it states: "The method of notification	22	A. The problem with it is that it names the
23	will consist of a memorandum of disciplinary action	23	complainant and a witness and now everyone in the
24	issued by the Office of Professional Standards to each	24	department knows who came forward and who talked and who
25	department head and Lieutenant. Each Lieutenant will	25	gave this information to, ostensibly, internal affairs.
_			g
	Page 98		Page 100
			idge ivo
1	make a reasonable effort to read the memorandum to each	1	That's the biggest problem with this memo.
1 2	make a reasonable effort to read the memorandum to each member under their command and return it to the Office	1 2	2
	member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time		That's the biggest problem with this memo.
2	member under their command and return it to the Office	2	That's the biggest problem with this memo. Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually
2 3	member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time	2 3	That's the biggest problem with this memo. Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?
2 3 4	member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter." Did I read that correctly? A. Yes, you did.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter." Did I read that correctly? A. Yes, you did.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office. And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's the biggest problem with this memo. <b>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually</b> <b>identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</b> A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office. And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's the biggest problem with this memo. Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct? A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office. And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's the biggest problem with this memo. Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct? A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office. And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word in front of another deputy; correct? And I'm talking A. Yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I mean, either Deputy Kullman or Deputy Richmond could have been the person who reported this; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word in front of another deputy; correct? And I'm talking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> <li>Q. I mean, either Deputy Kullman or Deputy Richmond</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word in front of another deputy; correct? And I'm talking A. Yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>A. In mean, either Deputy Kullman or Deputy Richmond could have been the person who reported this; correct?</li> <li>A. Both of those people, given the seriousness of the allegation, are going to be interviewed. And it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word in front of another deputy; correct? And I'm talking A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q about the paragraph referring to Deputy VanPatten.</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I mean, either Deputy Kullman or Deputy Richmond could have been the person who reported this; correct?</li> <li>A. Both of those people, given the seriousness of the allegation, are going to be interviewed. And it leaves it up to the imaginations of all the people</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>member under their command and return it to the Office of Professional Standards within the listed time parameter."</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. So if we go back to Document E which is exhibit again, Exhibit 5. This is a posting of disciplinary action that describes what happened. So it says an internal investigation occurred and it was sustained. And then it goes on to report essentially the bases for the sustained allegations. So one, the first paragraph is related to the December 22nd, 2016, issue that Richmond reported related to Thurman's use of extremely improper language; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And the second one is related to Jeff Thurman's use of another another time when he used the N-word in front of another deputy; correct? And I'm talking A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q about the paragraph referring to Deputy VanPatten.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>That's the biggest problem with this memo.</li> <li>Q. You would agree that it doesn't actually identify anyone as a complainant; correct?</li> <li>A. As we talked about earlier, there's only two black employees at the time there were only two black employees in the Spokane County Sheriff's Office.</li> <li>And then we have the offensive language that is listed here in the memo. I think it's a a pretty easy question for anyone who who hears this memo and then if the names are read, whether right or wrong, I think they know where that complaint came from.</li> <li>Q. If you look at Deputy Richmond, he's only referred to once in this memo and it's in the paragraph regarding the 12/22/16 comment from Sergeant Thurman that he heard; correct?</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. It also says that Deputy Kullman observed that same comment; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>A. In mean, either Deputy Kullman or Deputy Richmond could have been the person who reported this; correct?</li> <li>A. Both of those people, given the seriousness of the allegation, are going to be interviewed. And it</li> </ul>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

## David T. Sweeney

	Page 101		Page 103
1	the first place? Or I wonder who talked to internal	1	lieutenants to read this.
2	affairs about this? Because it was quite obvious it was	2	So, first off, they have to state the offensive
3	only let me read this again to make sure.	3	language. They are going to read this document. Why
4	Yeah, there's only two well, there's actually	4	you would make your lieutenants read this word this
5	three people. There's also Thurman. But there's two	5	offensive word in front of let's say a roll call room
6	people that are still in the department at this time	6	or something is is beyond the norm. That is the
7	that know about this conversation. And it's really	7	wrong way to dispel rumors, let's say.
8	problematic to me that you are going to name these two	8	And then the second part of this is naming
9	employees rather than just state what Thurman did,	9	and whether they are a victim or whether they are a
10	rather than just by stating he made offensive racist	10	witness or a complainant, whatever role that Kullman and
11	comments and I fired him because of these, that the	11	Richmond played in this, you basically named them in
12	Sheriff's memo was so much more explicit. It gets into	12	front of the whole department. That every lieutenant is
13	the language and names the people who overheard the	13	going to read this and let's say let's say by
14	language. I	14	chance I'm sure the whole department knew about this.
15	Q. Wouldn't	15	But let's say by some chance that there actually
16	A. I don't think that's I think that's a a	16	is an employee out there that goes, oh, wow. I never
17	very misguided way to proceed in order to tell the	17	heard about this. And then you, therefore, say and the
18	members of the department why someone is being fired in	18	people that know about this, their names are Deputy
19	order to reduce rumors. This almost makes it worse.	19	Tyler Kullman and Deputy Andrew Richmond. They are the
20	Q. Wouldn't you agree that members of the	20	ones that gave this information. Because of their
21	department needed to know specifically what Thurman was	21	testimony we now understand what exactly Corporal
22	found to have done?	22	Thurman said.
23	And I'm not talking about the names of the	23	And, again, I think probably most people knew
24	people who were witnesses.	24	about this. The officers this is going to be a very
25	But I mean, wouldn't you say that they needed	25	newsworthy and noteworthy event. And everyone is going
	Page 102	1	
			Page 104
1	to know that he made these horrible statements?	1	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is
1 2	to know that he made these horrible statements? A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying,	1 2	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just
	A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a	1	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.
2	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying,</li> <li>yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a</li> <li>result of saying these offensive words. This behavior,</li> </ul>	2	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.
2 3 4 5	A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no	2 3 4 5	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of
2 3 4 5 6	A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and	2 3 4 5 6	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.	2 3 4 5 6 7	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic. Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical. Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward. <b>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I wonder if anyone was offended?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not understanding what makes it worse in terms of reducing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I wonder if anyone was offended?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not understanding what makes it worse in terms of reducing rumors.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li><b>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</b></li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I wonder if anyone was offended?</li> <li>No, it names one of the two black officers on the department and the other the other officer,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not understanding what makes it worse in terms of reducing rumors.</li> <li>A. Two things, specifically. One, you are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li><b>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</b></li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I wonder if anyone was offended?</li> <li>No, it names one of the two black officers on the department and the other the other officer, Deputy Kullman. So it names these two employees as the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not understanding what makes it worse in terms of reducing rumors.</li> <li>A. Two things, specifically. One, you are writing you are writing down and in an official</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li><b>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</b></li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who reported this? I busk officers on the department and the other the other officer, Deputy Kullman. So it names these two employees as the ones that they have the knowledge other than Thurman,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I can see the Sheriff's motivation in saying, yes, here's as a result of this action. It was a result of saying these offensive words. This behavior, you've misrepresented the department and you have no position left here and, therefore, you are demoted and fired.</li> <li>So I I think it is clear what the Sheriff's intention here is here. To to relay the seriousness of this allegation and to explain why this corporal no longer works here because of this behavior. So it serves as a warning to others, hey, don't engage in racist behavior, particularly while you're working here. And it also serves to I think the goal, as written in the policy, is to reduce rumors. So in answer to your question he's putting this information out there in order to reduce rumors. I think that this goes overboard in its effort to reduce rumors. This almost this makes it worse.</li> <li>Q. And what makes it worse? The I guess I'm not understanding what makes it worse in terms of reducing rumors.</li> <li>A. Two things, specifically. One, you are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>to know about it. I'm making a guess there, but it is based on a lot of training and experience. This just really becomes problematic.</li> <li>Again, we're I'm using a hypothetical.</li> <li>Hypothetically, is there an employee or a group of employees that have never heard this before and now all of a sudden you are going to hear this offensive racist language and you are also going to hear the names of the people that reported. It's not best practices. And it really hurts those employees, because everyone knows who came forward.</li> <li><b>Q. But the report, again, doesn't the letter doesn't say who reported it; correct? It says who witnessed it.</b></li> <li>A. It does. In it does. It says, here's the two people. And it doesn't talk about that this was in roll call with a large group of officers present and everyone goes, who I wonder who came forward or I wonder who heard this? I wonder who reported this? I wonder if anyone was offended?</li> <li>No, it names one of the two black officers on the department and the other the other officer, Deputy Kullman. So it names these two employees as the</li> </ul>

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

	Page 105		Page 107
1	these racist comments and and and then, you know,	1	don't anticipate changing any of the information that
2	later on, it names Deputy VanPatten, too. Deputy	2	l've given, nor adding to it.
3	VanPatten, apparently, you have some information that	3	Q. And if I understand you correctly, the
4	you related to internal affairs and you also came	4	additional materials that you reviewed, the depositions
5	forward.	5	of Andrew Richmond, as well as of the Sheriff and the HR
6	That's not how you encourage employees to report	6	director for the County did not in any way alter or
7	incidents like this. The Department has a	7	change these opinions that you identify in your report
8	responsibility to investigate this racist behavior and	8	that we've gone over today; correct?
9	to react appropriately if they determine a sustained	9	A. I don't remember changing any of my opinions.
10	finding. Naming now three employees that heard you	10	I think we had a a good-natured debate on
11	know, that can really stop people from coming forward.	11	some of them and went back and forth and tried to get to
12	They think, wow. The next time I hear something	12	the heart of the matter. But I don't remember changing
13	offensive or I have something that should be	13	any of the opinions, no.
14	reported; right? We all have what we view as standards	14	MR. KITSON: All right. Those are all the
15	that police officers must follow these days,	15	questions that I have for you today. I appreciate your
16	particularly with increased scrutiny that we've faced	16	time in working through this with me.
17	within the past couple years. And then someone reads	17	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
18	this memo or they hear a lieutenant read this at roll	18	MR. KITSON: If your counsel has any
19	call, that's going to really discourage anyone from	19	questions or if we're
20	coming forward and saying, you know, there is no way I'm	20	MS. BARDEN: Yeah. I do need screen-sharing
21	getting my name read in front of roll call and everyone.	21	ability. I do have questions. I need screen-sharing
22	I'm keeping quiet about this. I'm not going to say	22	ability.
23	anything.	23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	It really hurts the department by doing this.	24	BY MS. BARDEN:
25	It really hurts these officers that came forward. They	25	Q. Mr. Sweeney, earlier there was discussion
	Page 106		Page 108
1	shouldn't be named because they did the right thing.	1	regarding can you see the document that I pulled up,
2	They shouldn't have their reputations yeah, they were	2	Mr. Sweeney?
3	honest and they did come forward. But still, there's	3	A. Yes, I can.
4	going to be a large group of officers that are going to	4	Q. So this is from the Exhibit B I'm not sure
5	look at them sideways, particularly on a veteran K9	5	what it was marked as that Mr. Kitson had brought to
6	handler who, from what I read, appeared to be quite	6	your attention that the first page is the notification;
7	popular and well-known in the Spokane area. And these	7	the second pages are these alleged questions that were
8	officers came out and put their reputations on the line	8	asked during your examination. So that looks like in
9	to tell others, yeah, this is what he said. And and	9	2018.
10	now you're named in front of your co-workers. It's	10	So my question for you is No. 6. There was no
11	really improper.	11	specific sorry. There was my apologies.
12	Q. So I'm almost done.	12	So No. 6, you know, I want to ask you, is this a
13	You would agree, though, that the witnesses to	13	basic question or is this more specific?
14	each of the problematic statements were identified. It	14	A. Well, what the question is judging is your
15	wasn't as though Deputy Richmond was the only person identified. Each of the other three witnesses	15	ability to do two things: One, either multitask or to,
16 17		16 17	two, prioritize.
17 18	Kullman, Bitzer, and VanPatten were all also identified by name; correct?	18	So the candidate gets the question and they probably can't do both; right? They have only got one
19	-	19	
20	<ul> <li>A. Yes, they were.</li> <li>Q. So we've gone through, we've talked about each</li> </ul>	20	air unit. So they have to pick the one that's more priority, as well as determine, you know, how close they
20	of your opinions today in your report. Are there any	20	are and where can they do the greatest help.
22	do you have any opinions that you've formulated related	22	There might not be a right answer to this
23	to this case that you expect to offer at trial that we	23	question. It might just be more of the ability of the
24	haven't discussed at all today?	24	candidate to specify and stick to a position. That I
25	A. Unless new information was presented to me, I	25	I would go to the robbery or I would go to the burglary.
-			

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

	Page 109		Page 111
1	For me, I'm going to the robbery. That's a more	1	Q. I want you to understand that this is the
2	serious crime than the burglary. So I would rather	2	context of this conversation and questioning is.
3	catch a robber and a more serious crime than the	3	A. Oh, yes, definitely.
4	burglar. And I would explain that to the panel.	4	Q. So this is the highlighted portion. This is on
5	So I think that's what it's trying to get them	5	page 7.
6	to stick to a position and why they would make the	6	A. Okay.
7	choice that they did.	7	Q. All right.
8	Q. Sure. So I guess my question to you is, is	8	A. Do you want me to read all this? Or are you
9	would you agree that if you had this question before you	9	going to ask me specific questions about it?
10	went into the interview that you would have more of an	10	Q. Yeah, I'll get to the specific part of it.
11	advantage than another interviewee?	11	A. Okay. I can see that the interviewer is still
12	A. Absolutely. Because it allows you to process,	12	asking her about the oral board.
13	as I just did in realtime, what's the best answer. And	13	Q. Okay. So we'll go down here. Sorry about that.
14	then to formulate your answer and then to practice	14	Okay. So this is where she Tim Hines said,
15	stating it confidently so that you come off as competent	15	"How did you already know what the questions were going
16	and confident when you answer.	16	to be?"
17	Q. So would you agree it was unfair if one	17	"Some of the guys from the ASU Unit, I went to
18	interviewee got this question ahead of time and another	18	them and I asked. What do I need to do to prepare for
19	interviewee did not?	19	it? And they kind of gave me a heads-up."
20	A. That would definitely provide an advantage,	20	Then Tim Hines says, "Okay. So, can you be a
21	specifically because it is a specific question. Yes.	21	little more specific about what kind of gave you a
22	Q. So I'm going to switch over to this specific	22	heads-up? Did they give you the questions?
23	document. This is from another deposition.	23	"Not all of them. No."
24	So this is kind of what you discussed with	24	"Any of them?
25	Mr. Kitson, but he did not bring it in front of you.	25	"One of them was the robbery one. But they said
	Page 110		Page 112
1	And this is the recorded interview of Deputy Krystal	1	it is pretty much like a normal oral board interview."
2	Bitzer and it was, I think, marked as I could tell	2	So I will stop there. So she did get one of
3	you real quick.	3	the the robbery one? The one I highlighted in the
4	But it is in the exhibit that's the 30(b)(6)	4	previous document, Exhibit B, where it was the robbery
5	deposition of the Sheriff. And it's been provided by	5	question.
б	Spokane. This is SC Richmond 048209 through SC	6	So Mr. Kitson was conveying to you that she only
7	Richmond 048228.	7	got a heads-up. But is this more than a heads-up,
8	Sorry I'm scrolling really fast. I just want to	8	giving a specific question?
9	bring you to the attention of the part of KB is	9	MR. KITSON: Objection to form.
10	Krystal Bitzer. TH is Tim Hines. He's the	10	THE WITNESS: It appears from what Bitzer is
11	interviewee or the interviewer of the interviewee	11	saying here that the heads-up and I would have liked
12	regarding this investigation of 20 2019-0014.	12	the interviewer to have honed in on this a little bit
13	So I'll have you kind of read over this for just	13	more.
14	a moment, and then I will go over the highlighted	14	But she says, "Not all of them, no."
15	portions with you as we go down.	15	And and Tim says, "Any of them."
16	A. All right. You can go down. And you can	16	And she says, "One of them was the robbery
17	scroll.	17	one. And they said it's pretty much like a normal oral
18	Okay. So she's describing going on flights,	18	board interview."
19	which I would expect that.	19	So what she's not stating is is she's
20	All right. You can scroll down.	20	telling about the robbery question, but the follow-up
21	And I'm just going to the yellow.	21	question that I would have liked to have seen is, oh,
22	Q. Yeah. We'll get to the you understand that	22	tell me about the robbery question. What did he say
23	she's getting questions about the ASU unit in her	23	about it? You know, and then did this was Thurman
0.4	interview?	24	she said she was talking to; is that right?
24			
24 25	A. All right.	25	Q. No. Acosta.

