UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

+ + + + +

DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION, PROSECUTION, AND DEFENSE OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
JANUARY 19, 2017

+ + + + +

The Panel met in the Grand Ballroom, Holiday Inn Arlington at Ballston, 4610 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 10:00 a.m., Martha Bashford, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT

Martha Bashford
MG(R) Marcia Anderson
Hon. Leo I. Brisbois
Kathleen Cannon
Meg Garvin
Hon. Paul W. Grimm
Dean Keith Harrison
A.J. Kramer
Jennifer Gentile Long
SGT(R) James Markey
Dr. Jennifer Markowitz
CMSAF Rodney J. McKinley
Dr. Cassia Spohn
BGen(R) James Schwenk

Meghan Tokash

Hon. Reggie Walton

WITNESSES

Hon. Jennifer M. O'Connor - General Counsel,
Department of Defense

CAPT Warren Record, JAGC, U.S. Navy, Chair, Joint Service Committee on Military Justice

Dwight Sullivan - Associate Deputy General Counsel for Military Justice, Department of Defense

Maria Fried - Associate Deputy Office of the General Counsel

STAFF:

CAPT Tammy P. Tideswell, U.S. Navy - Staff Director

LTC Patricia Lewis, U.S. Army - Deputy Staff
Director

Julie Carson - Legislative Liaison and Staff
Attorney

Theresa Gallagher - Staff Attorney

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

Lt Col Jacqueline Stingl, U.S. Air Force,
Alternate DFO

CONTENTS

Welcome and Introductions 4
Overview of the Court-Martial Process
Dwight Sullivan
Legislative Highlights and the History of Sexual
Assault Issues in the Armed Forces Since 2012
Captain Warren Record 101
History of the Response Systems to
Adult Sexual Assault Crimes Panel
and the Judicial Proceedings Panel
Maria Fried
Committee Planning Session
Martha Bashford
Public Comment
Adjourn

PROCEEDINGS

10:04 a.m.

LT COL STINGL: Good morning everyone and welcome to the very first meeting of the Department of Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces.

My name is Lieutenant Colonel

Jacqueline Stingl and I have been appointed as an Alternate Designated Federal Officer, or DFO, for this Committee. And, I will serve as the DFO for today's public meeting.

Captain Tammy Tideswell is the Staff Director to this Committee.

This Committee was established

pursuant to Section 546 of the National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and that

aside, by Section 537 of the National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and in

accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee

Act of 1972, 5 United States Code Appendix as

Amended and 41 CFR.

As this Committee is a Federal

Advisory Committee, it must comply with the

Federal Advisory Committee Act, commonly referred
to as FACA.

Committee meetings will be open to the public and transcribed.

The Committee also has a publically accessible website at http://dacipad.whs.mil.

Publically available information provided to the Committee is posted on the website to include information about the meetings of the Committee, transcripts and recordings of the meetings and background information documents provided to the Committee Members.

The Committee has not received any written requests for public comment at today's meeting.

Any information provided by the public to the Committee Members must be made available to the public. This includes emails or notes passed or sent to the Committee Members related to their work as Members of the Committee.

The Secretary of Defense has approved the appointment of the Members of this Committee.

And, Ms. Martha Bashford serves as its Chair.

As you will note on today's agenda, the Committee held an administrative session this morning. The purpose of that session was to provide administrative briefings and the oath of office to the Committee Members.

Today's public meeting has a full agenda which includes an overview of the court-martial process, legislative highlights and history of sexual assault issues in the Armed Forces since 2012 and a history of two predecessor panels in this specific area.

The briefers' presentations will be followed by a Committee planning session to determine the strategic way ahead.

Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, the FACA brief which was previously scheduled on the agenda for this morning will not take place today, as the presenter was unable to attend.

Accordingly, the Committee Members 1 2 will receive their FACA briefing here in the next public meeting. 3 4 Madam Chair, are you ready to proceed? 5 CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes, we are. Thank 6 you. 7 Thank you Lieutenant Stingl and good 8 I would like to welcome the Members, morning. 9 participants and everyone in attendance today to the first meeting of the Defense Advisory 10 11 Committee on Investigation, Prosecution and 12 Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces, or 13 DAC-IPAD. 14 The Secretary of Defense appointed 16 15 Members to the Committee and all Members are 16 present here today. 17 The DAC-IPAD, as you heard, was 18 created by provisions of the National Defense 19 Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2015 and 2016. 20 Our mandate is to advise the Secretary 21 of Defense on the investigation, prosecution and defense of allegations of sexual assault and 22

other sexual misconduct involving Members of the Armed Forces.

Please note that today's meeting is being transcribed and the complete written transcript will be posted on the DAC-IPAD website.

We will begin today's meeting with a presentation on the court-martial process provided by Mr. Dwight Sullivan, Associate Deputy General Counsel of the Department of Defense for Military Justice.

Mr. Sullivan is a Retired Marine Corps

Judge Advocate with 30 years of commissioned

service and will serve as the Designated Federal

Official for the DAC-IPAD.

Next, the Committee will receive a presentation on the recent legislative highlights and history of sexual assault issues in the Armed Forces provided by Captain Warren Record.

Captain Record is a U.S. Navy Judge
Advocate who current serves as the Chair of the
Joint Service Committee on Military Justice.

After we break for lunch, the

Committee will receive a final presentation on

the history and work of the two predecessor

Department of Defense Federal Advisory Committees
on sexual assaults.

The first is the Response Systems to Adult Sexual Assault Crimes Panel and the second is the Judicial Proceedings Panel.

Ms. Maria Fried, the Associate Deputy
General Counsel of the Department of Defense for
Personnel and Health Policy will provide this
presentation.

Ms. Fried has served as the Designated Federal Official for the Response Systems Panel and is currently the Designated Federal Official for the Judicial Proceedings Panel.

Following these informational presentations, the Committee will hold a planning session to discuss the task given us by Statute, our topical priorities and a strategic plan to implement our work.

Each public meeting of the DAC-IPAD

will include time to receive input from the 1 2 public and has been said, the Committee received no requests for public comment for today's 3 4 meeting. 5 Thank you very much for joining us 6 We are ready to begin the meeting and our today. 7 first presenter is Mr. Dwight Sullivan. 8 Thank you for joining us, Mr. 9 Sullivan. We look forward to hearing from you. Ms. Bashford, if you 10 CAPT TIDESWELL: don't mind, we are honored to have the DoD 11 12 General Counsel here, Ms. O'Connor who would like 13 to make some opening remarks on behalf of the 14 Department of Defense. If you don't mind, I know you all have 15 16 already heard Ms. O'Connor's bio, but I think the 17 public might benefit from the abbreviated version, Lieutenant Colonel Stingl, if you don't 18 19 mind. 20 And, Ms. O'Connor, if you would please 21 honor us with your presence. 22 LT COL STINGL: Today, we are most

fortunate to have the Honorable Jennifer M. 1 2 O'Connor, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense join us here this morning. 3 4 In her capacity at the DoD GC, Ms. 5 O'Connor was appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and is by 6 7 Statute, the Senior Legal Advisor to the 8 Department of Defense, providing legal advice on 9 all matters impacting the Department directly to the Secretary of Defense. 10 11 She supervises all lawyers within the 12 Department on a daily basis and they regularly deal with matters of grave importance to national 13 14 security. 15 Ms. O'Connor, thank you very much for 16 joining us today. 17 HON. O'CONNOR: Thank you. 18 Good morning everybody. 19 I'd like to welcome the distinguished 20 Members of the Defense Advisory Committee on 21 Investigation, Prosecution and Defense of Sexual 22 Assaults in the Armed Forces to your inaugural

meeting. One, I might add, that coincides with another significant inauguration event here in Washington, D.C.

As you're aware, this Advisory

Committee was established by the Secretary of

Defense as directed by Congress in the 2015 and

2015 National Defense Authorization Acts.

I am delighted to have such a distinguished panel of experts on this Committee. And, thank you for your public service and your willingness to dedicate your valuable time to the important task ahead of you.

Your work will follow the tremendous efforts of two predecessor DoD Advisory

Committees tasked to review and assess military sexual assault issues over the last four years, the Response Systems Panel and the Judicial Proceedings Panel.

In recent years, the Defense

Department has implemented numerous changes to
the manner in which sexual assault allegations
are investigated and tried.

By regulation, a report of any sexual assault over which the military justice system apparently has jurisdiction must be investigated by one of the three military criminal investigative organizations which are independent of the uniform chain of command, Army CID, NCIS and the Air Force OSI.

In 2012, the Secretary of Defense required that any charge of penetrative sexual assaults go to at least an O-6, a Colonel, or a Navy Captain who's also a Special Court-Martial Convening Authority for disposition.

No commanders lower in the chain of command such as a company or a battalion commander may act on such a charge.

In January of 2013, the Air Force launched an initiative called the Special Victims' Counsel Program to offer Servicemembers and their adult family members who report being the victim of a sex crime, a military lawyer to form an attorney-client relationship with for the purposes of representation.

That pilot program proved so successful that, later in 2013, the Secretary of Defense ordered all of the military Departments to institute such programs.

Congress has, subsequently, expanded eligibility for such representation to family members who are minors and DoD civilian employees who report being victims of sex crimes.

In 2014, at the request of the then Chairman of Joint Chiefs, General Dempsey, the Secretary of Defense ordered a comprehensive review of the military justice system.

That review was spearheaded by the Honorable Andy Effron, former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of the Armed Services. And, it led to the recently enacted Military Justice Act of 2016, the most substantial reform of the military justice system since 1968.

I know you'll be hearing more about that Statute later today, but I will highlight that it modernized the military justice system in a number of ways.

For example, tying the language of the number of UCMJ offenses more closely to their analogues in Title 18 while substantially enhancing the systems transparency such as by requiring the Department to establish an online database similar to PACER to provide the public with instantaneous access to filings in courtmartial cases.

While substantial reforms have already been made, it is critical to continue to improve the military's investigative prosecution and defense functions. Clearly, there's still a long way to go.

It's also important to closely scrutinize the reforms that have already been made to consider whether they may have produced any unintended negative consequences and whether they can be further improved.

This afternoon, as the Committee develops its strategic plan, I would encourage you to consider these topics.

Are those involved in the

investigation, prosecution and defense of sexual 1 2 assault cases in the military sufficiently trained and experienced and do they have adequate 3 resources to fulfill their responsibilities? 4 How are the military's investigation, 5 prosecution and defense functions performing in 6 deployed settings? 7 What best practices from civilian 8 9 jurisdictions should be incorporated into military practice? 10 11 Are the investigation, prosecution and 12 defense of sexual assault cases influenced by the 13 grade of either the suspect or the victim? 14 Are the Services collecting the right data and properly analyzing it to help inform 15 16 public policy decisions? 17 And, what has been the effect of the 18 Services special victims' counsel program or the 19 victims' legal counsel which is what they're 20 known as in the Navy and Marine Corps? And, are 21 changes to those programs warranted? 22 It's important that the new Secretary

of Defense be provided with the best possible advice concerning the investigation, prosecution and defense of sexual assault cases.

That is your charter over the next several years. Your collective qualifications and expertise on criminal justice issues will lend an authoritative and informed voice to the work of the Committee.

And, you have the opportunity to make a lasting impact on the Department and the lives of the men and women who so proudly serve in the Armed Services.

I thank you all, again, for your commitment and your service. I'd also like to thank the staff of the DAC-IPAD, a team of dedicated and talented attorneys, paralegals, administrative support personnel who I think you will find do a terrific job as they continue to provide this Committee with outstanding support.

As my time as the General Counsel, the Department draws to a close, I wish you great success and I look forward to following your

1	progress and hard work in the days, months and
2	years ahead.
3	Please do not hesitate to call on me
4	if there's anything I can do to help.
5	Thank you very much.
6	CAPT TIDESWELL: Thank you, ma'am.
7	Mr. Sullivan?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Ms. Bashford,
9	permission to move about the well.
10	CHAIR BASHFORD: Granted.
11	MR. SULLIVAN: From the legal
12	perspective, I used to practice in front of Judge
13	Grimm, so I'm kind of getting a flashback. It's
14	a nice flashback for me, I hope it's not too
15	dramatic for you, Your Honor.
16	HON. GRIMM: Same for me.
17	MR. SULLIVAN: So, let me preface this
18	by a warning that I'm just fascinated by military
19	justice. I can talk about it all day. As
20	General Schwenk knows, some days I do.
21	So, but, I don't want to cut into our
22	records time this morning, so I'm going to just

stop an hour from now no matter where I am, I'm just going to stop.

So, with that said, I encourage you to ask any questions or engage in any dialogue or raise any matter as we go along rather than wait.

So, at any time, just please feel free to jump in.

I want to start by providing an overview of the military justice system which may be helpful to you.

And, when you think about it, the group of people that is covered by the military justice system fall within this jurisdiction who includes one -- more than one and a third million active duty Servicemembers.

And, those Servicemembers are -- when you think about that, that's more than the population of ten states. It's more than the population of the District of Columbia.

So, right there, you have a major group that's subject to this military justice system.

And, then, those who are on active duty are subject to it 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days of the year. So, if a uniformed member is on leave for 30 days, let's say they come back from deployment, they're on leave for 30 days, they're no where near a military installation. You know, they're at home and they smoke marijuana. They have just violated the Uniform Code of Military Justice and can be prosecuted by court-martial for that.

So, if you are subject to the UCMJ, there is jurisdiction over you.

Now, some of you may have been familiar with a requirement that was in effect for 1969 to 1987 for there to be a service connection in order for the military justice system to have subject matter jurisdiction over an offense. That's gone. The Supreme Court did away with that in a case called Solorio.

So, again, the system is dependent upon the personal jurisdiction over the accused.

If that personal jurisdiction exists, the court-

martial system has jurisdiction without any further requirement.

But, those one and a third million people aren't the only folks in the country who are subject to the UCMJ. There are also about 800,000 members of the Reserve component of the various Services.

And, I know we have a proud Coast

Guard alumnus, and this includes the Coast Guard

as well. You're not only the DoD Military

Services, but also our colleagues in the Coast

Guard.

And, there are about 800,000

Reservists, including the Coast Guard and that includes National Guardsman and includes members of the Air Guard.

So, when they are on active duty, when a Reserve member -- I was a Marine Corps

Reservist, when I was on active duty as a Marine

Corps Reservist, I was subject to the Code while

I was performing my duties.

For our Guardsmen, if they are

performing duties in a federal capacity, they're 1 2 subject to the Code. If they're performing their duties in state capacity, they are not. 3 So, we have these 800,000 people who 4 come on and off of being subject to jurisdiction. 5 Do you all remember Brigadoon, you 6 7 know, the wonderful musical? Yes, so, the 8 jurisdiction comes and goes like the men who were 9 being shot, comes in from the mist then leaves. And, the military justice system also 10 sometimes has jurisdictions over civilians. 11 12 so, let's look at some instances where there's jurisdiction over civilians. 13 14 So, first, an active duty retiree who's entitled to pay is subject to the UCMJ. 15 16 So, General Schwenk, today, is subject to the 17 UCMJ even though he's a civilian. Because he's a 18 retired member of an active component entitled to 19 pay, he's subject to the UCMJ. 20 As a retired member of a Reserve 21 component, I am not. 22 Civilians accompanying the U.S. Forces in the field in either a time of declared war or a contingency operation, so, if we have a civilian that's accompanying us, they can be subject to the Code. This has been exercised since the Vietnam War a grand total of once.

And, it happened in a case in Iraq.

So, normally, when we have a contractor or a

dependent with us, what we'll do is we'll -- and

there's a criminal allegation, normally, would be

tried in U.S. District Court under MEJA.

This case in Iraq, it involved a dual national. This person was a national of both Canada and Iraq. MEJA does not allow us to try in U.S. District Courts under the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, we can't try somebody for an act committed in a country of which they are a citizen.

So, because this person had dual sovereignty, al be, he could not be tried by MEJA because he was an Iraqi citizen. The act happened in Iraq. We tried him by court-martial.

It went up to the Court of Appeals for

the Armed Forces which affirmed in a very narrow ruling which left open the question of whether the outcome would have been the same had it been a U.S. citizen, the outcome depended, in part, upon the fact that he was not a U.S. citizen.

And, then, certiorari was sought from the Supreme Court but denied.

So, again, that power, the second bullet on that slide has been used a total of only once and there's some ongoing question about that.

A third category of individual is, let's say we have somebody at the U.S.

Disciplinary Barracks supporting us on the campus and they've been sentenced to 20 years confinement.

And, their appellate review is complete and we discharge them, but they're still active U.S.D.B. They are still subject to courtmartial jurisdiction even though they've been discharged and are a civilian.

Now, these authorities are rarely

used. As I said, the second has been used only once. But, there are certain instances in which they have been used.

And, so, one example, right now, there are four people on military death row at Fort

Leavenworth. It was five until the day before yesterday when the President commuted the death sentence of Private Loving to confinement for life without eligibility for parole.

But, there are four people on death row. One of these four was prosecuted as a retiree. He normally would have been prosecuted for three homicides in North Carolina.

Convicted, sentenced to death, appealed his case

up through the North Carolina courts.

The North Carolina Supreme Court reversed his conviction, prosecuted again in North Carolina, acquitted. All right? So, then, he goes back in the line and serves out the remainder of his career and retires as a Master Sergeant, Master Sergeant Hennis.

Then a cold case unit, at the time of

these offense, all we could tell from the blood was the blood type. The blood type matched Hennis, but that's 17 percent of the American public, too.

And, but, through DNA evidence, a cold case unit went back and said, ah, there's only a one in several trillion chance it was anyone other than Hennis that left this evidence at the crime scene.

And, so, he couldn't be tried again in North Carolina. But, one important part of the system, of course, is under the dual sovereignty concept, because a court-martial is a federal entity and it was the state that acquitted him, the federal entity could charge him again.

And, he was tried by a court-martial and sentenced to death. He's one of the four people on death row.

Which also raises an important point, for an offense that happens in the United States, almost any common law type offense that's covered by the UCMJ falls under multiple jurisdictions.

So, I work at the Pentagon, the

Pentagon is an area of exclusive federal

jurisdiction. If a Servicemember is suspected of

committing an offense in the Pentagon -- in the

Pentagon -- that offense can be tried either by

court-martial or in Federal District Court in the

Eastern District of Virginia, but not both

because is the same sovereign.

If you have somebody out in town, so a Servicemember out in Virginia in Arlington commits an offense. That offense can be tried either in Circuit Court in Arlington County or it can be tried by the military or, because those are different sovereigns, it could be tried in both.

And, there are some areas of military bases that fall under concurrent jurisdiction.

And, so, and individual in that instance could be tried in state court or in U.S. District or by court-martial.

It's very rare for a Servicemember to be tried in U.S. District Court. Usually, the

cases where the individual accused is a Servicemember are handled in -- by court-martial rather than U.S. District Court.

But, sometimes, there are jurisdictional issues with regard to off-base offenses, particularly with states.

So, again, this power to try civilians is rarely used, but it is used on occasion and has been used in some fairly high profile cases.

So, let's go back to the beginning, you know, as a lawyer, I like to say, you know, what's the legal authority? So, what is the legal authority for our military justice system?

And, of course, it comes from the Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the Constitution specifically gives Congress the power to make rules and regulations for the government of the land of Naval Forces.

So, that's the basic power. And, before the UCMJ was enacted in 1950, there was separate military justice systems for the Army, and then ultimately the Air Force in the very

brief time the Air Force existed before the UCMJ was enacted, the Air Force and the Navy and Marines Corps. They fell under different -- entirely different systems.

So, the Army system was known as the Articles of War. In the Navy, it was governed by the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

Now, the Articles for the Government of the Navy were commonly known as Rocks and Shoals. You know, people refer to the UCMJ, in that era, the Articles for the Government of the Navy were referred to as Rocks and Shoals.

And, that is because Article 4 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy included a provision that said, and I quote, the punishment of death or such other punishment as a court-martial may adjudge, be inflicted upon any person in the Naval Service who intentionally or willfully suffers any vessel of the Navy to be stranded or run upon rocks or shoals.

And, so, that gave its colloquial name as it was known.

So, we have these entirely separate systems of criminal justice. There was widespread belief that these systems did not work particularly well during World War II.

And, so, after World War II, there was an effort in Congress to revise these systems.

And, then, with the advent of the Department of Defense, but also combined them, so we have the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Uniform not referring to the clothing that our Servicemembers wear, but to the fact that it's supposed to apply the same in all the Services.

As we'll see, in a lot of instances, it doesn't, but the idea was to have the system applied in the same way in all the Services.

So, Congress passes the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In 1950, President Truman signs it into law and then it becomes effective on the last day of May 1951.

And, the UCMJ, it does a lot and it does a lot more than what I'm going to say, but it's probably going to be half.

Let me just highlight three things that the UCMJ does and then talk about those three things in greater detail.

So, the first thing it does is it establishes the structure of the military justice system, the authority to have courts martial, the authority to NJP people. I'll talk about that more. NJP is non-judicial punishment, I'm going to talk about that more.

It also establishes the punitive articles. It provides the substantive critical offenses under which Servicemembers could be tried at court-martial.

And, the third thing that it does is it delegates a lot of authority from Congress to the President.

So, we saw that the Constitution gives
Congress the primary authority. Of course, the
President also has authority as the Commander in
Chief. In fact, the Supreme Court has actually
said that, even if Congress doesn't give the
President the authority to convene a court-

martial inherent in his authority as Commander in Chief, his inherent authority to convene a court-martial.

So, the President has some independent authority under Article II. But, under Article I, the main power, the bulk of the power was given to Congress.

Congress has delegated the substantial amount of that authority to the President and did so via the UCMJ. And, we'll look both at what those delegations are and then we'll look at how the President has executed those delegations until Art drags me off when I cut into his time.

And, so, just a warning before we go further or Volatility Ahead sign, here's a warning, there is about to be massive change to the system. So, it's a very interesting time to look at it.

So, Congress, though, as the General Counsel mentioned, on December 23rd of 2016, the President signed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

Division E of that legislation is the Military Justice Act of 2016. And, as the General Counsel mentioned, it's certainly the most systemic change, the most substantive change to the UCMJ since the Military Justice Act of 1968.

And, it's going to make a number of changes. It's going to make a lot of changes to the military justice system structure, to the way -- to the number of folks who sit on courtmartial.

It's going to make a lot of changes to the substantive law and the punitive articles.

But, most of the provisions in that bill don't take effect until the date to be designated by the President no later than January 1st, 2019.

And, because, as I earlier mentioned,
Congress has delegated a lot of authority to the
President, the President's going to need to
rewrite a lot of rules, the equivalent of the
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Rules

for Courts Martial, going to need to rewrite a lot of those in order to carry out this legislation.

So, the legislation says, hey, Mr.

President, provide those new regulations within a year, by January 1st, 2018 and then they have to take effect with the -- on a date that you're going to specify that's no later than January 1st, 2019.

So, for the remainder of my -- but, so, if you see, the first two years of your existence here, the system is not going to be this. The system's going to be what it is today.

And, then, even after two years, think about it, so, the President has it take effect in two years, well, an offense that occurs before that, so an offense that occurs in December of 2018 may tended to be tried under the current system.

And, so, you may even have after

January '19, the bulk of the cases for a while

still being tried under the current system.

So, it's very important that you understand the current system. And so, for the remainder of my remarks, with just a couple of asides that I won't be able to resist, I'm going to talk about the system as it exists today.

Jim Schwenk's smiling because Jim was just talking about that.

Okay, so, but for the bulk of my remarks, I'm going to talk about the system as it exists today.

My friend and colleague, Art Record, is going to talk to you next, the head of military justice for the Navy and is the Chair of the Joint Service Committee on Military Justice.

He's going to talk some about the Military Justice Act of 2016, correct? Because, you're going to talk some about the revisions that this legislation will create.

It may be helpful for you later
because once you've rolled up your sleeves and
understand the system a bit more, it may be
helpful later on to have another briefing on what

changes are coming.

But, so, again, I'm not going to talk about it aside from just a few snide asides.

Captain Record is going to talk about the subject today, but again, the focus is going to be on the system as it exists today and will exist for at least two more years.

Okay. So, we put the Volatility

Ahead, but there's also substantial volatility
behind us. Okay?

So, if you look at the last three years, okay, if you look from December 26th, 2013 through that legislation, not even counting, let's just put aside the Military Justice Act of 2016, okay, putting that aside, Congress has, first, enacted one new UCMJ Statute, Article 6B which is the Victims' Rights Statute.

In that same three year period, not only did they enact it, they amended it twice.

All right? And, then, they also amended 17 existing UCMJ Statutes, six of which they amended twice.

1 So, there's been substantial 2 volatility that has already happened as well. So, those of you who are very familiar 3 with the military justice system as it existed in 4 November of 2013, the system's a lot different 5 today than it was then. And, I am going to look 6 7 at those changes that have occurred. 8 So, I'll also mention that the -- that 9 we have this delegation of authority. President carries out that delegation of 10 authority through the Manual for Courts Martial. 11 12 I didn't have a prop, Art, could you 13 raise up that Manual for Courts Martial I have 14 right there? It's right by your seat. 15 HON. GRIMM: 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. 17 Sorry about that. Thank you. 18 So, this is the what the Manual for 19 Courts Martial looks like. And, when you look at this, I'll tell you, basically, this part here is 20 21 basically the Congressionally prescribed part and

everything else is prescribed in this by either

the President or the Department of Defense.

So, you have most systems, the Statute is only a little tiny bit of what you have. And, of course, beyond this, you have volume after volume of case law that further interprets this.

So, this provides the day to day rules for how the system's carried out.

And, so, when you look at the same time frame, December 2013 to December 2016, there have been four Executive Orders modifying this as well. Because I'm holding up the 2012 edition of this. This is the last one that's actually printed.

If you go online, you can find the 2016 version, which is the version that's in effect today. It's literally at the Army printers right now having copies being run off. So, we'll soon have a hard copy of 2016. The most recent hard copy we have is 2012, again, horribly out of date.

All right, so, we have volatility behind us, we have volatility ahead of us, so,

1	with that warning, I am going to, with great
2	trepidation, now describe the system as it exists
3	today, realizing that everything just changed and
4	everything is about to change again.
5	So, we'll start with the military
6	justice system structure.
7	So, there are lots of ways that
8	commanders discipline Servicemembers. Right?
9	So, there's counseling, there's what do you
10	have in the Navy where you have the Petty
11	Officers Counsel, what do you call that?
12	CAPT TIDESWELL: The Chief Petty
13	Officer of the Board?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Well, you guys have the
15	
16	CAPT TIDESWELL: Oh, the Captain's
17	Mast?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: No, no, no, where
19	the Petty Officers do it.
20	CAPT RECORD: DRB.
21	(SIMULTANEOUS TALKING)
22	MR. SULLIVAN: So, you have EMI, you

1 have --2 CAPT RECORD: DRB, the Disciplinary Review Board. 3 MR. SULLIVAN: And, so, all these 4 5 mechanisms and then, you know, you can put something in the person's Service record book. 6 There are various things you can do. 7 8 But, setting all of that aside, the 9 UCMJ prescribes four ways for a commander to deal with misconduct. All right? 10 So, there are non-judicial punishment, 11 12 and this is in the order or increasing severity, 13 non-judicial punishment, summary court-martial, 14 special court-martial and general court-martial. So, let's take a look at each of those. 15 16 So, NJP can be imposed only by 17 commander but there's certain very limited situations where that power can be delegated. 18 19 But, generally, it's a commander's power. 20 If you're not attached to or embarked

on a vessel and you're the person that is being

taken to NJP, you're allowed to say, no, I refuse

21

to be taken by NJP.

And, if you do that, there's a good chance your case is going to a special court-martial where you can get hammered a lot harder than you could at NJP. But, you know, but you may think, no, this NJP is a proceeding that's fair. I'm innocent, I want to invoke my rights to a court-martial and you can refuse NJP.

The Statute actually says you have a right to demand trial by court-martial. It doesn't -- it isn't carried out consistently with that legislation.

So, he refuses NJP. The commander just drop -- they don't actually have to take you to court-martial even though the Statute says demand a trial by court-martial.

If you're attached to or embarked on a vessel, you do not have the right to refuse NJP. And, that stands even if you're in a ship that's in the shipyard, you know, if you're on base. You know, you're not going underway any time soon, as long as you're still attached to,

1 you know, USS Kitty Hawk, you do not have the 2 right to refuse NJP. There are substantial differences in 3 I'm not 4 the way that the Services carry out NJP. 5 going to get into all those, but understand that 6 the way NJP happens in the Air Force is very different that Office Hours in the Marine Corps 7 8 or Mast in the Navy. 9 And, NJP is not a criminal conviction. All right? 10 11 So, what are some of the things that 12 the CO can do? 13 He can throw somebody in the 14 correctional custody for up to 30 days, forfeit up to half a pay per month for two months. 15 16 For those that are embarked upon and 17 attached to vessels, you can -- the CO can -- the 18 Captain of that ship can have him confined on 19 bread and water for three days. This will be one by where asides the 20 21 Military Justice Act of 2016 does away with that, no more. Well, it did with those -- when that 22

takes effect in sometime in 2019 probably, the power to give bread and water goes away.

But, today, and for the next two years, a Captain of ship can still subject someone to confinement on bread and water for three days as a non-judicial punishment.

Okay, summary court-martial is a oneperson court-martial. The -- it can't prosecute
an officer, it can only prosecute enlisted
members. Everyone can refuse trial by summary
court-martial, even if you're attached to or
embarked upon a vessel. Anyone can refuse trial
by summary court-martial.

There are enormous differences in the way that the Services carry these things out.

In the Air Force, they look sort of like a trial, in the Marine Corps, they don't.

There are enormous differences in the way they're carried out.

And, the Supreme Court has said that, because you don't have a right to counsel at a summary court-martial, but the Air Force kind of

gives you one, but because you don't have a right to it, the Supreme Court has said, it is not a criminal conviction. So, the summary courtmartial conviction is not a criminal conviction.

Actual punishment includes confinement for up to 30 days. Significantly, a summary court-martial cannot give someone a punitive discharge. They can't kick somebody out of the military.

Now, that said, it's quite common that you see someone gets a summary court-martial and then administratively separated on the basis that they have a summary court-martial conviction basically.

So, you'll often see a summary courtmartial in conjunction with an administrative
discharge. But, the summary court-martial itself
cannot kick somebody out of the military.

All right, that brings us to a special court-martial.

For most purposes, and I'll give you two important caveats to that, for most purposes,

a special court-martial looks an awful lot like a trial in a U.S. District Court.

And, if you just dropped somebody that's used to trying cases in U.S. District Court into a special court-martial as counsel or in with GCM's counsel, they could probably do it. You know, there's some oddities that they wouldn't notice, but they'd understand what's going on.

The Rules of Evidence are almost identical with two exceptions. One, you know, the 300 series on civil presumptions, it isn't part of what the President promulgated in the Military Rules of Evidence because they don't cover civil cases.

Instead, the President put in rules about search and seizure and self-incrim.

And, then, also, the other main difference is privileges. So, as you all know, Congress elected not to adopt the recommended privilege rules under the Federal Rules of Evidence. The President did adopt them in the

military and has revised them.

So, we have codified privilege rules under the 500 series of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

But, again, for the most part, you know, it translates pretty well. You know, of course, Judge Grimm had to deal with me litigating in front of him after litigating courts martial, maybe he'd tell you, it didn't. But, my perception is it translated pretty well.

As I stood up in the State Court in Maryland one time shortly after I got out of the Marine Corps, I stood up and I said, Your Honor, the Defense moves for a finding of not guilty.

And, I stopped and said, no I don't, for a judgment of acquittal. I used the military term instead of the Maryland term.

But, it translates fairly well if you remember which system you're litigating it in.

Okay, the two main differences, first, if you're being -- a member being tried can generally pick between trial by members, the

equivalent of a jury. The court-martial panel, they refer to as members. They are not a jury.

If the jury rules that apply constitutionally to states apply to the military justice system, it would be unconstitutional. It is, you know, it doesn't meet the jury requirements in terms of size, in terms of unaniminity, in terms of the way they're chosen. So, it's not a jury and that's actually quite important. It's a members panel, but it functions much like a jury.

If you -- if the member chooses to be sentenced by the jury, by the members, the members -- the member chooses to be tried. So, if the members are deciding guilt or innocence, they will also assess the sentence after an adversarial sentencing proceeding.

So, the way sentencing is done in our system, way different than the federal system or almost any state system.

If you're tried in front of the jury equivalent, the jury equivalent adjudges the

sentence, you go into sentencing right away after the findings of guilt are announced, okay, we're going into sentencing now.

Sometimes there's a break overnight, it just depends on what time of day, really, the members come back with a verdict.

But, if there is a conviction, there's going to be an adversarial hearing, Rules of Evidence apply. They're applied a bit differently, they're relaxed a bit, but they still apply and there's going to be an adversarial proceeding.

And, then, again, if it's member sentencing, the members come out, no pre-trial information report or anything of the like.

The other substantial difference, and this is something that General Counsel mentioned, in 2013 the Air Force started a pilot program of special victims' counsel that provided -- that's offered to people that reported to being the victim of the defense, a lawyer, a military lawyer to enter in to an attorney-client

relationship with them and represent them.

So, and then Congress, as the General Counsel mentioned, has expanded that program.

And, so, and the Marine Corps has chosen to make VLCs, as they're called in the Marine Corps, available to the victims of any offense, not just sex offenses and the other Services, they're limited to sex offenses, generally.

But, so, you're going to have a lawyer in that courtroom generally if it's a sex offense, you're generally going to have a lawyer in that courtroom who's representing the complaining witness in the case.

And, so, that also, you know, throws a wrinkle in the system. And, in some instances, that victim is going to be -- that victims' counsel is going to be even allowed to file a Writ of Mandamus challenging certain evidentiary rulings of the judge that are relevant under 18 USC 3771 in the federal system alleged violations of the Federal Crime Victims' Rights Act can be

taken to the U.S. Court of Appeals under Writ of 1 2 Mandamus. But, note that those are only for 3 violations of the Crime Victims' Rights Act 4 5 itself. In the system that Congress has 6 enacted for the military is different. 7 It's not 8 just you can seek a Writ of Mandamus if there's 9 been an alleged violation of the military Crime Victims' Rights Act, but the victim, also, if 10 11 there's been a ruling on a rape shield issue, if 12 there's been a ruling on psychotherapist-patient 13 privilege issue, if there's been a ruling on the 14 victims' advocate victim privilege with which the victim disagrees, a Writ of -- a Petition for 15 16 Writ of Mandamus can be filed in that instance as 17 well. So, there's a broader right to 18 19 interlocutory appeal at that stage.

CHAIR BASHFORD: When the members

Okay, so, I've gone over an awful lot.

I don't know -- yes, please.

20

21

panel is imposing sentence, do they have guidelines, minimums, maximums?

MR. SULLIVAN: For the most part, no. And, so, Congress has said that, if you are found guilty of a penetrative sex offense or an attempt to commit a penetrative sex offense as opposed to a contact sex offense, the sentence must include, if it's an officer, a dismissal which is the officer version of a dishonorable discharge, or if it's an enlisted member, it must include a dishonorable discharge. So, that's one of the very rare mandatory minimum.

There's also a mandatory minimum for murder, I'm sorry, for premeditated murder and for felony murder. The mandatory minimum for those is life. The mandatory minimum is life with eligibility for parole. Someone can also get life without eligibility for parole.

And, then, there's another -- the only other offense for which there's a mandatory minimum is spying in time of war for which the mandatory minimum is death. Okay?

That is actually one of the things that could change in two years, since, obviously, there's a constitutional about having a mandatory death sentence under Woodson v. North Carolina.

But, so that's going away in two years. And, it applies only in time of war and we haven't had to declare war -- it applies only in time of declared war. And, of course, we haven't had one of those since World War II.

So, you know, it hasn't been used lately, but that's -- those are the only mandatory minimums.

And, they are not given guidelines. In fact, one of the, we probably shouldn't get into this, but when DoD proposed the Military Justice Act of 2016, we proposed judge alone sentencing in non-capital cases with parameters that would function sort of like federal sentencing guidelines and require the sentencing judge to explain departures up or down.

They could depart, but they'd need to explain them which would provide basis for a

appellate review. Congress rejected that and it 1 2 chose not to go with parameters and chose to retain the option of member sentencing. 3 4 But, again, that's -- I don't know if 5 Art's going to talk about that, but that's in his presentation and not mine, so I will now be quiet 6 about that. 7 8 CHAIR BASHFORD: Thank you. 9 But, so, but great MR. SULLIVAN: 10 question. Anything else? We've gone over a lot 11 so far. Anything else that you want to talk 12 about now? Yes, sir? I don't know if it's now, 13 HON. GRIMM: 14 but will one of you talk about convening authority, the authority of the convening 15 16 authority to modify a sentence --17 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. 18 HON. GRIMM: -- imposed by members or 19 a military judge? 20 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, so that is one of 21 the things that changed on December 26th of 2013 and I'm going to talk about that change. 22

HON. GRIMM: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, you bet.

Okay, so, we're talking about special courts martial now. Today, a special courtmartial has to have at least three members. So, if you chose to be tried by members rather than judge alone, that court-martial is going to have at least three members, that's the statutory minimum. That's going to change.

So, I mentioned how NJPs in summaries, the procedures are very different among the Services. Here, for special courts martial and general courts martial, the procedures are very similar.

So, you know, any Army lawyer can walk into a Navy court-martial and litigate that case quite well. The procedures are very similar across the Services in special and general courts martial.

All right, so, the sentences that can be adjudged by special -- a special cannot either discharge an officer or give an officer

confinement. So, let's just put officers to the side for purposes of special court-martial.

For an enlisted member, a special court-martial can kick them out of the military with what's called a bad conduct discharge. That is a stigmatizing form of discharge. It's designed to create a lifetime stigma.

It cuts off veterans benefits, although, for the case of a BCD adjudged by a special, the VA can waive it and provide the person with benefits. But, again, it's designed to be a punitive discharge.

A special can confine somebody for up to 12 months. Used to be six months, Congress raised that. You can confine somebody at a special for up to 12 months. They can -- you can adjudge forfeiture up to two-thirds pay per month for 12 months.

And, you can bust somebody -- an enlisted member down to the lowest pay grade, down to E-1. Officers cannot be reduced in grade by either special court-martial conviction or a

BCD conviction.

Okay, so, moving on to GCMs, so, oh, and for the special court-martial conviction and a general court-martial conviction are considered federal convictions.

So, if you were being tried under Federal Sentencing Guidelines and you had a conviction by special court-martial, you have a previous federal conviction.

So, for purposes of the GCM, it has to have at least five members. The number of members is going to change.

A GCM can adjudge any sentence that is authorized for that offense. As you'll see, the President set the maximum, except for death eligible offenses, which Congress establishes.

A GCM can impose up to the maximum offense, punishment for that particular offense including death. And, as we mentioned before, people under death sentences from courts martial to death.

So, the maximum punishments for an

enlisted member include a dishonorable discharge; for an officer, it includes a dismissal, which, again, is the officer version of a DD.

They can also adjudge a BDC or no discharge except in the case of a penetrative sex offense.

Confinement up to the maximum for the offense, total forfeiture of pay and allowances, reduction to E-1 for enlisted members and death, if authorized.

So, for both a special and a GCM, here are the voting rules, and these are going to change in two years. But, for today, here are the voting rules.

A two-thirds majority is necessary to convict. But, if you have less than a two-thirds majority, so, let's say you have an eight member court-martial and they split 50/50 on guilt-innocence. That isn't a hung jury, it's an acquittal.

So, two-thirds majority necessary to convict. Anything less than two-thirds is an

acquittal.

And, think about in the military, one of those members is going to be senior to all the others. Right? And, I mean, this is the way it is in the military. I'll try two people withe identical date of rank.

You know, you're going to have two people, you're going to have these members, one of them is going to be senior. So, that senior member is going to be the president of the deliberations.

Congress was concerned that you wouldn't want that senior member to exert undue influence over the other people in the deliberation room.

So, they thought, you know what? If we have a hung jury, then what's to prevent that Colonel from going, you know, it really would be awfully good if we had a conviction here.

And, you know, so, Congress was so concerned about that, the members vote once and the outcome of that vote is that court-martial

finding. If it's two-thirds majority or more, it's a conviction; if it isn't, it's an acquittal.

And, again, there's that special reason why we don't have hung juries because Congress was so concerned about the influence of rank coming into the deliberation room.

For sentencing, interesting, for sentencing, there can be a hung jury, interestingly, for sentencing, you almost never see it, but it is theoretically possible.

So, generally, there's -- to impose a sentence, you need a two-thirds vote to get that sentence. However, there are two differences for that.

If it's death, the vote needs to be unanimous. There are special rules for death.

I'm not going to talk about those any more today.

Okay? It used to be that rape was a death eligible offense in the military, it isn't any more.

You may recall in Kennedy v.

Louisiana, the Supreme Court specifically left open the question of whether rape of a minor could be a capital offense. In the military, even though it can't be for status as they held in Kennedy v. Louisiana.

But, Congress, thereafter, went back and eliminated rape as a possible -- they eliminated death as a punishment for either rape or rape of a child. So, that issue doesn't exist. I'm just not going to talk about death cases because it's special rules. I'm not going to talk about those any more today.

But, if you want to impose a sentence for -- that's ten years or greater of confinement instead of two-thirds majority for that sentence, you need a three-fourths majority.

So, you think about it, you could envision a situation where there isn't a two-thirds vote for a sentence of less than ten years or a three-thirds for a sentence greater than ten years. And, that is, if you actually could have a hung members panel on sentencing, but, again,

it almost never happens.

Okay, so, Oliver Wendell Holmes

famously said, "The life of the law has not been
logic, it's been experience." So, let's look

from -- go from the theoretical and look at a
little bit of experience, including some courtmartial numbers.

So, in fiscal year 2015, the most recent year for which we have numbers, there a total 1,104 GCMs tried throughout the military.

So, this includes all four of the Services in DoD and the Coast Guard. That's the number of GCMs that were tried. About half of those were for sex offenses.

Special courts martial, 836; summary, 634 and then NJPs, remember we talked about NJPs before, 51,000. So, we put this in a pie chart, this is what we get.

So, you know, this, so, you know, the vast majority -- well, when something rises to the level of being dealt with under the UCMJ, as we talked about before, there are lots of things

1	that can happen under the UCMJ, counseling
2	sessions, service record entries and such.
3	But, if it gets to the UCMJ, the vast
4	majority of those cases with a blue field are
5	handled by NJP and then summary courts martial,
6	special courts martial and general courts martial
7	all make up each just a tiny sliver of that vast
8	majority of disciplinary actions that occur under
9	the UCMJ.
10	SGT MARKEY: Sir, can you go back to
11	that previous slide?
12	MR. SULLIVAN: You bet.
13	SGT MARKEY: Yes, thank you.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, then the next
15	slide we go to is going to show you how
16	HON. BRISBOIS: One moment.
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir?
18	HON. BRISBOIS: You broke down the
19	general courts martial by about 50 percent were
20	referred for sex assault related offenses.
21	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.
22	HON. BRISBOIS: Do you have a

1	breakdown for special courts?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Very few of those are
3	going to be sex offenses because, by Statute, any
4	penetrative sex offense has to go the GCM.
5	And, so, the only sex offenses that
6	could go to a special would be contact sex
7	offenses.
8	HON. BRISBOIS: Yes, and you've
9	already drawn that distinction.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: Right. And, that's
11	going to be it's not nearly the 50 percent
12	there, it's going to be much lower. I don't have
13	the exact number for that, Dr. Spohn, is that
14	something you've looked at?
15	DR. SPOHN: Yes, but I don't have
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sure.
17	DR. SPOHN: here.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: So, we can look at
19	that. I think it's a lot lower than that 50
20	percent.
21	And, then, so for now, now we can look
22	at, you know, for those of you that are involved

1 in the system a while ago, those numbers probably 2 look awfully small, don't they? And, so, that's just looking at how 3 we've been able to change over time. 4 5 So, if you look at the number of 6 Servicemembers in fiscal year 2015, there were about 4.5 percent fewer in 2015 than 2000. Okay? 7 8 And, so, we see that, you know, a 9 change of less than five percent, and yet, the number of GCMs is down almost a third in that 10 time frame. 11 12 The number of specials is down three-13 quarters in that time frame. 14 The number of summary is down three-15 quarters. 16 And, the number of NJPs is down more 17 than a third. 18 Now, let's go back another ten years 19 and you'll see an even more marked drop. 20 So, in fiscal year 1990, so, there's 21 been a drop of about a third, so the DoD was about a third, DoD and the Coast Guard combined 22

with that third larger than they are now. 1 2 thirds drop in GCMs. So, you know, that year, we were doing 3 4 3,000 GCMs across the Services, now, we're down 5 to about a 1,000. Specials, down to 87.5 percent. 6 7 going from 6,700 specials, I think, generally, 8 probably most of those tried by the Marine Corps, 9 right? A lot, the Department of the Navy back then tried the bulk of the specials. 10 11 BGEN SCHWENK: The BCD is special, I 12 believe. 13 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, exactly. 14 So, six, I've got to joke about the 15 bulk being probably the Marine Corps, by the way, 16 but the Marine Corps and the Navy account 17 disproportionately in that statistic. 18 So, again, down from 6,700 to 836. 19 Summary courts martial, similar decrease and then NJPs down two-thirds. 20 So a marked decrease in the in the use 21 22 of UCMJ proceedings over ten years and then even

1 greater decrease when we pulled the aperture back 2 further. 3 Okay, so, Judge Grimm, you asked about 4 the power of the CA. 5 I'm sorry, can I --MR. KRAMER: 6 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, please. 7 MR. KRAMER: So, what's the drop 8 attributed to? 9 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, I know of no good statistical study that looks at that question. 10 don't even know a bad one. 11 12 So, I can tell you what those of us that follow the UCMJ think contributes to that 13 14 but, anyone's guess is just as good as good mine. But, I'll tell you a couple things 15 16 that people think might have contributed to that, 17 again, we don't really know. 18 But, one thing that we think 19 contributes to that is, first, so, let's think 20 about it, so, it's probably going to mean, we 21 have that decrease in courts martial, it's 22 probably going to -- and NJPs, it's probably

going to mean, either, one, there's less 1 2 misconduct. Or, two, misconduct that does exist is 3 4 being dealt with by alternative means than the 5 UCMJ. Or, three, there's as much misconduct 6 7 but for some reason, it isn't being discovered. 8 Okay? 9 Anecdotally, I don't have any reason to believe three exists. So, I do have a reason 10 anecdotally to believe that one and two both 11 12 exist. And, to some extent, one and two, there's less misconduct and the misconduct that does 13 14 exist is being dealt with by other means. Those two probably account for the 15 bulk of that change. 16 17 So, let's think about this, why would 18 there be less misconduct today? 19 Well, one reason is, in our system, I don't know about how this is in the District of 20 21 Columbia criminal courts, please tell me, we find 22 that, in an enormous amount of our misconduct is

tied to alcohol. Is that the case in civilians 1 2 or is that not the case so much in the civilian? MR. KRAMER: 3 No, there's more drugs or 4 5 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, an enormous amount of our misconduct is people doing stupid 6 7 things when they're drunk. Okay? And, then, you 8 also have drug offenses. So, an enormous amount 9 part of misconduct. When you think about a deployed 10 11 military, a lot of those people are deployed in 12 areas where, one, by regulation, they're not 13 allowed to drink. And, two, even if they were 14 inclined to violate that rule, they probably can't get alcohol even if they wanted to. Right? 15 16

So, part -- so, what is one reason we might have had a decrease in crime in the military? Well, one reason is, because an enormous percentage of our folks today are deployed that weren't in 1990.

And, so, that large part of our military is not getting into alcohol related

17

18

19

20

21

All right? So, that's part of it. 1 offenses. 2 And, then, it may be, Dr. Spohn, you may know this, but it may also be that a higher 3 percentage of our military is married today than 4 5 in 1990. The married Servicemembers get into less misconduct on average than an unmarried 6 7 Servicemember. 8 So, the, you know, the -- so the 9 demographics of the Service may have changed in ways that move it toward being less likely to 10 11 engage in that misconduct. 12 There -- it used to be that we 13 provided rather liberal waivers. So, generally, 14 if you have a previous civilian conviction, you can't get into the military. 15 16 During the height of the Iraq 17 conflict, we were waiving that. So, and now, 18 we're not as much. 19 So, it may be that some of those stricter enlistment criteria are also tied to a 20 21 reduction in post-enlistment misconduct.

So, but, again, it's probably a

combination of those things and a lot more.

Okay?

And, then, the other part, so, it's probably also the case that there are -- there's offenses that used to be tried by courts martial that aren't. And, then I'll talk about a couple reasons for that.

But, again, this is anecdotal. One is, we hear from commanders that they are more reluctant to send to a court-martial someone that has combat experience. And, right now, an enormous percentage of our military has combat experience.

Sort of the threshold for getting into court has probably raised a bit.

Our sensitivity to a lot of issues like post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is a lot better today.

So, somebody that used to be just, you know, labeled as a miscreant, that's not the actual word they would use, but I can't quite properly say the actual word they would use.

Someone that used to be labeled a miscreant now might be thought of in a more holistic fashion as being somebody's suffering from PTSD, TBI.

And, then, but there's also been one really interesting thing that happened in the Marine Corps, because the Marine Corps vastly disproportionate percentage, if you look at the number of folks in the Marine Corps, the percentage of people in the Marine Corps -- in DoD that are in the Marine Corps, they compared that to the number of in the 1990s, the numbers of the Marines are subject to special courts martial is off the charts.

It used to be that a battalion commander, because in the Marine Corps, a battalion commander can convene a special courtmartial, it used to be that the battalion commander would send an awful lot of cases to special courts martial.

And, that changed a few years ago.