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

	De		D 11F
	Page 113		Page 115
1	A. Okay. Oh, this is Acosta.	1	deposition.
2	Q. Yeah. This is down here she talks about	2	(Exhibit 7 was marked.)
3	Acosta.	3	BY MR. KITSON:
4	A. Yeah. So I would I would love no.	4	Q. This is the recorded interview of Deputy Acosta
5	Let's let's back up on that.	5	conducted by Sergeant Hines on May 27th, 2019.
6	I would have liked to hear a more thorough	6	I'm going to scroll down here to page 10. Let's
7	question there so we could actually get into did Acosta	7	see. So just to give you a little context here,
8	provide one of the questions on the interview panel to	8	deputy
9	an interviewee and was that improper or not? I mean,	9	MS. BARDEN: I don't have I'm sorry to
10	that's the big question here.	10	interrupt you, but I don't see any Bates numbers on
11	And I would have liked Tim to expand on that a	11	there.
12	little bit and and really hone in on was she given	12	Can you give me the Bates numbers for this?
13	confidential information that she should not have been	13	MR. KITSON: I'm not sure I can at the
14	given? Or is this to be expected that if you are	14	moment, because I'm not sure I have my Bates I know
15	inquisitive and curious and you get to know people in	15	you have it. I'll give you a second to look for it and
16 17	the unit that they basically tell you all the questions	16	find it. And I'll look for a Bates version now as well
17	that are there.	17 18	if you would like.
18	It's it's a hard line to define. And I'm not	1	MS. BARDEN: I got it.
19	sure that I have enough information right now to render	19	MR. KITSON: Okay. Just for record
20	an opinion on it.	20	sorry, Heather. I didn't mean to pull up a non-Bates
21	But based on what she says, she knew there would	21	version.
22	be a robbery question.	22 23	What is the Bates on page 10?
23	And it it requires me to then do a bit of	1	MS. BARDEN: SC Richmond 047873.
24	guesswork. Does she really know the specifics	24	MR. KITSON: Okay. I will make sure that
25	specifics of the question? And that she's going to	25	the copy I provide the court reporter to make part of
	Page 114		Page 116
1	ask she's going to be asked to debate whether to go	1	the record is the Bates version.
2	on a burglary call or a robbery call.	2	BY MR. KITSON:
3	So I think that's why I put an if in my report.	3	Q. Okay. So going back to Acosta's interview here,
4	I need more information to really get to the	4	he's talking about how at the top, he says, "I know
5	bottom of this and and, unfortunately, the	5	that Bitzer came and asked questions about the unit."
6	interviewer didn't ask the required questions for me to	6	And Tim Hines who is TH asks, "So did you
7	answer that fully.	7	give her any advice or anything about what to expect
8	I will say this, it does appear, based on what	8	for, after applying for the unit prior"
9	you just showed me, that she knew there would be a	9	And then Acosta says, "Just like, just the stuff
10	robbery question.	10	to know like a F.L.I.R. and a spotlight, you know,
11	Potentially, that is unfair to the other	11	pre-flight stuff. Have an idea of it, your
	···· <b>,</b> , · ··· <b>,</b> · · · · · · ·		
12	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more	12	availability, and we'll be called out and kind of like
12 13	•	13	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit."
	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more	1	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any
13	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have.	13 14 15	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she
13 14 15 16	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time.	13 14 15 16	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?"
13 14 15 16 17	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a	13 14 15 16 17	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No."
13 14 15 16 17 18	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up.	13 14 15 16 17 18	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up. REDIRECTEXAMINATION	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up. R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. KITSON:	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up. R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. KITSON: Q. Give me a second here, please.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her oral board, that wouldn't be true?"
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Thank you.</li> <li>I don't think I have any other questions at this time.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up.</li> <li>R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Give me a second here, please.</li> <li>All right. So I'm going to share my screen.</li> </ul>	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her oral board, that wouldn't be true?" And then Acosta says, "I don't recall telling
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Thank you.</li> <li>I don't think I have any other questions at this time.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up.</li> <li>R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Give me a second here, please.</li> <li>All right. So I'm going to share my screen.</li> <li>And this is not a document that is in your box,</li> </ul>	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her oral board, that wouldn't be true?" And then Acosta says, "I don't recall telling her any of the questions on there."
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have. MS. BARDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have any other questions at this time. MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up. R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Give me a second here, please. All right. So I'm going to share my screen. And this is not a document that is in your box, but I can I will send this to our court reporter,</li> </ul>	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her oral board, that wouldn't be true?" And then Acosta says, "I don't recall telling her any of the questions on there." Hines says, "You don't recall discussing any of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>candidates. And potentially, that Deputy revealed more information than he or she should have.</li> <li>MS. BARDEN: Thank you.</li> <li>I don't think I have any other questions at this time.</li> <li>MR. KITSON: I just have I just have a follow-up.</li> <li>R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MR. KITSON:</li> <li>Q. Give me a second here, please.</li> <li>All right. So I'm going to share my screen.</li> <li>And this is not a document that is in your box,</li> </ul>	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things you have to go through and whatnot of a unit." And Hines says, "Okay. Did you provide her any advance notice as to what some of the questions she could expect to be asked might be?" And Acosta says, "No." And Hines says, "So, if Deputy Bitzer told me that the two of you actually talked about quite a few of the questions that she was subsequently asked on her oral board, that wouldn't be true?" And then Acosta says, "I don't recall telling her any of the questions on there."

29 (Pages 113 to 116)

#### David T. Sweeney

	Page 117		Page 119
1	the oral board?"	1	on your view that it would give her an unfair advantage
2	Acosta says, "I	2	over others?
3	"I'm telling you" and he goes on to say	3	A. Absolutely. If you know that question ahead of
4	and Hines says, "She told me that you did."	4	time, you could prepare your answer. Whereas someone is
5	Acosta goes, "Okay. Well, I would recall like	5	speaking extemporaneously off the top of their head is
б	yeah just you know our mission statement, and probably	6	going to have a much more difficult time processing and
7	like hours that we'd go up and fly, and stuff just	7	then giving that answer.
8	regarding the unit. Just have an idea what you'll know	8	It doesn't mean they wouldn't give a fine
9	about."	9	answer. In fact, they might be able to give the best
10	And Hines says, "Do you know if she talked to	10	answer. But it certainly is an advantage if you have
11	anybody else that she may be confusing you with?"	11	thought about the question ahead of time so that you can
12	Acosta goes, "I'm not sure. I know she might	12	then give the best answer possible that gives yourself
13	have spoke to Knight or other guys on the unit. I don't	13	an unfair advantage over the other candidates.
14	recall."	14	MR. KITSON: I don't have any further
15	And I'm just going to scroll down.	15	questions.
16	Here it says, "Do you have any recollection of	16	MS. BARDEN: Neither do I. Thank you.
17	sharing questions with her?"	17	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the
18	And he says, "I don't, yeah, I don't recall	18	deposition. We are going off the record. The time now
19	doing that, no."	19	is 12:32 p.m.
20	So apologies for a long reading here.	20	
21	But according to Deputy Acosta, he didn't recall	21	(Deposition concluded at 12:32 p.m.)
22	sharing specific questions with Deputy Bitzer; correct?	22	(Cirrecture was received )
23	A. That's what it sounds like.	23 24	(Signature was reserved.)
24	Scroll up just a little bit more there.	24	-000-
25	Q. Sure. Yeah.	25	-000-
23		23	
	Page 118		Page 120
1	A. Let's get his answer there.	1	
2	Q. Yeah.		CERTIFICATE
3	A. Up further. Oh.	2	
4	"She told me that you did."	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON )
5	"Okay. Well, I would recall like yeah just know		) SS.
6	our mission statement, and probably like hours that we'd	4	COUNTY OF KITSAP )
7	go up and fly and stuff just"	5 6	I, CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, a Certified Court
8	I think in answer to your question, it sounds	7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
9	like Acosta denies providing any questions ahead of time	8	certify that the foregoing transcript of the videotaped
10	to Bitzer.	9	videoconference deposition of DAVID T. SWEENEY, having
11	Q. Right. So I guess based on Bitzer's testimony	10	been duly sworn on FEBRUARY 15, 2022, is true and
12	and Acosta's testimony, would you stand by your, I	11	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
13	guess, stated opinion that I think you said earlier	12	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14	that you can't make a conclusion that one way or another	13	and seal this 24th day of February, 2022.
15	as to specifically whether or not Bitzer received notice	14 15	
16	of specific questions as they pertain to her interview?	16	Terrebal DVAUSSAR
17	A. Yeah, we've got conflicting information here,		CRYSTAL R. MCAULIFFE, RPR, CCR #2121
18	which hampers my ability to say absolutely yes or no	17	
19	that Bitzer was provided questions ahead of time which	18	
20	provided her an advantage over the other candidates. I	19	
21	can't really say.	20	
22	If she was, it it definitely is problematic,	21	
23	but I can't say for sure based on this conflicting	22	
24	information.	23 24	
25	Q. And your opinion that it's problematic is based	24	

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

	1	l	1	_
A	activity 90:19	agree 38:9 58:6	announcements	64:4
<b>A.A</b> 12:20	actual 20:1 81:13	63:10 66:5 67:13	63:16	<b>apply</b> 46:12 62:20
<b>a.m</b> 1:17 4:2,11	add 45:5	68:3 70:13 71:13	annually 26:14	62:21
42:9,12	adding 107:2	73:8 85:7,14 86:3	anonymity 92:18	applying 87:3
abilities 88:8	addition 57:1	86:10 88:14 93:14	answer 5:23 35:15	116:8
<b>ability</b> 66:7,11 67:1	additional 10:9,13	96:20 100:2	46:9 65:23 70:7	appointed 17:13
71:7 73:22,22	10:17 11:5 34:11	101:20 106:13	73:12 82:7,7,8,9	appreciate 107:15
107:21,22 108:15	36:7 39:13 47:23	109:9,17	83:12,14,24 86:1	appropriate 29:12
107.21,22 108.15	91:2 107:4	agreed 67:24	88:17 94:14	93:15 94:12
120:11	address 9:5,6,6,9	Agreement 22:7	102:16 108:22	appropriately
<b>able</b> 7:9 18:14	33:6 75:18 90:18	agreements 19:1	109:13,14,16	105:9
34:17 47:21 65:23	admin 38:13	<b>ahead</b> 7:6 11:25	114:7 118:1,8	approval 46:19,23
83:24 84:1 87:19	administrative	12:2,6 13:24	119:4,7,9,10,12	46:24 47:3
	96:12	21:20 34:15 37:8	answered 69:22,24	approve 50:14
89:21 119:9 <b>absolute</b> 81:21 97:7	<b>ADR</b> 17:10,19	37:9,10 46:4	70:1,8 73:4	approved 49:18
	adult 13:1,11,15	57:14 64:24 69:19	answers 6:1 65:25	50:7
<b>absolutely</b> 66:2 67:3,10 70:20	advance 89:20	75:5,13 79:12	69:16 70:4	approximately
109:12 118:18	116:15	80:7,12,18 81:8	anticipate 107:1	4:11 35:25
119:3	advantage 80:3,19	83:8 109:18 118:9	anybody 77:6	archive 50:22 59:4
	81:21 83:18,20	118:19 119:3,11	117:11	67:15
access 7:2,6,9 41:23 58:19	86:8 89:24 109:11	air 20:25 43:19	apologies 108:11	archived 47:19,21
	109:20 118:20	44:5 51:20 86:1	117:20	<b>Archives</b> 59:7,12
accessed 7:5	119:1,10,13	86:20 87:10	apparently 105:3	area 83:10 90:20
accidently 86:16	<b>advantages</b> 91:10	108:19	appear 114:8	106:7
account 56:24	91:15	allegation 98:25	appeared 78:18	areas 33:4,5 52:5
accreditation 14:14	advertisement	100:23 102:10	106:6	argument 17:24
accurate 12:16	44:25,25 63:13	allegations 24:6,7,9	appearing 1:19 2:2	29:21
21:8 23:5,6 30:8	advertises 44:10	38:8 98:12	appears 59:1	arrest 28:25
31:7 57:24 73:20	advertising 26:17	<b>alleged</b> 108:7	112:10	<b>arrive</b> 18:24 58:9
79:23,24 84:13	advice 24:24 25:13	<b>allow</b> 20:12 46:8	<b>applicable</b> 64:21	68:23 70:23 76:7
120:11	25:19 116:7	58:18	65:9	76:23
achieve 18:17	<b>advise</b> 48:14	allows 109:12	applicant 47:2 48:8	<b>arrived</b> 70:14
20:20 77:1	advised 74:23	ALs 13:1	64:9 85:10	<b>article</b> 10:19,21,22
Acosta 3:20 81:3	<b>Affair</b> 35:18	<b>alter</b> 107:6	<b>applicants</b> 44:13	11:6 93:8
81:24 83:6,21	<b>affairs</b> 21:2 61:18	alternatives 18:24	44:13,19,22 45:23	asked 32:8,17,22
84:5 86:4 112:25	92:17 99:25 101:2	analysis 63:8	46:8,14 47:9	33:6 39:21 50:19
113:1,3,7 115:4	105:4	and/or 28:17	62:16 63:22,22	53:7 54:3 83:9
116:9,17,22 117:2	affect 94:9	Andrew 1:5 3:13	64:2,11,15 65:12	85:11 86:5,6
117:5,12,21 118:9	affirmative 97:3	4:6,20 10:10	69:5 86:9	92:12 108:8
Acosta's 116:3	<b>agencies</b> 90:22,23	20:23 21:14 42:22	application 45:3	92:12 108:8
118:12	91:19 94:2	89:12 90:1 91:22	48:23 50:18 68:8	116:5,16,20,25
Act 77:5		92:12 103:19	<b>applications</b> 47:15	<b>asking</b> 12:10 34:13
action 29:13 93:15	<b>agency</b> 18:10 58:3	107:5		<b>asking</b> 12:10 34:13 59:3 111:12
96:10,12,22 97:3	74:8,19 88:15		63:20,24 64:10	
97:23 98:9 99:19	agents 91:19	announcement	<b>applied</b> 83:1 87:24	asks 52:11,19 116:6
102:3	<b>ago</b> 68:7	45:18 63:17	applies 62:15,19	aspect 70:5