And, one of the reasons people think that

changed, there was actual an article in the

Marine Corps Gazette and, you know, we all wrote these long articles, because does anyone read these? And, of course, the answer is no.

But, there was this one article in the Professional Journal that actually led to -- seems to have led the change.

There was an article in the Marine

Corps Gazette called The Lost Battalion. And,

so, when you go through a court-martial and

you're convicted and you're sentenced to a BCD

and you're kicked out of the military, well, you

don't actually get kicked out of the military at

that point because your case has to go through

levels of appeal.

And, the Marine Corps and the Navy, in particular, for a while, had a huge backlog in their cases. In fact, the Congress directed there be a study why the Department of the Navy had such a huge backlog.

So, these people were getting convicted and then for maybe three years, they were still members of the military. Now, they

weren't on active duty, they were in a status called appellate leave. But, in the status of appellate leave, they still count against the Marine Corps numbers.

And so, someone wrote an article in the Marine Corps Gazette that said, look, if you look at all the Marines that are on appellate leave, that's a battalion. So, we're losing a battalion of trigger pullers to have these guys on appellate leave.

And, that article actually seemed to lead CAs to, instead of sort of readily sending some people to special, instead, send it to a summary and then administrative discharge, which gets rid of the guy right away, no appeal, no appellate leave, no lost battalion.

So, again, an awful lot of reasons.

I'm sure many of you can come up with additional reasons, but those are some of the speculations.

Judge Grimm?

HON. GRIMM: I was just going to say, the administrative elimination was much faster

1	way of fixing some of these problems.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Exactly, exactly.
3	DEAN HARRISON: Mr. Sullivan?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, please.
5	DEAN HARRISON: I want to make sure I
6	understand the mandatory minimum for penetrative
7	sex assaults.
8	So, there is a mandatory minimum of at
9	least a punitive discharge, is that right?
10	MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
11	DEAN HARRISON: And, did I understand
12	you correctly that that has also taken away the
13	convening authority's charging discretion?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: So, great question.
15	Okay, so, there have been proposals in
16	Congress to take away a CA's authority to
17	exercise prosecutorial discretion and move it to
18	a judge advocate. That has not happened.
19	But, what Congress did do is say, hey,
20	CA, if you are going to refer for trial
21	penetrative sexual assault or attempted
22	penetrative sexual assault, the only forum to

which you can refer that is a GCM.

So, it's still the GCM convening authority who decides. But, if the special court-martial convening authority wanted to refer that to a special, he or she could not.

Only a general court-martial convening authority. So, a summary can't try it, a special can't try it, a general can.

But, it's not -- it isn't the case that a CA who gets such a charge has to refer it. But, the only place they can refer it to is a GCM.

Now, that said, Section 1744 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 imposed a review requirement for non-referral decisions.

So, this is what Congress said in that provision. Hey, general court-martial convening authority, if you're SJA writes and Article 34 advice letter, of course, you know, Dean, what that is, no reason anyone else should, but obviously, you know, so, if your SJA writes this

recommendation from the lawyer to the CA and says, hey, hey, General, hey, Admiral, you should refer this and the CA doesn't, that case has to go to the Secretary of the military department for review.

So, in the case of the Marine Corps, it would have to the Secretary of the Navy to review that non-referral decision.

The Statute also says, hey, General, hey, Admiral, if your lawyer writes in a 34 advice letter that this penetrative sexual assault should not go to a court-martial, that needs to be reviewed by your next senior General or Admiral in the chain of command.

So, whenever there is an Article 34, but remember lawyers writing an advice to a convening authority about a penetrative sexual assault, someone -- and, the CA does not refer it, someone has to review that non-referral. No requirement.

So, let's say the SJA says, don't refer it and the CA says, you know, thanks,

judge, I'm referring it, no requirement for review. But, if it's -- it does matter if the judge advocate says don't refer and there's a non-referral, still requires review one level up. If the judge advocate says refer and there's not a referral, review by the Secretary of the military department.

I also would say, so that provision was part of the NDAA for FY2014. That provision took effect on December 26th, 2013. So, we're a little bit more, we're listing three year out.

So, Dean, in that time, in those three years, how many instances do you think there have been? I know the exact number. How many instances do you think there have been where the SJA has said, hey, General, hey, Admiral, you should refer this penetrative sexual assault to a GCM and the Admiral or the General said no, requiring the Secretary of the military department, how many times do you think that's happened?

DEAN HARRISON: No much more than

1	zero.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Exactly, you would be
3	correct. And, that precisely is zero times.
4	BGEN SCHWENK: So, is that an example
5	of congressional influence on the independent
6	decision making of the convening authority?
7	MR. SULLIVAN: So, General, I'd say
8	that would be an example of congressional
9	constraint on the independent exercise of
LO	discretion by the convening authority which, of
L1	course, you know, as we all know, well, I guess
L2	we don't know, some of you have no reason to.
L3	So, in the military, under this
L 4	concept of unlawful command influence. A
L5	superior can't tell a junior how to exercise
L6	discretion about military justice matters,
L 7	unlawful command influence.
L8	BGEN SCHWENK: So, if the President
L9	said something about sexual assault cases, you
20	would become unlawful?
21	MR. SULLIVAN: Agent provocateur.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. SULLIVAN: See, that's the concept that you can't have unlawful command influence.

So, say there was a case, for example, the Commandant of the Marine Corps gave a number of speeches, it was called the Heritage Brief where he talked about the sex assault and basically said, false reporting is a myth, said a number of things. Said that in -- according to two members of a court-martial panel while the case was ongoing.

The appellate court said that violates the prohibition against unlawful command influence. You can't have unlawful command influence.

But, something that Congress has put in the UCMJ is, by definition, not unlawful. So, this would be a lawful, in fact, it is literally by law constraint, and he knows this, he's just prodding me because he likes to do it, so it's a lawful constraint adopted by Congress on the discretion of the convening authority in that instance.

1	Okay, so let
2	DEAN HARRISON: One more question, I'm
3	sorry.
4	The I can't remember the exact
5	title, but the Victim Advocate attorney, that are
6	
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, the SVC or VLC,
8	depending on what Service.
9	DEAN HARRISON: Do they participate in
10	Article 32 investigations?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: So, they are available
12	to represent the accused [sic] at the 32.
13	Congress also changed the law to say that a
14	victim
15	So, it used to be the case, well, it
16	still is the case today, that a civilian cannot
17	be compelled to testify at a 32, but a
18	Servicemember could.
19	Congress was concerned, hey, civilian
20	victims can't be subjected to this, to being
21	cross examined in a 32. Military victims can, as
22	I'm sure you know, there's a case under the Naval

Academy that resulted in a great deal of 1 2 attention about whether victims were being unfairly questioned and subjected to unfair 3 4 proceedings at a 32. 5 So, Congress changed the law and said, hey, it's always been the case that civilian 6 7 victims can opt out, now military victims can, 8 too. 9 So, the military victim can completely opt out of participating in the 32. But, that 10 11 SVC in the case of the Army or Air Force or the VLC in the case of the Navy or Marine Corps, is 12 13 available to form an attorney-client relationship 14 and represent a victim including for purposes. 15 So, if there was an issue that came up 16 at a 32 about psychotherapist-patient privilege 17 or scope of the rape shield law, that VLC or SVC 18 would be in there advocating for the interest of 19 the victim. 20 **DEAN HARRISON:** Thank you. 21 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor? 22 HON. BRISBOIS: So, there's zero times

when the convening authority has said I'm not 1 2 going to refer. But, do we know how many times when the staff judge advocate has said this case 3 should not be referred and it has referred? 4 5 That is, A, a great MR. SULLIVAN: question; B, a question that has led to 6 7 congressional hearings and I'm not kidding. 8 The short answer to the question is 9 And, so, the reason we can say that the first one is precisely zero is because we can, 10 11 you know, call up the legal apparatus for the Secretaries of military departments and say, how 12 13 many of these have you gotten and they tell us 14 zero. 15 But, there's no -- because there's no 16 requirement to report to anyone the other way, we 17 don't have a red belly button we can push and say 18 how many times has this happened? 19 So, the short answer to that question 20 is we don't know. 21 We know that there have been cases 22 that CAs have referred, notwithstanding the SJAs

advice not to. In fact, three of the cases from Naval Academy that we mentioned, the SJA advised the CA not to refer and the CA did.

So, we know it happens, but we don't know how often it happens. It appears that it is relatively -- and it appears that it is exceedingly rare, but it is longer than a null set.

Yes, please?

CMSAF MCKINLEY: Sir, a couple questions here.

The previous slide 1,100 in general courts-martial, 50 percent of those are sexual assault and that's a lot less numbers on general courts-martial over the previous couple of decades.

Do you have the percentages of the number of sexual assaults? Has the percentage of sexual assaults decreased or increased?

Also, a couple other things, how does that compare per capita to the civilian community?

And, also, do you have -- can you 1 2 provide for us how it breaks down per rank and the different branches of the Service for the 3 sexual assault secured rank? 4 5 MR. SULLIVAN: All three questions, 6 Chief, so the short answer to the question on how 7 that breaks down with civilians, and Dr. Spohn's -- you've analyzed that exact question, haven't 8 9 Why don't I yield the floor to you? DR. SPOHN: Well, I don't have the 10 11 data here with me, but we did look at -- Meghan's going to get it -- but, we did look at the 12 13 difference between those issues. 14 So, we can get that MR. SULLIVAN: information out to all the Members that report on 15 16 some of the research that has been done so far. 17 Also, the DoD SAPRO Office has what's 18 called a waterfall chart. So, we'll get you 19 reports to answer your first question about of 20 all the cases that come into the system, how many 21 of those end up going to court-martial. So, I can also get you some trend 22

lines answering your first question on that. 1 2 And, in terms of rank breakdown, I don't see anyone here from SAPRO to help with 3 I'll look into whether we can get that. 4 I know that the answer -- I know we 5 6 have data to respond to your first two questions, I would be surprised if we couldn't find data 7 that responds to your other question. 8 9 CMSAF MCKINLEY: Yes, it would be interesting to see if those more occur in a 10 11 dormitory barracks situation or, you know, in a 12 deployed location. Those are relevant questions. 13 MR. SULLIVAN: They are, they're very 14 important questions, agreed. Yes, we'll see what data is available and pump it out to you. 15 16 Okay, and so, my tech expert here, my 17 going forward doesn't always works. 18 But, let's stop here in any event. 19 So, if you could see it up to this point, you 20 could see the sexual assault report. 21 Okay, so, let's follow the system, 22 this will respond to your question, Judge Grimm,

about the CA powers.

And, so, let's just look at how a case progresses through the system. And, I'm going to use the Marine Corps example just because that's the Service that I know the best.

Okay, so, we're going to start with a sexual assault that's reported. And, so, if a sexual assault is reported, you'll recall the General Counsel mentioned that, by regulation, only what's called a Military Criminal Investigative Board position is allowed to investigate that offense.

So, a commander cannot say, I'm going to investigate that. And, in the Marine Corps, CID can't investigate it. And, in the Army -- the Marine Corps CID is different in the Army CID.

The Marine Corps CID can't investigate it, NCIS has to. In the Army, an MP can't investigate it, CID must. In the Navy, you know, Shore Patrol or National Guard can't investigate it, NCIS has to. In the Air Force, the SF can't

investigate it, OSI must.

So, any sexual assault, and this applies not only to the defendant but to the contact as well, must be investigated by the NCIS.

Once it's reported in either a restricted report which doesn't go in the military justice system but makes the victim eligible for services, or an unrestricted report which must go to the military justice system, or in the investigative system.

In the Marine Corps, they'll be offered a VLC right then. So, right from the beginning of the investigation, as soon as the person makes the restricted or unrestricted report, they are offered to form an attorney-client relationship with a VLC.

But, they don't have to. When you look across the Services, it looks like in about 75 percent of the cases an unrestricted report, the person chooses to enter into a attorney-client relationship with a VLC/SVC. They don't

have to, but it's always offered.

HON. GRIMM: What's that percent?

MR. SULLIVAN: About 75 for unrestricted reports. But, for restricted reports, it's about 25 percent. But, for unrestricted reports the latest data we have suggests about three-quarters take advantage of that.

Okay, so then, NCIS investigates.

And, then, so if the case goes forward, charges are preferred. So, somebody's subject to the Code swears that they have reason to believe that this Servicemember committed an offense.

And, so, if it's a penetrative sexual assault, so normally, in the Marine Corps, the charges would then go to a battalion commander who would serve as the special court-martial convening authority.

But, because, you'll recall the

General Counsel mentioned that for purposes of a

penetrative offense, it has to go to somebody

who's at least an O-6 and who is a special court-

martial convening authority.

So, in the Marine Corps, so, this the alleging a penetrative sexual assault, it's going to go to the regimental CO, not the battalion CO.

And, so, that individual is a special court-martial convening authority. In addition to being able to convene a special court, that person can order what's now called an Article 32 pre-trial -- a preliminary hearing.

And, so, they'll refer it to a preliminary hearing and that preliminary hearing officer will then provide a report back to the special court-martial convening authority who, at that point, could dismiss the charges or could refer the charges up.

You'll recall, for a penetrative offense, that person can't refer them to a special. If it's the contact offense, that person could also have the option to referring to a special.

HON. GRIMM: I might mention, my capacity to serve the military analogue of grand

jury?

MR. SULLIVAN: Exactly, exactly.

So, this preliminary hearing, except the only important difference on the preliminary of course, is the accused has the right to show up.

And, so, and be represented by counsel at that Article 32 preliminary hearing.

Okay, so then, so, let's say the special court-martial convening authority basically you refer to a GCM. So, that special, that regimental commander would then push it up to the division commanding general and that division commanding general will then get advice from his or her staff judge advocate.

And, then we talked about the consequences of that advice, depending upon what it recommends.

And, so, if they want to refer the case to the court-martial, they're refer it to a court and then the case, for most purposes, for most purposes, the case then belongs to the trial

judge.

And, so the trial judge is going to be presiding over that case.

The CA still gets to make some decision, especially anything that requires paying money. So, like if you want -- if there's a issue about bringing a witness in, the CA gets to decide whether to pay to bring that witness in and then the judge can review it.

But, for the most part, the case, at that point, belongs to the judge.

So, then, you get, let's say you a conviction, then the case goes back to the convening authority.

And, so, now, we get into this point where our Judgment Management Report, the laws change.

so, before 2013, that convening authority could either set aside any finding of guilty or could reduce the punishment in any way the convening authority wanted for any reason or no reason at all.

And, then, there was a prominent case out the Air Force, the Wilkerson case, where clemency was granted. There was a widespread consternation about clemency being granted.

It turns out that the factual basis on which clemency was granted turned out not to be so true, not to be so factual, that's a very delicate way of putting it.

And, so, Congress changed the law.

And, so, they said, for the most part, a CA, a convening authority, can no longer change the findings. They can no longer take the conviction and make it not a conviction or knock it down to a lesser included offense.

For the -- and so, then the court changed. Now, there's a caveat. There is one class of cases for which the convening authority still retains the old powers and that's for an offense for which the maximum punishment is less than two years, so the maximum punishment that the President prescribed the Manual for Courts Martial is less than two years, and, in fact,

that court-martial did not result in either a punitive discharge, so BCD, that kind of discharge, dishonorable discharge or dismissal, or more than six months of confinement.

So, turning it around the other way, the only cases where the CA can still exercise that power over findings and exercise general power over the sentence to knock it down, are cases that have less than a two year maximum punishment under the Presidentuary prescribe maximums and the court-martial resulted in a sentence that was -- it included confinement for no more than six months and didn't include a punitive discharge. Okay?

It's not important, I just know there's more.

SGT MARKEY: And, where do sex offenses fall in that particular decision process?

MR. SULLIVAN: So, Congress also said, so, essentially, no contact or penetrative offense would ever fall within that exception.

1 But, just to be sure, Congress went 2 ahead and said, oh, by the way, no Article 120 offense, which is the main Statute under which 3 4 these are tried ever qualifies regardless. So, essentially, so, for the cases 5 that you're most interested in, they don't apply, 6 7 okay, for the most part. 8 And, you can say there might be 9 violating unlawful general order, which is how we try to say underage drinking, you don't ask for 10 that one to apply as well. 11 12 This catches a real small number of 13 cases. 14 Now, Congress also restricted, but not to quite as great of an extent, the CAs power to 15 16 grant clemency on sentencing. 17 So, the way we do plea bargains in the 18 military, and most, if you look at most GCMs 19 across all the Services, most general courts 20 martial are resolved by a plea bargain. 21 But, if you look at special courts 22 martial across all the Services, most special

courts martial are resolved by plea bargain. We call them pre-trial agreements in the military.

They impose special rules. So, the way we do plea bargaining is weird, all right.

And, by the way, this is also going to change in two years, okay.

But, the way we do plea bargaining is very odd. Okay, so, the accused and the defense counsel negotiate with the convening authority and they agree on a maximum sentence.

So, General, have you been a convening authority? Okay, so, you've had defense counsel go to you and say, hey, General, here's why you should cap this case at no more than three months confinement.

And, then, you decide whether you're going to grant that request. Okay?

So, let's say the General grants that request. And, so, for this particular offense, let's say it's an unauthorized absence of three months. Okay, so somebody goes AWOL in the case of the Army or UA in the case of the Navy and

Marine Corps.

I also had a very funny discussion in the Air Force, of course, UA cases are drug cases, I had a discussion with an Air Force lawyer where we're both talking about a UA case which in the Marine Corps means an unauthorized absence case, an AWOL case. And, we're both talking about the same case, we were talking about UA case.

And so, suddenly he mentions a lab report. I'm like, you have lab reports for UA cases? And, I'm like, what, you know, because I'm thinking, in an AWOL case, you have a lab report?

And, he looks at me with this look of absolute horror on his face and goes, in the Marine Corps, you don't have lab reports on UA cases?

I'm like no. He's talking about a urinalysis kit.

Anyway, for Army purposes, you have an AWOL case and let's say you agree to a three

month deal, so you agree that this person will go to a special court-martial and whatever the sentence is, she'll knock down the confinement to no more than three months in exchange for this person pleading guilty.

So, then the case goes to a courtmartial. And, let's say the part of the deal, as
most deals do, says it has to be tried in front
of a judge, for members, you have to try in front
of a judge.

So, you go in front the judge and the judge has no idea what this deal. The judge knows there's a deal, but doesn't know what it's for. Okay?

So, then, let's say the judge comes back and says, okay, I sentence you to confinement for four months and a BCD.

Then the judge like opens up the secret envelop and sees that there's a deal between us and says to the accused, okay, well, the convening authority acts, you'll get no more than three months. That power still exists.

So, through the plea bargaining power, the CA can still knock down the sentence in that same way.

Now, let's say, the accused only gets two months at that court-martial. The accused gets the two months. So, the accused gets the better of the two deals. It's called beating the deal in military practice.

So, if you have a deal and you get it, you come in under the deal, you get the lower sentence.

If you have a deal and the courtmartial comes in above the deal, it's going to
get knocked down to the deal. Again, that's all
going to change in two years, but that's the odd
system we have today.

So, Congress retained that authority of the CA because they wanted to retain the ability to have plea bargains the way it's done in the military. They retained the authority of the CA with one exception, and here's that one exception.

You know, how we mentioned the mandatory minimum for penetrative offenses includes kicking you out with bad paper, a CA knock down that dishonorable discharge to a bad conduct discharge, but that's it. They can't knock it down lower, even through plea bargain.

There's one exception, it's very rarely used where a CA can give great expert clemency power if the trial counsel recommended, the trial counsel being military vernacular for prosecutor, if a prosecutor recommends after the court-martial, because the person, you know, rats out somebody else and participates with the government in another prosecution, they can get extra clemency there. It's very rarely done.

So, for the most part, Congress took away the CAs authority to grant clemency on the back end by your setting aside the discharge and setting aside confinement for more than a year.

But, they kept on the front end by being able to do it through a pre-trial hearing.

What time is it? I think I'm cutting

1 away on your time, by the way. 2 CAPT RECORD: It's 10:45, you have 45 minutes left. 3 4 (LAUGHTER) Let me stop. I talked 5 MR. SULLIVAN: way too long and I've strained everybody's 6 7 patience way too long. I'll just stop there. 8 You know, if anybody has anything else 9 they want to ask about, but I'm going to yield to Art and then, you know, if going forward if you 10 11 think it would helpful to hear more about the 12 system, as I've said, I am always happy to talk 13 about it and I'd be more than happy to come back 14 and yammer at y'all some more if anybody can 15 stand it. 16 So, does anybody want to raise 17 anything nor or everyone just wants a break and 18 wants me to shut up? 19 Just one thing, will we SGT MARKEY: 20 have access to that flow chart? Okay, thank you. Yes, sir. I believe 21 CAPT TIDESWELL:

that you all received that, I believe that Mr.

1 Sullivan stayed up all night and had an all 2 nighter because we had a new brief this morning. So, we will provide that to you. 3 4 SGT MARKEY: Thank you. MR. SULLIVAN: All right, thank you 5 6 very much. 7 SGT MARKEY: Thank you. 8 Is there any interest CAPT TIDESWELL: 9 in a comfort break? Is everybody good to go? Comfort break, I'd recommend a comfort break at 10 11 this point. 12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:26 a.m.) 13 14 CAPT RECORD: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 15 I'm Captain Art Record, Deputy 16 Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy for 17 Criminal Law, a really long title that nobody 18 really cares about, but also the Chair of the 19 Joint Service Committee on Military Justice, 20 which I guess is why Captain Tideswell asked me 21 to be here. 22 I have three rules that I really try

to work hard to adhere to, which I try to adhere:
never volunteer for duty in D.C.; never go back
to a job I've held before; and never follow Mr.
Sullivan when I speak.

(Laughter.)

CAPT RECORD: And so a long, long time ago Captain Tideswell called and said, hey, buddy, I need you to go to OJAG Code 20. This is when I was a lieutenant, went to work for General Schwenk. So that's to tell you that I'm violating my rule about going to jobs in D.C., I'm violating my rule about going back to a place I'd been before, and now I get to violate my rule about following Mr. Sullivan. So today is already a disaster for me.

(Laughter.)

CAPT RECORD: I'm hoping I'm setting your bar really low, because I've got to reset expectations after Mr. Sullivan's presentation.

I have some slides that I'm just going to use as anchors or weigh points as we go along hopefully to facilitate more of a dialogue and

some response. If I had a thesis for this brief, it would be that since 2012 the practice of military justice and the Department of Defense in general, and particularly with regards to sexual assault, has been through more changes than in the 51 years, 61 years of military justice that preceded that. So my thesis is we are in a time of significant scope and depth of change.

So I thought I would start the conversation by recognizing it -- if we go back and you'll see some dashes in there. If we go back to 1951 and the UCMJ, it was an imperfect product rolling out the door. It was far better than what had been the Articles of War and the Articles of the Governance of the Navy than what had preceded it, but it was not ready.

And that was really immediately tested in Korea when we had 55,000 courts-martial in the first year of the UCMJ. Do you remember our slide we just saw? We had about 2,000 total special and general courts-martial in 2015 for the whole DoD in one theater of operations. One

of my rules is don't do public math. I'm going to follow that rule.

(Laughter.)

CAPT RECORD: In one theater of operations we had way more courts-martial in 1952. But it was imperfect. And so we see a couple of holistic or major reviews in the next couple of decades.

So we from 1968 a review -- the 1968
Military Justice Act, which led to the 1969
"Manual for Courts-Martial." We call that over
at Code 20 here comes the judge. So we have -we realize that an option to note have a judge is
a good reason to not have a judge. So we have
mandatory presence of judges and we have
enhancement to the professionalism of the defense
bar.

So if I had a second thesis, it would be that changes, especially big changes, take time to take effect. So we see some enhancements of the rights of the accused, some recognition -- if you go back to the hearings on the UCMJ, which

are thankfully to the Army now available in the Library of Congress online, you can see that a lot of the concerns that still persist were there during the hearings. And one of the comments earlier was about the role of the commander. And so in the 1968 Act and the 1969 Manual, by addressing the role of the defense counsel and the role of the military judge, they tried to further refine the system.

Justice Act, our 1984 Manual and you see the next evolution of the system, which is the mirroring of civilian Rules of Evidence and Rules of Procedure. So, and I say that because those two, if you look at the role of the judge and the role of the defense counsel, we really see those things playing out in the '70s and '80s.

And then if you look at the Rules of Evidence and the Rules for Courts-Martial, we see those playing out in the '80s and '90s. And so, that kind of brings to my second thesis, which is there's a significant lag time in the application

of major change.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Why do I say that? 2012 until now has had a number of changes, some of which are contained in the Military Justice Act of 2016, but many of which were in previous legislative cycles or regulatory cycles. And so, Mr. Sullivan alluded to this. He pointed out some of But we had 75 significant military justice it. changes in NDAAs '12 through '15 -- or '12 through '16. So five NDAA cycles. We have 75 significant military justice changes. A number of sexual assault-related changes. And you're largely familiar with those. We'll hit some of the wave tops as we go along.

I realize I talk very fast, so if anybody has a question, just shout it out. And I am capable of shutting up.

So all of that leads up to here, but it's important for you to recognize that we're grounded in an ongoing dialogue. And many of you remember the number -- the claim of 26,000 rapes in the military. We have been in this dialogue

-- we're going to talk a little bit about -- mostly about 2012 until now, but this dialogue predates that time frame.

So back when then-Colonel Schwenk was my boss in Building 111, the good old days of Code 20, we were getting the same taskers, the same calls for data, the same questions regarding our handling of sexual assaults. In fact, we'll talk a little bit about data management, data related to sexual assaults. But back then the question was how do we get our arms around what the data is? And my boss said, well, we need to count -- create a system. And the JAG Corps has created three or four systems, none of which have really gotten to that point.

But, so we need to know how many there are. But this is the number that gets people's attention. This number has driven the creation of your predecessor Panels. And I am neither as good a public speaker as Mr Sullivan, nor am I as smart as Ms. Fried, so I will only say that there's a background rooted in some statistical

data that we can't ignore.

There's a narrative that commanders sweep it under the rug. And Mr. Sullivan alluded to the Wilkerson case, but that is a perception. And whether it's true or not -- I have a personal opinion as a former SJA that's not, but we recognize that's the narrative and that's what drives conversations about sexual assaults in the military Service.

We talked a little bit about mandatory discharges and sentencing schemes, and that also leads to the fairly partisan perceptions -- and not political partisan, but partisan perception of the military justice system, because when you do see a case play out, it's very hard to understand the outcome. And certainly on the accountability front that comes out.

From -- and I notice we have many esteemed members of the victims' rights organizations here in the audience, but for the victims and for those who represent them we recognize that there is a tension between our

military system in which the commander is responsible by statute and regulation for the maintenance of good order and discipline for ensuring an efficient and effective force. So there's a tension between that and this -- the most personal of all reports of offense that are going to lead to consequences, including being interviewed, having to do that to your commander. So that is part of the tension that drives the need for reviews.

And then in recent years -- I talked a little bit about the 1950 hearings on the UCMJ and the question about the role of the commanders. In recent years that has come up again. And we have seen challenges to the role of the commander. Of course two Panels ago the RSP looked into that fairly significantly. Some of the intervening groups have not looked at it in as much depth, but that is a part of the ongoing conversation.

And then the most recent really big ticket item that we see extensively reflected in

the National Defense Authorization Act for 2017 is the need to protect victims, reporters, first responders and those who serve them from retaliation, reprisal, ostracism, maltreatment, a wide variety of maligned types of treatment that could be affected upon people who are associated with the report of a sexual assault.

So a little bit of background. And I'd like to go beyond just JPP and RSP, again mostly because I'm not the smartest guy in the world, but also because we have a lot of history. So we're never at square one when we talk about reviewing issues related to the processing of sexual assault cases or the issue of sexual assaults more generally.

So if we go back in time for some of you who've been a part of these conversations, back in the oughties -- is that still a word?

(Laughter.)

CAPT RECORD: Back in the oughties we had the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assaults in the military Service, and this was a Panel

appointed by act of Congress that went around to the installations. I know I hosted -- I -- not I. Nobody came to my house. But we and my region hosted a team for about a week. And they did interviews, they did small-group-type surveys, focus groups. So we have some what I will call modern -- anything in the oughties and forward we'll call modern. So some modern experience with the Defense Task Force, of course ELPB and some other organizations.

We at the JSC have looked into this, both with our Sexual Assault Subcommittee and more recently with our collateral misconduct subsequently. So your active duty service organization that works for and on behalf of the General Counsel has looked into with some rigor issues related to things that you will be studying. The most recent sexual -- Collateral Misconduct Subcommittee I know more detail about because that was during my tenure as a voting group member, not as the chair.

By the way, I've been the chair for

about 21 days. Skipped right over Spring training. There was no Cactus League. It was just like, boom, we're going to the majors and briefing the DAC-IPAD. So if I strike out, you'll just know that I didn't get any warm-up pitches.

But, so I know from that one we put hundreds of hours into looking into the issue of collateral misconduct. We did non-scientific surveys, more polling of the various interests. I know from the Navy standpoint we communicated with our defense bar, with our Trial Counsel Assistance Program, our prosecution bar. communicated with our Victims' Legal Counsel Program. We at Code 20 speak to the leadership of our Victim Legal Counsel Program almost every single day. And so we reached out, collected all the data we could to try to make some good recommendations. So we're not blind to either the issues or the need to incorporate people far forward from the Washington Navy Yard and propose solutions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And then we'll just kind of lead into the last two very significant muscle movements were the JPP and the Military Justice Review Group, which had different focuses, of course. They were convened -- they arose out of the same sort of collection of incidents that created a focus, but different focus groups. So 2012 we get the new Article 120 Statute, which would be otherwise not all that interesting of an event in military justice history. Many of us would yawn except that 2013 was the year of great trial and tribulation for the military justice system.

So we talk about 2012 because that's the legislative history of our statute under which we're still operating, but 2012 was just another year in prosecution and defense of courts-martial except that it was the year that came before 2013.

So 2013 we see the Judicial

Proceedings Panel on Military Justice Review

Group. Of course JPP was created by Congress.

MJRG was internal, and MJRG recognized a need to

conduct a holistic review. So the Chairman and the Secretary collectively agreed we need to do a holistic review. We have not done a true holistic review since 1951. So that team -- and I am sure that at some point you will get a brief from one in a long line of people who are smarter and better at talking than myself

But Chief Judge Effron led the MJRG team, and they did literally from preamble to appendix, whatever. Let's look at everything in what I call the "Big Red Book" and see is the UCMJ and the "Manual for Courts-Martial" set up to achieve its purposes?

So that kind of leads to where we are today. If we're talking about the 2012 until now history of sexual assaults, we have to talk about the changes that have come. And then I'll finish up just because I'd really rather talk about the Military Justice Act of 2016 the whole time, but I'm really going to hit that towards the end because it's not going to take effect until sometime between now and January 1 of 2019, as

defined by the President.

information. And of course, we've got Dr. Spohn, but many of you are aware that there are many sources of information to make decisions about sexual assault. And we have had for years a report to Congress on sexual assault. You all will probably recall in 2013 President Obama directed more rigor in our analysis and directed us to prepare a report, what we called the POTUS Report, and which the staff at Code 20 considered an excuse to eat beer in the colonel's -- eat pizza, drink beer without shoes on in the colonel's conference room while working 24 hours a day for weeks on end.

But it was really somebody dig in and figure out what the data is, try to figure out what the data means. And so, that is another anchor to which I would invite your attention.

Of course we've got other sources of information.

The Military Service Academies Report is a valuable tool because it's survey-conducted. So

the Annual Report to Congress is really driven by reports of sexual assault that come in to the services. Restricted reported, unrestricted reports, and then data gathered about the disposition of those unrestricted reports.

The Military Service Academies Report is another DoD SAPRO tool that is driven by surveys, biennial surveys at the Service Academies. So a little more real time, a little more people-focused information. The RAND survey, the source of that 26,000 or 20,000, or whatever the next iteration, I should say. And then some FOIAs that shed light on what is going on.

So, and then the most recent focal areas. I mentioned retaliation and reprisal is a significant focal area. In fact, we've been working with Mr. Sullivan on an implementing reg for DoD to help address this. Of course I'll tout my own Service because I am wearing Navy stripes on my sleeve, and I'll say that Secretary of the Navy way back in December of 2014 signed a

SECNAV instruction explicit -- expanding the definition of retaliation and reprisal.

Many of you have aptitude experience or otherwise work with whistleblowers, and you'll know that historically our Military Whistleblower Protection Act and its implementation focus more on EO-type whistleblowers, so people who make protected communications to Congress. But SECNAVIST 5370 really tried to focus more on the maltreatment, ostracism and reprisal, a broader group of protection for whistleblowers. And DoD and all of the Services are also moving in that direction.

And a couple of other things that
drive the conversations that we have when we're
talking about the laws pertaining to sexual
assault are perceived incidence rates and the
delta between incidence rates and reporting
rates, restricted reporting and unrestricted
reporting and attempting to figure out why people
make a restricted or unrestricted report, our
interactions with the special victims' counsel

for the other Services' victims' legal counsel for the Navy and Marine Corps, because special victims' counsel could be confused with special victims' investigation and prosecution capability. So those are some of the focal points of the conversation.

And then we get into the weird way in which military law is made. And there are a lot of words on the screen. What I'll say is that of course Congress makes laws, but we also have laws that are made at the executive level by executive order, and we have laws that are made at the local level by some sort of order to punitive regulation. And we have aspects of the process that the JSC working for the DoD General Counsel will propose changes. And then we have groups such as yourself which make recommendations either to us or to Congress. So we have a lot of ways where all of these changes -- a lot of areas from which all these changes come.

So this is just one. And there's a reason why I'm going to show you 2014. But I

mentioned my number one thesis is that the scope of change since 2012 is the most significant in the history of the UCMJ. This is the military justice and SAPRO-related provisions from the FY 14 National Defense Authorization Act. And if you're a practitioner or a service member trying to keep up with this, this is what affected your life on this one particular topic in that one legislative cycle.

We stopped doing this slide after '15 because we couldn't come up with a type that was small enough and still be legible. So this is just two legislative cycles worth of SAPR and military justice-related changes, only from the NDAA. So only one source of change to the law affecting how we do these cases.

And, so this slide is an old slide
that I only offer because we talked about
important changes. I think most of us know and
have interacted with General Altenberg, or many
of us have fairly well knowledgeable and
experience with the judge advocate. And he

called the 2014 NDAA change the most significant since 1968. I'll leave that to him. He has said that. I would say whatever you think about 1968 versus 1983 versus 2014, NDAA 17 is -- has to take the cake as the most significant change.

So let's just talk a little bit about the changes. And I'm going to focus on '14 forward because as you may recall the real timeline, the genesis for our current changes really is triggered there in the fall -- summer/fall of 2013.

NDAA, most notably our current version of Article 120. We had a few changes in the FY 13 NDAA. Changes explode in the FY 14 NDAA, which by kind of how it happened to come out was not on the street when the fall furor of calendar year '13 hit. And so we got a chance to respond to some of the challenges that we saw in 2013.

Mr. Sullivan mentioned the codification of the Crime Victims' Rights Act, which had historically been partially implemented

by regulation, but certainly there were aspects that were left out and it was not statutory at the time.

Some of the other significant changes that year involved the elimination -- I think we talked about the commander's authority under Article 60 to take any action favorable to the accused after trial and the withdrawal of that, in most cases the imposition of mandatory minimum punishments in the form of the discharge. So what we see is that -- in FY 14 we see the beginning of the explosion of statutory, regulatory, and structural change.

We talked a little bit earlier about the Victims' Legal Counsel/Special Victims' Counsel Program. That program became fully applicable across the Services during FY 14 as well.

So we fast forward to '15, and this pace of change continues. Fifteen was not as significant or monumental in terms of the pace of change, but we did see some corrections to some

of the minor impacts of '15 and we did see some significant changes, including to the maximum punishment.

fy 16, another very large year, in fact almost as large as '14. And this goes back to my second thesis, which is that change takes time to evaluate. So FY 14 we get a special victims' counsel program. FY 15 we start hearing from people who are in special victims' counsel and VLC jobs, and we start hearing from people like first responders, SARCs, service providers. And there's a recognized need to protect people who take these very hard jobs on behalf of victims. So we see a statutory change regarding the reporting on the fitness of special victims' counsel.

Changes related to the retention of case files. That was a big one because many of you with experience in the Executive Branch know that we're all under records management or records disposition regulations and all of our records exist with some sort of FOIA Act record

system or some sort of Privacy Act system of records.

And case files, case notes are no different, so you keep it as long as you're legally required to and no longer, because you have this conflicting obligation to keep as long as you have to and an obligation to destroy when retention is no longer necessary. So we saw some changes to our case file retention requirements as well.

So that's the background for all of the changes that we've been dealing with until this year. And then this year we get the mother of all NDAAs for military justice.

we spend a lot of time talking about Section E, the Military Justice Act, but it is worth asking you to recognize also that in every NDAA there's usually a section dealing with military justice matters generally. And so, we saw a section in the 500 Series dealing with the rights of victims and with protection against retaliation and

reprisal, as well also addressing a study on the advisability of the military justice litigation career track. But I digress.

So in NDAA 17 we get the Military

Justice Act of 2016. And this is kind of where
the Joint Service Committee is spending our time
right now. It looks like this if you're a paper
person. If you're a PDF person, it just looks
like this one at a time.

(Laughter.)

Structural change. And so if I had a third thesis, it would be that the Department is aware of the need to continually assess ourselves, to continue to look at what we're doing and whether we're doing right, and that the Military Justice Act -- the Military Justice Review Group and its legislative proposal, which you can Google MJRG and find all of this right online, is proof that we are aware, we possess self-awareness. So the Military Justice Act includes structural and procedural and substantive changes. And most of

the comments that we normally talk about are on the procedural side. So I'll kind of run off a highlight of those.

we talked about the system as it exists today. Mr. Sullivan talked about the system as it exists today, but the changes for the Military Justice Act really -- if you remember his chart of something bad has happened until sentence is complete, the changes of MJA go beyond that. So in terms of something bad has happened, Congress -- we've never had the authority for judges to be involved in a case that was not referred to trial.

So referral is our equivalent right now of charging. If you were to submit a FOIA request and ask me what percentage of cases in which a person was charged, went to trial, then I'd say, all right, well, we have to work from referral, because preferral doesn't even necessarily require a judge advocate to be involved. You'll recall that we talked about the commanders owns the system.

So we lawyer types may not know that there is a preferred charge sheet if a commander is looking to dispose it through non-judicial punishment or if a commander conducts his preliminary inquiry in accordance of Rules of Courts-Martial 303 and makes his R.C.M. 303 decision that this case does not demand adjudication, or if it's sent to a summary court-martial. We never know that. But, so in that whole phase there's no authority for a judge to be involved under existing law.

The Military Justice Review Group looked at that, studied it and identified some places where that would be appropriate. For instance, digital communications, right, like you have to have a judge sign a warrant under the DCMA to get electronic communications. So that's one of our big changes, a significant structural change from the way we've done business since 1951, and really dating back to the Roman army, if you want to follow it that far back.

Another change that -- I'm going to

refer to my notes, if nobody minds that. Another change I would invite to your attention is along with those pretrial processing changes and authority for the appointment of magistrates.

One of the questions is what is appropriate for a judge to do, what's appropriate for a commander, and what do you do with things that are sort of in between? So there's an authorization for a magistrate program.

There's a requirement for regulations governing some sort of judicial tenure. Don't ask me what that's going to look like. I am a voting group member, but I don't have a clue yet. But, so the MJRG took what I would call some provisions we have all held beyond -- as not being subject to question for the first 20 years of my Naval Service and said why? Why are those not subject to question? And they did question them and proposed some changes that Congress has written into law.

That goes back to the second thesis point I made, which was change takes time. So

1969 you see -- 1968-'69 you see an expansion of the independence and the need for the judiciary. You track that through the '70s and '80s and you see the cases questioning the role of the judiciary and the interplay of the judiciary within an Executive Branch. And so, we had some cases in the Naval Service. Of course there was the big case, the Carlucci case. So challenges to the judiciary. And now we have come sort of to a place that will fairly closely mirror the authority of non-federal civilian judges, some sense of your seat is not impacted by the decision you make in this court-martial.

The second point that the Military

Justice Act really I think adds a benefit is the
enhancement of the role of the staff judge
advocate. So the Military Justice Act includes
significant amendments to Article 34. And we all
group with an Article 34 advice being sort of a
one-time moment-in-time opinion that only applies
in general courts-martial. So if anybody from
J'accuse to special court-martial getting this

report of an Article 32 hearing, anybody along the way says this case is dying, then that was the end of it.

The new Article 34 includes a requirement to consult with a judge advocate, not necessarily the commander staff judge advocate, but to consult with a judge advocate regarding the disposition of a special courts-martial as well. So a further integration. And there's a requirement to have what I will call a U.S. Attorney-like manual, a set of disposition, non-binding disposition guidance that should be considered by the commander.

So the Military Justice Act, sort of the first thing I would say it does is further civilianize or moves towards civilianization of our pretrial practice. The second thing I would say is it enhances the reliability and aligns with civilian practices our process of making a prosecutorial decision yes or not, but also offers post-trial relief.

You may recall Mr. Sullivan pointing

to this ping-pong game of back and forth with the court under Article 60. That ping-pong game is gone. And the new process, there will be some very narrow authority for the convening authority to make a post-trial -- to do some things post-trial, but the judge is now in charge of post-trial.

Which brings up a point we were talking -- he was talking about pretrial agreements. And in a weird oddity that I'm not smart enough to understand we never had a pretrial agreements authorizing statute in the military justice system. So the Military Justice Act for the first times gives us one. And this really kind of reflects that tension.

The only a commander had previously, to enter into a pretrial agreement was this plenary authority under Article 60 to only approve so much of the findings as he chose. So -- findings and sentence. So he or she would use that authority then as a basis to agree to exercise the authority in the pretrial agreement.

Kind of an odd way of building a system, but if you remember it was built in 1951 and evolved and was adapted to the needs. It would make sense that that was just how they found a way to do business.

I think we all agree pretrial agreements, plea bargaining is a valuable tool. Any prosecutor, any defense attorney would say this is a valuable tool that needs to be part of a system. Well, the Military Justice Act explicitly provides under the new Article 53(a) the authority for the convening authority and the accused to agree to the manner of disposition of the charges and/or specifications and/or to the limitations upon a sentence. That may be a judge. So a more modern and compatible with civilian practices pretrial agreement practice.

And then things that the next Panel will really appreciate, they really -- I apologize that I don't have a backward time machine, or just a time machine --

(Laughter.)

CAPT RECORD: -- to give you the benefit of this one now, but there's a 140(a), a new Article 140(a) that will require us to do a better job of keeping data, statistics, numbers, reports. That is what you really need to do any sort of analysis. And we just do not have a system for that that is applicable

Department-wide.

What this will look like I don't know, but I know Congress has mandated it, so we will do it. So 140(a). Some future group that will hopefully not be looking into sexual assaults. I hope they're going to be looking into something not nearly as intense. But some group some day will want to look at how many people were accused of driving in excess of the speed limit on the Washington Navy Yard, and they will have data on all that.

And then finally, another part of how we are here today. We talked about all of the Panels and Committees that have come before, and one of the challenges has been conducting an

ongoing review without a standing organization to do that and recognizing the internal conflict.

The UCMJ was built around the concept that the Code Committee would conduct that review, but it happens to have the appellate court on it. So a new Panel, a Military Justice Review Panel that will hopefully help in the far-distant future to avoid the need for Special Panels and Committees to look into these things.

Before I leave I just wanted to talk
a little bit -- well, actually no. But before I
get to the JSC's accomplishments, I forgot to
mention there are a couple of -- there are many
substantive punitive articles in the new Military
Justice Act, the majority of which were drawn
from the old Article 134 Presidentially-specified
offenses. So we have our enumerated offenses
that Congress gives us, and then we have the
offenses the President give us, and then we have
violations of orders. So if neither the Congress
nor the President has said thou shalt not or thou
must, my boss can tell me thou shalt not or thou

must and then that can be punished through Article 92.

Over the years that list of offenses within the enumerated offenses in Article 134 had really grown quite long, and Article 134 gives us the ability to assimilate crimes or to prosecute crimes, not capital, that are prejudicial during this point, or service-discredited. Well, over time the list of things that were prosecuted because they were prejudicial to good order and discipline or service-discrediting, which might -- was much longer than the list of enumerated offenses. And so the MJRG gathered up those that they thought they could fit into an offense without a requirement for proving the terminal element of prejudicial to good order and discipline or service-discrediting. So that's most of the substantive change.

I would highlight a couple of changes that are not just moving articles and rewording them to make them more applicable.

There's a new Article 93(a). So we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

talked about retaliation. And I bragged on my
Service's and my Department's instruction, but
Congress -- the new Article 93(a) has the exact
same terms that are in our SECNAV instruction
right now regarding maltreatment, ostracism, and
reprisal. So a new punitive Article to deal with
these type of maligned conduct towards reporters
of sexual assault.

And then we'll go to the back end of the punitive articles. No, I apologize. 132 at the back end of the punitive articles is our retaliation crime which deals with this maltreatment, reprisal, ostracism. The front end, 93(a), deals with an issue that we've had lots of conversations with the predecessor Committee about -- which is the -- punishing sexual interactions between people in positions of authority and people who are subordinate.

So the 93(a) is -- makes punishable having a sexual interaction with a person who is subordinate. For instance, in a recruiter-recruitee relationship or an

instructor-trainee relationship. So two major punitive articles that are related to your charter that unfortunately a couple of years down the road.

I would like to highlight, I mentioned that we're self-aware and the MJRG is one aspect of that. I would say the Joint Service Committee is another major aspect of that. And in your notes you see some of the executive orders that we've assisted in proposing and that has made it through to being signed by the President to try to address some of these things along the whole list of how do we implement the 2012 Article 120, what are the definitions and maximum punishments, all the way through the protection of the rights of representatives of victims in courts-martial, the implementation of Article 6(b), our victims' crime victims' rights.

So the Joint Service Committee has also been a partner in trying to make sure that we stay involved in addressing the issues that I think you're going to look at addressing.

And so, we are in a time of quite 1 2 significant change, and that change has proven to take -- the issuing of an edict or fiat has been 3 4 proven to take time to take effect, but we think 5 that we are on the right track. And subject to your questions, that is my brief, but I'm hoping 6 7 you have lots of questions because I love my job. 8 Yes, sir? 9 CMSAF McKINLEY: Sir, a great job. 10 Two quick questions for you: 11 One of your first slides says 26,000 12 What time period does that cover? 13 CAPT RECORD: So, that was the RAND 14 report, and I believe that that report covered 15 the one year prior to the taking of the survey, 16 and that the survey was taken in either 2012 or 17 2013. 18 CMSAF McKINLEY: That's a one-year --19 CAPT RECORD: So that is an estimated 20 prevalence rate using RAND's methodology, their 21 survey methodology, an estimated one-year prevalence -- or one-year incidence rate. 22

1 I know, because I just looked it up 2 for other reasons that in 2014 RAND estimated 20,500 incidents. So they take the -- they do 3 4 their surveys and then however they normalize it 5 and provide a statistical reliability. I don't 6 do math. 7 CMSAF McKINLEY: Well, looking at our 8 stats from last year on 1,100 general 9 courts-martials, and 550 of those were for sexual assault or rape, and you had 20,000 rapes, I'm 10 11 not -- I see issues there. 12 CAPT RECORD: So absolutely that is 13 the \$64,000 question. And I recognize Dr. Spohn has a lot of good information on this. 14 15 And would you like to speak now or 16 would you like me to really just screw it up? 17 think --18 (Laughter.) 19 DR. SPOHN: Well, the RAND survey, as I understand it, is a victimization survey. 20 21 so, it gets at crimes that are and are not

reported, correct?

CAPT RECORD: That's correct.

DR. SPOHN: And so, that's one of the differences between -- and some of those crimes that are reported are reported in a restricted way so that they're not investigated. And so, by the time you whittle that down to the crimes that are in fact reported -- and I assume you have that data as well, a number of unrestricted reported that occur each year.

CAPT RECORD: So the RAND survey;
because I'm not a statistician, I won't speak
beyond, they have a methodology that they use to
try to estimate the incidence rate, the
victimization rate across the Force by doing
surveys and then trying to take that data and
apply it Force-wide.

Where we have -- what I -- so we have the estimated incidence rate that we can get from RAND and then we have our reporting rate. We know for a fact how many restricted and unrestricted reports we get every year. Because we have a tool, we gather those for that

Congressional Report on Sexual Assaults in military Service.

Yes, sir?

to frolic and detour.

HON. GRIMM: Yes, but could you just give me a little more detail about the distinction between a restricted and unrestricted report? I got the gist of it, but I'd like to know a little bit more detail and who makes the decision? Is it the victim's decision? And what kind of guidance or counseling do they have available to them in deciding what happens?

CAPT RECORD: Certainly. So a little bit of background. And you just have to permit

If we go back into the early 2000s, we realized that victims of domestic violence were not reporting domestic violence because they were afraid their husband was going to get fired in the case of family advocacy programs. There's almost always the male Service member whose wife was afraid.

So they said -- so we created a tool

called restricted reporting for domestic violence. The same issue pops up later in the 2000s, a perception that victims of sexual violence are not coming forward. And so, we created a tool to authorize the filing of a restricted report.

And that one's a little bit more challenging, right, because if you're a commander and you become aware that there's been an alleged sexual assault within your organization, you have some legal obligations to refer that over to the MCIO, like Mr. Sullivan mentioned.

And so, this restricted report then -I say that because it's better, but it's still a
little bit of a work in progress. So the victim
ultimately holds the right to choose whether to
make a restricted or unrestricted report.