Page 122

aspects 14:19	<b>B</b> 29:20 42:15,15	113:21 114:8	binders 36:15	brand-new 15:10
aspirations 15:7	79:10 108:4 112:4	118:11,23,25	<b>bird's</b> 87:16	brandished 29:21
aspire 14:25 15:5	<b>B.A</b> 12:14,22	<b>bases</b> 98:12	<b>bit</b> 27:24 28:8 31:5	<b>break</b> 6:9 42:4,4,10
assigned 21:7	back 10:8 12:13,19	<b>basic</b> 108:13	54:8 80:13 83:2	bring 88:2 109:25
assignment 94:11	16:9 17:16 32:25	basically 32:14	97:10 112:12	110:9
assistance 32:16	36:14 42:5,11	44:12 61:23 69:11	113:12,23 117:24	broadly 43:17
33:17	54:8,21 58:13	103:11 113:16	<b>bits</b> 41:13	brought 75:24
assistant 20:4,15	62:11 67:2,4 68:5	basing 59:6 88:18	Bitzer 46:22 48:11	108:5
associate 26:10	69:12 70:22 71:17	<b>basis</b> 34:24	49:18 55:6 56:7	<b>Buell</b> 4:14
Association 27:9	73:2,3,3,3,11 75:9	<b>Bates</b> 38:25 39:6,12	56:18 57:5,20	<b>bullet</b> 63:6,16,20
<b>assume</b> 6:20 8:1,2	76:12,22 79:9	40:7,12 48:3	64:15 77:8,13	64:12 65:6 67:11
26:9	83:12 84:8,9	115:10,12,14,16	79:11,19 80:6	76:22
assuming 23:12	86:15,18 94:14,21	115:22 116:1	81:1 82:2,13 86:3	bullet-pointed
<b>ASU</b> 3:14 42:23	98:7 107:11 113:5	beginning 38:3	99:2 106:17 110:2	44:16
43:1 45:17 48:23	116:3	behavior 102:4,11	110:10 112:10	<b>bungle</b> 6:17
49:24 58:17 62:6	back-and-forth	102:13 105:8	116:5,18 117:22	<b>burglar</b> 109:4
62:17 79:12 81:4	58:8	<b>beings</b> 76:6	118:10,15,19	burglars 91:6
83:2 85:20 88:9	backed 77:19	<b>believe</b> 7:11,12	<b>Bitzer's</b> 46:20	burglary 91:5
99:1 110:23	background 12:11	13:21 14:17 15:3	80:22 118:11	108:25 109:2
111:17	63:21 82:23	15:4 20:7 24:3	<b>black</b> 92:21 100:5,5	114:2
attended 16:13	<b>bad</b> 24:23	28:22 29:2 30:25	104:21	<b>business</b> 26:1,16,18
attention 39:23	<b>bar</b> 27:6	33:21 35:4,10	<b>Bless</b> 46:2	74:19
70:25 78:19 108:6	Barden 2:4,4,4 3:7	38:6 46:24 49:10	Bloomer 38:8 48:5	<b>busy</b> 27:21
110:9	4:19,19 6:23 7:4	60:23 67:20 84:7	48:7,19 49:13,16	C
attorney 4:20	9:14 10:10 11:12	<b>Bellevue</b> 18:11	50:5 51:21 57:9	
attorneys 9:25	11:13,18 21:17	<b>benefit</b> 89:19	board 16:24 17:14	C 2:1,4 5:4 28:16 60:5 86:19 107:23
attributed 27:3	30:19 31:2,17,25	<b>best</b> 18:18,22 35:2	45:23 52:13 54:1	114:19 120:1,1
audible 5:23	32:5 33:5 34:9,11	39:19 48:21 51:2	55:13,24 57:1	cadre 45:6
author 38:4	40:12,23 41:4,8	59:20 77:24 84:14	58:23 59:2 65:2	call 29:17 31:15
authoring 10:8	41:23 43:12 57:12	104:9 109:13	66:25 67:7 85:12	32:19 66:2 94:24
<b>authority</b> 46:3 50:14	61:5 64:22 66:18	119:9,12 120:11 <b>better</b> 21:11 34:19	111:12 112:1,18 116:21 117:1	103:5 104:17
authorizations	67:17 71:16 72:24 75:4 77:17 81:5	38:25 60:20 70:1	<b>boards</b> 44:23 45:22	105:19,21 114:2,2
63:8	86:11 92:24 96:25	70:6,8 73:15	48:9 50:2,4,6,11	<b>called</b> 13:1 85:23
automatic 12:21	107:20,24 114:14	70:0,8 73:15 77:23 78:5,6,7,22	48:9 50:2,4,6,11 50:20 53:21 65:17	116:12
availability 116:12	115:9,18,23	87:16	<b>bold</b> 75:7	callouts 84:1 87:13
<b>available</b> 6:25 79:6	119:16	<b>betting</b> 37:24 43:15	<b>Border</b> 90:16	candidacy 69:5
<b>Avenue</b> 2:10 4:15	bargaining 22:7	<b>beyond</b> 103:6	<b>bottom</b> 39:1 114:5	candidate 51:4,7
9:9	23:3	<b>bias</b> 18:1 19:19	box 2:5 68:10	58:9 73:13 75:10
avoided 99:11	<b>base</b> 62:24	biased 72:19	114:23	80:2 108:17,24
aware 5:21 20:22	<b>based</b> 9:20 24:12	<b>big</b> 113:10	boy 42:15	candidate's 70:4
23:19 72:4 89:11	24:13 34:2 50:1	<b>bigger</b> 34:17 91:17	<b>brain</b> 66:9	candidates 51:10
89:18 90:3 91:22	56:23 58:16 59:11	<b>biggest</b> 100:1	brainstorming	52:12 55:5 58:22
92:11 93:4,7,13	59:13 81:20,22	<b>billed</b> 31:10	74:12,21 75:16	58:24 68:22 74:22
	96:20 104:2	<b>binder</b> 36:13 38:16	76:5	87:3 88:2 114:12
<u> </u>				118:20 119:13
	I	I	I	I

Page 123

				1 490 120
candidates' 69:16	<b>charge</b> 15:10 29:22	59:18	100:3 103:10	25:21
car 87:8 91:16	31:7 51:20 88:22	<b>collection</b> 3:13 35:3	complaint 10:2	consensus 57:5
care 78:16	charges 25:22	42:21 46:11 76:1	19:18 20:23 23:9	69:6
career 13:5 16:7	checked 68:11	<b>collective</b> 22:6 23:2	24:14 25:8 32:9	consider 94:2
21:23 25:16 86:23	checks 63:21	<b>college</b> 12:17,25	32:21 49:12	consideration
88:3	<b>chief</b> 16:6 20:3,4,14	<b>combine</b> 13:14	100:11,25	55:12,16,23
careers 15:23	20:15 36:16	79:24	complaints 24:16	<b>considered</b> 19:24
carry 93:20	<b>children</b> 67:4	<b>come</b> 16:9 18:18	24:17,18,20 30:12	67:23 94:1
case 8:8 9:8,15	chilling 77:10	25:1 29:1 42:5	<b>complete</b> 10:5	consist 97:23
16:10 17:25 18:1	<b>choice</b> 56:3 97:10	52:17 54:14 70:12	completed 14:16	consultant 26:4
18:8 20:21 24:8	109:7	73:11 76:25 78:24	completion 16:4	consulting 9:7,8
28:11,16,18,19,21	choices 56:5	81:20 106:3	59:17	26:1,1,12,15,15
29:4,7,8,9,10,11	chooses 97:10	109:15	comply 59:22	<b>contact</b> 17:18
29:14,25 30:10,24	chose 25:7 54:4	comes 18:20 33:20	components 16:6	contacted 31:17
31:1,8,10,15 32:5	circumstances	87:18 88:1	computer 7:2,18	contained 99:14
32:7,16,18,24	10:25	coming 15:23	8:22 65:20 66:10	contains 36:2
33:10 36:12,15	cited 62:12	105:11,20	75:20	contents 99:12
37:23 39:8 41:12	city 22:2,7,10,13,21	command 14:5,8	<b>concept</b> 74:4	contesting 69:13
43:4 45:16 58:15	78:6	20:20 23:22 44:21	concerned 5:15	context 30:16
62:2,19 63:10	<b>civil</b> 17:2 65:13	50:13 92:8,14,23	78:23	111:2 115:7
71:12 74:18 83:13	<b>civilian</b> 22:17	93:6,10 98:2	concerning 98:25	<b>continue</b> 12:22
87:10 96:7 106:23	civilians 29:20	<b>Commanders</b> 99:7	concluded 119:21	<b>contract</b> 15:12 22:6
cases 25:5 27:25	claims 3:14 21:15	comment 100:14	concludes 119:17	<b>control</b> 49:24
28:12 29:16,24	42:23 43:20	100:18	conclusion 18:25	
30:22 59:19	42.25 45.20 clarified 80:14		62:24 118:14	convening 4:12 conversation 32:4
<b>catch</b> 109:3	clarify 6:19	<b>comments</b> 53:8 99:1 101:11 105:1	conclusions 99:9	101:7 111:2
	e e	<b>commit</b> 84:15	conduct 38:20 72:9	conversations
<b>categories</b> 35:13 <b>cause</b> 4:7 25:14	<b>clarifying</b> 8:12 <b>class</b> 12:24 15:1,2	commitment 84:15	92:7 95:18,22	11:19
	24:13	committee 48:20	<b>conducted</b> 22:1	
CCR 1:25 120:16 centralized 91:6				<b>conveying</b> 112:6
	classes 61:12	committing 16:8	37:6 38:21 50:11	<b>copy</b> 40:5 46:17
<b>certain</b> 60:2 61:17	clear 102:8	<b>common</b> 3:16	51:18 115:5	115:25
61:24	<b>client</b> 32:10 33:12	24:11 44:25 45:3	<b>conducting</b> 21:14	<b>CORE</b> 59:8,9,12,13
<b>certainly</b> 13:9,19	<b>close</b> 36:1 39:23	45:25 47:17 50:15	24:6 54:2 71:14	60:8,14,14 61:22
33:9,11 119:10	82:19 108:20	58:5 60:7 61:8,25	72:7 77:4 83:22	62:5,8 66:23
Certified 120:6	<b>closely</b> 39:17	82:14	<b>confident</b> 109:16	71:18 74:5
certify 120:8	clothes 87:8	commonplace	confidential 3:17	<b>corner</b> 39:1
<b>cetera</b> 63:9	co-workers 17:5	90:22	99:13 113:13	<b>corporal</b> 46:17,19
<b>chain</b> 44:21 49:16	106:10	communicate	confidently 109:15	77:8 89:14 102:11
92:8,13,23 93:6,9	collaborating	66:12 67:1	conflicting 118:17	103:21
<b>chairing</b> 27:19	74:12,22	communication	118:23	<b>correct</b> 23:19 26:2
<b>chance</b> 103:14,15	collaborative 77:25	66:12 73:21	<b>conflicts</b> 17:4 85:19	27:4 30:18 31:9
change 11:6 13:4	colleague 77:15	Community 12:17	<b>confusing</b> 6:19	35:1,2 47:12,13
107:7	collect 59:20	compare 35:4	117:11	47:19 50:7,8 52:9
<b>changing</b> 107:1,9	collected 3:13	competent 109:15	confusion 28:8	52:10 53:23 54:24
107:12	32:20 42:22 43:10	complainant 99:23	conjunction 25:1	55:9,25 56:5 57:2

Page 124

	-	_	_	
57:6,11 60:25	5:24 20:6 33:22	days 18:5 105:15	97:25 99:24 101:6	described 68:13
63:12,13,18,25	34:4 69:12 114:24	daytime 87:7	101:18,21 102:5	describes 98:9
64:3,7,8,10,11,17	115:25 120:6	de-escalation 26:25	103:12,14 104:22	describing 10:24
64:20 65:11,14	covered 74:15 75:8	deadline 44:18	105:7,24	110:18
66:6,24 67:16	76:9,20	<b>debate</b> 107:10	departments 82:15	description 58:2
71:15 72:8,12,23	covers 14:18	114:1	depends 51:8 64:25	63:2 81:11
74:9,10 79:15,17	coworker 78:24	<b>December</b> 10:8,9	65:15 94:13	<b>desirable</b> 86:20
88:12 90:7 92:9	79:5.6	11:7 31:20 98:14	deposition 1:12 3:1	87:2,6,9,11 88:9
95:12 96:18 97:20	<b>create</b> 32:23	<b>decide</b> 52:18 54:14	4:5 6:10 7:10	88:15,25 89:4
98:16,17,20,24	created 36:5 74:7	54:18 83:15	9:12,18 10:1,11	91:13
99:2,3,15,16	creative 77:25	<b>decided</b> 46:12	10:11,16 11:10,20	<b>desire</b> 77:10 78:4
100:3,15,18,19,21	credibility 91:21	75:23	13:25 30:7,11	desired 63:8
104:13 106:18	credible 80:11	<b>decision</b> 70:15	31:13 34:5,20	destroy 61:16,21
107:8 117:22	crime 75:19 90:25	decision-makers	42:19 51:14 59:9	62:2
correction 64:1	91:5 109:2,3	20:11	60:10 95:2,15	destroyed 53:12
Corrections 90:17	criminal 27:6	decision-making	109:23 110:5	54:22 58:17 60:3
corrective 93:15	<b>criteria</b> 67:12,14	20:13	115:1 119:18,21	74:19
correctly 10:7	68:2 70:11 76:21	decisions 23:23	120:9	destroying 58:18
48:16 49:12,20	76:25 78:1	<b>deemed</b> 99:12	depositions 5:22	detail 40:4
53:18 56:21 66:22	critical 77:14	defendant 1:10 2:8	10:3 11:5 107:4	detective 19:8,14
84:11 98:5 107:3	crossed 16:16	4:22	deputies 22:24	87:5 89:14
<b>couched</b> 80:13	Crystal 1:25 6:6	defense 27:1,5,6,8	28:24 89:20	determination
83:14	13:24 120:6,16	<b>define</b> 65:1 66:7	deputy 3:15,20	81:21
counsel 4:17	<b>curious</b> 113:15	79:25 113:18	37:14 38:21 44:20	determine 37:19
107:18	current 9:5,9 30:1	definitely 13:21	46:22,25,25 47:3	67:9 105:9 108:20
counsel's 33:17	48:15	37:14 89:6 109:20	51:17,19,20,23	determined 16:4
counseling 93:5,14	currently 15:9 16:3	111:3 118:22	52:8,11,14,21	32:14
94:1,2	<b>CV</b> 12:1,4 16:1	definition 65:15	53:5,9,15,20	developed 14:11
country 14:13	25:24,25 32:24	degree 13:4,7,8	54:16,20 55:8,14	<b>Dick</b> 49:22
county 1:8,9 3:18	·	16:2	55:19,25 56:4,9	difference 13:17
3:19 4:7,22 16:23	D	demoted 102:6	56:13,16,23 57:4	91:17
17:9,16,17,18	<b>D</b> 5:4 51:12 92:3	demotion 99:5	57:18 68:6,7,13	different 13:16,19
18:11 21:1,7	114:19	denies 118:9	69:1 70:16 77:7,8	15:22,22 17:7,16
28:17,24 35:17,21	<b>D-a-v-i-d</b> 5:9	denoted 52:7	77:8,13 79:11	29:23 33:4 35:8
40:20 58:3 78:6	<b>Dan</b> 3:15 44:20	<b>deny</b> 50:14	80:6,22 81:2,3,24	46:6,7 55:23 63:2
85:22 88:16 89:11	51:17 52:8	denying 71:7 80:3	82:2,3,12 83:5,21	75:18 77:20 87:22
90:19 93:2,21	date 1:24 31:10	department 12:18	84:5 86:3,4 89:13	88:1,6 91:1,1,19
100:6 107:6 120:4	dated 10:8 95:8	13:7 15:8,10,12	92:6 97:17 98:20	differently 69:3
<b>County's</b> 10:12	<b>Dave</b> 49:16	15:15,24 18:8	98:22 99:2,6	difficult 88:17
couple 5:19 18:4	<b>David</b> 1:14 3:2 4:5	19:9,15,17,23	100:12,17,20,20	119:6
28:15 35:12 43:23	5:1,9,13,15,19 9:5	20:6 21:12 22:12	103:18,19 104:23	direct 7:7 28:1
63:15 105:17	40:5 42:13 44:24	22:14,19 23:1,17	105:2,2 106:15	42:14 48:1
course 14:11 23:22	120:9	25:7 61:12 76:2,3	110:1 114:12	directing 73:25
24:25	day 4:12 7:16 9:1	78:6 87:1,4,5,23	115:4,8 116:18	102:25
<b>court</b> 1:1 4:8,23	29:2 36:14 50:4,6	90:15,16,17 91:21	117:21,22	direction 76:1
,	57:23 120:13			
	I	l	l	