And if the victim makes -- wants to make a restricted report to get to services -- well, wants mental health or medical services or access to legal services, but only wants to make a restricted report, they can do that to a

receiver of restricted reports, which is your sexual assault response coordinator, your medical health personnel, your victims' legal counsel, receivers of restricted reports, people who would have privilege. You can't define the term with itself. People who would have privilege then become authorized to receive restricted reports.

If the victim tells a person who has a duty to report, then that is an unrestricted report. So you tell your CO, you tell law enforcement. There is still an area that still creates a challenge which is the what-if-I-tell-someone-else? So the governing regulations have tried to address -- because of course we all -- like in the Navy, Navy Regs 1137 explicitly requires you to report all known offenses that come under your observation, or whatever the words are. I'm not a lawyer.

But, so what if your friend tells you

I was sexually assaulted last night, or you see
them walking out crying and say what happened?
Then what are your obligations? So there's some

challenge. But for the most part victims have the right to choose whether the report is restricted or unrestricted, and that drives whether it gets a law enforcement investigation and whether they get the full panoply of services; those are good things, right, and whether their commander is notified and they become a witness and some things that are not necessarily desirable to all victims, or whether they make an unrestricted report and get a limited scope of services provided. So that's at their discretion subject to some exceptions when something wasn't intended to be an unrestricted report, but is unrestricted because of how it was made. HON. GRIMM: Thank you very much. CHAIR BASHFORD: Do you have a sense; if you had a pie chart up, of what percentage of reports would be restricted versus unrestricted?

CAPT RECORD:

(Laughter.)

that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Dr. Spohn, do you know

CAPT RECORD: I mean, so first off, I just don't remember. Last year I think we had -I think for the Navy last year we had about 60 -the total number of unrestricted last year I
believe was about 1,013 more or less. And I
believe the number of restricted was in the 600s.
Which kind of goes to I think your point, which
is there's this estimated incident rate number
that is really big.

And there's this number that is flowing in that we actually know anything about, have any ability to interact with the victim, is much smaller. And then of those the restricted report really narrows the ability to interact further because the law enforcement and the commander are the people who could do something about the bad act. Only know about let's say a fifth or a sixth of all the alleged estimated incidents.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Although again violating your rule never do math in public -
CAPT RECORD: I just did some, I know.

1 (Laughter.)

CHAIR BASHFORD: -- wouldn't that be about a third were restricted if you had 1,000-plus?

CAPT RECORD: About 600 were restricted, so --

CHAIR BASHFORD: And you -- out of 1,000-plus?

CAPT RECORD: About 600. Yes, so you're right. About a third. About 600 of about 1,600. So about a third are restricted who received services, but the military doesn't get to do its military thing.

DEAN HARRISON: I wonder with regard to the restricted reports or an SJA investigation that says we think something happened but there's not enough proof to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, what does a commanding officer do with regard to a Service member that he has a -- he or she has a pretty good feeling is victimizing other people, preserving that person's right to pursue their career while at the same time

safeguarding the rest of the command? Is there a uniform way outside of UCMJ of handling those situations?

reports the commander doesn't know. On the reports where there's not sufficient evidence, then the commander is aware, but in a significantly harder point. Because as you mentioned, there's the commander's statutory and moral obligation to maintain good order and discipline. And then there's the victim's rights and the accused's rights, and all of those are in constant tension against each other.

But one of the things that has
happened, both as a result of legislation and as
a result of internal action, is they've expanded
the statute of limitations, expanding the
retention requirements for records, not only for
law enforcement records, but if you went back
with your really good reading glasses and read
that little tiny print, but for SARC records as
well.

And they've created a tool to allow victims to convert from a restricted report to a unrestricted report. So a victim may come in and get a safe exam conducted, but choose to just do an unrestricted report and then may change their mind and jump back in. So there's some ability to revive or change a report.

There's also a new program coming online to allow victims to opt in to capture limited data regarding restricted reports, which then if there's ever like a match for that offender, in a future case the victim could opt -- elect to be contacted. Hey, I want to consider whether to go from restricted to unrestricted.

So they've tried to -- the system has tried -- the system, they, the system. I am totally relieving myself of all agency regarding any challenges you may have to what I'm saying, but the goal is to maximize victim dominion and sovereignty while respecting commanders' control. And then where those two butt up against each

other, a DoDI that has come out in these years of great changes directs commanders to give maximum consideration to the victim's wishes. So we've got Congress has told us to consider the victim's wishes as to disposition and a DoDI that requires commanders to give great consideration.

So they try to sort it out in accordance with those principles, recognizing that there --

DEAN HARRISON: I just -- we -- we're of course focusing on the criminal aspect, and a commanding officer is a convening authority in many cases, but he or she is also an employer and in some locations a dean of a school, and all of those different hats that they wear. And if an investigation does not result in a criminal prosecution, that does not mean that that person is sleeping well at night wondering about what's going on in their installation and whether or not somebody who might be making a military careers is not someone who should be making military career.

CAPT RECORD: And that's incredibly hard to stomach.

DEAN HARRISON: Yes.

stomach the absence of a binary solution, and so it's very easy to decide there's no evidence, so we're not going to go forward, or there's overwhelming evidence, so we are going to go forward. And I don't think this attitude still exists today, but for those of you who have been on active duty you know there's also a desire just for someone to be accountable.

So there's a desire to look at things through a binary lens that I experienced as a young judge advocate that I will not attribute to anyone left on active duty today, which was, all right, either it's true and he needs to go to jail or it's a lie and she needs to go to jail. I don't think that attitude prevails. In fact, one of our former prosecutors who I've worked with a lot over the years likes to talk about us as the most enlightened trauma-informed

organization with which she's ever been associated. But we recognize that that is at least a background, that I've got to have good order and discipline.

And that drives -- Mr. Sullivan
mentioned that if you have two-thirds minus one,
that's an acquittal. That's not a mistrial.

It's not a nolle pros. It's an acquittal.

Because as a commander it's real easy to say,
okay, IT1, you are not guilty. Now you have your
Top Secret clearance back. Get back to working
on this operating system.

It's hard to deal with uncertainty, the unknowingness, because we entrust often very young people, often not based on our own experience, but just based on the fact that they've been assigned. This is what we've been given. This is the person. We entrusted them with very valuable monetary systems, with high levels of access to information, with very important decisions really across the Force, including trusting some guy from the Navy Yard to

come brief the DAC-IPAD.

(Laugher.)

CAPT RECORD: So we give people -- not because they've proven to be capable, but just because of the position to which they've been assigned. You can't do that if you have just this persistent uncertainty. And so that's a tension that I experience less now as our -- as the training on things like trauma and neurobiology of trauma. As that has taken root, I recognize that just members in general, and certainly commanders and deciders also, are more aware of sometimes there's going to be some uncertainty.

But you're right, it's hard to stomach if you think about it.

extensive changes coming into UCMJ very soon, and just one of them just very simply is modification and definition of sexual harassment. That's just one. But do we have a plan on how to train and educate the 1.3 million members serving on these

changes as they come out?

CAPT RECORD: That's a great question that I get asked literally every single day. So I'll be an economist and I'll say on the one hand, but on the other hand.

On the one hand, in May of 2015 when the Military Justice Review Group gave us their legislative proposal, we started planning for that plan to train. But we couldn't really firm up that plan to train until December 23rd when the President signed the National Defense Authorization Act because we knew some things would change, and they did. So we've been moving towards it.

I can tell you that each of the Services is working through that. I know that for the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard we actually had a meeting yesterday about that and one of my taskers was to talk to my brothers and sisters at the Army and the Air Force to find out what they're doing. So I know it's in the works. I don't know what the exact answer is.

1	Any other questions?
2	(No audible response.)
3	CAPT RECORD: Well, thank you so much.
4	I think I actually have run over, so I appreciate
5	your tolerance. And just as Mr. Sullivan did, I
6	will say that I am available to you any time you
7	need something that I can offer. Captain
8	Tideswell called and the answer was absolutely
9	I'll be there.
10	As I mentioned, she has sent me to
11	places like Gulf Port and Code 20 and
12	(Laughter.)
13	CAPT RECORD: So like she's called and
14	asked a lot harder things than coming to the
15	Holiday Inn Arlington at Ballston of me, and I
16	have always said yes, and I assure you you will
17	get the same cooperation and consideration.
18	Thank you very much for your time.
19	ALL: Thank you.
20	CAPT TIDESWELL: Chair Bashford, this
21	is the part I think where we get to eat lunch.
22	CHAIR BASHFORD: Sounds great.

1	CAPT TIDESWELL: Maybe if I could
2	recommend we put it at 1:30, even though it will
3	be just a little shy of an hour so we stay on
4	schedule.
5	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.
6	CAPT TIDESWELL: And the good news is
7	I've been informed by our 1:30 speaker that she
8	will not take the full hour, so I told her she
9	already has
10	(Laughter.)
11	(Whereupon, the hearing was recessed
12	at 12:38 p.m. to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. this same
13	day.)
14	LT COL STINGL: Madam Chair, I would
15	note for the record that all 16 members of the
16	committee are present and have returned from
17	lunch.
18	Our speaker for this afternoon on the
19	agenda is Ms. Maria Fried from the Department of
20	Defense Office of General Counsel.
21	Madam Chair, are you ready to proceed?
22	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.

MS. FRIED: Madam Chair, distinguished Panel, good afternoon.

First and foremost, I would like to thank you all for your service to the DAC-IPAD. Having served and still serving as a Designated Federal Official to two other advisory committees, I appreciate the time and expertise you bring to this effort.

I was asked to provide a historical overview of two other Advisory Committees'

Panels. The Response Systems Panel to Adult

Sexual Assault Crimes, also known as the RSP and the Judicial Proceedings Since Fiscal Year 2012

Amendments Panel. These two Panels preceded the creation of the DAC-IPAD.

Since at least 2006, the Department has faced intense scrutiny from Congress, the White House, media and advocacy groups on how it handles sexual assault prevention, response, investigation, prosecution and adjudication. And as you have heard from Captain Record, there has been a lot of activity in this area by the

Department and Congress.

The RSP and the JPP were established by Congress as part of that effort to understand and address sexual assault in the military, specifically the NDAA for FY 2013 Section 576, Congress required DoD to establish two independent Panels to assess how the military handles assault and make recommendations. We should note that after enacting the legislation in 2013, Congress further expanded the scope of those two committees.

The legislation established in the RSP and JPP were specific in scope. The RSP was to conduct a comprehensive review of all responses to adult sexual assault, laying out specific areas of review, which I will get to shortly.

Its follow-on Panel, the JPP, is tasked with reviewing, among other things, implementation of UCMJ reforms related to the offense of sexual assault, restitution, and compensation to victims, as well as victim rights.

congress was specific as to the establishment of both of these Panels, including membership composition and qualifications.

Members had to be from the private sector and collectively possess expertise in the military, civilian law, investigations, prosecution, adjudication of sexual assault in federal and state courts, victim advocacy and the organization and mission of the Armed Forces and defenses related to sexual assault. Next slide, please.

So as you can see, the composition of the RSP was nine panel members. Five of those panel members were appointed by the Secretary of Defense, four of those panel members were appointed by the Chair and ranking members of the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The Chair of the RSP was the Honorable Barbara S. Jones, a former federal District Court judge in New York. Her bio and those of other RSP members are available on the RSP website.

The RSP terminated after one year from the date of its first public meeting. Initially, it was to remain in existence for 18 months from the time it was established but, given the urgency of the issues and the interest, the Secretary of Defense at the time, Secretary Hagel, shortened that period and requested they complete their work in a year. And shortly thereafter, Congress changed the Statute to say you will have a year to produce this work. So, they did quite a bit in that one year.

The RSP held 14 public meetings, heard testimony from former, current, and retired military officials and leaders, sexual assault victims, advocacy groups, academia, historians, members of Congress, including Senators Gillibrand and McCaskill, and Representatives Spears and Frankel. They heard from senior officials from our allied nations, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and countless other subject matter experts. It issued its report on June 27, 2014.

Congress also required that two of the RSP members also serve on the follow-on Panel of the JPP. To that end, Judge Jones is a Member of the JPP and, additionally, former Congresswoman, Representative Elizabeth Holtzman, who was Chair of the JPP, also served on the RSP.

Information on the work of the JPP and its membership is also available on the JPP website, which we can provide to you separately.

Next slide.

I just posted a few pictures of the Panels at work, the RSP in particular here. And I just wanted to get to the scope of the RSP at the moment.

As I mentioned earlier, the Congress was very prescriptive on what it wanted the Panel to look at. And I won't go through all these specifically but, essentially, the RSP looked at the processes in place from the time a person makes a report of a sexual assault to whoever that is, whether it is investigators, a sexual assault response coordinator, but just presents

to an official with a sexual report, up until disposition of a particular case, if it gets adjudicated.

I think somebody probably talked about unrestricted and restricted reports earlier and I understand that some questions came up as to the numbers. I have that information if you are interested. So I had that information. Just bear with me one moment.

CAPT TIDESWELL: Which slide, Ms. Fried?

MS. FRIED: It got it. I'm sorry.

So in 2015, there was a total of 6,083 reports of sexual assault involving members as either subjects or victims. Of that number, 4,584 were unrestricted reports, 1,499 were restricted reports. And that number also includes 504 incidents reported by Servicemembers that happened prior to service. So some of the reports come from people who may have been victimized before having been on active duty but they seek to report it because they are looking

for support services and additional resources.

And there is additional information on those numbers and the breakdown in the Sexual Assault Annual Report which we just posted online at the SAP, sapr.mil website.

So you have the slides in front of you. You can see the scope for the RSP is pretty broad. I will get into specifics in a moment but the next slides lay out what those areas were.

For instance, the strength and weakness of systems, including the administration of UCMJ investigation and prosecution during the period of 2007 through 2011, a comparison of military and civilian systems for those processes, also identifying best practices for incorporation into the military system.

They looked at sentencing guidelines, whether or not those would be something that would be helpful to the military; training levels of prosecutors and defense counsel; and courtmartial conviction rates and outcomes of judicial proceedings.

They also looked at the strengths and weaknesses of proposed legislative initiatives and the adequacy of support systems in place to assist victims.

So, as you can see, the breadth of what the RSP had to cover was quite large. To better manage the work of the Panel and ensure all areas were addressed, Judge Jones requested and the Department of defense approved the establishment of three subcommittees to assist the RSP in its review. The Role of the Commander Subcommittee was one of them, Comparative Systems was another, and Victim Services was a third.

The Role of the Commander Subcommittee looked at legislation pending and enacted, including proposed legislation from Senator Gillibrand that remove authority from commanders to convene courts-martial and invest that authority with military prosecutors. Given the intense discussion on this issue on the Hill and in pending NDAA, the RSP issued an interim report regarding the role of the commander and his

authority to convene courts-martial.

The RSP recommended against enacting this legislation because, after considering all of the evidence and testimony, there was no evidence that such a radical change to the fundamental structure of the military justice system would reduce incidents of sexual assault or increase reporting.

Two of the RSP members dissented from the majority view and provided separate views in their report. Ultimately, Congress did not enact Senator Gillibrand's recommendation.

The Comparative Systems Subcommittee did an extensive review comparing military and civilian systems. In some areas, this proved challenging for a variety of reasons, including how DoD defines sexual assault and its definition captures a wide range of sexual misconduct, whereas many civilian systems capture only felony-level offenses, such as rape.

Also, few civilian jurisdictions
maintain or publish prosecution and disposition

data. And the differences in disposition data between the military and civilian systems make it difficult to compare.

Victim Services Subcommittee reviewed support services available to victims in the military and civilian systems and, again, looked at best practices.

In total, the three subcommittees held 65 meetings and produced separate reports, views, and deliberation by the subcommittee. I just wanted to point out, the subcommittee does a lot of its work but what it prepares is only the work of the subcommittee. The RSP, which is the parent Panel, gets to consider that information and either adopt, modify, or disregard the work of the subcommittee. And the Panel, the RSP Panel, basically what is sent to the Secretary of Defense, is the work of the RSP, not the subcommittees. But again, the subcommittees inform that deliberation for the main Panel.

Next slide.

So actually I just want to note it was

132 recommendations, not 138. So that should be corrected. Sorry about that.

The RSP issued 132 recommendations and I believe you have been provided a listing of what those were. And the recommendations fell into seven major areas: measure the scope of sexual assault in the military and civilian communities; and assess the role of the commander, the commander's responsibility and accountability with regard to sexual assault prevention, and the commander's convening authority.

The third area was strengthening the Special Victims' Counsel Program, victims' rights, support and services.

Another area was ensuring the fairness and due process for those accused, those suspected of sexual assault; improving military justice procedures; sustaining and adequately funding promising DoD programs and initiatives; and conducting independent audits and assessments.

With respect to those recommendations, 1 2 DoD accepted 88 recommendations, partially approved 10 recommendations, and one 3 recommendation was disapproved. The remaining 4 recommendations were referred for further review 5 by the Department or were already under review by 6 7 the Military Justice Review Group, or the Joint 8 Services Committee on Military Justice, otherwise 9 in pending legislation. It deferred consideration of one 10 recommendation that recommended for an 11 12 independent panel to oversee sexual assault in 13 the military and the deferral was because the JPP 14 was already the next follow-on Panel and now we have the DAC-IPAD. 15 16 So that is where the RSP completed its

work.

Any questions? Okay, moving on to the next slide, please, the JPP.

So the JPP terminates in September It had a little bit longer duration than the RSP but like the RSP, it is required to

17

18

19

20

21

provide assessments and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and the Congress.

It is composed of five Members, two of whom, as I mentioned earlier, had to serve on the RSP. They were appointed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. And the purpose of the JPP is to conduct an independent review of judicial proceedings, conducted under the UCMJ involving adult sexual assault crimes, since the amendments that were made by the NDAA for FY 2012.

The deliverables are similar to what the RSP was required to produce reports. Next slide. And that is the JPP Members at action. Photo opportunities.

Okay. So the scope of the JPP was focused primarily -- it was a little bit more narrow than what the RSP had. It focused a lot on court-martial proceedings and processes regarding Article 120. And as a result, their work product focuses a lot on preliminary hearing processes, court-martial disposition, and Military Rules of Evidence regarding the prior

conduct of the victim and privileges.

Again, the scope of the -- I laid it out. I don't think I need to read that. Please feel free to read it in your leisure, unless you prefer I go over them.

on February 4, 2015. That report contained 11 recommendations. The Department approved seven of the 11 recommendations, partially approved three recommendations, and disproved one of the recommendations.

In 2016, the JPP released four reports: Restitution and Compensation,
Retaliation, Article 120, and Statistical Data
Regarding Military Adjudication of Sexual Assault
Offenses. Those are also posted on the website.

And currently, the Department is reviewing the recommendations that were made by the JPP, the 2016 annual -- in their reports.

Those are currently under review so I can't report any specific DoD action on those at this time. Next slide.

So the JPP also has a subcommittee. 1 2 That subcommittee consists of nine members, two of those are members of the JPP, the parent 3 Recently, they conducted site visits at 4 installations in the United States and in Asia 5 and they are currently preparing reports on 6 7 observations at those site visits relative to their taskings for consideration and deliberation 8 9 by the JPP. I would note that General Schwenk is a member of the JPP Subcommittee. And I would be 10 remiss if I didn't note that Meghan Garvin was an 11 12 active participant on the Victim Services 13 Subcommittee of the RSP and also appeared before 14 the JPP to speak on the issue of victim rights. And Dr. Cassia Spohn also assisted on both of 15 16 those Panels in their efforts in providing 17 information that was helpful to the committees. 18 So the next meeting is projected for February 24, 2017 of the JPP and that is open to 19 20 the public, just like this Panel is. 21 And with that, that concludes my

presentation. Does anyone have any questions?

Yes.

MR. KRAMER: Can I? The scope of the RSP was to assess the strengths, weaknesses, including the administration of the UCMJ, the investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of adult sexual assault crimes. And ours is the investigation, prosecution and defense.

MS. FRIED: Yes.

MR. KRAMER: And I was curious -- I do see they had about assessing the training level but I was curious how the defense got added to this committee because it wasn't part of the RSP.

MS. FRIED: So I think there was some

-- I would be speculating but I can tell you that
the RSP noted some issues with the defense bar.
In particular, there was concerns about pressure
to prosecute sexual assault cases that maybe some
of the disposition would have been appropriate.
There was concerns about undue command influence.
There was concern about resourcing of the defense
community because currently, if you are a victim
of sexual assault in the military, you have a

prosecutor on your case, you have a special victims' counsel assigned to your case, and sometimes you have a senior trial counsel. If you are a defense counsel, it is just the defense counsel, typically. You may have a senior defense counsel assigned but that may or may not be the case.

So I suspect they were just trying to balance the tables but I really can't speak to the thought process as the new DAC-IPAD. But I know that both Panels looked at the training levels and experience of both prosecution and defense.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

CAPT TIDESWELL: Ms. Fried, if you don't mind, Mr. Kramer, you raised a good point with the word "adult." Those were part of what the predecessor Panels were tasked with looking at. That word "adult" is not in the current language for you all. That is something that will be open for discussion.

CMSAF MCKINLEY: Let me ask a

question. Did you guys look at, at any point in time, the disposition or the follow-on what happened to the victim, even after the conviction of the perpetrator, but how did that victim -- did that victim stay in the military? How were they treated? Did you look at any of that?

MS. FRIED: So they heard testimony with regards to that. And in fact, the JPP issued a report recently on retaliation based on some of that testimony, that which was heard at the RSP and what was heard at the JPP.

Concerns were raised by participants of both Panels, especially in the victim advocacy groups, as well as some victims who did come and testify, and special victims' counsel that people who made reports of sexual assault perceived that they were being retaliated against after making that report, either by peers, they were being ostracized or excluded, or potentially even their leadership.

But actual data for that information, neither Panel looked at that that I can recall.

I know it came up and they did make broad 1 2 recommendations as to people making those allegations. But as to the specifics -- I hope I 3 4 am answering your question -- I don't think they 5 really dove deep in that. Yes, I just wonder 6 CMSAF MCKINLEY: 7 about did some of the victims choose to separate 8 or did they stay in or were they forced to --9 MS. FRIED: I think there was 10 testimony that some chose to separate. There was also testimony that said some continued on 11 12 because they found good support in their units. 13 MS. GARVIN: May I ask a question? 14 Yes, please. MS. FRIED: 15 You know that the next MS. GARVIN: 16 JPP meeting is February 2017. How long will the 17 JPP continue? 18 MS. FRIED: Until September 2017 is 19 when their work is concluded. I don't think they 20 will be having meetings up until that because 21 that is when it ends and they have to have their 22 report to Congress by then.

Anything else? Yes.

MS. CANNON: Were there reports

generated doing some of the things that you were
tasked to do; that is, a report that did compare
the civilian with the military handling of sexual
assault cases that didn't result in maybe the
materials we have in terms of the bills or
recommendations?

MS. FRIED: We have -- each of the subcommittees produced independent reports and we have compilations of those reports and they are available.

MS. CANNON: How are they available?

MS. FRIED: I think they are still available electronically. I have hard copies.

MS. CANNON: But some of these things you have investigated to a certain degree already?

MS. FRIED: Oh, yes. Yes, and the comparative systems -- all the subcommittees did a very comprehensive review and you will see that the annex that contains the work of the

subcommittee, is several inches thick and the RSP report, itself, is less but that is because they were informed and took that information and adopted it as their own in that process. But there is a lot of paperwork on the websites that basically all the resources that were used by the RSP that we posted, public information that was used, anything they deliberated on would be available on their website.

And as of yesterday, that was still up in up and I expect it still will be.

MS. CANNON: Thank you.

have any more information about the site visits because it says that reports are going to be forthcoming. I was just curious about what those site visits entail. Are there assessments? And I really feel strongly that what is happening in the field is very critical to the decision we are going to make within this committee and so sometimes going out into the field to see what is occurring -- and I am just curious. When you say

site visits, that could mean a lot of different things. I am curious what the composition is.

MS. FRIED: So the subcommittee, members of the subcommittee, not the entire subcommittee, went out to certain sites and I believe Mr. Schwenk participated in some of those as well, and spoke to stakeholders in the process, and basically took that information back to the subcommittee and deliberated on that information. And then that information gets reported out to the parent Panel, the JPP.

I know they looked at a variety of issues like defense investigative resources.

There is another one that escapes me at the moment but they have not completed their deliberations so it is not publicly available information, at this point. But the plan is that when the subcommittee is finished deliberating on their product that they wanted delivered to the JPP, that subcommittee briefs it publicly to the Panel. So members of this Panel could attend that information or at least -- attend those

briefings or at least have that information 1 2 available. Once it is publicly available, it will be made available to the Panel. 3 4 CHAIR BASHFORD: All right, with that, 5 thanks again. Madam Chair, if you 6 CAPT TIDESWELL: don't mind, I would recommend maybe a five-minute 7 8 break while we reconfigure the room for the 9 deliberations portion. Right, thank you. 10 CHAIR BASHFORD: 11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 12 went off the record at 1:56 p.m. and resumed at 13 2:02 p.m.) 14 CHAIR BASHFORD: All right. So if you all could take a look at Tab 11, I think sort of 15 16 a proposed outline, I think it is very ambitious for the time we have. What I would like to have 17 18 a sense of is who else, besides myself has no 19 military experience whatsoever. 20 Let's see, one, two, three, four, 21 five, six, seven. Okay, that is more than I had 22 thought. Just sometimes when people are using

acronyms I need to have to keep turning to Marcia and say what is an Article 32.

so one of things I would like to have us do, if our staff could provide, is contact information for everybody. I think so far all the emails have come to us individually. So if we could get preferred email, preferred phone number, it would be very helpful.

These are just some random things that came up to me while we were talking. All the websites that have been mentioned, like we found this on the SAPRO website, we could find this on this website, if we could actually have those websites sent to us, the links to them.

CAPT TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR BASHFORD: And the last thing I want to say before opening up to everybody is there is a lot of work that has been done in this already and I would hope, although some of the work I think necessarily will overlap, I don't want to redo what somebody has already done. So if we could try to forge new ground, perhaps.

There is no way it won't overlap but I don't want to just redo something.

So I think the first thing, then, is

logistics. What do people think about frequency of meeting? Once a year is not, I don't think -- is not a realistic option to get anything done.

BGEN SCHWENK: I think, from my perspective, it depends on whether we have subcommittees or not.

CHAIR BASHFORD: I think we will have subcommittees.

BGEN SCHWENK: So if we have subcommittees and they meet monthly or something, then you need to give them -- the full committee needs to give them some time to put something together to brief the big committee.

So if we did three months of subcommittee meetings and then come back and all get together and share what we have and redirect where subcommittees are going, based on the other peoples' views, then you end up with maybe three more meetings this year.

CHAIR BASHFORD: I also think -- how many people from the west coast as well? Not as many but a monthly meeting for the entire group means three days of being away from work, normally speaking. And then we can also do phone conferences, as needed.

What do people think in terms of subcommittees? And we have the option of expanding them beyond our membership, as well. We can bring other people in to various ones.

HON. BRISBOIS: Isn't identification of subcommittees today a little premature? I mean we really have to get our hands around what is the enabling charge of this committee.

CHAIR BASHFORD: But I want something to happen in the next three months.

HON. BRISBOIS: Sure but I mean if you identify a subcommittee and you organize it and it turns out we don't need that group after all because one of the things that came out to me from these materials is the definition of what is the scope of this committee is very much up in

the air. And until that is clarified, subcommittees are kind of just estimating or guessing.

One of the things that struck me is I think the five-year charge of this committee as compared to the one- and two-year charges of the prior committees suggests that this is much more of a, how is the implementation going kind of thing, as opposed to what changes to make. And that is going to have a different set of subcommittees than those other groups.

I mean I agree that subcommittees are probably the most effective way to do the work on the groundwork but until the group, as a body, identifies what is that scope within the enabling legislation, we can't really identify what those subcommittees should be.

CHAIR BASHFORD: And we only have one mandate, as opposed to the Response Systems. Our mandate is to review cases and that is also very broadly defined -- it is not defined.

HON. BRISBOIS: Exactly. That is part

of the problem.

that we are considering as a subcommittee that we want to look at, broaden that reviewing of cases? And I go back to the 138, 132 recommendations.

Is it something that we want to look at to see -- or is somebody looking at -- have those been implemented and are they effective and are they being measured or is that something that we, as part of this committee would want to do? And that is a pretty daunting task.

MS. CARSON: That is not something we formally review. But that is definitely something that this Panel can do.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.

MS. CANNON: Well on page 2, the planning session outline, it asks a lot of good questions and points that kind of talk about our substance and how we might bring some questions and issues. And then there is, on page 5, the idea of the subcommittees but I think we are all kind of coming together and really not gelled as

to what our specific role is, let alone the more general one. And I am not sure how to go forward from that but I think that there are some good questions here.

One is also history. As has been pointed out, we need to know the history that has come before us so we don't repeat it.

So answering these questions and devoting our attention to these pages of what is the strategic plan might not be able to be completely considered in an hour. So I don't know how we could break it down so that maybe we could digest. Before me coming to this, I had no idea exactly my role was going to be and I would imagine that I am not the only one. And I have learned a lot today and it is kind of overwhelming, in some respects. So where do you begin?

And I thought this outline has a lot of good questions but do we want to take some time to reflect on this stuff and come back or develop a strategy off of reflecting on this,

rather than coming up with some ideas off the top of our heads?

CHAIR BASHFORD: But one thing I think is on page 3, framing the mission. Since that is our only statutory task is to review cases, we should probably just, without making decisions, discuss what sorts of cases we would like to review or we think is appropriate to review. And they sort of, at least in sub (1), break them down a little bit.

DR. SPOHN: So in the data that has been collected by the JPP Staff, which I am reviewing now for Fiscal Year '15, that includes outcomes. So it would include the dispositions and the sentences and so on. But what it doesn't tell you is the why.

So there are a lot of cases that result in acquittals or dismissals. And there is not really anything in the database that tells you why those cases resulted in the dispositions that they did.

And so one possible approach might be

to take a random sample of cases that resulted in 1 2 acquittals or dismissals, or whatever kind of disposition one wanted to focus on and really go 3 to the case files and collect more detailed data 4 5 on those kinds of cases, if it is an evidentiary issue, if the victim refused to cooperate, is the 6 7 case moving forward, none of that is in the 8 database. 9 And so it might be interesting to get that kind of detail on the cases that resulted in 10 specific kinds of dispositions. 11 12 CHAIR BASHFORD: Do you have the breakdown of -- and if I am using the wrong 13 14 terminology -- once the charges have been preferred, what the ultimate --15 Disposition is. 16 DR. SPOHN: 17 CHAIR BASHFORD: -- for conviction. 18 DR. SPOHN: Yes. 19 CHAIR BASHFORD: And what would that 20 Or I don't mean to put you on the spot. Ιf 21 you don't have it on hand.

I don't have it right

DR. SPOHN:

before me but for Fiscal Year '15, there are 790 1 2 cases where charges were preferred. And I am just now starting to do some of the data analysis 3 4 on those cases. But as I recall, and maybe Meghan can, 5 I believe that the acquittal rate was something 6 7 around 25 to 30 percent. Yes, that's correct. 8 MS. PETERS: 9 MS. GARVIN: And just out of 10 curiosity, because the question on -- one of the questions that is on page 2 of these documents is 11 12 for us to make sure we have a common definition of case. Was there a common definition of case 13 14 for that data and what was it? DR. SPOHN: For the JPP, it is cases 15 16 where charges were preferred. 17 MS. GARVIN: And so nothing other than 18 cases where charges were preferred. 19 DR. SPOHN: Right. 20 MS. GARVIN: But then the entire 21 universe of cases that were preferred were --22 DR. SPOHN: Yes.

1	MS. GARVIN: Okay.
2	HON. GRIMM: But acquittal is by
3	trial, right?
4	DR. SPOHN: Yes.
5	HON. GRIMM: Not just because once
6	it has been preferred, then I don't know if there
7	is a dismissal if the victim did not want to
8	cooperate. In the civilian system, the
9	prosecutor brings a charge and could file a
10	motion to dismiss the charge if they didn't think
11	that they had the evidence.
12	DR. SPOHN: But that would be post
13	HON. GRIMM: Right. Acquittal implies
14	it went to trial.
15	DR. SPOHN: Yes, correct.
16	DEAN HARRISON: Could I go back to the
17	definition of case? Because it seems to me that
18	if we are dealing in an area where there are a
19	large number of victims who do not report. And
20	if that failure to report reflects a lack of
21	faith in the system, should we expand case to
22	basically I mean not just legal case, not just

prosecutions, but incidents of assault, which might mean, for example, finding out what veterans groups have who treat veterans who were assaulted during their service, who did not report anything until their separation. I'm just throwing that out.

If we are wondering -- an investigation, for example, the best investigation comes up when something is reported. And if people are failing to report, we can't have good investigations.

MS. TOKASH: This is Meghan Tokash speaking. I would agree with Dean Harrison. I think a case should envelope when the report of incident is started because I think it would be important for this Panel to investigate and inquire several things, as the process has started. Coming from a prosecutorial experience, you know what factors are being considered when judge advocates are advising commanders whether to prefer charges, or as we would say in the civilian world now, indict a specific individual?

What goes into that?

I know there was reference made to one of the changes being something akin to a U.S.

Attorneys' Manual for the military. You know certainly, there does not exist a uniform standard of prosecution and definitions of that in the armed Services right now. Would that be helpful at the initiation of the case? And if so, how would that impact preferral and then, subsequently, referral decisions?

CHAIR BASHFORD: I think it might be hard to get, although going to veterans' groups is one way but I think it is hard to get hard data on cases that were never reported. But to limit ourselves to cases that went forward only, I think we are seeing a very small subset of the universe and I think it would be crucial to us to see certainly unrestricted reports, where charges were not preferred. Ideally, I would like to see restricted reports as well but I don't know if that is something that is actually feasible or not. But the unrestricted reports which, for

whatever reason, were either deemed to be unfounded or were withdrawn by the complainant or they thought there was a lack of proof or what happened didn't fit the definitions of a crime, I would like to see -- I think this group would be badly served if we didn't get to see that as well because it could be very illuminating.

MS. LONG: Just sort of going to the back end of the what is a case, I am wondering if we will have access to transcripts for cases that did go forward to look at. And I know that they could be very voluminous and perhaps DoD has a method for going through and analyzing but are the notes of testimony available with these files for cases that have been disposed and moved through the system? And if so, would we have access?

CAPT TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am, there is transcripts of trials.

HON. GRIMM: If it is electronically available, then you could search. It is probably available in the searchable ones. If it is like

in the federal system, once you get it, you can 1 2 do a word search. MS. LONG: You can do that search but 3 4 I feel like to really understand outcomes, you 5 need to start reading through these transcripts to see where there might be trial issues, or 6 prosecution strategy issues, or whatever is 7 8 coming up. 9 DR. MARKOWITZ: Do we have records of trial for cases that ended in acquittal or only 10 in cases where there is a conviction? 11 12 CAPT TIDESWELL: There are records but 13 they are not verbatim. 14 DR. MARKOWITZ: So that will be the one challenge, I think, is that we don't have 15 16 apples and apples when we are looking at 17 conviction versus acquittal. And that is 18 something I think that needs to be considered. 19 CHAIR BASHFORD: I must say I am also 20 not 100 percent clear what the definitional difference is between sexual assault and sexual 21 22 misconduct. Here they say sexual -- did we want

to look at cases where sexual misconduct charge 1 2 is preferred? Does that mean something different factually or is that simply a charging decision 3 4 to charge somebody with something of a lesser 5 degree of severity? MS. CARSON: My sense is that leaves 6 open for you to determine if there are broader 7 areas you want to investigate, like sexual 8 9 harassment. But is there a 10 CHAIR BASHFORD: 11 definition of sexual misconduct, as opposed to 12 sexual assault? 13 MS. CARSON: No, that is not a defined 14 term. 15 CHAIR BASHFORD: And is there a 16 mechanism by which we could, even if it were 17 anonymized, find out the details of unrestricted 18 reports that, ultimately, where charges were not 19 preferred? 20 MS. CARSON: You want to look at 21 unrestricted reports where charges were not 22 preferred?

CHAIR BASHFORD: Where charges were 1 2 not preferred. Can we find that out? LTC LEWIS: Yes, there would be an 3 4 investigation filed. There is information. 5 There is data. It may not be in a cohesive form. MS. CANNON: You would have the 6 7 report. You would have the investigative file 8 and what happened -- where it ended. 9 MS. GARVIN: And with regard to 10 restricted reports, at this juncture, what is the 11 -- I mean the numbers are recorded, at least, 12 Is that the scope of data available on right? 13 restrictive reports, this shear number? 14 MS. CANNON: At this time. At this time, that is all you can get. I think there is 15 16 a movement, I am not sure if it is required or 17 not, but to try to gather more data from the 18 unrestricted reports I think for analysis 19 purposes. 20 SGT MARKEY: I would support the fact 21 that we need to really look at not just those 22 cases that are going into the system to either

charge or not charge but when you show the numbers of what they believe, 26,000 cases, and then you look at the numbers that actually made it into the court system, the process -- and I apologize for the term that I am using -- there is a very large gap.

And so my question would be, one, what is happening to these investigative cases prior to getting to the position where they are going to review it for charges or not? And are there gaps there that we need to look at investigatively from the first response to the investigative follow-up and the practices that are being conducted at that point to what kind of case is actually being presented to the prosecutor to review?

And are there concerns, gaps, that the prosecutor says I just don't have a good investigation; I just can't move this forward?

And maybe the ones that are being moved forward because of those gaps are not getting appropriate dispositions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I would love to grab the investigative case files. And that would include everything from the first contact response, every documentation. And I don't know. It has got to be a massive number of cases that investigations have been opened up on but I would like to be able to see is there something within that investigative process that we need to look at to improve the quality of that investigation to make a better determination on whether that is an appropriate case to move forward on the charge. Because folks are making decisions. I hear a lot of decisions that are being made whether to move cases or not and what information do they have that they are making that decision on? what facts or what circumstances have they been given to make that decision?

And so I think it is important to kind of go back upstream a little bit to look to see if there are some gaps and considerations in that process that would be appropriate for us to look at investigatively prior to the prosecutorial

position on these cases.

DR. SPOHN: We could really build on what the RSP did, in terms of I think one of their recommendations concerned unfounding. And I know they asked me to comment on the data from the various Services and what I found is that the Services defined unfounding differently and they had different people making the decision.

So one of the recommendations was that there should be some consistency across the Services. And so I would be really interested in a study that focused on the unfounded cases and determining whether they are, in fact, false or baseless, based on the wording. I think the recommendation was to follow the Uniform Crime Reporting definitions of false or baseless. I don't know whether that has happened but we could certainly do an analysis of those cases that were unfounded and why they were unfounded.

CHAIR BASHFORD: And apart from a Service-by-Service comparison, it probably would be interesting to look at, if you can drill down

that far, to a base-by-base or jurisdiction-byjurisdiction in the civilian world. You see some
police departments with a volume rate of like 65
percent and others with 5 percent.

DR. SPOHN: Five percent, yes.

CHAIR BASHFORD: So there are those disparities. It would be interesting to see.

DR. MARKOWITZ: There are some challenges, too, I guess, and forgive me for being incredibly narrow but coming specifically from the medical forensics sides of things, there are some aspects to this that are difficult to find some uniformity that are also probably worth looking at.

And so I am thinking about the fact that we don't consistently have the medical exams being conducted within military hospitals. Some of them are sent out to the civilian component, depending on either what Service it is or the jurisdiction or installation. On top of that, in places like Asia or Europe where you have folks having exams done on the economy there and the

differences, we know that these sorts of things impact the quality of the evidence, the quality of the testimony, the willingness of people to participate in the process to begin with, their understanding of restricted versus unrestricted and their general options.

So the question is, then, how do these sorts of things also impact the whole process how victims feel in terms of just participating, how those cases move through, and do these kinds of things make a general difference or is it negligible? And I don't think we have that information. So strictly from my tiny slice of the pie, I would say I would certainly be interested in looking at that.

CMSAF MCKINLEY: Ma'am, I would be interested in one of the questions I have there is the RAND study had 26,000 victims who said they were raped, 26,000 in a year. That is an enormous number. But that statistic comes from the fact that they were able to report that without anything happening to them, whether they

said this happened to me while I was active duty.

Now then there is only 550 that went to general

court-martial and then the big thing is why?

But I think probably a lot of the victims, they look at what has happened to other victims that they had seen before. And those victims were forced to separate from the military, or maybe go to another unit, or crosstrain into another career field and they become a victim again.

And how can we make recommendations so that they can freely come forward and report that they were raped and not have to feel like they are going to be a victim again, that they can no longer work in the unit? And until we fix that, we are going to have 26,000 reported privately but we are not going to have them coming forward.

CHAIR BASHFORD: I mean I think we have to look at -- when you are looking at an institution, are there structural impediments in place that disincentivize reporting? But there is also a cultural component, too. And I think

somebody had referenced ostracism. You know ostracism by peers, that is a very hard thing culturally to fix. It is easier to fix it in the command structure I think.

CMSAF MCKINLEY: But when you have a unit and you have the person who assaulted and the victim and they are in the same unit, and they work with the same people. And for the commander leadership in that squadron is what do you do with them now? You can't transfer them. So maybe you put one person working in the dorms or whatever or work in the orderly room. What do you do with them?

And it is hard to put them back into the normal workforce doing their normal work. Or maybe you put one of them in pretrial confinement.

But it is a very difficult thing and what it does is people in the squadron kind of take sides.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Very similar to college campuses.

CMSAF MCKINLEY: Yes, and it can tear a squadron and the mission and morale apart. It really can.

And so that person who is the victim, do they still want to be a part of that?

MS. LONG: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Go ahead.

MS. LONG: I'm just thinking of in terms of the cases that we are reviewing because there might be differences among the -- certainly not among the law but among maybe the way the different branches -- I always forget how to say it, the different branches, the different Services handle the cases, maybe if we can come up with some sort of form to make sense sort of an issue that you raised or among so that we can try and have some consistency in our review among the differences that might exist.

DR. MARKOWITZ: The other challenges that I would see is that I mean I do think that we need to decide whether we are looking at just adult sexual assault, if we are going to look at

child, because it is a very, very different beast altogether. And so we need to be thinking about what are we talking about when we are talking about an effective response to child sexual abuse versus adult, versus intimate partner assault. There are different services that are available to military members, depending on which one of those the victimization falls under.

So I think that probably an early task for us will be to decide whether the scope of this committee is to look at sort of sexual assault at large or whether we really need to think about narrowing this focus, since I think that will dictate how we move forward.

CHAIR BASHFORD: There is also how broad do you want to be in terms of the victim's relationship to the Services.

DR. MARKOWITZ: Right.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Obviously, I would think you would want to look at intrafamilial cases, where one person is not a member of the Service. But do we look at cases where somebody

has gone off base and assaulted a civilian? A lot of that I think would probably be handled with the civilian courts but I actually don't know.

MS. LONG: I think it would be helpful to look at that. At least in the beginning, I think we would want to look at the whole thing.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.

MS. CANNON: One of my concerns and kind of interest in being on this committee is this criminal defense attorney. And with the advent of victims' rights and victims being represented, as well as the prosecution of these cases, the concern is that there is parity in terms of resources and level of representation, level of experts, investigation resources, all of that. And I think that is a concern I would like to be able to -- you know in this comparative analysis, is there fairness in resources and such?

HON. WALTON: Yes, I think one challenge you always have when you deal with the

issue of sexual assault is whether the reports of sexual assault really reflects the magnitude of the problem. Because when I was Chair of the Prison Rape Elimination Commission, there was a number out there of how many assaults were purportedly taking place but the reality was that many of them were not being reported.

Now this may be beyond the scope of our mission but that is a major challenge because the 26,000 figure sounds bad but that may not be the real nature of the problem. It may be the tip of the iceberg. Because that is what we found in the Prison Rape Elimination issue is that we thought there were about 50,000 and then there was a survey done and it was estimated in 2014 there were about 100,000.

So I mean I don't know if that type of an assessment has been done or how you would do it because it is a major challenge.

BGEN SCHWENK: Let me just say my
thoughts on one of the issues was what do we
think the statutory scope of our charter is? And

being a guy in an executive branch person, I will read this as broadly as possible. So I admit that freely up front.

Okay, we are the third one of these things and the charters were specific to begin with and now they have become broader. But I don't think that means narrower. I think it means broader. It means we have got a lot of specific stuff that was done by the predecessors. We have taken action in Congress. The Secretary has taken action. The President has taken action. Now we need somebody for five years to look and see what is going on and tell us what is happening.

The case review, I believe, is the one we shall have to do. We have to do the case review. We have to figure out what we can learn from that and maybe that we learn that the data is insufficient to support getting to the whys and DoD needs to change its system, but whatever it is. But I don't think that is only. It is just one thing.

And I think when Jen O'Connor was here today as the DoD General Counsel, her issues she wanted us to look at were all really broad -- training, resources, affect broadly -- affecting the deployed environment, civilian best practices that DoD doesn't do. Why not? Is there a reason because of our deployable nature or what have you? Or should we adopt that civilian best practice? Just a whole bunch of things that lead me to conclude we really do have a broad charter. We can make it as broad as we want. The one thing we have to do is the case review.

So I don't know how we want to start on that. I was tempted --when I said earlier we need subcommittees, I was tempted to say the first thing, I would start by trying to wrap our heads around this and see what is there and read things, and to give us something to do, start on the cases. Because at least we can figure out what data is available in the Army; what data is available in the Navy; what data is available in the Marine Corps.

And in keeping with my broad charter,

I agree with those of you who think we start at
the allegation and we start right, what is the
data on allegations. And if we want to go to the
26,000 figure, which is the best extrapolation if
you believe that the statisticians can do
extrapolations from a more limited survey. It is
their extrapolation of well, if that data holds
factored for this or that, the estimate is about
26,000 types of sexual assault, not rapes but
sexual assaults in much broader definition, a
year in DoD and then here is the number we know
get reported and stuff.

To me, so I think we start from soup to nuts. We have a very broad charter. The thing we know we have to do is cases. So, I would suggest we start with cases while we are wrapping our heads around this.

And for subcommittees, nothing against DoD, but I will bet we will find out the data is different in every Service of what you can find and what you can't find. So that is a natural

way for us to get started and get our feet wet. We have an Army Subcommittee, and a Navy-Marine Corps Subcommittee, and Air Force Subcommittee, and they sit there and they start figuring out what information is here. Give ourselves a couple of months to do it and we come back together.

In the meantime, while we are at those Subcommittee meetings, we are talking to one another about where are we going to go next.

What are the issues that you see? What is a good follow-on issue from the JPP? They are going to drop some off that they are not making recommendations on that they have discovered from the site visits. Do we want to pick up one of those or not?

It gives us a way to get our feet wet while we are doing something productive. And also it does take a while to get authority to do Subcommittees. I mean it is, unfortunately, not under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, not something that is automatic. The Chair has got

to go back and ask for it. And then they are 1 2 going to ask questions about do you want only your people or do you want other new people that 3 4 we have to appoint because they can do that for 5 Who is going to be the Chair of each one of these things? Have you given them names? 6 7 Although I think the name we gave the JPP 8 Subcommittee was very clever -- Subcommittee. 9 Subcommittee A, B, C, CHAIR BASHFORD: 10 D. 11 Well, and for us, BGEN SCHWENK: Yes. 12 if we did the case thing to start with, it be 13 would Army, Navy, you know by departments and 14 that would be it and we could get started. 15 So, there is something substantive to 16 think about as a way to proceed. And feel free 17 to disagree because I have been wrong more than I 18 have been right. 19 Just one thing I want CHAIR BASHFORD: 20 to add is that my understanding is that the 21 Secretary of Defense can ask this committee to provide advice on issues of interest to him as 22

well. So far, we have no request that I am aware of. But that is something that could be in the future.

very much. I totally agree with you. I think, as I look through the list of tasks or possible subject matter that Jen O'Connor had spoken about in her comments, a lot of these can be answered or looked at through the review of a case, an investigative case from the time of disclosure all the way through the criminal prosecution of it, if it goes criminal.

What we would have to decide is when we do -- first of all, what type of materials are we going to need to do an effective review and develop what sort of metrics. What sort of data are we asking or what are we looking for in that case review? So we have a logical pattern of what things we need to look for. And we all have a degree of expertise that we can look at, which is great. We can look at it with 20 different sets of eyes with their experience.

I just finished or I am in the process of doing a review with a civilian law enforcement agency. And as I am doing these case reviews, I am identifying some of these concerns like data collection, like it is not being appropriately documented and it is not being collected. I can tell by some of these investigations there is a lack of training and experience by the investigator or the first responders. I can say that there are practices that you could see within an investigative review or a case review to say hey, you know what, I know of a practice, policy or best practice in the civilian world that would apply very well for that.

So I think I agree, as a foundation to start to look at these cases, I think we will start to see those questions come out and that is where we start to identify, okay, where are we and what do we need to do and that would be a great foundation for starting. So I agree with you wholeheartedly.

DR. MARKOWITZ: I would just add to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that, though, that if we are interested in
understanding the general issues related to what
is happening with restricted reports and why
people aren't coming forward, and, obviously, we
don't really have a whole lot of data, except for
raw numbers in terms of just the sheer number of
folks who are not reporting, then one of the
other things, while I agree very much with you,
we may also want to look at convening focus
groups with folks who are able to take restricted
reports within the military, so chaplains,
medical, our SARCs, and then the VLCs and SVCs,
and actually have a focus group with those folks
to say what are you hearing from victims about
their reticence to report. Why aren't they
reporting? What is causing people to flip their
reports to unrestricted, potentially, or when
they are considering whether you know what are
the thought process behind it? What are you
hearing as first responders? To be able to give
us at least some illustration of what is
happening on the restricted side of the fence.

CHAIR BASHFORD: It would also be interesting to find out is that a truly informed, voluntary decision of the person --

DR. MARKOWITZ: Yes.