	I			
directly 40:6	13:25 35:9 37:22	E	104:5	evaluation 51:6
director 10:12	38:19 39:6,18,22	<b>E</b> 2:1,1 5:4,4 29:10	employee's 94:8	79:5
27:14 107:6	39:25 42:15,15,20	33:3 94:22 95:1	employee-related	event 25:13 103:25
directs 99:7	42:20 43:13 49:4	98:7 107:23	18:3	everybody 42:7
disagree 75:6 76:8	50:25 51:12,25	114:19,19,19	employees 15:18	56:17
discern 69:15	60:4,13 61:3,4	120:1,1	17:5 18:6 22:17	evidence 20:1
discharge 95:11	86:15,16 95:1,7	earlier 21:23 36:10	24:22 62:14,15,21	33:11
discharged 96:17	95:14 98:7 103:3	38:16 67:21 70:22	99:8 100:5,6	exactly 40:6 92:1
disciplinary 95:21	108:1 109:23	75:11 84:11 93:8	101:9 104:6,10,23	103:21
95:24 96:9,12,22	112:4 114:23	100:4 107:25	105:6,10	<b>exam</b> 65:13
97:23 98:9 99:19	documentation	118:13	employment 16:11	examination 3:3,5
discipline 14:20	33:13 50:20 67:14	easier 43:5	19:22 27:19 63:6	45:11 84:10 108:8
23:17 93:25 94:3	92:11	Eastern 4:8	encourage 105:6	examine 71:12
94:7 95:22,24	documented 56:5	easy 100:9	ended 25:20 29:2	<b>examined</b> 5:2 68:6
96:13,18 97:19	documents 3:13	education 12:13	56:4	<b>example</b> 8:4 23:13
99:5	6:24,25 7:7,11 8:7	13:15 14:3 51:8	endorsement 44:20	77:7,12
disciplined 97:17	8:14 9:15,16,19	educational 12:11	ends 52:15 54:12	exchanges 74:14
97:19	9:21 10:9,13,17	<b>EEO</b> 19:16,21	enforcement 47:15	<b>excuse</b> 22:2 46:1
disclose 93:6	11:5 32:20 34:9	22:19 24:2,4	90:22	Executive 16:24
disclosure 79:6	34:11,23 35:1,3,7	30:17 61:10,19	engage 24:24 76:6	17:14 27:14
96:11,21 97:16	35:13 36:2,5 39:1	EEO-related 29:14	102:13	executives 14:12
disconnect 68:25	39:17 40:4,7,8,13	<b>effect</b> 77:10	Ennis 47:3 48:13	exercises 85:15
discourage 105:19	41:15 43:2,9,11	effective 99:6	55:7 57:6 64:15	<b>exhibit</b> 3:10 8:17
discriminated	43:19,24 47:7,18	<b>effort</b> 63:4 98:1	77:8	8:20 13:25 14:1
20:24 43:21	47:23 48:2 50:17	102:18	<b>enroll</b> 16:2	34:20 42:17,19
discrimination	50:21 58:16,20	efforts 90:25	<b>entice</b> 88:20	51:13,15 60:9,11
19:19 21:15 29:18	62:3 84:18 90:11	eight 18:4	entitled 39:11	67:16 74:1 79:9
30:12 95:23	<b>dog</b> 51:13	<b>either</b> 23:1 40:5	entry 12:21	84:8,9 86:18 92:4
discuss 94:23	doing 27:20 45:23	80:23 84:22 88:24	environments	94:18 95:2,15,16
discussed 32:24	66:9 69:11 73:1	100:20 108:15	78:11	96:9 98:8,8 99:18
67:20 70:17 75:11	73:10 77:20	electronic 36:14	equal 19:22 96:14	108:4 110:4 112:4
83:9 106:24	105:24 117:19	<b>Ellis</b> 48:5,7,19	<b>escape</b> 24:21	114:25 115:2
109:24	domestic 28:21	49:14,16,18,22	especially 14:24	<b>exhibits</b> 3:11 7:10
discussing 33:14	<b>door</b> 29:1	50:7 57:10	76:9 82:14	7:16 33:14
75:22 116:24	download 7:1	email 31:20 39:10	<b>essay</b> 67:8	existed 61:15
discussion 70:21	downloaded 6:25	39:11 47:4 48:4	essentially 33:3	expand 113:11
73:6 92:15 107:25	dozing 78:18	48:18,24 49:10,13	44:10 89:16 90:17	<b>expect</b> 6:8 81:4
discussions 33:9	<b>Drew</b> 56:7,14	49:15 50:5,15	92:5 95:20,24	82:4 83:23 106:23
dismissal 96:24	<b>drug</b> 90:19	57:8,16 67:21	98:12	110:19 116:7,16
<b>dispel</b> 103:7	<b>DT</b> 3:12 9:8 26:1	69:14 77:2	established 22:21	116:25
distinction 66:3,23	26:15	emails 47:24	<b>estimate</b> 19:5 23:25	expected 85:11
<b>District</b> 1:1,2 4:8,8	<b>due</b> 23:1 32:11 93:5	employee 10:25	24:1 26:14	86:1 113:14
Division 99:7	duly 5:2 120:10	11:1 17:6 23:18	estimated 24:3	experience 13:12
<b>DK</b> 52:8	duplication 40:17	23:20 24:11 25:7	31:13	16:11,12,20,21
<b>document</b> 8:5 12:3	duties 23:10 93:1	97:17,18 103:16	<b>et</b> 63:9	17:7,9 18:5 24:5
		,		
	•		1	

		•		
32:12 34:2 45:2	fairly 16:11 27:15	<b>find</b> 43:15 44:3	91:12,23	funding 91:2
46:5 50:10 51:8	30:8 33:19 45:20	62:5 81:13 115:16	foregoing 120:8	further 79:25
55:18 56:25 59:14	47:14 50:9 58:1	finding 39:9 79:18	forget 26:23	80:14 118:3
61:7 62:4,25	fairness 79:14	81:15 96:13	form 21:19 24:10	119:14
71:18 72:25 73:16	fall 27:1	105:10	30:19 32:1 36:13	<b>future</b> 94:10
77:19 87:20,25	familiar 21:3 23:12	<b>findings</b> 39:24 99:9	40:24 44:20 46:19	
88:18 104:2	24:10,15 46:13	<b>fine</b> 5:16 6:3,4,14	52:14 54:11 57:13	G
experiences 55:19	74:4 90:8 91:9	12:9 80:16 119:8	64:23 65:20 66:18	<b>G</b> 29:25
expert 6:17 26:17	families 82:21	finish 12:22 23:21	67:17 71:16 72:24	<b>gang</b> 90:18
28:17 29:11 30:15	far 5:15 25:8 30:2	finished 12:19	75:4 77:17 81:5	gathered 20:3
30:23 31:16,23	47:20 94:10	13:10	86:11 92:24 96:25	33:11
32:8,13	fast 18:19 110:8	firearm 29:22	112:9	gears 27:23
expertise 17:18	fault 82:12	fired 101:11,18	formal 53:22	general 20:8 26:11
30:16	favorite 71:3	102:7	formed 34:23	27:7 78:8 80:25
explain 84:2	favorites 71:4	firing 10:25 18:1	forming 41:25	81:10 85:16 86:7
102:10 109:4	<b>FBI</b> 90:14	<b>firm</b> 31:3	formulate 34:12	generally 18:19
explicit 101:12	February 1:24 3:4	first 5:1,21 12:12	45:16 109:14	20:9 46:5 53:18
<b>expound</b> 28:19	4:1,12 48:6 49:14	16:20 31:17,20	formulated 106:22	56:20 77:22 78:4
express 17:21	49:17 50:3,4	34:15,22 37:11	forth 70:22 107:11	78:9,10,21 91:12
expressing 47:4	120:10,13	39:8 43:25 44:4	forward 8:11 20:3	94:1 95:12
extemporaneously	<b>Federal</b> 16:24	58:14 63:6 94:14	54:18 67:23 99:24	generated 74:13
119:5	17:14	96:4 97:2 98:13	104:11,18 105:5	geographic 44:15
extensive 14:18	<b>feel</b> 6:10,19 7:18,22	101:1 103:2 108:6	105:11,20,25	gestures 5:25
<b>extent</b> 33:1	7:24,25 8:21 9:2	<b>fitting</b> 75:1	106:3	getting 13:8 15:15
extremely 98:15	34:6 51:4 91:17	five 11:24 22:1	found 18:19,25	90:25 91:1 105:21
<b>eye</b> 87:16	<b>feet</b> 85:15	31:15 33:4 42:5	20:11 78:20,20	110:23
<b>eyes</b> 13:19	felt 20:24 24:12	64:12 88:5	79:2,3,7 101:22	give 24:24 36:16
	32:10 33:11 51:2	five-year 24:1 62:1	four 18:4 28:13	39:5 45:8 59:21
$\frac{\mathbf{F}}{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}_{\mathbf{F}_{1}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$	51:3 59:20 69:15	Flight 44:5 45:11	46:14 55:5,7	60:1 65:21 70:21
<b>F</b> 7:12 95:14 120:1	78:16	84:10	64:11,13,14 73:2	82:10 84:20 86:12
<b>F.L.I.R</b> 116:10	field 6:17 88:11,14	flights 110:18	Fourth 4:15	91:20 111:22
<b>faced</b> 105:16	88:20 89:8 90:2	<b>fly</b> 117:7 118:7	<b>frame</b> 28:10	114:21 115:7,12
<b>facilitate</b> 40:10	<b>Fifth</b> 2:10	focusing 97:1	<b>free</b> 6:10,19 7:18	115:15 116:7
<b>fact</b> 17:12 19:16	fighting 90:25	folks 22:25 71:14	7:25 8:21 9:2	119:1,8,9,12
46:13 76:13 79:20	<b>figure</b> 18:19	72:6 77:7 89:20	front 98:20 103:5	give-and-take 58:7
82:25 92:12,20	<b>file</b> 35:15 36:2,8,12	follow 12:7 22:10	103:12 105:21	<b>given</b> 30:11 52:25
94:1,5 119:9	36:15,24 37:1,3	22:13 105:15	106:10 109:25	65:17 81:21 83:17
fact-finder 20:5	37:18 39:25	follow-up 112:20	<b>FTO</b> 88:11,23 89:3	92:19 100:22
<b>fact-gatherer</b> 19:24	<b>files</b> 7:5 94:9	114:18	89:13,17,21 90:6	107:2 113:12,14
<b>facts</b> 20:10 24:21	<b>fill</b> 63:8 68:12	followed 9:17	<b>FTOs</b> 88:23	<b>gives</b> 44:18 119:12
33:10	filled 63:4	22:11	fulfills 17:14	<b>giving</b> 62:20 70:2
factual 34:2	<b>final</b> 15:25 31:16	following 46:10	<b>full</b> 5:7 36:9,13,24	80:2 86:8 112:8
<b>failed</b> 93:1,2,2	44:22 58:9 70:12	61:23 96:23	36:25 58:19	119:7
<b>failure</b> 29:12 93:5	70:13,18,23 76:23	follows 5:3	<b>fully</b> 114:7	<b>glad</b> 16:17
<b>fair</b> 10:13 22:24	finally 47:2	<b>force</b> 90:9,14,21,24	<b>function</b> 17:15 20:5	<b>go</b> 7:6 8:11 11:25
30:15				12:2,6,19 13:24

16:10 19:25 21:20	105:19,22 106:4,4	guesswork 113:24	heather@barden	honest 106:3
28:4 30:2 34:15	109:1,22 110:18	guideline 80:15	2:6	honestly 26:20
37:8,9,10 40:4	110:21 111:9,15	guidelines 61:21	held 48:9	hopefully 9:23
41:21 43:13,23	113:25 114:1,22	66:23	help 8:10 15:24	16:11 17:22 18:17
49:15 54:8 57:14	114:25 115:6	guys 111:17 117:13	17:21,22 18:16,22	horrible 102:1
61:20 64:24 68:5	116:3 117:15		18:24 41:19 75:25	hour 11:17 31:7
69:19 75:5,13	119:6,18	H	108:21	42:3
79:9 81:8,16 82:6	gonna 52:18 54:15	half 11:17	helped 73:17	hours 18:4 31:13
82:23 84:8 85:4	91:20 94:6	halfway 16:3	helpful 33:12 73:3	31:15,16 87:7
86:15,18 91:7	good 5:6,16 7:10	hampers 118:18	helping 16:17 18:6	96:14,18 97:13
94:20 98:7 108:25	14:23 73:10 77:13	hand 120:12	23:4	117:7 118:6
108:25 110:14,15	78:4,12,18 85:24	handed 59:1	hereunto 120:12	house 28:24
110:16 111:13	87:24 89:7	handled 25:6,18	hesitation 35:6	housekeeping 5:19
114:1 116:13	good-natured	handler 106:6	hey 82:3 83:1,22	<b>HR</b> 10:4,12 22:14
117:7 118:7	107:10	happen 6:12 20:19	102:12	25:1 29:7 30:17
goal 18:22 102:15	Gotcha 39:16	80:17 97:4	<b>hi</b> 27:16	59:21 60:1 62:5
goes 30:3 49:13	government 3:16	happened 20:7,13	high 13:10	107:5
50:10 56:6 65:18	18:6 60:7 61:8	20:15 25:19 98:9	higher 15:6	<b>HR-</b> 29:14
97:16 98:11	71:10	happens 24:23	highlighted 68:21	HR-related 29:6,17
102:18 103:16	graduated 13:3	70:21	110:14 111:4	HR-type-related
104:18 117:3,5,12	14:3 15:1 16:14	happy 7:19 84:25	112:3	29:8
going 6:8 7:15 8:12	gray 83:10	86:24 96:1	highlights 36:17	<b>human</b> 19:9,15
8:13 11:25 12:10	great 8:12 10:5	harassment 17:25	Hines 3:13 21:5	22:8,18 39:24
16:10 21:17 27:23	27:10 31:12 87:17	19:18,19 29:17,20	35:19 37:6 38:14	61:19 76:6
28:1 30:19 35:12	greater 96:14,18	29:22,23 30:13	38:22 39:10,11	hundred 58:6
37:20 38:1,23	greatest 108:21	32:9	42:22 47:24 51:18	hundreds 36:2
40:23 42:2,3,8,13	ground 5:20 85:21	hard 7:21 88:19	52:7,7,11,19 53:3	<b>hurts</b> 104:10
42:14,14,24 43:23	grounds 95:23	93:17 113:18	53:7,14 55:3,10	105:24,25
44:2 45:7 46:16	group 50:12 52:18	head 5:24 31:24	55:15,21 56:1,8	hypothetical 70:2
48:1 49:2,5 51:12	54:14 56:24 57:4	97:25 119:5	56:11,15 80:24	83:3 85:8 104:4
52:4,4 54:21 55:1	57:10 68:9 73:12	heads-up 111:19	110:10 111:14,20	hypothetically
58:13,14 60:4,9	74:21,22 75:21	111:22 112:7,7,11	115:5 116:6,14,18	69:23 71:2 104:5
60:17 62:22 64:22	104:5,17 106:4	hear 6:4 17:21 69:1	116:24 117:4,10	I
65:4,19,20 66:7	groups 17:7	104:7,8 105:12,18	<b>Hines'</b> 21:13 35:23	
67:11 71:1,6,23	GS50-04B-22	113:6	36:6	<b>IA</b> 35:21 38:6 43:7
73:3,5 77:4,14	60:23	heard 100:15	hired 12:18 17:13	<b>idea</b> 21:11 69:17
79:5 81:5 82:12	guess 15:5 22:25	103:17 104:6,19	hiring 14:20 15:16	116:11 117:8
82:17,22 84:8,20	23:4 26:19,21	105:10	46:3 60:24 62:6	<b>Ideally</b> 34:1
84:22 85:18 86:11	34:25 37:1 44:24	hearing 6:3,6 10:7	62:14 78:15 79:14	ideas 75:22 76:1
87:1,2,7,13,14,17	45:15 47:7 57:23	100:25	hold 31:25 57:12	ideas/brainstorm
87:17 91:14,15	64:25 68:25 69:1	hears 100:9	86:16	74:14
94:6,8,20,21 95:1	84:4 89:21 90:11	heart 107:12	<b>holdout</b> 56:17	IDENTIFICATI
95:14 96:2 100:23	93:11,21 94:13,20	Heather 2:4 4:19	57:19	3:11 identified 0:24
101:8 103:3,13,24	102:20 104:1	31:2 32:19 40:3	hone 113:12	identified 9:24
103:25 104:7,8	109:8 118:11,13	40:11 48:22	honed 112:12	10:18 11:1 28:16
		115:20		31:22 35:1 81:2

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC 206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