CHAIR BASHFORD: -- or are they in any way being steered towards filing a report in a certain way.

DR. MARKOWITZ: Or not filing a report. Because I hear -- probably from my side of things I hear from folks just as much who are concerned about patients being discouraged from reporting because they don't feel like anything is going to happen. And I have sat in professional conferences with some of my colleagues who have talked point blank about discouraging patients from reporting.

So I think there may be as much pressure, potentially, that we don't recognize to not report because of the perception on the part of professionals who are interacting early on with victims about the utility of doing so. And that is just not something that we have ever

talked about. And so I think both of those
things are worth exploring.
CHAIR BASHFORD: And then just
flipping of the 790 charges preferred, the
acquittal rate, that is 75 percent to 70 percent
conviction rate, which is not bad. I mean that
is pretty
MS. CANNON: It's the other way
around.
CHAIR BASHFORD: I thought it was the
other way around.
PARTICIPANT: It is 25 percent
conviction and 75 percent acquittal.
CHAIR BASHFORD: Sorry. I take that
back.
DEAN HARRISON: Madam Chair, if I
could ask Chief McKinley a question.
CMSAF MCKINLEY: Sure.
DEAN HARRISON: Is there a way to
I'm not sure if there is an organization of
command enlisted advisors or if there is a way to
communicate because it seems to me that the

command enlisted advisor would have his or her finger on the pulse of whether or not a young victim of sexual assault perceived reporting as detrimental to career advancement.

any stats on that. I have been at every level of leadership there on the enlisted side. And none of those really came up. I mean we have our SARCs and so forth that have the Sexual Assault Resource Coordinator. We need to give you a list of all these things.

But I am sure we can get that but I think it is a major problem, I really do. And just like she was saying that -- I have a granddaughter that was raped. And my granddaughter, she chose not to come forward because she didn't want the stigma attached to it. And we found out much later. But that is real not only in civilian life but in the military.

DEAN HARRISON: I speak because I had occasion this week to a young woman -- well not

young anymore but a woman who had spent a career in the Army. And I was asking her to speak to some women who were thinking about enlisting and she refused to do it. I asked her why and she said that she had been the victim of sexual assault on several occasions in her military career and not reported it because she wanted to stay in the Army.

And at that time that she was in, she did not perceive the community as being receptive to hearing those reports. Not to say that she was right or wrong but her perception.

CMSAF MCKINLEY: And I don't think
that is any part of -- I mean I truly believe
leadership in all branches of the Services are
trying to do the right thing. But it is just,
like I said, down at the unit, you know when it
happens between people that are working together
and they know both parties or whatever and things
-- it is hard to deal with. And it is hard to
stay in that unit.

And so it is easier to say I am out of

here. And that is a shame because well they are a valuable resource. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars training them and they should have the opportunity to still have a career but they give it up because they were a victim. And we have got to fix that.

This is Meghan Tokash MS. TOKASH: speaking again. I am also just going to throw this out here but we are in a pretty nice position, since we are here for five years, to be able to follow the life of an actual case. And that is probably something that the two predecessor Panels had not been able to do. had been following statistics and cases. understand that is part of our charter as well but I think we would really be missing an opportunity if we didn't take advantage of that. And obviously, at some point when the case evolves into a public trial, that would be a real opportunity for us, as Members, to comment on and observe how the process is played out. So, I think that that might be something we should

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consider as well. And that might entail a site visit or several site visits but that might be a very worthy cause.

MS. LONG: That's a great idea.

BGEN SCHWENK: Just to comment on the site visits, I think that everybody -- well, I can only speak for myself. Okay, the FACA rules. Speaking for myself, and maybe being informed by hearing from other people, the site visits were terrific. They were not for attribution. We just sat in small rooms. We only took a couple of us so that they outnumbered us. So that was good. And we just let them talk.

And you do learn a lot contemporate with it is who you have. You think back to when you were that age and you were all hard charging and everything was awful if it didn't go your way. But we learned a lot. It was really good.

So I think that is something that really needs to get done at some point in the future.

MS. GARVIN: I will echo that. On the

victims that can be, we did site visits, and they were incredibly useful because we learned things that we didn't learn in the formal testimony.

BGEN. SCHWENK: Right.

MS. GARVIN: I would echo the idea of thinking of case as incident rather than case as something that a system has named as a case. I both agree and have some challenges with following a live case only because the fact of our existence alone attracts additional attention to things, and therefore the victim in that case as well as the alleged perpetrator in that case will have additional attention put on them if we are following a live case, and that a, tampers with what is happening in the case, right, because it's now shifted from what it was, but also the reality of privacy for both those people, even if it is a public case, when you turn a spotlight on it, it changes the reality, and for both the victim and the accused in that case, I'd have strong concerns.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Mr. Kramer, we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

haven't heard anything from you yet.

MR. KRAMER: No, well, I mean, I've heard - I've read the - I actually was reading the statute and it says, "to advise the Secretary of Defense on the investigation, prosecution, and defense of allegations of rape, forcible sodomy, and other sexual misconduct."

It clearly is very broad, not just any
- it says "allegation," so that's way before a
case even starts. I find it is extremely hard to
find how many cases are not reported, and that but that would seem to come within the scope of
this statute where it says "allegations" because
that's an allegation that's made later, but
that's extremely difficult.

But it seems to me that what we've talked about, whether it involves on the base, civilians, children, whatever it is, it says, "allegations of sexual and other misconduct involving members of the Armed Forces." It's very broad.

It seems to encompass almost

everything everybody has brought up is, "Does it include this?" because that's an allegation involving a member of the Armed Forces.

So I think that it's - I agree with General Schwenk that it's much - where you have a very broad mandate, that one specific recourse is what everybody has said, we have to look at cases, but the mandate seems to encompass almost everything that everybody has discussed.

HON. WALTON: I mean, that type of assessment has been done, so we don't have to really recreate the wheel. You can check with the Bureau of Justice Statistics which did the random anonymous survey that was done within the prison system to see what the incident of sexual assault would reflect even if they weren't reported, and that's how they were able to make an assessment as to what the actual level of assault was when compared to what the level of reported assaults were.

MR. KRAMER: Yes, I mean, it doesn't say anything about "reported." It just says

1	"allegations."
2	CHAIR BASHFORD: It's very broad.
3	HON. WALTON: But the Bureau of
4	Justice Statistics has all of that information
5	that would give you some insight as to how they
6	went about doing their survey.
7	CHAIR BASHFORD: And is that what RAND
8	did, and what's the most recent RAND study of the
9	military?
LO	CMSAF. McKINLEY: 2013?
L1	DR. SPOHN: 2014?
L 2	CHAIR BASHFORD: So not that long ago.
L3	No, we're not talking about something from -
L 4	(Simultaneous speaking)
L5	MS. GARVIN: And was the RAND -
L6	BGEN. SCHWENK: They used to always
L7	roll them out in the Spring when the Sexual
L8	Assault Prevention and Response Office did them,
L9	and then RAND did them afterward, say right
20	around in the Spring, and they were based on the
21	prior year's numbers. So if last Spring was
22	2016, it would have been 2015 numbers. Whether

fiscal year or calendar year, I don't know, but 2015 would have been that.

CHAIR BASHFORD: And I think that would be a good thing to have access to, to see the format of the study, what they ask, what their definitions were.

BGEN. SCHWENK: Yeah, I think if we do
the subcommittee, then we do them by what date is
available. We're doing cases, you know, broadly
defined. The idea is to find out if I'm in the
Department of the Army, "What the heck data does
the Army have from the initial allegation when,
you know, reported versus unreported? Have you
ever asked anybody about why people make reported
and don't go unreported? Do you have any data?"

Find out what they have so that we have a, "This is what's available," and then from that, we can decide what's missing, and what to dive down into, and where to go. But the first thing, we need to know what's there, whether from the Bureau of Justice Statistics or any place.

DR. SPOHN: A good place to start

would be the response. The RSP had waterfall 1 2 slides from each of the Services that sort of depicted the flow of cases from the allegation to 3 completion, and so those should be available. 4 5 Those waterfall slides should be available on the 6 website, I would think. 7 CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am. 8 And a question I'm not MS. GARVIN: 9 sure, hopefully someone knows, but we can also find out. With regard to both the RAND and the 10 11 RSP data and the waterfall, was that adult sexual 12 violence or - I think they both are not touching on kid/child. 13

CHAIR BASHFORD: Adult.

MS. GARVIN: Yeah, so we have a gap also if we include, and I - our charge allows us to include children, and I would say that it is something that should be looked at, then we have a gap in data, a different gap in data there.

CHAIR BASHFORD: But that doesn't mean that the Services haven't -

MS. GARVIN: Correct.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BASHFORD: They might have collected that.

MS. GARVIN: They might have. Ms. Anderson, you haven't said anything.

MG ANDERSON: I've been listening. In part of our presentation this morning, and it may have been new to some of the folks in the room who are not in the military, but there is a disparity in consequences for enlisted and officers when you may have very similar facts and circumstances.

And I don't know that that's going to fall within our charter, but I can't help but think at some point we may find someone asking us that question. Why is there an instance where you will find an enlisted soldier who is busted to E-1, and you will find an officer who doesn't suffer the same fate?

I think these days, it's probably a fair question, and there may be some history behind that, but I think we took a similar oath, and I think we have a similar ethos, or we should

have a similar ethos when it comes to our fellow 1 2 Servicemembers. So having, I think, that disparity 3 between how - the outcomes for officers and 4 5 enlisted, I think it's a question we may want to consider, maybe not at this point, but as we 6 review cases, we may find ourselves looking at, 7 8 as I said, similar fact patterns, and finding 9 very different outcomes. I think there's very 10 CHAIR BASHFORD: 11 little that doesn't fall under our charter. 12 thing I personally would like some clarification 13 on, one of the earlier speakers talked about the 14 - in the civilian world, we call them plea bargains. I thought it was, what, negotiated 15 16 plea in secret. 17 BGEN. SCHWENK: Pre-trial agreements. 18 CHAIR BASHFORD: And well, but then I 19 thought they said they went to court-martial 20 anyhow. Is that correct? 21 BGEN. SCHWENK: Mm-hmm. So that's - how is 22 CHAIR BASHFORD:

that a plea if you're still going to a 1 2 court-martial? HON. BRISBOIS: It's a sentencing 3 4 trial only, and that's adversarial, just as is 5 the guilt and innocent phase, and that's what they referred to as "beating the deal." 6 CHAIR BASHFORD: 7 Yeah. HON. BRISBOIS: So the incentive for 8 9 the defense is to get the military judge or the panel to come in below what the convening 10 11 authority agreed to. 12 BGEN. SCHWENK: So you go to trial. 13 HON. BRISBOIS: Right. 14 BGEN. SCHWENK: And under the 15 pre-trial agreement, the accused has agreed to 16 plea to certain offenses, all of them, some of 17 them, whatever, and so the judge takes the pleas, 18 then you go right into sentencing. 19 And when they go into sentencing after 20 the pleas, the defense puts on its "why I'm a 21 good guy" and the Government is "why you're not a

good guy" and the judge or the members, whoever

1	is doing it, usually it's a judge alone in a
2	pre-trial agreement, announces a sentence, and
3	then they open the magic pre-trial agreement and
4	decide whether you get the benefit of the
5	pre-trial agreement, or if the sentence was lower
6	than the pre-trial agreement, so you get the
7	sentence.
8	CHAIR BASHFORD: But if there's a
9	plea, there's still not a fact finding? Is that
LO	correct?
L1	BGEN. SCHWENK: Right, there isn't.
L 2	CHAIR BASHFORD: Okay.
L3	BGEN. SCHWENK: It's a plea. It's
L 4	just a plea.
L5	LT. COL. STINGL: If I could just
L6	interrupt for a moment, we still have the benefit
L7	of having this morning's first speaker who is the
L8	renowned expert on military justice.
L9	BGEN. SCHWENK: But we're tired of
20	hearing from him.
21	(Laughter)
22	LT. COL. STINGL: If you'd like to

1	weigh in on relevance or any of the -
2	BGEN. SCHWENK: You're welcome, Dwight.
3	LT. COL. STINGL: - any of that, I'm
4	sure -
5	HON. BRISBOIS: I'm sure it hasn't
6	changed that much since I was a trial counsel, at
7	least in terms of once you're in front of a
8	judge. The pre-trial agreement's usually
9	accompanied with some stipulated fact record that
10	the fact finder gets to, you know, assess all of
11	the good conduct/bad conduct character evidence.
12	BGEN. SCHWENK: All the aggravation
13	that the government wants will be in there.
14	HON. BRISBOIS: So there will be some
15	factual record. It's usually a stipulated record.
16	LTC. LEWIS: I'd like to add, ma'am,
17	the judge actually has to question the accused to
18	make sure that he is agreeing with the terms of
19	the charges to which he is allegedly pleading
20	guilty, so we go through a providence inquiry and
21	he is asked.
22	He goes through each charge and he

says, "Did you do this?" and he has to explain to 1 2 the judge exactly how and why he did what he did. And if the judge finds him to be provident, then 3 4 they go into the sentencing. He'll accept the 5 plea of guilty. Because there are times when, based upon his explanation, he's not provident. 6 7 He's not pleading to the actual charges. 8 CHAIR BASHFORD: But is there an 9 analogous system as there is in the civilian 10 I'm a prosecutor. I'm looking at this I don't like the case. I don't like the 11 case. 12 victim. The defendant seems like a - the accused 13 seems like a good person. 14 Is there a way to, as part of a plea, "So you're charged with 15 to lower the charges? 16 this, but I'm going to let you plead to this." 17 MS. GALLAGHER: Yes, ma'am, they can 18 plead to a lesser offense. 19 CHAIR BASHFORD: Okay. 20 MS. GALLAGHER: Absolutely, yes. 21 CHAIR BASHFORD: So I think that's

something we would want to see as well,

particularly when you brought up the difference between enlisted and officer, not just in outcomes, but during the progress of a case. Are they being offered a better outcome, not just getting a better outcome?

DEAN HARRISON: But I think the - this is Keith Harrison. I think the vision might be even further in the upstream when you compare it to the civilian world, because as a civilian prosecutor, you're just handling the criminal sphere, whereas the convening authority, and in the military that's the person that supplies the prosecutory discretion who is not necessarily a lawyer, might want to disclose -

For example, the perception might be that officers get to end their careers without going to any type of criminal arena for misconduct. I'm not just talking about sexual assault, whereas an enlisted person who engaged in the same conduct, again not just sexual assault, does not have that option of resigning and going home, so to speak. It's gotten quiet.

CMSAF. McKINLEY: I would like to gather the information. Get all of the data sent to us from the RSP and the statistics from RAND or whatever, and I'd like to have enough time to digest it to see what questions that I have of it, and then with that, send an email to the group.

Each one of us does that. We send an

Each one of us does that. We send an email on what our concerns are, and then we possibly have a conference call and we combine those, and in that conference call, we kind of set the agenda for when we meet in person again, and then possibly have a couple of cases that we review, and that way we have a road ahead, and we've all - we have something set for when we come the next time.

MS. CANNON: Can I ask you a question?

CMSAF. McKINLEY: Sure.

MS. CANNON: When you say "the data," you're talking about these other two panels that have done a lot of work?

CMSAF. McKINLEY: Yeah, that, plus all

of the statistical of each branch of Service and how many we've had and all. Yeah, so if we just had a time to digest that, and especially for those who have not been in the military, to really, you know, see what's out there.

HON. GRIMM: I have a question just in terms of availability of the information, where and how to access it. Is it possible to have a website that we all have access to so it's a shared cloud environment that we can go and click on it, rather than each one of us getting the same stuff, having to open it up, figuring out where we're going to file it, and how we're going to read it, where it's going to be.

If we could set up - if we had access to a site that was just simply the data repository that we're all looking at, so that if we had 15 case files and the reports from the other two committees that had already provided their reports, we could look at it whenever our schedules allow us to do it as long as we have on site access.

I'm sure it's not difficult to get
password protection so that it's not - so there's
adequate security, and we all have the same
ability to see that shared source access to
information.

LT. COL. STINGL: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, any information that you all review, and any - if there's a meeting, a Committee meeting, I'll just offer the definition that FACA offers.

It's, "any gathering of Advisory

Committee members, whether in person or through
electronic means, held with approval of an agency
for the purpose of deliberating on the
substantive matters upon which the Advisory

Committee provides advice or information." So we
could definitely make the information available
to you, but at the same time, any information
that's made available to you also has to be -

HON. GRIMM: I have no problem with it being available to anybody who wants to see it.

I just want to have a shared location where we

can look at it so we don't have to click, and save, and do all of that. It would just make it easier to look at.

DR. MARKOWITZ: I have concerns. Yeah, if we're looking at whole cases, that includes things like medical evidence, and genital photos, and like all - everything is losing in my mind right now.

So I agree that it would be nice to have like a central place you can get information, but I do think as we proceed, and again, that's why we need to talk about are we going to talk about kids?

I mean, there are some very specific privacy concerns related to review of cases and, you know, safety of individuals, and things like that that we, I think, need to be mindful of.

Even for cases that have been adjudicated, we can't - I mean, we need to be thinking about sort of the second and third order of effects here.

So I understand, like, from an expediency perspective, but if we cannot have a

central place that's just ours, then I would really want to make sure that we're very careful.

HON. GRIMM: Well -

BGEN. SCHWENK: Okay, all the information that we're going to get is going to come from somewhere else, right? We're not going to generate it ourselves. So when a Federal Advisory Committee gets information from the outside and it comes from the Government, it's marked.

It's either unmarked, which means it's open to the public and by law, we have to let the public have access to it, so that's that, or it's classified, in which case we can get access to it if we get clearance, and we won't in this Committee need it, but we could get access, but we couldn't let the public see it.

But the other one is for official use only kinds of stuff, the privacy stuff, the medical stuff, the - and that's supposed to be marked by whoever's delivering it to us. So let's say we heard about the Smith case from five

years ago and it was a big deal, and there are a 1 2 lot of lessons learned supposedly, and we asked the Service involved to send us the Smith case. 3 They should send it to us and either 4 say, "Look, this has been released to the public. 5 Everybody has already got it," in which case our 6 7 obligation, regardless of what's in there, is released to the public. 8 9 It's already been out there for them, or they would send us something and say, "This is 10 11 all public and this ain't, and we are denying 12 Freedom of Information Act requests for this 13 information for these reasons," and so then we're 14 obligated to follow that. So we don't have to make those 15 16 decisions. We just have to make sure whoever is 17 providing us the information remembers -18 DR. MARKOWITZ: Okay. 19 BGEN. SCHWENK: - to mark it 20 appropriately before they send it. 21 DR. MARKOWITZ: Great. 22 BGEN. SCHWENK: And then we follow

what they tell us.

HON. WALTON: Can I add something?
Whenever you talk about criminal justice issues,
there's always the elephant in the room that
sometimes people don't want to talk about, and
that's the issue of race.

And I know in the civilian world, there's significant disparity when it comes to race when it comes to conviction rate, when it comes to sentencing, when it comes to charging decisions, and if it's a reality in the civilian world, it has to be a reality also in the military world.

And it's something that we can't hide from, and it's something that needs to be looked at because I would suspect that if it hasn't been looked at, it's just like we have found in the civilian world, that there are problems along those lines.

MS. CANNON: A similar note would be sexual orientation.

MR. KRAMER: Can I ask a logistical

question? When we talk about either a case file or an investigative file, where - are they in an electronic form or hard copy form, and where are they kept? Are they kept at the location or are they in a central repository somewhere also?

CAPT. TIDESWELL: I would argue that typically they are not electronic. I believe a majority of the records would be in a hard copy. If they were investigative files, they probably rest at the various investigative agencies. So for instance, with the Navy, it would be with the Naval Criminal Investigative Service.

Records of trial, I think are based on where they are in the particular court process.

There is sort of an end stop for them where they come to sort of, I'll call it the headquarters for the various Services within the JAG Corps, you know, either at the appellate level, or, you know, there's a repository. Everybody has their own offices if the trial is over at the end of a trial.

And so, but I would argue that a

majority of these documents are not electronic. 1 2 They are in hard copy. And do you have any feel 3 MR. KRAMER: 4 for like an average? Is it like a red wall? 5 it a banker's box? I would argue, sir, 6 CAPT. TIDESWELL: 7 that sexual assault cases are very voluminous. 8 It would take hours to go through. 9 SGT. MARKEY: Madam Chair, then I guess I would ask for some guidance on what would 10 11 be the best logistical process for trying to 12 actually review a case, and I don't just think of written documentation. 13 14 I think of audio, video tapes, photographs, crime scene diagrams, witness 15 16 written statements. I'm sure those are all part 17 of a case file, and I'd love for you to mail me 18 all of those case files. I think your budget 19 would probably go over on that one. 20 So logistically, you know, do we need 21 to think about, how can we actually do that?

I can tell you with the cases that I reviewed, it

took me six months to go through all of these cases, and some were thick. Some were very thin.

I also did review of listening to audio and watching videotapes.

You know, if you want to do a complete and thorough review, it's more than just reading the report. And I'd also charge that we do really need to know what's going on in the field. They are the ones on the front line. They're the ones that are in the trenches. They're the ones that are having to work with these recommendations and work with these changes, and is it working or not?

And that's where I think we'd break down, and I think we would see, you know, is it working? And if it's not, are there other recommendations or other things that we need to look at? And we really present this as we're from the government, we're here to help, right, as opposed to we're going to audit, and we're going to assess, and we're going to evaluate.

I think what we want to present this

as we're really looking for, what do you need to help do your job better and to help serve the victims of sexual violence in the military?

These are no different in communities, in universities and colleges, on Indian reservations. It's all these core set of barriers and concerns and issues that are going on within sexual violence.

So I kind of digress, but I'm thinking of logistically how this group would take a file that's 12-inches thick and do a real good technical review, and then the question is how many of those cases do we do, and what's the sample of cases that we look at?

And so, I think we got to decide logistically how - what that would look like.

And I totally get the privacy and the information in there that, you know, we could have somebody go and redact.

MS. TOKASH: I mean, there are also going to be portions that are going to be sealed, I'm assuming, M.R.E. 513 hearings, genital

photos, psychotherapist/patient records, things like that that we will never have access to.

So this is Meghan Tokash again speaking. You know, there are going to be some portions of cases that we review historically that we'll never have access to because they've been judicially sealed.

DR. MARKOWITZ: If they went that far.

MS. GARVIN: And I would also, while
I know there are processes in place to ensure the
transfer of information, that the person on the
sending end marks things appropriately. I always
have concerns about that, so that the moment it
hits us, it is public, and again with a spotlight
on it that is really problematic.

And so before we say we want a case,

I think we need to have really detailed, through
our future meetings, what do we need? Where does
the anonymizing happen? When does it make its
way here, and how are we sure that we have not
put someone in jeopardy to the best of our
ability by having it here?

1	CHAIR BASHFORD: Could we get some
2	clarification on the FACA rules, I guess?
3	Because clearly when you are doing site visits
4	and you're gathering information, that is not
5	public. It's not open to the public.
6	BGEN. SCHWENK: Right.
7	CHAIR BASHFORD: So if we -
8	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am, the key
9	to that was the subcommittee.
10	CHAIR BASHFORD: Okay.
11	CAPT. TIDESWELL: So if you broke
12	yourselves off, if you so desire, into
13	subcommittees, that would give you perhaps the
14	level of sort of -
15	BGEN. SCHWENK: That's one of the
16	advantages of using subcommittees.
17	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes.
18	CHAIR BASHFORD: Then I think we have
19	to do that for records.
20	(Simultaneous speaking)
21	BGEN. SCHWENK: - but it's not open to
22	the public. You can - now, the subcommittee

doesn't have any authority to do anything except 1 2 one thing, report back to the big Committee. LT. COL. STINGL: And I'll just -3 BGEN. SCHWENK: And that's it. 4 5 the big Committee, so you have to work out what to do next. 6 7 CHAIR BASHFORD: Lieutenant Colonel? 8 LT. COL. STINGL: For reference, I'll 9 just read into - for the definition for subcommittee would be probably useful and 10 11 helpful, "A group, generally not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, that report 12 reports to an Advisory Committee and not directly 13 14 to a Federal officer or agency, whether or not its members are drawn in whole or in part from 15 16 the parent advisory committee." Can I ask another 17 MR. KRAMER: 18 logistical question? I know from MEJA cases that 19 there's a fair number of sexual assault cases or 20 misconduct cases that happen overseas. The cases 21 we saw, is there a feel for how many of those

occurred domestically and how many of them

occurred over - outside of the United States? 1 2 CAPT. TIDESWELL: I do not have that We could see if it's been parsed down 3 feel, sir. 4 within the RAND study. Because I quess there 5 MR. KRAMER: were about 500 general court-martials, right, on 6 7 sexual assault cases, and I'm just curious how 8 many of those were alleged in the United States 9 and how many overseas. 10 CAPT. TIDESWELL: That would be easy 11 to determine if you wanted us to go back and look 12 at the 500. That's a data point we could - we'd 13 just have to look at the charge sheet where the 14 offense occurred. MR. KRAMER: And then did the overseas 15 16 installations, if it's just an allegation and it 17 stopped at the investigative stage, did they -18 they would have a file on that, but it would be 19 in the overseas - on the base or wherever, the

CAPT. TIDESWELL: Or the Headquarters might be tracking that, so in other words, NCIS

installation?

20

21

Headquarters would probably know what's happened 1 2 out in their various field offices. DEAN HARRISON: Do we have any data on 3 4 sexual assault instances where one of the parties was in the military, but that was handled by 5 state and local prosecutors for whatever reason? 6 7 CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir. I believe we would be able to determine that, yes, sir. 8 9 MG. ANDERSON: This may have already 10 come up in our discussion and I may not have been following it, but do we know - I think you were 11 12 kind of going in that direction. 13 Do we know how many people who were 14 victims who elected to leave the military, how many have decided to say, and maybe, as you said, 15 16 maybe have gotten reclassified? 17 But we probably need to look at that 18 as well, and also break that down into restricted 19 and unrestricted. I don't know if you could pull 20 that data, Doctor, but there may be some way to 21 do that.

I don't have any data on

DR. SPOHN:

unrestricted.

CAPT. TIDESWELL: So General, one of the options you all have available is something we all refer to as an RFI, which is a Request for Information, and it's something that the staff would develop based on sort of the answers you were - the information you were looking for, and then we can send it to the various Services just inquiring, "What data do you have? Do you keep it? Do you parse it out?" and you know, just to find what it is you all are looking for, and we typically go through our Service representatives that each Service provides to the panel and give them a timeline, and so we could at least ask the question if you so desire.

MS. CANNON: Off of what Rodney had said about how to go forward, I think that one suggestion of doing this background review to see how we go forward, what do we know? What don't we know? What are our questions?

Before we look at a file and don't know what we're doing with that file, perhaps we

could break down, because we need subcommittees apparently, break down into areas of concern and look at this history.

Put together some questions that we think need to be answered or investigated further under those concerns, because I've written down 11 concerns that have been raised here, and if we have, like, I don't know, four or five that we want to delve into, maybe we'd learn a lot.

CHAIR BASHFORD: When we form a subcommittee, which I understand the process you have to go through, does - is there a specific task or agenda given to the subcommittee or can it change over time?

CAPT. TIDESWELL: Typically, the Chair of the Committee, you all come up with what you expect of the subcommittee, and it's written down, so it's a formal document tasking them with whatever it is you would like them to be tasked with.

BGEN. SCHWENK: But it's internal to the -

1	CAPT. TIDESWELL: It is.
2	BGEN. SCHWENK: -Committee that owns
3	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes.
4	BGEN. SCHWENK: - the Chair.
5	CHAIR BASHFORD: And if the Chair - it
6	could be very broad.
7	BGEN. SCHWENK: So you run that.
8	CAPT. TIDESWELL: And it's flexible,
9	and if, you know, monthly we want to change it,
10	then you just issue another -
11	MS. CANNON: You could just number
12	them.
13	CHAIR BASHFORD: Given the process
14	that needs to go forward, it would seem to be
15	trying to establish a certain number of them,
16	even if we don't have at the moment exactly what
17	they're going to do. It might be helpful to just
18	start the process if the Secretary of Defense has
19	to approve it. Is that like a 48-hour turnaround?
20	LT. COL. STINGL: I guess what would
21	be helpful to you is again, in the definition of
22	subcommittee, and like General Schwenk was great

to point out, if you want to, it's a much easier 1 2 approval process if you just want to form a subcommittee from the parent Advisory Committee, 3 4 because then we're not approving new members. 5 So that's quicker, but of course if you want to add some subcommittee members, yes, 6 7 they have to go through the whole approval 8 process like you all did to be appointed as well, 9 so that would take a bit more time. Although you all did your 10 LTC. LEWIS: 11 approval period in record time. 12 LT. COL. STINGL: This is true. This 13 is very true. 14 MR. KRAMER: Well, one of the reasons these other committees, they were much smaller, 15 16 so they needed outside people on their 17 subcommittees. I guess we have to figure out 18 whether we can staff the subcommittees ourselves. 19 BGEN. SCHWENK: Do it ourselves with 20 what we have. MR. KRAMER: Yeah, there's 16 of us. 21 22 The other biggest one, I think, was nine, right,

and one was five, so I think -

CHAIR BASHFORD: Well, 16 divides into four very nicely. It would seem to me that if we could set up four with a very broad agenda, because I take what Judge Brisbois said to heart, that you can't know what you're going to do until you don't know what you don't know, although he said it much more eloquently.

But if we got that approval process, we would then have a vehicle by which we could, when it's time to do so, actually look at cases.

CMSAF. McKINLEY: You know, another side thing that, when you talk about sexual assault and rape, a side effect of all of this is what it does to our national security interests. And many of you know about cases in Okinawa where we've raped, you know, there have been rape cases military against civilian in another country, Korea, and I could name several other countries.

And now, you know, very possibly, we may have to move out of those countries or, you know, change our agreements with them. So the

1	impact of military sexual assault is not just,
2	you know, on that local base or whatever. It's a
3	national security issue.
4	MS. LONG: I guess I would just say I
5	agree with forming the subcommittees, but I've
6	been listening to the concerns, but is there a
7	way to form the subcommittees, but to just get
8	some consensus around the concerns to make sure
9	that they're organized right before they get
10	assigned to a committee? I guess, Martha, I'm
11	asking you because you're the Chair, before we
12	commit to -
13	CHAIR BASHFORD: Is our membership
14	fluid as long as it's within the committee
15	itself? Can we change subcommittees?
16	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am.
17	LT. COL. STINGL: Yes, ma'am.
18	CHAIR BASHFORD: So I wouldn't be that
19	concerned about it yet -
20	MS. LONG: Okay.
21	CHAIR BASHFORD: - because -
22	MS. LONG: Okay.

I would just like to 1 CHAIR BASHFORD: 2 get the legal authority to be able when necessary to get cases to review, and then as we decide 3 4 that maybe we want to look at an investigation 5 here, or maybe we want to look at different things here, we can, I think then we could -6 7 MS. LONG: That's all I meant. CHAIR BASHFORD: - just change it. 8 Yeah, just -9 MS. LONG: The less we have to 10 CHAIR BASHFORD: 11 decide right today, I think the better. 12 MS. LONG: Perfect, yeah. 13 MS. CANNON: It seemed that the 14 documentation that was generated by the other panels was pretty voluminous, and it would be 15 16 good if we could kind of break that down into 17 different areas of interest, some people looking 18 into one thing, some people looking into others. 19 There have been different things 20 raised here, and then coming back with the 21 suggestions in those areas. Otherwise, we're all

reading everything, and I'm not sure if that's as

helpful. So I would suggest that we maybe break it down into three areas or something.

CHAIR BASHFORD: The only problem I see with that since I don't know what it is, is like how do we - I think we sort of have to take a high altitude look at it and then break it down.

MS. CANNON: Okay.

CHAIR BASHFORD: It's just hard to say, "Let's have a group look at this part of it," since I don't know what it is.

MS. CANNON: Okay.

CHAIR BASHFORD: Unless somebody is much more familiar with it.

thinking off the top of my head. If we're going to start by reviewing what's already there so we can get to wrap our - one subcommittee might start by being the RSP subcommittee, and their job is go through all of the RSP data, all of their reports, all of everything, and make sense out of it all in a condensed version to brief the rest of us that are not on that subcommittee.

Another one does that for the JPP.

Another one does that for other data that's available. You know, go to the Services and see what's there starting from the beginning to the end, and so they can come and say, "This is what - and you're never going to get this," or, "They don't collect that," or - so when we got back together as the big Committee, at least we'd have those in for us all to look at and start analyzing.

And if the subcommittee wrote little summary reports, they could send those out to everybody before we showed up, like the read-ahead, which would give us a chance to read it a week ahead of time, and think about it, and come here ready to discuss how we want to then proceed based on what they've done in the past.

SGT. MARKEY: Madam Chair?

CHAIR BASHFORD: Well, it's better than reading it all.

SGT. MARKEY: I was going to say are there not in some ways executive summaries, I'll

1	call them that, with those subcommittees already
2	that they've compiled? Do we know?
3	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Each of the reports,
4	the first couple of pages is literally the
5	executive summary of the findings and
6	recommendations.
7	SGT. MARKEY: Yeah, but I'm wondering
8	how comprehensive that is compared to if we were
9	to go through it, we'd find other things, okay.
10	BGEN. SCHWENK: It's like any
11	executive summary. It's good for most reasons,
12	but not if you really care about what's in it.
13	SGT. MARKEY: Okay, okay.
14	DR. SPOHN: It's just going to be the
15	highlights.
16	SGT. MARKEY: Okay.
17	MS. CANNON: I move to what he said.
18	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes, I think the
19	executive summary is not going to be sufficient
20	for our purposes.
21	SGT. MARKEY: Okay.
22	BGEN. SCHWENK: I mean, it is a good

start, but I think we want more.

DR. MARKOWITZ: The other question I have is have we taken a look at what the scientific literature has to say about experiences with sexual violence in the military in terms of, I mean, there have been some - I mean, there is a body of research that's out there that looks at, you know, obviously the short and long-term consequences health-wise and things like that, but there are also some studies that take a look at, you know, decisions around reporting, and involvement with the justice system, and that sort of thing, and has anybody taken a look at that so that we have that literature also available to us to -

I mean, it's wonderful to have RAND and have the internal stuff, but there is some publications within the peer reviewed literature, the scientific literature.

CHAIR BASHFORD: That are specific to the military?

DR. MARKOWITZ: That is specific to

the military. I'm familiar with all of the stuff 1 2 from the healthcare side of things, but I know that there is other stuff as well because, you 3 4 know, I mean, we've turned to that in terms of curriculum writing and whatnot. 5 So I do think that if we're going to 6 7 take a look at the literature and the statistics, we probably do need to look at the stuff that's 8 9 been published, you know, externally as well. BGEN. SCHWENK: Which, if we had a 10 subcommittee for the RFP, the JPP, and internal 11 12 DOD information, the fourth one could be external information -13 14 SGT. MARKEY: External, yeah. BGEN. SCHWENK: - Bureau of Justice 15 16 statistics, what's available there, you know, so 17 that we had a listing, and when we got back 18 together, we could say, "Yeah, number six on that 19 list, number," you know. That's what we need to 20 have. 21 SGT. MARKEY: Yeah.

HON. BRISBOIS: I'm still a little bit

at a loss for in order to put parameters around those reports, how do you identify the relevant material to report back without a clear definition of what as a group we have decided our charter is going to be? We'll end up making decisions. The different parameter set will have four different charter decisions without a unified one.

So, I mean, it seems to me our - we had five years to work on this, and the next six months, certainly the next quarter before the next meeting, the real meat and potatoes of what we should be doing ought to be to define that specific part.

"Review cases," what does that mean, and then how much of that broader authority do we want to exercise, and how? Without that, we're all going to be coming up with different priorities and different relevant reporting, and we won't be meshing.

So I'm seeing some inefficiencies in just going out and gathering data with

preliminary reports without that threshold being 1 2 clearly established. My understanding, and 3 CHAIR BASHFORD: maybe I'm wrong, is that this would not be to in 4 any way define our task, but just to have a 5 better understanding of what has preceded us. 6 HON. BRISBOIS: But everybody's going 7 8 to be making relevancy determinations on what to 9 include in their reports based on what they think the priority of the Committee as a whole is going 10 to be, and so, you know, each Committee is going 11 12 to be making different priority decisions. And then once, if we wait until after 13 14 the subcommittee work to come up with a unified mission statement for ourselves, some of that 15 16 subcommittee work is going to have to be redone 17 because the priorities will shift. 18 BGEN. SCHWENK: Which may be happening 19 for five years. 20 HON. BRISBOIS: Well, certainly. 21 BGEN. SCHWENK: You know, as we refocus from one thing to another. 22

But those shifts then 1 HON. BRISBOIS: 2 are efficient shifts because we're redefining saying that our original foundation needs to be 3 tweaked for a legitimate reason. You know, in 4 5 this case, we're saying, "Well, we didn't really have a foundational idea or a goal, you know, and 6 so here are all of our reports." 7 Now we get a foundation and it turns 8 9 out that we were wrong about what to report on, we've got to go back and redo that work. 10 11 see sort of a cart and a horse problem right now. 12 BGEN. SCHWENK: Well, you could use my 13 definition that everything is relevant. 14 HON. BRISBOIS: Well, but -15 BGEN. SCHWENK: I have this really 16 broad -17 (Simultaneous speaking) 18 HON. BRISBOIS: And that gives us the 19 flexibility in the second part of the mission 20 statement that we develop to pick the things that 21 we want to talk about, racial disparities, 22 enlisted versus officer disparities, overseas,

you know, versus domestic disparities, you know, and prioritize those things in a way that those important issues of our own identification fall into that broad language.

But until we decide those fundamental foundational goals, then we don't have anything to make our relevancy determinations on as we're looking at source data.

DR. SPOHN: I tend to agree because there are some foundational issues that will really determine even just looking at data or looking at prior research. For example, if we're going to include children, there's a whole different literature out there on prosecution and investigation of child sexual assault.

HON. BRISBOIS: And some of those general courts-martial are going to be child sexual assault.

DR. SPOHN: Right, and if we're going to - I mean, it seems like everyone is in agreement that we should start with an allegation of a sexual assault, but what does sexual assault

mean? Are we going to only include the penetrative offenses, or are we going to include the contact offenses as well? So it does seem that there are some sort of foundational questions that we need to answer about what a case is if we're going to do case review.

DR. MARKOWITZ: So I'll just go ahead and sort of step into the fray. I personally don't think we should tackle children.

BGEN. SCHWENK: It's an undertaking.

DR. MARKOWITZ: Yeah, I think that this is a - I think that the services provided to children are very, very different. I think that there are ethics and privacy issues related to looking at child victims that may be more than we want to tackle.

So I just, that would be my personal preference. I can be talked around on that, but I just put that out there that if we want to try to keep things, you know, pretty straightforward in terms of where we've been and where we're moving forward, it may be easiest to keep it

focused on adult victims.

HON. GRIMM: Did the earlier ones differentiate? Because I think I agree with you that we could always move to that once we get our arms around the one that is the most - what was the focus of the other two studies first.

DR. MARKOWITZ: The previous ones were both adults.

HON. GRIMM: So it seems like that's not a bad starting place, and then that might take us -

MS. GARVIN: Right, I would just want to make sure that we're not precluding it downstream.

DR. MARKOWITZ: Yes.

MS. GARVIN: Because I actually have a strong opinion we should go there, but not first, because the research to date - the work to date has been in adult, but so many other processes being put in place, including the SVC and VLC are now representing kids, and so if we're going to start evaluating that intervention

at some point, we need to also look there.

DR. MARKOWITZ: Yeah, I agree, going forward, I absolutely 100 percent agree.

HON. GRIMM: Yeah, to start.

DR. MARKOWITZ: We need to start - it just seems like if we need to sort of focus ourselves, that we leave kids off the table until we really have a handle on the processes for safeguarding privacy and all of that kind of thing.

at this point, and it seems to me that the biggest concern I've heard expressed around the table is that people should be able to serve in the military without being sexually assaulted, which doesn't mean we can't ever get to the issue of children, but if the big focus is how do we prevent this, and how do we keep military cohesiveness, and a path forward, and just results, we're really looking at adults.

That's not to say we're not going to look at also members of the Service who are doing

domestic violence, sexual assaults on civilian 1 2 spouses, but the bulk of this should be how can we keep people in the Service without being 3 sexually assaulted? 4 5 MS. LONG: Well, I wanted - I have a differing opinion because I think adults who are 6 out of the Service should also be included 7 8 because of the victimization. And because of 9 what we know about reporting and perpetration, I'm not sure that the people perpetrating against 10 the non-military are not also perpetrating 11 against military, but we're not hearing it. 12 13 CHAIR BASHFORD: I just didn't follow 14 you, adults who are not in Service? MS. LONG: Who are not in Service. 15 when you were saying - so looking at the victim 16 17 pool that we're looking at -18 CHAIR BASHFORD: Right. 19 MS. LONG: - not only military, but 20 also other civilians who are victims, just to 21 make sure that they're included in the original 22 pot, okay.

DR. MARKOWITZ: My sense is that as we delve into the issues related to adults, that will really help us sort of focus up our questions about how things may differ with children or, you know, where the gaps are there and things like that, so.

HON. WALTON: But when you say "adult victim" though, you're saying adult victims who have some association with the military or any adult? Because aren't those who are non-military dealt with in the civilian world?

DR. MARKOWITZ: Not necessarily, no.

example. I know cases where, you know, the military member is deployed. The spouse is home living in base housing, and she is sexually assaulted by another military member on base in her own house, and that stuff happens, but that is on a military installation, a military member on a civilian. You know, so those are things I think we should look that.

CHAIR BASHFORD: And those reports

1	would be handled -
2	CMSAF. McKINLEY: Though the military.
3	CHAIR BASHFORD: - simultaneously with
4	the civilian prosecution or just in -
5	CMSAF. McKINLEY: No.
6	CHAIR BASHFORD: - courts-martial?
7	CMSAF. McKINLEY: That would go
8	through court-martial.
9	HON. GRIMM: So it would be in the
10	data pool that we're looking at?
11	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.
12	DR. SPOHN: In the data from 2012 to
13	2014, a quarter of the victims were civilians.
14	HON. GRIMM: Yes.
15	CHAIR BASHFORD: A quarter?
16	DR. SPOHN: Yes.
17	BGEN. SCHWENK: You know, I sort of
18	agree with Leo's point about we do need to get a
19	focus on this, but I guess my thought was that we
20	don't all know enough yet to be able to really do
21	a focus. So I think he's absolutely right that
22	we need to give ourselves a focus.

I just thought that if we gathered up the RFP, JPP data stuff, and we each had, as whatever subcommittee we were on, dig into it and think about things in the big picture, and read reports, when we got together the next time, it would be a lot easier to go directly to what he said which is, "All right, now that we have our feet wet and we know some things, more than we did three months ago or whatever the time difference is, what are we going to focus on? What is going to be the parameters we're going to go after for this year?" and then - so I guess I do agree with you. I was just trying to give us a chance to get our feet wet first, and you'd rather -

HON. BRISBOIS: But I think -

BGEN. SCHWENK: - analyze it first.

HON. BRISBOIS: - Judge Grimm's point of having a central place where we can review that source data, the RFP and JPP report, and the RSP report, I mean, you know, that gives us all three months to do that when we can do it with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the number one agenda topic for the next 1 2 quarterly meeting being finalized. You know, enabling legislation gives 3 us a lot of discretion. 4 So at the next meeting, 5 we exercise that and say, "This is what we're going to do for the next four-and-a-half years, 6 7 four-and-three-quarter years." 8 BGEN. SCHWENK: Or even one year. 9 HON. BRISBOIS: Or one year. 10 CHAIR BASHFORD: I mean, I think it's 11 preferable if all of us start out with the same 12 knowledge base. 13 BGEN. SCHWENK: I agree. 14 CHAIR BASHFORD: The only question is is it feasible that we can all get through those 15 16 two, what there is out there on JPP and the Joint 17 Response Systems. If it's feasible, I think that 18 would be preferable that we have all looked at 19 it. 20 HON. BRISBOIS: I mean, if we have 21 three months to do that background work, that 22 seems to me, you know, feasible. I mean, we

don't - you know, how deeply into the source
data, but - and beyond the executive summary, but
into the report itself. I think I can get
through two reports in three months.

percent. I just thought there was a value added to the discussion, to the exchange of ideas which you can't get if you're not in a meeting. Even if we do phone calls, you know, we can conference the meetings where you talk about the data, but I do better -

I mean, I can read, but I don't assimilate as well as when I hear somebody else who read the same thing and said, "I can get that out of that," or, "What about this?" and I didn't even think of that issue.

I don't know, so that's why I thought start earlier with the subcommittee meetings rather than later, but I certainly agree with you that in three months, most of us ought to be able to get through the bulk of that stuff and have some good ideas for when we come back.

1	CHAIR BASHFORD: If we all start with
2	the same knowledge base, I think that's
3	preferable. I think we're very uneven right now,
4	and mostly that has to do with the
5	military/non-military experience, so if we could
6	all look at that, I think that's better. We're
7	almost out of our time for this meeting. Is
8	there a way to upload those that we could all
9	have access to them?
10	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am. From
11	what I'm hearing, a lot of what you want is open
12	source at this point, right?
13	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.
14	CAPT. TIDESWELL: The reports and - so
15	there would be no reason why we -
16	BGEN. SCHWENK: Is there links to the
17	RSP website and a link to the JPP website?
18	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Or we can consolidate
19	it all in one place for you on the DAC-IPAD
20	website.
21	BGEN. SCHWENK: Or whatever, yeah.
22	CAPT. TIDESWELL: That could go live

in a day.

HON. BRISBOIS: In effect, that's what

I was - if you could consolidate it for us
CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir.

HON. BRISBOIS: Because I know if I had to go find it on my own, my calendar is not going to allow me to be there plunking away on the internet, and not between motion hearings and conferences, and, you know, occasionally a trial. I do get one once in a while.

But, you know, being able to go right to the source that you put together and read what I have time to read, that's what I need.

CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir, and it would be beneficial for the public. They would also have the same access and they could see what you all are looking at.

CMSAF. McKINLEY: May I make a suggestion? I'm on another board with several professors from major colleges and no military experience, and we learned that they were, you know, overblown with all of the acronyms we use

1	in the military, and we sent them a list of
2	familiar acronyms.
3	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir.
4	CMSAF. McKINLEY: So it might be a
5	good idea for the non-military members just to
6	get a list.
7	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir.
8	DEAN HARRISON: I have a question
9	about FACA. Are we prohibited from, for example,
10	if I had a question about something and if I
11	called Mr. Kramer to discuss, I can't do that?
12	LT. COL. STINGL: No.
13	DEAN HARRISON: Okay.
14	LT. COL. STINGL: Not at this point.
15	DEAN HARRISON: Okay, I could call you
16	guys. Okay, and you could call them.
17	CHAIR BASHFORD: Also, I thought I
18	heard in the ethics lecture that when we email
19	each other, that's public record, is that
20	correct?
21	BGEN. SCHWENK: You can't
22	substantively if it's communication.

1	CHAIR BASHFORD: I just wanted -
2	BGEN. SCHWENK: And that - you know,
3	the Committee's at risk if we start breaking
4	rules and going around the corner, so, you know,
5	you just can't talk to one another until we get
6	back here at some kind of a meeting, but we can
7	talk to the staff.
8	MS. GARVIN: But the Advisory Committee
9	is good?
LO	CHAIR BASHFORD: Subcommittee.
L1	BGEN. SCHWENK: Subcommittee, yeah,
L2	it's a different world.
L3	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Chair Bashford, it's
L 4	unfortunately that the FACA brief was not given
L5	today, and so we can either wait until the next
L6	meeting - I think what I'm hearing is a quarterly
L7	meeting in several months.
L8	CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes.
L9	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Or there's an option
20	where we could try and do it over the telephone
21	where we gather, because that's more
22	administrative in nature, if that would be

1	beneficial, so you can sort of proceed with your
2	work.
3	CHAIR BASHFORD: I think that would be
4	helpful.
5	CAPT. TIDESWELL: So we can send
6	something.
7	CHAIR BASHFORD: We've been peppering
8	you with those questions.
9	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am.
10	BGEN. SCHWENK: Are you going to send
11	an email out with proposed dates?
12	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir, I will.
13	CHAIR BASHFORD: So we're going to get
14	email addresses and telephone numbers, but we
15	won't use those to contact people until we have
16	broken up into subcommittees. I think this has
17	been very useful. I think it's great to meet
18	everybody in person. I think we're supposed to
19	stop in five minutes.
20	My sense is that what we will do is
21	just review the open source data from the two
22	prior Committees, and then when we reconvene,

we'll discuss that, see what gaps there are or 1 2 where that wants to launch us in the future, because we have an extraordinary, extraordinarily 3 4 broad scope of work. 5 HON. GRIMM: And the source material will be consolidated to a website or a link that 6 7 you will send to us that we can then go to, as 8 Leo says, when we have that time available? 9 CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, sir, and just to 10 manage expectations, we all do have off tomorrow. Because of the inauguration, it's going to be 11 12 very difficult to move about the city, so we'll 13 hit it hard first thing Monday morning. 14 BGEN. SCHWENK: What are you doing Saturday? 15 Thanks, General. 16 CAPT. TIDESWELL: 17 BGEN. SCHWENK: I'll meet you in 18 church. 19 MR. KRAMER: And we've heard lots of 20 valid problems with this, but it does say, "for purposes of providing advice, shall review on an 21 ongoing basis cases involving allegations." 22

think we ought to think for the next three months about how we could possibly go about that given all of the privacy.

I mean, there are so many concerns, but that's our main, that's our specific charter in addition to the general one, so I think we ought to think about that.

SGT. MARKEY: And I second that, Mr. Kramer. I really think we need to define, you know, which cases are we going to look at? I mean, are we going to look at a time frame? Are we going to look at the geographical location? How are we going to assess those investigations?

Are we going to do it from the point of where they were charged going through the court-martial, or is it the prior investigation where there was a disclosure and an investigation was stopped, and identify and designate which are those cases? How much information are we going to view?

And then I'm more than happy and willing to share my assessment and review

process, and this is strictly from an investigative standpoint of what I did and how I continue to review sexual assault investigations, the data metrics that I collect, and what I do with that data, and how I actually have built an online - not an online, it's a web-based system for gathering that data and I can pull it out.

I can also share the metrics that I used to review these cases. It may be a little bit different, but it might be a starting point for us to take a look at it say, "Okay, if we're going to review these cases from an investigative standpoint, and not from the prosecution or the court-martial, you know, what are the things we want to look at?"

You know, and I've defined, you know, the biographical basic information, and that can be everything standard you see in a report, and then victim interaction, what would that look like, investigative follow-up, what did that look like, evidentiary follow-up, what did that look like, and then do an overall case assessment.

I actually, believe it or not, I 1 2 actually put a process together to do that, and so far it's been okay, and I'm willing to share 3 4 that information with anybody that would like to, again, that would be on the investigative process 5 review. 6 7 MR. KRAMER: Not until we get into subcommittees. 8 9 MS. LONG: Right, I think your attrition studies, people should read because we 10 used them all the time, well, like the ones that 11 12 were replicated. DR. SPOHN: 13 From Los Angeles? 14 MS. LONG: From Los Angeles or others. Just to look at what you looked at, I think it's 15 16 really instructive. 17 CHAIR BASHFORD: We should also in the 18 next few months start thinking to follow-up on 19 A.J.'s suggestion, how are we going to review a 20 Because even the ones where charges were 21 preferred, that's 790. I don't think we can

22

logistically do that.

We've got to figure out a way to get a sample, and of the ones where charges weren't preferred, and if we can get to some sort of sense of the restricted, at least the numbers. How are we going to get a representative sample? Because I'm always wary when people pick. It's better to figure out some other way. So if we could start thinking about what we want to do during our adjourned time -

BGEN. SCHWENK: So we have two agenda items next time. What are we going to do for this year, and how are we going to do a case review?

CHAIR BASHFORD: Exactly.

DR. SPOHN: And just for logistics, are we meeting again in person in two or three months?

CHAIR BASHFORD: I believe we should meet in person in about three months. I think more than quarterly is logistically hard for people. Most of us, perhaps not Sergeant Markey, have day jobs still. He's retired.

1	HON. BRISBOIS: He's got a 24/7 job.
2	SGT. MARKEY: Watching you is my job.
3	CHAIR BASHFORD: And I think less than
4	quarterly is - things just sort of flitter away.
5	So if that's the consensus, that would be my
6	recommendation.
7	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Ms. Bashford, are
8	you all comfortable with coming back to
9	Washington, D.C.?
10	DEAN HARRISON: For now.
11	CHAIR BASHFORD: For now. I think we
12	should at some point decide if, you know, for the
13	convenience of the members, if a different site
14	at some point might be appropriate, and as we
15	have subcommittees, I do think site visits are
16	important.
17	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am.
18	HON. BRISBOIS: Or even of the
19	Committee as a whole, eventually going other
20	places lends access and credibility.
21	CHAIR BASHFORD: Right.
22	HON. BRISBOIS: But that's, again,

1	later this year or next year.
2	CHAIR BASHFORD: Baby steps first.
3	HON. BRISBOIS: Yes.
4	CAPT. TIDESWELL: And Ms. Bashford,
5	the only other thing I would raise is there is a
6	report due on the 30th of March, the bylaw. We,
7	as the staff, will go ahead and draft the
8	recommendation for you. It can be just very
9	basic, you know, what's occurred today, sort of
10	what the way ahead is as we know it so far.
11	And ma'am, I'll send that to you, and
12	then at some point we'll have to send it out to
13	all of the members individually because you all
14	are not allowed to deliberate, but you're allowed
15	to come back to me one at a time to get your
16	concurrence on that, and that's what will be
17	submitted as the report.
18	CHAIR BASHFORD: You have a lot of
19	track changes.
20	CAPT. TIDESWELL: Yes, ma'am.
21	BGEN. SCHWENK: That's the report in
22	March of what we did last year? It shouldn't be

1	hard.
2	CHAIR BASHFORD: I think we've got to
3	conclude this meeting.
4	LT. COL. STINGL: Ma'am, did I hear
5	you close the meeting?
6	CHAIR BASHFORD: I'm closing the
7	meeting at 3:43.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
9	went off the record at 3:43 p.m. and resumed at
10	3:34 p.m.)
11	CHAIR BASHFORD: I understand there is
12	a request for public comment.
13	MR. CHRISTENSEN: That is correct.
14	CHAIR BASHFORD: And we would be happy
15	to hear from you.
16	MG. ANDERSON: And I apologize, Madam
17	Chairwoman. I thought you be - just it's on the
18	schedule, so I thought that would be next on the
19	agenda.
20	CHAIR BASHFORD: Could you just tell
21	us who you are, sir?
22	MR. CHRISTENSEN: Sure, I know some of

you, but most of you I do not know. I am Don Christensen, Colonel United States Air Force, retired. I served 23-and-a-half years in the Air Force, all of it as a judge advocate. I have served as an area defense counsel, a circuit defense counsel, which is the defense counsel for the civilians, as a chief circuit trial counsel in Europe, which is like a chief prosecutor here.

I have served as a staff judge advocate, both in the United States and a deployed location. I have served as a military judge for two years, and I have served my last four years as the chief prosecutor for the Air Force, and I also was the chief of the appellate division for the United States Air Force for the government side.

I am currently president of Protect
Our Defenders, which is an organization dedicated
to reforming military justice, and we also
advocate for survivors of sexual assault.

So my comments, briefly, I was very excited to hear the questions that were going on.

I had seen the briefings earlier. But one thing I wanted to clear up before you started on your deliberations and left was just a few factual things that I thought could be cleared up, and then give you what I think is something very important for you to consider as you start your deliberation over the next five years.

First, I've heard a lot of people talk about the RAND survey. The RAND survey was a one-time survey that occurred in 2014. Before that, the surveys were done by the Department of Defense, and now they're back to the Department of Defense by the DMDC, which stands for the Defense Manpower Data Center, so it's an internal survey again.

every time they do the survey. It occurs every two years. It's not an annual survey. In 2010, the numbers were 20,000. In 2012, they were 26,000. In 2014, they were 20,500 more or less. That includes sexual assault and rape, referred to as rape, sexual assault and rape.

You will hear people discount these numbers by saying it could be somebody looking at you wrong or sexual harassment. No, it is a sexual offense by definition under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, so those are sexual assaults.

about the RAND survey is it's only of active duty military members. It does not count or in any way catch up civilian victims, or DoD dependent victims, or DoD civilian employee victims, so it only is that group. It's what I call the soft numbers because it's a survey.

Every year, we get hard numbers from SAPRO. They give us the exact number of sexual assault allegations, both restricted and unrestricted, how many of those resulted in preferral charges, how many of those resulted in referral charges, and how many of those resulted in a conviction for a sexual offense.

The current numbers on that, okay, so the most recent numbers or the fiscal year '15

numbers, those were about 4,200 unrestricted reported, about 1,400 or so restricted reports.

Of those 4,200 or so unrestricted reports, 918, I believe is the exact number, have referral of charges for a sexual assault offense.

Of those 918, about 189 were disposed of by what we call an administrative discharge in lieu of court-martial. That's for an officer and enlisted. About 550 actually went to trial, and 255 resulted in a conviction for a sex offense.

The military will often inflate the sex offense conviction number by - so we have somebody who's charged with rape and underage drinking, gets acquitted of rape, gets convicted of underage drinking, they will count that as a conviction, but the actual numbers of sex assault convictions, 255 out of the potential 20,000 plus civilians.

There has been questions about how civilians have jurisdiction. Civilian - so the United States military has jurisdiction over every offense committed by every military member

who is active duty anywhere in the world, so it doesn't matter. They have jurisdiction. That jurisdiction is almost always shared with some other entity, whether it's overseas or here. The United States military's policy is to maximize jurisdiction.

So there has been a lot of question about if the offense occurred off base, civilians will handle it. Sometimes they do, but the military will always try to get jurisdiction. So as somebody said, about 20 percent of the cases last year involved a civilian victim.

All right, and then I'm just about done with the numbers, and then what I want to get to.

Somebody asked about, I believe it was the Chief asked about how many civilians or how many victims leave after they report? DoD did an IG report that came out last year that I would encourage you to read dealing with retaliation and that subject, and one-third of victims, active duty victims are discharged within a year

of reporting, typically within seven months of reporting the offense, so that's from the DoD numbers.

I recommend you look at two reports by the Human Rights Watch who did very detailed reports on retaliation in the military and the impact on survivors of sexual assault after report.

Finally, then I'll get to what I have to say, the role of the commander will come up, and one thing I would like to encourage for many of you who are not military members, there is often a, from all sides of this debate, a muddying of the waters to what it means to be a convening authority versus commander.

The United States military has 15,000 commanders throughout all of their Services. Of those 15,000, about 480 are general court-martial convening authorities, the people who have the authority to send a sexual assault case to trial.

Of those 480, about 148, the last year we have numbers available, which I believe was

2014, actually referred a case to trial, so 99.9 percent of the commanders do not send cases to general courts-martial, just so you know.

all right, my thing that I want you to understand as you go forward, and I hear this debate, and I know you're trying to decide what you are really looking at, for me as someone who has served almost exclusively in military justice for 23-plus years, what is the problem? Well, I have issues with command. I'm not going to talk about that because that's what you're looking at.

What is the issue that's facing the military to keep them from really getting a handle on this? That is experience, experience with investigators, experience with prosecutors, experience with defense counsel. The military has a - the JAG Corps has, and investigative services, have this view of generalists when it comes to their attorneys.

So for example, in the Air Force which

I'm most experienced with, there is a very big

push to get you out of litigation after your

first assignment and you may never see it again.

Very few of us got to litigate for very long.

And what I would tell you is that these cases are too serious, too complex, too detailed to have young captains serving as lead prosecutors, the same with our investigators.

The investigation experience you have would almost be the entirety of the OSI. The years that you have sums up their experience.

As a prosecutor, I cannot tell you how many times that the investigator I was dealing with, the lead investigator on the case, a serious case, a murder case, a child abuse case, child pornography case, rape case, that was the first time they served as a lead investigator, and it was the last time they served as a lead investigator because they were moved onto something else.

Within the investigative world,
especially in the Air Force, what they want to
get them into is counterintelligence, and that's
where they send them, and so the reality of it is

you have really talented, dedicated 1 2 investigators, defense counsel, and prosecutors who are not allowed to specialize in it. 3 4 Specialization is what I would 5 encourage you to look at, and I guarantee you'll get push back from the Services on that, but I 6 7 would just ask you to have an open mind and 8 understand that if we always did what the 9 Services said, we still wouldn't have judges. We still wouldn't have appellate 10 courts. We still wouldn't have individual -11 12 excuse me, independent defense counsel in the 13 military because every one of those things, the 14 Services didn't want. So good luck. 15 CHAIR BASHFORD: Thank you. 16 LT. COL. STINGL: Madam Chair, is it 17 your desire to readjourn the meeting at this 18 point? 19 CHAIR BASHFORD: Yes, I am readjourning 20 the meeting at 3:54. 21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 22 went off the record at 3:54 p.m.)

acquittals 184:18 185:2 adjudges 47:22 advocating 81:18 Α adjudicated 160:3 acquitted 25:18 26:14 **affect** 206:4 A.J 1:17 affirmed 24:1 289:14 235:18 A.J.'s 281:19 acronyms 178:1 274:22 adjudication 126:8 afraid 140:18,21 a.m 1:12 4:2 101:13 275:2 155:20 157:7 168:15 afternoon 15:19 154:18 abbreviated 10:17 act 4:17,19,21 5:3 7:19 170:5 155:2 ability 98:19 134:6 13:15 14:16 23:15,16 administration 161:11 afterward 222:19 144:12.14 147:6 23:20 32:22 33:2,5 170:4 age 218:16 234:4 243:22 35:16 36:14 42:21 administrative 6:5.7 agencies 239:10 able 35:4 64:4 89:7 49:22 50:4,10 52:16 17:17 44:16 73:14,22 agency 147:18 211:3 99:21 183:10 195:7 75:14 104:10 105:6 276:22 289:7 234:13 245:14 198:21 203:18 212:10 105:11 106:4 110:1 administratively 44:12 agenda 6:4,10,20 212:20 217:11,13 111:1 114:19 117:6 Admiral 76:2,10,14 154:19 232:12 249:13 221:17 247:8 254:2 119:5 120:21 122:22 77:16,18 252:4 271:1 282:10 266:14 269:20 272:20 123:1,17 124:5,17,21 admit 205:2 285:19 274:11 125:7 128:15,17 adopt 45:20,22 164:15 **Agent** 78:21 above-entitled 101:12 129:14 130:14 131:10 206:8 aggravation 229:12 177:11 285:8 294:21 133:15 144:17 152:12 adopted 79:20 175:4 ago 64:1 71:20 102:7 absence 95:20 96:7 208:21 234:7 237:12 adult 3:12 9:7 13:19 109:16 222:12 237:1 149:5 245:12 155:11 156:15 167:9 270:9 absolute 96:16 action 121:7 146:16 170:6 171:17,19 agree 95:10 96:22 97:1 absolutely 138:12 167:13 168:21 205:10 201:22 202:5 224:11 130:21 131:6,13 153:8 230:20 266:3 205:11,12 224:14 265:1,19 181:12 188:13 207:2 269:21 actions 62:8 268:7,8,10 210:5 211:15,20 **abuse** 202:4 293:13 active 19:15 20:1 21:17 adults 265:8 266:20 212:8 219:8 221:4 academia 158:15 21:19 22:14.18 24:19 267:6.14 268:2 235:9 253:5 263:9 Academies 115:21 73:1 111:14 149:11 advancement 215:4 265:3 266:2.3.11 116:6,9 149:16 160:21 169:12 advantage 88:7 217:17 269:18 270:13 271:13 **Academy** 81:1 83:2 199:1 288:8 290:1,22 advantages 244:16 272:5,19 accept 230:4 activity 155:22 advent 30:7 203:12 agreed 85:14 114:2 accepted 166:2 acts 12:7 97:21 adversarial 47:17 48:8 227:11,15 access 15:7 100:20 agreeing 229:18 actual 44:5 70:21,22 48:12 227:4 141:21 150:20 190:10 71:22 172:21 217:11 advice 11:6,8 17:2 agreement 130:17,22 190:17 223:4 233:8,9 221:18 230:7 289:16 75:20 76:11,16 83:1 131:17 227:15 228:2 233:15,22 234:4 adapted 131:3 90:14,17 128:19 228:3,5,6 263:21 236:13,14,16 243:2,6 add 12:1 209:20 211:22 209:22 234:16 278:21 agreement's 229:8 273:9 274:16 283:20 229:16 238:2 251:6 advisability 124:2 agreements 95:2 accessible 5:8 added 170:11 272:6 advise 7:20 220:4 130:10,12 131:7 accompanied 229:9 addition 89:6 279:6 advised 83:2 226:17 252:22 accompanying 22:22 additional 73:18 161:1 advising 188:20 ah 26:6 23:3 161:2 219:10,13 **advisor** 11:7 215:1 ahead 6:17 12:12 18:2 accomplishments additionally 159:4 advisors 214:21 32:15 36:9 38:22 94:2 133:12 advisory 1:3 4:5,20 5:2 address 116:19 136:12 201:7 232:14 256:15 account 65:16 67:15 142:14 156:4 5:3 7:10 9:4 11:20 264:7 284:7,10 accountability 108:17 addressed 162:8 12:4,14 155:6,10 ain't 237:11 165:10 addresses 277:14 air 2:15 13:7,16 21:16 208:21 234:7,11,15 accountable 149:12 addressing 105:7 124:1 236:8 245:12,13,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 accused 20:21 28:1 136:21,22 251:3 276:8 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 80:12 90:5 95:8 97:20 adds 128:15 **advocacy** 140:19 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 98:4,5,6 104:21 121:8 adequacy 162:3 155:18 157:8 158:15 152:20 181:1 208:3 131:13 132:15 165:17 adequate 16:3 234:3 172:13 286:2,3,13,15 292:20 219:20 227:15 229:17 adequately 165:19 advocate 8:13,21 50:14 293:20 230:12 adhere 102:1,1 74:18 77:3,5 80:5 akin 189:3 accused's 146:12 Adjourn 3:21 82:3 90:15 101:16 al 23:19 achieve 114:13 alcohol 68:1,15,22 adjourned 282:9 119:22 125:20 128:17 acquittal 46:16 57:20 adjudge 29:17 55:17 129:5,6,7 149:15 **aligns** 129:18 58:1 59:3 150:7,8 56:13 57:4 286:4,10,20 allegation 23:9 207:3 186:6 187:2,13 adjudged 54:21 55:9 advocates 188:20 220:9,14 221:2 191:10,17 214:5,13

237:20 243:12 223:12 224:3 246:16 anonymized 192:17 152:3 153:14 155:9 263:21 anonymizing 243:19 approval 234:13 251:2 196:5 216:4 223:14 229:21 237:2 290:16 allegations 7:22 12:21 anonymous 221:14 251:7,11 252:9 173:3 207:4 220:6,13 answer 72:3 82:8,19 **approve** 130:19 250:19 290:17 220:19 222:1 278:22 84:6,19 85:5 152:22 approved 6:1 162:9 asking 123:17 210:17 288:16 153:8 264:5 166:3 168:8,9 216:2 225:14 253:11 alleged 49:21 50:9 answered 210:8 249:5 asks 182:17 approving 251:4 141:9 144:18 219:12 answering 85:1 173:4 aptitude 117:3 aspect 136:6,8 148:11 246:8 183:8 area 6:14 27:2 116:17 aspects 118:14 121:1 allegedly 229:19 answers 248:6 142:11 155:22 165:13 197:12 assault-related 106:12 alleging 89:3 anybody 100:8,14,16 165:16 187:18 286:5 assaulted 142:20 188:4 allied 158:19 106:16 128:21 129:1 areas 27:16 68:12 allow 23:13 147:1,9 223:14 234:21 258:13 116:16 118:19 156:16 200:6 203:1 266:15 233:21 274:7 281:4 161:9 162:8 163:15 267:4 268:17 165:6 192:8 249:2 allowances 57:8 anymore 216:1 assaults 9:5 11:22 13:10 74:7 83:18,19 allowed 40:22 49:18 254:17,21 255:2 anyone's 66:14 68:13 86:11 284:14 **Anyway** 96:21 arena 231:17 107:8,10 108:8 284:14 294:3 apart 196:20 201:2 argue 239:6,22 240:6 110:15,21 114:16 allows 224:16 132:12 140:1 204:5 aperture 66:1 **Arlington** 1:11,11 27:10 alluded 106:7 108:3 207:11 221:20 267:1 apologize 131:20 27:12 153:15 Altenberg 119:20 135:10 194:5 285:16 armed 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:12 288:6 **Alternate** 2:16 4:10 7:12 8:2,18 11:22 assess 12:15 47:16 apparatus 82:11 alternative 67:4 apparently 13:3 249:2 14:15 17:12 24:1 124:14 156:7 165:8 altitude 255:6 157:9,17,18 189:7 170:3 229:10 241:21 appeal 50:19 72:14 altogether 202:2 73:15 220:20 221:3 279:13 alumnus 21:9 appealed 25:14 arms 107:11 265:5 assessing 170:10 ambitious 177:16 **Appeals** 14:15 23:22 army 2:8 13:6 28:21 assessment 204:18 amended 4:22 36:19,20 50:1 29:5 38:16 54:15 221:11,18 279:22 36:21 **appeared** 169:13 81:11 86:15,16,19 280:22 amendments 128:18 appears 83:5,6 95:22 96:21 105:1 assessments 165:22 155:14 167:9 appellate 24:17 53:1 126:20 152:20 206:20 167:1 175:17 American 26:3 73:2,3,7,10,16 79:11 208:2 209:13 216:2,8 assigned 150:17 151:6 amount 32:9 67:22 68:6 133:5 239:18 286:14 223:11,12 171:2,6 253:10 68:8 294:10 **arose** 113:5 assignment 293:1 analogous 230:9 appendix 4:21 114:10 **Art** 32:13 35:11 37:12 assimilate 134:6 analogue 89:22 **apples** 191:16,16 100:10 101:15 272:13 analogues 15:3 applicable 121:17 Art's 53:5 assist 162:4,10 132:7 134:21 **analysis** 115:9 132:6 article 28:15 29:13 32:5 Assistance 112:13 186:3 193:18 196:18 application 105:22 32:5 36:16 71:22 72:4 Assistant 101:16 203:19 applied 30:15 48:9 72:7 73:5,11 75:19 assisted 136:10 169:15 analyze 270:17 **applies** 52:6,7 87:3 76:15 80:10 89:8 90:8 **Associate** 2:4,5 8:9 9:9 analyzed 84:8 128:20 94:2 113:8 120:13 associated 110:6 150:2 analyzing 16:15 190:13 apply 30:12 47:3,4 48:9 121:7 128:18,19 association 268:9 256:10 48:11 94:6,11 139:16 129:1,4 130:2,18 **assume** 139:7 anchor 115:19 211:14 131:11 132:3 133:16 assuming 242:22 anchors 102:21 appoint 209:4 134:2,4,5,22 135:3,6 assure 153:16 appointed 4:9 7:14 11:5 and/or 131:14,14 136:13,17 167:19 attached 40:20 41:17 **Anderson** 1:14 225:4,5 111:1 157:14,16 168:14 178:2 41:22 42:17 43:11 247:9 285:16 167:5 251:8 articles 29:6,7,8,11,14 215:17 **Andy** 14:14 31:11 33:13 72:2 appointment 6:2 127:4 attempt 51:5 anecdotal 70:8 appreciate 131:19 103:14,15 133:14 attempted 74:21 anecdotally 67:9,11 153:4 155:7 134:20 135:10,11 attempting 117:20 **Angeles** 281:13,14 approach 184:22 136:2 attend 6:22 176:21,22 appropriate 126:14 annex 174:22 **Asia** 169:5 197:21 attendance 7:9 announced 48:2 127:5,6 170:18 184:8 aside 4:18 36:3,14,15 attention 81:2 107:18 announces 228:2 194:21 195:11,21 40:8 91:19 99:18,19 115:19 127:2 183:9 annual 116:1 161:4 asides 35:4 36:3 42:20 219:10,13 283:14 168:19 287:18 appropriately 211:5 asked 66:3 101:20 attitude 149:9,19

attorney 2:11,12 80:5 190:14,21,22 193:12 bargaining 95:4,7 98:1 **bet** 54:2 62:12 207:20 131:8 203:11 202:6 206:20,21,21 131:7 better 70:18 98:7 attorney-87:16,21 223:9,17 224:4,5 **bargains** 94:17 98:19 103:13 114:7 132:4 attorney-client 13:21 234:17,19,21 248:3 226:15 141:14 162:7 195:10 48:22 81:13 256:3 258:15 259:16 barracks 24:14 85:11 231:4,5 242:2 254:11 Attorney-like 129:11 278:8 291:22 barriers 242:7 256:19 261:6 272:11 attorneys 17:16 292:19 base 41:21 203:1 273:6 282:7 average 69:6 240:4 Attorneys' 189:4 avoid 133:8 220:17 246:19 253:2 beyond 38:4 110:9 attracts 219:10 aware 12:4 115:4 268:16,17 271:12 125:10 127:15 139:12 attribute 149:15 124:13,20 141:9 273:2 290:8 145:17 180:9 204:8 attributed 66:8 146:7 151:13 210:1 base-by-base 197:1 272:2 attribution 218:10 awful 45:1 50:20 71:18 based 150:15,16 172:9 **BGEN** 65:11 78:4,18 attrition 281:10 73:17 218:17 179:20 196:14 222:20 179:7,12 204:20 audible 153:2 awfully 58:19 64:2 230:6 239:13 248:6 209:11 218:5 219:4 **audience** 108:20 222:16 223:7 226:17 **AWOL** 95:21 96:7,13,22 256:17 261:9 audio 240:14 241:3 baseless 196:14,16 226:21 227:12,14 В audit 241:20 bases 27:17 228:11,13,19 229:2 audits 165:21 **B** 82:6 209:9 **basic** 28:19 280:17 229:12 236:4 237:19 Australia 158:20 **Baby** 284:2 284:9 237:22 244:6,15,21 authoritative 17:7 back 20:5 25:19 26:6 basically 37:20,21 245:4 249:21 250:2,4 authorities 24:22 28:10 48:6 60:6 62:10 44:14 79:7 90:11 250:7 251:19 255:14 291:19 164:17 175:6 176:8 257:10,22 259:10,15 64:18 65:9 66:1 89:12 authority 13:12 28:12 91:13 97:16 99:18 187:22 261:18,21 262:12,15 28:13 31:6,7,15,18,19 basis 11:12 44:12 52:22 264:10 269:17 270:17 100:13 102:2,12 92:5 130:21 278:22 31:22 32:1,2,5,9 103:10,12 104:22 271:8,13 272:5 33:19 37:9,11 53:15 107:4,10 110:16,18 battalion 13:14 71:14 273:16.21 275:21 53:15,16 74:16 75:3,4 110:20 116:22 122:5 71:16,17 72:8 73:8,9 276:2.11 277:10 75:7,19 76:17 78:6,10 123:15 126:20,21 73:16 88:16 89:4 278:14,17 282:10 79:21 82:1 88:18 89:1 **BCD** 55:9 56:1 65:11 284:21 127:21 130:1 135:9 89:6,13 90:10 91:14 135:11 140:15 146:19 72:10 93:2 97:17 **BGen(R)** 1:20 91:19,21 92:11,17 147:6 150:11.11 **BDC** 57:4 biennial 116:8 95:9,12 97:21 98:17 176:8 179:18 182:5 **bear** 160:9 **big** 104:19 109:21 98:20 99:17 121:6 183:21 187:16 190:9 beast 202:1 114:11 122:18 126:18 125:12 126:10 127:4 195:19 200:14 208:6 beating 98:7 227:6 128:8 144:9 179:16 beer 115:12,13 128:11 130:4.4.18.21 209:1 214:15 218:15 199:3 237:1 245:2.5 130:22 131:12.12 245:2 246:11 254:20 beginning 28:10 87:14 256:8 266:17 270:4 135:18 148:12 162:17 256:7 259:17 260:3 121:12 203:6 256:4 292:21 162:19 163:1 165:12 262:10 272:22 276:6 **behalf** 10:13 111:15 biggest 251:22 266:13 208:19 227:11 231:11 283:8 284:15 287:12 122:13 **bill** 33:15 245:1 254:2 260:16 294:6 belief 30:3 bills 174:7 291:15,20 background 5:13 believe 65:12 67:10,11 **binary** 149:5,14 authority's 74:13 107:22 110:8 123:11 88:12 100:21,22 **bio** 10:16 157:21 authorization 4:17,19 140:13 150:3 248:18 137:14 144:5,6 165:4 biographical 280:17 7:19 12:7 32:22 75:14 176:6 186:6 194:2 bit 35:21 38:3 48:9,10 271:21 110:1 119:5 127:8 205:15 207:6 216:14 61:6 70:15 77:11 backlog 72:16,19 152:12 239:7 247:7 281:1 backward 131:20 107:1,9 108:10 282:18 289:4 290:16 authorize 141:5 bad 55:5 66:11 99:3,4 109:12 110:8 120:6 authorized 56:14 57:10 125:8,10 144:17 291:22 121:14 123:15 133:11 142:7 204:10 214:6 265:10 **belly** 82:17 140:8,13 141:7,15 belongs 90:22 91:11 158:11 166:21 167:16 authorizing 130:12 badly 190:6 automatic 208:22 **balance** 171:9 beneficial 274:15 277:1 184:10 195:19 251:9 availability 233:7 Ballroom 1:10 benefit 10:17 128:15 259:22 280:10 available 5:9,19 49:6 132:2 228:4,16 blank 213:15 **Ballston** 1:11 153:15 80:11 81:13 85:15 benefits 55:8,11 **blind** 112:19 **banker's** 240:5 105:1 140:11 153:6 bar 102:18 104:17 best 16:8 17:1 86:5 **blood** 26:1,2,2 157:22 159:8 164:5 112:12,13 170:15 161:15 164:7 188:8 **blue** 62:4 174:12,13,15 175:9 206:5,8 207:5 211:13 board 39:13 40:3 86:11 **Barbara** 157:20 176:16 177:2,2,3 bargain 94:20 95:1 99:6 240:11 243:21 274:19

body 181:14 258:7 206:4 223:9 **cap** 95:14 catch 288:10 **book** 40:6 114:11 **broke** 62:18 244:11 capability 118:5 **catches** 94:12 capable 106:17 151:4 **boom** 112:3 **broken** 277:16 category 24:12 capacity 11:4 22:1,3 **boss** 107:5,12 133:22 **brothers** 152:19 **cause** 218:3 box 240:5 brought 221:1 231:1 89:22 causing 212:16 bragged 135:1 **buddy** 102:8 capita 83:21 caveat 92:16 **brain** 70:18 **budget** 240:18 capital 60:3 134:7 caveats 44:22 branch 122:19 128:6 **build** 196:2 **CAPT** 2:2,7 10:10 18:6 Center 287:14 205:1 233:1 building 107:5 131:1 central 235:10 236:1 39:12,16,20 40:2 branches 84:3 201:12 built 131:2 133:3 280:5 239:5 270:19 100:2,21 101:8,14 201:13 216:15 bulk 32:6 34:21 35:8 102:6,17 104:4 certain 25:2 40:17 bread 42:19 43:2,5 65:10,15 67:16 267:2 110:20 124:11 132:1 49:19 174:17 176:5 breadth 162:5 137:13,19 138:12 213:7 227:16 250:15 272:21 break 9:1 48:4 100:17 bullet 24:9 139:1,10 140:12 certainly 33:3 108:16 101:9,10,10 177:8 bunch 206:9 143:20 144:1,22 121:1 140:12 151:12 183:12 184:9 241:14 Bureau 221:13 222:3 145:5,9 146:4 149:1,4 189:5,18 196:18 247:18 249:1,2 223:21 259:15 151:3 152:2 153:3,13 198:14 201:10 260:11 254:16 255:1,6 business 126:19 131:5 153:20 154:1,6 261:20 272:19 certiorari 24:6 **breakdown** 63:1 85:2 **bust** 55:19 160:10 171:15 177:6 **CFR** 4:22 161:3 185:13 **busted** 225:16 178:15 190:18 191:12 breaking 276:3 **butt** 147:22 224:7 239:6 240:6 chain 13:6,13 76:14 breaks 84:2,7 **button** 82:17 244:8,11,17 246:2,10 Chairman 14:10 114:1 brief 6:19 29:1 79:5 **bylaw** 284:6 246:21 247:7 248:2 Chairwoman 285:17 101:2 103:1 114:5 249:15 250:1,3,8 challenge 142:12 143:1 C 137:6 151:1 179:16 253:16 257:3 273:10 191:15 203:22 204:9 255:21 276:14 C 4:1 209:9 273:14,18,22 274:4 204:19 briefers' 6:15 **CA** 66:4 74:20 75:10 274:14 275:3.7 challenges 109:15 briefing 7:2 35:22 112:4 276:13,19 277:5,9,12 120:19 128:8 132:22 76:1,3,18,22 83:3,3 **briefings** 6:7 177:1 278:9,16 283:7,17 147:19 197:9 201:19 86:1 91:4,7 92:10 287:1 93:6 98:2,18,21 99:3 284:4,20 219:8 **briefly** 286:21 99:8 **Captain** 3:9 4:13 8:19 challenging 49:19 **briefs** 176:20 **CA's** 74:16 8:20 13:11 36:4 42:18 141:8 163:16 Brigadoon 22:6 **Cactus** 112:2 43:4 101:15,20 102:7 chance 26:7 41:3 **bring** 91:8 155:8 180:10 cake 120:5 153:7 155:21 120:18 256:14 270:14 182:19 calendar 120:17 223:1 Captain's 39:16 **change** 32:16 33:4,4 274:6 bringing 91:7 captains 293:5 39:4 52:2 53:22 54:9 **brings** 44:19 105:21 call 18:3 39:11 82:11 **capture** 147:9 163:19 56:12 57:13 64:4,9 130:8 187:9 95:2 104:11 111:7,8 **captures** 163:18 67:16 72:6 91:17 **Brisbois** 1:14 62:16,18 114:11 127:14 129:10 care 257:12 92:11 95:5 98:15 62:22 63:8 81:22 226:14 232:10,11 career 25:20 124:3 103:8 106:1 119:2,15 180:11,17 181:22 239:16 257:1 275:15 145:22 148:22 199:9 120:1,5 121:13,20,22 227:3,8,13 229:5,14 215:4 216:1,7 217:5 122:6,14 124:12 275:16 288:12 289:7 252:5 259:22 261:7 called 13:17 20:19 49:5 careers 148:20 231:16 126:19,22 127:2,22 careful 236:2 134:18 137:2,2 147:5 261:20 262:1,14,18 55:5 72:8 73:2 79:5 263:16 270:16,18 84:18 86:10 89:8 98:7 cares 101:18 147:7 152:13 163:5 205:20 249:14 250:9 271:9,20 274:2,5 102:7 115:10 120:1 Carlucci 128:8 283:1,18,22 284:3 141:1 153:8,13 **Carolina** 25:13,15,16 252:22 253:15 254:8 broad 161:8 173:1 275:11 25:18 26:11 52:4 changed 39:3 53:21 202:16 206:3,10,11 calls 107:7 272:9 carried 38:7 41:11 69:9 71:20,22 80:13 43:19 207:1,15 220:8,21 81:5 92:9,16 158:9 **campus** 24:14 221:6 222:2 250:6 **carries** 37:10 229:6 campuses 200:22 252:4 262:16 263:4 Canada 23:13 158:19 carry 34:2 42:4 43:15 **changes** 12:20 16:21 278:4 Carson 2:10 182:12 33:8,8,12 36:1 37:7 Cannon 1:15 174:2,13 broaden 182:4 192:6,13,20 103:5 104:19,19 174:16 175:12 182:16 broader 50:18 117:10 cart 262:11 106:3,9,11,12 114:17 193:6,14 203:9 214:8 CAs 73:12 82:22 94:15 192:7 205:6,8 207:11 232:17,19 238:20 118:16,19,20 119:14 119:19 120:7,9,12,14 260:16 248:16 250:11 254:13 99:17 Cassia 1:19 169:15 broadly 181:21 205:2 255:7,11 257:17 120:15 121:4 122:2

	ı	ı	1
122:17 123:9,12	circuit 27:12 286:5,7	252:12 268:13 269:2	232:16 236:6 239:16
124:22 125:6,9	circumstances 6:19	269:5,7 274:18 275:4	247:10 249:16 256:5
126:18 127:3,19	195:16 225:11	coast 21:8,9,11,14	256:16 261:14 272:22
134:19 148:2 151:18	citizen 23:17,20 24:4,5	61:12 64:22 152:17	284:15 291:10
152:1 181:9 189:3	city 278:12	180:2	comes 22:8,9 28:14
219:19 241:12 284:19	civil 45:12,15	Code 4:21 20:9 21:20	97:15 98:13 104:12
chaplains 212:11	civilian 14:7 16:8 22:17	22:2 23:4 30:9,16	108:17 188:9 198:20
character 229:11	23:3 24:21 68:2 69:14	88:12 102:8 104:12	226:1 236:9 238:8,9
charge 13:9,15 26:15	80:16,19 81:6 83:21	107:6 112:15 115:11	238:10,10 292:19
75:10 126:2 130:6	105:13 128:11 129:19	123:15 133:4 153:11	comfort 101:9,10,10
180:14 181:5 187:9	131:17 157:6 161:14	288:5	comfortable 283:8
187:10 192:1,4 194:1	163:15,19,21 164:2,6	codification 120:21	coming 36:1 59:7 141:4
- III			
194:1 195:11 224:16	165:7 174:5 187:8	codified 46:2	147:8 151:18 153:14
229:22 241:7 246:13	188:22 197:2,18	cohesive 193:5	182:22 183:13 184:1
charged 125:17 230:15	203:1,3 206:5,8 211:2	cohesiveness 266:19	188:18 191:8 197:10
279:15 289:13	211:13 215:19 226:14	coincides 12:1	199:17 212:4 254:20
charges 88:10,16 89:14	230:9 231:9,9 238:7	Col 2:15 4:3 10:22	260:18 283:8
89:15 131:14 181:6	238:11,18 252:18	154:14 228:15,22	command 13:6,14
185:14 186:2,16,18	267:1 268:11,20	229:3 234:6 245:3,8	76:14 78:14,17 79:2
188:21 189:18 192:18	269:4 288:10,11	250:20 251:12 253:17	79:12,13 146:1
192:21 193:1 194:10	289:20 290:12	275:12,14 285:4	170:19 200:4 214:21
214:4 229:19 230:7	civilianization 129:16	294:16	215:1 292:10
230:15 281:20 282:2	civilianize 129:16	cold 25:22 26:5	Commandant 79:4
288:18,19 289:5	civilians 22:11,13,22	collateral 111:13,18	commander 13:15
charging 74:13 125:15	28:7 68:1 84:7 220:18	112:9	31:19 32:1 40:9,17
192:3 218:16 238:10	267:20 269:13 286:7	colleague 35:11	41:13 71:15,16,18
chart 61:17 84:18	289:18,20 290:8,17	colleagues 21:11	86:13 88:16 90:12
100:20 125:8 143:18	claim 106:21	213:15	105:5 109:1,8,16
charter 17:4 136:3	clarification 226:12	collect 185:4 256:7	126:2,4 127:6 129:6
204:22 206:10 207:1	244:2	280:4	129:13 130:16 141:8
207:15 217:15 225:13	clarified 181:1	collected 112:17	143:7 144:16 146:5,7
226:11 260:5,7 279:5	class 92:17	184:12 211:6 225:2	150:9 162:11,14,22
charters 205:5	classified 236:14	collecting 16:14	165:9 200:9 291:10
charts 71:13	Clause 28:15	collection 113:6 211:5	291:15
check 221:12	clear 191:20 260:3	collective 17:5	commander's 40:19
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2	287:2	collectively 114:2 157:5	121:6 146:9 165:9,11
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8	287:2 clearance 150:11	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15	college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4	college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16 chosen 47:8 49:5	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commitment 17:14
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16 chosen 47:8 49:5 Christensen 285:13,22	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9 137:9,18 138:7	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1 151:1 152:1 160:20	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commitment 17:14 commits 27:11
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16 chosen 47:8 49:5 Christensen 285:13,22 286:2	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9 137:9,18 138:7 151:17 171:22 173:6	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1 151:1 152:1 160:20 172:14 178:6 179:18	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commitment 17:14 commits 27:11 committed 23:16 88:13
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16 chosen 47:8 49:5 Christensen 285:13,22 286:2 church 278:18	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9 137:9,18 138:7 151:17 171:22 173:6 198:16 200:5 201:1	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1 151:1 152:1 160:20 172:14 178:6 179:18 183:7,21 199:12	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commitment 17:14 commits 27:11 committed 23:16 88:13 289:22
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9 137:9,18 138:7 151:17 171:22 173:6 198:16 200:5 201:1 214:18 215:5 216:13	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combination 70:1 combine 232:10 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1 151:1 152:1 160:20 172:14 178:6 179:18 183:7,21 199:12 201:14 208:6 211:17	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commit 51:6 253:12 committed 23:16 88:13 289:22 committee 1:3 2:3 3:16
chief 14:14 31:20 32:2 39:12 84:6 114:8 214:17 286:7,8,13,14 290:17 Chiefs 14:10 child 60:9 202:1,4 263:15,17 264:15 293:13,14 children 220:18 224:17 263:13 264:9,13 266:17 268:5 choose 141:16 143:2 147:4 173:7 chooses 47:12,14 87:21 chose 53:2,2 54:6 130:19 173:10 215:16 chosen 47:8 49:5 Christensen 285:13,22 286:2 church 278:18	287:2 clearance 150:11 236:15 cleared 287:4 clearly 15:12 220:8 244:3 261:2 clemency 92:3,4,6 94:16 99:9,15,17 clever 209:8 click 233:10 235:1 client 87:17,22 close 17:21 285:5 closely 15:2,14 128:10 closing 285:6 clothing 30:10 cloud 233:10 clue 127:13 CMSAF 1:19 83:10 85:9 137:9,18 138:7 151:17 171:22 173:6 198:16 200:5 201:1	collectively 114:2 157:5 college 200:22 colleges 242:5 274:20 colloquial 29:21 Colonel 4:8 10:18 13:10 58:18 245:7 286:2 colonel's 115:12,14 Columbia 19:19 67:21 combat 70:11,12 combined 30:8 64:22 come 20:5 22:5 48:6,14 73:18 84:20 98:10 100:13 109:14 114:17 116:2 118:20 119:11 120:16 128:9 132:21 142:17 147:3 148:1 151:1 152:1 160:20 172:14 178:6 179:18 183:7,21 199:12	121:6 146:9 165:9,11 commanders 13:13 39:8 70:9 108:2 109:14 125:22 148:2 148:6 151:12 162:17 188:20 291:17 292:2 commanders' 147:21 commanding 90:13,14 145:18 148:12 comment 3:19 5:16 10:3 196:5 217:20 218:5 285:12 comments 105:4 125:1 210:8 286:21 Commission 204:4 commissioned 8:13 commit 51:6 253:12 commitment 17:14 commits 27:11 committed 23:16 88:13 289:22

5:3,5,7,10,11,14,15 5:19,21,22 6:2,5,8,16 7:1,11,15 8:16,22 9:2 9:18 10:2 11:20 12:5 12:9 15:19 17:8,19 35:14 101:19 124:6 133:4 135:16 136:7 136:19 154:16 157:17 157:18 166:8 170:12 175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13 commonly 5:3 29:9
9:18 10:2 11:20 12:5 12:9 15:19 17:8,19 35:14 101:19 124:6 133:4 135:16 136:7 136:19 154:16 157:17 157:18 166:8 170:12 175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
35:14 101:19 124:6 133:4 135:16 136:7 136:19 154:16 157:17 157:18 166:8 170:12 175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
133:4 135:16 136:7 136:19 154:16 157:17 157:18 166:8 170:12 175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
157:18 166:8 170:12 175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
175:20 179:14,16 180:14,22 181:5 182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
182:10 202:11 203:10 208:21 209:21 234:7 234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
234:9,12,16 236:8,16 245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
245:2,5,12,13,16 249:16 250:2 251:3 253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
253:10,14 256:8 261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
261:10,11 276:8 283:19 Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
Committee's 276:3 committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
committees 9:4 12:15 132:21 133:8 155:7 156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
156:11 169:17 181:7 233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
233:19 251:15 277:22 Committees' 155:10 committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
committing 27:4 common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
common 26:21 44:10 186:12,13
communicate 214:22
communicated 112:11 112:14
communication 275:22 communications 117:8
126:15,17
communities 165:8 242:4
community 83:22 170:21 216:10
commuted 25:7
company 13:14 comparative 162:12
163:13 174:20 203:18
compare 83:21 164:3 174:4 231:8
compared 71:10 181:6 221:19 257:8
comparing 163:14
comparison 161:13 196:21
compatible 131:16 compelled 80:17
compensation 156:21
168:13 compilations 174:11
compiled 257:2
complainant 190:2 complaining 49:14

```
complete 8:4 24:18
 125:9 158:8 241:5
completed 166:16
  176:15
completely 81:9 183:11
completion 224:4
complex 293:4
comply 5:2
component 21:6 22:18
 22:21 197:18 199:22
composed 167:3
composition 157:3,12
comprehensive 14:11
  156:14 174:21 257:8
concept 26:13 78:14
 79:1 133:3
concern 170:20 203:14
 203:17 249:2 266:13
concerned 58:12,21
 59:6 80:19 196:4
 213:11 253:19
concerning 17:2
concerns 105:3 170:16
 170:19 172:12 194:17
 203:9 211:4 219:21
 232:9 235:4.15 242:7
 243:13 249:6,7 253:6
 253:8 279:4
conclude 206:10 285:3
concluded 173:19
concludes 169:21
concurrence 284:16
concurrent 27:17
condensed 255:21
conduct 55:5 99:5
  114:1 133:4 135:7
 156:14 167:7 168:1
 229:11 231:20
conduct/bad 229:11
conducted 147:4 167:8
 169:4 194:14 197:17
conducting 132:22
  165:21
conducts 126:4
conference 115:14
 232:10,11 272:9
conferences 180:6
 213:14 274:9
confine 55:13,15
confined 42:18
confinement 24:16
 25:8 43:5 44:5 55:1
 57:7 60:14 93:4,12
 95:15 97:3,17 99:19
 200:17
```

conflict 69:17 133:2

conflicting 123:6

```
confused 118:3
Congress 12:6 14:5
  28:16 30:6,16 31:15
  31:18,21 32:7,8,19
  33:19 36:15 45:20
  49:2 50:6 51:4 53:1
  55:14 56:16 58:12,20
  59:6 60:6 72:17 74:16
  74:19 75:17 79:15,20
  80:13,19 81:5 92:9
  93:20 94:1,14 98:17
  99:16 105:2 111:1
  113:21 115:7 116:1
  117:8 118:10,18
  125:11 127:19 132:10
  133:18,20 135:3
  148:4 155:17 156:1,3
  156:6,10 157:1 158:9
  158:16 159:1,15
  163:11 167:2 173:22
  205:10
congressional 78:5,8
  82:7 140:1
Congressionally 37:21
Congresswoman 159:4
conjunction 44:16
connection 20:16
consensus 253:8 283:5
consent 11:6
consequences 15:17
  90:17 109:7 225:9
  258:9
consider 15:16,21
  147:14 148:4 164:14
  218:1 226:6 287:6
consideration 148:3.6
  153:17 166:10 169:8
considerations 195:20
considered 56:4 115:11
  129:13 183:11 188:19
  191:18
considering 163:3
  182:3 212:18
consistency 196:10
  201:17
consistently 41:11
  197:16
consists 169:2
consolidate 273:18
  274:3
consolidated 278:6
constant 146:13
consternation 92:4
Constitution 28:15,16
  31:17
constitutional 52:3
constitutionally 47:4
constraint 78:9 79:18
```

79:20 consult 129:5,7 contact 51:7 63:6 87:4 89:18 93:21 178:4 195:3 264:3 277:15 contacted 147:13 contained 106:4 168:7 contains 174:22 contemporate 218:14 **CONTENTS** 3:1 contingency 23:2 continually 124:14 continue 15:10 17:18 124:15 173:17 280:3 continued 173:11 continues 121:20 contractor 23:7 contributed 66:16 **contributes** 66:13,19 control 147:21 convene 31:22 32:2 71:16 89:7 162:18 163:1 convened 113:5 convenience 283:13 convening 13:12 53:14 53:15 74:13 75:2,4,6 75:18 76:17 78:6,10 79:21 82:1 88:18 89:1 89:6,13 90:10 91:14 91:18,21 92:11,17 95:9,11 97:21 130:4 131:12 148:12 165:11 212:9 227:10 231:11 291:15.19 conversation 103:10 109:20 118:6 conversations 108:8 110:17 117:15 135:15 convert 147:2 convict 57:16,22 convicted 25:14 72:10 72:21 289:14 **conviction** 25:17 42:9 44:3,4,4,13 48:7 55:22 56:1,3,4,8,9 58:19 59:2 69:14 91:13 92:12,13 161:21 172:3 185:17 191:11,17 214:6,13 238:9 288:20 289:10 289:12,16 convictions 56:5 289:17 **cooperate** 185:6 187:8 cooperation 153:17 coordinator 142:2