				•
106:14,16,18	70:14 73:22,23	58:16,19,24 59:16	14:20 22:1 24:2,4	61:24 69:17 71:11
identify 4:17 100:3	76:24 80:2,10	59:17 65:3,7 66:4	24:6	key 9:19 16:5 36:17
107:7	81:15,22 82:10,24	66:6,16,24,25	investigative 36:7	killing 29:2
identifying 28:12	83:6,17 84:4,5	69:2,14 70:17	43:7,10	kind 16:25 17:10
95:21	86:7 92:20 93:12	76:16,17 77:3,9	investigator 19:17	22:18 25:2,10,13
imaginations	94:25 99:14,25	77:13,21 78:14,15	19:22 21:7 22:19	26:24 29:23 40:1
100:24	102:17 103:20	80:7,22,23 81:3	32:13 61:10,11	79:25 81:10,17,17
<b>impact</b> 11:6	105:3 106:25	81:13,16,24 82:1	<b>invoice</b> 31:14	84:16 89:16 90:24
important 61:15	107:1 113:13,19	82:16 83:1,4	involved 28:12,20	96:21 97:13
87:15	114:4,13 118:17	87:21 92:15	31:15 46:7 53:10	109:24 110:13
imposed 96:14	118:24	109:10 110:1,24	55:15	111:19,21 116:12
97:19 99:5	informational 74:9	112:1,18 113:8	issue 25:15 75:20	King 16:23 17:9,16
<b>improper</b> 80:4 82:5	initial 32:4,19 34:9	115:4 116:3	83:11 98:14	17:17,18 18:11
98:15 99:20	48:8 50:2	118:16	issued 97:24	KITSAP 120:4
106:11 113:9	initially 32:3	interviewed 17:12	issues 5:20 17:4,8	Kitson 2:9 3:6,8
improved 89:3	initiative 82:13	51:1 63:23 68:7	19:21 30:17,23	4:10,21,21 5:5 6:4
inappropriate 84:6	inquisitive 113:15	100:23	33:5	6:7 13:24 14:2
99:1,10	instrumental 15:15	interviewee 109:11	item 29:10	21:24 30:21 32:2
incidents 87:15	intention 102:9	109:18,19 110:11	<b>items</b> 44:17	40:3,14,15,25
105:7	interact 22:8	110:11 113:9		41:1,6,9 42:2,13
<b>include</b> 23:7 51:3	interest 18:16	interviewer 110:11	J	42:18 51:16 57:17
97:16	44:19 46:18,20	111:11 112:12	<b>Jason</b> 2:14 4:14 6:5	60:4,12 65:10
<b>includes</b> 12:3 74:17	47:1,4,10	114:6	<b>Jeff</b> 46:17 56:13,17	66:20,21 68:4
including 10:10	interesting 15:18	interviewing 45:24	56:19 57:22,22	71:22 73:24 75:12
36:3 44:15 63:22	77:18	62:13 73:1	98:18	79:8 81:7 85:6
inconsistent 99:20	internal 21:2 22:4	interviews 36:3	<b>job</b> 9:22 13:12	86:14 93:3 94:19
increased 26:18	35:18 44:25 50:24	37:4,6,7,13 38:18	14:21 17:10 27:20	95:17 97:15
105:16	51:1,10 58:16,22	39:23 71:14 72:7	51:9 62:20 63:16	107:14,18 108:5
independent 33:23	61:10,18 62:16,20	72:9 77:4 79:13	63:17 73:11 77:13	109:25 112:6,9
33:24 90:12	69:14 92:16 94:15	80:17,23 83:22	78:12 88:3	114:17,20 115:3
<b>INDEX</b> 3:3,10	96:11,21 98:10	intimate 104:25	<b>Jones</b> 38:5	115:13,19,24
indicated 26:23	99:9,13,25 101:1	investigate 24:18	judging 108:14	116:2 119:14
28:11	105:4	105:8	<b>July</b> 91:23 <b>jump</b> 42:3	Kitsonm@lanep
indicates 25:25	<b>interrupt</b> 75:13	investigated 21:1	<b>June</b> 51:18 94:23	2:12
99:4	115:10	25:21	95:8	<b>knew</b> 61:15 83:7,7
individually 8:14	interruption 53:6	investigating 3:13 42:22	<b>Justice</b> 12:15	83:8 103:14,23
37:25	<b>interrupts</b> 53:15 56:13		Justice 12.15	113:21 114:9 Knight 2:15 44:20
industry 79:13,21 inform 99:8	interspersed 41:14	<b>investigation</b> 20:12 21:14,21 23:5,21	K	<b>Knight</b> 3:15 44:20 51:18,19 52:8,8
<b>informal</b> 74:14	interview 3:15,20	23:23 25:22 36:4	<b>K9</b> 106:5	52:11,14,21 53:5
information 19:25	10:24 20:1 37:14	36:5,9,24 37:1	<b>KB</b> 110:9	53:9,15,20 54:20
20:2 32:15,22	37:15 38:21 45:9	38:8 39:22 47:25	keep 16:18 38:23	55:8,14,19,25
33:18 35:8 36:13	51:17,23 52:13	92:17 95:11 98:10	62:22 73:18	56:4,9,13,16 57:4
36:18 66:8,11	53:25 54:2,16,19	99:9 110:12	keeping 105:22	57:18 68:7,13
67:2 69:25 70:9	54:24 56:23 58:5	investigations	Kent 29:12	70:16 117:13
01.2 07.20 10.7	01.2100.200.0		kept 53:8,11 61:16	,0.10 11/.10
	l		l	l

			•	
Knight's 51:23	L 30:2,3,3,4	17:13 18:11 25:1	little 27:24 28:8	23:16 36:4
54:16 56:23 68:6	labeled 7:11	27:21 33:2 34:15	31:5 34:17 44:7	<b>Louis</b> 3:20
69:1	labor 19:20,21	42:4 69:13 75:17	54:8 60:19 111:21	<b>love</b> 113:4
knock 28:24	27:19	79:9 83:2,11 85:2	112:12 113:12	lower 93:25
<b>know</b> 6:5,11,16,18	lack 51:8 87:16	85:4,19 86:15,18	115:7 117:24	lying 25:12
7:20 15:25 18:11	lacking 67:19	87:4,15 92:1,3	LLC 4:15 26:1,5,7	• • •
22:24 24:23 26:20	70:24 71:12 73:21	103:5,7,13,13,15	Local 3:16 60:7	M
27:12,15 30:17	laid 22:12	113:5,5 115:6	61:8	<b>M</b> 1:5 4:6 5:4
31:22 32:17 34:3	landlord-tenant	118:1	<b>locate</b> 8:14	107:23 114:19
36:4 37:15 40:25	17:8 18:12	letter 44:19 46:17	located 4:15	<b>mad</b> 27:18
41:1,24 43:11	<b>LANE</b> 2:10	46:20,21 47:1,9	location 6:24	maintain 33:22
45:20 49:1,7	language 22:6	104:12	long 6:9,11 11:16	majority 56:19
53:17 56:11 59:23	98:15 100:7	letters 47:11	11:23 36:1 80:1	57:21 58:11
62:12,15 65:18,22	101:13,14 103:3	level 14:24 93:5,14	82:7 117:20	making 52:16
69:2,21,23 70:18	104:8	99:4	longer 74:19 82:9	54:12 79:18 91:17
70:24 72:11 73:8	large 22:16,18 35:7	liability 28:18 29:9	102:11	104:1
76:5 77:4,7,15	39:25 43:13 77:20	lieutenant 5:12	longstanding 19:1	<b>man</b> 13:20
80:16 82:14 84:1	87:3 88:23 90:23	38:5 88:24 97:25	look 8:17,20,20,21	manageable 49:2
85:1 86:5 88:4,11	91:4 104:17 106:4	97:25 103:12	8:21 13:18 16:9	management 14:19
89:20 90:1 91:2,6	largely 33:16 77:19	105:18	31:11 34:15 35:3	14:21
93:18 94:10 95:4	larger 44:7 60:19	lieutenants 99:8	35:14 37:18 41:18	manager 61:11
95:10,21,25	larger-sized 86:25	103:1,4	44:1 52:14 54:11	78:15
100:11 101:7,21	late 62:9,10	life 13:16 15:22	58:14 69:12 70:4	managers 14:13
102:1 103:18	late-in-life 12:23	light 92:20 99:17	70:4,7 71:17	manner 10:6 23:24
104:1 105:1,11,20	law 12:14 31:2	lighter 94:5	73:12 83:24 86:5	Manual 3:19 22:5
108:12,20 111:15	47:14 59:24 69:12	liked 112:11,21	92:3 96:1 100:12	March 15:9
112:23 113:15,24	71:11,21 90:22	113:6,11	106:5 115:15,16	mark 13:25 51:13
115:14 116:4,10	laws 59:22	limited 74:17	looked 9:18 10:2,2	60:9 95:1 114:25
116:10 117:6,8,10	lawsuit 20:22 29:12	line 8:3 79:25 97:2	10:20 47:8 50:18	marked 14:1 42:17
117:12 118:5	34:24	106:8 113:18	57:9 61:3 64:14	51:15 60:11 94:18
119:3	Lawyers 27:8	link 6:23 7:5,6,9	67:21 68:8 77:1	95:16 108:5 110:2
knowing 94:15	<b>lays</b> 44:10	list 16:10 27:24	85:21 99:18	115:2
knowledge 21:2	lead 76:4 91:8	28:12 29:16,25	looking 8:25 37:17	master's 16:2,5
33:23 47:6 66:10	leadership 15:5	35:17 45:12,14	38:15 39:20 43:15	match 57:8,15 61:2
67:1 90:12 104:24	91:7 95:9	46:10 54:2,3 58:9	43:18 45:5 62:11	material 36:19
104:25 120:11	leaning 52:2	66:5 69:6 79:12	78:1 84:8,17	38:17 39:20 65:19
<b>Knowles</b> 38:12	learners 13:1	80:7,12 84:13	looks 7:10 12:9,12	71:19
<b>knows</b> 99:24	leave 23:22 38:13	88:2	12:13 16:23,24	<b>materials</b> 46:12
104:10	85:2	listed 9:16 28:5	85:4 94:5 108:8	50:12,19 64:5,9
Krystal 46:20 99:2	leaves 100:24	30:11 32:23 98:3	lost 56:19	64:16 68:8 80:9
110:1,10	led 10:25	100:8	lot 36:20 38:17	90:4 107:4
Kullman 100:17,20	left 15:8 29:1 102:6	listen 73:2	53:17 65:17 73:1	Matt 56:7
103:10,19 104:23	legal 17:2	<b>lists</b> 28:7,8 44:14	73:1,23 78:2	<b>matter</b> 4:6 31:18
106:17	legitimate 82:25	63:2	87:17 91:10 104:2	65:24 71:4 107:12
L	let's 7:8 12:24 16:9	literally 52:22	Loudermill 23:13	mature 13:18
<b>L</b>				McAULIFFE 1:25
	-	-	-	-

120:6,16	mentioning 81:14	<b>N</b> 2:1 5:4,4 107:23	<b>nice</b> 16:18	numbering 8:11
<b>mean</b> 6:16 8:4,7	met 61:21	107:23 114:19,19	<b>night</b> 6:24	numbers 8:2,2,3
9:7 65:12 66:3	method 58:11	<b>N-word</b> 98:19	<b>nine</b> 85:4	37:23 38:25 39:1
68:15 72:21 75:13	97:22	name 4:14 5:7 81:9	no-contact 28:22	39:6 40:7,13 61:2
76:11 86:22	<b>Michael</b> 2:9 4:9	97:17 101:8	nods 5:24	115:10,12
100:20 101:25	midsized 86:25	105:21 106:18	non-Bates 115:20	numerical 52:24
113:9 115:20	<b>Mike</b> 4:21 5:15	named 47:2 103:11	nonverbal 5:25	53:2 55:22
119:8	85:5	106:1,10	norm 103:6	
meaning 33:24	mimic 22:13	names 99:22	normal 112:1,17	0
50:11 54:1 57:19	mimicked 22:20	100:10 101:13,23	Northeast 9:9	<b>O</b> 5:4 107:23,23
59:2	mine 6:15	103:18 104:8,21	Northwestern 14:4	114:19
means 43:16 87:13	Minimal 74:2	103:10 101:0,21	14:7,12,15	<b>o0o-</b> 4:3 119:24
97:3,3	minor 25:6	naming 103:8	notes 50:24 52:16	oath 5:2
<b>meant</b> 13:9,11	<b>minutes</b> 11:17,24	105:10	52:22,23,23 53:4	<b>object</b> 30:19 40:23
mechanics 53:2	42:6 68:7	<b>nature</b> 85:16	53:12 54:4,12,17	57:12 64:22 71:16
<b>mediate</b> 18:7,10	misconduct 25:6	necessarily 33:24	54:22 58:22,25	81:5 86:11,12
mediated 17:15	83:11	83:5	59:18,21 68:16	objection 21:19
mediating 17:7	misguided 101:17	need 5:22 6:9,12	69:10 71:15 72:7	31:25 66:18 67:17
mediation 16:21	misrepresented	7:22,24 8:24 9:1	72:8,11,15,17,18	72:24 75:4 77:17
17:18	102:5	17:17 26:25 35:14	72:21 73:4,17	92:24 96:25 112:9
mediations 16:25	missed 68:1	44:14 65:22,22,23	74:18,25 75:2	observe 23:4
19:5	missing 51:11	65:24 71:11	76:16,18 77:4,9	observed 23:16
mediator 16:23	67:25 68:22 69:18	107:20,21 111:18	77:11,14,16	100:17
meeting 99:1	69:21	114:4	noteworthy 103:25	obtain 19:25
meetings 76:7	mission 117:6	needed 34:14 74:19	notice 39:9 47:9	obtaining 13:4
<b>member</b> 23:8 26:6	118:6	89:6 101:21,25	50:18 63:11,14	<b>obvious</b> 101:2
26:8 27:13 85:20	moment 21:17	needs 63:7 71:20	96:21 99:12	obviously 18:12
98:2	86:12 110:14	negotiate 17:22	116:15 118:15	29:5 32:21 38:1
members 26:6	115:14	neighbors 91:7	noticed 4:9	47:18 55:12 96:17
90:14 101:18,20	months 15:4	<b>Neither</b> 119:16	notices 36:4	occur 85:20 96:12
<b>memo</b> 25:1,1 38:14	morning 5:6 11:15	Neuerberg 4:14	notification 45:4,9	96:23 97:2,3,12
94:23 95:8 100:1	11:22,23	Neuerburg 2:14	97:22 108:6	occurred 73:6
100:8,9,13,25	motivation 102:2	neutral 17:21	notifications 23:8	98:10
101:12 105:18	mouthful 56:20	18:15 20:10	23:11	occurs 70:10
memorandum 3:17	<b>move</b> 16:7 55:1	<b>never</b> 15:11 53:11	notified 67:22	offended 104:20
38:12 95:2 97:23	60:17 67:23 75:25	62:2 78:20 79:2,3	<b>notify</b> 23:20	offensive 100:7
98:1 102:25	85:1,3	88:22 103:16	notoriety 91:20	101:10 102:4
memories 73:16	moved 88:5	104:6	number 14:3 15:1	103:2,5 104:7
memory 73:15	moving 53:7 79:9	<b>new</b> 10:21 62:16	15:9 18:1 35:17	105:13
84:16	94:20	88:7 106:25	39:5,12,15 41:15	offer 20:8,19 93:17
<b>memos</b> 36:23	multi-agency 90:14	News 27:1,5	44:16 55:5,6,6,7	106:23
mentioned 24:17	91:11	newspaper 10:19	56:16 63:2 87:3	offered 28:17 33:4
29:19 30:10 37:23	multiplies 90:24	10:21,22 11:6	88:23 90:23	91:22
55:22 58:12 70:22	multitask 108:15	newsworthy	numbered 8:9	offering 79:19
91:20 93:8,9		103:25	45:13	office 3:18 6:23
	N			21:1,6 35:18,19
		Ī	l	l

				v
35:21 40:19,20	84:20 85:3,4,5	oral 44:22 45:11,21	overtime 87:14	50:22 59:4 64:16
44:11 58:4 72:5	86:15,18 88:11	48:9 50:2,4,11,20	88:21	65:3,14 67:15,15
87:12 88:16 89:2	90:5,8 95:8,14	52:12 53:21 54:1		68:19 69:9 74:13
89:10,12 90:15	96:8 110:18 111:6	55:12,24 57:1	P	81:24 86:4 103:8
93:19 94:16 95:10	111:11,13,14,20	58:23 59:2 65:2	<b>P</b> 2:1,1	110:9 111:10
95:20 96:22 97:24	113:1 115:19,24	65:17,21 66:13,25	<b>p.m</b> 48:6 49:14,17	115:25
98:2 100:6	116:3,14 117:5	67:7 84:10 85:11	119:19,21	participants 1:19
<b>Office's</b> 99:21	118:5	111:12 112:1,17	package 15:17	2:2 54:1 59:2
officer 16:13 44:5	<b>old</b> 13:17	116:21 117:1	packet 48:2,22 50:2	participated 59:15
45:11 84:10 85:25	oldest 12:24	orally 66:10	50:18	75:16
88:12,15 90:2	once 7:7 100:13	order 18:15 20:20	page 3:5,11 8:2,10	particular 8:24
91:18 104:22	one-hour 31:15	23:23 28:22 34:11	28:1,10,11 29:25	24:13 48:24 52:25
officers 15:19	ones 9:19 103:20	49:1 52:17,18	34:15,23 39:3,8	particularly 102:13
22:25 85:21 86:23	104:24,25	54:13,15 58:8	39:10 43:14 44:4	105:16 106:5
88:20 89:9 92:21	oops 86:15	59:22 67:22 68:22	45:10 48:1,2 49:4	parties 17:21 18:17
103:24 104:17,21	open 7:8,8 8:5,21	69:11 76:7 77:1	54:10 55:1 60:18	18:18,22
105:15,25 106:4,8	42:14,25 95:14	88:21 89:15	85:13 96:8,8	parts 41:14
official 76:2,3	opened 8:1	101:17,19 102:17	108:6 111:5 115:6	passage 8:15
85:22 102:24,25	opening 8:13 44:6	<b>Oregon</b> 15:10,12	115:22	<b>Pat</b> 49:16 50:5
<b>oh</b> 27:10,15 28:6	openings 48:15	15:23 16:24 17:11	pages 36:1,2,18	51:21
38:4 103:16 111:3	operating 91:6	17:14 59:15,19,22	38:2,9 39:20	paths 16:16
112:21 113:1	operation 91:4,8	59:24	45:13 84:9 108:7	Patrick 48:4
118:3	opine 30:23	organizations	paid 38:13 39:23	patrol 44:16 70:6
okay 7:11,15 8:18	opinion 20:8,15	17:17 77:21	70:25	89:15,23 90:16
10:7 11:4,13,16	28:17 29:11 30:6	orientation 44:15	panel 17:19 46:3,5	91:18
11:18,25 12:8	31:16 34:24 50:22	original 10:2 25:12	67:2,22 78:14	patterned 22:20
14:22 16:9 19:5	58:14,17,21,25	94:14	83:10 109:4 113:8	<b>pawn</b> 91:8
21:25 23:7,12	59:3,5,6,11 60:22	Originally 9:14	panelist 46:6 59:16	<b>pay</b> 87:14 96:15
25:24 26:23 27:10	60:22,25 66:14,16	ostensibly 99:25	59:18 78:15	97:13
27:11 28:6 29:3	66:22 68:19 69:10	<b>OSU</b> 16:2	panelists 58:6	paying 78:19
29:10,25 30:4	79:10,11,19,22	outcome 15:25	70:12,23,25 73:6	<b>PC</b> 2:10
35:12 36:25 37:21	80:11 83:17 86:19	18:16 20:21 93:7	77:22 83:7	<b>PD</b> 19:9,10,11
39:16 40:16 41:8	92:3,6 93:17	93:12 95:10	panels 58:17 59:16	<b>PDR</b> 79:4
41:20,22 43:17,23	94:22 113:20	outlined 33:10	paper 36:13 65:20	<b>pencil</b> 67:5,6
44:4 45:10,20	118:13,25	61:21	66:9 67:5	<b>pending</b> 6:11
46:10,16 47:18,23	opinions 9:17,20	outlines 95:20,24	paragraph 8:2	<b>people</b> 15:16,21
49:13 50:17 52:4	11:7 32:23 33:3,4	97:5	98:13,22 100:13	19:25 25:13 26:11
52:11,19,24 53:3	33:7,21 34:1,3,12	outlook 13:16	parameter 98:4	45:4,5 52:17
53:14,20,25 55:1	41:12,25 42:3	<b>outside</b> 25:20 30:16	parents 25:10	54:13 57:11 72:21
55:3,10,21 56:8	43:4 45:16 58:14	overall 22:14 30:8	parlay 87:19	73:2,2 74:21
56:11,15,23 57:18	95:3 106:21,22	overboard 102:18	part 17:2 23:10,15	75:21 77:21,24
58:1,10,13 60:17	107:7,9,13	overheard 101:13	26:11 28:7 35:7	78:5,9,20 82:15
61:7 63:15 64:9	opportunity 16:1	oversee 49:24 78:3	36:5,7 38:11	82:18,20 83:21
66:14 73:25 75:15	19:22 62:21 80:3	oversight 49:23	40:11,19 41:11	88:20 89:5,7,7,25
79:9,25 82:2	opposed 55:24	50:14 91:2	43:2,7,10,18	100:22,24 101:5,6
			45:15 47:19 48:21	
	•		•	

	1	1	1	
101:13,24 103:18	please 4:17 5:7,25	20:25 21:25 44:11	119:4	proceed 101:17
103:23 104:9,16	6:10,16 7:18	44:14 45:17 46:14	prepared 85:18	proceeding 45:12
105:11 113:15	48:14 60:19	47:4 48:23,24	preparing 40:21	process 17:3,3
perceived 24:19	114:21	56:1,2 62:6,16,21	present 36:17	20:13 23:1,5,13
<b>percent</b> 15:4 58:6	<b>PO</b> 2:5	63:4,7,12,18	50:25 104:17	23:16 40:11 43:10
perform 16:25	point 7:17,24 8:19	64:20 65:5 67:9	presentation 65:21	43:20 47:19 49:7
performance 55:13	12:14 13:13 16:13	68:12 71:6,8 72:3	presented 20:10	50:9 54:19,19
55:24	20:14 24:21 34:8	82:5 84:3 85:17	24:10 30:24	58:2,8,19 59:17
performed 24:2	34:10 38:17 41:23	86:21 87:6,11	106:25	62:13 64:17 65:3
31:8	52:4 63:6,20	88:9,10,15 89:1	preserved 23:4	65:14 67:24 68:14
period 24:1,5 59:23	64:12 65:6 67:11	91:23 102:6	pretty 15:17 18:19	68:20 69:9,14
60:2 61:17,24	67:19 68:18 69:17	108:24 109:6	33:1 35:4 36:14	70:23 73:23 75:10
periods 61:20	72:13,14,16 76:8	positions 15:6	53:15 69:20 87:6	76:3 77:6 78:17
person 21:5 52:15	76:22 77:16 81:10	21:22 45:1 47:16	100:8 112:1,17	79:1 81:4,14,25
54:12 69:22 71:8	82:1 83:16 93:11	62:17 87:1,20	previous 31:14	82:4,16 83:1 86:5
81:18 82:9 88:3	93:22	88:1	36:11 112:4	95:25 109:12
100:21 106:15	pointed 45:7	possibilities 75:22	previously 43:14	processes 74:15
person's 72:18	points 15:22,22	possibility 97:8	primarily 18:6	processing 119:6
personal 55:19	25:17 63:15,16	possible 119:12	22:11	professional 14:24
56:3	police 12:18 13:6	possibly 19:7 20:19	primary 19:16 46:3	21:6 35:19 78:1
personally 52:16	14:4,7,12,13,19	28:25 51:5 83:11	prior 26:22 31:1	97:24 98:3
54:13	14:23 15:8,10,11	posted 51:9	54:10 116:8	professionals 26:11
personnel 14:19	15:13,15,19,24	posting 62:20	prioritize 108:16	program 14:17
15:20 39:25 75:9	16:6 18:8,13	63:11,17 96:9	priority 108:20	89:3
76:12 94:9	19:17 20:4,4	98:8 99:19,20	private 83:6	progressing 54:18
<b>pertain</b> 118:16	21:12 22:5,12	<b>postings</b> 63:17	probably 11:17	promotions 94:10
pertained 62:5	26:25 29:9,12	potential 23:17	22:16 26:22 27:18	<b>proof</b> 71:9
<b>phone</b> 11:14 31:15	61:11,11 82:14	31:23	37:16 42:4 49:6	<b>proper</b> 94:24
32:19 33:9 50:16	86:23 90:15,16	potentially 32:8	49:11 62:9 78:2,2	<b>propose</b> 18:24
phrased 6:18	105:15	35:3 94:9 114:11	86:6 87:6 103:23	protected 24:13
physical 20:1	<b>policies</b> 22:2,3,5	114:12	108:18 117:6	protocol 70:6
pick 5:24 108:19	23:2 40:19,20	<b>POWELL</b> 2:10	118:6	<b>prove</b> 69:24 70:3
picked 26:16 56:6	41:10,24 96:6,23	practice 19:20	<b>problem</b> 18:20	<b>provide</b> 5:23 23:11
88:7	99:21	59:20 109:14	20:17 75:17,19,19	40:12 41:4 47:10
piece 24:24 25:19	policy 3:19 16:2	practices 104:9	76:5 82:23 83:5	80:1 86:6,6
67:5	72:5 95:18,19,21	pre-decided 71:1,3	91:3 99:22 100:1	109:20 113:8
<b>pieces</b> 41:13	96:4,20 97:5	71:5	problematic 83:19	115:25 116:14
<b>Pierce</b> 28:17,24	99:18 102:15,25	pre-flight 116:11	101:8 104:3	provided 10:10
<b>pilot</b> 85:20	political 14:21	predisposed 72:19	106:14 118:22,25	29:11 33:12 34:23
place 22:9 77:23	<b>poor</b> 27:20	preferred 44:14	problems 6:6	35:11 40:6 41:2
78:22 87:21 101:1	<b>popular</b> 106:7	preparation 9:18	procedure 45:25	43:12 54:2 61:4
plain 87:8	portion 58:21 96:1	10:1 11:10,19	70:6 72:5	79:12,19 80:1,6
<b>plaintiff</b> 1:6 2:3	111:4	43:3	procedures 40:19	80:12 110:5
4:20 20:23 58:18	<b>portions</b> 110:15	prepare 9:12 20:2	40:20 41:10,14	118:19,20
played 103:11	<b>position</b> 13:7 19:2	36:16 84:3 111:18	96:7	providing 23:8

				0
41:11 118:9	questions 6:18 12:1	68:9 70:10,12,13	113:12,24 114:4	60:7 61:12,14,16
provision 84:5	35:12 41:20 45:11	74:23,24 76:21,23	118:21	61:17,21 62:13,22
<b>public</b> 16:2 77:5	45:13,14,19,21	89:22 99:6	realtime 4:15	63:2,3 71:10 74:2
publication 26:24	46:4,6,8,9,11	rankings 48:8 50:6	109:13	74:3,5,7,13,15
27:2,6	50:19 54:3,4 59:1	50:21 51:10 55:12	reason 6:16 35:6	75:1,3,8 76:2 77:5
<b>published</b> 26:25	59:3,17 65:7,23	68:12,23 78:17,25	77:22	77:15
<b>pull</b> 12:2 37:16	66:4,6 68:17	89:17	reasonable 98:1	<b>recruiting</b> 62:6,13
60:4 84:23 115:20	69:25 73:5,19	rate 31:6 52:16	reasonably 85:11	88:19
pulled 37:22 108:1	78:18 79:12,20	54:13	reasons 88:10 89:6	recruitment 60:24
purpose 78:8	80:7,12,16 83:8,9	rated 52:12	recall 34:13 37:8	63:4 76:15,18
purposes 9:7 47:21	83:25 84:10,13,15	raters 52:23 53:3	37:12 45:15 48:18	reduce 101:19
59:9 66:17	84:21 85:7,9,9,10	rating 46:19,23,24	51:22 73:22 96:5	102:15,17,19
pursue 7:17,25	85:25 107:15,19	47:3 52:15 54:11	96:6 116:22,24	reducing 102:21
pursued 14:16	107:21 108:7	ratings 55:4	117:5,14,18,21	refer 5:12,14 7:16
purview 25:20	110:23 111:9,15	react 105:9	118:5	8:3 51:12 58:13
put 27:8 35:8 36:12	111:22 113:8,16	read 10:5 21:16,21	receive 93:24	59:8 60:14,22
56:13 80:8,13	114:6,15 116:5,15	25:2 36:23,25	received 12:14	73:17 75:9 76:22
88:7 89:8 106:8	116:20,23,25	39:19,24 40:1	24:12 34:14 40:13	reference 8:25 9:1
114:3	117:17,22 118:9	48:16 49:2,11,20	41:15 62:7 74:7	28:10
<b>putting</b> 15:16	118:16,19 119:15	51:24 53:17,18	93:4 118:15	referencing 39:2,7
56:17 90:23	quick 31:19 110:3	56:20 62:18 81:20	recognize 18:22	95:3
102:16	quickly 11:14	84:19,22,23,25	95:6	referred 8:8 37:23
	16:11 38:18 85:13	91:25 92:1,2,16	recollection 9:2	38:15 100:13
Q	95:25	94:24 95:6 97:2	21:9 39:19 48:21	referring 36:21
qualifications	quiet 105:22	97:14 98:1,5	72:10 80:21,25	58:20 60:13 61:1
58:23 63:9	quite 14:18 82:17	100:10 101:3	81:1,23 84:14	76:11 98:22
quality 78:5	101:2 106:6	103:1,3,4,13	117:16	<b>refers</b> 75:24
quarters 82:20	116:19	105:18,21 106:6	recommendation	reflected 94:8
<b>question</b> 6:11,15,20		110:13 111:8	46:21 47:11,12	refresh 9:2
43:1 44:24 46:7	R	reading 36:9,18,19	55:17 56:25	regarding 31:18
52:25 53:4,8	<b>R</b> 1:25 2:1 5:4	36:21 37:7 45:18	recommendations	48:19 58:22 59:24
55:11 68:15 70:7	107:23 114:19,19	71:19 90:10	53:13 82:17	95:10 100:14
70:8 71:24,25	120:1,6,16	117:20	recommended 45:8	108:1 110:12
72:2,4 73:12	race 24:14 32:11	reads 105:17	record 4:4,18 5:8	117:8
77:18 78:23 82:6	race-based 24:17	<b>real</b> 6:9 110:3	13:22 25:3,3 42:5	regards 23:17
82:25 85:22 88:17	racist 101:10	real-world 13:12	42:9,12 60:14	35:23
94:15 96:4 99:17	102:13 104:7	really 14:18 19:21	61:8 69:17 73:18	<b>Regional</b> 44:5 90:9
100:9 102:16	105:1,8	25:14 26:16 52:15	115:19 116:1	regurgitate 66:8
108:10,13,14,17	range 39:17	54:12 73:13,21	119:18	<b>relate</b> 30:12 66:11
108:23 109:8,9,18	rank 74:22	75:23 77:12,14	recorded 3:15,20	<b>related</b> 19:21 21:14
109:21 112:5,8,20	ranked 57:11,19	84:15 89:1,9	36:3 37:4,6,13	24:17,18,25 25:22
112:21,22 113:7	ranking 48:20 49:8	93:21 94:12,14	51:17,23 110:1	29:17 30:16 38:6
113:10,22,25	49:9 50:12 55:5	101:7 104:3,10	115:4	38:7 40:7 42:23
114:10 118:8	55:22,22 56:2	105:11,19,24,25	records 3:16 36:7	43:19 46:19,22
119:3,11	57:5,23 58:16,20	106:11 110:8	42:21 58:18 60:3	47:24 60:24 61:7
questioning 111:2	67:12,14,22 68:3			
- 0		l		

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC 206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