159:22 215:10

DAC-IPAD 7:13,17 8:5 copies 38:17 174:15 136:3 208:6 218:11 cover 45:15 137:12 232:13 257:4 copy 38:18,19 239:3,8 162:6 8:15 9:22 17:15 112:4 240:2 **course** 26:12 28:14 covered 19:12 26:21 151:1 155:4,15 **core** 242:6 31:18 38:4 46:7 52:8 137:14 166:15 171:10 273:19 **corner** 276:4 72:3 75:20 78:11 90:5 create 35:18 55:7 daily 11:12 Corps 8:12 16:20 21:18 96:3 109:16 111:9 dashes 103:11 107:13 21:20 29:3 42:7 43:17 created 7:18 107:14 data 16:15 84:11 85:6,7 113:4,21 115:3,20 46:13 49:4,6 65:8,15 116:19 118:10 128:7 113:6,21 140:22 85:15 88:6 107:7,9,9 141:5 147:1 65:16 71:6,6,8,9,10 142:14 148:11 251:5 107:12 108:1 112:18 court 14:15 20:18 23:10 creates 142:12 115:17,18 116:4 71:15 72:1,8,15 73:4 73:6 76:6 79:4 81:12 23:22 24:7 25:16 27:6 creation 107:18 155:15 132:4,17 139:8,15 86:4,14,16,18 87:12 27:12,19,22 28:3 credibility 283:20 147:10 164:1,1 31:20 43:20 44:2 45:2 crime 13:20 26:9 49:22 168:14 172:21 184:11 88:15 89:2 96:1,6,17 107:13 118:2 152:17 45:5 46:11 50:1 60:1 50:4,9 68:17 120:21 185:4 186:3,14 206:22 208:3 239:17 70:15 79:11 89:7 135:12 136:18 190:4 189:14 193:5,12,17 292:17 90:21 92:15 130:2 196:15 240:15 196:5 205:18 206:20 **correct** 35:16 74:10 133:5 157:20 194:4 crimes 3:12 9:7 14:8 206:20,21 207:4,8,20 78:3 138:22 139:1 239:14 134:6,7 138:21 139:3 210:16 211:4 212:5 court- 6:10 15:7 20:22 186:8 187:15 224:22 139:6 155:12 167:9 223:11,15 224:11,19 226:20 228:10 275:20 24:19 31:22 32:2 170:6 224:19 232:2,19 criminal 13:4 17:6 23:9 285:13 33:10 41:3 44:3,15 233:16 246:12 247:3 corrected 165:2 54:4 61:6 71:16 88:22 30:2 33:22 42:9 44:3 247:20,22 248:9 correctional 42:14 97:6 98:12 161:20 44:4 67:21 86:10 255:19 256:2 260:22 corrections 121:22 court-martial 3:4 8:8 101:17 148:11,16 263:8,11 269:10,12 correctly 74:12 13:11 20:10 23:21 203:11 210:11,12 270:2,20 272:2,10 counsel 2:1,4,6 8:10 26:13.16 27:6.20 28:2 231:10.17 238:3 277:21 280:4.5.7 9:10 10:12 11:2 13:18 29:17 31:13 40:13.14 239:12 287:14 40:14 41:8,10,15,16 database 15:6 184:19 16:18,19 17:20 32:20 criteria 69:20 33:3 39:11 43:21 45:5 43:7,8,11,13,22 44:7 critical 15:10 31:11 185:8 45:6 48:17,19 49:3,18 44:11,13,17,20 45:1,5 175:19 date 33:15 34:7 38:20 86:9 88:20 90:7 95:9 47:1 54:7,16 55:2,4 cross 80:21 58:6 158:2 223:8 95:12 99:9,10 105:7 55:22 56:3,4,8 57:18 cross-199:8 265:18,19 105:16 111:16 112:12 58:22 70:10 72:9 75:4 **crucial** 189:17 dates 277:11 112:14,16 117:22 75:6,18 76:12 79:9 crying 142:21 dating 126:20 118:1,3,15 121:16 84:21 88:17 89:6.13 **cultural** 199:22 daunting 182:11 122:8,9,16 142:3 90:10,20 93:1,11 97:2 culturally 200:3 day 18:19 20:2 25:6 98:5 99:12 126:9 154:20 161:20 165:14 curiosity 186:10 30:19 38:6,6 48:5 128:13,22 167:18,21 171:2,3,4,5,6 172:15 **curious** 170:9,11 112:17 115:15 132:14 206:2 229:6 286:5,6,6 199:3 226:19 227:2 175:16,22 176:2 152:3 154:13 274:1 286:7 292:16 294:2 269:8 279:16 280:14 246:7 282:22 294:12 289:8 291:18 current 8:21 34:18,22 days 18:1,20 20:2,3,4,6 Counsel/Special court-martials 246:6 35:2 120:9,13 158:13 42:14,19 43:6 44:6 121:15 courtroom 49:11,13 171:19 288:21 107:5 112:1 180:4 counseling 39:9 62:1 courts 23:14 25:15 31:6 **currently** 9:15 168:17 225:19 140:10 34:1 37:11,13,19 46:9 168:20 169:6 170:21 **DCMA** 126:17 count 73:3 107:13 286:17 **DD** 57:3 54:4,12,13,18 56:20 288:9 289:15 61:15 62:5,6,6,19 curriculum 259:5 deal 11:13 40:9 46:7 counterintelligence 63:1 65:19 66:21 custody 42:14 81:1 97:1,7,12,13,19 293:21 67:21 70:5 71:12,19 cut 18:21 32:13 98:8,9,10,12,13,14 counting 36:13 92:21 94:19,21 95:1 **cuts** 55:8 135:6 150:13 203:22 countless 158:21 157:8 203:3 294:11 cutting 99:22 216:20 227:6 237:1 countries 252:19,21 courts-martial 83:13,15 cycle 119:9 dealing 123:12,19,21 cycles 106:6,6,10 187:18 290:20 293:11 **country** 21:4 23:16 103:18,21 104:5,11 252:18 105:19 113:17 114:12 119:13 deals 97:8 98:7 135:12 **County** 27:12 126:6 128:21 129:8 135:14 D couple 35:3 66:15 70:6 136:16 162:18 163:1 dealt 61:21 67:4,14 83:10,15,20 104:7,8 263:17 269:6 292:3 **D** 4:1 209:10 268:11 117:14 133:13 134:19 courts-martials 138:9 **D.C** 12:3 102:2,11 283:9 dean 1:16 74:3,5,11

75:20 77:12,22 80:2,9 81:20 145:14 148:10 148:14 149:3 187:16 188:13 214:16,19 215:21 231:6 247:3 275:8,13,15 283:10 death 25:5,7,10,14 26:17,18 29:16 51:22 52:4 56:15,19,20,21 57:9 59:16,17,19 60:8 60:10
debate 291:13 292:6 decades 83:16 104:8 December 32:20 34:17 36:12 38:9,9 53:21 77:10 116:22 152:10
decide 91:8 95:16 149:6 201:21 202:10 210:13 223:18 228:4 242:15 254:3,11 263:5 283:12 292:6
decided 247:15 260:4 deciders 151:12 decides 75:3 deciding 47:15 140:11 decision 76:8 78:6 91:5 93:18 126:7 128:13
129:20 140:9,9 175:19 192:3 195:15 195:17 196:8 213:3 decisions 16:16 75:16 115:5 150:21 184:6
189:10 195:12,13 237:16 238:11 258:11 260:6,7 261:12 declare 52:7 declared 23:1 52:8
decrease 65:19,21 66:1 66:21 68:17 decreased 83:19 dedicate 12:11 dedicated 17:16 286:18 294:1
deemed 190:1 deep 173:5 deeply 272:1 defendant 87:3 230:12 Defenders 286:18
defense 1:1,3,3 2:2,5 4:5,6,16,18 6:1 7:10 7:12,14,18,21,22 8:10 9:4,10 10:14 11:3,8 11:10,20,21 12:6,7,19 13:8 14:3,11 15:12 16:1,6,12 17:1,3 30:8 32:21 38:1 46:14 48:21 75:14 95:8,12
103:3 104:16 105:7

105:16 110:1.21 111:9 112:12 113:16 119:5 131:8 152:11 154:20 157:15 158:6 161:20 162:9 164:18 167:2,6 170:7,11,15 170:20 171:4,4,6,13 176:13 203:11 209:21 220:5,6 227:9,20 250:18 286:5,6,6 287:12,13,14 292:16 294:2,12 **defenses** 157:10 deferral 166:13 deferred 166:10 **define** 142:5 260:13 261:5 279:9 defined 115:1 181:21 181:21 192:13 196:7 223:10 280:16 **defines** 163:17 definitely 182:13 234:17 definition 79:16 117:2 151:20 163:17 180:21 186:12.13 187:17 192:11 207:11 234:10 245:9 250:21 260:4 262:13 288:4 definitional 191:20 definitions 136:14 189:6 190:4 196:16 223:6 degree 174:17 192:5 210:20 delegated 32:8 33:19 40:18 delegates 31:15 delegation 37:9,10 delegations 32:11,12 deliberate 284:14 deliberated 175:8 176:9 deliberating 176:18 234:14 deliberation 58:15 59:7 164:10,20 169:8 287:7 deliberations 58:11 176:16 177:9 287:3 delicate 92:8

delighted 12:8

delta 117:18

deliverables 167:11

delivered 176:19

delivering 236:21

delve 249:9 268:2

demographics 69:9

demand 41:10,16 126:7

Dempsey 14:10 denied 24:7 **denying** 237:11 **depart** 52:21 **department** 1:1 2:2,4 4:5 8:10 9:4,10 10:14 11:2,8,9,12 12:20 15:5 17:10,21 30:7 38:1 65:9 72:18 76:4 77:7,20 103:3 124:13 154:19 155:16 156:1 162:9 166:6 168:8,17 223:11 287:11,12 Department's 135:2 Department-wide 132:8 departments 14:3 82:12 197:3 209:13 departures 52:20 depended 24:4 **dependent** 20:20 23:8 288:10 depending 80:8 90:17 197:19 202:7 **depends** 48:5 179:8 depicted 224:3 deployable 206:7 **deployed** 16:7 68:10,11 68:20 85:12 206:5 268:15 286:11 deployment 20:5 **depth** 103:8 109:19 **Deputy** 2:4,5,8 8:9 9:9 101:15 167:5 describe 39:2 designate 279:18 designated 2:14 4:10 8:14 9:13,15 33:16 155:5 designed 55:7,11 desirable 143:9 **desire** 149:11,13 244:12 248:15 294:17 destroy 123:7 detail 31:3 111:19 140:5,8 185:10 detailed 185:4 243:17 291:5 293:5 details 192:17 determination 195:10 determinations 261:8 263:7 **determine** 6:17 192:7 246:11 247:8 263:11 determining 196:13 detour 140:14 detrimental 215:4 **develop** 183:22 210:16 248:6 262:20

develops 15:20 devoting 183:9 **DFO** 2:16 4:10,11 diagrams 240:15 dialogue 19:4 102:22 106:20,22 107:2 dictate 202:14 differ 268:4 difference 45:19 48:16 84:13 90:4 191:21 198:11 231:1 270:10 differences 42:3 43:14 43:18 46:20 59:14 139:3 164:1 198:1 201:10,18 different 27:14 29:3,4 37:5 42:7 47:19 50:7 54:11 84:3 86:16 113:4,7 123:4 148:15 176:1 181:10 192:2 196:8 201:12,13,13 202:1,6 207:21 210:21 224:19 226:9 242:4 254:5,17,19 260:6,7,18,19 261:12 263:14 264:13 276:12 280:10 283:13 differentiate 265:3 differently 48:10 196:7 differing 267:6 difficult 164:3 197:12 200:18 220:15 234:1 278:12 dig 115:16 270:3 digest 183:13 232:5 233:3 digital 126:15 digress 124:3 242:9 directed 12:6 72:17 115:9.9 direction 117:13 247:12 directly 11:9 245:13 270:6 **Director** 2:8.9 4:14 directs 148:2 disagree 209:17 disagrees 50:15 disapproved 166:4 disaster 102:15 **discharge** 24:18 44:8 44:17 51:9,11 54:22 55:5,6,12 57:1,5 73:14 74:9 93:2,3,3 93:14 99:4,5,18 121:10 289:7 discharged 24:21 290:22 discharges 108:11

disciplinary 24:14 40:2 division 33:1 90:13,14 269:12,16 281:13 **educate** 151:22 282:15 62:8 286:15 effect 16:17 20:14 **discipline** 39:8 109:3 **DMDC** 287:13 draft 284:7 33:15 34:7,15 38:16 134:11,17 146:11 43:1 77:10 104:20 **DNA** 26:5 drags 32:13 150:4 **Doctor** 247:20 dramatic 18:15 114:21 137:4 252:14 disclose 231:14 document 249:18 drawn 63:9 133:15 274:2 disclosure 210:10 documentation 195:4 **effective** 30:18 109:4 245:15 279:17 240:13 254:14 draws 17:21 181:13 182:8 202:4 discount 288:1 documented 211:6 **DRB** 39:20 40:2 210:15 discouraged 213:11 documents 5:13 186:11 drill 196:22 effects 235:20 efficient 109:4 262:2 discouraging 213:16 240:1 drink 68:13 115:13 discovered 67:7 208:14 **DoD** 10:11 11:4 12:14 drinking 94:10 289:14 effort 30:6 155:8 156:3 discretion 74:13,17 14:7 21:10 52:15 efforts 12:14 169:16 289:15 78:10,16 79:21 61:11 64:21,22 71:10 drive 1:11 117:15 **Effron** 14:14 114:8 143:12 231:13 271:4 84:17 103:22 116:7 driven 107:18 116:1,7 eight 57:17 116:19 117:11 118:15 **discuss** 9:19 184:7 drives 108:8 109:9 either 16:13 23:1 27:5 256:16 275:11 278:1 156:6 163:17 165:20 143:3 150:5 27:12 37:22 54:21 discussed 221:9 166:2 168:21 190:12 driving 132:16 55:22 60:8 67:1 87:6 discussion 96:2,4 205:20 206:2,6 drop 41:14 64:19,21 91:19 93:1 112:19 162:20 171:21 247:10 207:12,20 259:12 65:2 66:7 208:13 118:18 137:16 149:17 272:7 288:10,11 290:18 dropped 45:3 160:15 164:15 172:18 dishonorable 51:9,11 291:2 drug 68:8 96:3 190:1 193:22 197:19 57:1 93:3 99:4 **DoDI** 148:1,5 drugs 68:3 236:11 237:4 239:1 disincentivize 199:21 doing 65:3 68:6 119:10 drunk 68:7 239:18 276:15 dismiss 89:14 187:10 124:15,16 139:14 dual 23:11.18 26:12 elect 147:13 dismissal 51:8 57:2 152:21 174:3 200:15 due 6:18 165:17 284:6 elected 45:20 247:14 93:3 187:7 208:18 211:2.3 duration 166:21 electronic 126:17 duties 21:21 22:1,3 dismissals 184:18 213:21 222:6 223:9 234:13 239:3,7 240:1 185:2 228:1 244:3 248:18 duty 19:15 20:2 21:17 electronically 174:15 disorder 70:17 248:22 260:13 266:22 21:19 22:14 73:1 190:20 disparities 197:7 278:14 102:2 111:14 142:9 element 134:16 149:11,16 160:21 262:21,22 263:1 dollars 217:3 elephant 238:4 disparity 225:9 226:3 domestic 140:16,17 199:1 288:8 290:1,22 eligibility 14:6 25:9 51:17,18 238:8 141:1 263:1 267:1 **Dwight** 2:4 3:5 8:9 10:7 **dispose** 126:3 domestically 245:22 229:2 eligible 56:16 59:20 **disposed** 190:15 289:6 dominion 147:20 dying 129:2 87:9 Don 286:1 **disposition** 13:12 116:5 eliminated 60:7,8 Ε 122:21 129:8,11,12 door 103:13 elimination 73:22 121:5 131:13 148:5 160:2 dormitory 85:11 **E** 4:1,1 33:1 123:16 204:4,13 163:22 164:1 167:21 dorms 200:11 **E-1** 55:21 57:9 225:17 Elizabeth 159:5 eloquently 252:8 170:18 172:2 185:3 doubt 145:18 earlier 33:18 105:5 185:16 **dove** 173:5 121:14 159:15 160:5 **ELPB** 111:10 dispositions 184:14,20 downstream 265:14 167:4 206:14 226:13 email 178:7 232:6,9 185:11 194:22 275:18 277:11,14 **Dr** 1:18,19 63:13,15,17 265:2 272:18 287:1 early 140:15 202:9 disproportionate 71:7 69:2 84:7,10 115:3 emails 5:20 178:6 embarked 40:20 41:17 disproportionately 138:13,19 139:2 213:20 65:17 143:20 169:15 184:11 easier 200:3 216:22 42:16 43:12 disproved 168:10 185:16,18,22 186:15 235:3 251:1 270:6 EMI 39:22 employee 288:11 disregard 164:15 186:19,22 187:4,12 **easiest** 264:22 dissented 163:9 employees 14:7 187:15 191:9,14 Eastern 27:7 **distinction** 63:9 140:6 196:2 197:5,8 201:19 employer 148:13 easy 149:6 150:9 distinguished 11:19 202:18 211:22 213:4 246:10 enabling 180:14 181:15 213:8 222:11 223:22 271:3 12:9 155:1 eat 115:12,12 153:21 **District** 19:19 23:10,14 235:4 237:18,21 enact 36:19 163:11 echo 218:22 219:5 27:6,7,19,22 28:3 243:8 247:22 257:14 **enacted** 14:16 28:20 economist 152:4 45:2,4 67:20 157:20 258:2,22 263:9,19 **economy** 197:22 29:2 36:16 50:7 264:7,11 265:7,15 dive 223:19 **edict** 137:3 162:15 divides 252:2 266:2,5 268:1,12 edition 38:11 enacting 156:9 163:2

encompass 220:22 221:8 **encourage** 15:20 19:3 290:20 291:11 294:5 ended 191:10 193:8 ends 173:21 enforcement 142:11 143:4 144:15 146:19 211:2 engage 19:4 69:11 **engaged** 231:19 enhancement 104:16 128:16 enhancements 104:20 **enhances** 129:18 enhancing 15:4 enlightened 149:22 **enlisted** 43:9 51:10 55:3,20 57:1,9 214:21 215:1,7 225:9,16 226:5 231:2,19 262:22 289:9 enlisting 216:3 enlistment 69:20 **enormous** 43:14.18 67:22 68:5.8.19 70:12 198:20 ensure 162:7 243:10 **ensuring** 109:4 165:16 entail 175:17 218:1 enter 48:22 87:21 130:17 entire 176:4 180:3 186:20 entirely 29:4 30:1 entirety 293:8 entitled 22:15,18 entity 26:14,15 290:4 entries 62:2 entrust 150:14 entrusted 150:18 enumerated 133:17 134:4,12 **envelop** 97:19 envelope 188:14 environment 206:5 233:10 envision 60:18 **EO-type** 117:7 equivalent 33:21 47:1 47:22,22 125:14 era 29:11 **escapes** 176:14 **especially** 91:5 104:19 172:13 233:3 293:20 **essentially** 93:21 94:5 159:18 establish 15:5 156:6

250:15 established 4:15 12:5 156:2,12 158:4 261:2 establishes 31:5,10 56:16 establishment 157:2 162:10 esteemed 108:19 estimate 139:13 207:9 **estimated** 137:19,21 138:2 139:18 144:8 144:18 204:15 estimating 181:2 ethics 264:14 275:18 ethos 225:22 226:1 **Europe** 197:21 286:8 evaluate 122:7 241:21 evaluating 265:22 event 12:2 85:18 113:9 eventually 283:19 everybody 11:18 101:9 178:5,17 218:6 221:1 221:7,9 237:6 239:19 256:13 277:18 everybody's 100:6 261:7 evidence 26:5.8 45:10 45:14,22 46:4 48:9 105:13,19 146:6 149:6,8 163:4,5 167:22 187:11 198:2 229:11 235:6 evidentiary 49:19 185:5 280:21 evolution 105:12 evolved 131:2 **evolves** 217:19 exact 63:13 77:14 80:4 84:8 135:3 152:22 288:15 289:4 exactly 65:13 74:2,2 78:2 90:2,2 181:22 183:14 230:2 250:16 282:14 exam 147:4 examined 80:21 example 15:1 25:4 78:4 78:8 79:3 86:4 188:2 188:8 231:15 263:12 268:14 275:9 292:20 exams 197:16,22 exceedingly 83:7 exception 93:22 98:21 98:22 99:7 exceptions 45:11 143:13 **excess** 132:16

executed 32:12 executive 38:10 118:11 118:11 122:19 128:6 136:9 205:1 256:22 257:5,11,19 272:2 exercise 74:17 78:9,15 93:6,7 130:22 260:17 271:5 exercised 23:4 exert 58:13 exist 36:6 60:10 67:3,12 67:14 122:22 189:5 201:18 existed 29:1 37:4 **existence** 34:12 158:3 219:10 existing 36:21 126:11 exists 20:22 35:5,10 36:6 39:2 67:10 97:22 125:5,6 149:10 expand 187:21 **expanded** 14:5 49:3 146:16 156:10 expanding 117:1 146:17 180:9 expansion 128:1 **expect** 175:11 249:17 expectations 102:19 278:10 expediency 235:22 experience 61:4,6 70:11,13 111:9 117:3 119:22 122:19 150:16 151:8 171:12 177:19 188:18 210:22 211:8 273:5 274:21 292:14 292:14,15,16 293:7,9 experienced 16:3 149:14 292:21 experiences 258:5 **expert** 85:16 99:8 228:18 **expertise** 17:6 155:7 157:5 210:20 experts 12:9 158:21 203:16 explain 52:20,22 230:1 explanation 230:6 explicit 117:1 explicitly 131:11 142:15 **explode** 120:15 exploring 214:2

excited 286:22

exclusive 27:2

excluded 172:19

exclusively 292:8

excuse 115:12 294:12

explosion 121:12 expressed 266:13 extensive 151:18 163:14 extensively 109:22 extent 67:12 94:15 external 259:12,14 externally 259:9 extra 99:15 extraordinarily 278:3 extraordinary 278:3 extrapolation 207:5,8 extrapolations 207:7 Extraterritorial 23:15 **extremely** 220:10,15 eyes 210:22

F **FACA** 5:4 6:19 7:2 218:7 234:10 244:2 275:9 276:14 face 96:16 faced 155:17 facilitate 102:22 facing 292:12 fact 24:5 30:11 31:20 52:14 72:17 79:17 83:1 92:22 107:8 116:17 122:5 139:7 139:20 149:19 150:16 172:8 193:20 196:13 197:15 198:21 219:9 226:8 228:9 229:9,10 factored 207:9 factors 188:19 facts 195:16 225:10 factual 92:5,7 229:15 287:3 factually 192:3 **failing** 188:10 failure 187:20 fair 41:7 225:20 245:19 Fairfax 1:11 fairly 28:9 46:18 108:12 109:17 119:21 128:10 fairness 165:16 203:19 faith 187:21 fall 19:13 27:17 93:18 93:22 120:10,17 225:13 226:11 263:3 falls 26:22 202:8 false 79:7 196:13,16 familiar 20:14 37:3 106:13 255:13 259:1 275:2 family 13:19 14:6

exchange 97:4 272:7

140:19

famously 61:3

11			
far 53:11 84:16 103:13	finalized 271:2	floor 84:9	87:16 121:10 193:5
112:20 126:21 178:5	finally 132:19 291:9	flow 100:20 224:3	201:15 239:3,3
197:1 210:1 243:8	find 17:18 38:14 67:21	flowing 144:11	249:10 251:2 253:7
281:3 284:10	85:7 124:19 152:20	fluctuate 287:16	formal 219:3 249:18
		fluid 253:14	
far-distant 133:7	178:12 192:17 193:2		formally 182:13 format 223:5
fascinated 18:18 fashion 71:2	197:13 207:20,21,22	focal 116:15,17 118:5	
fast 105:10 106:15	213:2 220:10,11 223:10,16 224:10	focus 36:5 111:6 113:7 113:7 117:6,9 120:7	former 14:14 108:6 149:20 157:20 158:13
121:19	,	185:3 202:13 212:9	159:4
	225:14,16,17 226:7	212:13 265:6 266:6	
faster 73:22	248:11 257:9 274:6		forming 253:5
fate 225:18	finder 229:10	266:17 268:3 269:19	Fort 25:5 forth 130:1 215:9
favorable 121:7	finding 46:14 59:1	269:21,22 270:10	
feasible 189:21 271:15	91:19 188:2 226:8	focused 167:16,17	forthcoming 175:16
271:17,22	228:9	196:12 265:1	fortunate 11:1
February 168:7 169:19	findings 48:2 92:12	focuses 113:4 167:20	forum 74:22
173:16	93:7 130:19,20 257:5	focusing 148:11	forward 10:9 17:22
federal 2:14 4:10,20 5:1	finds 230:3	FOIA 122:22 125:15	85:17 88:10 100:10
5:3 8:14 9:4,14,15	finger 215:2	FOIAs 116:13	105:10 111:8 112:21
22:1 26:13,15 27:2,6	finish 114:17	folks 21:4 33:10 68:19	120:8 121:19 141:4
33:22 45:21 46:3	finished 176:18 211:1	71:8 195:12 197:21	149:7,9 183:2 185:7
47:19 49:21,22 52:18	fired 140:18	212:7,10,13 213:10	189:15 190:11 194:19
56:5,7,9 155:6 157:7 157:20 191:1 208:21	firm 152:9 first 4:4 7:10 9:6 10:7	225:7 follow 12:13 66:13	194:20 195:11 199:12 199:17 202:14 212:4
234:7 236:7 245:12			
245:14	22:14 31:4 34:11	85:21 102:3 104:2	215:16 248:17,19
	36:16 46:20 66:19	126:21 196:15 217:11	250:14 264:22 266:3
feel 19:6 168:4 175:18 191:4 198:9 199:13	82:10 84:19 85:1,6	237:14,22 267:13 follow-on 156:17 159:2	266:19 292:5 found 51:4 131:4
209:16 213:12 240:3	103:19 110:2 122:11 127:16 129:15 130:14	166:14 172:2 208:12	173:12 178:11 196:6
209.10 213.12 240.3		100.14 172.2 200.12	173.12 176.11 190.0
245.24 246.2	107.11 111.1 155.0	follow up 104:12	201-12 215-10 220-17
245:21 246:3	137:11 144:1 155:3	follow-up 194:13	204:13 215:18 238:17
feeling 145:20	158:2 179:3 194:12	280:20,21 281:18	foundation 211:15,20
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2 240:17 242:10 246:18	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2 240:17 242:10 246:18 248:21,22	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2 240:17 242:10 246:18 248:21,22 filed 50:16 193:4	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1 flashback 18:13,14	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14 forfeiture 55:17 57:8	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 frey 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4 Fried 2:5 3:14 9:9,13
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2 240:17 242:10 246:18 248:21,22 filed 50:16 193:4 files 122:18 123:3 185:4 190:14 195:2 233:18	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1 flashback 18:13,14 flexibility 262:19	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14 forfeiture 55:17 57:8 forge 178:22	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4 Fried 2:5 3:14 9:9,13 107:21 154:19 155:1
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1 flashback 18:13,14 flexibility 262:19 flexible 250:8 flip 212:16 flipping 214:4	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14 forfeiture 55:17 57:8 forge 178:22 forget 201:12	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4 Fried 2:5 3:14 9:9,13 107:21 154:19 155:1 160:11,12 170:8,13
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1 flashback 18:13,14 flexibility 262:19 flexible 250:8 flip 212:16	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14 forfeiture 55:17 57:8 forge 178:22 forget 201:12 forgive 197:9	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4 Fried 2:5 3:14 9:9,13 107:21 154:19 155:1 160:11,12 170:8,13 171:15 172:7 173:9
feeling 145:20 feet 208:1,17 270:8,14 fell 29:3 165:5 fellow 226:1 felony 51:15 felony-level 163:20 fence 212:22 fewer 64:7 fiat 137:3 field 23:1 62:4 175:19 175:21 199:9 241:8 247:2 Fifteen 121:20 fifth 144:18 figure 115:17,17 117:20 204:10 205:17 206:19 207:5 251:17 282:1,7 figuring 208:4 233:12 file 49:18 123:9 187:9 193:7 233:13 239:1,2 240:17 242:10 246:18 248:21,22 filed 50:16 193:4 files 122:18 123:3 185:4 190:14 195:2 233:18 239:9 240:18 filing 141:5 213:6,8 filings 15:7	158:2 179:3 194:12 195:3 206:16 210:14 211:9 212:20 223:19 228:17 257:4 265:6 265:18 270:14,17 278:13 284:2 287:8 293:1,15 fiscal 4:17,19 7:19 32:22 61:8 64:6,20 75:14 155:13 184:13 186:1 223:1 288:22 fit 134:14 190:4 fitness 122:15 five 25:6 56:11 64:9 106:10 157:13 167:3 177:21 197:5 205:12 217:10 236:22 249:8 252:1 260:10 261:19 277:19 287:7 five-minute 177:7 five-year 181:5 fix 199:15 200:3,3 217:6 fixing 74:1 flashback 18:13,14 flexibility 262:19 flexible 250:8 flip 212:16 flipping 214:4	280:20,21 281:18 followed 6:16 following 9:17 17:22 102:14 217:14 219:9 219:14 247:11 force 2:15 13:7,16 28:22 29:1,2 42:6 43:16,22 48:18 81:11 86:22 92:2 96:3,4 109:4 110:21 111:9 139:14 150:21 152:20 208:3 286:2,4,14,15 292:20 293:20 Force-wide 139:16 forced 173:8 199:7 Forces 1:4 3:8 4:7 6:13 7:12 8:2,19 11:22 22:22 24:1 28:18 157:9 220:20 221:3 forcible 220:6 foremost 155:3 forensics 197:11 forfeit 42:14 forfeiture 55:17 57:8 forge 178:22 forget 201:12 forgive 197:9 forgot 133:12	foundation 211:15,20 262:3,8 foundational 262:6 263:6,10 264:4 four 12:16 25:5,10,11 26:17 38:10 40:9 61:11 97:17 107:14 157:15 168:12 177:20 249:8 252:3,4 260:7 286:13 four-and-a-half 271:6 four-and-three-quarter 271:7 fourth 259:12 frame 38:9 64:11,13 107:3 279:11 framing 184:4 Frankel 158:18 fray 264:8 free 19:6 168:4 209:16 Freedom 237:12 freely 199:12 205:3 frequency 179:4 Fried 2:5 3:14 9:9,13 107:21 154:19 155:1 160:11,12 170:8,13 171:15 172:7 173:9 173:14,18 174:9,14

friend 35:11 142:19 frolic 140:14 front 18:12 46:8 47:21 97:8,9,11 99:20 108:17 135:13 161:6 205:3 229:7 241:9 fulfill 16:4 full 6:9 143:5 154:8 179:14 fully 121:16 function 52:18 functions 15:12 16:6 47.11 fundamental 163:6 263:5 **funding** 165:20 funny 96:2 furor 120:17 further 15:18 21:2 32:15 38:5 66:2 105:9 129:9,15 144:15 156:10 166:5 231:8 249:5 future 132:11 133:7 147:12 210:3 218:21 243:18 278:2 **FY** 119:4 120:12,14,15 121:11,17 122:4,7,8 156:5 167:10 **FY2014** 77:9

G

G 4:1 Gallagher 2:12 230:17 230:20 game 130:1,2 gap 194:6 224:15,19,19 gaps 194:11,17,21 195:20 268:5 278:1 **Garvin** 1:15 169:11 173:13,15 186:9,17 186:20 187:1 193:9 218:22 219:5 222:15 224:8,15,22 225:3 243:9 265:12,16 276:8 gather 139:22 193:17 232:2 276:21 gathered 116:4 134:13 270:1 gathering 234:11 244:4 260:22 280:7 **Gazette** 72:1,8 73:6 **GC** 11:4 **GCM** 56:10,13,17 57:11 63:4 75:1,2,12 77:18 90:11 GCM's 45:6

GCMs 56:2 61:10.12 64:10 65:2,4 94:18 gelled 182:22 general 2:1,4,6 8:10 9:10 10:12 11:2 14:10 17:20 18:20 22:16 32:19 33:3 40:14 48:17 49:2 54:13,18 56:4 62:6,19 75:6,8 75:18 76:2,9,13 77:16 77:18 78:7 83:12,14 86:9 88:20 90:13,14 93:7 94:9,19 95:11,13 95:18 101:16 102:9 103:4,21 111:16 118:15 119:20 128:21 138:8 151:11 154:20 169:9 183:2 198:6,11 199:2 206:2 210:4 212:2 221:5 246:6 248:2 250:22 263:17 278:16 279:6 291:18 292:3 generalists 292:18 generally 40:19 46:22 49:9,11,12 59:12 65:7 69:13 110:15 123:20 245:11 generate 236:7 generated 174:3 254:14 **genesis** 120:9 genital 235:7 242:22 Gentile 1:17 gentlemen 101:15 geographical 279:12 getting 18:13 68:22 70:14 72:20 107:6 128:22 194:9,21 205:19 231:5 233:11 292:13 Gillibrand 158:17 162:17 Gillibrand's 163:12 gist 140:7 give 31:21 43:2 44:7,21 54:22 99:8 132:1 133:19 140:5 148:2,6 151:3 179:14,15 206:18 208:5 212:20 215:10 217:5 222:5 244:13 248:13 256:14 268:13 269:22 270:13 287:5 288:15 given 9:19 32:7 52:13 150:18 158:4 162:19

195:17 209:6 249:13

250:13 276:14 279:2

gives 28:16 31:17 44:1

glasses 146:20 goal 147:20 262:6 **goals** 263:6 Google 124:18 gotten 82:13 107:15 231:22 247:16 Governance 103:15 governed 29:6 governing 127:11 142:13 government 28:18 29:7 29:8,11,14 99:14 227:21 229:13 236:9 241:19 286:16 grab 195:1 grade 16:13 55:20,21 grand 1:10 23:5 89:22 granddaughter 215:15 215:16 grant 94:16 95:17 99:17 granted 18:10 92:3,4,6 **grants** 95:18 **grave** 11:13 greater 31:3 60:14,20 66:1 **Grimm** 1:16 18:13,16 37:15 46:7 53:13,18 54:1 66:3 73:20.21 85:22 88:2 89:21 140:4 143:16 187:2,5 187:13 190:20 233:6 234:20 236:3 265:2.9 266:4 269:9,14 278:5 **Grimm's** 270:18 ground 178:22 **grounded** 106:20 groundwork 181:14 group 19:12,21 111:21 113:4,21 117:11 124:17 126:12 127:13 128:19 132:11,14 152:7 166:7 180:3,19 181:14 190:5 212:13 232:7 242:10 245:11 255:9 260:4 288:12 groups 109:18 111:6 113:7 118:16 155:18 158:15 172:14 181:11 188:3 189:12 212:10 grown 134:5 guarantee 294:5 **Guard** 21:9,9,12,14,16 61:12 64:22 86:21 152:17 Guardsman 21:15

130:14 133:18 134:5

208:17 262:18 270:21

271:3

Guardsmen 21:22 quess 66:14 78:11 101:20 197:9 240:10 244:2 246:5 250:20 251:17 253:4,10 269:19 270:12 guessing 181:3 guidance 129:12 140:10 240:10 **guidelines** 51:2 52:13 52:19 56:7 161:17 guilt 47:15 48:2 227:5 guilt- 57:18 guilty 46:14 51:5 91:20 97:5 150:10 229:20 230:5 **Gulf** 153:11

Hagel 158:7 half 30:22 42:15 61:13 hammered 41:4 hand 152:5,5,6 185:21 handle 201:14 266:8 290:9 292:14 handled 28:2 62:5 203:2 247:5 269:1 handles 155:19 156:8 handling 107:8 146:2 174:5 231:10 **hands** 180:13 happen 62:1 180:16 213:13 243:19 245:20 happened 23:6,21 37:2 71:5 74:18 77:21 82:18 120:16 125:8 125:11 142:21 145:16 146:15 160:19 172:3 190:4 193:8 196:17 199:1,5 247:1 happening 175:18 194:8 198:22 205:14 212:3,22 219:15 261:18 happens 26:20 42:6 61:1 83:4,5 133:5 140:11 216:18 268:18 happy 100:12,13 279:21 285:14 harassment 151:20 192:9 288:3 hard 18:1 38:18,19 102:1 108:15 122:13 149:2,4 150:13 151:15 174:15 189:12 189:13,13 200:2,14 216:20,20 218:16 220:10 239:3,8 240:2

255:8 278:13 282:20 hesitate 18:3 157:19 **implement** 9:21 136:13 285:1 288:14 hey 34:4 74:19 75:18 honored 10:11 implementation 117:6 harder 41:4 146:8 76:2,2,2,9,10 77:16 hope 18:14 132:13 136:17 156:19 181:8 153:14 77:16 80:19 81:6 173:3 178:19 implemented 12:20 Harrison 1:16 74:3,5,11 95:13 102:7 147:13 hopefully 102:22 120:22 182:8 77:22 80:2,9 81:20 211:12 132:12 133:7 224:9 implementing 116:18 145:14 148:10 149:3 hide 238:14 hoping 102:17 137:6 **implies** 187:13 187:16 188:13 214:16 high 28:9 150:19 255:6 horribly 38:20 importance 11:13 horror 96:16 214:19 215:21 231:6 higher 69:3 important 12:12 15:14 highlight 14:20 31:1 horse 262:11 16:22 26:11,19 35:1 231:7 247:3 275:8,13 44:22 47:10 85:14 275:15 283:10 125:3 134:19 136:5 hospitals 197:17 **highlights** 3:7 6:11 8:17 **hats** 148:15 hosted 111:2,4 90:4 93:15 106:19 Hawk 42:1 hour 19:1 154:3,8 119:19 150:21 188:16 257:15 He'll 230:4 Hill 162:20 183:11 195:18 263:3 283:16 hours 20:2 42:7 112:8 head 35:12 255:15 historians 158:15 287:6 288:7 headquarters 239:16 historical 155:9 115:14 240:8 **impose** 56:17 59:12 246:21 247:1 historically 117:5 house 111:3 155:18 60:13 95:3 imposed 40:16 53:18 heads 184:2 206:17 120:22 243:5 157:17 268:18 207:18 **history** 3:7,11 6:12,13 **housing** 268:16 75:15 health 9:11 141:20 http://dacipad.whs.mil 8:18 9:3 110:11 imposing 51:1 142:3 113:10,14 114:16 5:8 imposition 121:9 health-wise 258:9 huge 72:16,19 119:3 183:5,6 225:20 **improve** 15:10 195:9 healthcare 259:2 249:3 **Human** 291:5 improved 15:18 hear 70:9 100:11 **hit** 106:13 114:20 hundreds 112:8 217:2 improving 165:18 195:12 213:9,10 120:18 278:13 hung 57:19 58:17 59:5 inaugural 11:22 272:13 285:4,15 hits 243:14 59:9 60:22 inauguration 12:2 286:22 288:1 292:5 hold 9:18 husband 140:18 278:11 heard 7:17 10:16 holding 38:11 incentive 227:8 155:21 158:12,18 **holds** 141:16 207:8 inches 175:1 172:7,10,11 220:1,3 **Holiday** 1:11 153:15 iceberg 204:12 incidence 117:17,18 137:22 139:13.18 236:22 266:13 275:18 holistic 71:2 104:7 idea 30:14 97:12 182:21 278:19 287:8 114:1,3,4 183:14 218:4 219:5 incident 144:8 188:15 hearing 10:9 14:19 48:8 **Holmes** 61:2 223:10 262:6 275:5 219:6 221:15 89:9,11,11 90:3,8 Holtzman 159:5 **Ideally** 189:19 incidents 113:6 138:3 99:21 122:8,10 129:1 home 20:7 231:22 ideas 184:1 272:7,22 144:19 160:18 163:7 154:11 167:20 212:14 268:15 identical 45:11 58:6 188:1 identification 180:11 212:20 216:11 218:9 inclined 68:14 homicides 25:13 228:20 267:12 273:11 Hon 1:14,16,22 2:1 263:3 include 5:10 10:1 51:7 276:16 11:17 18:16 37:15 identified 126:13 51:10 57:1 93:13 hearings 82:7 104:22 53:13,18 54:1 62:16 identifies 181:15 184:14 195:2 221:2 62:18,22 63:8 73:21 105:4 109:12 242:22 identify 180:18 181:16 224:16,17 261:9 274:8 81:22 88:2 89:21 211:18 260:2 279:18 263:13 264:1,2 heart 252:5 140:4 143:16 180:11 identifying 161:15 included 29:14 92:14 180:17 181:22 187:2 heck 223:11 211:4 93:12 267:7.21 height 69:16 187:5,13 190:20 **IG** 290:19 includes 5:20 6:10 held 6:5 60:4 102:3 203:21 221:10 222:3 19:14 21:9,15,15 44:5 **ignore** 108:1 127:15 158:12 164:8 227:3,8,13 229:5,14 **II** 30:4,5 32:5 52:9 57:2 61:11 99:3 234:13 233:6 234:20 236:3 124:21 128:17 129:4 illuminating 190:7 help 16:15 18:4 85:3 238:2 259:22 261:7 illustration 212:21 160:18 184:13 235:6 287:21 116:19 133:7 225:13 261:20 262:1,14,18 **imagine** 183:15 241:19 242:2,2 268:3 263:16 265:2,9 266:4 including 21:14 56:19 immediately 103:17 helpful 19:10 35:19,22 268:7 269:9,14 **impact** 17:10 189:9 61:6 81:14 109:7 270:16,18 271:9,20 122:2 150:22 157:2 100:11 161:19 169:17 198:2,8 253:1 291:7 178:8 189:8 203:5 274:2,5 278:5 283:1 158:16 161:11 162:16 **impacted** 128:12 245:11 250:17,21 283:18,22 284:3 impacting 11:9 163:16 170:4 265:20 255:1 277:4 **honor** 10:21 18:15 impacts 122:1 incorporate 112:20 Hennis 25:21 26:3,8 impediments 199:20 46:13 62:21 81:21 incorporated 16:9 Heritage 79:5 **Honorable** 11:1 14:14 **imperfect** 103:12 104:6 incorporation 161:16

increase 163:8 increased 83:19 increasing 40:12 incredibly 149:1 197:10 219:2 independence 128:2 independent 13:5 32:4 78:5,9 156:7 165:21 166:12 167:7 174:10 294:12 Indian 242:5 indict 188:22 individual 24:12 27:18 28:1 89:5 188:22 294:11 individually 178:6 284:13 individuals 235:16 inefficiencies 260:21 inflate 289:11 inflicted 29:17 influence 58:14 59:6 78:5,14,17 79:2,13,14 170:19 influenced 16:12 inform 16:15 164:20 **information** 5:9.11.13 5:18 48:15 84:15 115:3,5,20 116:10 138:14 150:20 159:7 160:7.8 161:2 164:14 169:17 172:21 175:3 175:7,14 176:8,10,10 176:17,22 177:1 178:5 193:4 195:14 198:13 208:5 222:4 232:2 233:7 234:5,8 234:16,17,18 235:11 236:5,8 237:12,13,17 242:17 243:11 244:4 248:5,7 259:12,13 279:19 280:17 281:4 informational 9:17 informed 17:7 154:7 175:3 213:2 218:8 **inherent** 32:1,2 initial 168:6 223:12 Initially 158:2 initiation 189:8 initiative 13:17 initiatives 162:2 165:20 **injury** 70:18 Inn 1:11 153:15 innocence 47:15 57:19 innocent 41:7 227:5 **input** 10:1 **inquire** 188:17 inquiring 248:9

inquiry 126:5 229:20 **insight** 222:5 **installation** 20:7 148:19 197:20 246:20 268:19 installations 111:2 169:5 246:16 instance 27:18 50:16 79:22 126:15 135:21 161:10 225:15 239:11 instances 22:12 25:2 30:13 49:16 77:13,15 247:4 instantaneous 15:7 institute 14:4 institution 199:20 instruction 117:1 135:2 135:4 instructive 281:16 instructor-trainee 136:1 insufficient 205:19 integration 129:9 **intended** 143:13 intense 132:14 155:17 162:20 intentionally 29:18 interact 144:12,14 interacted 119:20 interacting 213:20 interaction 135:20 280:19 interactions 117:22 135:17 interest 81:18 101:8 158:5 203:10 209:22 254:17 **interested** 94:6 160:8 196:11 198:15,17 212:1 interesting 32:17 59:8 71:5 85:10 113:9 185:9 196:22 197:7 213:2 interestingly 59:10 interests 112:10 252:15 interim 162:21 interlocutory 50:19 internal 113:22 133:2 146:16 249:21 258:17 259:11 287:14 internet 274:8 interplay 128:5 interprets 38:5 interrupt 228:16 intervening 109:18 intervention 265:22

interviewed 109:8

interviews 111:5

intrafamilial 202:20 Introductions 3:2 invest 162:18 investigate 86:12,14,15 86:18,20,21 87:1 188:16 192:8 investigated 12:22 13:3 87:4 139:5 174:17 249:5 investigates 88:9 investigation 1:3 4:6 7:11,21 11:21 16:1,5 16:11 17:2 87:14 118:4 143:4 145:15 148:16 155:20 161:12 170:5,7 188:8,9 193:4 194:19 195:9 203:16 220:5 254:4 263:15 279:16,17 293:7 investigations 80:10 157:6 188:11 195:5 211:7 279:13 280:3 investigative 13:5 15:11 86:11 87:11 176:13 193:7 194:8 194:13 195:2.8 210:10 211:11 239:2 239:9,10,12 246:17 280:2,12,20 281:5 292:17 293:19 investigatively 194:12 195:22 investigator 211:9 293:11,12,15,17 investigators 159:21 292:15 293:6 294:2 invite 115:19 127:2 invoke 41:7 involved 15:22 23:11 63:22 121:5 125:12 125:21 126:11 136:21 237:3 290:12 involvement 258:12 **involves** 220:17 **involving** 8:1 160:14 167:8 220:20 221:3 278:22 Iraq 23:6,11,13,21 69:16 Iraqi 23:20 **Israel** 158:20 issue 50:11,13 60:9 81:15 91:7 110:14 112:8 135:14 141:2 162:20 169:14 185:6 201:16 204:1,13 208:12 238:6 250:10

intimate 202:5

253:3 266:16 272:16 292:12 issued 158:22 162:21 165:3 172:9 issues 3:8 6:12 8:18 12:16 17:6 28:5 70:16 84:13 110:13 111:17 112:20 136:21 138:11 158:5 170:15 176:13 182:20 191:6,7 204:21 206:2 208:11 209:22 212:2 238:3 242:7 263:3,10 264:14 268:2 292:10 **issuing** 137:3 **IT1** 150:10 item 109:22 items 282:11 iteration 116:12

J 1:19 **J'accuse** 128:22 **Jacqueline** 2:15 4:9 **JAG** 107:13 239:17 292:17 **JAGC** 2:2 jail 149:18,18 **James** 1:18,20 **January** 1:8 13:16 33:16 34:6,8,21 114:22 **Jen** 206:1 210:7 Jennifer 1:17,18 2:1 11:1 jeopardy 243:21 Jim 35:6,6 job 17:18 102:3 132:4 137:7,9 242:2 255:19 283:1,2 jobs 102:11 122:10,13 282:22 join 11:3 joining 10:5,8 11:16 Joint 2:3 8:22 14:10 35:14 101:19 124:6 136:7,19 166:7 271:16 joke 65:14 Jones 157:20 159:3 162:8 Journal 72:5 **JPP** 110:9 113:3,21 156:2,13,17 159:3,4,6 159:7,8 166:13,19,20 167:6,13,15 168:6,12 168:19 169:1,3,9,10 169:14,19 172:8,11

36:14 37:4 39:6 42:21 173:16,17 176:11,20 245:17 246:5,15 learned 183:16 218:18 184:12 186:15 208:12 47:5 52:16 78:16 87:8 251:14,21 275:11 219:2 237:2 274:21 278:19 279:9 281:7 209:7 256:1 259:11 87:10 101:19 103:3,6 leave 20:4,5 73:2,3,8,10 270:2,20 271:16 104:10 105:11 106:4 73:16 120:2 133:10 273:17 106:8,11 108:14 247:14 266:7 290:18 **JSC** 111:11 118:15 113:3,10,12,20 lab 96:10,11,13,17 Leavenworth 25:6 **JSC's** 133:12 114:19 119:4 123:14 labeled 70:20 71:1 leaves 22:9 192:6 judge 8:13,20 14:14 123:17,19 124:2,5,16 lack 187:20 190:3 211:8 **lecture** 275:18 led 14:16 72:5,6 82:6 18:12 46:7 49:20 124:17,21 125:7 ladies 101:14 126:12 128:15,17 lag 105:22 104:10 114:8 52:16,20 53:19 54:7 laid 168:2 66:3 73:20 74:18 77:1 129:14 130:13,13 left 24:2 26:8 60:1 77:3,5 82:3 85:22 131:10 133:6,15 land 28:18 100:3 121:2 149:16 152:7 163:6 165:19 90:15 91:1,2,9,11 language 15:1 171:20 287:3 97:9,10,11,12,12,15 166:7,8 221:13 222:4 263:4 legal 11:7,8 16:19 18:11 28:12,13 82:11 97:18 101:16 104:12 223:21 228:18 238:3 large 68:21 122:4,5 112:14,16 118:1 258:12 259:15 286:19 104:13,14 105:8,15 162:6 187:19 194:6 114:8 119:22 125:20 288:5 292:8 121:15 141:11,21 202:12 126:10,16 127:6 justice-related 119:14 **largely** 106:13 142:3 187:22 254:2 128:16 129:5,6,7 larger 65:1 legally 123:5 Κ 130:6 131:16 149:15 **legible** 119:12 **lasting** 17:10 157:21 159:3 162:8 Kathleen 1:15 lately 52:11 legislation 33:1 34:3,4 188:20 227:9,17,22 35:18 36:13 41:12 keep 119:7 123:4.6 latest 88:6 228:1 229:8,17 230:2 178:1 248:9 264:20 146:15 156:9,12 Laugher 151:2 230:3 252:5 270:18 264:22 266:18 267:3 162:15,16 163:3 Laughter 78:22 100:4 286:4,9,12 292:13 102:5,16 104:3 166:9 181:16 271:3 judges 104:15 125:12 keeping 132:4 207:1 110:19 124:10 131:22 legislative 2:10 3:7 128:11 294:9 Keith 1:16 231:7 138:18 143:22 145:1 6:11 8:17 106:5 judgment 46:16 91:16 **Kennedy** 59:22 60:5 153:12 154:10 228:21 113:14 119:9,13 judicial 3:13 9:8,16 124:18 152:8 162:2 **kept** 99:20 239:4,4 launch 278:2 12:17 113:19 127:11 launched 13:17 legitimate 262:4 **kev** 244:8 155:13 161:21 167:7 kick 44:8,18 55:4 law 26:21 30:18 33:13 **leisure** 168:4 judicially 243:7 kicked 72:11,12 38:5 61:3 79:18 80:13 lend 17:7 judiciary 128:2,5,5,9 kicking 99:3 81:5,17 92:9 101:17 lends 283:20 Julie 2:10 kid/child 224:13 118:8 119:15 126:11 lens 149:14 jump 19:6 147:6 kidding 82:7 127:20 142:10 143:4 Leo 1:14 278:8 **juncture** 193:10 kids 235:13 265:21 144:15 146:19 157:6 Leo's 269:18 June 158:22 266:7 201:11 211:2 236:12 lesser 92:14 192:4 **junior** 78:15 **kinds** 185:5,11 198:10 lawful 79:17,20 230:18 **juries** 59:5 236:19 laws 91:16 117:16 **lessons** 237:2 **jurisdiction** 13:3 19:13 Kingdom 158:20 118:10,10,12 **let's** 20:4 22:12 24:13 20:12,17,21,22 21:1 kit 96:20 lawyer 13:20 28:11 28:10 36:14 40:15 22:5,8,13 23:15 24:20 48:21,22 49:10,12 55:1 57:17 61:4 64:18 Kitty 42:1 27:3,17 197:2,20 knew 152:12 54:15 76:1,10 96:5 66:19 67:17 76:21 knock 92:13 93:8 97:3 289:20,21 290:2,3,6 126:1 142:18 231:14 85:18.21 86:2 90:9 290:10 lawyers 11:11 76:16 91:12 95:18,20 96:22 98:2 99:4,6 97:7,15 98:4 114:10 jurisdiction-by- 197:1 **knocked** 98:14 **lay** 161:9 115:2 120:6 144:17 jurisdictional 28:5 knowledge 271:12 laying 156:15 273:2 lead 73:12 109:7 113:1 177:20 236:22 255:9 iurisdictions 16:9 22:11 26:22 163:21 knowledgeable 119:21 206:9 293:5,12,15,16 letter 75:20 76:11 level 61:21 77:4 118:11 jury 47:1,2,3,6,9,11,13 **known** 16:20 29:5,9,22 leaders 158:14 47:21,22 57:19 58:17 118:13 170:10 203:15 142:16 155:12 leadership 112:15 59:9 90:1 knows 18:20 79:18 172:20 200:9 215:7 203:16 215:6 221:18 justice 2:3,4 8:11,22 221:19 239:18 244:14 97:13 224:9 216:15 13:2 14:12,16,18,21 Korea 103:18 252:19 leads 106:18 108:12 levels 72:14 150:20 17:6 18:19 19:9,13,21 Kramer 1:17 66:5,7 114:14 161:19 171:12 20:9,16 22:10 28:13 68:3 170:2,9 171:14 **League** 112:2 **Lewis** 2:8 193:3 229:16 28:21 30:2,9,17 31:5 171:16 219:22 220:2 learn 205:17,18 218:14 251:10 33:2,5,9 35:13,14,16 221:21 238:22 240:3 219:3 249:9 Liaison 2:10

liberal 69:13 242:10,16 281:22 249:9 270:6 271:4 148:20,21 172:17 Library 105:2 282:20 273:11 284:18 287:8 173:2 184:6 195:12 **lie** 149:18 **logistics** 179:4 282:15 290:7 195:15 196:8 208:13 long 1:17 15:12 41:22 260:5 261:8,12 lieu 289:8 **lots** 39:7 61:22 135:15 lieutenant 4:8 7:7 10:18 72:2 100:6,7 101:17 137:7 278:19 male 140:20 102:9 245:7 102:6,6 114:6 123:4,6 Louisiana 60:1,5 maligned 110:5 135:7 love 137:7 195:1 240:17 life 25:9 51:16,16,18 134:5 173:16 190:8 maltreatment 110:4 61:3 119:8 215:19 191:3 201:6,8 203:5 Loving 25:8 117:10 135:5,13 217:11 218:4 222:12 233:21 low 102:18 manage 162:7 278:10 lifetime 55:7 253:4,14,20,22 254:7 lower 13:13 63:12,19 management 91:16 107:9 122:20 light 116:13 254:9,12 267:5,15,19 98:10 99:6 228:5 likes 79:19 149:21 281:9,14 293:2 230:15 **Mandamus** 49:19 50:2 limit 132:16 189:15 lowest 55:20 50:8,16 long-term 258:9 limitations 131:15 longer 83:7 92:11,12 Lt 2:15 4:3 10:22 mandate 7:20 181:19 123:5,8 134:12 154:14 228:15,22 181:20 221:6,8 146:17 limited 40:17 49:8 166:21 199:15 229:3 234:6 245:3,8 mandated 132:10 143:11 147:10 207:7 looked 63:14 109:17,18 250:20 251:12 253:17 mandatory 51:12,13,15 line 25:19 114:6 241:9 111:11,16 126:13 275:12,14 285:4 51:16,20,22 52:3,12 lines 85:1 238:19 138:1 159:18 161:17 294:16 74:6,8 99:2 104:15 **LTC** 2:8 193:3 229:16 link 273:17 278:6 162:1,15 164:6 108:10 121:9 links 178:14 273:16 171:11 172:22 176:12 251:10 manner 12:21 131:13 list 134:3,9,12 136:13 210:9 224:18 238:15 luck 294:14 Manpower 287:14 210:6 215:10 259:19 238:17 271:18 281:15 lunch 9:1 153:21 manual 37:11,13,18 154:17 92:21 104:11 105:6 275:1,6 looking 64:3 112:8 126:3 132:12,13 105:11 114:12 129:11 **listening** 225:5 241:3 M 138:7 160:22 171:18 189:4 253:6 listing 77:11 165:4 182:7 191:16 197:14 M 2:1 11:1 March 284:6.22 259:17 198:15 199:19 201:21 M.R.E 242:22 Marcia 1:14 178:1 210:17 226:7 230:10 Maria 2:5 3:14 9:9 literally 38:16 79:17 **ma'am** 18:6 178:15 114:9 152:3 257:4 233:17 235:5 242:1 190:18 198:16 224:7 154:19 literature 258:4,15,18 248:7,11 254:17,18 229:16 230:17 244:8 marijuana 20:8 258:19 259:7 263:14 263:8,11,12 264:15 253:16,17 273:10 Marine 8:12 16:20 litigate 54:16 293:2 266:20 267:16,17 277:9 283:17 284:11 21:18,19 42:7 43:17 **litigating** 46:8,8,19 269:10 274:17 288:2 284:20 285:4 46:13 49:4,6 65:8,15 litigation 124:2 292:22 292:7,11 machine 131:21,21 65:16 71:6,6,8,9,10 little 38:3 61:6 77:11 looks 37:19 45:1 66:10 Madam 7:4 154:14,21 71:15 72:1,7,15 73:4 107:1,9 108:10 87:19 96:15 124:7,8 155:1 177:6 214:16 73:6 76:6 79:4 81:12 109:12 110:8 116:9,9 258:8 240:9 256:18 285:16 86:4,14,16,18 87:12 120:6 121:14 123:15 **Los** 281:13,14 294:16 88:15 89:2 96:1,6,17 133:11 140:5,8,12 losing 73:8 235:8 magic 228:3 118:2 152:17 206:22 141:7,15 146:21 loss 260:1 Marines 29:3 71:12 magistrate 127:9 154:3 166:21 167:16 lost 72:8 73:16 magistrates 127:4 73:7 180:12 184:10 195:19 lot 30:13,20,21 31:15 magnitude 204:2 mark 237:19 mail 240:17 marked 64:19 65:21 226:11 256:11 259:22 33:8,12,19,21 34:2 280:9 37:5 41:4 45:1 50:20 main 32:6 45:18 46:20 236:10,21 live 219:9,14 273:22 53:10 63:19 65:9 94:3 164:20 279:5 Markey 1:18 62:10,13 93:17 100:19 101:4,7 **lives** 17:10 68:11 70:1,16,18 maintain 146:10 163:22 71:18 73:17 83:14 175:13 182:2 193:20 living 268:16 maintenance 109:3 local 118:13 247:6 105:3 110:11 118:8 major 19:20 104:7 210:4 240:9 256:18 253:2 118:18,19 123:16 106:1 124:11 136:1,8 256:21 257:7,13,16 138:14 149:21 153:14 location 85:12 234:22 165:6 204:9,19 257:21 259:14,21 155:22 164:11 167:17 239:4 279:12 286:11 215:13 274:20 279:8 282:21 283:2 167:20 175:5 176:1 Markowitz 1:18 191:9 locations 148:14 majority 57:15,17,21 178:18 182:17 183:16 191:14 197:8 201:19 **logic** 61:4 59:1 60:15,16 61:20 logical 210:18 183:19 184:17 195:12 62:4,8 133:15 163:10 202:18 211:22 213:4 logistical 238:22 199:4 203:2 205:8 239:8 240:1 213:8 235:4 237:18 210:8 212:5 218:14 240:11 245:18 **majors** 112:3 237:21 243:8 258:2 logistically 240:20 218:18 232:21 237:2 making 78:6 129:19 258:22 264:7,11

I		
265:7,15 266:2,5	221:21 224:20 235:14	48:14 50:22 53:18
268:1,12	235:19 242:20 257:22	54:5,6,8 56:11,12
marks 243:12		
	258:6,7,16 259:4	57:9 58:3,8,21 60:22
married 69:4,5	260:9,15 263:20	72:22 79:9 84:15 97:9
Martha 1:12,13 3:17 6:3	264:1 266:16 270:21	108:19 151:11,22
253:10	271:10,20,22 272:12	154:15 157:4,13,14
martial 6:11 15:8 21:1	279:4,11	157:15,16,22 158:16
24:20 31:6 32:1,3	means 67:4,14 96:6	159:2 160:14 163:9
33:11 34:1 37:11,13	115:18 180:4 205:7,8	167:3,13 169:2,3
37:19 41:4 44:4,16	205:8 234:13 236:11	176:4,21 202:7
46:9 54:4,5,12,13,19	291:14	217:20 220:20 227:22
56:20 61:7,15 62:5,6	meant 254:7	234:12 245:15 251:4
62:6,19 65:19 66:21	measure 165:6	251:6 266:22 275:5
70:5 71:13,17,19 89:1	measured 182:9	283:13 284:13 288:9
92:22 94:20,22 95:1	meat 260:12	291:12
97:7 98:13 161:21	mechanism 192:16	membership 157:3
Maryland 46:12,17	mechanisms 40:5	159:8 180:9 253:13
massive 32:16 195:5	media 155:18	men 17:11 22:8
Mast 39:17 42:8	medical 141:20 142:2	mental 141:20
Master 25:20,21	197:11,16 212:12	mention 37:8 89:21
match 147:11	235:6 236:20	133:13
matched 26:2	meet 47:6 179:13	mentioned 32:20 33:3
material 260:3 278:5	232:12 277:17 278:17	33:18 48:17 49:3
materials 174:7 180:21	282:19	54:10 56:19 83:2 86:9
210:14	meeting 1:6 4:4,12 5:17	88:20 99:1 116:16
math 104:1 138:6	6:9 7:3,10 8:3,7 9:22	119:1 120:20 136:5
144:21	10:4,6 12:1 152:18	141:12 146:9 150:6
matter 19:1,5 20:17	158:2 169:18 173:16	153:10 159:15 167:4
77:2 101:12 158:21	179:5 180:3 234:9,9	178:11
177:11 210:7 285:8	260:12 271:2,4 272:8	mentions 96:10
290:2 294:21	273:7 276:6,16,17	meshing 260:20
matters 11:9,13 78:16	282:16 285:3,5,7	met 1:10
123:20 234:15	294:17,20	method 190:13
maximize 147:20 290:5	meetings 5:5,11,12	methodology 137:20
maximum 56:15,17,22	158:12 164:9 173:20	137:21 139:12
57:7 92:19,20 93:9	179:18,22 208:9	metrics 210:16 280:4,8
95:10 122:2 136:14	243:18 272:10,18	MG 225:5 247:9 285:16
148:2	Meg 1:15	MG(R) 1:14
maximums 51:2 93:11	Meghan 1:21 169:11	military's 15:11 16:5
McCaskill 158:17	186:5 188:12 217:7	290:5
MCIO 141:12	243:3	military/non-military
McKinley 1:19 83:10	Meghan's 84:11	273:5
85:9 137:9,18 138:7	MEJA 23:10,13,19	million 19:14 21:3
151:17 171:22 173:6	245:18	151:22
198:16 200:5 201:1	member 20:4 21:18	mind 10:11,15,19 147:6
214:17,18 215:5	22:18,20 46:21 47:12	171:16 177:7 235:8
216:13 222:10 232:1	47:14 48:13 51:10	294:7
232:18,22 252:12	53:3 55:3,20 57:1,17	mindful 235:17
268:13 269:2,5,7	58:10,13 111:21	minds 127:1
274:18 275:4	119:6 127:13 140:20	mine 53:6 66:14
mean 58:4 66:20 67:1	145:19 159:3 169:10	minimum 51:12,13,15
144:1 148:17 176:1	202:21 221:3 268:15	51:16,21,22 54:9 74:6
180:13,17 181:12	268:17,19 289:22	74:8 99:2 121:9
185:20 187:22 188:2	members 5:14,19,21,22	minimums 51:2 52:12
192:2 193:11 195:15	6:2,8 7:1,8,15,15 8:1	minor 60:2 122:1
199:18 201:20 204:17	11:20 13:19 14:7 21:6	minors 14:7
100.10 201.20 204.17		
208:20 214:6 215:8		minus 150:6
	21:15 43:10 46:22 47:2,10,13,14,15 48:6	minus 150:6 minutes 100:3 277:19
208:20 214:6 215:8	21:15 43:10 46:22	

mirror 128:10 mirroring 105:12 misconduct 8:1 40:10 67:2,3,6,13,13,18,22 68:6,9 69:6,11,21 111:13,19 112:9 163:18 191:22 192:1 192:11 220:7,19 231:18 245:20 miscreant 70:20 71:1 missing 217:16 223:18 mission 157:9 184:4 201:2 204:9 261:15 262:19 mist 22:9 mistrial 150:7 **MJA** 125:9 MJA16 124:11 MJRG 113:22,22 114:8 124:18 127:14 134:13 136:6 modern 111:7,8,8 131:16 modernized 14:21 modification 151:19 **modify** 53:16 164:15 modifying 38:10 moment 62:16 159:14 160:9 161:8 176:15 228:16 243:13 250:16 moment-in-time 128:20 Monday 278:13 monetary 150:19 **money** 91:6 month 42:15 55:17 97:1 **monthly** 179:13 180:3 250:9 months 18:1 42:15 55:14,14,16,18 93:4 93:13 95:14,21 97:4 97:17,22 98:5,6 158:3 179:17 180:16 208:6 241:1 260:11 270:9 270:22 271:21 272:4 272:20 276:17 279:1 281:18 282:17,19 291:1 monumental 121:21 moral 146:10 morale 201:2 morning 4:3 6:6,21 7:8 11:3,18 18:22 101:2 101:14 225:6 278:13 morning's 228:17 mother 123:13 motion 187:10 274:8 move 18:9 69:10 74:17 194:19 195:11,13

198:10 202:14 252:21 257:17 265:4 278:12 moved 190:15 194:20 293:17 movement 193:16 movements 113:2 moves 46:14 129:16 moving 56:2 117:12 134:20 152:13 166:18 185:7 264:22 **MP** 86:19 muddying 291:14 multiple 26:22 murder 51:14,14,15 293:13 **muscle** 113:2 musical 22:7 myth 79:7 N

N 4:1 name 4:8 29:21 209:7 252:19 named 219:7 names 209:6 narrative 108:2.7 narrow 24:1 130:4 167:17 197:10 narrower 205:7 narrowing 202:13 **narrows** 144:14 **national** 4:16,18 7:18 11:13 12:7 21:15 23:12,12 32:21 75:14 86:21 110:1 119:5 152:11 252:15 253:3 **nations** 158:19 **natural** 207:22 nature 204:11 206:7 276:22 Naval 28:18 29:18 80:22 83:2 127:17 128:7 239:12 Navy 2:2,7 8:20 13:11 16:20 29:2,6,7,9,12 29:14,19 35:13 39:10 42:8 54:16 65:9,16 72:15,18 76:7 81:12 86:20 95:22 101:16 103:15 112:11,21 116:20,22 118:2 132:17 142:15,15 144:3 150:22 152:17 206:21 209:13 239:11 Navy-Marine 208:2 **NCIS** 13:6 86:19,22 87:5 88:9 246:22

119:15 120:1,4,13,14 120:15 123:18 124:4 156:5 162:21 167:10 **NDAAs** 106:9 123:14 near 20:6 nearly 63:11 132:14 necessarily 125:20 129:6 143:9 178:20 231:13 268:12 necessary 57:15,21 123:8 254:2 need 33:20 34:1 52:21 59:13 60:16 102:8 107:12,16 109:10 110:2 112:20 113:22 114:2 122:12 124:14 128:2 132:5 133:8 153:7 168:3 178:1 179:14 180:19 183:6 191:5 193:21 194:11 195:8 201:21 202:2 202:12 205:12 206:15 210:15,19 211:19 215:10 223:20 235:12 235:17,19 236:16 240:20 241:8.17 242:1 243:17.18 247:17 249:1,5 259:8 259:19 264:5 266:1,5 266:6 269:18,22 274:13 279:9 needed 180:6 251:16 **needs** 59:16 76:13 131:3,9 149:17,18 179:15 191:18 205:20 218:20 238:15 250:14 262:3 negative 15:17 negligible 198:12 negotiate 95:9 negotiated 226:15 neither 107:19 133:20 172:22 neurobiology 151:10 never 59:10 61:1 102:2 102:2,3 110:12 125:11 126:9 130:11 144:21 189:14 243:2 243:6 256:6 293:1 new 16:22 34:5 36:16 101:2 113:8 129:4 130:3 131:11 132:3 133:6,14 134:22 135:3,6 147:8 157:21 171:10 178:22 209:3 225:7 251:4

night 101:1 142:20 148:18 nighter 101:2 **nine** 157:13 169:2 251:22 **NJP** 31:7,8 40:16,22 41:1,5,6,8,13,19 42:2 42:4,6,9 62:5 **NJPs** 54:10 61:16,16 64:16 65:20 66:22 **nolle** 150:8 **non-** 75:15 non-binding 129:12 non-capital 52:17 non-federal 128:11 non-judicial 31:8 40:11 40:13 43:6 126:3 non-military 267:11 268:10 275:5 non-referral 76:8,19 77:4 non-scientific 112:9 normal 200:15,15 normalize 138:4 normally 23:7,9 25:12 88:15 125:1 180:5 North 1:11 25:13,15,16 25:18 26:11 52:4 **notably** 120:13 **note** 6:4 8:3 50:3 104:13 154:15 156:9 164:22 169:9,11 238:20 **noted** 170:15 notes 5:20 123:3 127:1 136:9 190:14 **notice** 45:8 108:18 notified 143:7 notwithstanding 82:22 November 37:5 null 83:7 number 14:22 15:2 33:7 33:10 56:11 61:12 63:13 64:5,10,12,14 64:16 71:8,11 77:14 79:4,8 83:18 94:12 106:3,11,21 107:17 107:18 119:1 139:8 144:4,6,8,10 160:15 160:17 178:8 187:19 193:13 195:5 198:20 204:5 207:12 212:6 245:19 250:11,15 259:18,19 271:1 288:15 289:4,12 numbers 61:7,9 64:1 71:11 73:4 83:14

nicely 252:3

132:4 160:7 161:3 193:11 194:2,3 212:6 222:21,22 277:14 282:4 287:16,19 288:2,13,14,21,22 289:1,16 290:14 291:3,22 numerous 12:20 **nuts** 207:15

O 4:1 **O'Connor** 2:1 10:12,20 11:2,5,15,17 206:1 210:7 **O'Connor's** 10:16 **O-6** 13:10 88:22 oath 6:7 225:21 **Obama** 115:8 obligated 237:14 obligation 123:6,7 146:10 237:7 obligations 141:11 142:22 observation 142:17 observations 169:7 observe 217:21 **obviously** 52:2 75:22 202:19 212:4 217:18 258:8 occasion 28:8 215:22 occasionally 274:9 occasions 216:6 occur 62:8 85:10 139:9 occurred 37:7 245:22 246:1,14 284:9 287:10 290:8 occurring 175:22 occurs 34:16,17 287:17 odd 95:8 98:15 131:1 oddities 45:7 **oddity** 130:10 off-base 28:5 offender 147:12 offense 20:18 26:1,20 26:21 27:4,5,11,11 34:16,17 49:7,12 51:5 51:6,7,20 56:14,18,18 57:6,8 59:20 60:3 63:4 86:12 88:13,21 89:17,18 92:14,19 93:22 94:3 95:19 109:6 134:14 156:20 230:18 246:14 288:4 288:20 289:5,10,12 289:22 290:8 291:2 offenses 15:2 28:6 31:12 49:7,8 56:16

news 154:6

nice 18:14 217:9 235:9

NDAA 77:9 106:10

61:14 62:20 63:3.5.7 68:8 69:1 70:5 93:18 99:2 133:17,17,19 134:3,4,13 142:16 163:20 168:16 227:16 264:2,3 offer 13:18 119:18 153:7 234:10 offered 48:20 87:13.16 88:1 231:4 offers 129:21 234:10 office 2:5 6:8 42:7 84:17 154:20 222:18 officer 4:10 39:13 43:9 51:8,9 54:22,22 57:2 57:3 89:12 145:18 148:12 225:17 231:2 245:14 262:22 289:8 officers 39:11,19 55:1 55:21 225:10 226:4 231:16 offices 239:20 247:2 official 2:14 8:15 9:14 9:15 155:6 160:1 236:18 officials 158:14.19 **OJAG** 102:8 **Okinawa** 252:16 old 92:18 107:5 119:17 133:16 **Oliver** 61:2 once 23:5 24:10 25:2 35:20 58:21 87:6 177:2 179:5 185:14 187:5 191:1 229:7 261:13 265:4 274:10 one's 141:7 one- 43:7 181:6 one-third 290:21 one-time 128:20 287:10 one-year 137:18,21,22 ones 180:10 190:22 194:20 241:9,10,10 265:2,7 281:11,20 282:2 ongoing 24:10 79:10 106:20 109:20 133:1 278:22 online 15:5 38:14 105:2 124:19 147:9 161:4 280:6,6 open 5:5 24:2 60:2 169:19 171:21 192:7 228:3 233:12 236:12 244:5,21 273:11 277:21 294:7 **opened** 195:6 opening 10:13 178:17

opens 97:18 operating 113:15 150:12 operation 23:2 operations 103:22 104:5 **opinion** 108:6 128:20 265:17 267:6 opportunities 167:14 **opportunity** 17:9 217:4 217:17,20 **opposed** 51:6 181:9,19 192:11 241:20 **opt** 81:7,10 147:9,12 option 53:3 89:19 104:13 179:6 180:8 231:21 276:19 options 198:6 248:3 order 20:16 34:2 40:12 89:8 94:9 109:3 118:12,13 134:10,16 146:10 150:4 235:20 260:1 ordered 14:3,11 orderly 200:12 orders 38:10 133:20 136:9 organization 111:15 133:1 141:10 150:1 157:9 214:20 286:18 organizations 13:5 108:20 111:10 organize 180:18 organized 253:9 orientation 238:21 original 262:3 267:21 **OSI** 13:7 87:1 293:8 ostracism 110:4 117:10 135:5,13 200:1,2 ostracized 172:19 ought 260:13 272:20 279:1,7 oughties 110:18,20 111:7 outcome 24:3,4 58:22 108:16 231:4,5 outcomes 161:21 184:14 191:4 226:4,9 231:3 outline 177:16 182:17 183:19 outnumbered 218:12 outside 146:2 236:9 246:1 251:16 outstanding 17:19 overall 280:22

overblown 274:22

overlap 178:20 179:1

overnight 48:4 overseas 245:20 246:9 246:15,19 262:22 290:4 oversee 166:12 overview 3:4 6:10 19:9 155:10 overwhelming 149:8 183:17 owns 125:22 owns-- 250:2 P P 2:7 4:1 p.m 154:12,12 177:12 177:13 285:9 10

P 2:7 4:1 **p.m** 154:12,12 177:12 177:13 285:9,10 294:22 pace 121:20,21 **PACER** 15:6 page 182:16,20 184:4 186:11 pages 183:9 257:4 panel 1:10 3:12,13 9:7 9:8,14,16 12:9,17,18 47:1,10 51:1 60:22 79:9 110:22 113:20 131:18 133:6,6 155:2 155:11,14 156:17 157:13,14,15 159:2 159:16 162:7 164:14 164:16,17,20 166:12 166:14 169:4,20 172:22 176:11,21,21 177:3 182:14 188:16 227:10 248:13 panels 6:14 107:19 109:16 132:21 133:8 155:11,14 156:7 157:2 159:12 169:16 171:11,18 172:13 217:13 232:20 254:15 panoply 143:5 paper 99:3 124:7 paperwork 175:5 paralegals 17:16 parameter 260:6 parameters 52:17 53:2 260:1 270:11 parent 164:14 169:3 176:11 245:16 251:3 parity 203:14 parole 25:9 51:17,18 parse 248:10 **parsed** 246:3 part 24:4 26:11 37:20 37:21 45:13 46:5 51:3

68:9,16,21 69:1 70:3

77:9 91:10 92:10 94:7

97:7 99:16 109:9.19 110:17 131:9 132:19 143:1 153:21 156:3 170:12 171:17 181:22 182:10 201:5 213:19 216:14 217:15 225:6 230:14 240:16 245:15 255:9 260:14 262:19 partially 120:22 166:2 168:9 participant 169:12 214:12 **participants** 7:9 172:12 participate 80:9 198:4 participated 176:6 participates 99:13 participating 81:10 198:9 particular 56:18 72:16 93:18 95:19 119:8 159:12 160:2 170:16 239:14 particularly 28:6 30:4 103:4 231:1 parties 216:19 247:4 partisan 108:12.13.13 partner 136:20 202:5 **passed** 5:21 **passes** 30:16 password 234:2 path 266:19 patience 100:7 patients 213:11,16 Patricia 2:8 Patrol 86:21 pattern 210:18 patterns 226:8 **Paul** 1:16 pay 22:15,19 42:15 55:17,20 57:8 91:8 paying 91:6 **PDF** 124:8 peer 258:18 peers 172:18 200:2 pending 162:15,21 166:9 penetrative 13:9 51:5,6 57:5 63:4 74:6,21,22 76:11,17 77:17 88:14 88:21 89:3,16 93:21 99:2 264:2 **Pentagon** 27:1,2,4,5 people 19:12 21:4 22:4 25:5,10 26:18 29:10 31:7 48:20 56:20 58:5 58:8,14 66:16 68:6,11 71:9,21 72:20 73:13 110:6 112:20 114:6

11770010001010
117:7,20 122:9,10,12
132:15 135:17,18
142:4,6 144:16 145:21 150:15 151:3
160:20 172:15 173:2
177:22 179:4 180:2,7
180:10 188:10 196:8
198:3 200:8,19 209:3
209:3 212:4,16
216:18 218:9 219:18
223:14 238:5 247:13
251:16 254:17,18
266:14 267:3,10
277:15 281:10 282:6
282:21 287:8 288:1
291:19
people's 107:17
people-focused 116:10
peoples' 179:21
peppering 277:7
perceive 216:10
perceived 117:17
172:16 215:3
percent 26:3 62:19
63:11,20 64:7,9 65:6
83:13 87:20 88:2,5
186:7 191:20 197:4,4
197:5 214:5,5,12,13
266:3 272:6 290:11
292:2
percentage 68:19 69:4
70:12 71:7,9 83:18
125:16 143:18
percentages 83:17
perception 46:10 108:4
108:13 141:3 213:19
216:12 231:15
perceptions 108:12
Perfect 254:12
performing 16:6 21:21
22:1,2 period 36:18 137:12
158:7 161:13 251:11
permission 18:9
permit 140:13
perpetrating 267:10,11
perpetration 267:9
perpetrator 172:4
219:12
persist 105:3
persistent 151:7
person 23:12,18 29:18
40:21 43:8 55:11
87:15,21 89:8,17,19
97:1,5 99:12 124:8,8
125:17 135:20 142:8
148:17 150:18 159:19
200:6,11 201:4
1

202:21 205:1 213:3 230:13 231:12,19
232:12 234:12 243:11
277:18 282:16,19
person's 40:6 145:21
personal 20:21,22
108:5 109:6 264:17 personally 226:12
264:8
personnel 9:11 17:17
142:3
perspective 18:12 179:8 235:22
pertaining 117:16
PETERS 186:8
Petition 50:15
Petty 39:10,12,19
phase 126:10 227:5 phone 178:7 180:5
272:9
Photo 167:14
photographs 240:15
photos 235:7 243:1 pick 46:22 208:15
262:20 282:6
picture 270:4
pictures 159:11
pie 61:17 143:18 198:14
pilot 14:1 48:18 ping-pong 130:1,2
pitches 112:6
pizza 115:13
place 6:21 75:11 102:12
128:10 159:19 162:3 199:21 204:6 223:21
223:22 235:10 236:1
243:10 265:10,20
270:19 273:19
places 126:14 153:11
197:21 283:20
plan 9:20 15:20 151:21 152:9,10 176:17
183:10
planning 3:16 6:16 9:18
152:8 182:17
play 108:15 played 217:21
playing 105:17.20
plea 94:17,20 95:1,4,7
98:1,19 99:6 131:7
226:14,16 227:1,16
228:9,13,14 230:5,14 plead 230:16,18
pleading 97:5 229:19
230:7
pleas 227:17,20
please 8:3 10:20 18:3

74:4 83:9 157:11 166:19 168:3 173:14 **plenary** 130:18 plunking 274:7 **plus** 232:22 289:17 point 26:19 72:13 85:19 89:14 91:11,15 101:11 107:15 114:5 127:22 128:14 130:8 134:8 144:7 146:8 164:11 171:16 172:1 176:17 194:14 213:15 217:18 218:20 225:14 226:6 246:12 251:1 266:1,12 269:18 270:18 273:12 275:14 279:14 280:10 283:12 283:14 284:12 294:18 **pointed** 106:7 183:6 **pointing** 129:22 points 102:21 118:6 182:18 **police** 197:3 **policy** 9:11 16:16 211:13 290:5 political 108:13 **polling** 112:10 **pool** 267:17 269:10 pops 141:2 **population** 19:18,19 pornography 293:14 Port 153:11 portion 177:9 portions 242:21 243:5 **position** 86:11 151:5 194:9 196:1 217:10 positions 135:17 possess 124:20 157:5 possible 17:1 59:11 60:7 184:22 205:2 210:6 233:8 possibly 232:10,13 252:20 279:2 **post** 187:12 post-enlistment 69:21 post-traumatic 70:17 post-trial 129:21 130:5 130:6,7 posted 5:10 8:5 159:11 161:4 168:16 175:7 pot 267:22 potatoes 260:12 potential 289:17 potentially 172:19 212:17 213:18 **POTUS** 115:10 power 24:8 28:7,17,19 32:6,6 40:18,19 43:2

66:4 93:7.8 94:15 97:22 98:1 99:9 powers 86:1 92:18 **practice** 16:10 18:12 98:8 103:2 129:17 131:17 206:9 211:12 211:13 **practices** 16:8 129:19 131:17 161:15 164:7 194:13 206:5 211:10 practitioner 119:6 pre-trial 48:14 89:9 95:2 99:21 226:17 227:15 228:2,3,5,6 229:8 preamble 114:9 **preceded** 103:7,16 155:14 261:6 precisely 78:3 82:10 precluding 265:13 predates 107:3 predecessor 6:14 9:3 12:14 107:19 135:15 171:18 217:13 predecessors 205:9 preface 18:17 prefer 168:5 188:21 **preferable** 271:11,18 273:3 preference 264:18 preferral 125:19 189:9 288:18 preferred 88:11 126:2 178:7,7 185:15 186:2 186:16,18,21 187:6 189:19 192:2,19,22 193:2 214:4 281:21 282:3 prejudicial 134:7,10,16 preliminary 89:9,11,11 90:3,4,8 126:5 167:20 261:1 premature 180:12 premeditated 51:14 prepare 115:10 **prepares** 164:12 preparing 169:6 prescribe 93:10 **prescribed** 37:21,22 92:21 prescribes 40:9 prescriptive 159:16 **presence** 10:21 104:15 present 1:13 7:16 154:16 241:18,22 **presentation** 8:8,17 9:2 9:12 53:6 102:19 169:22 225:6

19:6 50:21 66:6 67:21

	l	1	<u>, </u>
presentations 6:15	50:13,14 81:16 142:5	213:14	292:15 293:6 294:2
9:18	142:6	professionalism	prosecutory 231:13
presented 194:15	privileges 45:19 168:1	104:16	protect 110:2 122:12
presenter 6:22 10:7	probably 30:22 43:1	professionals 213:20	286:17
presents 159:22	45:6 52:14 64:1 65:8	professors 274:20	protected 117:8
preserving 145:21	65:15 66:20,22,22	profile 28:9	protection 117:6,11
president 11:5 25:7	67:15 68:14 69:22	program 13:18 14:1	123:22 136:15 234:2
30:17 31:16,19,22	70:4,15 115:8 160:4	16:18 48:18 49:3	proud 21:8
32:4,9,12,21 33:16,20	181:13 184:6 190:21	112:13,15,16 121:16	proudly 17:11
34:5,15 37:10 38:1	196:21 197:13 199:4 202:9 203:2 213:9	121:16 122:8 127:9	prove 145:17
45:13,16,22 56:15 58:10 78:18 92:21	217:12 225:19 239:9	147:8 165:14 programs 14:4 16:21	proved 14:1 163:15 proven 137:2,4 151:4
115:1,8 133:19,21	240:19 245:10 247:1	140:19 165:20	provide 6:7 9:11 15:6
136:11 152:11 205:11	247:17 259:8	progress 18:1 141:15	17:19 34:5 52:22
286:17	problem 182:1 204:3,11	231:3	55:10 84:2 89:12
President's 33:20	215:13 234:20 255:3	progresses 86:3	101:3 138:5 155:9
Presidentially-specifi	262:11 292:9	prohibited 275:9	159:9 167:1 178:4
133:16	problematic 243:15	prohibition 79:12	209:22
Presidentuary 93:10	problems 74:1 238:18	projected 169:18	provided 5:9,13,18 8:9
presiding 1:12 91:3	278:20	prominent 92:1	8:19 17:1 48:19 69:13
pressure 170:16 213:18	procedural 124:22	promising 165:20	143:11 163:10 165:4
presumptions 45:12	125:2	promulgated 45:13	233:19 264:12
pretrial 127:3 129:17	Procedure 33:22	proof 124:19 145:17	providence 229:20
130:9,12,17,22 131:6	105:14	190:3	provident 230:3,6
131:17 200:16 pretty 46:6,10 145:20	procedures 54:11,13 54:17 165:19	prop 37:12 properly 16:15 70:22	providers 122:11 provides 31:11 38:6
161:7 182:11 214:7	proceed 7:4 154:21	proposal 124:18 152:8	131:11 234:16 248:13
217:9 254:15 264:20	209:16 235:11 256:17	proposals 74:15	providing 11:8 19:8
prevails 149:19	277:1	propose 112:21 118:16	169:16 237:17 278:21
prevalence 137:20,22	proceeding 41:6 47:17	proposed 52:15,16	proving 134:15
prevent 58:17 266:18	48:12	127:19 162:2,16	provision 29:15 75:18
prevention 155:19	proceedings 3:13 9:8	177:16 277:11	77:8,9
165:11 222:18	9:16 12:18 65:22 81:4	proposing 136:10	provisions 7:18 33:14
previous 56:9 62:11	113:20 155:13 161:22	pros 150:8	119:4 127:15
69:14 83:12,15 106:5	167:8,18	prosecute 43:8,9 134:6	provocateur 78:21
265:7	process 3:4 6:11 8:8	170:17	psychotherapist-pati 50:12 81:16
previously 6:20 130:16 primarily 167:16	93:19 118:14 129:19 130:3 165:17 171:10	prosecuted 20:10 25:11,12,17 134:9	psychotherapist/pati
primary 31:18	175:4 176:8 188:17	prosecution 1:3 4:6	243:1
principles 148:8	194:4 195:8,21 198:4	7:11,21 11:21 15:11	PTSD 71:3
print 146:21	198:8 211:1 212:19	16:1,6,11 17:2 99:14	public 1:6 3:19 4:12 5:6
printed 38:13	217:21 239:14 240:11	112:13 113:16 118:4	5:16,18,20 6:9 7:3
printers 38:17	249:11 250:13,18	148:17 155:20 157:6	9:22 10:2,3,17 12:10
prior 137:15 160:19	251:2,8 252:9 280:1	161:12 163:22 170:5	15:6 16:16 26:4 104:1
167:22 181:7 194:8	281:2,5	170:7 171:12 189:6	107:20 144:21 158:2
195:22 222:21 263:12	processes 159:19	191:7 203:13 210:11	158:12 169:20 175:7
277:22 279:16	161:15 167:18,21	220:5 263:14 269:4	217:19 219:18 236:12
priorities 9:20 260:19 261:17	243:10 265:20 266:8 processing 110:13	280:13 prosecutions 188:1	236:13,17 237:5,8,11 243:14 244:5,5,22
prioritize 263:2	127:3	prosecutor 99:11,11	274:15 275:19 285:12
priority 261:10,12	prodding 79:19	131:8 171:1 187:9	publically 5:7,9
prison 204:4,13 221:15	produce 158:10 167:12	194:16,18 230:10	publications 258:18
privacy 123:1 219:17	produced 15:16 164:9	231:10 286:8,13	publicly 176:16,20
235:15 236:19 242:17	174:10	293:10	177:2
264:14 266:9 279:3	product 103:13 167:20	prosecutorial 74:17	publish 163:22
private 25:8 157:4	176:19	129:20 188:18 195:22	published 259:9
privately 199:16	productive 208:18	prosecutors 149:20	pull 247:19 280:7
privilege 45:21 46:2	professional 72:5	161:20 162:19 247:6	pulled 66:1
	I	I	I

pullers 73:9 **pulse** 215:2 **pump** 85:15 punishable 135:19 punished 134:1 punishing 135:16 **punishment** 29:16,16 31:8 40:11,13 43:6 44:5 56:18 60:8 91:20 92:19,20 93:10 122:3 126:4 punishments 56:22 121:10 136:14 **punitive** 31:10 33:13 44:7 55:12 74:9 93:2 93:14 118:13 133:14 135:6,10,11 136:2 purportedly 204:6 purpose 6:6 167:6 234:14 purposes 13:22 44:21 44:22 55:2 56:10 81:14 88:20 90:21,22 96:21 114:13 193:19 257:20 278:21 pursuant 4:16 pursue 145:22 **push** 82:17 90:12 292:22 294:6 **put** 36:8,14 40:5 45:16 55:1 61:17 79:15 112:7 154:2 179:15 185:20 200:11,14,16 219:13 243:21 249:4 260:1 264:19 265:20 274:12 281:2 puts 227:20 putting 36:15 92:8 Q

qualifications 17:5 157:3 qualifies 94:4 quality 195:9 198:2,2 quarter 260:11 269:13 269:15 quarterly 271:2 276:16 282:20 283:4 quarters 64:13,15 question 24:2,10 53:10 60:2 66:10 74:14 80:2 82:6,6,8,19 84:6,8,19 85:1,8,22 106:16 107:11 109:13 127:16 127:18,18 138:13 152:2 172:1 173:4,13 186:10 194:7 198:7 214:17 224:8 225:15

225:20 226:5 229:17 232:17 233:6 239:1 242:12 245:18 248:15 258:2 271:14 275:8 275:10 290:7 questioned 81:3 questioning 128:4 questions 19:4 83:11 84:5 85:6,12,14 107:7 127:5 137:6,7,10 153:1 160:6 166:18 169:22 182:18,19 183:4,8,20 186:11 198:17 209:2 211:17 232:5 248:20 249:4 264:5 268:4 277:8 286:22 289:19 quick 137:10 quicker 251:5 quiet 53:6 231:22 quite 44:10 47:9 54:17 70:21 94:15 134:5 137:1 158:11 162:6 quote 29:15

R

R 4:1

R.C.M 126:6

race 238:6,9 racial 262:21 radical 163:5 raise 19:5 37:13 100:16 284:5 raised 55:15 70:15 171:16 172:12 201:16 249:7 254:20 raises 26:19 **RAND** 116:10 137:13 138:2,19 139:10,19 198:18 222:7,8,15,19 224:10 232:3 246:4 258:16 287:9,9 288:8 **RAND's** 137:20 random 178:9 185:1 221:14 range 163:18 rank 58:6 59:7 84:2,4 85:2 ranking 157:16 rape 50:11 59:19 60:2,7 60:8,9 81:17 138:10 163:20 204:4,13 220:6 252:14,17 287:21,22,22 289:13 289:14 293:14 raped 198:19 199:13 215:15 252:17 rapes 106:21 137:12

rare 27:21 51:12 83:7 rarely 24:22 28:8 99:8 99.15 rate 137:20,22 139:13 139:14,18,19 144:8 186:6 197:3 214:5,6 238:9 rates 117:17,18,19 161:21 rats 99:12 raw 212:6 reached 112:17 read 72:2 146:20 168:3 168:4 205:2 206:17 220:3 233:14 245:9 256:14 270:4 272:12 272:14 274:12,13 281:10 290:20 read-ahead 256:14 readily 73:12 reading 146:20 191:5 220:3 241:6 254:22 256:20 readjourn 294:17 readjourning 294:19 ready 7:4 10:6 103:16 154:21 256:16 real 94:12 116:9 120:8 150:9 204:11 215:19 217:19 242:11 260:12 realistic 179:6 reality 204:6 219:17,19 238:11,12 293:22 realize 104:13 106:15 realized 140:16 realizing 39:3 reason 59:5 67:7,9,10 67:19 68:16,18 75:21 78:12 82:9 88:12 91:21,22 104:14 118:22 190:1 206:6 247:6 262:4 273:15 reasonable 145:17 reasons 70:7 71:21 73:17,19 138:2 163:16 237:13 251:14 257:11 recall 59:22 86:8 88:19 89:16 115:8 120:8 125:21 129:22 172:22 186:5 receive 7:2 8:16 9:2 10:1 142:7 received 5:15 10:2 100:22 145:12 receiver 142:1 receivers 142:4

138:10 207:10

receptive 216:10 recessed 154:11 reclassified 247:16 recognition 104:21 recognize 106:19 108:7 108:22 123:18 138:13 150:2 151:11 213:18 recognized 113:22 122:12 recognizing 103:10 133:2 148:8 recommend 101:10 154:2 177:7 291:4 recommendation 76:1 163:12 166:4,11 196:15 283:6 284:8 recommendations 112:19 118:17 156:8 165:1,3,5 166:1,2,3,5 167:1 168:8,9,10,11 168:18 173:2 174:8 182:5 196:4,9 199:11 208:14 241:12,17 257:6 recommended 45:20 99:9 163:2 166:11 recommends 90:18 99:11 reconfigure 177:8 reconvene 154:12 277:22 record 2:2 3:9 8:19.20 35:11 36:4 39:20 40:2 40:6 62:2 100:2 101:13,14,15 102:6 102:17 104:4 110:20 122:22 124:11 132:1 137:13,19 138:12 139:1,10 140:12 143:20 144:1,22 145:5,9 146:4 149:1,4 151:3 152:2 153:3,13 154:15 155:21 177:12 229:9,15,15 251:11 275:19 285:9 294:22 **recorded** 193:11 recordings 5:12 records 18:22 122:20 122:21,22 123:2 146:18,19,21 191:9 191:12 239:8,13 243:1 244:19 recourse 221:6 recreate 221:12 recruiter-recruitee 135:22 red 82:17 114:11 240:4

redact 242:19

II	i	1	Ī
redefining 262:2	regulatory 106:6	245:12 260:3 262:9	285:12
redirect 179:19	121:13	270:20,21 272:3	requested 158:7 162:8
redo 178:21 179:2	rejected 53:1	280:18 284:6,17,21	requests 5:16 10:3
262:10	related 5:21 62:20	290:18,19 291:8	237:12
redone 261:16	68:22 107:10 110:13	reported 48:20 86:7,8	require 52:19 125:20
reduce 91:20 163:7	111:17 122:17 136:2	87:6 116:3 138:22	132:3
reduced 55:21	156:19 157:10 212:2	139:4,4,7,9 160:18	required 13:9 123:5
reduction 57:9 69:21	235:15 264:14 268:2	176:11 188:10 189:14	156:6 159:1 166:22
refer 29:10 47:2 74:20	relationship 13:21 49:1	199:16 204:7 207:13	167:12 193:16
75:1,4,10,11 76:3,18	81:13 87:17,22	216:7 220:11 221:17	requirement 20:14 21:2
76:22 77:3,5,17 82:2	135:22 136:1 202:17	221:20,22 223:13,14	75:15 76:20 77:1
83:3 89:10,15,17	relative 169:7	289:2	82:16 127:10 129:5
90:11,19,20 127:1	relatively 83:6	reporters 110:2 135:7	129:10 134:15
141:11 248:4	relaxed 48:10	reporting 79:7 117:18	requirements 47:7
reference 189:2 245:8	released 168:6,12	117:19,20 122:15	123:9 146:18
referenced 200:1	237:5,8 relevance 229:1	139:19 140:17 141:1	requires 77:4 91:5
referral 75:16 77:6		163:8 196:16 199:21	142:16 148:5
125:14,19 189:10 288:19 289:4	relevancy 261:8 263:7 relevant 49:20 85:12	212:7,16 213:12,16 215:3 258:12 260:19	requiring 15:5 77:19 research 84:16 258:7
referred 5:3 29:12	260:2,19 262:13	267:9 291:1,2	263:12 265:18
62:20 82:4,4,22	reliability 129:18 138:5	reports 84:19 88:4,5,6	reservations 242:6
125:13 166:5 227:6	relief 129:21	96:11,17 109:6 116:2	Reserve 21:6,18 22:20
287:21 292:1	relieving 147:18	116:4,5 132:5 139:21	Reservist 21:19,20
referring 30:10 77:1	reluctant 70:10	142:1,4,7 143:19	Reservists 21:14
89:19	remain 158:3	145:15 146:5,6	reset 102:18
refine 105:9	remainder 25:20 34:10	147:10 160:5,14,16	resigning 231:21
reflect 183:21 221:16	35:3	160:17,20 164:9	resist 35:4
reflected 109:22	remaining 166:4	167:12 168:13,19	resolved 94:20 95:1
reflecting 183:22	remarks 10:13 35:3,9	169:6 172:16 174:2	resource 215:10 217:2
reflects 130:15 187:20	remember 22:6 46:19	174:10,11 175:15	resources 16:4 161:1
204:2	61:16 76:16 80:4	189:18,20,22 192:18	175:6 176:13 203:15
refocus 261:22	103:19 106:21 125:8	192:21 193:10,13,18	203:16,19 206:4
reform 14:17	131:2 144:2	204:1 212:3,11,17	resourcing 170:20
reforming 286:19	remembers 237:17	216:11 233:18,20	respect 166:1
reforms 15:9,15 156:19	remiss 169:11	245:13 255:20 256:12	respecting 147:21
refuse 40:22 41:8,18	remove 162:17	257:3 260:2 261:1,9	respects 183:17
42:2 43:10,12	renowned 228:18	262:7 268:22 270:5	respond 85:6,22 120:18
refused 185:6 216:4	repeat 183:7 replicated 281:12	272:4 273:14 289:2,3 291:4,6	responders 110:3
refuses 41:13 reg 116:18	report 13:1,19 14:8	repository 233:17	122:11 211:9 212:20 responds 85:8
regard 28:5 145:14,19	48:15 82:16 84:15	239:5,19	response 3:11 9:6,14
165:10 193:9 224:10	85:20 87:7,9,16,20	represent 49:1 80:12	12:17 103:1 142:2
regarding 107:7 122:14	89:12 91:16 96:11,14	81:14 108:21	153:2 155:11,19
129:7 135:5 147:10	110:7 115:7,10,11,21	representation 13:22	159:22 181:19 194:12
147:18 162:22 167:19	116:1,6 117:21 129:1	14:6 203:15	195:3 202:4 222:18
167:22 168:15	137:14,14 140:1,7	representative 159:5	224:1 271:17
regardless 94:4 237:7	141:6,13,17,19,22	282:5	responses 156:14
regards 103:4 172:8	142:9,10,16 143:2,10	representatives 136:16	responsibilities 16:4
Reggie 1:22	143:14 144:14 147:2	158:17 248:12	responsibility 165:9
regimental 89:4 90:12	147:3,5,7 158:22	represented 90:7	responsible 109:2
region 111:4	159:20 160:1,22	203:13	rest 146:1 239:10
Regs 142:15	161:4 162:21 163:11	representing 49:13	255:22
regularly 11:12	168:6,7,21 172:9,18	265:21	restitution 156:20
regulation 13:1 68:12	173:22 174:4 175:2	reprisal 110:4 116:16	168:13
86:9 109:2 118:14	187:19,20 188:5,10	117:2,10 124:1 135:6	restricted 87:7,15 88:4
121:1	188:14 193:7 198:21	135:13	94:14 116:3 117:19
regulations 28:17 34:5 122:21 127:10 142:13	199:12 212:15 213:6	request 14:9 95:17,19	117:21 139:4,20
122.21 127.10 142.13	213:9,19 241:7 245:2	125:16 210:1 248:4	140:6 141:1,6,13,17
II	•	•	•