62:8 63:11,18	43:8 58:13 60:15	respond 85:19	39:22 40:18 41:11	110:20,25 111:7
66:1,13 75:2	92:3,13,18 98:11	91:18	43:18 50:12 80:9	112:24 113:19
93:12 98:13,15,18	104:12 105:6	responding 87:14	84:21	114:22 118:11
105:4 106:22	106:21 107:7	response 49:11	reviewed 9:16	right-hand 39:1
<b>relates</b> 74:1 93:18	114:3	responses 91:11	10:14,17,19 37:13	rights 23:1
relating 62:13 99:2	reported 1:25 92:7	responsibility	41:10 43:2,16	ring 91:5
relatively 25:5	92:8,23 93:9	105:8	47:8 51:22 67:15	<b>robber</b> 109:3
relay 102:9	98:14 100:21	responsible 23:3,8	76:12 84:12 90:4	robbery 108:25
release 94:25 97:11	104:9,13,19	result 55:9 89:17	92:12 107:4	109:1 111:25
99:13	105:14	95:22 102:3,4	reviewers 50:25	112:3,4,16,20,22
relevant 8:8 9:24	reporter 4:23 5:24	results 58:19,23	reviewing 9:23	113:22 114:2,10
39:21	114:24 115:25	60:1 63:21 64:19	45:15,17 48:18,23	role 19:13,14 21:12
<b>relied</b> 40:9	120:7	65:1,2,8 69:13	80:22 81:23 96:5	21:13,13 22:14
rely 20:18 72:9	<b>Reporting</b> 4:15	70:19 77:1 78:24	96:6	23:15 103:10
76:24,25	reports 20:2 28:17	résumé 44:19	<b>Richmond</b> 1:5 4:6	roles 22:20,21
<b>relying</b> 59:14 76:15	35:22,24	46:18,21 47:1,5	4:20 10:3 20:23	roll 94:24 103:5
<b>remained</b> 20:9,10	represent 35:24	51:6 55:17	24:8,9 37:15	104:17 105:18,21
remaining 85:9	42:21 43:9 51:19	résumé/CV 47:10	38:21 39:4,9,11	room 103:5
remember 24:21	60:6 90:13	résumés 56:24	39:13,14,15 43:20	<b>RPR</b> 1:25 120:16
25:18 29:4 35:2	representing 4:21	63:20,24 64:10	46:25 48:12 55:6	<b>rubric</b> 53:23
36:9 37:7 40:22	represents 4:20	retain 59:21	56:18 57:5,19	<b>rule</b> 56:19
41:16 43:18,22	reputations 106:2	retained 30:22 31:1	64:15 77:8 89:12	rules 5:20 22:9,11
45:17,18 48:23,25	106:8	31:2 32:5 63:3	90:1 91:22 92:7	22:12 58:11
49:7,8,12,25	request 34:10 77:9	71:20 74:18	92:12 98:14	ruling 20:5
62:10 75:15 81:9	77:15 79:6	retaining 61:14	100:12,20 103:11	<b>rumors</b> 99:10
81:10,13,18 82:1	requested 77:6	retains 60:2	103:19 106:15	101:19 102:15,17
83:3 84:11,17	92:17	retaliate 25:7	107:5 110:6,7	102:19,22 103:7
90:10 91:25 92:1	requests 63:8	retaliation 24:16	115:23	running 15:16
92:16 107:9,12	require 68:24 72:6	24:19,20,25 25:2	Richmond's 3:14	
remembering	required 13:6	25:14,17 29:18	10:11 21:15 42:23	S
49:10	44:12 47:9 72:15	30:13	47:1 92:19	<b>S</b> 2:1 107:23,23
<b>remove</b> 18:14	72:17 73:9 96:23	retention 3:16	rid 62:2 74:24	S-w-e-e-n-e-y 5:10
<b>render</b> 80:10	114:6	59:23,25 60:7,14	86:16	safe 16:18 90:9
113:19	requirement 71:13	61:8,13 62:1 72:3	right 5:18,19 12:5	91:23
rendered 92:5	requirements 51:9	74:2 75:1	12:10 13:2,3	safety 70:5
rendering 43:3	59:8,10,12,13	reticence 92:19	16:19 19:12 27:6	<b>save</b> 64:5
<b>report</b> 3:12 8:6,24	62:5	retired 15:9	28:6 35:16 37:17	saved 59:4 68:19
8:25 9:1,2,17 10:3	requires 113:23	retrieved 47:21	37:20 38:2,2,4	<b>saw</b> 14:14 90:3
10:8,18 11:8 12:3	requisitions 63:7	return 98:2	39:3 42:2,13,16	93:8
24:3 28:11 30:1,6	reserved 119:23	revealed 114:12	54:10 71:19 72:20	saying 40:8 50:5
32:23,25 33:3,6	Resident 1:5	revealing 72:22	76:13 77:22 78:11	79:20 102:2,4
33:16,20 34:6,16	resolution 20:16	review 7:23 9:15	85:2,5 89:6	105:20 112:11
34:21 35:18,24	resources 19:9,15	11:4 23:22 31:15	100:10 105:14	says 14:3 29:11
36:6,10,19 38:3,7	22:8,19 39:25	32:20,22 33:18	106:1 107:14	44:4,18 48:7
40:9,21,25 41:25	61:19	36:6 37:5 39:18	108:18,22 110:16	49:18 52:14,21
				53:3,9,14,15
	1	I	1	1

54:20 55:3,8,10	46:16 95:4 110:17	selected 48:14 90:1	serves 102:12,14	<b>sign</b> 88:21
55:14,15,21 56:1	110:20 115:6	90:6	service 65:13	Signature 119:23
56:8,9,11,15,16	117:15,24	selecting 62:14	services 17:20	signed 15:14
57:10 63:1 64:2	scrolling 7:21	selection 20:24	session 76:5	significant 89:19
71:11 72:15,16	95:25 110:8	43:20 48:19 49:7	sessions 75:17	significantly 16:14
74:13 76:9,17	scrutiny 105:16	50:10,21 54:19	set 34:9 45:21	similar 21:13,23
81:6 96:11 98:10	seal 120:13	57:2 58:2 67:12	120:12	24:7 25:10 30:23
100:17 104:13,15	search 31:19 37:24	68:2 70:23 75:9	settlement 17:23	36:10,11 59:22,24
111:20 112:14,15	Seattle 1:16 2:11	75:10 76:21 81:4	18:17	65:21
112:16 113:21	4:1,16 12:18 13:6	91:12	settlements 18:18	simple 17:24 25:14
116:4,9,14,17,18	15:8 18:7,7,8,10	send 32:25 114:24	18:25	simply 25:6
116:22,24 117:2,4	18:12,13 19:10,11	sense 8:23 10:6	sexual 17:25 19:19	single 39:24 49:2
117:10,16,18	19:17 21:12 22:3	22:15,22 25:23	share 7:19 12:6	69:25 78:13
SC 39:13 110:6,6	22:5,8,10,21	40:2	25:13 42:15	<b>sir</b> 5:6
115:23	59:14,19 61:11	sensitive 61:25	114:22	sit 17:20 18:19
scan 37:24 38:18	88:18,25 89:4	sent 6:23 7:4 9:14	<b>shared</b> 92:20	24:11 65:13 72:9
49:5	second 8:5 45:10	32:19 34:9 48:22	sharing 7:20 8:13	sitting 67:5
scanned 40:2 49:6	56:14,18,19 57:12	50:5 57:9	8:16 117:17,22	situation 18:15
52:1 84:18	57:19,20 69:24	sentences 58:15	<b>sheet</b> 52:20 53:4	<b>six</b> 15:4 85:3
scans 35:7	71:9 74:11 84:20	separate 38:7	sheets 53:8,22	six-month 14:11,17
Scantron 67:6	85:13 98:18 103:8	sergeant 3:13 11:2	sheriff 10:4,12,24	skill 120:11
schedule 3:16 60:8	108:7 114:21	19:9,14 21:5	22:2 28:18 93:2,8	skills 44:13,14,16
60:15 61:9 75:2	115:15	35:19,23 36:6	93:15 95:9 97:9	45:8 73:22 88:7
scheduled 44:22	section 14:3 27:19	37:6 38:8,13,14	99:15 107:5 110:5	skimmed 10:3
50:3,5	60:23,23,24 61:1	38:22 42:22 47:24	sheriff's 3:18 21:1	84:15
school 12:14 13:10	62:11,12 63:1	48:4,7,18 51:18	35:18,21 40:18,20	skip 89:16,21
13:17 14:4,7 67:4	74:1,11,11 75:24	51:21 52:7,19	44:11 58:3 72:5	small 87:1,4 91:3
score 52:20 55:17	76:12,14,15,19	53:7 55:3,10,15	87:12 88:16 89:2	<b>smart</b> 65:23
56:25 68:22	92:5 96:2,9	55:21 56:1,11	89:10,12 90:15	Societies 12:15
scored 52:12 71:5	security 15:20	57:9 80:23 88:24	93:5,14,19 94:16	<b>sole</b> 26:5,6,8
scores 52:24 53:2	16:13	89:15,23 92:7	95:9,20 96:22	solely 59:11
scoring 53:22,23	see 7:5,10,13 12:8	95:11 96:17,23	99:20 100:6	<b>solution</b> 18:20,23
65:25 67:12,14	16:1,17,22 20:19	99:5 100:14 115:5	101:12 102:2,8	76:7
68:2,10 69:3,7	30:2 33:2,18	sergeants 15:19	<b>Shoreline</b> 12:17,20	solutions 20:20
76:21	35:10 38:17 39:8	92:6,13,22 93:4	<b>short</b> 82:7,8 83:12	75:18
scorings 78:25	39:15 45:8 50:2	93:16	<pre>short-circuit 40:3</pre>	<b>solve</b> 75:19
screen 7:21 8:13,16	65:4,6 67:23 68:2	series 74:16 75:8	short-term 74:8	solving 76:5
12:6,8 44:1 76:13	76:14 78:24 82:20	serious 25:15 93:18	<b>show</b> 7:15 70:3	somebody 23:9
84:23,25 114:22	83:9,12 85:13	109:2,3	72:18	46:22 50:13 72:20
screen-sharing	87:21 89:24 102:2	seriousness 100:22	<b>showed</b> 114:9	82:6 86:4
107:20,21	108:1 111:11	102:10	showing 50:20	somewhat 13:15
screened 63:22	115:7,10	serve 16:23 77:21	<b>shows</b> 39:9	sorry 13:22 19:11
<b>screening</b> 67:12,13	seeing 31:20 38:12	89:14	<b>sic</b> 41:14	37:8 48:2 64:3
68:1 76:21	49:8,8	served 88:22 89:17	side 33:25	66:19 67:18 69:19
scroll 25:24 42:24	seen 25:5 112:21	90:6	sideways 106:5	72:1 75:13 86:13
L	•	•	•	·

	_	_	_	-
108:11 110:8	3:18,18 4:6,9,22	stay 8:10	supervisor 17:6	5:1,4,4,9,9 107:23
111:13 115:9,20	19:9,11 21:1,6	step 89:16	46:18,23 47:3,12	114:19,19 120:1,1
sounds 6:14 97:6,6	35:17,21 40:19	stick 108:24 109:6	53:21 55:17 56:25	120:9
117:23 118:8	44:4 58:3 88:16	sting 91:8	78:3	tactical 44:5 45:10
<b>span</b> 49:24	89:11 90:8,15,16	stop 71:23 85:3	supervisor's 44:20	84:9 85:15
<b>ŠPD</b> 21:25 22:2	90:19 93:21 100:6	96:16 105:11	supervisors 93:1	take 18:4 29:12
89:7	106:7 110:6	112:2	99:8	33:25 42:4 44:2
<b>speak</b> 11:11,13,16	<b>spoke</b> 11:14,22	<b>stored</b> 66:8	support 20:25	55:16 70:21 71:15
11:23	81:2 117:13	straight 50:1	43:19 44:5 51:20	72:7,8,11,15,17
speaking 11:18	<b>spot</b> 69:25	street 86:24	86:2,20 87:10	77:11 91:3
119:5	spotlight 116:10	Streets 90:9 91:23	91:1	taken 1:24 23:18
specialist 10:4	spring 14:17	strengths 69:15	supposed 27:19	42:10 55:11 59:1
59:21 60:1 61:20	<b>SPU</b> 16:13,14,18	strike 32:3 47:7	64:4,5	65:17 68:17
specialized 45:5	<b>ss</b> 120:3	66:15	<b>sure</b> 5:9,21,23,25	talk 8:15 25:3
87:23 91:16	staff 20:20 23:22	strong 44:15,16	6:22 7:8 8:16	27:24 73:7 94:21
specialty 45:1	50:13	strongly 34:6	14:25 15:17 16:9	104:16
47:15 50:11 58:2	Staffing 14:4,8	structure 31:6	19:2 23:4,15,25	talked 11:12 13:14
82:15	stamped 48:3	students 16:18	33:13 34:18 37:1	32:9,12 36:10
<b>specific</b> 41:20 52:5	stand 118:12	studies 14:13	37:16,16,18 38:4	43:14 69:4 70:5
61:12 74:15 75:8	standard 45:20	studying 65:18	40:14,18 44:2	81:19 99:24 100:4
80:21 81:12 84:13	47:14 50:9 53:16	stuff 24:23 41:21	46:10 49:3,9 52:3	101:1 106:20
85:8,15 96:2	58:1	116:9,11 117:7	54:9 55:19 60:20	116:19 117:10
108:11,13 109:21	standards 21:6	118:7	61:16 64:14 69:7	talking 24:21 63:14
109:22 111:9,10	35:20 38:20 61:15	subject 65:24 77:5	84:12 90:13 94:4	65:22 69:8 70:17
111:21 112:8	79:13,22 95:18	subjects 51:1,2	101:3 103:14	81:14,17 95:7
117:22 118:16	97:24 98:3 105:14	submit 44:19 47:9	108:4 109:8	98:20 101:23
specifically 9:19	start 12:10 39:5	submits 50:12	113:19 115:13,14	112:24 116:4
16:21 33:6 34:22	started 15:24 26:17	submitted 46:11	115:24 117:12,25	talks 44:12 62:12
35:23 51:22 75:7	Starting 16:12	64:16 68:8	118:23	74:12 95:23 99:18
76:18,22 81:9	state 1:9 5:7 15:11	subsequently	suspect 28:22	113:2
83:4 90:10 101:21	15:13,23 21:19	116:20	sustained 96:13	task 90:9,14,21,24
102:23 109:21	33:21 34:22 58:15	successful 14:13	97:12 98:11,12	91:12,23
118:15	59:7,12,15,19	20:16,21 44:13	105:9	tasked 90:18
specification 39:13	66:20 101:9 103:2	63:21 64:1,6 65:5	swear 4:24	taxes 26:21
specifications 63:7	120:3,7	sudden 104:7	Sweeney 1:14 3:2	tell 16:25 19:13
specificity 37:12	stated 11:7 41:25	suggestions 76:2	3:12 4:5 5:1,9,10	27:15 40:8 41:5
<b>specifics</b> 113:24,25	118:13	suitability 85:17,22	5:13,13 7:10 9:8	45:4 52:2 70:11
specified 29:10	statement 117:6	suitable 67:9	26:1,15 107:25	93:23 101:17
68:17 76:18	118:6	Suite 2:11 4:16	108:2 120:9	106:9 110:2
<b>specify</b> 108:24	statements 20:18	<b>summary</b> 36:17	switch 27:23	112:22 113:16
specifying 97:11	102:1 106:14	38:3 97:18	109:22	telling 93:23 94:5
spell 5:7	states 1:1 4:8 97:22	summation 10:13	sworn 5:2 22:17	112:20 116:22
<b>spend</b> 86:23	stating 101:10	supervise 15:20	120:10	117:3
<b>spent</b> 33:18	109:15 112:19	supervised 51:21		<b>tells</b> 93:24
<b>Spokane</b> 1:3,8 2:5	status 92:19	88:23	$\frac{\mathbf{T}}{\mathbf{T} + 1 + 2 +$	temporary 74:8
			<b>T</b> 1:14 2:9 3:2 4:5,9	
	1	·		•

[				
<b>ten</b> 11:24	think 10:19 12:25	112:23	told 12:19 32:7	71:3 77:20 85:14
tentatively 44:22	13:8,10,11,15,17	<b>Thurman's</b> 57:23	116:18 117:4	88:4 92:21 100:4
term 87:16	25:19 28:3 30:6	92:7 95:11 96:24	118:4	100:5 101:4,5,8
terminated 63:5	33:1 34:1,14	98:15,18	top 9:16 31:24	102:23 104:16,21
termination 99:6	36:21 38:4,15	<b>Tim</b> 21:5,13 39:10	116:4 119:5	104:23 108:15,16
terms 6:17 26:4	40:17 44:1 49:11	39:11 52:7,11	totally 6:18	116:19
32:17 47:14 50:10	65:8,15 66:25	53:3,14 110:10	track 8:10	<b>Tyler</b> 103:19
67:14 69:5 102:21	67:18,25 68:21,25	111:14,20 112:15	traffic 14:20	type 17:3,23 24:14
<b>test</b> 63:21 64:19	69:2 71:17,21	113:11 116:6	trafficking 90:19	30:17 44:13,25
65:1,11,16 66:2,6	72:23 73:10,13,14	<b>time</b> 4:11 6:9 7:17	trained 62:19	45:1 67:6,7 84:4,5
66:7,10,17,24,25	75:9 76:11,20	7:24 8:19 12:20	training 15:16 34:3	85:8,11 86:7
67:3,6,7,10 68:17	77:12 78:8,13	16:8 19:3,8 21:7	61:12,23 62:4,7	90:21 94:11
testified 5:3,22	79:2 82:25 83:15	23:22 24:6 33:19	62:25 71:18 75:16	<b>types</b> 47:15 63:3
54:23 84:11	85:15 86:16 87:10	34:10 41:6 42:9	87:18 88:11,14,20	84:2 85:10 91:11
<b>testify</b> 33:22 34:6	88:8 89:2,5 94:6	42:12 45:19 46:4	89:8,22 90:2	94:17
testimony 9:8,25	95:6 97:8,10	49:23 51:21,24	91:16 104:2	typically 74:8
52:5 66:19 68:6	100:8,11 101:16	53:1,21 60:2	trajectory 13:5	
68:13 69:2 103:21	101:16 102:8,14	61:17,20,24 62:7	transcribed 37:7	U
118:11,12	102:18 103:23	66:14,16 73:7	transcript 52:9	<b>uh-huh</b> 52:21 53:1
testing 53:2 64:20	105:12 107:10	77:9,16 78:13	54:7 55:2 80:22	53:5 55:14
65:4 75:10	109:5 110:2 114:3	80:10,12,18 83:8	120:8	<b>ultimate</b> 50:13 55:8
tests 65:7 66:4 67:8	114:15 118:8,13	88:19 92:21 93:22	transcription 36:3	ultimately 55:4
73:1	thinking 67:4	93:24 97:12 98:3	transcripts 10:16	unanimous 56:9,12
<b>TFO</b> 48:8	third 28:1 63:16	98:19 100:5 101:6	37:3,5	uncovered 20:11
<b>TH</b> 52:7 110:10	thorough 9:22 10:5	105:12 107:16	transferred 17:12	undergraduate
116:6	73:10,20 113:6	109:18 114:16	transfers 94:10	12:13
Thank 5:11 9:3	thoroughly 33:19	118:9,19 119:4,6	transitory 74:2,4	underpinnings
13:22 21:18 30:20	thought 9:19,24	119:11,18	75:2,2	14:21
60:21 107:17	12:22 72:1 119:11	timeline 23:20,21	treated 32:10	undersheriff 38:12
114:14 119:16	thoughts 51:2	50:1	treatment 24:12,17	48:5,7,19 49:23
thanks 44:9 49:19	threats 28:23	timelines 23:19	trial 27:8 106:23	50:7 57:10 67:21
thing 18:12 25:4	three 31:16 55:6	<b>timely</b> 23:24	tried 22:13 87:22	67:24 74:24
37:17 53:10 66:17	56:18 57:20 61:24	<b>timing</b> 41:1	88:5 107:11	understand 6:15
68:21 78:11 94:11	63:3 88:4 92:6,13	tipping 86:8	trouble 25:12	31:5 37:2 47:20
106:1	93:16 101:5	<b>titled</b> 45:10	true 70:20 116:21	49:22 53:25 66:22
things 13:10,18	105:10 106:16	titles 41:18	120:10	72:2 103:21 107:3
18:2 23:7 25:8	<b>three-ring</b> 36:13,15	today 5:14,20,23	truthful 77:11	110:22 111:1
33:21 34:5 44:15	38:16	6:1,9,13 7:3,15	<b>try</b> 35:3 43:6 82:4	understandable
49:1,5 51:3,4	throwing 75:22	9:13 11:10 31:14	trying 86:1 91:25	92:22,25
53:13 55:16,23	thrown 53:13	33:15 42:5,19	109:5	understanding
57:1 61:25 62:1	Thurman 11:2	47:22 48:9 60:10	Twenty-five 19:7	34:8 54:6 55:4
75:23,25 84:2	38:13 56:17 57:18	69:12 106:21,24	<b>two</b> 15:10 18:5 28:7	59:7 79:17 80:5
87:22 89:2 91:9	57:22 96:17	107:8,15	28:8 29:20 30:5	102:21
94:17 102:23	100:14 101:5,9,21	today's 6:10 9:18	45:13 48:14 55:6	understood 6:20
108:15 116:13	103:22 104:24	10:1 11:20	58:15 63:15 67:22	<b>unfair</b> 18:1 19:19
				19:20 24:12 79:21
	I	I	I	I

				-
80:18,20 83:20	version 115:16,21	87:21 95:4 96:2	99:18 105:16	word 48:24,24 49:4
84:6 86:8 109:17	116:1	108:12 110:8	106:20,20 107:8	51:24,25 103:4,5
114:11 119:1,13	versions 40:8	111:1,8	118:17	words 33:17 51:7
<b>unfairly</b> 32:11	versus 4:6 29:12	wanted 16:20 20:19	weaknesses 69:16	82:12 87:20 93:20
unfortunately	versted 18:16	89:5,20,22	wealth 87:24	102:4
114:5	<b>veteran</b> 106:5	wants 82:23	websites 26:18	work 6:21 9:5,6,7
<b>union</b> 17:8	victim 20:18 103:9	warning 24:22	Wednesday 48:5	15:23 18:9 26:4
unit 20:25 21:2	videoconference	102:12	weight 93:20	26:10,12,15 30:9
42:23 43:19 44:5	1:12,19 2:2 3:1	warrant 28:25	welcome 42:24	30:15 31:8 32:8
45:5 50:11 51:20	120:9	Washington 1:2,5	43:5	32:13,14,18 36:11
58:3 62:17 78:3,4	videographer 2:14	1:9,9,16 2:5,11	well-known 106:7	41:11 42:7 75:21
78:5 80:7 82:3	4:4,23 42:8,11	3:16 4:1,7,9,16	<b>Welton</b> 46:19	77:23,24 78:2,10
83:8,25 86:2,20	119:17	12:15,21 27:8,10	48:10 49:18 55:5	78:22 82:18,19
87:11 88:22 89:15	videotaped 1:12	59:7,12,23 60:7	56:6,16 57:5	87:7 89:14,21
108:19 110:23	3:1 120:8	120:3,7	64:15 77:9	91:4
111:17 113:16	view 7:22 13:18	wasn't 13:6 20:6	Welton's 46:17	worked 61:18,19
116:5,8,13 117:8	87:16 105:14	56:9,12 64:19	went 12:13 28:24	89:7
117:13	119:1	65:11 69:3,25	33:19 55:11 69:4	working 86:24
<b>United</b> 1:1 4:8	viewed 69:4 91:5	71:23 80:10 83:21	79:1 107:11	90:18 91:3 102:14
units 82:16 91:1	91:13 94:17	106:15	109:10 111:17	107:16
University 12:15	viewpoints 17:22	way 8:9 11:6 15:7	weren't 64:19	workings 94:16
12:21 14:12 15:11	violations 97:18	29:17 38:11,25	84:12	workplace 17:4
15:24 59:15,20	violence 28:21	41:7 52:2 53:13	WESTERN 1:2	24:23 78:21
unnecessary 99:10	<b>virtue</b> 23:2	54:17 56:4,5	whatnot 116:13	works 5:17 102:11
unsuccessful 64:2,6	volition 33:8	60:17 62:18,18	WHEREOF	worried 79:3,4
up-to-date 30:1	volunteer 17:20	67:3 68:16 69:1	120:12	worse 25:9 101:19
uphold 79:13	19:2,3 78:9,10	70:1,20 71:18	wide 15:21	102:19,20,21
<b>upper</b> 14:19,24	volunteered 88:6	72:23 78:25 80:5	wife 27:14,15 28:23	wouldn't 64:21
<b>use</b> 98:15,19 99:13	volunteers 17:19	80:17 84:6 97:9	29:2	72:18 74:20 77:10
useful 35:14	78:9	97:14 101:17	<b>win</b> 57:23	86:7 101:15,20,25
usually 12:23 17:2	voluntold 78:10	103:7 105:20	witness 4:24 5:1	116:21 119:8
18:4 20:3 53:12		107:6 118:14	6:3 21:21 32:8,13	wow 103:16 105:12
72:22 82:16	W	<b>ways</b> 23:3	42:16 57:15 64:25	write 32:25 33:16
utilized 45:22	wait 69:24 71:8	<b>WDTL</b> 27:12	67:18 71:17 72:25	34:3 46:4 52:22
	want 5:12,14 7:17	<b>we'll</b> 8:5,14,14	75:6 77:18 86:13	52:23 53:4 54:17
	8:15,17,20 17:13	13:24 42:5,15	92:25 97:1 99:23	65:19 72:22 73:9
<b>v</b> 1:7	18:14 19:8,20	51:13 59:8 110:22	103:10 107:17	79:11 84:16
Valley 90:16	21:19 27:24 28:15	111:13 116:12	112:10 120:12	writing 31:16
<b>value</b> 74:2,9	31:11 33:25 36:18	we're 6:8,12 42:8	witnessed 104:14	59:16 67:7 102:24
VanPatten 98:23	36:19,20 37:1,18	60:9 67:4 69:11	witnesses 101:24	102:24
105:2,3 106:17	38:1,23 41:18	69:21 70:24 95:1	106:13,16	writings 20:9
variable 31:6	45:4,8 52:6 64:13	104:4 107:19	<b>won</b> 57:21	written 32:21
variety 9:14 15:21	75:18 77:23,24	we've 31:13 42:2	wonder 100:25	35:19 62:23 66:13
32:20 76:6	78:11,12,21,21	50:17 53:16 54:21	101:1 104:18,19	97:9 102:15
various 8:7 37:4	81:12 82:13,15	54:21,22 67:15	104:19,20	wrong 25:11
verbalize 5:25	83:9,25 84:21			
1	1			

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC 206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

	1	1	1	
100:10 103:7	<b>1</b> 3:12 13:25 14:1	35:25	43:14	9
wrote 35:25 54:4	34:20,25 45:13	20,000 26:20,21	<b>343-page</b> 37:22	<b>9:29</b> 1:17 4:2,11
	48:10 79:9 86:18	<b>2000s</b> 62:9	<b>36-page</b> 42:20	<b>94</b> 3:17
X	92:4	<b>2004</b> 13:8		<b>95</b> 3:18
<b>X</b> 5:4 107:23	1/23/18 44:21	2008 53:10 54:21	4	<b>98101</b> 4:16
114:19	<b>1:52</b> 49:17	<b>2010</b> 53:10 54:21	<b>4</b> 3:16 48:13 60:9	<b>98111</b> 2:11
	<b>10</b> 115:6,22	62:10	60:11 74:1	<b>99</b> 15:4
<u> </u>	<b>10:27</b> 42:9	<b>2016</b> 98:14	<b>40</b> 24:4 96:14,18	<b>99203</b> 2:5
<b>yeah</b> 12:9,23 14:10	<b>10:35</b> 42:12	2017 25:25 28:16	97:13	<b><i>772</i>03</b> 2.3
16:20 22:23 27:13	<b>107</b> 3:7	2018 43:19 45:11	<b>42</b> 3:13	
27:22 28:4 38:24	<b>10th</b> 31:20	48:6 49:17 108:9	<b>4200</b> 2:11	
40:12,18 43:9	<b>11</b> 34:25 45:13	<b>2019</b> 51:18 91:24	<b>45</b> 11:17	
49:3 55:20 56:13	114 3:8	115:5	<b>4616</b> 9:9	
70:17 85:2,14	115 3:20	<b>2019-0014</b> 35:18,22	<b>48321</b> 48:3	
91:9 98:21 101:4	12 96:8	110:12	<b>4th</b> 51:18	
106:2,9 107:20	<b>12/22/16</b> 100:14	<b>2019-0023</b> 35:22		
110:22 111:10	<b>12:32</b> 119:19,21	38:7	5	
113:2,4 117:6,18	<b>1300</b> 22:16	2020 29:11	<b>5</b> 3:6,17 55:1 94:18	
117:25 118:2,5,17	<b>1325</b> 4:15	<b>2021</b> 10:9 11:7	95:2 98:8	
year 9:15,23 10:20	<b>13rd</b> 95:8	14:17 15:9 26:24	<b>5-</b> 22:17	
14:5 21:22 26:17	<b>13th</b> 94:23	31:21	<b>509.315.8089</b> 2:6	
26:19,22	<b>14</b> 3:12	<b>2022</b> 1:24 3:4 4:1	<b>51</b> 3:15	
years 13:12,16 22:1	<b>1400</b> 22:17	4:12 120:10,13		
26:22 28:13 61:25	<b>142</b> 60:18	<b>206.223.7000</b> 2:12	6	
63:3 77:20 88:5	<b>1420</b> 2:10	<b>21</b> 13:16	<b>6</b> 3:18 74:1 85:7	
105:17	<b>15</b> 1:24 3:4 4:1	<b>2121</b> 1:25 120:16	95:15,16 96:9	
yellow 110:21	120:10	<b>22nd</b> 98:14	99:18 108:10,12	
<b>Yep</b> 9:4 34:20 44:8	<b>156</b> 9:10	<b>24th</b> 120:13	<b>6/13/19</b> 99:6	
55:20	<b>15th</b> 4:12	<b>25th</b> 9:9	<b>60</b> 3:16	
yesterday 11:14,16	<b>16</b> 13:12	<b>2700</b> 31:14	<b>600</b> 22:17	
<b>young</b> 13:20	<b>16th</b> 10:9 11:7	<b>27th</b> 115:5	7	
youngster 25:11	<b>17</b> 13:12			
	<b>1840</b> 4:16	3	<b>7</b> 3:20 35:17 85:8	
Z		<b>3</b> 3:15 28:10,11	111:5 114:25	
<b>Zoom</b> 4:13	2	29:25 48:12 51:13	115:2	
0	<b>2</b> 3:13 42:17,19	51:15 84:9	<b>7:28</b> 48:6 49:14	
	48:11 67:6,16	<b>30</b> 15:3 36:1	<b>7th</b> 48:6 49:14 50:3	
<b>0016</b> 39:9	73:13 74:11 84:8	<b>30(b)(6)</b> 10:11	50:4	
<b>0139</b> 39:4	84:9,9	110:4	8	
<b>0384</b> 39:11	<b>2.5</b> 31:13	<b>300</b> 31:7 36:18	<b>8</b> 35:21	
<b>04</b> 13:3 <b>047873</b> 115:22	<b>2/7/18</b> 44:23	<b>31</b> 48:2	<b>80's</b> 13:10	
<b>047873</b> 115:23	2:21-cv-00129-S	<b>32</b> 48:1,2,3,3	<b>80s</b> 13:20	
<b>048209</b> 110:6	1:7 4:7	<b>322</b> 48:3	<b>8663</b> 2:5	
<b>048228</b> 110:7	<b>20</b> 13:16 110:12	<b>340</b> 95:18	8003 2.3 8th 49:17	
1	<b>20-page</b> 36:19	<b>340.10</b> 96:9		
	20-something	<b>343</b> 38:2,9 39:20		
		1	I	I