II			
4.44.40.00.4.40.4.4.7	404:40.004:0.055:40	40.0 57.40 44 50.47	044.045.04.045.4
141:19,22 142:1,4,7	184:13 201:9 255:16	48:8 57:12,14 59:17	244:6,15,21 245:4
143:3,19 144:6,13	reviews 104:7 109:10	60:11 95:3 101:22	249:21 250:2,4,7,22
145:3,6,11,15 146:4	211:3	104:1 105:13,13,18	251:19 255:14 257:10
147:2,10,14 160:5,17	revise 30:6	105:19 126:5 167:22	257:22 259:10,15
189:20 193:10 198:5	revised 46:1	218:7 244:2 276:4	261:18,21 262:12,15
212:3,10,22 247:18	revisions 35:17	ruling 24:2 50:11,12,13	264:10 269:17 270:17
282:4 288:16 289:2	revive 147:7	rulings 49:20	271:8,13 272:5
restrictive 193:13	rewording 134:20	run 29:20 38:17 125:2	273:16,21 275:21
result 93:1 146:15,16	rewrite 33:21 34:1	153:4 250:7	276:2,11 277:10
148:16 167:19 174:6	RFI 248:4		278:14,17 282:10
184:18	RFP 259:11 270:2,20	<u> </u>	284:21
resulted 81:1 93:11	rid 73:15	S 4:1 157:20	Schwenk's 35:6
184:20 185:1,10	rights 36:17 41:7 49:22	safe 147:4	scientific 258:4,19
288:17,18,19 289:10	50:4,10 104:21	safeguarding 146:1	scope 81:17 103:8
results 266:20	108:19 120:21 123:21	266:9	119:1 143:11 156:10
resumed 177:12 285:9	136:15,18 146:11,12	safety 235:16	156:13 159:13 161:7
retain 53:3 98:18	156:22 165:15 169:14	sample 185:1 242:14	165:6 167:15 168:2
retained 98:17,20	203:12 291:5	282:2,5	170:2 180:22 181:15
retains 92:18	rigor 111:16 115:9	SAP 161:5	193:12 202:10 204:8
retaliated 172:17	rises 61:20	SAPR 119:13	204:22 220:12 278:4
retaliation 110:4 116:16	risk 276:3	sapr.mil 161:5	screen 118:9
117:2 123:22 135:1	road 136:4 232:14	SAPRO 84:17 85:3	screw 138:16
135:12 168:14 172:9	rocks 29:9,12,20	116:7 178:12 288:15	scrutinize 15:15
290:20 291:6	Rodney 1:19 248:16	SAPRO-related 119:4	scrutiny 155:17
retention 122:17 123:8	role 105:5,7,8,15,15	SARC 146:21	sealed 242:21 243:7
123:9 146:18	109:13,15 128:4,16	SARCs 122:11 212:12	search 45:17 190:21
reticence 212:15	162:11,14,22 165:8	215:9	191:2,3
retired 8:12 22:18,20	183:1,14 291:10	sat 213:13 218:11	searchable 190:22
158:13 282:22 286:3	roll 222:17	Saturday 278:15	seat 37:15 128:12
retiree 22:14 25:12	rolled 35:20	save 235:2	SECNAV 117:1 135:4
retires 25:20	rolling 103:13	saw 31:17 103:20	SECNAVIST 117:9
returned 154:16	Roman 126:20	120:19 123:8,20	second 9:7 24:8 25:1
reversed 25:17	room 58:15 59:7 115:14	245:21	104:18 105:21 122:6
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12 281:6,19 282:13	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3 rule 68:14 102:11,12,13	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5 219:4 221:5 222:16	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3 seeing 189:16 260:21
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12 281:6,19 282:13 reviewed 76:13 164:4	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3 rule 68:14 102:11,12,13 104:2 144:21	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5 219:4 221:5 222:16 223:7 226:17,21	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3 seeing 189:16 260:21 seek 50:8 160:22
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12 281:6,19 282:13 reviewed 76:13 164:4 240:22 258:18	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3 rule 68:14 102:11,12,13 104:2 144:21 rules 28:17 33:21,22,22	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5 219:4 221:5 222:16 223:7 226:17,21 227:12,14 228:11,13	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3 seeing 189:16 260:21
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12 281:6,19 282:13 reviewed 76:13 164:4	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3 rule 68:14 102:11,12,13 104:2 144:21	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5 219:4 221:5 222:16 223:7 226:17,21	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3 seeing 189:16 260:21 seek 50:8 160:22 seen 109:15 199:6
reversed 25:17 review 12:15 14:12,13 24:17 40:3 53:1 75:15 76:5,8,19 77:2,4,6 91:9 104:9 113:3,20 114:1,3,4 124:17 126:12 133:1,4,6 152:7 156:14,16 162:11 163:14 166:5 166:6,7 167:7 168:20 174:21 181:20 182:13 184:5,8,8 194:10,16 201:17 205:15,17 206:12 210:9,15,18 211:2,11,11 226:7 232:14 234:8 235:15 240:12 241:3,6 242:12 243:5 248:18 254:3 260:15 264:6 270:19 277:21 278:21 279:22 280:3,9,12 281:6,19 282:13 reviewed 76:13 164:4 240:22 258:18 reviewing 110:13	room 58:15 59:7 115:14 177:8 200:12 225:7 238:4 rooms 218:11 root 151:10 rooted 107:22 row 25:5,11 26:18 RSP 109:17 110:9 155:12 156:2,12,13 157:13,19,22,22 158:1,12 159:2,6,12 159:13,18 161:7 162:6,11,21 163:2,9 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:16,22,22 167:5 167:12,17 169:13 170:3,12,15 172:11 175:1,7 196:3 224:1 224:11 232:3 255:18 255:19 270:21 273:17 rug 108:3 rule 68:14 102:11,12,13 104:2 144:21 rules 28:17 33:21,22,22 38:6 45:10,14,16,21	245:21 saying 147:19 215:14 262:3,5 267:16 268:8 288:2 says 34:4 41:9,15 76:2 76:9,21,22 77:3,5 97:8,16,20 129:2 137:11 145:16 175:15 194:18 220:4,9,13,18 221:22 230:1 278:8 scene 26:9 240:15 schedule 154:4 285:18 scheduled 6:20 schedules 233:21 schemes 108:11 school 148:14 Schwenk 1:20 18:20 22:16 65:11 78:4,18 102:10 107:4 169:9 176:6 179:7,12 204:20 209:11 218:5 219:4 221:5 222:16 223:7 226:17,21 227:12,14 228:11,13 228:19 229:2,12	104:18 105:21 122:6 127:21 128:14 129:17 235:20 262:19 279:8 secret 97:19 150:11 226:16 Secretaries 82:12 Secretary 6:1 7:14,20 11:10 12:5 13:8 14:2 14:11 16:22 76:4,7 77:6,19 114:2 116:21 157:14 158:6,6 164:17 167:2,5 205:10 209:21 220:4 250:18 section 4:16,18 28:15 75:13 123:16,19,20 156:5 sector 157:4 secured 84:4 security 11:14 234:3 252:15 253:3 seeing 189:16 260:21 seek 50:8 160:22 seen 109:15 199:6 287:1

seizure 45:17 served 9:13 155:5 232:12,15 233:15 self-aware 136:6 159:6 190:6 286:3,5,9 self-awareness 124:20 286:11,12 292:8 242:6 252:4 260:6 self-incrim 45:17 293:15,16 sets 210:22 Senate 11:6 157:17 serves 6:3 8:21 25:19 setting 40:8 99:18,19 **Senator** 162:16 163:12 **service** 2:3 8:14,22 102:17 **Senators** 158:16 12:10 17:14 20:15 settings 16:7 send 70:10 71:18 73:13 29:18 35:14 40:6 62:2 seven 20:2 165:6 168:8 232:6,8 237:3,4,10,20 69:9 80:8 84:3 86:5 177:21 291:1 248:8 256:12 277:5 101:19 108:9 110:22 severity 40:12 192:5 277:10 278:7 284:11 111:14 115:21 116:6 sex 13:20 14:8 49:7,8 284:12 291:20 292:2 116:8,20 119:6 49:11 51:5,6,7 57:5 122:11 124:6 127:17 293:22 sending 73:12 243:12 128:7 136:7,19 140:2 senior 11:7 58:3,9,9,13 140:20 145:19 155:4 289:10,12,16 76:13 158:18 171:3,5 160:19 188:4 197:19 sexually 142:20 266:15 sense 128:12 131:3 202:22 207:21 233:1 267:4 268:16 SF 86:22 143:17 177:18 192:6 237:3 239:12 248:12 **SGT** 62:10,13 93:17 201:15 255:20 268:1 248:13 266:22 267:3 277:20 282:4 267:7,14,15 100:19 101:4,7 sensitivity 70:16 **Service's** 135:2 sent 5:21 126:8 153:10 Service-by-Service 210:4 240:9 256:18 164:17 178:14 197:18 256:21 257:7,13,16 196.21 232:2 275:1 service-discredited 257:21 259:14,21 **sentence** 25:8 47:16 134:8 279:8 283:2 48:1 51:1.7 52:4 service-discrediting **SGT(R)** 1:18 53:16 56:13 59:13.14 134:11.17 **shalt** 133:21.22 Servicemember 27:3 60:13,15,19,20 93:8 **shame** 217:1 93:12 95:10 97:3,16 27:10,21 28:2 69:7 **share** 179:19 279:22 98:2,11 125:9 130:20 80:18 88:13 280:8 281:3 131:15 228:2,5,7 Servicemembers 13:18 **shared** 233:10 234:4,22 sentenced 24:15 25:14 19:15,16 30:11 31:12 290:3 she'll 97:3 26:17 47:13 72:10 39:8 64:6 69:5 160:18 sentences 54:20 56:20 226:2 **shear** 193:13 184:15 services 14:15 16:14 **shed** 116:13 **sentencing** 47:17,18 16:18 17:12 21:7,11 **sheer** 212:6 30:12,15 42:4 43:15 48:1,3,14 52:17,19,19 **sheet** 126:2 246:13 **shield** 50:11 81:17 53:3 56:7 59:8,9,10 49:8 54:12,18 61:11 60:22 94:16 108:11 65:4 87:9,19 94:19,22 shift 261:17 161:17 227:3,18,19 116:3 117:12 121:17 **shifted** 219:16 230:4 238:10 141:19,20,21 143:6 shifts 262:1,2 separate 28:21 30:1 143:11 145:12 152:16 **ship** 41:19 42:18 43:4 157:17,18 161:1 163:10 164:9 173:7 shipyard 41:20 173:10 199:7 162:13 164:4,5 **shoals** 29:10,12,20 separated 44:12 165:15 166:8 169:12 **shoes** 115:13 separately 159:9 189:7 196:6,7,11 **Shore** 86:21 separation 188:5 201:14 202:6,17 **short** 82:8,19 84:6 September 166:20 216:15 224:2,21 258:9 173:18 239:17 248:8 256:3 shortened 158:7 264:12 291:17 292:18 Sergeant 25:21,21 **shortly** 46:12 156:16 282:21 294:6,9,14 158:8 **series** 45:12 46:3 Services' 118:1 **shot** 22:9 **shout** 106:16 123:21 serving 151:22 155:5 serious 293:4,13 293:5 **show** 62:15 90:5 118:22 serve 4:11 8:14 17:11 session 3:16 6:5,6,16 194:1 88:17 89:22 110:3 9:19 182:17 **showed** 256:13 159:2 167:4 242:2 sessions 62:2 **shut** 100:18 266:14 **set** 56:15 83:8 91:19 **shutting** 106:17

114:12 129:11 181:10 **shy** 154:3 sic 80:12 **side** 55:2 125:2 212:22 213:9 215:7 252:13 252:14 259:2 286:16 sides 197:11 200:20 291:13 sign 32:15 126:16 **signed** 32:21 116:22 136:11 152:11 significant 12:2 103:8 105:22 106:8,11 61:14 62:20 63:3,4,5 113:2 116:17 119:2 63:6 74:7 79:6 93:17 120:1,5 121:4,21 122:2 126:18 128:18 137:2 238:8 significantly 44:6 109:17 146:8 signs 30:18 similar 15:6 54:14,17 175:13 182:2 193:20 65:19 167:11 200:21 225:10,21,22 226:1,8 238:20 simply 151:19 192:3 233:16 Simultaneous 39:21 222:14 244:20 262:17 simultaneously 269:3 single 112:17 152:3 sir 53:12 62:10,17 83:10 100:21 137:8,9 140:3 151:17 240:6 246:3 247:7,8 274:4 274:14 275:3,7 277:12 278:9 285:21 sisters 152:20 sit 33:10 208:4 site 169:4,7 175:14,17 176:1 208:15 218:1,2 218:6,9 219:1 233:16 233:22 244:3 283:13 283:15 sites 176:5 situation 60:18 85:11 situations 40:18 146:3 six 36:21 55:14 65:14 93:4,13 177:21 241:1 259:18 260:10 sixth 144:18 **size** 47:7 **SJA** 75:19,22 76:21 77:16 83:2 108:6 145:15 **SJAs** 82:22 **Skipped** 112:1 **sleeping** 148:18 sleeve 116:21 **sleeves** 35:20

	1	1	1
slice 198:13	sought 24:6	speed 132:16	starting 186:3 211:20
slide 24:9 62:11,15	sounds 153:22 204:10	spend 123:16	256:4 265:10 280:10
83:12 103:20 119:10	soup 207:14	spending 124:6	starts 220:10
119:17,17 157:10	source 116:11 119:15	spent 216:1 217:2	state 22:3 26:14 27:19
159:10 160:10 164:21	234:4 263:8 270:20	sphere 231:11	46:11 47:20 157:8
166:19 167:13 168:22	272:1 273:12 274:12	split 57:18	247:6
slides 102:20 137:11	277:21 278:5	Spohn 1:19 63:13,15,17	statement 261:15
161:6,9 224:2,5	sources 115:5,20	69:2 84:10 115:3	262:20
sliver 62:7	sovereign 27:8	138:13,19 139:2	statements 240:16
small 64:2 94:12 119:12	sovereigns 27:14	143:20 169:15 184:11	states 1:1 4:21 19:18
189:16 218:11	sovereignty 23:19	185:16,18,22 186:15	26:20 28:6 47:4 169:5
small-group-type 111:5	26:12 147:21	186:19,22 187:4,12	246:1,8 286:2,10,15
smaller 144:13 251:15	speak 102:4 112:15	187:15 196:2 197:5	289:21 290:5 291:16
smart 107:21 130:11	138:15 139:11 169:14	222:11 223:22 247:22	statistic 65:17 198:20
smarter 114:6	171:9 215:21 216:2	257:14 263:9,19	statistical 66:10 107:22
smartest 110:10	218:7 231:22	269:12,16 281:13	138:5 168:14 233:1
smiling 35:6	speaker 107:20 154:7	282:15	statistician 139:11
Smith 236:22 237:3	154:18 228:17	Spohn's 84:7	statisticians 207:6
smoke 20:8	speakers 226:13	spoke 176:7	statistics 132:4 217:14
snide 36:3	speaking 180:5 188:13	spoken 210:7	221:13 222:4 223:21
sodomy 220:6	217:8 218:8 222:14	spot 185:20	232:3 259:7,16
soft 288:12	243:4 244:20 262:17	spotlight 219:19 243:14	stats 138:8 215:6
soldier 225:16	spearheaded 14:13	spouse 268:15	status 60:4 73:1,2
Solorio 20:19	Spears 158:18	spouses 267:2	statute 9:19 11:7 14:20
solution 149:5	special 13:11,17 16:18	Spring 112:1 222:17,20	36:16,17 38:2 41:9,15
solutions 112:22	40:14 41:3 44:19 45:1	222:21	63:3 76:9 94:3 109:2
somebody 23:16 24:13	45:5 48:19 54:3,4,12	spying 51:21	113:8,14 130:12
27:9 42:13 44:8,18	54:18,21,21 55:2,3,10	squadron 200:9,19	146:17 158:9 220:4
45:3 55:13,15,19	55:13,16,22 56:3,8	201:2	220:13
70:19 88:21 95:21	57:11 59:4,17 60:11	square 110:12	Statutes 36:21
99:13 115:16 148:20	61:15 62:6 63:1,6	staff 2:7,7,8,10,12 4:13	statutory 54:8 121:2,12 122:14 146:9 184:5
160:4 178:21 182:7	65:11 71:12,16,19	17:15 82:3 90:15 115:11 128:16 129:6	204:22
192:4 200:1 202:22 205:12 242:18 255:12	73:13 75:3,5,7 88:17	178:4 184:12 248:5	
272:13 288:2 289:13	88:22 89:5,7,13,18,20 90:10,11 94:21,22	251:18 276:7 284:7	stay 136:21 154:3 172:5 173:8 216:8,21
290:11,16	95:3 97:2 103:21	286:9	stayed 101:1
somebody's 71:3 88:11	117:22 118:2,3 122:7	stage 50:19 246:17	steered 213:6
someone-else 142:13	122:9,15 128:22	stakeholders 176:7	step 264:8
soon 38:18 41:22 87:14	129:8 133:8 165:14	stand 100:15	steps 284:2
151:18	171:1 172:15	standard 189:6 280:18	stigma 55:7 215:17
sorry 37:16,17 51:14	Specialization 294:4	standing 133:1	stigmatizing 55:6
66:5 80:3 160:12	specialize 294:3	standpoint 112:11	Stingl 2:15 4:3,9 7:7
165:2 201:6 214:14	specials 64:12 65:6,7	280:2,13	10:18,22 154:14
sort 43:16 52:18 70:14	65:10	stands 41:19 287:13	228:15,22 229:3
73:12 113:6 118:13	specific 6:14 156:13,15	start 19:8 39:5 86:6	234:6 245:3,8 250:20
122:22 123:1 127:7	157:1 168:21 183:1	103:9 122:8,10 191:5	251:12 253:17 275:12
127:11 128:9,19	185:11 188:22 205:5	206:13,16,18 207:2,3	275:14 285:4 294:16
129:14 132:6 148:7	205:9 221:6 235:14	207:14,17 208:4	stipulated 229:9,15
177:15 184:9 190:8	249:12 258:20,22	209:12 211:16,17,18	stomach 149:2,5
201:15,15 202:11	260:14 279:5	223:22 250:18 255:16	151:15
210:16,16 224:2	specifically 28:16 60:1	255:18 256:9 258:1	stood 46:11,13
235:19 239:15,16	156:5 159:18 197:10	263:21 265:22 266:4	stop 19:1,2 85:18 100:5
244:14 248:6 255:5	specifications 131:14	266:5 271:11 272:18	100:7 239:15 277:19
258:13 262:11 264:4	specifics 161:8 173:3	273:1 276:3 281:18	stopped 46:15 119:10
264:8 266:6 268:3	specify 34:8	282:8 287:6	246:17 279:18
269:17 277:1 282:3	speculating 170:14	started 48:18 152:8	straightforward 264:20
283:4 284:9 sorts 184:7 198:1,8	speculations 73:19 speeches 79:5	188:15,18 208:1 209:14 287:2	strained 100:6 stranded 29:20
30113 104.7 190.1,0	apecules / 3.0	203.14 201.2	311 a11ucu 23.20
II			1

strategic 6:17 9:20 15:20 183:10 strategy 183:22 191:7 **street** 120:17 strength 161:10 strengthening 165:13 **strengths** 162:1 170:3 stress 70:17 stricter 69:20 strictly 198:13 280:1 strike 112:4 **stripes** 116:21 strong 219:21 265:17 strongly 175:18 struck 181:4 structural 121:13 124:12,21 126:18 199:20 structure 31:5 33:9 39:6 163:6 200:4 **studied** 126:13 studies 258:10 265:6 281:10 **study** 66:10 72:18 124:1 196:12 198:18 222:8 223:5 246:4 studying 111:18 stuff 183:21 205:9 207:13 233:12 236:19 236:19,20 258:17 259:1,3,8 268:18 270:2 272:21 stupid 68:6 **sub** 184:9 subcommittee 111:12 111:19 162:12,14 163:13 164:4,10,11 164:13,16 169:1,2,10 169:13 175:1 176:3,4 176:5,9,18,20 179:18 180:18 182:3 208:2,3 208:3,9 209:8,8,9 223:8 244:9,22 245:10 249:11,13,17 250:22 251:3,6 255:17,18,22 256:11 259:11 261:14,16 270:3 272:18 276:10 276:11 subcommittees 162:10 164:8,19,19 174:10 174:20 179:9,11,13 179:20 180:8,12 181:2,11,12,17 182:21 206:15 207:19 208:20 244:13,16 249:1 251:17,18 253:5,7,15 257:1

277:16 281:8 283:15 subject 19:21 20:2,11 20:17 21:5,20 22:2,5 22:15,16,19 23:4 24:19 36:4 43:4 71:12 88:11 127:16,18 137:5 143:12 158:21 210:7 245:11 290:21 **subjected** 80:20 81:3 **subjects** 160:15 submit 125:15 submitted 284:17 **subordinate** 135:18,21 subsequently 14:5 111:14 189:10 subset 189:16 substance 182:19 **substantial** 14:17 15:9 32:8 36:9 37:1 42:3 48:16 substantially 15:3 substantive 31:11 33:4 33:13 124:22 133:14 134:18 209:15 234:15 substantively 275:22 success 17:22 successful 14:2 suddenly 96:10 suffer 225:18 suffering 71:3 suffers 29:19 sufficient 146:6 257:19 sufficiently 16:2 suggest 207:17 255:1 suggestion 248:18 274:19 281:19 suggestions 254:21 suggests 88:7 181:7 **Sullivan** 2:4 3:5 8:9,12 10:7,9 18:7,8,11,17 37:16 39:14,18,22 40:4 51:3 53:9,17,20 54:2 62:12,14,17,21 63:2,10,16,18 65:13 66:6,9 68:5 74:2,3,4 74:10,14 78:2,7,21 79:1 80:7,11 81:21 82:5 84:5,14 85:13 88:3 90:2 93:20 100:5 101:1,5 102:4,14 106:7 107:20 108:3 116:18 120:20 125:5 129:22 141:12 150:5 153:5 **Sullivan's** 102:19 summaries 54:10

256:22

summary 40:13 43:7,10

44:15,17 61:15 62:5 64:14 65:19 73:14 75:7 126:8 256:12 257:5,11,19 272:2 summer/fall 120:11 **sums** 293:9 superior 78:15 supervises 11:11 **supplies** 231:12 support 17:17,19 161:1 162:3 164:5 165:15 173:12 193:20 205:19 supporting 24:14 supposed 30:12 236:20 277:18 supposedly 237:2 **Supreme** 20:18 24:7 25:16 31:20 43:20 44:2 60:1 surprised 85:7 **survey** 116:11 137:15 137:16,21 138:19,20 139:10 204:15 207:7 221:14 222:6 287:9,9 287:10,15,17,18 288:8.13 survey-conducted 115:22 **surveys** 111:6 112:10 116:8,8 138:4 139:15 287:11 survivors 286:20 291:7 suspect 16:13 171:8 238:16 suspected 27:3 165:18 sustaining 165:19 **SVC** 80:7 81:11,17 265:20 **SVCs** 212:12 swears 88:12 **sweep** 108:3 system 13:2 14:12,18 14:21 19:9,13,22 20:17,20 21:1 22:10 26:12 28:13 29:5 30:14 31:6 32:17 33:9 34:12,19,22 35:2,5,9 35:21 36:6 37:4 39:2 39:6 46:19 47:5,19,19 47:20 49:16,21 50:6 64:1 67:19 84:20 85:21 86:3 87:8,10,11 98:16 100:12 105:9 105:12 107:13 108:14 109:1 113:12 123:1,1 125:4,6,22 130:13 131:1,10 132:7

43:13,22 44:3,6,11,13

147:16,17,17 150:12 161:16 163:7 187:8 187:21 190:16 191:1 193:22 194:4 205:20 219:7 221:15 230:9 258:13 280:6 system's 34:13 37:5 38:7 systemic 33:4 systems 3:11 9:6,14 12:17 15:4 28:21 29:4 30:2,3,6 38:2 107:14 150:19 155:11 161:11 161:14 162:3,12 163:13,15,19 164:2,6 174:20 181:19 271:17

Т

Tab 177:15 table 266:7,14 tables 171:9 tackle 264:9.16 taken 40:22 41:1 50:1 74:12 137:16 151:10 205:10,11,11 258:3 258:14 takes 43:1 122:6 127:22 227:17 talented 17:16 294:1 talk 18:19 31:2.7.9 35:5 35:9,12,15,17 36:2,4 53:5,11,14,22 59:18 60:10,12 70:6 100:12 106:15 107:1,9 110:12 113:13 114:16 114:18 115:2 120:6 125:1 133:10 149:21 152:19 182:18 218:13 235:12,13 238:3,5 239:1 252:13 262:21 272:10 276:5,7 287:8 292:10 talked 61:16,22 79:6 90:16 100:5 108:10 109:11 119:18 121:6 121:14 125:4,5,21 132:20 135:1 160:4 213:15 214:1 220:17 226:13 264:18 talking 35:7 39:21 54:3 96:5,8,8,19 114:7,15 117:16 123:16 130:9 130:9 178:10 202:3,3 208:9 222:13 231:18 232:20 **Tammy** 2:7 4:13

tampers 219:14

tapes 240:14

task 9:19 12:12 110:21 111:9 182:11 184:5 202:9 249:13 261:5 tasked 12:15 156:18
111:9 182:11 184:5 202:9 249:13 261:5 tasked 12:15 156:18
202:9 249:13 261:5 tasked 12:15 156:18
II
171:18 174:4 249:19
taskers 107:6 152:19
tasking 249:18
taskings 169:8
tasks 182:2 210:6
TBI 71:3 team 17:15 111:4 114:4
114:9
tear 201:1
tech 85:16
technical 242:12
telephone 276:20
277:14
tell 26:1 37:20 46:9
66:12,15 67:21 78:15
82:13 102:10 133:22
142:10,10 152:15
170:14 184:16 205:13
211:7 238:1 240:22
285:20 293:3,10 tells 142:8,19 184:19
tempted 206:14,15
ten 19:18 60:14,19,20
64:18 65:22
tend 263:9
tended 34:18
tension 108:22 109:5,9
130:15 146:13 151:8
tenure 111:20 127:11
term 46:16,17 142:5
192:14 194:5 terminal 134:15
terminal 134.15
terminates 166:20
terminology 185:14
terms 47:7,7,8 85:2
121:21 125:10 135:4
174:7 180:7 196:3
198:9 201:9 202:16
203:15 212:6 229:7
229:18 233:7 258:6
259:4 264:21
terrific 17:18 218:10
tested 103:17 testify 80:17 172:15
testiny 80:17 172:15 testimony 158:13 163:4
172:7,10 173:10,11
190:14 198:3 219:3
thank 7:5,7 10:5,8
11:15,17 12:10 17:13
17:15 18:5,6 37:17
53:8 62:13 81:20
100:20 101:4,5,7
143:16 153:3,18,19
I

155:4 171:14 175:12 177:10 210:4 294:15 thankfully 105:1 **thanks** 76:22 177:5 278:16 theater 103:22 104:4 then-Colonel 107:4 theoretical 61:5 theoretically 59:11 Theresa 2:12 thesis 103:1,7 104:18 105:21 119:1 122:6 124:13 127:21 they'd 45:8 52:21 thick 175:1 241:2 242:11 thin 241:2 things 31:1,3 40:7 42:11 43:15 52:1 53:21 61:22 66:15 68:7 70:1 79:8 83:20 105:17 111:17 117:14 127:7 130:5 131:18 133:9 134:9 136:12 143:6,8 146:14 149:13 151:9 152:12 153:14 156:18 174:3 174:16 176:2 178:3,9 180:20 181:4 188:17 197:11 198:1,8,11 205:5 206:9,18 209:6 210:19 212:8 213:10 214:2 215:11 216:19 219:2,11 235:6,16 241:17 243:1,12 254:6,19 257:9 258:10 259:2 262:20 263:2 264:20 268:4,6 268:20 270:4,8 280:14 283:4 287:4 294:13 third 19:14 21:3 24:12 31:14 64:10,17,21,22 65:1 124:12 145:3.10 145:11 162:13 165:13 205:4 235:20 thirds 60:19 65:2 thorough 241:6 thou 133:21,21,22,22 thought 58:16 71:2 103:9 134:14 171:10 177:22 183:19 190:3 204:14 212:19 214:10 226:15,19 269:19 270:1 272:6,17 275:17 285:17,18 287:4

thousands 217:3 three 13:4 25:13 31:1,3 36:11,18 42:19 43:6 54:5,8 67:6,10 72:21 77:11,12 83:1 84:5 95:14,20 96:22 97:4 97:22 101:22 107:14 162:10 164:8 168:10 177:20 179:17.21 180:4,16 255:2 270:9 270:22 271:21 272:4 272:20 279:1 282:16 282:19 three- 64:12,14 three-fourths 60:16 three-quarters 88:7 three-thirds 60:20 threshold 70:14 261:1 throw 42:13 217:8 throwing 188:6 throws 49:15 THURSDAY 1:8 ticket 109:22 **Tideswell** 2:7 4:13 10:10 18:6 39:12,16 100:21 101:8.20 102:7 153:8.20 154:1 154:6 160:10 171:15 177:6 178:15 190:18 191:12 224:7 239:6 240:6 244:8,11,17 246:2,10,21 247:7 248:2 249:15 250:1,3 250:8 253:16 257:3 273:10,14,18,22 274:4,14 275:3,7 276:13,19 277:5,9,12 278:9,16 283:7,17 284:4,20 tied 68:1 69:20 timeline 120:9 248:14 times 77:20 78:3 81:22 82:2,18 130:14 230:5 293:11 tiny 38:3 62:7 146:21 198:13 **tip** 204:12 tired 228:19 title 15:3 80:5 101:17 today 6:21 7:9,16 10:6 10:22 11:16 14:20 22:16 34:13 35:5,10 36:5,6 37:6 38:16 39:3 43:3 54:4 57:13 59:18 60:12 67:18 68:19 69:4 70:18 80:16 98:16 102:14 114:15 125:5,6

132:20 149:10.16 180:12 183:16 206:2 254:11 276:15 284:9 today's 4:12 5:16 6:4,9 8:3,7 10:3 Tokash 1:21 188:12,12 217:7,7 242:20 243:3 told 148:4 154:8 tolerance 153:5 tomorrow 278:10 tool 115:22 116:7 131:7 131:9 139:22 140:22 141:5 147:1 top 150:11 184:1 197:20 255:15 topic 119:8 271:1 topical 9:20 topics 15:21 tops 106:14 total 23:5 24:9 57:8 61:10 103:20 144:4 160:13 164:8 totally 147:18 210:5 242:17 touching 224:12 tout 116:20 town 27:9 track 124:3 128:3 137:5 284:19 tracking 246:22 train 151:21 152:9,10 199:9 trained 16:3 training 112:2 151:9 161:19 170:10 171:11 206:4 211:8 217:3 transcribed 5:6 8:4 transcript 8:5 transcripts 5:12 190:10 190:19 191:5 transfer 200:10 243:11 translated 46:10 translates 46:6,18 transparency 15:4 trauma 151:9,10 trauma-informed 149:22 traumatic 70:17 treat 188:3 treated 172:6 treatment 110:5 tremendous 12:13 trenches 241:10 trend 84:22 trepidation 39:2 trial 41:10,16 43:10,12 43:17 45:2 46:22 74:20 90:22 91:2 99:9

thoughts 204:21

99:10 112:12 113:11 121:8 125:13,17 171:3 187:3,14 191:6 191:10 217:19 227:4 227:12 229:6 239:13 239:20,21 274:9 286:7 289:9 291:20 292:1 trials 190:19 tribulation 113:12 tried 12:22 23:10,19,21 26:10,16 27:5,11,13 27:14,19,22 31:13 34:18,22 46:21 47:14 47:21 54:6 56:6 61:10 61:13 65:8,10 70:5 94:4 97:8 105:8 117:9 142:14 147:16,17 trigger 73:9 triggered 120:10 trillion 26:7 true 92:7 108:5 114:3 149:17 251:12,13 truly 213:2 216:14 **Truman** 30:17 trusting 150:22 **try** 23:13,15 28:7 58:5 75:7,8 94:10 97:9 101:22 102:1 112:18 115:17 136:11 139:13 148:7 178:22 193:17 201:17 264:19 276:20 290:10 trying 45:4 119:6 136:20 139:15 171:8 206:16 216:16 240:11 250:15 270:13 292:6 turn 219:19 turnaround 250:19 turned 92:6 259:4 turning 93:5 178:1 turns 92:5 180:19 262:8 tweaked 262:4 twice 36:19.22 two 6:13 9:3 12:14 34:11,14,16 36:7 42:15 43:3 44:22 45:11 46:20 52:2,5 57:13 58:5,7 59:14 67:3,11,12,15 68:13 79:9 85:6 92:20,22 93:9 95:6 98:5,6,7,15 105:14 109:16 113:2 119:13 136:1 137:10 147:22 155:6,10,14 156:6,11 159:1 163:9 167:3 169:2 177:20 217:12 232:20 233:19

265:6 271:16 272:4 277:21 282:10,16 286:12 287:18 291:4 two- 60:18 65:1 two-thirds 55:17 57:15 57:16,21,22 59:1,13 60:15 65:20 150:6 two-year 181:6 tying 15:1 type 26:2,2,21 119:11 135:7 204:17 210:14 221:10 231:17 types 110:5 126:1 207:10

typically 171:5 239:7

248:12 249:15 291:1

U **U.S** 2:2,7,8,15 8:20 22:22 23:10,14 24:4,5 24:13 27:19,22 28:3 45:2.4 50:1 129:10 189:3 **U.S.D.B** 24:19 **UA** 95:22 96:3,5,9,11,17 **UCMJ** 15:2 20:11 21:5 22:15,17,19 26:22 28:20 29:1,10 30:20 31:2 32:10 33:5 36:16 36:21 40:9 61:21 62:1 62:3,9 65:22 66:13 67:5 79:16 103:12,19 104:22 109:12 114:12 119:3 133:3 146:2 151:18 156:19 161:12 167:8 170:4 **ultimate** 185:15 ultimately 28:22 141:16 163:11 192:18 **unable** 6:22 unaniminity 47:8

underage 94:10 289:13 289:15 understand 35:2,21 42:5 45:8 74:6,11 108:16 130:11 138:20 156:3 160:6 191:4 217:15 235:21 249:11 285:11 288:7 292:5 294:8

unanimous 59:17

96:6

151:7,14

unauthorized 95:20

uncertainty 150:13

unconstitutional 47:5

understanding 198:5 209:20 212:2 261:3,6 undertaking 264:10 underway 41:21 **undue** 58:13 170:19 **uneven** 273:3 unfair 81:3 unfairly 81:3 unforeseen 6:18 unfortunately 6:18 136:3 208:20 276:14 unfounded 190:2 196:12,19,19 unfounding 196:4,7 unified 260:8 261:14 uniform 13:6 20:9 30:9 30:9,16 146:2 189:5 196:15 288:4 uniformed 20:3 uniformity 197:13 unintended 15:17 unit 25:22 26:6 199:8 199:15 200:6,7 216:17,21 **United** 1:1 4:21 26:20 158:20 169:5 246:1,8 286:2,10,15 289:21 290:5 291:16 units 173:12 universe 186:21 189:17 universities 242:5 unknowingness 150:14 unlawful 78:14,17,20

79:2,12,13,16 94:9 **unmarked** 236:11 unmarried 69:6 unreported 223:13,15 unrestricted 87:9,15,20 88:4,6 116:3,5 117:19 117:21 139:8,21 140:6 141:17 142:9 143:3,10,14,14,19 144:4 147:3,5,15 160:5,16 189:18,22 192:17,21 193:18 198:5 212:17 247:19 248:1 288:17 289:1,3 **upload** 273:8 upstream 195:19 231:8

urgency 158:5 urinalysis 96:20 USC 49:21 use 65:21 70:21,22 86:4 102:21 130:20 139:12 236:18 262:12 274:22 277:15 useful 219:2 245:10

277:17 USS 42:1 usually 27:22 123:19 228:1 229:8,15 **utility** 213:21

V

v 52:4 59:22 60:5 **VA** 55:10 valid 278:20 valuable 12:11 115:22 131:7,9 150:19 217:2 value 272:6 variety 110:5 163:16 176:12 various 21:7 40:7 112:10 180:10 196:6 239:10,17 247:2 248:8 vast 61:20 62:3,7 **vastly** 71:6 vehicle 252:10 **verbatim** 191:13 verdict 48:6 vernacular 99:10 version 10:18 38:15,15 51:9 57:3 120:13 255:21 versus 120:4,4 143:19 191:17 198:5 202:5,5 223:13 262:22 263:1 291:15 vessel 29:19 40:21 41:18 43:12 vessels 42:17 veterans 55:8 188:3,3 veterans' 189:12 victim 13:20 16:13 48:21 49:17 50:10,14 50:15 80:5,14 81:9,14 81:19 87:8 112:16 141:15,18 142:8 144:12 147:3,12,20 156:21 157:8 162:13 164:4 168:1 169:12 169:14 170:21 172:3 172:4,5,13 185:6 187:7 199:10,14 200:7 201:4 215:3 216:5 217:6 219:11 219:20 230:12 267:16 268:8 280:19 290:12 victim's 140:9 146:11 148:3,4 202:16 victimization 138:20 139:14 202:8 267:8 victimized 160:21 victimizing 145:20 victims 14:8 49:6 80:20

80:21 81:2,7,7 108:21

110:2 122:14 123:21

136:16 140:16 141:3 volunteer 102:2 208:17 209:16 210:11 Wilkerson 92:2 108:4 143:1,9 147:2,9 vote 58:21,22 59:13,16 213:6,7 214:8,11,19 willfully 29:19 156:21 158:15 160:15 60:19 214:21 218:18 220:9 willing 279:22 281:3 voting 57:12,14 111:20 willingness 12:11 162:4 164:5 172:14 230:14 232:14 243:20 173:7 187:19 198:9 127:13 247:20 253:7 261:5 198:3 198:18 199:5,6,7 263:2 273:8 282:1,7 wish 17:21 W 203:12 212:14 213:21 wishes 148:3,5 284:10 288:10 219:1 242:3 247:14 W 1:16 ways 14:22 39:7 40:9 withdrawal 121:8 wait 19:5 261:13 276:15 264:15 265:1 267:20 69:10 118:19 256:22 withdrawn 190:2 waive 55:10 268:8 269:13 288:10 weakness 161:11 withe 58:5 weaknesses 162:2 288:11,11 290:18,21 **waivers** 69:13 witness 49:14 91:7,8 290:22 waiving 69:17 170:3 143:8 240:15 victims' 13:18 16:18,19 wear 30:11 148:15 WITNESSES 2:1 walk 54:15 36:17 48:19 49:17,22 walking 142:21 wearing 116:20 woman 215:22 216:1 women 17:11 216:3 50:4,10,14 108:19 wall 240:4 web-based 280:6 112:14 117:22 118:1 Walton 1:22 203:21 website 5:8,10 8:6 wonder 145:14 173:6 118:3,4 120:21 221:10 222:3 238:2 157:22 159:9 161:5 wonderful 22:7 258:16 121:15,15 122:8,9,15 268:7 168:16 175:9 178:12 wondering 148:18 wanted 68:15 75:4 188:7 190:9 257:7 136:17,18 142:3 178:13 224:6 233:9 165:14,14 171:2 273:17,17,20 278:6 Woodson 52:4 91:21 98:18 133:10 172:15 203:12 159:13,16 164:11 websites 175:5 178:11 word 70:21,22 110:18 video 240:14 178:14 176:19 185:3 206:3 171:17,19 191:2 videotapes 241:4 216:7 246:11 267:5 week 20:3 111:4 215:22 wording 196:14 Vietnam 23:5 276:1 287:2 256:15 words 118:9 142:18 view 163:10 279:20 wants 100:17,18 141:18 weeks 115:15 246:22 292:18 weigh 102:21 229:1 work 5:22 9:3.21 12:13 141:20,21 229:13 weird 95:4 118:7 views 163:10 164:9 234:21 278:2 17:8 18:1 27:1 30:3 179:21 war 23:1,5 29:6 30:4,5 130:10 102:1,9 117:4 125:18 violate 68:14 102:13 welcome 3:2 4:4 7:8 141:15 158:8,10 51:21 52:6,7,8,9 violated 20:8 11:19 229:2 159:7,12 162:7 103:14 violates 79:11 warm-up 112:5 Wendell 61:2 164:12,12,15,18 violating 94:9 102:11 warning 18:18 32:14,16 went 23:22 26:6 60:6 166:17 167:20 173:19 102:12 144:21 39:1 94:1 101:13 102:9 174:22 178:18,20 violation 50:9 warrant 126:16 111:1 125:17 146:19 180:4 181:13 199:15 200:8,12,15 232:21 violations 49:21 50:4 warranted 16:21 176:5 177:12 187:14 133:20 Warren 2:2 3:9 8:19 189:15 199:2 222:6 241:11,12 245:5 violence 140:16,17 wary 282:6 226:19 243:8 285:9 260:10 261:14,16 141:2,4 224:12 242:3 Washington 12:3 289:9 294:22 262:10 265:18 271:21 242:8 258:5 267:1 112:21 132:17 283:9 weren't 68:20 73:1 277:2 278:4 Virginia 1:11 27:7,10 wasn't 143:13 170:12 221:16 282:2 worked 149:20 **vision** 231:7 Watch 291:5 west 180:2 workforce 200:15 wet 208:1,17 270:8,14 visit 218:2 working 115:14 116:18 watching 241:4 283:2 visits 169:4,7 175:14,17 water 42:19 43:2,5 what-if-l-tell- 142:12 118:15 150:11 152:16 waterfall 84:18 224:1,5 200:11 216:18 241:13 176:1 208:15 218:2,6 whatnot 259:5 218:9 219:1 244:3 224:11 whatsoever 177:19 241:16 works 85:17 111:15 283:15 waters 291:14 wheel 221:12 **VLC** 80:7 81:12,17 wave 106:14 Whistleblower 117:5 152:21 87:13,17 122:10 way 6:17 15:13 30:15 whistleblowers 117:4,7 world 30:4,5 52:9 265:21 33:9 42:4,6 43:15,18 117:11 110:11 188:22 197:2 **VLC/SVC** 87:22 47:8,18,19 58:4 65:15 White 155:18 211:13 226:14 230:10 231:9 238:7,12,13,18 **VLCs** 49:5 212:12 **whittle** 139:6 74:1 82:16 91:20 92:8 voice 17:7 93:5 94:2,17 95:4,5,7 who've 110:17 268:11 276:12 290:1 volatility 32:15 36:8,9 whoever's 236:21 293:19 98:3,19 100:1,6,7 wholeheartedly 211:21 worth 119:13 123:17 37:2 38:21,22 104:5 111:22 116:22 volume 38:4,5 197:3 197:13 214:2 **whys** 205:19 118:7 126:19 129:2 voluminous 190:12 131:1,4 136:15 139:5 wide 110:5 163:18 worthy 218:3 240:7 254:15 146:2 179:1 181:13 widespread 30:3 92:3 wouldn't 45:8 58:13 voluntary 213:3 189:13 201:11 208:1 wife 140:20 145:2 253:18 294:9

294:10.11 **19** 1:8 34:21 32:20 33:2 35:16 Ζ wrap 206:16 255:17 **1950** 28:20 30:17 36:15 38:9,15,18 zero 78:1,3 81:22 82:10 wrapping 207:18 109:12 42:21 52:16 106:4 82:14 114:19 124:5 168:12 **wrinkle** 49:16 **1951** 30:19 103:12 Writ 49:19 50:1,8,15,16 114:4 126:20 131:2 168:19 222:22 0 writes 75:19,22 76:10 **1952** 104:6 **2017** 1:8 32:22 110:1 writing 76:16 259:5 **1968** 14:18 33:6 104:9,9 166:21 169:19 173:16 1 written 5:16 8:4 127:20 105:6 120:2,3 173:18 **1,000** 65:5 **1968-'69** 128:1 **2018** 34:6.18 240:13,16 249:6,17 **1,000-plus** 145:4,8 **1969** 20:15 104:10 **2019** 33:17 34:9 43:1 wrong 185:13 209:17 **1,013** 144:5 216:12 261:4 262:9 105:6 128:1 114:22 **1,100** 83:12 138:8 288:3 **1972** 4:21 **21** 112:1 **1,104** 61:10 wrote 72:1 73:5 256:11 **1983** 105:10 120:4 23-and-a-half 286:3 **1,400** 289:2 **1984** 105:11 23-plus 292:9 **1,499** 160:16 X **1987** 20:15 23rd 32:20 152:10 **1,600** 145:11 1990 64:20 68:20 69:5 **24** 20:2 115:14 169:19 1.3 151:22 Υ 1990s 71:11 **24/7** 283:1 **1:30** 154:2,7,12 yammer 100:14 **25** 88:5 186:7 214:12 1st 33:17 34:6,9 1:56 177:12 Yard 112:21 132:17 **255** 289:10,17 **10** 166:3 2 **26,000** 106:21 116:11 150:22 10:00 1:11 yawn 113:10 **2** 182:16 186:11 137:11 194:2 198:18 10:04 4:2 year 4:17,19 20:3 32:22 **2.000** 103:20 198:19 199:16 204:10 **10:45** 100:2 2:02 177:13 207:5,10 287:20 34:6 36:18 61:8,9 **100** 191:20 266:3 272:5 20 24:15 102:8 104:12 26th 36:12 53:21 77:10 64:6.20 65:3 75:15 **100,000** 204:16 **27** 158:22 77:11 93:9 99:19 107:6 112:15 115:11 **101** 3:9 **285** 3:19 103:19 113:11,16,17 123:15 127:16 153:11 **11** 168:7,9 177:15 249:7 120:17 121:5 122:4 210:21 290:11 **11:26** 101:13 3 20,000 116:11 138:10 123:13,13 137:15 **111** 107:5 **3** 184:4 138:8 139:9,21 144:2 287:19 289:17 **1137** 142:15 **20.500** 138:3 287:20 **3.000** 65:4 144:3.4 155:13 158:1 **12** 55:14,16,18 106:9,9 158:8,10,11 179:5,22 **2000** 64:7 **3:34** 285:10 120:12 184:13 186:1 198:19 2000s 140:15 141:3 **3:43** 285:7,9 **12-inches** 242:11 207:12 223:1,1 **2006** 155:16 **3:54** 294:20,22 **12:38** 154:12 270:12 271:8,9 **2007** 161:13 **30** 8:13 20:4,6 42:14 **120** 94:2 113:8 120:14 282:12 284:1,1,22 **2010** 287:18 44:6 186:7 136:13 167:19 168:14 287:16 288:14,22 **2011** 161:13 **300** 45:12 **13** 120:14.17 290:12,19,22 291:21 **2012** 3:8 6:13 13:8 **303** 126:6,6 **132** 135:10 165:1.3 year's 222:21 38:11,19 103:2 106:2 **30th** 284:6 182:5 107:2 113:7,13,15 **32** 80:10,12,17,21 81:4 years 7:19 8:13 12:16 **134** 133:16 134:4,5 12:19 17:5 18:2 24:15 114:15 119:2 136:13 81:10,16 89:8 90:8 **138** 165:1 182:5 137:16 155:13 167:10 34:11,14,16 36:7,12 129:1 178:2 **14** 28:15 119:5 120:7,15 43:4 52:2,6 57:13 269:12 287:19 34 75:19 76:10,15 121:11,17 122:5,7 2013 13:16 14:2 36:12 60:14,19,21 64:18 128:18,19 129:4 158:12 **365** 20:3 65:22 71:20 72:21 37:5 38:9 48:18 53:21 **140(a)** 132:2,3,11 **3771** 49:21 77:13 92:20,22 95:6 77:10 91:18 113:11 **148** 291:21 98:15 103:6,6 109:11 113:18,19 115:8 **15** 106:9 119:10 121:19 4 109:14 115:6 127:16 120:11,19 137:17 122:1,8 184:13 186:1 134:3 136:3 148:1 156:5,10 222:10 **4** 3:2 29:13 168:7 233:18 288:22 149:21 205:12 217:10 **2014** 14:9 75:15 116:22 **4,200** 289:1,3 **15,000** 291:16,18 237:1 260:10 261:19 118:22 120:1,4 138:2 4,584 160:16 **154** 3:14 158:22 204:16 222:11 271:6,7 286:3,12,13 **4.5** 64:7 **16** 7:14 106:10 122:4 269:13 287:10,20 **41** 4:22 287:7,18 292:9 293:8 154:15 251:21 252:2 yesterday 25:7 152:18 292:1 **45** 100:2 **17** 26:3 36:20 120:4 **2015** 4:17 7:19 12:6,7 4610 1:11 175:10 124:4 yield 84:9 100:9 48-hour 250:19 61:8 64:6,7 103:21 1744 75:13 York 157:21 152:6 160:13 168:7 **480** 291:18.21 **177** 3:17 222:22 223:2 young 149:15 150:15 **18** 3:5 15:3 49:20 158:3 2016 4:19 7:19 14:17 215:2,22 216:1 293:5 **189** 289:6

			520
	1	I	1
5 4:21 182:20 197:4			
50 62:19 63:11,19 83:13			
50,000 204:14			
50/50 57:18			
500 46:3 123:21 246:6			
246:12			
504 160:18			
51 103:6			
51,000 61:17			
513 242:22			
53(a) 131:11			
537 4:18			
5370 117:9			
546 4:16			
55,000 103:18			
550 138:9 199:2 289:9			
576 156:5			
6			
6(b) 136:17			
6,083 160:13			
6,700 65:7,18			
60 121:7 130:2,18 144:3			
600 145:5,9,10			
600s 144:6			
61 103:6			
634 61:16			
64,000 138:13			
65 164:9 197:3			
6B 36:16			
7			
70 214:5			
70s 105:17 128:3			
75 87:20 88:3 106:8,10			
214:5,13			
790 186:1 214:4 281:21			
8			
8 28:15			
800,000 21:6,13 22:4			
80s 105:17,20 128:3			
836 61:15 65:18			
87.5 65:6			
88 166:2			
00 100.∠			
9			
90s 105:20			
918 289:3,6			
92 134:2			
93(a) 134:22 135:3,14			
135:19			
99.9 292:1			
	l		
II .			

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Defense Advisory Committee on Sexual

Assault in the Armed Services

Before: US DoD

Date: 01-19-17

Place: Arlington, VA

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &