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

(DAC-IPAD)

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY DECEMBER 6, 2022

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Grand Ballroom at the Ritz-Carlton Pentagon City, 1250 South Hayes Street, Arlington, Virginia, at 9:00 a.m., the Honorable Karla N. Smith, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT Hon. Karla N. Smith, Chair MG(R) Marcia Anderson* Ms. Martha Bashford Mr. William E. Cassara* Ms. Meg Garvin Hon. Suzanne Goldberg Hon. Paul W. Grimm* Mr. A.J. Kramer Ms. Jennifer Gentile Long Ms. Jenifer Markowitz* Hon. Jennifer O'Connor* BGen(R) James Schwenk* Dr. Cassia Spohn Ms. Meghan Tokash Hon. Reggie Walton

ALSO PRESENT Mr. Dwight Sullivan, Designated Federal Officer DAC-IPAD STAFF Colonel Jeff A. Bovarnick, JAGC, U.S. Army, Director Ms. Julie K. Carson, Deputy Director Mr. Dale L. Trexler, Chief of Staff Ms. Stacy Boggess, Senior Paralegal* Ms. Audrey Critchley, Staff Attorney Ms. Alice Falk, Technical Writer-Editor Ms. Theresa Gallagher, Staff Attorney Ms. Nalini Gupta, Staff Attorney* Ms. Amanda Hagy, Senior Paralegal Mr. R. Chuck Mason, Staff Attorney Ms. Marguerite McKinney, Management & Program Analyst Ms. Meghan Peters, Staff Attorney Ms. Stayce Rozell, Senior Paralegal Ms. Terri Saunders, Staff Attorney Ms. Kate Tagert, Staff Attorney Ms. Eleanor Magers Vuono, Staff Attorney Dr. William Wells, Criminologist*

*Via video-teleconference

CONTENTS

Welcome and Introduction to Public Meeting 4
Uniform Code of Military Justice Panel
Selection
Survivors United
Special Victims' Counsel/Victims' Legal Counsel
(SVC/VLC) Panel
Offices of Special Trial Counsel Panel
DAC-IPAD and U.S. Government Accountability
DAC-IPAD and U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) Racial Disparity Reports
Office (GAO) Racial Disparity Reports
Office (GAO) Racial Disparity Reports Discussion
Office (GAO) Racial Disparity Reports Discussion

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 9:01 a.m. Good morning. 3 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm 4 Dwight Sullivan. I'm the Designated Federal 5 Officer of the Defense Advisory Committee for the Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual 6 7 Assault in the Armed Forces, better known as the 8 DAC-IPAD. 9 This meeting of the DAC-IPAD is now officially open. Judge Smith, you have the con. 10 11 CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan, 12 and good morning, everyone. I want to welcome the members and all attendees to the 25th public 13 14 meeting of the Defense Advisory Committee on 15 Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual 16 Assault in the Armed Forces or DAC-IPAD. 17 Today's meeting will be in person and 18 by videoconference via Zoom for members and 19 presenters. For those joining by video, please 20 mute when not speaking. If we have technical 21 difficulties, we will break for ten minutes, move to a teleconference line, and send the 22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

instructions by email.

2	The Secretary of Defense created the
3	DAC-IPAD in accordance for the Fiscal Year 2015
4	National Defense Authorization Act. The DAC-
5	IPAD's statutory purpose is to advise the
6	Secretary of Defense on the investigation,
7	prosecution, and defense of allegations of sexual
8	assault, and other sexual misconduct involving
9	members of the Armed Forces.
10	Representatives from the Military
11	Services Criminal Law divisions, who serve as
12	specific experts and liaisons to their services,
13	have joined us today. Welcome.
14	We will begin today with a panel of
15	service representatives to discuss the court-
16	martial panel selection process. This continues
17	the committee's discussion and education on a
18	topic of importance to the committee and that is
19	the difference in the military's process for
20	selecting panel members under the UCMJ versus the
21	civilian practice of random jury selection under
22	the Sixth Amendment.

1	The remainder of the morning is
2	dedicated to victim issues with a focus on victim
3	impact statements. We will hear from Survivors
4	United, the victims' advocate group dedicated to
5	helping victims of sexual assault committed by
6	members of the Armed Forces. We will then hear
7	from a panel of representatives from the Services'
8	Special Victims Counsel, Victims Legal Counsel
9	Programs.
10	After lunch, we will welcome back the
11	General Counsel of the Military Departments and
12	the Service Judge Advocate's General and Staff
13	Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine
14	Corps. This panel will provide an update on the
15	status of the four offices of Special Trial
16	Counsel and answer questions from the committee.
17	After a break, we have a staff briefing
18	on racial disparity reports and will close out the
19	day with a public comment session.
20	The public meeting will continue
21	tomorrow morning beginning at 8:55 a.m. and the
22	full committee will receive updates from our three

subcommittees that were formally established with 1 2 subcommittee members appointed after our September meeting. We will hear from the Case Review 3 Subcommittee, chaired by Ms. Bashford; the Special 4 5 Projects Subcommittee, chaired by Ms. Tokash; and the Policy Subcommittee, chaired by General 6 7 Schwenk. I want to thank all of the members for 8 9 their work on subcommittees between full committee 10 meetings. 11 The public meeting will close out 12 tomorrow morning with a deliberation session focused on our fifth annual report due in March 13 14 2023, and the meeting wrap up as we plan our next meeting in March and look toward our work in 2023. 15 16 This meeting is being recorded and 17 transcribed and a complete written transcript will 18 be posted on the DAC-IPAD website at www.dac-19 ipad.whs.mil. 20 If a meeting attendee wants to make a 21 public comment, please submit your name no later than 2:00 p.m. to whs.pentagon.em.mbx.dac-22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	ipad@mail.mil. Comments will be heard at my
2	discretion at the end of today's session.
3	To assist the court reporter and to
4	avoid multiple people speaking at the same time,
5	committee members should signal if they have a
6	question or wish to speak by stating your name and
7	waiting to be acknowledged before proceeding.
8	Thank you to everyone for attending
9	today.
10	Over to you, Colonel Bovarnick, to
11	start the meeting. Thank you.
12	COL BOVARNICK: Thank you, Chair Smith.
13	I just have a quick update on committee action
14	since our 24th Public Meeting on September 21st,
15	2022 and Chair Smith mentioned briefly. On
16	September 24th, the DoD General Counsel formally
17	established the DAC-IPAD's three permanent
18	subcommittees, the Case Review Subcommittee, the
19	Policy Subcommittee, and the Special Projects
20	Subcommittee, and approved separate terms of
21	reference for each subcommittee.
22	On October 18th, the Secretary of

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Defense appointed the following members to each 1 2 subcommittee: Case Review Subcommittee, Ms. Bashford as the chair, Ms. Garvin, Ms. Long, and 3 Policy Subcommittee, General General Schwenk. 4 5 Schwenk as the chair, General Anderson, Honorable Goldberg, Honorable O'Connor, and Judge Smith. 6 7 Finally, the Special Projects Subcommittee, Ms. Tokash is the chair, Judge Grimm, Mr. Kramer, Dr. 8 9 Markowitz, Dr. Spohn, and Judge Walton. The subcommittees, as noted, will provide updates on 10 their activities tomorrow. 11 12 With that, I'm going to hand it off to 13 Ms. Teri Gallagher, who is going to introduce the 14 topic and presenters for our first session. 15 MS. GALLAGHER: Good morning, Chair 16 Smith and committee members. It's my pleasure to 17 welcome representatives from each service to 18 provide the committee information on panel 19 selection processes and training. Each has 20 experience as a Staff Judge Advocate advising 21 convening authorities on panel selections. Their 22 biographies can be found at Tab 2(a) in your

public meeting read ahead materials. 1 Each 2 representative will provide a five-minute introduction to their service's processes and then 3 be available to address questions from the 4 committee. 5 Tab 2(c) of your materials contains the 6 7 text of UCMJ Article 25(e)(2) which provides the 8 criteria for selection of panel members by the 9 convening authority. Tab 2(d) contains sample documents used 10 by each service in their panel selection process. 11 12 This presentation is a continuation of the discussion from the last meeting where in 13 14 response to your questions, Major Dray from the Army JAG School and Colonel Bovarnick provided 15 16 general information on panel selection and 17 information specific to the Army panel selection 18 process. 19 Tab 2(d)(5) contains sample of the Army 20 selection documents referenced at the prior 21 meeting, including potential panel member nomination documents, convening authority 22

selection documents, convening orders, and excusal requests.

Colonel Kennebeck, Chief of the Army Criminal Law Department, is here to provide additional information on the Army processes.

Our first presenter will be Colonel 6 7 Shannon Sherwin, the Staff Judge Advocate for the 8 Air Force Air, Education, and Training Command 9 joining us virtually from Texas. She will be followed by Captain Andrew House, the Staff Judge 10 11 Advocate of the U.S. Naval Academy; Colonel 12 Christopher Tolar, Deputy Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps; Commander 13 14 Kismet Wunder, Executive Officer for the Coast Guard Legal Services Command in Norfolk, Virginia; 15 16 and finally, Colonel Kennebeck.

17 Chair Smith, at this time I would like 18 to turn the floor over to Colonel Sherwin for her 19 introductory remarks.

20 COL SHERWIN: Thank you very much. 21 Good morning, Chair Smith, committee members, 22 everyone. It's a pleasure to be here today and

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

thank you for the opportunity to speak here today
 on behalf of the Air Force to introduce panel
 selection process.

I am currently the Air Education Training Command Staff Judge Advocate sitting down here in San Antonio, Texas, so thank you for letting me appear virtually.

The member selection process in the Air 8 9 Force starts at the installation level and in accordance with Department of the Air Force's 10 Instruction 51-201 which is our administration of 11 12 military justice. Our squadron commanders nominate a portion of their eligible officers and 13 14 enlisted members up through their chain of command to their group commanders who then pass that 15 16 information over to the Installation Legal Office. 17 The Installation Legal Office places them in a 18 pool of members for a certain period of time and 19 that period of time can be anywhere from three to 20 six months. Those nominating commanders, whether 21 they're the squadron commander or the group 22 commander, do have access to the personal records

of all of the individuals that they are going to 1 2 nominate for panel selection and to be put in that They look at those eligible officers as 3 pool. those that meet the criteria of Article 25 and the 4 Rule for Court-martial 502. 5 The Legal Office will keep that pool 6 7 and when they need to do a referral for a courtmartial, whether that is at the special court-8 9 martial convening authority level or the GCM level, they will look at that pool and then they 10 will take that pool and work that authority, the 11 12 convening authority package for referral. 13 They will compile a list of officers 14 and enlisted members depending on the type of The number will change depending on the 15 court. 16 type of court, and the selection panel, whether 17 they're officers, enlisted or a combination of the 18 It will depend on the accused. two. 19 They will review that group of panel 20 members for disqualification such as the accuser, 21 a witness, members of the same unit. Maybe they're 22 unavailable for the time period that they're

looking at for trial because of a temporary duty
 or leave or some other reason that they cannot sit
 during that time frame.

They will compile that list and that 4 5 list will then be provided to the special courtmartial convening authority, along with what we 6 7 call a data sheet, a member data sheet. And that 8 data sheet will give all of the Article 25 9 criteria plus any court-martial experience that they may have, discharge, administrative discharge 10 panel membership that they may have, or anything 11 12 that may keep them from being able to sit as a 13 member.

14 That whole package will go up to the special court-martial convening authority. It will 15 16 remain there for obviously, the special court-17 martial, and then if not, then that nominating 18 package, so the SCMCA will also nominate members 19 that he or she believes fit the criteria of 20 Article 25 to provide to the GCMCA for his or her 21 consideration as well.

22

All of those documents are forwarded to

1	the GCMCA SJA Office who then will draft and sign
2	the pretrial advice and provide that potential
3	list of members to the GCMCA for consideration.
4	During that discussion, the convening authorities
5	are advised that they can choose any member under
6	their chain of command or those that are provided
7	by another chain of command, for instance, our
8	tenant unit sitting on the installation.
9	They can also ask for additional panel
10	members. If they do not believe that that is
11	representative of their installation, the court
12	member of the Air Force or the accused, they are
13	able to do write-ins if they need to or simply ask
14	for more panel members.
15	Once the GCMCA picks those members and
16	considers everything in that package to include
17	those data sheets that the members provide during
18	their nomination process, then that list comes
19	back to the GCMCA SJA and then the special order
20	is produced.
21	In the event replacement members are
22	necessary, but most GCMCA and special court-

martial convening authorities will allow the SJAs 1 2 and delegate that down to the SJA to be able to excuse up to one third of the panel members prior 3 to needing to do a full replacement package. 4 But 5 in the event that we do need to a full replacement package, those processes -- the members actually 6 7 will do the excusal and that will route to their 8 chain of command after the special court-martial 9 convening authority to then be forwarded to the GCMCA as well. 10

11 Those nominating commanders who 12 recommend that their member be excused will 13 provide two additional names of somebody who is 14 available and meet the Article 25 criteria so that 15 the GCMCA and the special court-martial convening 16 authority do have the ability to have decision 17 space and pick from those individuals.

18 In the event that that is not enough, 19 obviously, our convening authorities can ask for 20 additional members and that data pool that was 21 originally utilized can be utilized again.

Convening authorities are detailing the

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

best qualified person for courts-martial in accordance with the criteria of Article 25, UCMJ and the rules for Court-martial 502. Where the accused is enlisted, the convening authorities will detail or may detail a court-martial panel of all officers, all enlisted or a combination of the two.

The SJAs at all levels will ensure that 8 9 no involvement by trial counsel or the assistant trial counsel is used in the identification of the 10 prospective court members. SJAs will reiterate to 11 12 the convening authority and duty iterate throughout the entire process the Article 25 13 criteria and we will maintain it at the SJA levels 14 all of the documents submitted to the convening 15 16 authority in the course of detailing members, 17 those are those data sheets.

18 The convening authorities do detail a 19 sufficient number of members so that after the 20 exercise of challenges, the required amount of 21 members remain depending on the type of court. So 22 you can see packages that go up to the GCMCA with

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

over 30 names on that panel so that they have the 1 2 right amount to pick from and they'll pick anywhere from 17 to 18 to 19 to 20. 3 So that is just a quick overview of the 4 5 Air Force's process and thank you for your time and I stand by for any questions. 6 7 CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Colonel 8 Up next, we have Captain House from the Sherwin. 9 Naval Academy. Good morning. Good morning, madam chair, 10 CAPT HOUSE: distinguished members of the panel. 11 Thank you for 12 this opportunity to address the panel today. 13 The member selection process lies at 14 the heart of an effective, fair, and responsive 15 military justice system that seeks to secure good 16 order and discipline in a manner consistent with 17 our ideals, due process, and the rule of law. 18 By way of background, I had the great 19 honor to serve as a Navy Judge Advocate for 25 20 years, the majority of which either as a defense, 21 Navy Defense Counsel, at both the trial and appellate level, or as a Staff Judge Advocate, 22

managing and executing the court-martial process 1 2 from the perspective of the convening authority. I've also enjoyed the opportunities to 3 work with the Navy Victims Legal Counsel Program 4 and to engage both U.S. Marine Corps and U.S. 5 Coast authority in litigating cases at trial. 6 With regard to member selection, I 7 would suggest at the outset that our ability in 8 9 the military to rely on established articles per the UCMJ, the rules for courts-martial, and an 10 often standardized members collection and 11 12 selection process increases our ability to meet 13 our obligation to not only convene courts, but in 14 my opinion to do so with court members who take their responsibilities seriously and who stand out 15 16 for their professional record in meeting such 17 duties. 18 The process starts with Article 25 of

19 the UCMJ whose sum effect is to require convening 20 authorities to appoint members who have 21 distinguished themselves in judgment, maturity, 22 and deportment. Professional expertise, life

experience and appropriate temperament all bear
 towards selection and service on a military
 members panel.

In my own practice, Article 25 serves as the basis for engaging, informing, and assisting convening authorities in the member selection process. These are the factors directly discussed and used and set with that convening authority to seat a panel.

In my experience, these factors lead to 10 11 panels which include educated, engaged, and 12 inquisitive members who faithfully review the evidence, hold the Government to its burden, and 13 14 follow guidance from the military judge as to the conduct and content of a trial. They follow those 15 16 orders because they are used to following orders 17 and they do their duty because it has become their 18 nature to do so.

19 This nature, when coupled with the 20 typical administrative and almost antiseptic 21 members collection process in my experience 22 provides the Government a forum where they will

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

have to meet their burden of proof and defendants 1 2 an environment where their service is respected and their rights, including their right to be 3 presumed innocent, are honored. 4 While the precise members collection 5 and selection practice may differ slightly among 6 7 various services or commands, the process is governed by the same rules and typically requires 8 9 the convening authority to draw upon a large and diverse pool of potential members varying in rank, 10 age, career designator, duty assignments, 11 professional history, and personal background. 12 13 In larger fleet concentration areas 14 like during a prior assignment of mine to Navy Region Mid-Atlantic in Norfolk, this required 15 16 collection and consideration of a pool of 17 literally hundreds of officers and enlisted 18 personnel drawn from multiple subordinate commands 19 who are personally unknown to the convening 20 authority, but who are nominated by their 21 respected commanders as individuals who meet the 22 standards for selection set by the UCMJ.

1	Even where those pools are smaller, as
2	in my current assignment to the U.S. Naval
3	Academy, those same responsibilities apply to the
4	convening authority who may know potential members
5	more closely, but in my experience is firmly and
6	fully committed to providing a fair trial. Our
7	rules then offer both the Government and the
8	defense the chance to robustly challenge that
9	expectation at trial.
10	Navy Judge Advocates are repeatedly and
11	continuously trained in member selection matters,
12	while executing military justice duties, to
13	include real time updates when appellate court
14	decisions impact or alter the existing practice.
15	These counsel are then responsible for training
16	and advising their superiors when they meet with
17	or advise them in member selection decisions.
18	In the end, Article 25 and the
19	selection process I have described yield, in my
20	view, a potential panel that is both committed to
21	serving the ends of justice while remaining
22	respectful of the rights of the accused.

I	∠
1	Thank you again for this opportunity
2	and I look forward to answering your questions.
3	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Captain. Up
4	next, we have Colonel Tolar.
5	COL TOLAR: Good morning, Chair Smith
6	and committee members. Thank you for inviting the
7	Marine Corps to be here. I'm happy to present our
8	take on today's panel.
9	Like the other services, the Marine
10	Corps's panel selection process is based on and
11	complies with the criteria of Article 25 of the
12	UCMJ, particularly the requirement that the
13	convening authority personally select members to
14	serve on the panel who the convening authority
15	believes are best qualified by reason of age,
16	education, training, experience, length of
17	service, and judicial temperament.
18	There is not a standard process across
19	the Marine Corps and each convening authority
20	exercises discretion in the manner of identifying
21	and selecting those who are best qualified.
22	The SJA provides legal advice

consistent with Article 25 to both the convening 1 2 authority and to any command members nominating potential members for the convening authority to 3 ultimately select. Typically, a convening 4 5 authority will assign a committee to work to establish a standing panel of officers and 6 7 enlisted Marines to serve on any courts-martial 8 ultimately referred to it. Convening authorities 9 may also sign a convening order for a specific 10 case.

11 Convening orders are often signed weeks 12 or months before a case is referred to a standing 13 panel and before the court-martial ultimately 14 convenes. Consequently, it is common for members on the convening order to be unavailable for the 15 16 court-martial due to any number of reasons 17 including leave, temporary duty, deployment, or 18 receipt of orders to a new duty station. In such 19 cases, prior to assembly of the court-martial, the 20 convening authority may excuse those members from 21 the panel and select new members to replace them 22 using Article 25 criteria.

1	Standing panels are usually kept in
2	place for one year and sometimes through the
3	duration of the convening authority's command,
4	although there is no standard in the Marine Corps.
5	Let me run through a quick overview of
6	the typical process in the Marine Corps. So
7	typically, the convening authority through the SJA
8	will direct subordinate commanders or perhaps
9	primary staff members such as the G1, G2, G3, et
10	cetera, to nominate a certain number of officers
11	and sometimes enlisted Marines of varying grades
12	to potentially serve on the court-martial panel.
13	They are directed to use Article 25 criteria when
14	nominating potential members and potential members
15	usually complete a member questionnaire for
16	submission to and consideration by the convening
17	authority.
18	Once compiled, the SJA typically builds
19	a package for the convening authority containing
20	an alphabetical roster of all members of the

(202) 234-4433

21

22

I

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

command and then the completed questionnaires and

printouts from the Marine Corps total core system

www.nealrgross.com

1	are also provided for the nominated members.
2	The SJA will advise the convening
3	authority that he or she must personally select
4	the members the convening authority believes are
5	best qualified by Article 25 criteria, that any
6	member of the command may be chosen and the
7	convening authority is not limited only to those
8	who have submitted questionnaires.
9	SJA will also recommend the convening
10	authority to pick a certain number of members, for
11	instance, 20 to 30 to 40 for his consideration and
12	will request the convening authority initial the
13	alphabetical roster next to the names of the
14	members chosen to ultimately serve on the panel.
15	The SJA will take this information,
16	draft a convening order and return it to the
17	convening authority for signature. If a member is
18	excused prior to assembly of the court-martial and
19	new members are needed and if the convening
20	authority did not appoint alternate members, the
21	convening authority uses the same process to
22	choose new members. A modified convening order is

drafted and signed by the convening authority, removing the excused member and adding the new members.

As previously stated, convening 4 5 authorities use Article 25 criteria to select panel members. When it comes to consideration of 6 7 race and gender in the selection process, the 8 convening authority may take race and gender into 9 account as seeking good faith to ensure the court-10 martial panel is representative of the military population. However, a convening authority is 11 12 constitutionally prohibited from including or 13 excluding a potential member based on gender and/or race with the intent of achieving a 14 particular result as to findings or sentence. 15

Several means of training are available to members, service members who are involved in the court-martial process. Judge Advocates attend a basic lawyer course at Naval Justice School. They may attend basic or advanced Staff Judge Advocate courses at the Naval Justice School, at the Army JAG School, and they may even attend the

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

graduate course for one year of academic training at the Army JAG School.

Commanders may attend the Naval Justice 3 School Senior Leader Course intended for 05 and 06 4 5 commanders to teach them the nuts and bolts on how to administer their commands. And in the Marine 6 Corps, new 05 and 06 commanders are required to 7 8 attend Cornerstone, which is a two-week period of 9 instruction, again, instructing commanders on how to administer their commands. That includes a full 10 day of legal breakout sessions administered by two 11 12 senior Judge Advocates in which they use vignettes 13 to walk through various scenarios including panel selection and unlawful command influence. 14

And then finally, legal officers and 15 16 other members of the command also have training They can attend the Naval 17 available to them. 18 Justice School legal officer course, and then 19 oftentimes the local legal services support 20 section will hold a day or two of training to 21 instruct those members involved in facilitating 22 the panel selection process.

1

2

1 Thank you. 2 CDR WUNDER: Good morning, Chair Smith and members of the DAC-IPAD. Thank you for the 3 opportunity to participate in this important work. 4 5 I'm lucky to be joined by all of my DoD colleagues and their wealth of experience on all things 6 7 military justice, especially the court-martial 8 convening process. 9 As I'm sure you are aware, but it is worth highlighting, although we all operate under 10 11 the same rules, the Coast Guard is different. The 12 Coast Guard is different because we are a smaller service. We deal with less courts-martial on an 13 annual basis and because we have centralized our 14 prosecution functions under one command. 15 Right 16 now, that command is the Legal Service Command 17 which will be transitioning to the new Office of 18 the Chief Prosecutor next year. 19 The Coast Guard's convening authorities 20 are also different than their DoD counterparts. 21 Our general court-martial convening authorities, 22 in large part, are responsible for a smaller

1	number of members who are often spread over a
2	multi-state AOR. In light of these facts, the
3	Coast Guard has developed techniques to account
4	for our differences. Specifically, our commands
5	frequently make their members available to other
6	commands when they are selecting members. We
7	often use nominations from commands outside of or
8	subordinate to the convening authority, and we
9	most frequently use standing panels.
10	Our Staff Judge Advocates and convening
11	authorities work closely together on a myriad of
12	legal issues including military justice. And
13	while this is not exclusive to the Coast Guard, we
14	feel like there is a synergy between the SJA
15	offices and our client commands.
16	And so when the panel selection process
17	is required, the Coast Guard Staff Judge Advocates
18	already have an established relationship with
19	their principals. We found that this helps with
20	the relatively smooth court-martial convening and
21	panel member selection process.
22	Additionally, our legal program is

small enough that if there's a need to engage with other legal offices to facilitate a robust pool of potential panel members, the Coast Guard Staff Judge Advocate cadre all know each other and work well to accomplish this mission.

Addressing some of the proposed 6 7 questions to the panel, the Coast Guard conducts 8 training with our commanders on their roles and 9 responsibilities dealing with military justice and do address panel selections and context to that 10 training. But because we convene less courts-11 12 martial, Staff Judge Advocates generally provide desk-side training when there is a need to select 13 14 a panel with our convening authorities.

With the exception of advising that 15 race and gender and all other protected categories 16 17 cannot be used to exclude any panel members, race 18 and gender, although authorized to be considered, 19 are generally not part of the SJA's advice on 20 panel member selection. Stated otherwise, the 21 Coast Guard does not have a practice of selecting 22 panel members because of any particular race or

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

gender.

1

2	Additionally, even if that was a
3	consideration used by a convening authority,
4	because our standard practice is using standing
5	panels, it would be ineffective because the
6	convening authorities are not creating a panel
7	with any particular accused in mind.
8	We have previously provided sample
9	documents that we have used when we go through the
10	panel member selection process and I'm happy to
11	address any questions that came out of those
12	documents.
13	Thank you again for this opportunity to
14	participate in today's discussion.
14 15	participate in today's discussion. CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much.
15	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much.
15 16	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much. Last, but not least, we have Colonel Kennebeck.
15 16 17	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much. Last, but not least, we have Colonel Kennebeck. COL KENNEBECK: Thank you, Madam Chair,
15 16 17 18	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much. Last, but not least, we have Colonel Kennebeck. COL KENNEBECK: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the committee. It's my pleasure to
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much. Last, but not least, we have Colonel Kennebeck. COL KENNEBECK: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the committee. It's my pleasure to speak to the DAC-IPAD today.
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you very much. Last, but not least, we have Colonel Kennebeck. COL KENNEBECK: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the committee. It's my pleasure to speak to the DAC-IPAD today. I'm Colonel Chris Kennebeck and the

1 in September and I know that Colonel Bovarnick 2 already talked about a lot of details related to Army panel selection. I think we do business 3 similarly to my compatriots up here, except maybe 4 5 In my last jurisdiction, it was a Corps volume. command. We have about 20,000 service members 6 7 under that command and my boss, I was the Staff Judge Advocate, chose 150 panel members to serve 8 9 on 3 separate standing panels to try the number of cases that we pushed through. 10 11 So just to make it practical, he'd have 12 a large, 3-ring binder with an alpha roster of every name of every service member, 20,000. He'd 13 14 have a smaller, 3-ring binder with the nominations from the subordinate commanders and that generally 15 16 would include all your 06s, all your lieutenant 17 colonels, mostly your majors, a lot of your 18 captains, and all the way down, and then enlisted, 19 E9s, E8s, all the way down to typically E5s.

20 Occasionally, you could have an E4 serve on a 21 panel. I've seen college educated, 29-year-old 22 specialists who probably would satisfy the

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

requirements of Article 25.

2	So in that broad swath, then my boss
3	would pick the panel members and again, not for
4	any particular panel, but for a standing panel we
5	typically last a year, so we typically move in the
6	summer, pick a new panel in August, stands for a
7	year, you pick a new one the following year.
8	I will also include that Article 25
9	does have 6 criteria and so the statute is pretty
10	clear, but precedence since 1964 has allowed us to
11	be inclusive. Consideration of race and gender to
12	ensure fair representation has been upheld. That
13	is before the CAAF right now for decision and it
14	will be interesting to see what that decision is,
15	but I just think it's I want to say out loud
16	Article 25 inclusion is permissible. Exclusion is
17	not permissible. Panel stacking, picking a panel
18	for a specific outcome is not permitted by Article
19	25 and precedent.
20	And with that, I think I'll pass it
21	back to the committee to answer some questions.
22	Thank you, you.

	33
1	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Madam Chair, may I make
3	an addendum?
4	CHAIR SMITH: Yes.
5	MR. SULLIVAN: So, Colonel Kennebeck
6	just mentioned the order from the Court of Appeals
7	for the Armed Forces in the Jeeter case.
8	I think it may be helpful to the, to
9	the committee members, to hear a little bit more
10	about that.
11	So on October 24th of 2022, after
12	hearing oral argument in the Jeeter case, the
13	Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces specified
14	two additional issues it wanted to consider.
15	And so it mentioned the Crawford case,
16	which Colonel Kennebeck just mentioned, which was
17	the 1964 case that said hey, when you're picking
18	panels, it's permissible for a convening authority
19	to consider race to include you know, the race of
20	a, of a member who is the same race, race of the
21	accused. That's what the Crawford case was about.
22	And since then, that jurisprudence has

been broadened somewhat to suggest that trying to pick members that represent a fair cross-section of the military community, that that may be a permissible criterion.

5 So the Court specified two issues in 6 the Jeeter case. First, it said in United States 7 v. Crawford, this Court held that in the course of 8 panel selection, a race conscious process is 9 permissible for the purpose of inclusion.

How does the Crawford decision affect the analysis of this case under Avery v. Georgia, a 1953 case in which Georgia used a race conscious jury venire process that excluded all African Americans from the panel.

And then the second issue in, that was specified by Jeeter was, in light of appellant's statement at oral argument that race is an improper consideration in detailing panel members, should this Court overrule United States v. Crawford.

21 So I thought it was important for the 22 committee members to know that those two issues

1

2

3

are now under active consideration. 1 2 A decision is expected in the Jeeter case by the close of this Court's term, which will 3 4 be at the end of September of 2023. CHAIR SMITH: All right, so at this 5 point, we would like to open this up for questions 6 7 from committee members of the panel. So I'll 8 start. I have a question. 9 When the subordinate commanders are 10 recommending panel members, when I guess they provide a list to the convening authority. 11 12 Is the subordinate commander from, who 13 oversees whoever the accused is, are they excluded 14 from providing a list? I'm wondering how, how you ensure that 15 16 the accused doesn't end up having people who are 17 familiar with the case, or familiar with the 18 accused, how you make sure that those people are 19 not included. 20 Is that segment, I'm trying to think of 21 what you call it in the military, is that 22 particular group excluded all together, or is that

something through a voir dire process you would learn?

3	CAPT HOUSE: Good morning, ma'am.
4	From the, excuse me, from the Navy's
5	perspective they're not excluded. We would use a
6	voir dire process to determine whether or not that
7	the potential member has some type of potential
8	bias, or unfair advantage, or awareness of the
9	case, or awareness of a connection to the
10	defendant.
11	In a small, the current command that
12	I'm working at is pretty small. It's only about
13	8,000 total Navy/Marine Corps personnel at the
14	Naval Academy.
15	So they're going to, they may know this
16	person. But then we would use the, and but that's
17	not a necessarily an exclusion to keep them off a
18	panel.
19	It's the Article 25 factors would still
20	be the factors that would govern who the vice
21	admiral would place on the, on the panel, on the
22	potential panel.

1

1	And then we would rely on defense and
2	the prosecution through a voir dire process, to
3	weed out anyone he might have an inappropriate
4	connection to the case.
5	Over.
6	COL KENNEBECK: I would just add that
7	in addition to that, even before that, Article 24
8	prohibits anyone who's an accuser from serving as
9	a panel member. Or anyone who under ranks the
10	accused to serve as a panel member.
11	So by Rule, they would be excluded.
12	And typically, the nominees are just picked from
13	the pool. And, then we pare down what the panel
14	looks like based on who the accused is.
15	Over.
16	COL SHERWIN: This is Colonel Sherwin.
17	From the Air Force side is, is that pool what may,
18	may contain them but the panel member, but the
19	pool that's put towards the GCMCA will not contain
20	the, the commander of the unit or the members of
21	the unit for that individual accused.
22	CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Goldberg, did you

1

have a question?

2 COL BOVARNICK: Yes, I also wanted to point out to the members, within your documents I 3 know that they're voluminous for the court-martial 4 5 selection tab. I guess if you go to tab 3 and just go 6 backwards a little bit, page 3 of an Army document 7 8 lists automatic excusal criteria so that the 9 convening authority. Like so for example, this document 10 11 says, members and witness in a case. Members 12 acting as an accuser or forward investigator that made a recommendation are not recommended. 13 14 So there are, there are some methods for example, even though the people will be, the 15 16 members, nominees will be in the pool, the staff 17 judge advocate could use the commander's automatic 18 excusal authority. 19 So for example, Private Jones is in If there's another 20 Company A of 1st Battalion. 21 member that's listed Company A of 1st Battalion, 22 they can be automatically excused.

1	So they don't have to go through this
2	process of showing up in court, and then the
3	person's like hey, that's my squad leader up
4	there.
5	So there are methods to get after what
6	you're saying like someone actually knows the
7	person, they're in the same like company size
8	unit.
9	This is just an example in some of the
10	documents where it's automatically excused. You
11	don't even have to go through that voir dire
12	process of even sending the person into court.
13	Just wanted to point that out. So
14	there are, there are some methods to get after
15	that so you don't waste everybody's time.
16	So back over to the folks for
17	questions.
18	MEMBER GOLDBERG: Great, thank you so
19	much, and thanks to our panelists for your
20	comments.
21	I have two questions, I think one is
22	empirical, the other is, may vary more. And that

is in the nomination process, which seems to be 1 2 where the action is in terms of winnowing down the potential pool, I couldn't tell. 3 It sounds like there's guite a bit of 4 variation in what percentage of the total number 5 of available individuals is nominated. 6 7 And that that may vary across, pretty 8 significantly across services and across 9 installations. Is that right? Am I understanding 10 that correctly? 11 Because something you said, Colonel 12 Kennebeck, made me think that actually lots of 13 people are moving into the nomination process. 14 And the action happens at the, so at that panel selection for an individual court-martial. 15 16 So I just want to understand if that's 17 similar across the services. In other words, are 18 most people nominated, and nomination is a sort of 19 weeding out the real, that people who may be more problematic? 20 21 Or are relatively few people nominated 22 and then the, you know, you sort of go to

availability of the individuals when you're 1 2 putting together the group for the, for the courtmartial. 3 4 COL TOLAR: Good morning, thanks for the question. 5 In the Marine Corps, at least, when we 6 ask subordinate commanders, or some of the G shops 7 to nominate members, we'll typically ask for 10-15 8 9 nominees. And they'll use the Article 25 criteria. 10 So to your point of weeding out those 11 12 who may, maybe not as qualified. That's in fact, 13 that's what they do. They pick the best qualified in accordance with the Article 25 criteria. 14 We consolidate those questionnaires and 15 16 those nominations from across all the commands, 17 and present that to the commander. 18 That's the primary staff that he's 19 looking at, but he also has the alphabetical 20 roster of every single member of that command from which to choose from. 21 22 And he can go through that roster, and

1 I've seen it many times, where they won't, they'll 2 pick folks who have not submitted questionnaires, have not been nominated by subordinate commanders. 3 4 So that, the convening authority will 5 make an independent determination on who he believes, he or she believes is best qualified 6 under Article 25. 7 8 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Then can I just ask 9 you a quick follow up? If someone is going off roster to choose, is that they're choosing people 10 11 who, who they have interacted with then? 12 Or how would they know if they don't 13 have the forms on those people? 14 COL TOLAR: That --15 (Simultaneous speaking.) 16 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Would it be sort of 17 random, or, or is it based on familiarity? 18 COL TOLAR: I think it would be based 19 on familiarity. It would not be random in my 20 experience. 21 The convening authority would have 22 some, would need some reason to believe that

person that he's selecting is the best qualified
 under Article 25.

The Coast Guard operates 3 CDR WUNDER: 4 almost exactly the same as our Marine colleagues. 5 That our subordinate commands or commands in the area where the court-martial is going to be 6 7 convened, would use the Article 25 criteria to 8 look at their members and select the best 9 qualified. And then submit those to the convening 10 11 authority for their consideration, along with the 12 alpha roster, the list of all of the members under 13 that convening authority's command. 14 And sometimes they pick from the list of nominated members, or sometimes they pick from 15 16 members of their own crews. 17 CAPT HOUSE: Frankly, ma'am, there are 18 some Navy fleet concentration areas where there 19 would be potentially thousands and thousands of 20 members. San Diego, Norfolk, Jacksonville. 21 So, we use a similar process. The subordinate commanders will use the Article 25 22

www.nealrgross.com

1 factors to provide us a list of 50-100 members 2 from their commands. Those lists will be pulled together 3 4 into a larger pool for the general court-martial 5 convening authority, including all those 6 questionnaires. 7 Then the legal staff does a, spends a 8 lot of time checking in to make sure that these 9 people are still where we think they are, that they haven't transferred. That they haven't been 10 11 assigned to some TAD or deployed. 12 Then we come up with a list for the 13 general, for the admiral to go through and 14 appoint. We generally appoint double of what we 15 would expect to be sitting and actually at a 16 court-martial. 17 At least double of those people will 18 go, and then go through the voir dire process to 19 see who will be ultimately determined to sit on 20 the panel. Over. 21 COL KENNEBECK: And I'll finish up. My 22 description earlier was an anecdote from when I

	4
1	was a Corps SJA. We have three corps in the Army
2	and they're large.
3	But I had been a Division SJA before,
4	and in that panel we wouldn't ask for all
5	colonels, all lieutenant colonels.
6	So depending on the size of the unit,
7	you might ask for fewer people. But I have two
8	comments about that.
9	One, I think typically what that helps
10	is it helps identify people who are about to
11	retire, so maybe they don't get nominated.
12	People who are going to PCS in the
13	middle of the year. You know, people who have
14	other things that sometimes going on in their
15	careers, they might get nominated for those
16	reasons. And I think that helps efficiency.
17	And then number two, I definitely have
18	had GCMCA select from the alpha roster book. And
19	a lot of times another anecdote is you know, the
20	CG will ask a brigade commander I want three
21	lieutenant colonels out of your formation.
22	And the brigade commander gives three

	4
1	lieutenant colonels, and the CG's like I want to
2	see more lieutenant colonels out of that unit.
3	So he flips open the alpha roster, he's
4	says no, I want this lieutenant colonel out of
5	that brigade.
6	And he might not know him well but, or
7	her well, but say I think that is the person that
8	I want to choose.
9	So I think for all those reasons, that
10	the nomination process really is meant to help
11	efficiency, and not sort of guard off people that
12	might, you might want to see on the panel.
13	MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you so much.
14	And if I could just ask my follow up question.
15	It's helpful to understand the, the process.
16	And what I'm thinking about sitting
17	here is that you know, most of the factors in
18	Article 25 are kind of empirical, right?
19	How long have you been with the
20	service? What's your education level and all of
21	this. And then there's the judicial temperament
22	factor that, that lets a lot more in potentially.

1	And so both that factor and then this
2	sort of going on and off list factors, are the
3	places where either it seems the, the selecting,
4	the person who's doing the selection can err on
5	the side of inclusion, can err on the side of, or
6	can prioritize other factors when they're putting
7	together the panel.
8	And so that's the part that at least as
9	I sit here, I would like to understand more kind
10	of what constrains those choices for the, you
11	know.
12	We all might have roughly the same idea
13	of judicial temperament, but we might see it more
14	in the people we know. Or we might see it more
15	in, in group A or group B.
16	And one thinking about your perspective
17	on what constrains that and what constrains the
18	kind of I'm going with these people because
19	they're kind of familiar to me and I, I know them
20	and I like them, which might lead the pool to kind
21	of stay in a particular vein, rather than be a
22	more cross-sectional.

1	CAPT HOUSE: Well in my experience, if
2	it's a smaller command where I'm working now, it's
3	the convening authority vice admiral generally has
4	a good sense of the character, of the nature, the
5	temperament, the judgment of most of the people
6	who would be potential panel members.
7	In a larger command where there are
8	thousands and thousands, in my experience the
9	admiral relies on the judgment of his subordinate
10	commanders who know these people, who have spent
11	time with them, who are aware of their character,
12	and their performance.
13	Who are aware of their nature, and
14	their openness to serving this important duty in
15	the way that it's supposed to be served.
16	I think it, and our questionnaires
17	help. We have a standardized questionnaire we use
18	in the Navy, developed by our judiciary, and there
19	are a number of questions on there.
20	All, of course, all the biological
21	information and you know, biographics, and where
22	you're from, and how many times you might have

served on, done this or done that.

1

2 But there's questions also in there about general opinions on certain things. 3 And 4 that does provide some insight to the convening authority as to the overall temperament of the 5 6 person. Over. CHAIR SMITH: One of the complaints 7 8 that we've heard during the comment section, we've 9 had a couple different officers come in who were convicted of different offenses. 10 11 And they've been mostly minority 12 officers who have come in and spoken to the 13 committee. And I believe every one of them has 14 indicated that their panel was all White. So what do you do specifically, when 15 16 you are looking at the list, how do you counter 17 that to make sure that, or, or do you counter that 18 recognizing of course this Jeeter case is out 19 there. 20 But with this idea of having a jury of 21 your peers, what do you do to try and make it a 22 diverse panel?

1	COL KENNEBECK: I'll jump on that one
2	first. I have worked for different commanders a
3	number of times, and I've had one commander who
4	said, I don't want to see race or gender.
5	You know, just give me the names, the
6	unit, their duties, and I want the nomination list
7	and the alpha roster and then I'm going to pick.
8	In an effort I guess, to be purposefully blind to
9	race or gender.
10	And then I've had other commanders say
11	no, I want to see that. Because I want to be able
12	to purposefully pick a spectrum that represents,
13	that's more representative.
14	I think I would probably personally,
15	this is and I'm not speaking for Army or for
16	policy, but personally prefer the latter.
17	I think it helps to be purposefully
18	inclusive. And I think Article 25 allows you to
19	do that. But I mean those diversity is not
20	purposefully included in Article 25. So we must
21	stick with the criteria that exist today. I'll
22	leave it there.

1	MEMBER GRIMM: This is Paul Grimm, if
2	I can get a question to follow up on the Chair's
3	question.
4	CHAIR SMITH: Yes.
5	MEMBER GRIMM: I have a question for
6	any of the panelists that fall on the same line
7	about the racial composition of panels. And the
8	perception of fairness in the composition of a
9	panel.
10	It sounds like there are times when in
11	a large command you're picking a large number of
12	potential individuals, even when there may not be
13	a specific court-martial that has been convened.
14	So you're going to have 50, 100, 200,
15	however many people you have available. And if a
16	court-martial comes down the line, they're the
17	ones you're going to draw from after you then go
18	back and eliminate the people about to retire, or
19	who have just been you know, sent out to a
20	deployment or something of that nature.
21	Now you've got a court-martial comes
22	in. I want to get a better feeling if you would

be good enough to help me with that, as to the, that court-martial is going to start. The trial is going to begin.

Do you have a certain number of individuals who are brought in as a jury panel, from which the parties have the opportunity to do what we call voir dire in the, in the civilian system, question them, find out information about them, and exercise challenges either for cause, or for peremptory challenges.

11 These are hallmarks of the jury 12 selection process in the civilian community, which 13 give it its legitimacy, and the ability to raise 14 questions about the composition of a panel, whether it's race-based, or any other issue that 15 16 might create a legitimate concern about the 17 fairness, and the impartiality of that panel. 18 So can you help me out with that? 19 Thank you for the question. COL TOLAR: 20 So I think we'd all agree that we have very 21 similar system in the military, a very similar 22 process in the military justice system.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

So once the convening authority selects 1 2 his panel and signs the convening order, those members once the court-martial is assembled, they, 3 they complete questionnaires, detailed 4 questionnaires as has been previously mentioned. 5 Those are provided to defense counsel, 6 to trial counsel, and there is a voir dire process 7 exactly as you described where, where defense and 8 9 prosecutors have the, the opportunity to challenge 10 for cause, and also to, to use peremptory 11 challenges. 12 So I believe that that is covered. 13 CDR WUNDER: If I could just add on to 14 that as well, that normally our convening authorities select two or three times more members 15 16 than are required for the courts-martial itself. 17 And so there is essentially a pool of 18 panel members, potential panel members that do go 19 through the voir dire process. 20 And the counsel have an opportunity to 21 examine those witnesses. I'm sorry, panel members, for bias, or for fitness to serve on that 22

particular courts-martial. And, ultimately, the 1 2 panel that is selected is from that pool. Over. Just to follow up. 3 MEMBER GRIMM: 4 Could you give me some thought, some information 5 about the number of peremptory challenges? So for example, there's no limit in the 6 7 federal system to the number of challenges for 8 But once you have the actual peremptories, cause. 9 the defendant in a felony case in federal court, 10 has up to 10 peremptory challenges, the government 11 up to six. 12 I'd just like to get a sense of how 13 many of those challenges are available. Does it 14 change by court-martial type? And if you have any thoughts on that, 15 16 I'd appreciate it. Thank you. 17 COL KENNEBECK: Correct me if I'm wrong 18 team, but I think we each get one peremptory. 19 Government and defense, and then there's no limit 20 to challenge for cause. 21 And in the Army, we tend to start with 22 16 to 20 for an ending panel of eight. And that

1	way you can get through the voir dire process.
2	And if you somehow get so low that you
3	get below eight, then you, you reach down and you
4	grab substitutes and you bring them in and voir
5	dire them, until you have the sufficient panel.
6	But we generally tend to start with 16
7	to 20.
8	MEMBER GRIMM: Thank you.
9	MR. SULLIVAN: And Colonel Kennebeck,
10	you might want to mention how the, the peremptory
11	renews with each draw.
12	COL KENNEBECK: Well I'd hate to get
13	the Rule wrong. I didn't quite study up on this.
14	But Mr. Sullivan, I think you might remember the
15	Rule and I'll.
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, so chime in behind
17	you.
18	The Rule provides that every, every
19	member of the panel will potentially be subject to
20	a peremptory challenge.
21	So in this situation that Captain
22	Kennebeck posits, which it isn't infrequent where

1 you have the panel drop below quorum, and it can 2 drop below quorum one of two ways. If that happens and you have substitute 3 members come in, those members will also be 4 5 subject to peremptory challenges. So while each party is statutorily 6 entitled to one peremptory challenge, in practice 7 8 there may be multiple rounds of that one 9 peremptory challenge. And then one other factor, do you want 10 to talk about the enlisted representation? 11 12 COL KENNEBECK: Yes, so for an enlisted 13 panel, you must maintain one-third, a ratio of 14 one-third to the member. 15 So if you somehow peremptorily 16 challenge your last enlisted and now you only have 17 two left out of eight, you have just busted your 18 panel and you need to bring in some more enlisted 19 members. And then the peremptory challenge comes 20 back to life again in the next round. 21 COL BOVARNICK: If I could I want to --22 (Simultaneous speaking.)

I	с
1	COL KENNEBECK: For the new members.
2	COL BOVARNICK: for Judge Grimm and
3	for the members. I know we flooded you with a lot
4	of documents, I think like 1,000 pages.
5	But perhaps to show, to kind of get
6	after Judge Grimm's question. At the beginning
7	now, so tab 2d, I think it is.
8	And if you just flip to the first
9	couple pages to the Air Force materials, I'll even
10	use the Air Force as an example here.
11	So the process described by each of our
12	experts on the panel, this nomination process, so
13	thousands of folks that the subordinate commands
14	actually nominate people and those names.
15	And as was mentioned, we have like
16	these big huge binders over here on this table.
17	There's a separate document we call the alpha
18	roster. That's everybody in the command, even if
19	they weren't nominated.
20	So then the convening authority picks
21	this jury pool. I'll just use that word, and
22	there are a whole bunch of people on it.

1	Then for a particular case so to get up
2	to Judge Grimm's question, one of the documents I
3	mean I guess it's I don't know the pages aren't
4	numbered, is like literally the third page under
5	the Air Force stuff.
6	It says, special order for a case. The
7	top department of the Air Force headquarters,
8	base, state, zip code.
9	That's the actual jury pool to call it
10	that, for an actual case. The members that are
11	going to show up in the court for a case.
12	Actually the next page shows you,
13	sorry, general court-martial of U.S. v. Member.
14	These individuals are going to show up in the
15	actual court-martial, be sitting there, voir dire,
16	back judge allows some questions we talked about
17	last time.
18	Then each of the counsel will get to do
19	voir dire, and, and group voir dire and then
20	individual voir dire, to try to build if they want
21	to do a challenge for cause. And then as was
22	noted, the one peremptory.

1	But that's how you get after the actual
2	in the courtroom specific case. I just hope that
3	was clear because I feel like the question was,
4	you know, we have all these documents here that
5	the group's provided.
6	But that's what happens is there's
7	actual jury for a specific case that comes in and
8	sits down in the courtroom, that will go through
9	that process.
10	And there can be if members, so many
11	members are charged for cause. I'll give you an
12	example we call busting quorum.
13	If you don't have alternate members
14	standing by, like literally in the courtroom
15	somewhere, the panel's there and you come up to
16	you have to have eight for a, the GCM.
17	And now the defense counsel, do you
18	have a peremptory. Let's say you have like nine
19	members left and the defense counsel says yes,
20	peremptory on this person.
21	Then you turn to the trial counsel.
22	Trial counsel peremptory. If the trial counsel

says yes and it goes below eight, you've busted 1 2 Then you've got to bring in another quorum. 3 member, or more members. 4 Anyway, that gets at some specifics but 5 these documents all lay that stuff out how it works. 6 7 Sorry, back over to the panel. CHAIR SMITH: All right, Judge Walton 8 9 has a question, and then Dr. Spohn has a question. MEMBER ANDERSON: This is General 10 11 Anderson, and I have one as well. 12 CHAIR SMITH: Let's start with Judge 13 Walton. 14 MEMBER WALTON: Good morning, I'm not unsympathetic to the challenge that many times you 15 16 may face on certain basis of providing ethnic and 17 racial diversity, because I don't have that 18 problem in Washington, D.C. where I preside. 19 But I also have been presiding for 20 seven years over criminal cases in Pittsburgh 21 where I grew up, and in seven years and all the trials I've had, I've had two Black jurors. 22

	e
1	And I know from that there's a
2	perception among the population that this, the
3	cards are stacked against someone who's going to
4	trial if you're African American in the Pittsburgh
5	area, as compared to if you're White.
6	And I know from things I've had said
7	to me by members of the military, especially
8	officers who feel the same way, that on certain
9	bases, there aren't many African Americans there.
10	And as a result of that, they don't
11	feel that they are getting a panel that's
12	representative of who they are.
13	What if, I mean do you perceive that as
14	a problem that you face? And if you do, what can
15	be done to address it?
16	I know that you indicated in the Coast
17	Guard you can go to other I guess, locations and
18	bring panel members from those locations. But I
19	assume that's not the case in the other services.
20	If it is a problem, and I have to
21	believe it is, what can be done to try and address
22	that?

I

Because sometimes perception is more 1 2 significant than reality. And if people feel that they're not getting a fair shake because of who 3 they are and what they look like, I think it 4 undermines the respect that people are going to 5 have for the process. 6 7 COL SHERWIN: Judge Walton, this is 8 Colonel Sherwin. In the Air Force, our GCMCAs 9 more times than not, actually have a wide breadth of individuals they can pull from. 10 11 They don't have to stay at the 12 installation level that it's at. So for instance, 13 in 20th Air Force where I was most recently, I had four different installations that I could actually 14 pull for to get members for my GCMCA. 15 So if he didn't like the 16 17 representation, so if the case was at F.E. Warren 18 Air Force Base in Wyoming, he could go outside to 19 any of the four installations that he actually 20 overseed and pull members from that and bring them 21 in TDY to, for the panel. 22 So like the Coast Guard, we have the

ability to go outside as long as they're in our 1 2 command, or another commander has given us permission to use their member. 3 4 CDR WUNDER: I was just going to add, 5 sir, that in my experience, our convening authorities are very conscientious and think a lot 6 7 about this process when they go through it. 8 Because they realize the importance and 9 the impact that selecting these members has on some future accused. 10 11 And while they may not be doing it for 12 any particular race, gender, or any other 13 protected category, they are doing it with thought 14 and with conscious about what they are creating. And so they may, the makeup of the 15 16 panel may not be with any particular race, color, 17 or anything else, but they are picking people who 18 they believe will do the best job for this 19 mission. 20 And they do take that very seriously. 21 Over. I second that comment. 22 COL KENNEBECK:

1	I've seen, I mean it takes hours to select panel
2	when I do that with my boss.
3	Looking at ORBs, looking at who the
4	selectees are. And to select in like my last job
5	150, obviously that takes some time.
6	I think that if this panel is
7	concerned, I think perception matters. I would
8	never want a, an accused of color to look at a
9	panel who, that's all White and, and have to
10	accept that this is what happened to me.
11	I don't believe it's a problem, but I'm
12	a White male. So perhaps my perception of it
13	isn't accurate. But I think if there is a
14	perception issue, then it should be expressly
15	addressed in 25 to permissively allow for
16	inclusion.
17	MEMBER SPOHN: Thank you very much for
18	your presentations.
19	Regarding the use of peremptory
20	challenges, in the civilian court system their use
21	is guided by Batson v. Kentucky, which prohibits
22	the use of peremptory challenges to exclude people

based on race or ethnicity.

1

2 So that if one side makes a prima facie case that there is in fact, racial discrimination, 3 4 then it's up to the other side to come up with a racially neutral explanation for the use of the 5 challenge. 6 I know Batson doesn't apply to the 7 military court system. 8 9 It does? Oh, okay, someone told me 10 that it doesn't, but. COL KENNEBECK: Oh, it does and there's 11 a decent amount of jurisprudence related to that. 12 13 There's definitely precedent on point. Panels are 14 challenged, they're challenged by the selection methodology so there's a decent amount of case law 15 16 on that, as well. 17 MEMBER SPOHN: So the same principles apply in the, in the military. 18 19 CDR WUNDER: And I would just add to 20 that, but there's also the unlawful, or if there's 21 command influence that also may come up that would be a, I guess a parallel track to a Batson issue, 22

as well.

1

2	CHAIR SMITH: All right, Ms. Garvin has
3	a question and then we'll hear from General
4	Anderson, and I have another question, and so does
5	Ms. Goldberg.
6	MEMBER CASSARA: Excuse me, this is Mr.
7	Cassara
8	(Simultaneous speaking.)
9	MEMBER GARVIN: thank you for all the
10	information so far. This is Ms. Garvin.
11	This may be outside the scope of what
12	you can share and that's fine, or what you know,
13	but I am curious and it builds off a question from
14	my colleague about different understandings of
15	judicial temperament, that criteria in Article 25.
16	And I am curious because what seems to
17	happen right, is you have a pool of folks and then
18	nominations happen, although of course you can go
19	to the alpha list. But as we're contemplating
20	notions of what is and is not judicial
21	temperament, our own cognitive biases are going to
22	come into play there of what is and isn't.

	ll little
1	And I think there's plenty of research
2	that shows that folks who have similarly situated
3	backgrounds to myself, likely consider have
4	judicial temperaments I agree with. Right,
5	there's research around this.
6	So I'm curious what is the training
7	around cognitive biases, particularly racism,
8	gender, class, all of that, around what is and
9	isn't going to come into your assessment of
10	judicial temperament.
11	So what is the training all along, to
12	try to understand one's cognitive biases, as you
13	are assessing someone for their judicial
14	temperament?
15	CAPT HOUSE: Well I would say that
16	training begins at boot camp, or at OCS, or at the
17	Naval Academy.
18	I mean we are picking officers and
19	enlisted personnel who have spent often years in
20	the military, learning about fair treatment. And
21	learning about the equality that's important for
22	all Americans.

This is a consistent, and I think 1 2 serious obligation that the Navy and the military services feel. 3 I mean you would be hard pressed to 4 5 find anyone who's going to sit on a panel, who has not spent a considerable amount of time talking 6 7 about these issues, being trained about EO, being 8 trained about the necessity to approach every 9 defendant from the perspective of a presumption of 10 innocence. 11 And a military judge is certainly going 12 to underscore that in his or her conversations 13 with the panel members. 14 But we are blessed in some way in that we have a certain cadre of people in the military 15 16 who are, who are all being trained, and all being vectored towards a certain direction when it comes 17 18 to diversity and equal treatment, and you know, 19 taking care of our fellow sailors, Marines, Coast 20 Guardsmen, airmen, and soldiers. I mean there is a commitment to each 21 22 other because we are a closed, tight-knit

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	community. And, I think there is a commitment to
2	look out for each other. Over.
3	COL KENNEBECK: On top of that, I'll
4	say that in the Army, we have really started to
5	focus on implicit bias as you know, an intentional
6	portion of our training at the judge advocate
7	school. And, you know, we have these
8	conversations with our commanders, as well. It's
9	good to be self-aware when you're making decisions
10	such as selecting a panel.
11	But in practice, I have to say that I'm
12	not sure that judicial temperament is the most
13	dispositive factor used by convening authorities.
14	I mean, oftentimes it is the age,
15	experience. And judicial temperament is sort of
16	fed by the notion that that person that I'm
17	picking was a sergeant major, or was a commander,
18	or has had to act in that, you know, impartial
19	role before. Or hasn't. And that it feeds the
20	narrative. It feeds sort of the decision process
21	in that way.
22	CHAIR SMITH: General Anderson?

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

I

MEMBER CASSARA: This is Mr. Cassara. 1 2 Could I speak after General Anderson very briefly? CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Long is next, and 3 4 then. MEMBER CASSARA: Oh, well, I mean, 5 6 whenever, yes. 7 CHAIR SMITH: Okay. MEMBER CASSARA: After the last person. 8 9 CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. MEMBER CASSARA: Whoever that might be. 10 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIR SMITH: Sorry about that. 13 MEMBER ANDERSON: Good morning 14 everyone, and thank you to the panel members I mean for your, your presentations. 15 16 I just have a question about Article 25 17 as it applies to members of the guard or reserve 18 from any service, who are on active duty. 19 I don't know how the policies may, may 20 affect this but I was wondering if there is on any 21 of the, anybody is nominated or is it on any of 22 the panels, from those parts of the services.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Because in many cases, the Army I know 1 2 we have reserve units that are on many of the installations that do have active duty members as 3 4 part of those, those organizations. And whether 5 or not they're considered for service. I have a personal experience where I 6 7 was on active duty at the Pentagon. There was a 8 general officer who was on trial for sexual 9 assault of a family member. And I just wondered, could I have been 10 nominated, or is there a policy that would have 11 12 prevented me from being nominated to serve? Thanks. 13 14 COL SHERWIN: Ma'am, this is Colonel Sherwin. The Air Force in our AFI 51-201, it does allow us to 15 16 detail reservists. 17 And it actually tells us that for those 18 court-martials involving reservists, the convening 19 authority should look and consider detailing 20 reserve members who are on active duty. 21 So and if they meet the Article 25, 22 then they should be considered.

I	/
1	MEMBER ANDERSON: But I'm also talking
2	about, I should have clarified that. That it for
3	active or reserve trials, not just restricted to
4	reserve members.
5	Thanks.
6	CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Long?
7	MEMBER LONG: Sorry, I didn't know if
8	they were going to respond more to that.
9	CHAIR SMITH: Did you want to respond?
10	CDR WUNDER: Yes, ma'am.
11	I would just say anecdotally, recently
12	I was a part of a court-martial convening process
13	where reservists were put on the panel for an
14	active duty member.
15	And, so we use Article 25 criteria
16	regardless of their status. Reserve, active duty,
17	or other, or national guard. The Coast Guard
18	doesn't have national guard, obviously.
19	But we would use that same criteria in
20	order to select the panel members.
21	CHAIR SMITH: Thanks.
22	MEMBER LONG: Thank you.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

7
I have a question for Commander Wunder,
and I'm sorry if I missed it on other
questionnaires.
But on the Coast Guard questionnaire I
was interested in your perspective of the
responses you typically get to question 39, which
is the, do you think a defendant would receive a
fair trial basically, it's a little self-
reflective, with someone in your, if you were in
the defendant's seat and you're the panelist.
Would the defendant have a fair trial.
And I was curious what kind of
responses you get to that. Do you feel that it's
a helpful question, or do people typically just
answer as they think the convener would want to
hear?
CDR WUNDER: Yes, ma'am, thank you for
the question. I have seen court-martial panel
member questionnaires come back and this question
answered in a way that a member says, because and
typically because of something in my past, whether
that be dealing with another criminal matter

1 themselves or a close family member, they don't 2 think that they could sit in judgment of somebody 3 else.

Some people have identified religious reasons, or just who they are, their, their own personal temperaments to say that I cannot sit in judgment of another person. And I would say that that's where those types of responses would show up. Over.

CHAIR SMITH: Mr. Cassara?

MEMBER CASSARA: Hi, this isn't really a question, it is an observation from somebody with over 30 years of military justice experience, and trying cases for about 25 years.

15 The very first court-martial I ever 16 tried in 1990, it was an African American accused, 17 and there was not a single African American on the 18 panel.

19 The last case I tried in 2018, '16, the 20 first one was an Army case, this last one was an 21 Air Force case. I had an African American 22 accused, and there was not a single African

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

American on the panel.

	-
2	I would venture to say without a
3	scientific analysis or any data, that in my
4	empirical experience the overwhelming majority of
5	my cases fell into that category.
6	A lower enlisted, and in the lower
7	enlisted ranks there are a much large amount of
8	African Americans than there are in the officer
9	ranks.
10	So I would have lower enlisted African
11	American accused, and if they chose as is usually
12	the case, more so in the Air Force than in the
13	Army, if they chose an officer panel, an almost
14	exclusively White panel.
15	And if it was in the Army, unless we
16	chose an enlisted panel, it was an almost
17	exclusively White panel.
18	So I just want to note for my other
19	panel members, that I really disagree with those
20	who are saying that this is not a problem.
21	Whether it is a systemic exclusion, or
22	whether it's just the raw numbers, the final panel

selection in my experience, leads to panel, an 1 2 accused looking out at a panel, and I remember one very clearly telling me, you know, 15-20 years ago 3 4 wow, there's nobody here that looks like me. And that is more the norm than the 5 I'm not, you know, so exception in my experience. 6 7 if anybody wants to comment on that, feel free. 8 But I just wanted to let my other panel 9 members know that at least from one lawyer's 10 empirical experience, that's what happens out in the field. 11 12 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: I will actually just 13 second Mr. Cassara's observation that in, in 14 officer panels, that is also my experience. That they are overwhelmingly White panels. 15 So I think the committee 16 CHAIR SMITH: 17 would be interested in getting some numbers on 18 that, if I could just jump out and speak for 19 everyone. 20 So perhaps we could get some follow up 21 on stats with respect to, for each of the services 22 with respect to panels for officers, and then for

enlisted.

1

2	And that kind of piggybacks on a
3	question that I had, which is whether in 2022,
4	almost 2023, it would make more sense to have a
5	random selection process that's computer
6	generated.
7	An algorithm or however you would do
8	it, just like you know, when we do jury selection
9	in my court, the computer generates the list and
10	they come up to the courtroom, and we go from
11	there with our voir dire process.
12	So how would you see that working in
13	the military, having a system where if it's
14	officers, you know, you're putting in what, they
15	have an algorithm that's already a computer
16	generated system with the factors required under
17	Article 25.
18	COL KENNEBECK: I'll jump in first on
19	that one and say first of all, let's just go back
20	to my hypothetical.
21	I'm at a Corps, 20,000 people and in
22	the formation, and if I were to randomly select

1	100 out of that 20,000, what do you think the
2	majority would be?
3	E4 and below probably under 24, and
4	within that majority, what do you think that much
5	of the majority is a White male? I'm not sure
6	that random, especially left of Article 25, would
7	get you what you're looking for.
8	I think we'd be better off orienting in
9	the direction of either looking at best practices
10	in those states who have found ways to overcome
11	diversity problems in panels, and then taking a
12	look at Article 25 as a, to be more purposeful
13	about inclusion.
14	Because I think even if enlisted, take
15	it another step. You looked at a convening order
16	with about 20 names on it. Twenty officers, maybe
17	10 enlisted.
18	You could take great effort to build a
19	diverse panel of 20 officers, and 10 enlisted.
20	But invariably, come time of trial you're going to
21	have two of them TDY, one's deployed, one suddenly
22	decided to retire. And you're bringing

1 substitutes in.

2	And now you've changed the makeup of
3	the, the panel that you've built. Unless you want
4	the services to build a panel for every case, for
5	every accused, which would at least in the Army,
6	become pretty cumbersome for our 600 cases a year.
7	So happy to share numbers but I think
8	that the randomization can get, if you really were
9	random from the beginning, from the get go, I
10	don't think it would go the direction that you're
11	looking for.
12	Over.
13	MEMBER WALTON: Let's talk about
14	sentencing. We in the federal system, did adopt
15	sentencing guidelines which initially were
16	mandatory.
17	And one of the principle reasons for
18	the adoption of the guidelines and making them
19	mandatory, was racial disparity. Because there
20	was a big gap between what a African American
21	would get, and what a White person would get
22	committing the same crime, with the same

www.nealrgross.com

2	Those guidelines were declared
3	mandatorily unconstitutional, and now they are
4	advisory. And unfortunately what we've seen is
5	that disparity has crept back into the system.
6	Has there been any type of evaluation
7	of the sentencing within the military, and whether
8	that type of disparity exists?
9	And if so, what is being done to try
10	and address it?
11	COL KENNEBECK: The military is going
12	to judge alone sentencing soon, except in capital
13	cases. And there will be, I think we have a study
14	under way right now to establish proposed
15	sentencing criteria.
16	So I think we're going that direction
17	that's already underway. Unless I'm overstating,
18	Mr. Sullivan, I'll let you correct me if I'm
19	wrong. But I think that's right.
20	MR. SULLIVAN: I happen to be on the
21	Military Sentencing Parameters and Criteria Board.
22	So, Your Honor, the Congress in the last NDAA

adopted a new sentencing system that will apply in 1 2 cases where all findings of guilty are for offenses that occur after December 27th, 2023. 3 And those cases will be governed, 4 5 exactly as Colonel Kennebeck said, a judge alone Right now, we have the equivalent 6 will sentence. of juror sentencing at the option of the accused 7 8 in some cases, but we're going to move to all 9 judge-alone sentencing. 10 And so, for most offenses, the offense 11 will have a parameter range. Parameter just is 12 the equivalent of guideline. When Congress passed 13 the statute, there was a realization that 14 guidelines had become somewhat of a freighted 15 term, so they picked another word that means the 16 same thing. 17 So there's going to be a parameter 18 range, and then the judge can depart either above 19 or below the parameter, but must provide a written 20 explanation, and then that written explanation 21 will be challenged by either party on appeal. CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Tokash. 22

Thank you. 1 MEMBER TOKASH: Are the 2 panel member questionnaires going to be joint at some point, or are there any efforts to work in 3 4 that regard so that, across the services, the 5 panel member questionnaire will look uniform? Thank you. 6 7 COL KENNEBECK: I'm going to jump out 8 in front and say I don't think that's a purposeful 9 step that's being taken. I think the panel questionnaires do allow different services to talk 10 about questions that might tie to the mission. 11 12 We work in different places. Life is 13 very different when you're on a ship that -- when 14 you're in Joint Base Lewis-McChord, and sometimes that can be relevant, and when you're asking 15 16 potential panel members about their service on the 17 panel. So I do think it's important that some of 18 those differences are recognized. 19 And I also will say, though, that I am 20 fully aware that the OSTC leads are routinely 21 getting together. They're talking about business 22 rules, and I would imagine that this is going to

be a discussion. We already share best practices
 across the service. We educate one another. We
 go to each other's schools.

So this notion of panel questionnaires is not novel. We do share information. I just don't think that there's a purposeful effort to make a purple questionnaire. Over.

CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Goldberg.

9 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you again for 10 all of your comments. Can you speak? And I know we are short on time, so I'd be happy to have a 11 12 follow-up on this in writing. But if you could 13 speak to the number of women that are typically on 14 panels, and one other issue that was raised to me from service members including some victim service 15 16 counsel, which is that women are 17 disproportionately likely to be excluded from

18 panels for two reasons.

One, because they are more likely
either in the military or outside of the military
to be subjected to sexual assault, and two, they
are more likely to have been trained as or

8

participated at some point in their careers as a victim advisor or supporter or in some capacity. And that has been the basis at least in some 4 proceedings for an argument that somebody with that training should be excluded from a panel because of a perception that they could not be fair.

8 I don't know if I'd be interested in 9 your views about whether that actually -- whether that resonates with you, whether you believe that 10 11 that is true and a basis for exclusion, but also 12 the empirical question.

13 CAPT HOUSE: Ma'am, I would say, in my 14 experience, I would say almost every members panel 15 for contested trials that I've been involved in, 16 there have been women. It has been gender 17 diverse.

18 I would agree with some of the They have not always been as ethnically 19 comments. 20 or culturally diverse as they might be, but gender 21 diverse seems to be, in my experience, has been -we seem to be better about. 22

1

2

3

5

6

7

As far as our history or having been 1 2 trained to support victims or victim advocacy or whatever, it would come down to the voir dire. 3 It would really just come down -- I have not seen 4 women systematically excluded because of having 5 those prior duties or responsibilities, but 6 7 certainly, if I'm the defense counsel in that case, there's going to be a lot of questions about 8 9 the extent of those duties, the type of services that were performed, sort of the person's personal 10 11 approach to that. Particularly, if I'm in a sex assault 12 13 case, that would be of significant questioning by 14 the defense counsel during voir to determine if 15 there's some type of bias. It makes that person, 16 from the defense's perspective, unsuitable to sit 17 on the court-martial. Over. 18 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Very quick follow-up. 19 When you were saying that you've generally seen 20 women on the panels, is that as true for officer 21 panels, as it is, for enlisted in your experience? Yes, ma'am. 22 CAPT HOUSE:

	۲ ۱
1	CHAIR SMITH: Mr. Kramer.
2	MEMBER KRAMER: Thank you. Thank you
3	very much, and sorry to extend this, but I had a
4	question. I think I heard Colonel Sherwin say
5	that for an enlisted personnel that the panel
6	could be either be all officers, all enlisted, or
7	mixed.
8	And I was curious, but I think I heard,
9	sorry, Colonel Kennebeck say that, in the army, it
10	had to be at least one third enlisted personnel
11	for an enlisted trial. I'm curious if that
12	first of all, who makes that decision? Is it the
13	convening authority whether it's all officers, all
14	enlisted or mixed, in the Air Force?
15	And, of course, that can make a big
16	difference in diversity as well as the enlisted
17	person's perception of whether they're receiving
18	a trial of their peers. And, so, I'm curious if
19	the other services allow or require a certain
20	percentage or allow an entire allow it to be
21	all enlisted or all officers and who makes that
22	decision. Thanks.

	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
1	COL SHERWIN: So, sir, this is Colonel
2	Sherwin. So I'll talk on the part of the Air
3	Force first. So our panel members, if the member
4	is enlisted, they will have both on there, and
5	then the member, the actual accused, gets to elect
6	whether he wants enlisted on his panel or not, or
7	her panel.
8	And so, if we just did a officer in the
9	past we used to just do an officer panel and
10	then. When they elected to have enlisted on, then
11	we would go and replace members. And the panel
12	had to the sitting panels. So the panel that
13	sits at the actual court-martial has to be at
14	least one third.
15	So it actually, if you're getting
16	through the voir dire process, if every single one
17	of the officers got kicked, as long as there's at
18	least one third left that are military
19	enlisted, I apologize, then the panel gets to sit.
20	If as was explained, if we have
21	eight is what you needed for your GCM, and we went
22	down to two enlisted, well, we've been just busted

1	quorum. So it is driven at least the election
2	of whether or not an enlisted member wants an
3	all-officer panel or having enlisted on there is
4	driven by the actual accused.
5	In the event that it is I have never
6	seen one start fully enlisted. It usually is the
7	officers get kicked off during voir dire process.
8	Does that help?
9	MEMBER KRAMER: Yes. Thank you.
10	COL KENNEBECK: Sir, there are only two
11	types of panels, enlisted and officer, and that's
12	controlled by the rules from court-martial. It's
13	the same for all the services, not different
14	between the services.
15	So the rules for court-martial lay that
16	out, and the enlisted panel must be at least one
17	third. She's right, but I don't think I've ever
18	seen a full enlisted panel, just enlisted. It
19	could happen, but I don't think that that
20	typically does happen. So it's either officer
21	panel, all officer, or at least one third
22	enlisted.

1	MEMBER KRAMER: And why is there why
2	have we never seen an all enlisted panel?
3	COL KENNEBECK: That's how the system
4	was built. I think it probably ties to age,
5	experience, training, length of service. I think
6	those factors helped shape the way the rules were
7	built.
8	CHAIR SMITH: What would you do to
9	change things so that juries ended up being
10	represented? In other words, is there something
11	you would change about Article 25?
12	How could you ensure that a Hispanic
13	officer who is charged with whatever is actually
14	tried by a jury of his peers? If you were making
15	a recommendation, what would it be? And that
16	might have to be the last question, but I have to
17	hear the answer.
18	CAPT HOUSE: I think Article 25 is your
19	answer then, ma'am. I think we take Article 25
20	incredibly seriously. It's the rule. That's how
21	we follow it. I think a, however you would word
22	it, a discussion of the importance of inclusion

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

I

somewhere in Article 25, just to make that clear 1 2 to a convening authority, would provide us greater latitude than currently exists in Article 25. 3 I think, on top of that, the voir dire 4 5 process remains a very vigorous and important component to every military trial. And the better 6 that both the government and the defense are at 7 8 that, and the better that -- the more training 9 that we have in that, the better panels we will get to do what's important for the government and 10 11 for the defendant. Over. 12 I totally agree. COL KENNEBECK: Ι 13 think we should -- I think a possibility is to 14 adopt Crawford statutorily incorporated into Article 25 to account for race and gender. 15 16 CHAIR SMITH: I'm looking at the Do we have time for another question? 17 Colonel. 18 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you so much. 19 Actually not another question. It's just a repeat 20 of the question I asked before about gender on 21 panels and women on panels, and I would be 22 interested to hear from a couple of our other

panelists on that, unless you all endorse what was shared initially.

3	COL KENNEBECK: Sorry, I'm talking too
4	much. I routinely see females, we have females on
5	our panels as well, but I have seen what you're
6	alluding to, which is through the voir dire
7	process a lot of female panel members might be
8	removed, and that does come from the
9	questionnaire. I mean, that process is vigorous.
10	I think it inures it's meant to inure to the
11	benefit of the accused to let the accused pick a
12	panel that appears representative to that accused.
13	A lot of times that will result in
13 14	A lot of times that will result in certain people being excused for a cause,
14	certain people being excused for a cause,
14 15	certain people being excused for a cause, especially when some of the questions are do you
14 15 16	certain people being excused for a cause, especially when some of the questions are do you know someone who's been sexually assaulted? Do
14 15 16 17	certain people being excused for a cause, especially when some of the questions are do you know someone who's been sexually assaulted? Do you have a family member? Do you have strong
14 15 16 17 18	certain people being excused for a cause, especially when some of the questions are do you know someone who's been sexually assaulted? Do you have a family member? Do you have strong feelings about this type of crime?
14 15 16 17 18 19	certain people being excused for a cause, especially when some of the questions are do you know someone who's been sexually assaulted? Do you have a family member? Do you have strong feelings about this type of crime? That dialogue that happens afterwards

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

1	observation. But I think that, representation
2	wise, we probably could do better, but I think
3	Article 25, if it were changed to allow for
4	purposeful inclusion, would help remedy that.
5	CHAIR SMITH: Do we have time for any
6	other questions?
7	Thank you very much for your time. We
8	really appreciate it.
9	COL BOVARNICK: We'll take a break for
10	10 minutes. Reconvene at, say, 10:40.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12	went off the record at 10:27 a.m. and resumed at
13	10:41 a.m.)
14	MS. SAUNDERS: Okay. Switching gears
15	to the topic of victim impact statements at
16	sentencing proceedings, we now welcome Ms. Adrian
17	and Dr. Breck Perry, who are founding members of
18	Survivors United as well as Mr. Ryan Guilds, who
19	is an attorney who has represented survivors and
20	civilians in military court proceedings.
21	Survivors United and Mr. Guilds
22	initially raised the issue with Congress of

whether crime victims are being given the 1 2 opportunity to fully inform the courts of the impact of the crimes perpetrated against them. 3 Α member of Survivors United also provided public 4 5 comment to the DAC-IPAD in February of 2020. The Perrys and Mr. Guilds are here today to provide 6 7 the Committee with an update on their concerns regarding victim impact statements. 8 Their 9 biographies can be found at Tab 3A of the meeting materials, and the Perrys and Mr. Guilds will take 10 a few minutes to provide their perspectives and 11 12 then be available to address questions from the 13 Committee. So I'll turn it over to you, Mr. 14 Guilds.

Thank you. 15 MR. GUILDS: Madam Chair 16 and Members of the Committee, it's my great 17 privilege to appear before you today and provide 18 my perspective and experience on the important 19 issues this committee confronts. I first appeared 20 before the predecessor to this committee several 21 years ago to discuss the strengthening of the 22 psychotherapy privilege and rape shield laws, and

I am pleased and proud today to appear both as a pro bono victim legal counsel who has represented dozens of sexual assault survivors and as counsel for Survivors United, a victim-created, victim-led organization providing a survivor perspective that informs the military justice process taking place each and every day across this nation.

I represented my first military-8 9 connected survivor in 2012, a brave midshipman whose life garnered national attention when four 10 members of the Navy football team were charged 11 12 with her gang rape. Since that time, and thanks 13 in no small measure to the attention garnered by 14 that case and her bravery in coming forward, the military justice system has undergone foundational 15 16 and transformative changes in how it investigates 17 and prosecutes sexual assault. Dozens of 18 important and meaningful reforms have taken place, 19 many informed by the work of this Committee and 20 those that came before it.

21 And so I would be remiss in not 22 thanking this Committee for your important work

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

but also in particular in highlighting the work of committee staff who I know work diligently, often behind the scenes to provide real world data and perspective on these important issues. You have the thanks and deep appreciation of survivors everywhere.

Survivors United is a nonprofit 7 8 organization founded by victims of military-9 connected trauma and based on the principle that the survivor's voice matters, not just in the 10 11 telling of the story but in the lessons we can 12 learn from those stories. Survivors United works 13 to ensure that the victim's perspective is received and heard at all levels of the the 14 15 military justice system. Its members -- we call 16 them Sheep Dogs -- come from varying experiences 17 and backgrounds but of common hope and goal; 18 continued improvement in the military justice 19 system's investigation and prosecution of sexual 20 assault and harassment. The organization includes 21 current and former military personnel as well as civilian victims. Together this otherwise 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

unaffiliated group is neither sheep nor predator. They give voice to their stories with the knowledge that only through education and validation of the victim perspective can meaningful change occur.

It is through that experience that we 6 7 come before you today to discuss the survivor 8 experience and providing impact statements at 9 sentencing. For many survivors who are able to report and ultimately see their assailant 10 11 convicted, the victim impact statement is a 12 seminal moment in the criminal justice process. Indeed for many of my clients and Survivors United 13 14 members, it is the opportunity to give voice to the harm caused by the assault, and the only 15 16 opportunity to confront the individual responsible 17 for their pain and anger. Victim impact 18 statements are an essential pathway to justice and healing. For many survivors, it is more important 19 20 than the actual sentence itself. 21 Article 60 provides that survivors have

22

1

2

3

4

5

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

a right to be reasonably heard at sentencing.

Rules for court-martial 1001 governs the way in 1 2 which that right is effectuated. There are three ways, in my experience, in which victim impact 3 statements are usually received at sentencing. 4 First, survivors can testify live or via a sworn 5 Both options afford the statement under oath. 6 7 defense an opportunity to cross-examine the survivor. 8

9 Alternatively, survivors may provide an This provides the survivor an 10 unsworn statement. 11 opportunity to address the court and members 12 without cross-examination by defense, although 13 defense has the right to rebut any statements made 14 in the unsworn statement and the statement itself 15 is not evidence. In my experience doing this work 16 for over a decade and the experience of Survivors United's membership, the unsworn statement, which 17 18 is often read live by the survivor, is the most 19 common victim impact statement approach taken at 20 sentencing, and it is the one I frequently advise 21 my clients to employ.

22

Unsworn statements must be submitted to

trial and defense counsel in advance of 1 2 presentation to the court and members to allow for an opportunity to object. It is in this process 3 that Survivors United has seen anecdotal evidence 4 of significant limitations on what victims are 5 allowed to say at sentencing, and it is why 6 7 Survivors United appreciates the work this Committee is undertaking in gathering data and 8 9 information on the limitations placed on victims 10 at sentencing.

11 In particular, in our experience, 12 survivors have been limited in their ability to 13 speak directly to the accused at sentencing, to 14 advance their beliefs of a particular type of sentencing result, to describe in detail what has 15 16 happened to them or the ways in which that does 17 not fit into the defense narrative, and to express 18 too much emotion. Often these limits are self-19 imposed, placed on survivors by well-meaning 20 victim legal counsel, special victims counsel, or 21 prosecutors who are concerned that the victim statements will run afoul of the law. 22 Others are

whittled down in court with the judge serving as the final arbiter and editor. Whatever the source, these limits seriously undermine the value and power of the victim impact statement and serve to reinforce the survivor sense of powerlessness, and they are not necessary to protect the accused rights.

Recent case law has expanded and 8 9 clarified what victims may say at sentencing, but more work can and should be done. 10 That is why we 11 appreciate the opportunity to speak here today, 12 and why it is my great pleasure to hear, along 13 with you, from Survivors United founding member, 14 Adrian Perry, and her husband, Lieutenant Colonel 15 Breck Perry, Marine Corps Retired, on their 16 experience.

I thank you again for your time today
and look forward to answering any questions you
may have including questions regarding the jury
selection panel process, an issue of deep concern
to Survivors United and its members. Thank you.
MS. PERRY: Madam Chair and Members of

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

	l · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	the Committee, my name is Adrian Perry, and I am
2	the co-founder of Survivors United. Before I
3	introduce Survivors United, I want to take the
4	time to thank the DAC-IPAD panel for inviting
5	Survivors United, specifically my husband and I,
6	to be here today to share our experience
7	surrounding victim impact statements and the
8	military justice system, so thank you.
9	Throughout my statement, I will be
10	using the term "survivor" and "victim"
11	interchangeably. I wanted to address that
12	terminology as I do not want to offend anyone who
13	may be a victim or survivor of sexual abuse or
14	sexual assault. As I have worked with various
15	clients through Survivors United as well as Victim
16	Witness, I have found that some of my clients
17	prefer survivor while others prefer victim.
18	Survivors United is a nonprofit
19	organization that supports survivors of sexual
20	assault within the military while ensuring the
21	voice of the survivor is heard at all levels of
22	the military criminal justice process. We also

have an advocacy group known as the Sheep Dogs who are the voice of the survivors that we support. The Sheep Dogs mission is to educate legislators, military leaders, and policy makers regarding survivor experiences within the military justice process surrounding sexual assault cases.

Survivors United would be honored to 7 8 continue to provide the DAC-IPAD with valuable 9 experiences we receive from survivors on various issues and challenges that current or future 10 11 survivors bring to our attention. I attended the 12 last DAC-IPAD meeting virtually where the issue of 13 jury diversity was discussed as it was previously 14 discussed with the prior panel. Our family 15 personally encountered that very same challenge 16 with a jury that was stacked with all males in our 17 case for our two daughters who were victims of 18 sexual abuse. They were six years old at the 19 Our organization has also encountered time. 20 challenges with survivors having sufficient access 21 to information regarding their case. So these two current items of interest to DAC-IPAD are also 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

issues we would be privileged to provide feedback on going forward should the DAC-IPAD desire us to do so.

4 As far as victim impact statements are 5 concerned, my husband and I faced a myriad of challenges as well as restrictions when it came to 6 7 us both being able to provide a victim impact 8 statement to the court on behalf of, at the time, 9 one of our six-year-old daughters who was the victim of sexual abuse by one of my husband's 10 previous bosses, who was a Colonel in the United 11 12 States Marine Corps. I was originally told I 13 would be able to provide a victim impact statement 14 on behalf of my child only later to be told that only one of us could provide one. My husband and 15 16 I talked over great length about this decision. 17 As you can imagine, that was very difficult to 18 choose one of us to speak on behalf of our child 19 whose innocence was stolen. And ultimately, we 20 decided that it would be most appropriate if he 21 gave the victim impact statement since he was the 22 active duty service member and it was his boss who

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

1

harmed our daughters.

2 I am now elated to know this issue has been addressed making it now permissible for both 3 parents of a child victim to provide a victim 4 impact statement on behalf of a child victim. 5 I have been blessed with many 6 7 opportunities in the civilian justice system to see what right looks like regarding victim impact 8 9 statements while serving as a Victim Witness assistant director for a local county in Virginia. 10 11 I have sat in on many cases of child sexual abuse 12 and adult sexual assault cases where the judge 13 allowed immediate family members to provide victim 14 impact statements on behalf of or in support of their loved on. I have also been able to hear 15 16 what these individuals were able to say in their 17 statements. I have never experienced a situation 18 where the civilian court restricted what could be 19 said as long as it directly pertained to the abuse 20 the accused was convicted of and as long as the 21 content was focused on how the crime impacted the 22 victim emotionally, physically, mentally,

spiritually, and financially. 1 I've seen 2 statements delivered where the victim spoke directly to their abuser in their victim impact 3 In our case, you will hear from my 4 statement. 5 husband about how we could not speak directly to our daughter's abuser, and my husband had to 6 7 actually stand facing the jury with his back to our daughter's abuser as he delivered his 8 9 statement.

From a personal and professional 10 standpoint, delivering a victim impact statement 11 12 is a moment that many victims and their loved ones 13 wait for a very, very long time. They finally get 14 to speak directly to the court and to their abuser about the level of pain and anguish that the 15 16 defendant's actions inflicted upon them. It takes 17 a great deal of courage and emotional energy to 18 sit down and relive the abuse in order to 19 powerfully and impactfully tell the court and the 20 abuser about the trauma they have suffered. For 21 a judge to unnecessarily or incorrectly restrict 22 a victim from having their voice fully heard is

simply minimizing the level of pain and trauma 1 2 that the crime has caused them. To put it plain and simple, it is insulting for a victim to have 3 4 that moment tarnished after everything that they 5 have endured and the silence that they've had to face for so long throughout the duration of the 6 investigation and the criminal proceedings leading 7 up to sentencing. It's a long time to be silent. 8 9 The purpose of a victim impact statement is to do just that, provide an impact to 10 11 the court at sentencing. How can this purpose be 12 fully realized across all cases if some of these 13 statements are being unnecessarily restricted 14 resulting in the victim being incapable of disclosing the overall traumatic effects the crime 15 16 has caused them. I always reference the USA 17 Olympic Gymnastics sexual abuse case involving 18 Larry Nassar when referencing an example of what 19 right looks like when discussing victim impact 20 statements. The judge in that case allowed every 21 single woman that he harmed and that he victimized 22 to speak freely and powerfully to the court and to

the defendant about the impact of the abuse they endured.

In our daughter's case, I made it very 3 4 clear that as a mother, I was so upset that I 5 could not speak up for my child. I was eventually told that I could speak at sentencing but that I 6 7 could only do so through sworn testimony from 8 direct questioning. I was warned that I would 9 have to take the stand and be subject to crossexamination by defense once again. 10 I welcomed 11 this challenge if it meant I could advocate for 12 our daughter. Once I took the stand, I was only 13 allowed to answer direct questions from the 14 prosecution, and I could not deviate whatsoever 15 from that questioning. So everything that I had 16 written down in hopes of being able to say to the 17 court, that was taken from me. 18

18 Knowing what I know now as a
19 professional working with victims of crime, I'm in
20 absolute shock that as a mother of a child victim,
21 that right was stolen from me. Being able to
22 provide a statement to the court at sentencing can

1

	-
1	be extremely empowering and freeing for a victim,
2	and it's a moment that can open the very first
3	door to hopeful healing for survivors. I am
4	hopeful that through advocacy and research, future
5	victims going through the military court system
6	will be afforded the dignity and respect to fully
7	utilize this right without illegitimate
8	restrictions so their voice can be heard and
9	healing can begin.
10	In closing, I would like to mention my
11	concern after reviewing the data from the previous
12	DAC-IPAD meeting surrounding victim impact
13	statements in military courts. In my professional
14	opinion, it seemed that the numbers of cases where
15	an actual victim impact statement was given was
16	somewhat low in comparison to the amount of guilty
17	verdicts. I understand that not every victim
18	wants to provide a victim impact statement, but in
19	my professional experience, when offered the
20	opportunity to do so, all of the victims I worked
21	with in Victim Witness as a victim advocate
22	capacity chose to provide a statement in some

format once they received a thorough explanation of what a victim impact statement is.

I am curious if all victims going 3 4 through the military court process are being 5 notified of their right to provide a victim impact statement and if so, are they being fully educated 6 on what a victim impact statement entails and all 7 8 options available to them on how to deliver one to 9 the court. Education is knowledge and knowledge is power. If we are not fully educating victims 10 of their rights in the military justice process 11 12 and what those rights mean to them, we are failing 13 victims of sexual assault in the military.

14That's all that I have for you all, and15I would like to turn it over to my husband, Breck16Perry. And thank you all again for your time and17inviting us to be here today. We truly appreciate18it.

DR. PERRY: Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of the Committee. My name is Breck Perry and I'm a retired Marine Lieutenant Colonel. I'm a former uniformed victim advocate, and I'm a

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

1 member of the advisory board for Survivors United.
2 I'd like to thank you for taking time to listen to
3 our testimony today regarding victim impact
4 statements, and it's my hope that our story will
5 compel you to recommend legislative changes that
6 eliminate restrictions on impact statement
7 protocol during military trials.

As my wife mentioned, we were faced 8 9 with significant challenges during both the presentencing preparation and the sentencing 10 hearing phases. During the trial, Adrian and I 11 12 were advised to prepare victim impact statements 13 that we would be allowed to read, at sentencing, 14 if the jury decided to convict. This process in and of itself was simultaneously heart-wrenching 15 16 but liberating. For the first time, we would be able to publicly express how our daughters' trauma 17 18 had impacted them.

19 At first, we were told that Adrian and 20 I could both speak but later we were told that 21 only one of us were permitted to speak during the 22 sentencing hearing. After the guilty verdict was

delivered, I prepared to give my victim impact 1 2 statement before the court. I had to face the jury and not the defendant, making it a strange 3 arrangement where my back was turned towards my 4 5 daughter's convicted abuser. I remember the judge stopping me in the middle of my statement and 6 7 telling me that I could not say certain things. 8 He then asked for my written statement to be 9 brought to him. He red-penned it and crossed out 10 important thoughts that I wanted to convey to the 11 court.

12 The judge returned my statement to me and told me that I had 15 minutes to revise it. 13 In a flood of emotions, I did what I was told and 14 I ran to an adjacent building. I scrounged some 15 16 writing material. I revised the letter and 17 reoccupied the court stand within the imposed 15-18 minute deadline. When I started reading my 19 statement again, the judge stopped me again and 20 said, "That will be enough, Major Perry," 21 dismissing me back to my gallery -- or back to the gallery before I was able to finish my statement. 22

I returned to my seat feeling angry, confused, and defeated wondering why a judge would restrict and suppress me in that way when as a father, I was there to be a voice for my daughter who was voiceless and who had her innocence stolen from her at the age of six.

7 The defense was then allowed to proceed with their impact presentation while the judge 8 9 allowed the defense to call character witnesses, present multiple three-inch binders full of the 10 11 convicted abuser's personal decorations and 12 military awards, pictures, and even allowed him to 13 talk to the jury where he droned on and on about 14 saving his retirement, nothing about the impact that he caused to my family and to my daughter. 15

To add insult to injury, the judge reminded the jury that the convicted abuser was a decorated colonel reading out his military awards and accomplishments during his time in service. I could not believe what I was hearing and seeing. Why did the judge allow this to happen? Why was my wife not allowed to share her impact statement?

Why was I silenced and not allowed to face the 1 2 abuser when I tried to advocate for my daughter and describe the horrific devastation that he 3 4 imparted upon our family? In the Marines, I 5 learned that when it comes to experiencing trauma, pain shared is pain divided. For many victims, 6 presenting their impact statement is the first and 7 8 only opportunity for them to share that pain and 9 let their voice be heard. Thank you so much for your time and 10 11 this opportunity to speak with you today. At this 12 time, my wife and I would be more than happy to 13 answer any questions regarding the testimony that 14 we presented today. Thank you so much, Mr. 15 CHAIR SMITH: 16 and Mrs. Perry for sharing your stories. We 17 really appreciate your being here and Mr. Guilds 18 as well. 19 Mr. Guilds, you indicated there were 20 three ways to give a victim impact statement, but 21 I think I only heard two, so -- and perhaps I 22 missed it, the first one being live testimony

where they're subjected to cross-examination; the 1 2 second one being an unsworn statement without cross-examination. And then what's the third? 3 4 MR. GUILDS: A sworn statement --5 CHAIR SMITH: A sworn statement but not 6 MR. GUILDS: -- that is subject --7 8 sorry, go ahead. 9 CHAIR SMITH: Sorry. Is that one 10 subject to cross as well? 11 MR. GUILDS: Yes -- yes, it is. 12 CHAIR SMITH: So how is that different than the first one? 13 14 MR. GUILDS: So one is live. 15 CHAIR SMITH: Okay. 16 MR. GUILDS: One is direct cross, 17 right. One is a sworn statement, therefore, 18 evidence. Therefore, the rules provide for an 19 opportunity to cross-examine, so you could imagine that direct is almost the statement itself and 20 21 then there's cross-examination. I candidly have 22 never seen that happen.

115

1	CHAIR SMITH: Okay.
2	MR. GUILDS: And then the third is the
3	unsworn statement.
4	CHAIR SMITH: Do you have, any one of
5	you Ms. Perry mentioned she wasn't sure what
6	type of education is provided to victims when
7	they're weighing whether or not to give a victim
8	impact statement. How are they informed that they
9	have a right to make a victim impact statement?
10	If you know, is there a standard requirement for
11	all the services, you know, that they be provided
12	with information about giving a victim impact
13	statement and what that looks like? Or is it kind
14	of willy-nilly, for lack of a better way of saying
15	it?
16	MR. GUILDS: I would not describe it as
17	willy-nilly. There is a form. The military loves
18	their acronyms and their numbers, so I don't know
19	the precise number of the form, but there is a
20	form that's provided to victims. Typically, if
21	their first contact is with a military
22	investigative unit, they'll be brought that form

at that time, which will list and describe their 1 2 rights, among them the right to provide an impact statement at the conclusion of a successful 3 conviction. And then trial counsel will advise 4 victims of that right. Typically, it's my 5 experience -- and of course, victims legal 6 7 counsel, in their role, will provide that. That's 8 one of the critical roles that victims legal 9 counsel, special victims counsel provides. Now I would hasten to add -- and this 10 11 is one of the concerns at Survivors United -- is 12 that there -- the provision of victims legal 13 counsel, special victims counsel is not 14 comprehensive. It does not provide those services to civilians who are outside of the DoD or family 15 16 structure, so that's the first thing. And that is 17 based upon this Committee's own data, the 18 significant minority of the assaults that take 19 place. So the reason that I exist in this world, 20 in part, is to fill that gap, and there are many, 21 many survivors who are not informed of those 22 services. And that's one of the significant

concerns Survivors United has is the ability to 1 2 connect survivors with civilian organizations to provide that victim's legal counsel so that they 3 4 can then do what we did for the Perrys, which was to explain their rights, however limited. 5 MEMBER BASHFORD: In addition -- I just 6 7 want to make sure I'm clear. So you don't have to 8 just provide notice of an intent to give a 9 statement, you have to provide the actual statement itself? 10 11 If the statement is MR. GUILDS:

12 unsworn, the current rules require that that 13 statement be provided in advance of being read 14 either to the members or the court so --

15 MEMBER BASHFORD: So there's no 16 opportunity for an extemporaneous statement then? 17 MR. GUILDS: In an unsworn statement, 18 no; right? If you're on direct, of course, if you 19 were doing direct, then the answer is going to be 20 the answer, and it would be a normal witness as it 21 would be any other witness subject to objection 22 and so forth and follow-up on redirect. But an

unsworn statement is something that's provided in 1 2 advance to defense and trial counsel, and that's where the discussion takes place. 3 This -- you don't need to read this but this is literally an 4 5 example of one that I had last month where the Then defense counsel red-6 statement was written. 7 lined it. Then we negotiated it. Then we argued 8 it in court. That's how the unsworn statement 9 process works. 10 MEMBER BASHFORD: In my jurisdiction, all you had to do was give 72 hours' notice and 11 12 that was it. The person got to -- within the 13 parameters of decorum. 14 MR. GUILDS: Sure. 15 MEMBER BASHFORD: You're in a 16 courtroom. They got to say whatever they wanted 17 to say. 18 MR. GUILDS: Yes. And I think that's 19 one of the potential suggested changes is to 20 eliminate that process, that advanced notice 21 process. I think, you know, in terms of what to do, right, like what are the things that we see 22

that are important here to think about. I think
-- number one, I think there is ambiguity as to
whether or not a survivor can speak directly to
the defendant. I think that should be clarified.
I think they should have that opportunity. I've
had courts-martials where it's not been permitted.
I've had courts-martials where it is permitted.

But I can promise you that for the 8 9 survivors that I've represented, it is an 10 important component to the process. Speaking to 11 the person who has taken power from you, because 12 that's what assault is, and taking that power 13 back, that is one of the essential elements of the 14 victim impact statement. And many survivors can only do that if they can face the person who 15 16 caused them the pain. And so it's not an 17 insignificant moment although it may seem like it 18 to those who have never been a survivor.

In addition, one of the things that we continue to see is unnecessary limitations on what happened during the assault. So I'll give you an example. And this is not unusual that the case

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

gets charges of 120 offense. The case goes through a very lengthy process and ultimately results in a plea agreement to a 128 assault charge. A 128 assault charge is not sexual in nature, but it's physical in nature, and the defendant has his narrative, his proffer as part of that plea agreement.

8 Well, what would the survivor like to 9 do? The survivor would like to describe what happened to her, and she would like not to be 10 11 limited by what the defendant has to say. She 12 would like to describe it. This very same 13 statement that I showed you today significantly 14 limited her ability to say what happened being almost beholden to the defense narrative. And I 15 16 understand there are important and significant due 17 process limitations. We can't just simply take 18 things from 10 years ago that are unrelated to the 19 crime, but there has been a significant narrowing of the survivor's ability to describe what's 20 21 happened to them as part of the victim impact statement that I think needs to be addressed. 22

ĺ	-
1	And then finally, one of the things
2	that we've seen recently that I've seen
3	recently in specific cases is the impact of the
4	pretrial and trial process itself. It is common
5	parlance to say this and so I hesitate to use
6	words that when said so often don't have meaning.
7	But the military justice system is as violent, if
8	not more violent, than the assault itself for many
9	survivors. And having to go through that process
10	is something they should be entitled to describe.
11	And in at least two of the last three court-
12	martials that I've appeared in, survivors have not
13	been permitted to express the pain, difficulty,
14	and challenges confronted by navigating the
15	military justice system. And we believe that's
16	something that's something that should be changed.
17	MEMBER WALTON: You indicate that
18	victim survivors and advocates are fearful of
19	running afoul of the limitations on victim impact
20	statements. Are those limitations the subject of
21	some legal authority or just judicially imposed?
22	MR. GUILDS: There is legal authority.

You know, there are rules that require --1 2 currently, the rule, 1001(c) requires only victim impact statement. And then there is a series of 3 cases that describe what you can say about what 4 5 happened in the crime. So there is some case law out there that suggests some limitations, and 6 7 courts are left to try to figure out where that 8 line is. And that's not unusual to this 9 particular area of jurisprudence. Often courts 10 have to interpret case law. So we're not 11 complaining about it but the ambiguity in the 12 rules and in some cases, the specific language in 13 the rules -- for example, the inability to make a 14 comment at sentencing about what you think should happen at the sentence, those are things that are 15 16 in the rules themselves.

17 So this is not an area that CAAF and 18 the subordinate courts have not tried to address 19 in some way, but it is not consistent across the 20 branches. It's not well understood. And perhaps 21 more importantly, from our perspective, there is 22 not a recognition that judges should tread very

1lightly when they touch a victim impact statement.2And if I could say I mean this is every3argument I make, I make without case law, it's one4of the first things I say when they try to limit;5this statement is sacred and unless there is6and I apologize to keep looking at our defense7colleagues here because I am, by training, a8defense lawyer unless there is a specific,9real, meaningful constitutional right implicated,10that survivor should be able to say whatever she11or he wants within the manner of the rules, and12judges should be very reticent to try to interfere13with that process.14MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the15perpetrator actually receive, and did you think16the process had an impact on what that sentence17ultimately was?18DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was19dishonorable discharge equivalent. And I think he		
 argument I make, I make without case law, it's one of the first things I say when they try to limit; this statement is sacred and unless there is and I apologize to keep looking at our defense colleagues here because I am, by training, a defense lawyer unless there is a specific, real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, that survivor should be able to say whatever she or he wants within the manner of the rules, and judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a 	1	lightly when they touch a victim impact statement.
 of the first things I say when they try to limit; this statement is sacred and unless there is and I apologize to keep looking at our defense colleagues here because I am, by training, a defense lawyer unless there is a specific, real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, that survivor should be able to say whatever she or he wants within the manner of the rules, and judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a 	2	And if I could say I mean this is every
5 this statement is sacred and unless there is and I apologize to keep looking at our defense colleagues here because I am, by training, a defense lawyer unless there is a specific, 9 real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, 10 that survivor should be able to say whatever she or he wants within the manner of the rules, and judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	3	argument I make, I make without case law, it's one
 and I apologize to keep looking at our defense colleagues here because I am, by training, a defense lawyer unless there is a specific, real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, that survivor should be able to say whatever she or he wants within the manner of the rules, and judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a 	4	of the first things I say when they try to limit;
7 colleagues here because I am, by training, a 8 defense lawyer unless there is a specific, 9 real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, 10 that survivor should be able to say whatever she 11 or he wants within the manner of the rules, and 12 judges should be very reticent to try to interfere 13 with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the 15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	5	this statement is sacred and unless there is
 defense lawyer unless there is a specific, real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, that survivor should be able to say whatever she or he wants within the manner of the rules, and judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a 	6	and I apologize to keep looking at our defense
9 real, meaningful constitutional right implicated, 10 that survivor should be able to say whatever she 11 or he wants within the manner of the rules, and 12 judges should be very reticent to try to interfere 13 with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the 15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	7	colleagues here because I am, by training, a
10 that survivor should be able to say whatever she 11 or he wants within the manner of the rules, and 12 judges should be very reticent to try to interfere 13 with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the 15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	8	defense lawyer unless there is a specific,
11 or he wants within the manner of the rules, and 12 judges should be very reticent to try to interfere 13 with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the 15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	9	real, meaningful constitutional right implicated,
judges should be very reticent to try to interfere with that process. MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	10	that survivor should be able to say whatever she
<pre>13 with that process. 14 MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the 15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a</pre>	11	or he wants within the manner of the rules, and
MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the perpetrator actually receive, and did you think the process had an impact on what that sentence ultimately was? DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	12	judges should be very reticent to try to interfere
15 perpetrator actually receive, and did you think 16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	13	with that process.
16 the process had an impact on what that sentence 17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	14	MEMBER WALTON: What sentence did the
<pre>17 ultimately was? 18 DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was 19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a</pre>	15	perpetrator actually receive, and did you think
DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	16	the process had an impact on what that sentence
19 dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a	17	ultimately was?
	18	DR. PERRY: Yes, sir. He so he was
20 dishonorable discharge equivalent. And I think he	19	dismissed from the Marine Corps, so it's like a
	20	dishonorable discharge equivalent. And I think he
21 got	21	got
22 MS. PERRY: Five years.	22	MS. PERRY: Five years.

	- -
1	DR. PERRY: five years in prison.
2	But then that was overturned in appeal.
3	CHAIR SMITH: The conviction was
4	overturned, or the sentence was changed?
5	DR. PERRY: Everything.
6	MS. PERRY: Everything, the entire
7	conviction.
8	CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Goldberg.
9	MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you and thank
10	you very much for sharing your experience and for
11	sharing what you do. Two questions. One is some
12	of us on this Committee have taken up reading some
13	of the examples of cases in which victim impact
14	statements were limited to see what has happened
15	to relatively a small number compared to the
16	overall number of cases, but what you just
17	described about a lot of the pre the sort of
18	prior to trial limitation on victim impact
19	statements was something that we were talking
20	about. And it would be or that I've been
21	thinking about it would be helpful to hear more
22	from your perspective about how this Committee

could understand more of what happens pretrial. 1 2 Is there any way in which we could research this? And related to that, is it -- you 3 4 described negotiating with the defendant. Is it 5 also negotiating with the judge ahead of trial? And so to the extent you could give us any more of 6 7 a way to get an empirical window there? 8 And I'll just note my second question. 9 It's a separate topic and we can come back to it afterwards, which is what are the arguments 10 against permitting the victim to speak directly to 11 12 the defendant and why don't you find those 13 compelling? 14 Okav. I'll start with the MR. GUILDS: empirical question first. I think that's part of 15 16 why we asked this Committee to look at it, because 17 of the challenges we were having in terms of 18 empirically how to look at particularly the pre-19 writeup process. So when I described all of these 20 changes, right, if you were to read the record of 21 court-martial in this case, you would not know that that happened; right? You will see the judge 22

-- this is, in part, to answer a part of your 1 2 question -- judges have their own obligation independent of defense counsel to monitor a 3 sentencing. And so in the Perrys case as well as 4 5 in cases that I've experienced, the judge will unilaterally, on their own initiative, seek to 6 7 edit statements if necessary, if they believe it's necessary. So that will take place independent of 8 9 any defense objections. But the give and take, the back and 10 forth with defense counsel, that's a process that 11 you don't see. And I don't see a way to get raw data on that. I do think the people sitting perhaps behind the -- from the military detail,

12 13 14 the uniformed victims legal counsel and special 15 16 victims counsel, will have perspectives on that. 17 Are their members actually looking at the law and 18 self-editing because they understand the law to be 19 a particular way? What are their experiences in negotiating with defense counsel and with courts? 20 21 That might be outside of the record of trial. 22 Those are, I think, your best ways, your best

avenues would be some sort of survey of their
 experiences. I think I forgot the second part of
 your question. Apologize.

4 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Let me actually 5 insert a more directly-related question if I might, which is I think there's -- it's come up in 6 7 some cases a question whether a victim's counsel 8 has standing to address the court on any 9 limitations that a judge might be putting on the victim's ability to speak. And I've certainly 10 11 seen in at least one case where there was argument 12 on whether the victim's counsel did have standing, 13 and the court ruled no. and I wonder if you had 14 any view on whether the victim's counsel could speak on behalf of the victim when -- if their 15 16 statement is limited in some way like it was in 17 your case?

18 MR. GUILDS: I have never -- well, I've 19 experienced limitations on standing since I 20 started taking this case. When I started taking 21 these cases, there was no Article 6(b) and we were 22 just doing our best. So in terms of this issue,

it would be hard for me to understand how now a 1 2 victim's legal counsel could not have standing, because the case law is clear that the victim's 3 4 right to sentencing is unique to the victim. And 5 trial counsel cannot actually present a victim's legal counsel's statement, because it is 6 inconsistent with 1001(c). So if you look at the 7 8 case law, the CAAF has actually said -- and this 9 has been a challenge in child pornography cases where the victims -- the number of offenses is 10 11 ubiquitous, those victims are not going to want to 12 come in. And trial counsel has wanted to find 13 ways to get those victim impact statements into 14 evidence, and they -- and the court has held that that is not permissible unless there is some 15 16 evidence that the victim is actually requesting that and that it's in fact their statement. 17 The 18 trial counsel's got a separate track which is aggravation; right? That's entirely distinct from 19 20 the victim impact statement. 21

So to answer your question directly, I have not been limited. In fact, it's been the

22

exact opposite. Trial counsel has been limited in
 their ability to advocate with respect to the
 victim impact statement.

Chair, could I ask a MEMBER GARVIN: 4 5 quick follow-up question on that exact narrow issue of standing? Have you seen limitations on 6 7 appellate standing of SVC around some of the 8 issues, particularly all the way up to CAAF, cause 9 I think that might be part of where the question 10 is coming from, the cases we've read, not standing at the court-martial level but seeking review. 11

MR. GUILDS: I see. I would have to
defer to others in terms of the appellate process.
I am in the soup at the ground level.

15 CHAIR SMITH: Have you seen a gap in 16 victim support or victim impact statements for 17 children? In other words, you know, it seems that 18 the adults can get the support that they need but 19 what about the children who are victims? 20 MR. GUILDS: So it's a challenging area

for a variety of reasons. I think what happened
to the Perrys and their court-martial, candidly,

which generated some of the anxiety in terms of 1 2 their ability to speak, I don't think that that would happen today. We haven't seen -- I have 3 4 not seen a definitive ruling from the CAAF on this 5 issue, but some of the subordinate court of appeals have indicated that the notion of victim 6 7 is not limited to the guardian designated and that 8 they would both be permitted to express on behalf 9 of their children the impact. So -- but also candidly, my experience in representing children 10 is not significant enough for me to feel 11 comfortable offering a broader opinion than that. 12 13 MEMBER GARVIN: Switching gears a 14 little bit, but at least two of you have mentioned this when you were talking, and I didn't write 15 16 down the note sufficiently, but mentioned that you 17 also would have something to say about the jury 18 selection that we were talking about with the last 19 panel. And so I want to make sure we hold space 20 for that in case any of you wanted to comment on 21 that, too. 22

MR. GUILDS: Yes, we do. Thank you.

So our experience, my experience, the experience
 of Survivors United is that women are
 systematically excluded from jury panels. I'm not
 professing that there's an intention behind that,
 but I see the result. And what we see is that I
 have never had a court-martial with more than one
 woman on the panel itself, never.

We have seen, you know -- and for 8 9 whatever reason, I have a disproportionately larger number of Marine Corps cases than other 10 cases, and so I recognize that that pool is 11 12 smaller than perhaps some of the other branches. 13 But in our recent experience, what you heard, Ms. 14 Goldberg, that's what I see, this systematic exclusion that comes from being a uniformed victim 15 16 advocate from experiencing a sexual assault or 17 simply not being identified and placed on a 18 potential panel. Those are things that we see in 19 the real, every single one of our court-martials, 20 and it has a very significant adverse consequence. 21 So I will give you one specific example 22 in honor of one of my clients; 19-year-old girl

travels to California to go on her very first vacation. She thinks it's going to be an amazing experience. She's there with her friend. Her friend's married to a Marine. They go to a party and at that party, she's brutally assaulted. She subsequently reports that assault, and she waits for over 18 months to go to trial.

Now this is a girl who is not a part of 8 9 the military justice system. She lives in rural She doesn't know anything about the 10 Tennessee. process itself, and she's heard along the way all 11 12 of the things that she did as a child or as a 13 young adult that are going to potentially come out 14 at that court-martial, and yet she's brave enough to come forward. 15

And she knows that she's got this amazing lawyer, because I told her I was amazing. So she knows that she's got all of that going for her, and she shows up at the court-martial in the middle of the desert in California, and she looks across at the potential members that are going to decide whether or not to believe her, and there is

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

one woman out of 20, one. 1 That's a problem. Ι 2 think she felt defeated in that moment, and it's an issue that is important and critical for 3 defendants to receive a fair trial, but it is also 4 5 critical for survivors. It is not a binary choice between supporting defendants and supporting 6 7 victim's rights. And we see it every day in the courts that I attend and the feedback we receive 8 9 from our membership that the systematic exclusion of women from venire panels and from eventual 10 panels is a compelling and significant problem. 11 12 So we appreciate this Committee taking a look at 13 that issue. 14 MEMBER TOKASH: Hi. This is Meghan 15 Tokash. I have a question for the Perrys and then a question for you, sir. So first, for the 16 17 Perrys, just so I understand correctly, did you have Ryan's assistance during the court-martial, 18 19 i.e., did you have a victim's counsel assisting 20 you at the time? 21 DR. PERRY: Yes, ma'am. We had 22 service-level victim legal counsel, so we started

	L
1	with a captain and then he just inexperienced.
2	We asked for someone else. We got a major and
3	then my wife contacted Ryan, and Ryan and his team
4	provided civilian-level victim legal counsel to
5	us.
6	MEMBER TOKASH: But was that after the
7	court-martial had concluded that Ryan came on?
8	DR. PERRY: Oh, no, ma'am.
9	MEMBER TOKASH: Oh.
10	DR. PERRY: It was during the process.
11	It was prior to, when we were go when the
12	investigation was going on, and there were so many
13	things happening with, you know, evidence
14	collection, you know, the convening at the "what
15	are you doing there" thing, and just so much going
16	on. We needed some guidance. We needed a heavy
17	hitter and that's when my wife contacted Ryan.
18	MS. PERRY: We were initially assigned
19	a captain in the Marine Corps as our VLC, and he
20	was a wonderful, kind gentleman. However, we did
21	not feel that he was, I guess, experienced enough
22	to take on our case. So our daughter's abuser was

a full bird colonel about to be a brigadier 1 2 general. So I mean he had already been passed over once for brigadier general, so we were 3 dealing with some very high-ranking individuals. 4 5 So when we would have meetings, we did not feel that he was able to advocate for us in a way that 6 7 we needed to be advocated for because rank does matter in the military. You know your place. 8 9 That's just how it is. So we did request a more 10 senior, more experienced VLC through the military, 11 and we were assigned a major. 12 But in between that time, I started to 13 do my own research and sought Arnold & Porter and 14 ended up with an incredible amazing attorney. So, 15 you know, we were very grateful for that, and he 16 was able to -- it was wonderful because he was 17 able to provide civilian experience that was even 18 helpful to the trial counsel that maybe they 19 weren't thinking of. So it ended up being a 20 really, really great thing for us as far as just 21 advocating on behalf of our children. And then 22 MEMBER TOKASH: Thank you.

have you used interlocutory appeals for
enforcement mechanism of the Crime Victims' Rights
Act for violations that are occurring at courtsmartial? In particular, I'm thinking about the
victim's right to not be excluded from the
courtroom, and the victim's right to be reasonably
heard under 18 U.S.C. 3771?

MR. GUILDS: The answer is I have 8 9 wanted to many times, but I serve at the pleasure of the victim, and it is very few victims who want 10 to delay what they have finally gotten to. 11 So I 12 have been at court-martial several times where I 13 thought the issue was of significant moment and as 14 a matter of broader development of jurisprudence, it would be helpful to move forward, but -- and I 15 16 know you agree with me when I say this but 17 ultimately, we work for the victim. And so in 18 those cases, the victims have not wanted to move 19 forward on interlocutory appeal. And that's one 20 of the challenges of our appellate system in 21 addition to the limitations in how things are reviewed on appeal verse -- by a writ. 22

	т Т
1	But it's a real challenge to get some
2	of these issues up earlier because as we've
3	described, and as I think this panel understands,
4	the road that Ms. Perry described in terms of
5	going forward is so long that the idea you're
6	going to delay it another six months or something
7	to deal with an issue, it makes it very difficult
8	for victims to be willing to move forward.
9	MEMBER WALTON: Let me just ask, Mr.
10	Guilds, the individual who the example that you
11	gave, the individual who she accused, was that an
12	officer or an enlisted member? And what was the
13	ultimate result in the case?
14	MR. GUILDS: It was an officer. If
15	you're talking about the case where there was a
16	limitation, sir? Oh, the 19-year-old. He was
17	acquitted. He was acquitted, interestingly
18	enough, and I'm a poker player so I feel pretty
19	good in saying this, on a vote of 5 to 3 in favor
20	of conviction, the one panel member being one of
21	the members that we anticipated would have voted
22	for a conviction. But because of the unanimity

(202) 234-4433

requirement, there was no retrial. So we did not 1 2 have the necessary numbers to sustain a conviction despite a significant number of those members 3 believing in the accused's guilt. 4 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you again for 5 all that you're sharing. Wondering -- you know, 6 I know you're familiar with the changes to RCM 7 8 1001 -- wondering if -- you know, of course, 9 there's the proposal to remove the prohibition on 10 recommending a specific sentence. I assume you 11 agree with that? 12 MR. GUILDS: We do. 13 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Wondering if there 14 are other changes that you would recommend? And this is where I'll come back to that second 15 16 question that I asked before, one of the issues 17 that you -- the three of you all raised was the 18 ability to speak directly to the defendant and 19 wondering if that is something that you see as 20 being important for RCM 1001, or whether you see 21 that protection you're seeking as being elsewhere? 22 And the related question to that is what would be

1	the arguments against allowing for the victim
2	advocate to speak or the victim to speak
3	directly to the defendant and then what your
4	response is?
5	MR. GUILDS: Thank you for the
6	question. I think we've reviewed the policy
7	subcommittee's recommendations or at least
8	preliminary recommendations that talk about
9	removing both the limitation on speaking to
10	sentencing and the advanced turning over of the
11	victim impact statements. I think those are
12	important.
13	I think what we would also advocate for
14	is that standard I described. You know, there is,
15	in many ways, appropriately assumptions that
16	benefit defense; right? Like when we talk about
17	one of the issues that comes around with jury
18	selection, it's about the liberal grant mandate
19	which means that if there is any doubt, we're
20	going to strike a juror. We would ask for a
21	similar type of assumption that absent some
22	identifiable meaningful constitutional not

Ī	
1	meaningful identifiable and real constitutional
2	violation of risk to the accused, that the victim
3	be allowed to say what they want to say. Some
4	sort of presumption, I think, would be helpful
5	because I'm saying it now in argument because I
6	feel it, but I don't have any case law or basis to
7	support it. So unless the judge unless I am
8	able to convince a judge emotionally, I don't have
9	the law behind me, and that's a problem.
10	In terms of and I know this will be
11	the third time what's the arguments against?
12	I would imagine the as a defense counsel, the
13	arguments that I I have not heard these but, of
14	course, much more significant risk when you're
15	talking about panel members that could use
16	inappropriate considerations in violation of the
17	defendant's rights, right, with respect to
18	sentencing. I think that's an issue that's not
19	present when you have judge sentencing, judge
20	alone sentencing. So I think the risks there are
21	significantly limited. If I were to put on my
22	defense cap and say I would argue that if the

defendant is -- has a right, of course, to present 1 2 mitigation, but the aggravation actually has to relate to the offense itself. So if those things 3 get too attenuated, then that's not -- it's a due 4 5 process violation because he's being sentenced for something that he was not convicted of. 6 Those 7 would be the arguments that I would imagine. And we agree that those are significant concerns. 8 We 9 just don't think the line is being drawn anywhere close to where there's a real meaningful 10 constitutional risk to the accused. 11 12 MEMBER GOLDBERG: The other issue is 13 around facing the defendant. 14 MR. GUILDS: Oh, and in terms of facing the defendant, yes, I mean I think that certainly 15 16 I could see some language to that. I think it 17 might also be an educational piece. I think that 18 what the Perrys experienced and what the judges 19 see is they have this independent obligation for 20 decorum, right, and they have an independent 21 obligation to ensure that the sentencing statement 22 fits within the prescribed parameters, but they

don't really have any guidance. So whether that's 1 2 specific within the rule itself, whether it's in the committee notes, I think real meaningful 3 4 quidance that both empowers the victim statement and then creates examples of things that should be 5 permitted I think would be beneficial. 6 MEMBER SCHWENK: 7 This is Jim Schwenk. 8 I have a question when I get a chance. 9 CHAIR SMITH: Yes. Go ahead. 10 MEMBER SCHWENK: Thank you. Ryan, how 11 wide do you think the rule ought to be for the 12 victim impact statement? Right now it says the victim talks about harm to the victim. 13 We've 14 heard that some judges allow the victim to talk about harm to the victim's children in a child 15 16 abuse sex abuse case. What about harm to parents, 17 harm to spouses, harm -- do you think it should be broadened in some way, or you think you should 18 19 have to tie it back to yourself -- "and my spouse 20 was all upset and this has affected me this way," 21 any comments on --22 MR. GUILDS: Thank you for the

I don't think it -- we know the case 1 question. 2 law doesn't require -- the current case law does not require that the victim be named. 3 The CAAF has held that. And I think what flows from that 4 5 is this broader notion that crime does impact more than just that person. And I do think, you know, 6 with some understandable limitations, but I do 7 8 think that those beyond the victim -- and I'm not 9 just talking about guardians -- the crimes that occur impact families, they impact relationships, 10 11 and I think it's important for those individuals 12 who are also affected to have an opportunity to 13 speak.

So I do think it could be broader. 14 Ι 15 think that there is nothing wrong or inappropriate 16 about getting the full measure of the impact of a 17 convicted accused's actions on the community and 18 the individuals that it impacted. So I would 19 advocate for the broadest possible expanse of that 20 narrative at trial.

21 MEMBER SCHWENK: Another question I 22 have is you mentioned the difference between judge 1 alone sentencing and member sentencing and the
2 concerns. In your practice, do you see a
3 difference in the oversight by the judge of the
4 victim impact statement when it's a member's case
5 compared to the oversight by the judge of a victim
6 impact statement when it's a judge alone
7 sentencing --

8 I would expect -- sorry. MR. GUILDS: 9 I didn't mean to interrupt. I would expect there to be a difference but I candidly have not seen a 10 11 This case was a judge alone trial. difference. 12 The last court-martial that I had in the Air Force 13 was a -- I mean granted, it was a two star general 14 and so it had attention but that was judge only 15 There was still limitations that were trial. 16 imposed. And in terms of the jury, in terms of 17 members themselves, I've seen those limitations. 18 I think courts would be more likely to place those 19 limitations, but I have not seen it in my 20 practice. Thank you very much. 21 MEMBER SCHWENK: CHAIR SMITH: I think that concludes 22

our questioning. Thank you so much for being 1 2 We really appreciate it. here. Thank you for having us. 3 MR. GUILDS: 4 DR. PERRY: Thank you. 5 COL BOVARNICK: I recommend we have 6 like a 10-minute break, and then we'll get the 7 next panel situated if that works for everyone. 8 So 11:45 we'll reconvene. 9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:35 a.m. and resumed at 10 11 11:46 a.m.) 12 MS. SAUNDERS: We now welcome the 13 program managers from each of the Service's 14 Victims' Counsel Programs. They're here to provide information on victim impact statements 15 16 and appellate issues related to victim impact 17 rights, or related to victims' rights. 18 Their biographies can be found at tab 19 4-A in your materials and each representative will provide a brief introduction and then will address 20 21 questions from the Committee. Our first presenter 22 will be Colonel Carol Brewer, the Chief of the

Army's Special Victim Counsel Program, followed by 1 2 Captain Dan Cimmino, the Chief of the Navy Victims' Legal Counsel Program; Lieutenant Colonel 3 4 Iain Pedden, the Chief of the Marine Corps 5 Victims' Legal Counsel Program; Colonel Tracy Park, the Chief of the Air Force Victims' Counsel 6 Program; and Ms. Elizabeth Marotta, the Chief of 7 8 the Coast Guard's Office of Member Advocacy. 9 So we'll turn it over to you, Colonel 10 Brewer. 11 COL BREWER: Good morning. We were 12 asked to first tell you a little bit about 13 ourselves, so thank you for giving me that 14 opportunity. I just wanted to -- currently the 15 Chief of the Army's Special Victim Counsel 16 Program. Very proud of that position. So far 17 since 2016 the Army has assisted over 13,000 18 victims as they go through the investigative and 19 disciplinary process. 20 I've been in this position since June 21 of 2021 and that's given me the opportunity to

oversee two certification courses, and we're

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

currently planning one for February and then this 1 upcoming summer as well, in addition to five 2 regional trainings as all of our regions are 3 required to do an annual refresher every year. 4 We were also asked to tell you a little 5 bit about our past litigation experience. 6 I've 7 had great opportunities to serve in several different roles in the military justice process 8 9 over my 21 years in the Army. Most recently I was a special victim prosecutor for three years. 10 Before that I was a defense counsel for three 11 12 I was also a trial counsel earlier in my vears. 13 career. And also participated as lead counsel in 14 trials as a brigade judge advocate and oversaw trials as a deputy SJA and SJA. 15 So for a total 16 I've worked on about 57 different trials. 17 We were finally asked to discuss our 18 recent experience with victim impact statements. 19 So there's two areas really, and I think some of 20 them we'll get to address more depending on your 21 questions, but I am involved in the training of that at the -- at our certification course. 22

Because that's such a critical thing that our special victims' counsel assist victims with, I am the trainer for one of the two classes we present on that during our training, and I'd be happy to answer any questions on that.

And as an SVP I was very involved with 6 7 not only our special victim counsel, our civilian 8 victims' counsel like Mr. Guilds who I had the 9 honor to work with while I was in that role, but working directly with victims, whether represented 10 or not, to make sure that they understood fully 11 12 what they were able to present, how best to present it and how I could assist them in 13 14 presenting that. And I used those lessons when training our special victim counsel. 15

I provided them with an example of one of the best unsworn statements I ever heard in a court-martial. They can use that example and use that with the victims that they represent. And so that's both my recent experience as a trainer and as a litigator. And then I'm happy to answer any other questions you all have as we move

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

throughout. Thank you.

2	CAPT CIMMINO: Good morning, Madam
3	Chairwoman and distinguished panel members. I am
4	the Chief of the Navy Victims' Legal Counsel
5	Program. I have been serving in this position
6	since October of 2021.
7	Prior to assuming leadership of the
8	Navy VLC Program I was the Chief of Staff for
9	Defense Service Offices. During my 25-year Navy
10	career I have served in a variety of assignments
11	including as a defense counsel, assignments
12	officer, staff judge advocate, legislative counsel
13	in the Office of Legislative Affairs, as an
14	executive officer, a commanding officer, and as
15	the Executive Assistant Special Counsel to the
16	General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.
17	As the Chief of the Navy Victim Legal
18	Counsel Program I have the privilege to lead a
19	global organization supervising 44 zealous Navy
20	victim legal counsels serving in the field as well
21	as civilian paralegals and administrative support
22	staff. Since January of 2022 I have traveled

extensively and by the end of this month I will 1 2 have visited 23 of our 27 locations where Navy VLC I expect to visit the remaining four 3 work. overseas locations in January of 2023. 4 I meet individually with each of my VLC 5 either in person or via Teams at least one time 6 I meet with my VLCP officer in 7 per quarter. charge at least twice monthly, and I conduct 8 9 frequent synced calls with the Chief Trial Judge 10 of the Navy and Marine Corps, the Chief Judge of 11 the Department of the Navy, as well as other 12 military justice leaders including the leadership of the new Office of Special Trial Counsel. 13 Ι 14 speak frequently with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and Commander -- Naval Legal Service 15 16 Command who is my reporting senior. For today's testimony I look forward to 17 18 discussing the issues proscribed by the DAC-IPAD 19 regarding victim impact statements, VLC training 20 with regard to victim impact statements, and VLC 21 involvement with the appellate practice, as well

as any other areas you may raise. Thank you.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	LTCOL PEDDEN: Good morning, Your Honor
2	Madam Chairwoman, members of the Committee. My
3	name is Lieutenant Colonel Iain Pedden. I'm the
4	Chief Victims' Legal Counsel of the United States
5	Marine Corps. In the interest of judicial economy
6	and brevity I'm going to minimize the introduction
7	and say only that the mission of the Navy Victim
8	Legal Counsel organization is to provide legal
9	advice, legal counseling, and representation to
10	victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and
11	other offenses at all phases of the military
12	justice process.
13	And if you'll permit me one point of
14	order, which I did speak to Mr. Guilds about after
15	his remarks, that includes specifically civilians
16	that are otherwise unaffiliated with the military.
17	I grant exception to policy requests every time
18	they request it. And so that includes many
19	victims who would have otherwise no affiliation
20	with the military whatsoever.
21	Again beyond that, in the interest of
22	time, I'll defer any further comments. I very

	-
1	much look forward to your questions. Thank you.
2	COL PARK: Good morning, Madam Chair,
3	ladies and gentlemen. I'm Colonel Tracy Park and
4	I am the Chief of the Victims' Counsel for the
5	Department of the Air Force. I have been in this
6	role since July of 2021. In this capacity I'm
7	responsible for strengthening support to victims,
8	advancing the overall effort to building a culture
9	of trust and respect, and eliminating barriers to
10	full participation by victims of violent crimes.
11	My team is comprised of 60 judge
12	advocates, 52 paralegals, and one civilian
13	appellate counsel at 49 locations worldwide. Our
14	victims' counsel and paralegals are detailed to
15	represent victims of sex-related offenses and
16	domestic violence crimes for military courts-
17	martial and in administrative legal matters, as
18	well as provide confidential legal advice to
19	victims of interpersonal violence including
20	victims of sexual harassment.
21	Our mission is to advise, advocate for,
22	and empower victims of violent crime. We

represent the victim and only the victim and not the chain of command at any particular base. In this way no one in the chain of command of either the victim or the offender will influence a victims' counsel's representation.

I have served as a prosecutor involved 6 in the investigation and pretrial preparation of 7 8 victim-centric offenses such as assault, child 9 pornography, and sexual assault. I've also served as a special assistant United States attorney and 10 11 liaison to the local prosecuting attorney's 12 office. I have also been a staff judge advocate 13 advising convening authorities and commanders on 14 a variety of disciplinary and military justice matters including victim care and support. 15

16 In this capacity I've trained 17 commanders and discussed policies and procedures 18 working to ensure victims are treated with dignity 19 and respect and have access to the proper 20 resources. My recent experience with victim 21 impact statements have been through oversight of 22 the victims' counsel training and issues raised

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

1	through victims' counsel in this role.
2	Thank you for inviting me. I am
3	honored to be here and look forward to answering
4	your questions.
5	MS. MAROTTA: Good morning. I'm
6	Elizabeth Marotta, the Chief of Office of Member
7	Advocacy for the United States Coast Guard. I'm
8	responsible for both Special Victims' counsel
9	Program and the disability attorney function.
10	Prior to the Coast Guard I served 25
11	years in the Army and retired at the rank of
12	colonel. While in the Army I most recently served
13	as the Chief of Defense Appellate Division and the
14	Special Victims' Counsel Program manager. I also
15	served in numerous other positions including staff
16	judge advocate, Deputy Government Appellate
17	Division, Government Appellate Division, Chief of
18	Justice and trial counsel on two occasions.
19	My experience with victim impact
20	statements in the Coast Guard is limited as only
21	a small number of cases make it that far,
22	therefore it's difficult to capture trends as how

judges are treating victim impact statements. 1 2 However we believe the judges are following the rules as written. I look forward to answering 3 4 your questions. 5 MEMBER LONG: My question is for Lieutenant Colonel Pedden. I want to make sure I 6 7 understood. Did you say that the special victims' counsel can represent non-military victims? 8 Is 9 that what you were clarifying? 10 LTCOL PEDDEN: Yes, ma'am, that's The general policy is that ordinarily we 11 correct. 12 wouldn't offer those services as a matter of right 13 as opposed to military service members who are 14 entitled to those services as a matter of right. 15 However, when it's in the best interest of the 16 client, when a client requests, I can make an exception to policy. 17 I've never denied one. 18 MEMBER LONG: Thank you very much. And 19 I was curious about the other members, if you 20 could respond to that? 21 COL BREWER: Sure. On behalf of the 22 Army I do have that authority to grant those

1 exceptions to policy. We get those pretty 2 frequently from someone -- the most common that we get are people who were previously entitled to our 3 services because they're either a dependent or a 4 5 service member and they've lost that eligibility because they've left the service for one reason or 6 7 another, or in many cases have divorced the person who's currently under investigation for assaulting 8 9 Those are granted 100 percent of the time. them. 10 We do also get requests from people who have had no prior affiliation with the Department 11 12 of Defense and are therefore not by right entitled

13 to our services. And those we approve depending 14 on the circumstances. If there's a reason to 15 believe that that victim's interests are not going 16 to be aligned with the government, if there's some 17 very strong military nexus based upon their 18 employment or how this assault occurred, we 19 generally approve those. We approve those in the 20 vast majority of the cases. Probably about 1 out 21 of every 10 requests of that type is rejected. 22 Every other one where they were prior-entitled to

1

our services are approved.

2 CHAIR SMITH: Is there a process for 3 referring non-military victims for -- to get that 4 victim assistance?

5 Yes, ma'am. COL BREWER: Whenever a victim meets with either an investigator or any 6 7 other victim support services they're made aware of our program. And if they request a special 8 9 victim counsel, they're forwarded to that office and those people conduct an initial inquiry and 10 11 then will forward a memorandum to my office 12 explaining why they believe an exception to policy should or should not be approved. My team will 13 14 conduct any follow-up questions, and then usually within about a day we either approve or deny that 15 16 request and make sure that the victim and their 17 assigned SVC are informed of that.

18 CAPT CIMMINO: For us in the Navy the 19 similar process to our colleagues. Since I've 20 been in the position I have not denied any request 21 as a VLC has submitted the package, giving their 22 advice on whether they should be represented.

Anyone that has requested representation and my 1 2 counsel believe it's necessary. We have just approved every single one of them. Thank you. 3 COL PARK: Good morning. So we have a 4 5 similar process called the extraordinary circumstances request. So we will see quite 6 7 frequently folks who -- civilians who are not 8 otherwise authorized services. Frequently I do 9 approve them. My subordinate district chiefs are 10 also authorized to approve those and frequently do We typically look at a couple of factors, 11 so. 12 which is the status of the victim, the status of 13 the accused, the nature of the offense and the 14 legal needs that are described, and to find out whether or not there are other avenues for a 15 16 victim to receive legal services before detailing 17 a victims' counsel.

MS. MAROTTA We also have the same process and do similar analysis. We've gotten to the point where our investigative services will routinely contact us and say we have a victim here who would like your services. And then we'll

coordinate with the victim and make sure that they 1 2 understand and are asking for our assistance. This is Meghan Tokash 3 MEMBER TOKASH: for the record. My question for each of the panel 4 5 members is what training are you providing to your counsel with respect to enforcement mechanisms for 6 7 the CDRA? And if you know now, what is the data with respect to each of your services for numbers 8 9 of appeals filed when there are actual or perceived violations of 18 U.S.C. 3771? Thank 10 11 you. 12 COL BREWER: So during our 13 certification course our SVCs receive training on 14 kind of a historical perspective of how victims' rights have developed and what victim rights are 15 16 applicable to their client. So if they understand 17 what those are and can then explain that to their 18 clients so their clients understand why their SVC 19 is bringing up certain matters, why we're 20 encouraging them to do certain things, and what 21 our recommendations are going to be, but -- so 22 that they understand what their rights are

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

regardless of whether or not the SVC is even thinking about it, the victim. We want them to be empowered by understanding what their rights are. So that's our primary focus when we train them on those.

What they are also training on is that 6 7 when they perceive that there's a violation and 8 have done what they can at the local level to 9 alert trial counsel, defense counsel, staff judge advocates, judges to that perceived violation and 10 11 then -- and are not receiving a remedy, that they 12 would then alert us and then would consider whether or not a writ or some other assured relief 13 14 is the right path.

Our SVCs routinely assist their clients 15 16 with filing congressional inquiries, other 17 complaints against the chain of command for those 18 violations. We have not had a writ filed in quite 19 some time. I am not aware of any since I have been in the seat. We do have a file cabinet of 20 21 those that were filed because -- and what that indicates to me is that as this has become a more 22

1

2

3

4

5

settled area of law there have been fewer situations where we cannot remedy this by the normal negotiations and bringing matters to the judges' attention.

5 And we have seen it in general when we reach out to a trial counsel and say you are 6 7 failing to do X, Y, or Z. In general it's not 8 through malice, but through an oversight or just 9 someone being new to the position and not understanding that and once made aware have 10 11 complied and have been provided whatever notice or 12 access has been available. So that's been the 13 experience that I've seen in my year-and-a-half 14 with the Army program.

Similar to us, ma'am, on 15 CAPT CIMMINO: 16 this historical trend and the training that we do 17 in our certification course and then building up 18 as they go through if we have monthly trainings that may be necessary to remind folks. 19 But I am unaware of any situation since I've been in the 20 21 seat in October where we haven't been able to resolve those issues at lower levels. 22 So I'm not

1

2

3

aware of any data, but I can -- I could take that 1 2 question back and see if there's anything we could provide back, if I have anything. 3 Over. LTCOL PEDDEN: Thank you for the 4 5 question and it's an interesting one. I'11 respond I guess in two different ways: First, I 6 7 don't know exactly what the empirical data is, although you've got me curious enough to ask now. 8 9 I suspect that the numbers are very low. 10 I will tell you that we currently have one case that is docketed. It is a written appeal 11 that was the subject of a summary denial by the 12 13 NMCCA about a month-and-a-half ago and that case 14 is now docketed at CAAF. Whether or not they're going to grant or direct briefing or anything else 15 16 we don't know and I don't want to comment on the 17 facts and circumstances of the case for obvious 18 But that's the one of which I'm aware at reasons. 19 this moment. 20 As to training that you asked about, we 21 provide about four hours of training during the

VLC certification course on a combination of writ

and appellate practice with respect to the matters 1 2 that you're asking about. I would draw an important distinction here between writs as what 3 I view as routine practice, not necessarily 4 exceptional or extraordinary, and then appeals. 5 And so for example, a writ taken from 6 7 the decision of a military judge and contrary to a victim's rights pursuant to say MRE 412, I would 8 9 view that as a routine practice to file a request for the grant of a writ at the Court of Criminal 10 I don't necessarily view that as an 11 Appeals. 12 appeal of what the judge said. That's the last

means by which the victim can vindicate their interest at trial before the information, for example, that's protected by MRE 412 is actually made public or otherwise disclosed or made available for use by defense at trial. And so that's routine practice.

A writ appeal from the CCA to CAAF I
would view as appellate practice, much as I would
view appellate practice and perhaps the VLC role
in an appeal on a case that resulted in a

conviction of an accused that was the subject of an automatic appeal, for example, at the CCA. The VLC and the victim may well need to have a voice in that process as well. And so there are some distinct areas here that I think merit exploration.

7 I will get back to you and to the
8 Committee on the empirical number. I think it's
9 actually very small.

Good morning again. 10 COL PARK: So we 11 actually have an appellate -- civilian appellate 12 counsel. So Ms. Devon Wells. She's sitting in 13 the back. She has been with us since April of 14 2021 and she brings invaluable experience. She served as a victims' counsel in the Army while on 15 16 active duty before coming to us.

17 In terms of training she really 18 spearheads the training for our victims' counsel 19 and victims' paralegals on appellate matters. She 20 teaches at our victims' counsel certification 21 course. She does regular division training and 22 she teaches at our advanced sexual assault

1

2

3

4

5

litigation course as well. And she also supports other services when requested to speak about her practice as appellate counsel. To date she's actually represented 32 victims on appellate matters.

In terms of the writs she's actually 6 filed in the last 18 months five -- I'm going to 7 8 skip back to my notes -- five petitions for 9 extraordinary leave to the Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals and the court ordered answers in 10 11 The petitions addressed all of the cases. 12 differing rights and concerns under Article 6(b) 13 and generally involving victim standing, privacy, 14 and fairness. She filed one writ appeal at the 15 Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces on the case 16 for standing, but it was summarily denied. And that is all I have. 17

MS. MAROTTA: In the Coast Guard we attend DoD certification courses because we don't have our own schoolhouse. So the -- we rely on what is taught at the DoD courses for our SVC, however we also conduct bimonthly training where

1

2

3

4

we all come together and we do refresher training or deep dives on topics.

As far as writs goes we do have a 3 4 civilian attorney who does our appellate practice, 5 works with the SVCs if they have an issue that comes up during trial and most recently we had a 6 writ last month and it was granted. 7

8 Thank you very much MEMBER GOLDBERG: 9 for your presentations. So I have a little -small bucket of questions that go to the -- I 10 11 don't know if you were here for the earlier discussion about jury selection, panel selection, 12 13 but one question goes to what -- again what I had 14 heard, which is that women are disproportionately excluded from being -- is juror the right word? 15 16 I think I was using the --17 PARTICIPANT: Panels.

MEMBER GOLDBERG: 19 PARTICIPANT: Panel.

20 MEMBER GOLDBERG: Panel? See I --21 right. I mean the panel that is making the 22 decision in a specific court-martial, not the

Sorry?

18

1

panel from which all of the members are drawn. 1 So I heard that women were being 2 disproportionately excluded in part because 3 4 they're more likely to be -- have experienced 5 sexual assault and in part because they're more likely to have been trained as a victim advocate. 6 And I'm wondering if that is consistent with your 7 8 experience. And if it is: (A) whether you think 9 people with the training can be impartial; and (B) do you have thoughts on how to address that, 10 11 whether it's an Article 25, or Rule 25, or 12 whatever, or any -- in any other way? 13 And then second, did you have -- or in 14 the voir dire process if there are additional constraints that you would recommend for that 15 16 process? 17 And then second, whether you have any 18 recommendations related to RCM 1001 that we 19 haven't already discussed? And no need to go --20 and if others agree with what a person has said, 21 that would be fine, or happy to hear from all of 22 you, whatever you think best.

1	COL BREWER: And yet we'll still start
2	at one end of the table and move down.
3	(Laughter.)
4	COL BREWER: No, thank you for that
5	question. From my experience in the courtroom
6	there are definitely fewer women on panels than
7	we'd like. And I think it's very clear from the
8	description that you heard earlier of how panels
9	are selected that obviously if you're pulling from
10	the senior of both enlisted and officers the
11	number of women in that pool is much less. So
12	there are going to be fewer women even just
13	available to be on those panels.
14	And then if we look within the other
15	part of that, how many are going to be subject to
16	even just the questions about that prior training
17	as a victim advocate, as a prior victim. Women I
18	think do volunteer for those positions at a high
19	rate, however what we've seen is just because of
20	the breakdown of who exists in the military in
21	terms of male and female we have lots of men who
22	are also victim advocates and work throughout the

1

SHARP Program.

2	I have seen both men and women receive
3	harsh questions and very, very deep dives into the
4	impact of that training on them as a panel member.
5	Does this impact how they view a victim's report
6	of a crime? And then what I would do as a special
7	victim prosecutor during voir dire would be to ask
8	those rehabilitating questions about the fact that
9	they're still fair, they're still open as a matter
10	of fact that they're received education on how
11	trauma impacts the way a person reports over the
12	period of time. And the problem is that yes, that
13	may bias them, but it biases them to have to be
14	educated about an area that's critically important
15	to those types of trials as we proceed.
16	So we can argue for the fact that that
17	prior experience is not a bias. It then falls to
18	a judge whether or not they find that that
19	supports a them being excluded for cause or
20	and whether or not or forces the person doing
21	that deep inquiry into using their preemptory
~~	

22 challenge, which as we've already discussed

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

there's just that one. So I have seen far too few 1 2 women on panels. Very frequently if there is a woman on the panel it's just one. 3 I can only 4 think of one case where there were two. 5 And so that is definitely something where, as the panel members earlier discussed --6 7 having inclusion being part of what's permitted I 8 think would go a long way towards making sure that 9 our commanders have that tool to be able to reach into their formation and specifically look for 10 women to be on their panels. When I've had that 11 12 experience of helping commanders pick those panels 13 I've been lucky that I had commanders who already 14 did that on their own. They wanted them to be an inclusive group and did their best to make sure 15 16 they were.

And so I think that's probably the best remedy is just continuing to train on how to do voir dire, how to rehabilitate, and for our judges on why someone being smart doesn't mean that they're biased. And I think that would help a great deal across the board. And I'll pass it

along to anybody else.

2	CAPT CIMMINO: Just as a follow up, I
3	think anyone could be impartial as they go through
4	the process, but just by her training or that
5	individual's training I hope that's not the
6	limiter. I don't have the specific empirical data
7	to show what the numbers were, but I did ask that
8	question in the back, are we really under-
9	represented in gender or race? What are the
10	numbers? So I'd like to see the numbers before I
11	commented on the specifics.
12	But I think as Colonel Brewer said,
13	throughout any process I would hope that folks
14	understanding the rules could be impartial. Just
15	because they have that training doesn't mean they
16	would have a specific situation how they would
17	work on the panel.
18	LTCOL PEDDEN: I would agree with
19	Captain Cimmino's assessment in that regard. I
20	mean voir dire is the appropriate and transparent
21	process for determining whether or not a person is
22	qualified to sit after applying the Article 25

I'm not sure that Article 25 would be 1 criteria. 2 the right place to assert modifications to that. But with respect to under-3 representation I think without seeing specific 4 numbers, I think as a general rule that's true and 5 likely more so in the Marine Corps than elsewhere. 6 7 I believe that we have fewer women serving in the 8 Marine Corps proportionately than in the other 9 And women are more likely to experience services. sexual assault. And so those two factors combined 10 11 might operate to minimize the representation of 12 women on our various panels and courts-martial. I'd want to look carefully at numbers. 13 14 And I believe if I'm not mistaken, the Government Accountability Office has looked at some of those 15 16 issues in the past. And they're presenting I 17 think tomorrow or later today. That might be an 18 important question for them, too. But that was probably a very long yes. I think there's under-19 20 representation, Madam Secretary. And I'm not sure 21 that it's within the purview of the victims' legal 22 lane to propose changes to Article 25, but I would

certainly welcome better representation on the panels.

3 COL PARK: I don't have anything to 4 add.

5 MEMBER GOLDBERG: If you had anything on 1001, RCM 1001? I should also say that what I 6 7 was -- part of the prompt for the question related 8 to over-representation of women among victims' 9 legal counsel and SVCs was -- and those who have that training was -- it was suggested to me that 10 11 a number of women over their careers have been 12 volun-told that these are positions they should 13 take so that it's not only a disproportionate 14 expression of interest, but a kind of guiding of 15 women into these roles.

16 I'm not asking you to address that 17 question, although I see several of you nodding, 18 but that's where that question came from.

19 COL BREWER: Ma'am, I'll say that 20 amongst our program, the Special Victims' Counsel 21 Program, it's not disproportionately female. We 22 have many, many men within the system.

1

1	L.
1	And what we found interesting was that,
2	while female victims, we don't have a high
3	prevalence of them expressing a preference as to
4	the gender of their counsel, we have seen that
5	with male victims, that they really do appreciate
6	being able to have a male SVC. But we have a
7	large number of men within our team.
8	In terms of the proposals from JSC, we
9	fully support the idea of specifically allowing
10	the SVCs to be definitively heard on the
11	objections regarding victim impact statements. It
12	just was not it's been judge dependent.
13	Many judges allow counsel to be heard
14	on that matter. And it just seems that obviously
15	that is the person best equipped to be heard on
16	that matter as to why something is, in fact,
17	victim impact and not something objectionable to
18	ask a trial counsel, who's representing the
19	government's interests, to be able to have that
20	in-depth knowledge and be prepared to answer that.
21	It's just not the best answer. So we fully
22	support that.

We also supported the other changes of 1 2 allowing a broader definition of victim impact, because it just seems that why would the person 3 deciding what the appropriate sentence is not 4 benefit from hearing about all the different areas 5 of impact that that crime had on not only that 6 7 victim but those close to her. The only caution I saw personally was 8 9 when it defined other people who could speak as the victim's family, just to keep in mind that 10 11 every victim may define that word very differently, and that left to kind of a 12 traditional definition of family we might leave 13 14 people out who we're not intending to, such as fiances, caregivers, and even I can imagine the 15 16 soldier who takes that first report from their 17 friend and escorts them through that process, 18 encourages them to report. The impact on that 19 person is also something I, as a prosecutor, would 20 absolutely put on the stand to talk about the 21 impact to the military.

22

And I'll defer to the rest of the team

for some of the other changes to RCM 1001 that I'm sure I'm not thinking of right now. But we just thought in general, as we talked about it as a team, because we do tend to talk amongst ourselves, that in general granting greater rights to victims to speak before these proceedings is an incredibly positive change.

8 CHAIR SMITH: Do you think that having 9 judge sentencing versus panel sentencing will 10 alleviate some of the concern with respect to 11 allowing victims to freely speak about their 12 experience?

LTCOL PEDDEN: Thank you for the
question, Your Honor. I think the short answer to
your question is yes or at least it should.

With respect to the proposed modifications to RCM 1001, the removal of that language doesn't quite persuade me that the new rule says what we think it would, right. And so, if you just read the rule on its face after the removal of that language, what it says is that the victim may only offer victim impact and

mitigation, which presumptively means nothing else.

And so I think that the -- I didn't 3 4 make it through all 826 pages, but the read-ahead 5 materials had some questions about that, too. And we think that very expressing directive language 6 7 to the effect that the victim may express a view 8 with respect to an appropriate sentence on an 9 offense would be more constructive and better able 10 to accomplish that goal. 11 With respect to judge-alone sentencing, 12 Your Honor, I think that should alleviate a lot of 13 those questions. And it's probably a good 14 opportunity to point out the irony of judge-alone 15 proceedings now. 16 And so several other panel members have 17 expressed concerns about the submission of a 18 statement, for example, in advance and that the 19 statement is given to the military judge, given to 20 the defense counsel, and counsel for the 21 government. They all read it. There are 22 potentially arguments about its prudence or

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

www.nealrgross.com

admissibility. The statement may or may not be
 redacted. And then it's returned to the victim
 for a recitation into the record.

In a judge-alone proceeding, the judge has already seen every word on that document. The only person that's not allowed to speak those words is the victim.

8 And that strikes me as a little bit 9 ironic, especially in a scenario where the judge is presumed to be able to faithfully apply the law 10 and to ignore those portions of a statement that 11 12 are impermissible, as would a judge with those portions of a statement of an accused which are 13 14 impermissible during the unsworn statement of that 15 party to the proceedings.

16And so I think it would alleviate some17of the concerns. I'm not convinced that without18specific language in RCM 1001 that those concerns19will actually be furthered by the rule.20MEMBER WALTON: Regarding individuals21who identify differently than their biological

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

sex, are there any unique issues related to that

population that we need to be concerned about, who are purported victims?

I will just say that we 3 COL BREWER: don't track our client, victim clients by whether 4 5 they are transgender, identify by any way that they choose is appropriate, or by their given 6 7 gender. We don't track by that. So we don't really have statistics to show that. 8 I can tell 9 you I get very few reports from my team about that 10 issue. 11 I will say during the Air Force 12 certification course last May one of the SVCs in

13 training was transgender and offered to them that14 she believes there are unique issues.

And so I think having someone who's got 15 16 that experience is probably the best place to go 17 for that, because she very generously offered that 18 anybody who had that issue, where that was a topic that was part of the climate they were supporting 19 a victim through, could reach out to her 20 21 regardless of branch to get that support and that 22 assistance from someone who comes from a place of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

1

2	But we don't track that, nor am I aware
3	of any circumstances where we've addressed it.
4	COL PARK: So we did, so at the Air
5	Force certification course, we did have a block on
6	LGBTQ and male victimization. And we've had
7	training in the past just to identify some
8	sensitivities and other legal issues that may
9	arise.
10	We don't, again, track any of the
11	statistics on I don't get the information on
12	our particular victims that we represent. But we
13	have identified it as an area that probably needs
14	to be further developed in terms of training our
15	teams.
16	LTCOL PEDDEN: If I may, Judge Walton,
17	I would offer only and I don't want to over-
18	disclose on behalf of any of my counsel. But one
19	of my counsel, among my best, is a transgender
20	woman, who has an extraordinary background and
21	experience not only in those issues as a matter of
22	personal experience but also as a matter of law.

One of her civilian objectives in her 1 2 professional practice there was helping folks go through name change processes and alleviate a lot 3 of the built in legal discrimination that's in the 4 system that those folks face. 5 I'd be happy to get you a point paper 6 back on that from somebody who has a much better 7 view of it than I do. 8 9 MEMBER WALTON: Thank you. I wanted to make sure 10 MEMBER GARVIN: 11 no one else was coming back in. Okav. 12 So I want to go back to the writ 13 practice and the appellate practice for just a 14 moment and ask you all to, this won't be a pure hypothetical, but to think beyond kind of maybe 15 16 the data you currently have, although I'd like to 17 come back to the interpretation of the data you 18 currently have at some point. 19 But the thing about victim impact 20 statements as we currently are talking about that 21 as an example of right of a victim, I want to ask a two-part appellate question. 22

1	The first part is if you know or
2	reasonably, or one of your SVCs or VLCs know or
3	reasonably should know that there will be a
4	discussion, debate over the statement in that
5	particular location about the context of it or
6	content of it, are you prepping that VLC and SVC
7	for either a writ in the moment or doing any
8	anticipatory work around a writ, around what is
9	allowed or disallowed, because what we know is
10	that this area of law is still emerging and
11	evolving. And if we don't take appeals, writs, we
12	won't get clarity of law.
13	And so are you working with your SVCs
14	and VLCs around kind of anticipating and then
15	teeing up possible writs, rather than waiting in
16	the moment and then putting a victim to the
17	decision in this moment of, oh my gosh, can we
18	reasonably try to stop this proceeding and take a
19	writ and the trauma that imposes, or is there
20	anything you're doing proactively around
21	litigation like we do in the civilian side around
22	victims' rights?

And then the second question of, if 1 2 things are allowed and the now-convicted person raises error on their ordinary appeal for what was 3 brought in, are your SVCs and VLCs participating 4 5 in that ordinary appeal as anything other than amicus, because, of course, the victim's right is 6 7 actually at issue? So two parts. I'll get us started. 8 COL BREWER: And 9 so the Army system, we don't have typically

10 appellate SVC representation. What we do have is 11 at the Army Court for Criminal Appeals, the deputy 12 clerk is also an appellate victim liaison. And 13 when there's an issue that, she provides the 14 normal notices to victims that just go throughout 15 the appellate process.

However, when there's an issue where either the victim is asking questions that indicate that that victim would need additional support or if either defense appellate or government appellate sees that issue, they contact us directly. And then we consider whether or not we have somebody who can take on that issue.

(202) 234-4433

I	
1	We would communicate obviously with, as
2	Colonel Park mentioned, their appellate counsel.
3	We'll talk with Ms. Wells. We'll talk with those
4	attorneys at GAD-DAC and at the clerk to make sure
5	that not only if we do provide that representation
6	that it's competent representation, because we
7	don't do much work in the appellate world from
8	this program.
9	We don't do a lot towards having like
10	writs kind of ready to go. We do keep the writs
11	that have been filed in the past. And those are
12	obviously available to our team.
13	We talk to them about how if they have
14	issues they can coordinate with us, and if they
15	see them coming because there's some kind of a
16	conflict, that we want to be a part of that team.
17	And thankfully our team is very communicative and
18	would reach out to us when they see those issues.
19	What our training and what our practice
20	has shown has been very effective, though, has
21	been to work with counsel ahead of time. And this
22	is where not because we're required to provide it

ahead of time, because that pre-advanced notice of 1 2 the unsworn statement can be after findings. It can be just before it's presented. And then the 3 4 judge would give everybody time to consider, and then it would go forward. 5 However, what we found is much more 6 helpful for all the parties involved, but 7 specifically our client, is to discuss it ahead of 8 9 time so that if somebody does have a change if 10 they want to request or someone says I will object to this, we can discuss it ahead of time. 11 12 And the training we provide and the 13 assistance we provide is how to articulate within 14 the bounds of that unsworn statement why it's tied to what's permissible. 15 16 So, if you're going to talk about how 17 you still have fear in the future for X, Y, and Z, 18 a judge could say, well, that's about, you know, 19 recidivism, I'm not going to allow you to talk 20 about that, that's not impact to you. 21 Teaching the team how to phrase it in a way, I worry about my future because I'm still 22

afraid of X, Y, Z, that's something that's 1 2 different because of the assault that happened, like tying it back in there and helping them use 3 4 that language to even avoid it being objectionable. 5 So I think we're kind of hitting it 6 kind of, as was said earlier, like in the kind of 7 8 battle situation during the trial process. But 9 our appellate, kind of how we help, is really still developing I would say in the Army program. 10 11 CAPT CIMMINO: As for our appellate 12 practice, it's evolving. So we have four to five 13 VLC that are assigned to our appellate team. And 14 we have them stood up. And some were formerly appellate counsel that are now VLC. 15 So, and 16 they're scattered around the world. 17 We actually just, as of earlier this 18 week, I've confirmed we have hired a GS-14 who 19 will oversee our entire appellate practice. And 20 that's one of her primary duties is to assist on 21 the appellate side. But we're getting very 22 active, separately from appellate government, to

work with our counsel, to work up packages. 1 2 On victim impact statements, we have not filed any appeals in that area. Mostly we're 3 4 dealing with 412 issues or things dealing. That's 5 where the appellate side is spending a lot of our time. 6 7 But the collaboration, our team is made 8 up of former civilian prosecutors on Reserve 9 recall to former appellate counsel to folks that are just military justice experts. So we are 10 evolving in the area. 11 12 But specifically to the victim impact 13 statement side, we're not proactive on the 14 appellate side yet, but we are evolving into that And it may be somewhere where our practice 15 area. will take us, ma'am. 16 17 LTCOL PEDDEN: We haven't seen specific 18 appeals or writs related to victim impact 19 That could be a function of how late statements. 20 in the process those things emerge. But it's 21 something I'll definitely keep my eyes open for. 22 I will say I anticipate a rise in writ

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

and appellate litigation from Marine Corps VLC community writ large, mainly because that's what I've asked them to do. I have asked them to litigate the fringe and to be very aggressive in the means by which they seek to assert the rights of their clients.

7 To that end, and I'd be remiss, I 8 failed to mention it earlier. I appreciate the 9 second bite at this apple. Our appellate program is actually sort of under construction as it were. 10 11 We recently hired a GS-15 litigation 12 attorney-adviser and expert, who concluded nearly three decades of service in the Army JAG Corps 13 14 with duty as the SVC program manager and then worked on the MJRG for a while and then came to 15 16 advise this community. His name is Mr. Peter Yob. 17 He's seated behind me to my left.

And so that's, one of his primary tasks is to make sure that our folks are trained and equipped to conduct writs and appellate practice. And we're already seeing a rise in those numbers. I expect that trend to continue.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	COL PARK: So two things, number one
2	is, in terms of filing the writs, it really
3	depends on the victim. So we've seen cases where,
4	as you said, we want to advance. You know, we
5	think that there is good room for us to grow as a
6	program or expand the rights of victims or get a
7	court to just make a decision. But the victims
8	don't want to. And ultimately, we respect the
9	victim's decision, even in terms of filing those
10	writs.
11	On the second question, I might have
12	flipped them, but the Air Force Court of Criminal
13	Appeals distinguishes between the interlocutory
14	appeals on behalf of victims and post-trial victim
15	appeals.
16	So the court's rules of practice
17	specifically provide for interlocutory petitions
18	for extraordinary relief by victims. But for
19	post-trial appeals, I think this is what you might
20	have noted, there is no specific provision for
21	appellate victims' counsel to practice. And as
22	such, victims are treated as amicus. So it

remains untested as to whether or not they would 1 2 accept this substantive motion from a victim. I have nothing to add. 3 MS. MAROTTA: I agree that, you know, our practice, even though 4 we have an appellate attorney who will enter an 5 appearance and receive copies of pleadings, our 6 7 participation is on an amicus basis. So it's more information passing to the 8 9 victims should they choose to get that information throughout the appeal. Some victims are done 10 11 after the trial. But about a third of them want 12 somebody to monitor the case and provide them information. 13 14 MEMBER TOKASH: This is Meghan Tokash. Would it be a helpful recommendation to the 15 16 services if this committee recommended augmenting 17 your offices with more civilian expertise? 18 From your testimony, it seems like each 19 of the services have some type of a civilian 20 In particular, the Air Force component. 21 highlighted what seems to be a very successful attorney handling these types of appeals. 22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

191

	L.
1	Would that be something that would be
2	helpful, that would help buttress this particular
3	area of law and make sure that crime victims'
4	rights in the military are being protected in a
5	more full-throated way?
6	COL BREWER: I will just say that I
7	don't think anything in the current rules prevents
8	any of us from taking that step. And so I think
9	obviously if this organization recommended it, I
10	think it's something that could be executed.
11	I know we've talked about like how we
12	can best utilize civilian positions within our
13	program. And so we're always open to great ideas
14	for how we can better serve the community.
15	So I don't think there's anything that
16	currently is stopping us. And we do learn from
17	each other, because we've all been, as Colonel
18	Park said, like we use their great counsel to, not
19	only in our training but as we go through the
20	process. So all of us having, you know, that
21	person in our team I think is only going to make
22	us better able to serve.

1	CAPT CIMMINO: Because we haven't
2	our person just got hired, so she'll be coming up
3	hopefully by January. Obviously, we're new to the
4	game with bringing her on board. I think to say
5	we would need more right now, the Navy has been
6	very supportive of us to provide us this resource.
7	So personally, as I sit right now, I think we're
8	adequate, given they've just hired us the person
9	to do what the language would authorize us to do.
10	MEMBER TOKASH: We'll have you report
11	back to us on how that's going.
12	CAPT CIMMINO: Yes, ma'am.
13	LTCOL PEDDEN: I think we're in the
14	same position, ma'am. You know, having just hired
15	Mr. Yob, I'm thrilled with the experience and
16	expertise he's lent us so far. I'd like an
17	opportunity to observe where that takes us for a
18	few months.
19	MS. MAROTTA: I can just add that
20	obviously the Coast Guard is very supportive of
21	having civilian attorneys. Our Deputy Judge
22	Advocate General is even a civilian attorney. And

we have two civilians in our SVC program. And we have a request in for the Coast Guard for three additional civilian attorneys.

So we do recognize that having that continuity and the expertise is invaluable to training the active duty counsel that come in and out of the role and developing them.

MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you. 8 I'd like 9 to just toss out a general question, which is, if you were to prioritize other issues related to 10 SVCs and VLCs that you think the DAC-IPAD should 11 12 be thinking about, what would you put at or near 13 the top of your list? And you're welcome to 14 follow up if you don't have them right at the top of your mind right now. 15

16 COL PARK: I think it was one of our 17 prep questions. But I think an interesting 18 concept would be the restorative justice and 19 engagement. And it is something that victims have 20 noted, to have a different avenue to have their 21 voices heard or some other type of mechanism to, 22 you know, in some cases meet with the accused

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

1	and/or senior officials and to get what they want
2	to get out of it, sometimes an apology versus what
3	they get through a conviction at a court-martial.
4	You know, they don't necessarily get that.
5	So justice looks different to every
6	victim. And from some of the feedback we've
7	received, that would be I think a program worth
8	exploring.
9	COL BREWER: I'm just going to say that
10	like we totally agree. As I said, we talked about
11	a lot of this ahead of time, that we all agree
12	that that's great.
13	I also just think having the ability
14	to, if we are given questions that you all have
15	about are these problems or, you know, you've
16	heard one anecdote, you'd like more data, we've
17	learned a lot just by having to look into that, by
18	asking our teams.
19	We've started in the Army an exit
20	survey for all of our clients. And the data is
21	new. But we're starting to get that great data
22	back, very positive but informative.

1	And so we can continue to expand that
2	and to ask them questions, like do you feel that
3	your victim impact statement was limited and to
4	explain it to us. But like whenever we get those
5	questions from you and from other sources about
6	potential problems, that's been a great
7	opportunity.
8	And to have this forum, and really I
9	think all of our services are very supportive of
10	what we can do. When we say this will help us
11	better serve our victims, we get very little
12	pushback. Most people want to be a part of that
13	positive change.
14	And so it's just when those ideas and
15	questions trigger those great ideas, like
16	restorative justice and how we could expand that
17	into the military, we've gotten mostly positive,
18	yeah, let's talk about how to implement it, very
19	little pushback onto how to do it.
20	So just, you know, whatever, whenever
21	there's those questions, we're open to being a
22	part of that conversation, and so are our teams.

They've provided us great feedback about all the questions that you all had.

MEMBER BASHFORD: I noticed you're all very accomplished, very senior members. But when, at least four of you said when you started, three of you started last year. One of you started this year. Is this a short-term assignment? And if so, do you think it should be longer?

9 COL BREWER: I'll say for the Army like most of our senior positions it's a two-year 10 position. I can say, because I have experience 11 12 with both special victim counsel and different 13 areas of litigation, it doesn't appear to be, from 14 my perspective, it's not too short. If asked to do it longer, I would be more than happy to 15 16 because it's very rewarding.

But I didn't feel like it was the type of job where because it's only two years I just am starting to understand what the challenges are as I, you know, only have six months left in the position. I've definitely had positions like that over my time in the military where as soon as I

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

understood it was about time for me to go try something else exciting.

But this job, because we're I think 3 4 very senior people, I think because we're 5 experienced in the justice process, you come into it where I certainly learned much more than I 6 7 expected, but when I started it was pretty easy to 8 understand where our mission was, what we needed 9 to do to move forward, and how I could be a 10 positive part of that. 11 So I'm scheduled to be CAPT CIMMINO: 12 here through the summer of '24 at least, ma'am. 13 I can say it's been probably the most fulfilling 14 job I've had in my career. So my predecessors did four years on 15 16 average. So I don't envision -- the JAG Corps at 17 least on the Navy does not look at this as a 18 skipping point, partly because I'm the supervising 19 attorney for all of the VLC. Everyone reports to 20 So I sign all their fitness reports. me. It's 21 important they have longevity. If I was just coming in and out, it would affect their careers. 22

1

2

	195
1	So, generally, I will be at least three
2	years until the summer of '24.
3	LTCOL PEDDEN: As the junior and newest
4	member of the panel here, ma'am, I would say a
5	couple of things. First, I work directly for the
6	Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant. And he
7	posted me to this position pursuant to my request.
8	I don't just enjoy the work. I'm passionate about
9	it. And I'd like to stay for as long as I
10	possibly can.
11	I think it's foreseeable that a two- to
12	three-year assignment or tour length is probably
13	what's in the cards for the Chief Victims' Legal
14	Counsel in the Marine Corps. If they let me stay
15	longer than that, I will.
16	COL PARK: I anticipate the same. It's
17	a two- or three-year assignment. And I think it
18	is good to have change. This program is
19	constantly changing. There's one thing to be said
20	for continuity. But there is something else to
21	see and explore.
22	I came in with a different background

1 from my predecessor. And I wanted to move the 2 program forward in different ways. So allowing us 3 to do that in a two- to three-year cycle I think 4 works. And my victims' counsel and my mid-level, 5 those district chiefs, are on a two- to three-year 6 cycle as well.

7 MS. MAROTTA: I would just add that 8 adding a civilian to each of the services will 9 accomplish the continuity and, you know, assist with the training and things like that. 10 I think 11 that that will most likely get more at what's 12 needed rather than necessarily keeping one person 13 or keeping the active duty folks longer.

14 LTCOL PEDDEN: Could I follow up on 15 that very briefly, ma'am?

16 Only to say that I think there's also 17 some independent value to be gained from having a 18 person who's been the Chief Victims' Legal Counsel 19 or in a senior SVC billet then go to other 20 billets, then cross-pollinate and make sure that 21 those practice communities are aware of some of 22 the specific challenges that our clients face and

that our attorneys face from a personnel 1 2 management perspective, that that's useful in other areas of the institution, too. 3 COL BAVARNICK: Judge Smith, before 4 everyone gets up and breaks, General Anderson just 5 had one clarifying comment just before everyone 6 starts getting up and moving around. So, General 7 Anderson. 8 9 MEMBER ANDERSON: Thank you very much, 10 and I appreciate the opportunity. I just wanted to clarify the question 11 12 I asked regarding Article 25 and using Reservists 13 and Guard personnel as members of panels. 14 Basic question on some earlier comments about the concerns about diversity, and just 15 16 wanted to determine whether or not that was being 17 used as an opportunity to increase the pool to 18 provide more diversity by adding more people of 19 color and women to the standing pools. And I only 20 heard from one service about their actual process 21 to include members of the Guard and Reserve. 22 So at least my sense is that making

this maybe a standard requirement or having a 1 2 process to provide for that opportunity for active members of the Guard and Reserve at certain 3 4 installations where they have, are tenants or are 5 subordinate organizations, and also in a larger sense for cases involving senior enlisted 6 7 personnel and senior officers when it can be 8 difficult to find peers who haven't worked 9 directly with them or maybe have a personal relationship. 10 11 So that was my clarification. Thank 12 you. 13 COL BAVARNICK: Thank you, ma'am. So, 14 Judge Smith, we're going to break for lunch now 15 until 1330. 16 CHAIR SMITH: Thank you so much for 17 appearing. 18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 19 went off the record at 12:43 p.m. and resumed at 20 1:36 p.m.) 21 COL BOVARNICK: Chair Smith and 22 Committee members, I'd like to welcome back our

distinguished visitors who provided the Committee an initial assessment in June on the establishment of the Offices of Special Trial Counsel, and they're here to provide an update.

5 I want to welcome the General Counsel 6 of the military departments, Honorable Ricci for 7 the Department of the Army, Honorable Coffey for 8 the Department of the Navy, and Honorable Beshar 9 for the Department of the Air Force.

And welcome to Lieutenant General 10 11 Risch, the Judge Advocate General of the Army; 12 Vice Admiral Crandall, the Judge Advocate General 13 of the Navy; Major General Bligh, the SJA to the 14 Commandant of the Marine Corps; and we have a late 15 addition with the Deputy Judge Advocate General of 16 the Air Force, Major General Vernon, who's joining 17 us virtual.

18 Literally, as of this morning,
19 Lieutenant General Plummer was going to join us,
20 the Judge Advocate General Of the Air Force, but
21 he couldn't make it.

22

1

2

3

4

And, ma'am, I recommend we start with

opening remarks, and we'll go right down the line 1 2 with the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and Department of the Air Force. 3 And we 4 have plenty of time for questions and answers from 5 the Panel members. So, with that, I'll turn it over to 6 7 Honorable Ricci for the Department of the Army. Thank you. Appreciate it, 8 MS. RICCI: 9 Colonel Bovarnick. Good afternoon, Judge Smith and 10 11 esteemed Committee members. Thank you for 12 providing Lieutenant General Risch and I the 13 opportunity to update you once more on the 14 progress made, as directed by Secretary Wormuth, to establish the Army's Office of Special Trial 15 16 Counsel and its integration across the Force. 17 We are happy to report that the 18 implementation of the NDAA and DoD requirements 19 are ahead of schedule, and we do not anticipate 20 any impediments to reaching established milestones 21 and achieving full operating capability by December 2023. 22

(202) 234-4433

1	The Army's effort in establishing the
2	Office of Special Trial Counsel are focused on
3	structural change that will ensure independence,
4	expertise, and preservation of the Army's
5	commitment to good order and discipline. The
6	OSTC, or the Army likes acronyms, so we call it
7	the OSTC enhances our ability to hold offenders
8	appropriately accountable, provide a victim-
9	centered response, and develop a culture of
10	respect and prevention in direct alignment with
11	the Secretary of the Army's stated objective to
12	reduce harmful behaviors.
13	Since we last spoke in June, the Army
14	OSTC was established as a field operating agency
15	through a collaborative effort between my office
16	and the Office of the Judge Advocate General. In
17	furtherance of the establishment of the OSTC, a
18	transition team led by a senior Army prosecutor
19	and a civilian attorney, both experts in special
20	victim prosecution with experience in transforming
21	policy and process, continue to work to prepare

22

I

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

the OSTC for the successful transfer of

1

disposition authorities.

2	The Army nominated a highly qualified
3	individual to serve as its first Lead Special
4	Trial Counsel in compliance with the statutory
5	requirements set by Congress for general officer
6	promotions. The Senate recently confirmed Colonel
7	Warren Wells as the U.S. Army's first Lead Special
8	Trial Counsel and for the promotion to the rank of
9	Brigadier General.
10	Now, achieving independence for both
11	the Trial Judiciary and Trial Defense Service has
12	long been a part of the Army JAG Corps's
13	operational structure. I'm confident that the
14	OSTC will likewise operate independently and that
15	it will reach referral decisions free from
16	improper influence.
17	The OSTC is a unique Army organization
18	were the lead prosecuting attorney is directly
19	supervised by the Secretary of the Army. While
20	there is no question that this organization is
21	civilian led, there will be specially trained and
22	certified military Special Trial Counsel working

across the Army that will zealously execute its mission as intended by Congress.

Independence and victim-centered expert 3 prosecutions will be the hallmark of the system 4 envisioned by Secretary Wormuth. A successful 5 system that addresses accountability, response, 6 and, most importantly, prevention will be both 7 8 independent from but fully supported by the chain 9 of command, convening authorities, and offices of the Staff Judge Advocate across the Army. 10 11 The Judge Advocate General, the 12 incoming Lead Special Trial Counsel, and I will 13 work in partnership with complementary and defined 14 roles which emphasize the requirement for independent decision-making on the litigation of 15 16 covered defenses free from improper influence 17 while ensuring the military justice enterprise is 18 optimized for the effective administration of 19 justice and good order and discipline. I will continue to monitor and assess 20

22

21

1

2

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

progress. And as I stated in June, you have my

deepest commitment to ensuring the independence

and proper resourcing of the Office of Special Trial Counsel.

I will now yield the floor to 3 4 Lieutenant General Risch to provide more detail on 5 the training and experience of counsel and timeline, all of which has my full support. 6 LTG RISCH: Thank you, ma'am. 7 Good afternoon, Madam Chairwoman and 8 9 members of the Committee. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide additional details on the 10 11 progress already achieved, as well as the plans in 12 place, for the successful implementation of the 13 Office of Special Trial Counsel by December 27th 14 of 2023. Bottom line, I am confident that the 15 16 Army is on track in effectively implementing the Fiscal Year '22 NDAA and the related DoD 17 18 requirements. As I have traveled across our 19 installations over the past year, I am buoyed by the enthusiasm that our Judge Advocates and our 20 21 paralegals are expressing and demonstrating over the transformation of our practice and the 22

208

(202) 234-4433

1

2

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

increased demand for litigation assignments and expertise within our new Office of Special Trial Counsel.

As the General Counsel mentioned, the 4 5 Senate has recently confirmed the selection by an Army Promotion Board of our Lead Special Trial 6 7 Counsel, or LSTC, Colonel Promotable Warren Wells. 8 He is eager to assume this new assignment and is 9 well prepared to establish and then lead this organization responsible for the investigation and 10 11 trial-level prosecution of all covered offenses, 12 and he is already in transition to do so.

Our new LSTC holds our highest-level 13 14 military justice skill designator and has served in multiple litigation and supervisory positions 15 16 on both the prosecution and defense sides of the 17 bar. He also served as a Staff Judge Advocate for 18 two of our largest jurisdictions with robust 19 criminal law dockets, routinely advising on referral decisions. 20

21 This combination of military justice 22 expertise and organizational leadership experience

1

2

3

makes him an ideal choice to serve as the LTSC. 1 2 I am certain that Colonel Wells will excel in the execution of his statutory obligation to supervise 3 and oversee all prosecutors within the Office of 4 the Special Trial Counsel. 5 Now, the Army's near-term focus is on 6 7 the education, training, and certification of 8 Special Trial Counsel and on the development and 9 refinement of business rules for the OSTC. The 10 statutory requirement to establish training 11 criteria and certification standards is entrusted 12 to the service TJAGS.

13 As such, I directed our current Chief 14 of our Trial Counsel Assistance Program, Colonel Rob Stelle, from whom you will hear tomorrow, to 15 16 lead the effort as the acting LSTC in standing up 17 the Office of Special Trial Counsel and to develop 18 a thorough certification course and additional 19 training requirements. He partnered with our 20 civilian attorney highly qualified experts, each 21 of whom have decades of experience in prosecuting 22 felony crimes special victims cases, to develop

business rules that ensure a sound, efficient,
 victim-centered assessment is provided in every
 reported case.

In creating our OSTC structure and 4 5 drafting all of our business rules and certification standards, Colonel Stelle and the 6 7 OSTC Operational Planning Team have taken into 8 account best practices from civilian jurisdictions 9 and the substantial experience that our civilian attorneys bring to the discussion and planning 10 11 effort.

12 Together, we have developed an initial four-week certification course and overall process 13 14 that sets rigorous standards for education, training, experience, and temperament. 15 I 16 recognize that Committee members are keenly 17 interested in observing such training, and to that 18 end, the Army has provided you with a list of over 19 90 military justice training events scheduled for 2023. 20

21 Training in the Army JAG Corps has for 22 years been a joint enterprise with our sister

services. Our schoolhouses are shining examples 1 2 of this jointness. As a perfect example, Colonel Wells, our incoming LSTC, served as an instructor 3 at the Air Force JAG School at Maxwell Air Force 4 Base for three years and was tapped to serve as 5 the Chief of their Military Justice Division. 6 7 As you may recall, in my prior statement to you last June, I discussed the 8 9 opening of the state-of-the-art Army Advocacy Center. And since that time, the Center has 10 already hosted two joint events, one hosted by the 11 12 Coast Guard, and another designed to train Judge 13 Advocates serving as special assistant U.S. 14 attorneys in each of our services. The Army, just like the other services, 15 16 has historically welcomed both students and 17 instructors from other services to share expertise 18 at our schoolhouse. Detailed planning is well 19 underway for both faculty and students from all services to both teach and train at our Advocacy 20 21 Center, learning from each other's unique 22 experiences, practices, and cultures.

1	Jointness has many benefits,
2	particularly for training. My counterparts on
3	this Panel and I routinely search for commonality
4	and consistency in education, training, policy,
5	and practice. Nevertheless, I believe it is
6	important to maintain an agile system that
7	accounts for the unique characteristics and
8	mission of each individual service.
9	Just as the federal, state, and even
10	county judicial systems are governed by common
11	statute, policy, and process, and at times conduct
12	joint training as such, individual jurisdictions
13	still operate with autonomy to suit the unique
14	needs of their community and constituency. The
15	Department of Defense and its military departments
16	are no different. Congress has long recognized
17	the unique missions and character of each service
18	and the need for independence in many of our
19	functions, including military justice.
20	I close by thanking you again. We
21	greatly appreciate the insights provided by
22	members of this Committee and by the Panel of

civilian prosecutors that preceded our appearance at the June meetings. We have benefitted from the lessons learned and shared across federal, state, and local jurisdictions to develop a structure and launch a system that features transparency, efficiency, and victim focus as well as education, training, experience, and expertise.

We are committed to continuously taking 8 9 a hard look at ourselves with an eye toward constant improvement in both the investigation and 10 adjudication of covered and non-covered offenses. 11 12 This look is both internal and external. We 13 purposely included civilian subject-matter experts 14 in our planning process and have listened carefully to their recommendations, adopting many 15 16 with a view toward opportunities for change and 17 improvement.

Additionally, our regiment has hired a Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and are in the process of hiring a wellness coordinator and a data analyst, all of whom I believe will fill current voids in our ability to

both accurately see ourselves and then plan, train, and execute policies and programs to address identified deficiencies.

Additional personnel in our recruiting and retention offices and intensified and novel efforts in those arenas will allow us to attract more and more diverse applicants and retain the experienced counsel we already have to address the growth in personnel that the Army's leadership has provided to us to support our OSTC's success.

11 I am confident that the OSTC and our 12 overall military justice system will continue to 13 emphasize experience, expertise, diversity, and 14 wellness for not only our litigators but everyone within our structure while simultaneously 15 16 providing support, transparency, continuity, and 17 compassion for our victims, all while ensuring the 18 due process that has been and must continue to be 19 its foundation.

20 Our ultimate goal is to restore the 21 trust of everyone involved in the process, a trust 22 that is absolutely vital for our system to be

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

successful. I look forward to your insights and
 questions. Thank you.

Madam Chair, distinguished 3 MR. COFFEY: members of the Committee, Committee staff, fellow 4 5 Panel members, Vice Admiral Crandall and Major General Bligh are pleased to appear before you 6 Together, we will update you on the 7 once again. 8 Department of the Navy's progress to implement the 9 requirements of the Fiscal Year '22 National Defense Authorization Act as they relate to the 10 11 Office of Special Trial Counsel or, as we say in 12 the Department of the Navy, OSTC. There are weeks 13 where the Navy may follow the Army's lead, but 14 this is not that week. I want to begin by reiterating Navy 15

Secretary Carlos Del Toro's commitment to eradicate sexual misconduct from our ranks. When we last appeared before the Committee, I described Secretary Del Toro's Implementation Advisory Panel, or IAP, a meeting of senior leaders of the Department of the Navy chaired by the acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy For Manpower and

1

Reserve Affairs.

2	The IAP continues to meet biweekly to
3	monitor progress on the Department's efforts to
4	implement military justice reforms in the FY '22
5	NDAA and to advise Secretary Del Toro on how to
6	best improve prevention response and
7	accountability through implementation of the
8	Independent Review Commission's approved
9	recommendations.
10	Since our last appearance before this
11	Committee, the IAP expedited several important
12	departmental improvements, including its Safe-To-
13	Report policy and its No Wrong Door policy. These
14	two policies encourage victims to come forward
15	without fear of being punished for minor
16	collateral misconduct and to ensure that victims
17	receive response services regardless of what
18	supporting agency they first approach.
19	The IAP receives frequent updates on
20	the OSTC because we all understand that these
21	independent, specialized, and expert officers are
22	essential to ensuring a fair system that our

sailors and Marines trust to deliver just results. 1 2 Admiral Crandall and General Bligh will update you on the specific progress the Navy and 3 Marine Corps have made in establishing the 4 Departments' two OSTCs. But before turning the 5 microphone over to my colleagues, I want to first 6 7 describe some Department-wide accomplishments in the implementation of this reform. 8 9 The Navy and Marine Corps OSTCs reached initial operational capability before Secretary of 10 11 Defense Austin's deadline of mid-July this past 12 Following that important step and upon the vear. 13 advice of his IAP, Secretary Del Toro issued his 14 policies governing the Navy and Marine Corps Offices of Special Trial Counsel. 15 16 This bedrock document lays out roles, 17 responsibilities, and expectations for the 18 Departments' two OSTCs and their assigned personnel. In it, Secretary Del Toro stresses 19 20 that the OSTCs must be independent, specialized, 21 expert, and ethical. To facilitate independence, the Lead 22

Special Trial Counsel of the Navy and the Marine
 Corps will report directly to Secretary Del Toro
 without intervening authority. The two Lead STCs
 will independently oversee all case-specific
 activities and be responsible to the Secretary for
 the effective operation and administration of
 their respective office.

Each must independently identify 8 9 requirements for organizing, manning, training, resourcing, and equipping their organizations. 10 Consistent with the provisions of Article 6 of the 11 12 Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Judge Advocate of the Navy and the Staff Judge Advocate 13 14 to the Commandant of the Marine Corps will be responsible for addressing those requirements. 15

16 The LSTCs will each serve for a 17 specified fixed term of three years, which could 18 be further extended at the Secretary's direction 19 for a fixed term of any length. Like the Lead 20 Special Trial Counsel, each Special Trial Counsel 21 shall be assigned to the OSTC for a fixed term of 22 not less than three years, which may be extended.

(202) 234-4433

	22
1	Special Trial Counsel will similarly be
2	independent of the chains of command of both the
3	accused and the victim of any covered offense. To
4	reinforce their independence, Special Trial
5	Counsel shall be supervised by a superior Special
6	Trial Counsel and evaluated only by personnel
7	assigned to the OSTC. Secretary's policy is
8	clear; no person from outside the OSTC may attempt
9	to influence a Special Trial Counsel's
10	determination regarding the disposition of any
11	offense.
12	The Department of the Navy's OSTCs will
13	maintain specialization expertise by focusing
14	their efforts on the investigation and litigation
15	of covered offenses. This emphasis on
16	specialization and expertise will be reflected in
17	the OSTC's initial training and education
18	policies. In accordance with the Secretary's
19	policy, those will be promulgated by the end of
20	this month. Standard operating procedures will
21	follow by July 1st of next year.
22	By Secretary Del Toro's policy, Special

Trial Counsel will not perform duties outside the 1 2 In fact, only the Lead Special Trial OSTC. Counsel may approve the request to detail a 3 Special Trial Counsel to a court-martial in which 4 5 the OSTC has not exercised its authority. The Lead Special Trial Counsel's authority here is 6 7 non-delegable, and the decision may not be reviewed or appealed. 8

9 Admiral Crandall and General Bligh will 10 tell you more about the Departments' selections 11 for Lead Special Trial Counsel, Captain Jonathan 12 Stephens and Colonel K. Scott Woodard, both of 13 whom have been nominated by the President. On 30 14 November, the Senate confirmed Colonel Woodard's nomination, and we anticipate a confirmation vote 15 16 on Captain Stephens in the very near future.

You'll hear from my colleagues that
these two officers possess the expertise and
acumen to faithfully execute Secretary Del Toro's
policies and will capably lead their OSTC to full
operational capability before the statute's
December 27, 2023, deadline.

	∠ 1
1	I am proud to serve as Navy GC, in
2	particular during this period of reform of the
3	military justice system. I know from my extensive
4	interaction with them that Admiral Crandall and
5	General Bligh each bring considerable energy,
6	experience, and determination to every aspect of
7	this task, and I endeavor to do my part as well.
8	But the Department's success depends on more than
9	just commitment.
10	To institutionalize transformational
11	change, we need sustainable resourcing to move
12	beyond the status quo in prevention, response, and
13	accountability. Using the OSTC and other military
14	justice reforms codified in the FY '22 NDAA as an
15	example, we expect the Department's Judge Advocate
16	community to grow by more than 150 personnel with
17	related information technology, equipment, travel,
18	training, and facility requirements.
19	The Department's detailed planning
20	accounts for this growth, but as the Committee
21	knows, the Fiscal Year '23 NDAA may expand the
22	definition of covered offenses to additional

crimes, including sexual harassment. Our ongoing assessment suggests that adding sexual harassment as a covered offense would, unsurprisingly, increase the investigative and prosecutorial workload of the OSTCs beyond what we have currently planned and might require more growth than currently budgeted.

This change may not only impact the 8 9 OSTC but would also increase the workload of Judge Advocates who defend Sailors and Marines accused 10 11 of sexual harassment. My concerns about 12 sustainable resourcing are not limited to the 13 Judge Advocate community but instead pervade all 14 aspects of the Department of the Navy's 15 prevention, response, and accountability programs. 16 And specifically, I want to apprise you of the 17 following.

We have, at the Department of the Navy,
decided that the Navy Criminal Investigative
Service, NCIS -- its professional cadre will be
tasked to investigate formal complaints of sexual
harassment throughout the Department. To expand

its mandate and ensure that sexual harassment complaints are independently, professionally, and thoroughly investigated, NCIS will have to receive resourcing commensurate with that critical mission.

I am confident that Secretary Del Toro 6 7 and other senior civilian and military leaders 8 throughout the Department will continue to 9 prioritize these reforms in our plans and our budgets. But I share this with the Committee 10 11 because I hope that as you discharge your 12 important responsibility to provide advice and recommendations on the investigation, prosecution, 13 and defense of criminal misconduct in the Armed 14 15 Forces, that you will take to heart this message. 16 The military departments need sustainable 17 resourcing to end this scourge of sexual 18 misconduct which has plagued us for far too long. 19 With that, I'll turn to Admiral 20 Crandall and General Bligh for specific updates on 21 the Navy and Marine Corps Offices of Special Trial 22 Counsel.

1

2

3

4

	2.
1	Admiral?
2	VADM CRANDALL: Thank you, Mr. Coffey.
3	Madam Chair Smith and distinguish
4	members, thank you for the opportunity to update
5	you on the significant progress we've made to
6	successfully implement the Navy's Office of
7	Special Trial Counsel. As Mr. Coffey stated, we
8	remain fully on track to establish the Office of
9	Special Trial Counsel by December 2023.
10	At our last meeting in June, General
11	Bligh and I laid out our four-phase approach to
12	reach full OSTC operational capability. We
13	previously completed Phase 1 planning and remain
14	deeply involved in Phase 2, the building phase, as
15	we are committed to building a Navy Office of
16	Special Trial Counsel that is independent,
17	specialized, and expert.
18	The Navy's Office of Special Trial
19	Counsel will utilize a centralized oversight and
20	decentralized execution of the mission. The Navy
21	will field an OSTC consisting in part of a lean
22	headquarters function here in D.C. and two main

regional offices, one in Norfolk and the other in 1 2 San Diego, comprised of approximately 90 personnel, officer, enlisted, and civilian staff. 3 They will support the fleet in ten 4 5 different geographic locations. The OSTC will be led by a flag officer who will report directly to 6 the Secretary and be responsible for the effective 7 operations and administration of the OSTC. 8 9 As Mr. Coffey mentioned, after selection by a Promotion Selection Board, which 10 11 convened in May of 2022, the President has 12 nominated Captain Jonathan Stephens for advancement to Rear Admiral Lower Half. 13 If 14 Confirmed by the Senate, Captain Stephens will serve as a Lead Special Trial Counsel for the 15 16 Navy's OSTC. 17 He's been serving as the Secretary's 18 interim Lead for the OSTC since June of 2022, 19 working to ensure full operating capability by 20 December. He brings an extensive knowledge of 21 every facet of our military justice system. 22 Having served with the OJAG

Headquarters, Criminal Law Division, working 1 2 policy issues, and also having served as a senior defense counsel, a senior trial counsel, a 3 military judge, Commanding Officer of Defense 4 Service Office West, and most recently Chief Judge 5 of the Navy-Marine Corps Trial Judiciary, Captain 6 7 Stephens has been a part of the Navy's Military 8 Justice Litigation Career Track since 2008 and is 9 a military justice expert within the track. He has a tireless work ethic and an 10 11 innovative mindset. And if confirmed, he will be 12 a sterling leader for the Navy's OSTC. In addition to being independent of the 13 14 chain of command, as the General Counsel highlighted, the Navy's OSTC will be specialized 15 16 and laser focused on those statutory duties of 17 investigating and prosecuting covered offenses. 18 Only the Lead Special Trial Counsel may approve 19 his or her counsel to perform duties outside of the Office of Special Trial Counsel, including 20 21 detailed courts-martial involving non-covered 22 offenses.

1	In September of this year, pursuant to
2	Article 24 Alpha, subparagraph Bravo of the UCMJ,
3	I established criteria for certification and
4	assignment of Navy Special Trial Counsel.
5	Specifically, they must have completed all
6	necessary educational and licensing requirements,
7	have been previously certified by me to be
8	detailed as a trial counsel for a general court-
9	martial under Article 27 Bravo of the UCMJ, have
10	been previously sworn to perform duties of a trial
11	counsel in accordance with Article 42 Alpha UCMJ,
12	and have successfully completed a course
13	specifically focused on the litigation of special
14	victim crimes or one focused on the litigation of
15	covered offenses.
16	Additionally, all Special Trial Counsel
17	must have successfully completed the Department of
18	the Navy's Military Justice Orientation Course and
19	the Special Trial Counsel Certification Course.
20	Further, a Special Trial Counsel must have been

22 Military Justice Litigation Career Track.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

previously selected as a Specialist 1 in the

21

	4
1	The Navy established the track in 2007
2	to identify, select, develop, train, and retain
3	Judge Advocates with a demonstrated aptitude for
4	military justice litigation. Selection as a
5	military justice litigation career track officer
6	occurs via a competitive board process.
7	A Judge Advocate selected as a
8	Specialist 1 must have a minimum of 24 months of
9	experience in military justice litigation billets,
10	which includes service as a trial or defense
11	counsel, military commissions trial or defense
12	counsel, appellate government or defense counsel,
13	victim's legal counsel, or a military trial or
14	appellate judge.
15	Additionally, applicants for
16	designation as a Specialist 1 must have
17	substantial participation in at least ten courts-
18	martial or complex hearings. Finally, those
19	selected for certification must have the proper
20	temperament, including sound judgment under
21	stressful circumstances, maturity, composure,
22	levelheadedness, fairness, character, and

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC integrity.

2	Those in the rank of Commander or above
3	who are selected for STC certification and an OSTC
4	leadership billet must meet all of those criteria,
5	as well as having completed an approved masters of
6	law program or an analogous litigation externship.
7	They must also have been previously selected as a
8	Specialist 2 or an expert in the Military Justice
9	Litigation Career Track and have previously
10	completed a Special Trial Counsel tour or have
11	served in a military justice leadership billet in
12	a large fleet concentration area.
13	A Judge Advocate selected as a
14	Specialist 2 must have a minimum of 84 months of
15	experience in military justice litigation billets
16	and must have substantial participation in at
17	least 20 courts-martial or complex hearings. A
18	Judge Advocate selected as an expert must have a
19	minimum of 12 years experience in military justice
20	litigation billets and substantial participation
21	in at least 50 courts-martial or complex hearings.
22	We have identified a core cadre of our

first Special Trial Counsel that best meet these 1 2 criteria and have provisionally slated them for assignment to our OSTC offices around the globe 3 with a report date of summer 2023. The 4 5 establishment of the OSTC also includes the expansion of Navy Defense Service Offices with 6 7 additional Judge Advocates and enlisted and 8 civilian support staff to ensure that all the 9 accused charged with a covered offense are represented by well-trained, experienced, and 10 11 skilled defense teams.

12 The Navy utilizes a career military 13 justice training continuum that includes the 14 Defending Sexual Assault Cases course, training at 15 the National Criminal Defense College, and through the National Association of Criminal Defense 16 17 Lawyers, among others, to ensure that Navy defense 18 counsel will have similar qualification in terms 19 of experience and expertise as Special Trial 20 Counsel.

21 General Bligh will now discuss the 22 Marines' efforts since our last meeting in June.

	2
1	MAJGEN BLIGH: Madam Chair Smith,
2	distinguished members, thank you for the
3	opportunity to appear before you today to discuss
4	the Marine Corps's Office of Special Trial
5	Counsel.
6	Central to these efforts is the
7	establishment of a constitutionally sound system
8	for the prosecution and defense of covered
9	offenses. Like the Navy, the Marine Corps's
10	Office of Special Trial Counsel will be
11	independent, specialized, and possessing the
12	expertise necessary to fully and successfully
13	execute its mission.
14	The Marine Corps's Office of Special
15	Trial Counsel will also utilize centralized
16	oversight and decentralized execution of the
17	mission. It will consist of a lean headquarters
18	element and four regional offices, the east at
19	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; the west at Camp
20	Pendleton, California; the Pacific at Camp Foster,
21	Okinawa, Japan; and then the National Capital
22	Region at the Marine Corps Base Quantico.

These regional offices will be led by 1 2 senior experienced litigators with oversight and supervision of Special Trial Counsel at nine 3 installations. As Mr. Coffey has already 4 indicated, the President has nominated, and in the 5 last week the Senate confirmed, Colonel Scott 6 7 Woodard to serve as the first Lead Special Trial Counsel of the Marine Corps. 8 9 Colonel Woodard is an exceptional 10 choice, having extensive military justice 11 experience as a trial counsel, defense counsel, 12 military justice instructor, trial judge, Chief 13 Judge of the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Criminal 14 Appeals, and most recently as my principal advisor on all military justice matters. 15 16 Colonel Woodard's criminal justice 17 experience, however, is not limited to just 18 military justice. He also served as a Commandant 19 of the Marine Corps Fellow at the Department of 20 Justice, where he participated in the 21 investigation and prosecution of domestic and international terrorism subjects as a member of 22

DOJ'S National Security Division Counterterrorism Section.

1

2

3	In September, pursuant to Article 24(a)
4	UCMJ, I established the criteria to certify Marine
5	Corps Judge Advocates to serve as Special Trial
6	Counsel. The certification criteria include,
7	similar to the Navy's, completion of all
8	educational and licensing requirements necessary
9	for assignment as a Judge Advocate, certification
10	by the Judge Advocate under Article 27(b) of the
11	UCMJ, and be sworn under Article 42(a) of the
12	UCMJ, and successful completion of a course
13	focused on the litigation of special victim crimes
14	or a course specifically focused on the litigation
15	of covered offenses.
16	Judge Advocates must also successfully

17 complete a Special Trial Counsel certification
18 course. Further, the Judge Advocate in the ranks
19 of Captain and Major must possess at least 24
20 months of experience in military justice
21 litigation, which includes service in billets such
22 as trial or defense counsel, military commissions

trial or defense counsel, appellate government or 1 2 appellate defense counsel, victims legal counsel, and military trial or appellate judge. 3 Additionally, these Judge Advocates 4 must have participated in a minimum of ten courts-5 martial, tribunals, or complex hearings involving 6 7 covered offenses, including at least one courtmartial or tribunal involving a covered offense 8 9 that was tried to verdict. Our Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel 10 11 leaders within the Office of Special Trial Counsel 12 require additional experience, including a master's of criminal law or an analogous 13 14 fellowship or service as a military judge. Additionally, if not previously certified as a 15 16 Special Trial Counsel, Lieutenant Colonel leaders 17 require a minimum of 72 months of military justice 18 litigation experience, participation in at least 19 25 courts-martial, tribunals, or complex hearings 20 involving covered offenses, including at least three courts-martial or tribunals that were tried 21 to verdict. 22

I	2
1	A Colonel not previously certified as
2	a Special Trial Counsel is required to have at
3	least 96 months of military justice litigation
4	experience, participation in at least 50 courts-
5	martial, tribunals, or complex hearings involving
6	covered offenses and including at least five
7	courts-martial or tribunals that were tried to
8	verdict.
9	Finally, those selected for
10	certification must have the proper temperament,
11	including sound judgment under stressful
12	circumstances, maturity, composure,
13	levelheadedness, fairness, character, and
14	integrity.
15	After establishing the certification
16	criteria, I convened a board to identify Marine
17	Corps Judge Advocates potentially qualified for
18	certification as Special Trial Counsel based upon
19	the established certification criteria. This
20	screening board reviewed the records of all Judge
21	Advocates in the ranks of Captain, Major, and
22	Lieutenant Colonel, and identified those Judge

Advocates as potentially qualified for certification based on their education and experience.

After review and input by the 4 5 leadership of the Office of Special Trial Counsel on the results of that screening board, I further 6 7 refined the list of those I assessed as qualified 8 to serve as Special Trial Counsel. This 9 eligibility determination will remain in effect for four years, and during that period, any of 10 11 these officers may be assigned to the Office of 12 Special Trial Counsel and will be formally 13 certified in writing upon their successful 14 completion of the Special Trial Counsel 15 Certification Course.

16 Our efforts to establish the Office of 17 Special Trial Counsel also include reinforcing the 18 Defense Services Organization with additional 19 field grade Judge Advocates, administrative 20 officers, civilian litigation attorney advisors, 21 and civilian support staff to ensure that counsel 22 representing accused charged with a covered

1

2

offense are well trained, experienced, highly 1 2 skilled, and competent. The additional field grade Judge 3 4 Advocates will be designated as Special Defense 5 Counsel and will have similar qualifications in terms of experience and expertise as Special Trial 6 Counsel. 7 8 In conclusion, we can unequivocally 9 state the Marine Corps remains fully on track to establish an independent, specialized, and expert 10 Office of Special Trial Counsel by December of 11 12 2023. Thank you. 13 MR. COFFEY: Thank you, General Bligh. 14 Madam Chair, this concludes the opening remarks of the Department of the Navy. We would 15 16 be happy to answer any questions later on. Thank 17 you. 18 MR. BESHAR: Great. Good afternoon. 19 Madam chair, distinguished members of the 20 Committee, Ms. Goldberg -- my former law school 21 classmate, with whom I just reconnected, if I may say this, Ms. Goldberg, for the first time in 30 22

	4
1	years I'm very grateful for the opportunity to
2	appear on behalf of Secretary Kendall to talk
3	about the OSTC, and I'm delighted to be joined by
4	my esteemed colleague, Major General Vernon.
5	Secretary Kendall has established a
6	clear tone and set of expectations regarding our
7	responsibility to combat the scourge of sexual
8	assault and sexual harassment. In September, the
9	Secretary stated unequivocally that eradicating
10	sexual assault and harassment and creating a
11	command climate in which no one feels disrespected
12	or unsafe is a Commander's and a leader's core
13	responsibility.
14	This commitment has been reinforced by
15	Undersecretary Jones, who recently testified
16	before Congress that sexual assault and sexual
17	harassment undermine our Force lethality,
18	operational readiness, and mission success and
19	that this is a war-fighting issue, a readiness
20	issue, and a leadership issue.
21	Major General Vernon will provide an
22	overview of the Department's plans regarding the

I'd like to focus my remarks on three 1 OSTC. 2 specific topics: first, oversight of the LSTC by Secretary Kendall; second, the implications of 3 including sexual harassment as a covered offense; 4 5 and third, the Secretary's expectation that leaders empowered with actionable data will take 6 7 the steps necessary to foster an appropriate 8 climate within their operations.

9 So, first, oversight. The recently confirmed Lead Special Trial Counsel will report 10 directly to Secretary Kendall, as Mr. Coffey said, 11 12 without intervening authority. While the precise 13 contours of the Secretary's oversight role are still to be defined, likely elements will include 14 assessing the adequacy of OSTC resources, ensuring 15 16 the independence of the OSTC, and analyzing key 17 data trends to guide the Department's efforts.

18 Important work is underway to identify 19 appropriate metrics. These may include, one, the 20 experience of victims and the percentage who 21 choose not to participate in OST cases; two, 22 overall timelines, including the duration of

investigations and prosecutions; three, due process protections, such as the percentage of cases reversed on appeal; and fourth, demographic trends based on race and ethnicity.

5 Second, sexual harassment as a covered 6 offense -- the IRC has emphasized the importance 7 of addressing the continuum of harm that too often 8 begins with sexual harassment. In that regard, 9 the potential inclusion of sexual harassment as a 10 covered offense, as others have said, will have 11 important impacts on the OSTC.

12 As a threshold matter, a final determination has to be made as to who will take 13 14 the lead in investigating these offenses and the particular expertise, including relating to cyber 15 16 harassment, that will be needed. In addition, 17 current estimates vary widely from one-third 18 increase in cases to multitudes of that as the 19 likely volume and potential impact on resourcing 20 of sexual harassment cases that will reach the 21 OSTC.

22

1

2

3

4

An objective of the Department as a

1	whole will be to develop effective strategies to
2	address what is widely perceived as significant
3	under-reporting of sexual harassment.
4	Third, commanders' responsibility.
5	With covered offenses being moved from the chain
6	of command to the OSTC, Secretary Kendall has made
7	clear that the formation of an independent
8	reporting and prosecution chain does not relieve
9	Department of the Air Force leaders of their
10	foundational command responsibility to foster a
11	culture where every airman and guardian feels
12	safe.
13	By way of example, a priority for all
14	of us is to be vigilant about overt and more
15	subtle forms of retaliation against alleged
16	victims who step forward to report unacceptable
17	behavior. To empower Commanders and other leaders
18	to make informed decision, the Department of the
19	Air Force is working to develop detailed metrics
20	and trending data that can be used to develop
21	important insights at both the command and
22	individual base levels.

(202) 234-4433

i	24
1	While the OSTC will take the lead in
2	particular prosecutions, the rest of the
3	Department must work assiduously on prevention,
4	climate and culture, and victim care and support.
5	Our overarching goal in implementing these
6	reforms, as General Risch said earlier, is to
7	restore trust in the system and belief amongst all
8	stakeholders that due process has been followed.
9	I commend the Committee for holding
10	another important hearing on these issues.
11	Major General Vernon?
12	MAJ GEN VERNON: Madam Chairwoman Smith
13	and distinguished members of this Committee,
14	Lieutenant General Plummer very much wanted to
15	appear before you today, and we wanted to be there
16	in person but for reasons that I believe you've
17	been made aware of were unable to do so. But we
18	very much appreciate the opportunity and are
19	grateful for another opportunity to be here before
20	you on behalf of Secretary Kendall to update you
21	on our ongoing efforts to successfully stand up
22	and implement the Office of Special Trial Counsel.

Lieutenant General Plummer and I can 1 2 assure you that we and the Air Force and Space Force team are firmly committed to reinforcing 3 trust in the military justice system. Lieutenant 4 5 General Plummer remains steadfast in his prior commitment to this Committee that the successful 6 7 implementation of the OSTC is his top priority. We remain dedicated to our collective 8 9 efforts to weed out sexual assault and other serious offenses in the military. Since the 10 11 Independent Review Commission released its report 12 on sexual assault in the military and the 13 subsequent passage of the Fiscal Year 2022 NDAA, 14 we've devoted our most experienced and senior 15 military justice practitioners to ensure the 16 seamless standup of the OSTC. 17 The last time we met with this 18 Committee, we explained in detail our phased 19 implementation effort. What I'd like to do now is detail our efforts since June as we look ahead 20 21 full statutory operational capability in December of 2023. 22

We're pleased to advise that our Lead Special Trial Counsel was confirmed by the Senate last week and coordination is underway for Brigadier General Select Christopher Brown to be promoted to the Grade of 7 and transferred to the National Capital Region.

A military police officer before 7 8 becoming a Judge Advocate, Brigadier General 9 Select Brown has served as a prosecutor, defense counsel, and a court appellate military judge. 10 He 11 led the Military Justice Division of the Air Force 12 Judge Advocate General School before later becoming the school's Commandant. He led our 13 14 Military Justice Policy Division at the Air Staff level and has served as a Staff Judge Advocate 15 16 both at the wing and major command level.

In sum, his extensive experience trying cases and advising convening authorities at the tactical level before later developing the next generation of litigators at the schoolhouse and implementing military justice policy at the enterprise and strategic level make him the

absolute perfect choice to be our inaugural Lead 1 2 Special Trial Counsel. We look forward to partnering with Brigadier General Select Brown in 3 the ongoing standup of the OSTC. 4 The Department of the Air Force OSTC 5 reached initial operational capability on 15 June 6 7 2022, a month ahead of the DoD directive standup 8 date of 15 July. At that time, Lieutenant General 9 Plummer certified the first cadre of 19 Special Trial Counsel to serve as lead counsel on cases 10 11 involving covered offenses. 12 Secretary Kendall also issued his 13 policies governing the Department of the Air Force 14 Special Trial Counsel to codify his intent regarding the execution of this critical mission. 15 16 The LSTC is structured in a district 17 model similar to the Department of Justice to 18 build key relationships with local offices, align 19 with DAF law enforcement entities, and keep Commanders accountable for climate and culture. 20

To ensure qualified and experienced
Judge Advocates are assigned to OSTC roles, the

Department has developed a robust staffing process 1 2 analyzing multiple data points, including prior military justice experience and duties, litigation 3 training, prior criminal justice experience, the 4 number and types of courts-martial participated 5 in, military grade and assignment history, 6 7 temperament and interpersonal qualities, civilian 8 and military education, and personal interest in 9 criminal litigation.

10 Candidates are vetted by our Professional Development Directorate with the 11 12 leadership of our provisional OSTC based on a holistic review of the candidates' experience, 13 14 expertise, and acumen for litigation. Once the most qualified candidates are identified by the 15 16 OSTC, Lieutenant General Plummer personally 17 assesses their qualifications and assigns them to 18 duty within the OSTC.

As we discussed last time, the Judge
Advocates selected for OSTC duty are required to
complete the foundational Special Trial Counsel
Qualification Course. We held our inaugural

course in May of 2022, and the next is scheduled
 for May of '23.

The course comprises a range of 3 instructors, including Air Force senior 4 5 litigators, senior service subject-matter experts, Department of Air Force subject-matter experts, 6 7 and law enforcement criminal investigative 8 agencies. We continue to refine the course 9 content to ensure we provide the most relevant training on topics like complex litigation 10 11 strategy, in-depth briefings from forensic 12 experts, complex charging analysis based on trends 13 in appellate law, and roundtable discussions for 14 peer-to-peer development.

To further the critical partnership between law enforcement investigators and OSTC prosecutors, agents from the Air Force Office of Special Investigations will take part in the STC Qualification Course, just as they did last May, partnering with attorneys in practical exercises and analyzing case scenarios.

22

In addition to our collaborative

training effort, we've established three liaison 1 2 officer positions to be filled by OSI Special Agents, who will be assigned to the Air Force 3 Judge Advocate General School and the OSTC. 4 5 Meanwhile, our Judge Advocates assigned to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, where OSI 6 7 trains its agents, is actively engaged in the OSTC 8 training effort.

9 OSTC leadership will continuously 10 monitor Special Trial Counsel performance to 11 ensure the requisite proficiency is maintained. 12 Should these proficiency standards not be 13 maintained, we have established procedures for 14 removal by the Lead Special Trial Counsel.

We instituted fixed three-year 15 16 assignments for Special Trial Counsel, consistent 17 with DoD policy, to ensure they develop and 18 maintain optimal effectiveness. To meet full 19 operational capability of OSTC by the effective date of 27 December 2023, Lieutenant General 20 21 Plummer will assign an initial cadre of 32 Judge 22 Advocates to support this effort.

	∠
1	Additionally, we have a proposed
2	resourcing plan to increase the staffing of OSTC
3	through fiscal year 2026 to meet anticipated
4	increases in reports of covered offenses,
5	investigations, and courts-martial.
6	Finally, in the next phase of OSTC
7	implementation, we'll continue to refine our
8	education and training plans and standard
9	operating procedures for OSTC's integration with
10	law enforcement investigators.
11	As your subcommittees meet tomorrow,
12	they will have the opportunity to talk in greater
13	depth about our ongoing efforts to stand up and
14	resource the OSTC with our current acting Lead
15	Special Trial Counsel and our current Director of
16	Professional Development. Our team looks forward
17	to highlighting all our initiatives to make OSTC
18	a success.
19	Lieutenant General Plummer and I are
20	resolute in our commitment to the success of OSTC.
21	This is a no-fail mission for us and is critical
22	to reinforcing trust in the military justice

system.

2	Thank you again for the opportunity to
3	appear before you, and we look forward to your
4	questions. Thank you.
5	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you.
6	All right. Well, I'll start with a
7	question. What procedures will you have in place
8	to ensure that there is no undue influence on
9	Special Trial Counsels by Commandants, convening
10	authorities, or SJAs?
11	MR. COFFEY: Well, we start at the very
12	top. I could start with the Secretary's
13	instructions that forbids that. As it gets
14	fleshed out, perhaps Admiral Crandall or General
15	Bligh can elaborate on whether there will be more
16	granular instructions. But the word has certainly
17	gone out from the Secretary that these folks are
18	independent and are not to be interfered with by
19	the command, convening authorities, or anyone
20	else, for that matter. I'm looking for a precise
21	passage in the policy, but he's made that quite
22	clear.

So I think a part of 1 VADM CRANDALL: 2 that is also going to be training to ensure that people understand that the Secretary has set a 3 very important standard there that needs to be 4 followed. So there's going to be various training 5 audiences that we're going to have to train to. 6 7 So you think the fleet writ large needs to understand how these changes impact the 8 9 military justice system under which they fall under now. We're going to have to train those 10 non-lawyers who are legal officers and clerks at 11 12 commands, as well as all those commanding officers and the triads, the executive officers and the 13 14 senior enlisted leaders, to understand this new system and to understand the independence of the 15 16 OSTC and the fact that there is no ability to 17 pressure any determination made with any kind of 18 undue influence. 19 And then the Staff Judge Advocates, who 20 serve those convening authorities who will be

responsible for convening courts-martial that are

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

determined to move forward by the Office of

22

	25
1	Special Trial Counsel they'll have to be
2	trained, and also make sure their convening
3	authorities, their supervisors, understand those
4	new relationships.
5	So I think there's a training piece
6	that comes into this as well, ma'am.
7	LTG RISCH: I concur, ma'am. As far as
8	the Army is concerned, that's started already.
9	Number one, to echo the comments of Mr. Coffey
10	that it started at the top, the Secretary and I
11	had a conversation about unlawful command
12	influence and went through the slides and
13	briefings on that.
14	And every time she has spoken, she has
15	stressed the independence of this organization.
16	It will be built into policies. It's already gone
17	into training, so Commanders training that we have
18	at the schoolhouse, when this new structure is
19	discussed, that's one of the first things that's
20	there.
21	Commanders have asked, and that's one
22	of the things we discussed with OSD was the

ability to communicate a victim's wishes, 1 2 especially if that victim is not actually represented by a special victim counsel. 3 And we 4 do have some of those cases, and that's where the command would play a role. 5 I've tried to educate Commanders to let 6 7 them know that this is not something that it's no 8 longer their responsibility. They still have a 9 responsibility for victim care, for the accused care, and then when the case comes back down tried 10 11 by a Special Trial Counsel in the Office of 12 Special Trial Counsel, but in a courtroom that 13 belongs to the installation and with SJ support, 14 as well, too. 15 So there's got to be that coordination 16 and communication by Commanders. It's been made very clear that while they can provide input 17 that's nonbinding input -- and that is an 18 19 independent structure. 20 If I may, Madam Chair, I MR. COFFEY: 21 found the cite for the record in the SECNAV's September 7, 2022, memo regarding policies 22

	23
1	governing the Navy-Marine Corps OSTC. I'll just
2	cite for your staff for the record it's paragraph
3	3B, Independence and Readiness, subparagraphs 1,
4	2, and 3, which would be that they will execute
5	their duties independently from the chain of
6	command, that they'll conduct their activities
7	free from unlawful or unauthorized influence, and
8	that they'll be rated by Special Trial Counsel,
9	not by others. So that's for the record.
10	MAJ GEN VERNON: Madam Chair, if I may,
11	for the Air Force
12	CHAIR SMITH: Sure.
13	MAJ GEN VERNON: Thank you. From the
14	Air Force perspective, obviously just as in the
15	other services, we intend to do extensive training
16	on this issue. Secretary Kendall has been very
17	clear in his direction, as well, about the
18	independence of this office.
19	And so, in addition to the training as
20	well as the other things that have been discussed
21	here today, I will mention that the independence
22	of attorneys is not a new concept in any of the

services. We have our Trial Defense Services as
 well as our victims counsel.

3	And so our counsel are very comfortable
4	in the space of being able to indicate if they
5	feel that their independence is being intruded
6	upon at all. So we do feel that our folks are
7	comfortable doing so if that should happen. So
8	it's really that combination, as has been
9	mentioned, of the training as well as the support
10	from the highest levels of the Air Force. Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIR SMITH: Thank you.
13	Ms. Bashford?
13 14	Ms. Bashford? MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested
14	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested
14 15	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested in the cases that OSTC is not going to take. You
14 15 16	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested in the cases that OSTC is not going to take. You said that the cases you will take that decision
14 15 16 17	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested in the cases that OSTC is not going to take. You said that the cases you will take that decision is final. I presume that's the same for the cases
14 15 16 17 18	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested in the cases that OSTC is not going to take. You said that the cases you will take that decision is final. I presume that's the same for the cases that are triaged out.
14 15 16 17 18 19	MEMBER BASHFORD: I am very interested in the cases that OSTC is not going to take. You said that the cases you will take that decision is final. I presume that's the same for the cases that are triaged out. Who's making the decision to send a

I	
1	it early on? Is it the end of a two-months-long
2	investigation? And what happens to those charges
3	if the decision is made not to take it?
4	My understanding is only OSTC could do
5	an Article 120 court-martial. So what happens to
6	the things that are triaged out?
7	LTG RISCH: From the Army, I'll tell
8	you, all great questions, and all that we're
9	working on right now. I talked about how we've
10	already gone through our business roles, but we
11	wanted to wait till the Lead Special Trial
12	Counsel, who is responsible for running it, came
13	on board. He is now on board. He's not promoted
14	yet, but he's in the position, and he's looking
15	those things.
16	And so that'll be part of our policy.
17	What I've reminded everybody is there are
18	standards and so forth, but there's a process by
19	which those decisions will be made, who's going to
20	review at what level when those decisions are
21	made. So we've made no final decisions. As soon
22	we do, we'll be transparent with that, as we are.

VADM CRANDALL: I would offer that on 1 2 the Navy side it's similar. The team is working on the standard operating procedures as to how 3 4 those things will function as they stand up. So we're not there yet to be able to share all the 5 details with you, but that's coming here. 6 7 We owe our SOPs by the 1st of July. So 8 the training plan is next on the hook, by 31 9 December. And then we'll have to dig in even deeper and work on those SOPs and answer some of 10 11 those very questions you have. 12 But when it comes to Article 120, if 13 the decision's been made -- by the statute, it 14 says if the decision's been made by the OSTC that 15 it is not going to a general or a special court-16 martial. It cannot be taken by a traditional 17 convening authority to a court. They don't have 18 that ability to do that -- would have to deal with 19 it in a different way, potentially. 20 There may be other reasons to 21 administratively separate somebody, but if the 22 OSTC's made that determination, a 120 would not go

to a court.

1

2	CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Goldberg?
3	MEMBER GOLDBERG: Thank you all for
4	your testimony. I have a couple of questions
5	because you're at this unique point of having
6	thought a lot through, and thank you for sharing
7	all of that, and also in the building stage. And
8	as we know, sort of thoughtful building can lead
9	to the better institutional design in the end.
10	So wondering, picking up on a theme
11	from this morning's conversation I don't know
12	if any of you were here, but how are you ensuring
13	that the people who are populating these offices
14	are going to be demographically diverse? That's
15	question one.
16	Question two is what structure do you
17	have now for conferring with victims legal
18	counsel, or SVCs, whichever your branch uses, so
19	that they are having some input or sort of an
20	ongoing feedback loop with respect to the building
21	that you're doing? And the third is what
22	structure do you have now for conferring across

Because you're all thinking through 1 the services? 2 a similar set of challenges and questions. And I understand that the services each 3 have unique environments and unique challenges and 4 5 opportunities. But this seems to be an opportunity where having more alignment than in 6 some other areas where there are preexisting 7 8 reasons for having differentiation might be 9 useful. So wondering concretely what you're doing 10 on that. 11 MS. RICCI: I just want to jump in 12 first and say the first part of your question 13 about diversity really delights me. I know that 14 the Army is very much concerned about ensuring diversity within our Force and within our 15 16 prosecution force and that the Judge Advocate 17 General, who I will allow to speak to his 18 programs, has been very fully engaged. 19 And since my time on board, I have seen 20 the very sincere and concerted effort to continue 21 to move diversity forward. And the Army is in a good place at this moment in comparison to the 22

rest of the legal community, but we have more work
 to do. And I'll let General Risch speak to those
 programs.

4 LTG RISCH: Yes, ma'am. So as far as 5 diversity I'll address it from two ways: Number one, it's a top-down, but it's also a bottom-up. 6 What I mean by top-down is as we've heard over and 7 8 over again, if I see no one in the upper echelons 9 of your leadership here in the Office of Special Trial Counsel, 0-6 and one-star positions, how do 10 11 I know that I can achieve that? And so two of the 12 three 0-6 referral authorities that will make 13 those decisions are women and happen to be African 14 American women. They were not chosen for that I can show you their military justice 15 reason. 16 bona fides and it was a great selection. So 17 that's from the top.

And then from the bottom that's why I mentioned at length the efforts that we've made in diversity, equity, and inclusion. So we stood up a council. We stood up field boards to find out what we didn't know. So the leadership. There

(202) 234-4433

was a mechanism from the bottom up for our forces 1 2 within the regiment, not just in military justice, but in the regiment as a whole to identify best 3 4 practices, things that we can do to get better. 5 In addition we stood up an office and we hired a civilian director. She's been on board 6 for about three months. 7 Her focus is not only 8 training and education, but to actually go out 9 into the field and to kind of get the feel as well. 10 11 We also have a deputy 0-6 in that 12 office who actually sits in our assignment 13 process. Doesn't have the final say on 14 assignments, but is there to remind us what we're 15 missing, to talk about the gaps that are there. 16 A Hispanic officer, but one that's well-regarded 17 by everyone in the regiment as well and just has 18 his finger on the pulse of things. And it's been 19 very effective to tell us what we're missing in 20 the assignment process as well, too. 21 So and then as I said in my statement,

we've got lots of recruiting and retention, novel

concepts that are out there. We've asked for more 1 2 individuals. In the Army JAG Corps we do all of our own recruiting, so it's not done by recruiting 3 command, just because we were able to convince the 4 5 powers that be that just to send recruiters out to recruit lawyers and paralegals doesn't necessarily 6 work that well. So we do all our own. 7 But we were doing it on the cheap. We asked the 8 9 leadership for more and we actually got more 10 resources.

11 So additional resources plus novel 12 intensified efforts to get after it to target 13 historically Black colleges and universities. We 14 identified more than you need to know probably, but on the list of top 50 law schools with the 15 16 most diverse populations, 27 of those schools are in four states. So we're targeting those states 17 18 with greater efforts to get after, because this is 19 a problem that we not only have to solve within 20 the OSTC, but within our regiment as a whole. And 21 we're going to do it from the bottom up.

MR. COFFEY: If I may address your

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

question about what the services are doing 1 2 together. We're doing a lot together. We're talking guite a bit. Mr. Beshar, Ms. Ricci and I 3 4 several months ago after we were all confirmed, 5 set up a regular drum beat of every two weeks. Doesn't always work out because of schedules, but 6 7 we routinely exchange ideas, have very candid 8 discussions about the challenges. 9 This is -- for me personally this is my number one issue as general counsel of the Navy is 10 to get this right. As I said last time, I was 11 12 commanding officer of a reserve squadron the '90s. I can't believe this is still an issue. We got to 13 14 It's important for everything else we do. fix it. And so we talk about that routinely. We exchange 15 16 drafts of policies. And if Carrie has a better 17 idea, I'm happy to steal it and pass it off as 18 mine. And I think it's worked out very, very 19 well. 20 I agree that each of the services has 21 their unique perspective. And we all respect that, but I think it's been a really positive 22

collaborative relationship on this extremely important issue.

I'd just follow up briefly 3 MR. BESHAR: on Mr. Coffey's comments. This is an intractable 4 challenge that we're talking about that has been 5 -- that the Department has been grappling with for 6 7 years, if not decades. And so I think the 8 immensity of the task we are all keenly aware of, 9 and not just across the services. But probably as the newcomer at this table I've been extremely 10 11 heartened by the interactions with Ms. Krass and 12 the experts within OSD, particularly Dwight 13 Sullivan, who you know well, and Rich Gross, who 14 have been immense resources to me. And General Vernon, would you like to 15 16 address the first two questions for Ms. Goldberg? 17 MAJGEN VERNON: Yes, sir. Thank you. 18 With regard to diversity, diversity is a huge 19 priority for the Department of the Air Force in 20 all aspects and as well as particularly for this 21 discussion with the JAG Corps and the OSTC. And it does start with recruiting as well as the 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

professional development throughout an individual's career. And so we do want to maximize that diversity because it is important that those who are prosecuting cases represent the community throughout the Air Force.

And so we do a lot of different things 6 7 to maximize our recruiting and our retention, but we are -- of the 32 projected judge advocates that 8 9 will be in the initial cadre in the OSTC next summer 50 percent of those will be female and 25 10 percent of those will be diverse. For our 0-5 and 11 12 above level, those who are more senior STCs, 23 13 percent of those are diverse and 44 percent are 14 female. So we are very optimistic about our 15 ability to continue to grow. We still have work 16 to do in that arena, as we all do, but we are very 17 excited about that initial cadre of special trial 18 counsel.

With regard to victims' counsel we do
currently have great relationships between our
victims' counsel as part of the trial process. In
these types of cases obviously now we're currently

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

following the rules that STC provides in the law, but that will grow as we -- as the team that looks at those cases will grow as we roll out the OSTC. An important person in that team is the victim's counsel and ensuring that the victim's voice is heard at all stages of the trial.

7 And so that is something that our folks 8 are trained to when they go through their initial 9 victims' counsel training. That is something that 10 we train our staff judge advocates on as well as 11 all of our prosecutors and throughout the process, 12 that that is an important voice that we need to 13 make sure is part of the process.

And then I will just add on the issue 14 of the collaboration I know that our acting lead 15 16 special trial counsel, Colonel Bettis -- I know 17 she meets regularly with her counterparts from the 18 other services, and that has been extremely 19 helpful as we learn and share lessons as we work 20 through what our procedures will be with the 21 Office of Special Trial Counsel. Thank you. 22 CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. We'll go to

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1

Mr. Kramer and then Dr. Spohn.

2	MEMBER KRAMER: Thank you all very
3	much. I have a question. I think I heard the
4	Navy and the Marine Corps talk about defense
5	counsel, both with respect to training and
6	experience. I was unclear how parallel the
7	situation was and whether you think there should
8	be whether the Office of Special Trial Counsel
9	runs the risk of being so experienced and so adept
10	at their job that it runs the risk of being an
11	imbalance with defense counsel.
12	And I'm curious first of all about the
13	other two the Army and the Air Force, whether
14	they have focused on defense counsel as well as
15	the Navy and the Marine Corps. And second of all,
16	how I know the legislation doesn't provide for
17	it, but how parallel a situation you think it
18	should be with defense counsel. And part of that
19	is and I know the answer to this I think, that
20	it's just as hard to ensure diversity of defense
21	counsel as well because especially if a number of
22	the accused are people of Color or and so

that's enough questions, I guess. Thank you. 1 2 LTG RISCH: I'm certainly ready to address your question. We were concerned about 3 that obviously, that it looked like the finger 4 might be on the scale on the government side. 5 And so when we went and asked the leadership, 6 particularly -- specifically the Secretary and the 7 8 Chief, we asked for increased growth on the TDS 9 side as well, too. So we're more than happy to share our structural slides with you, if you don't 10 11 have them. And I think you'll see that the growth 12 on both sides of the bar has been equivalent, as 13 will the training and education and the selection, 14 the assignment of folks as well. What we found is the growth has been so 15 16 significant that unless you're going to take every 17 one from a current office and move them over to 18 OSTC, both TDS and government side, you're left 19 with the other five core legal disciplines not

having that expertise. So we're reaching out to our mobilized reservists, some who have 5, 10, 15 or more years of education and training, specific

training in either prosecution or defense, asking them to mobilize for a year or two to cover until we can grow those additional positions.

MS. RICCI: And I'll just add the other part of this is also ensuring that they have the appropriate administrative support and not just grow attorneys but not have the support there. So that is also part of the package.

9 LTG RISCH: You may also be tracking 10 that Congress has -- so we're looking into the potential for a budget, TDS managing their own 11 12 budget, and then also doing a manpower analysis to determine the needs of -- additional needs of TDS. 13 14 Quite honestly I think we've addressed that 15 already, but we'll be interested to see what that 16 shows.

MAJGEN BLIGH: Sir, I'll just -- on the Marine Corps side we are going to add some additional MOS designators for folks who have reached certain experiential levels, which will help us when we do our slating every year, ensure we have even -- equal on either side of the aisle,

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

That's our process to keep things balanced. 1 sir. 2 VADM CRANDALL: And on the Navy side, just a little bit about our slating process for 3 the 0-4 and above. For all of these positions we 4 5 had a large group in the room of about 12 people. I was there, too. But the senior defense counsel 6 7 of the Navy was in the room, the senior prosecutor 8 in the current form in our RLSO structure was in 9 We had our interim lead OSTC in the the room. room. We had the Chief Judge of the Navy in the 10 11 So as we were detailing these kind of room. 12 limited number of skilled litigators we were 13 getting a good balance across all of the portions 14 of the litigation enterprise that need to be 15 represented. 16 And I will just jump back in on the diversity piece a little bit because I would echo 17

18 what Major General Vernon said. I mean the
19 recruitment piece is really critical. So we build
20 a broad bench of folks who represent all across
21 America as we come in so that as we get to the
22 senior stages we have those folks to draw upon.

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

So it's really very complex. It includes 1 2 important mentoring and retention along the way. And one way we're trying to get at it 3 4 in the Navy is we have something called our 5 Standing Advisory Committee on Inclusion and Diversity. That stood up about two years ago, 6 7 January of '21. So that's an advisory group that advises me as a judge advocate general. 8 They've 9 done a couple of things over the last years: One is they suggested we add a sixth governing 10 principle to our JAG Corps principles. 11 Stand for 12 diversity, equity, and inclusion. So we did that. Another recommendation was that we 13 14 should remove the LSAT score for our accessions boards when we're looking to bring people into the 15 16 Navy JAG Corps because it really measures your 17 performance your first year of law school and 18 we're looking at people who are already in their 19 second year. And the Army had done it. So we 20 tested it and what we found was the board spent 21 more time talking about people and less time focusing on numbers. So that's I think important 22

for us.

2	But also now they recommended that our
3	military justice career litigation track set up a
4	DEI advisory committee within the track to
5	encourage people to apply for the track, to
6	provide mentors so people who might say I don't
7	see a senior track person who represents some of
8	my background. And we can link people up and help
9	break down barriers of people think they won't be
10	welcome or won't fit in or whatever it is, because
11	we need to do better at that. So that's been on
12	board about a year now and I think that's an
13	important change for us to ensure we not only have
14	good diversity across our entire JAG Corps, but
15	within our litigation track as well.
16	MR. BESHAR: It's always hard being
17	remote, General Vernon.
18	MAJGEN VERNON: Yes, sir. Thank you.
19	With regard to the question on the defense
20	counsel, when this discussion first started, just
21	like our sister services we raised the concern
22	internally of making sure that holistically the

military justice system is fair and due processed. 1 2 And so as we take at that we also, just as the other services, are going to increase the number 3 of our defense counsel to meet the need. We also 4 -- our Career Litigation Development Program takes 5 into account building not only those futures OSTC 6 prosecutors, but our defense community as well. 7 Also as has been mentioned, ensuring they have 8 9 their own funding as well as their own 10 investigators.

11 And so we are very mindful of making 12 sure that the defense community has all they need 13 to include their own course that they will be 14 holding to certify their defense counsel in order to be able to handle -- cover defenses. 15 And so as 16 we go forward we will continue to identify those 17 areas and ensure that we do have that critical 18 parity within the military justice system. Thank 19 you.

20 MEMBER SPOHN: Thank you very much for 21 your presentations. This is obviously a very 22 significant change in policy and practice and it's clear from your presentations that you've thought
 about how to implement the change consistently and
 with fidelity to the legislation.

4 But putting on my academic researcher 5 hat I'm wondering if you've thought at all about how to evaluate the impact of the change. 6 That is, are you going to be promulgating standards, 7 8 performance measures for the OSTC or for the LSTC 9 or for the individual STCs? I mean have you thought about how you will evaluate the impact of 10 that -- of this very significant change on the 11 outcomes of sexual assault cases and other 12 13 factors?

MR. COFFEY: If I may, I think the test will be -- we will not know for several years, but the test will be whether the service members trust us anymore. Do they trust us again? Do they trust the process?

19 I don't know how we'll go about 20 measuring that. Perhaps surveys. But will people 21 feel that there's justice there? That they're 22 heard? How quickly -- to your point, how quickly

do we get to a just result? So I think that's the 1 2 I think your question may be directed measure. more to how you evaluate the STCs and et cetera. 3 4 But I think again that's the means. The ends is 5 restoring trust in the system so that there is accountability and prevention and that we finally 6 7 eradicate as best as we can the scourge. So I 8 think that's going to be the test and we're not 9 going to know the -- we're not going to know 10 whether we pass or not for several years. 11 MEMBER SPOHN: Yes. 12 But we're going to work it MR. COFFEY: 13 hard. 14 Yes, I just want to add, MS. RICCI: 15 while it's still pre-decisional, we have been 16 discussing measures of effectiveness. And it's 17 not an easy point and it requires careful thought. 18 And we are looking at different metrics. And I 19 think Honorable Beshar mentioned some possible 20 metrics in his opening statement and it's 21 something that we know we have to address. Now 22 that we're getting everything in place and we feel

that we're on a good glide path to be fully 1 2 operating capable we do want to look at measures of effectiveness and establish those and continue 3 4 to refine those as we move forward. Thank you for 5 that question. To your question, ma'am, 6 LTG RISCH: have we thought about it, my response is every 7 8 single day. 9 (Laughter.) 10 LTG RISCH: Really. Because it is -we know we need to be successful in this and we're 11 12 taking all the steps to be so. But I've been 13 asked that question and I've asked myself that 14 question, what does success look like and how do 15 you measure it? 16 I can tell you the things we -- I don't 17 think it is; and these are personal answers. Ι 18 don't think it's more courts-martial. I don't 19 think it's more convictions. I really -- and 20 that's why I said in my opening statement I think 21 it's trust in the system. If you go back to 22 really what was the linchpin for the Army the

Vanessa Guillen situation, the Fort Hood
 independent review on which Ms. Ricci sat, came
 back and told us unequivocally soldiers have lost
 trust in us as leaders. Families have lost trust.
 We need to restore that trust. And this is a huge
 part of it.

And I think if there a metric by which 7 8 you measure that it is the difference between the 9 number of sex assaults you believe are happening 10 and the numbers that are reported. And quite 11 honestly in my world the closer you get to every 12 victim reporting the offense means there's trust 13 in the system, they believe they'll be well taken 14 care of, someone will listen to them, they won't be retaliated against, all the things we talk 15 16 about. Right now that's where I am.

But I also mentioned the data analysts because what I need is someone to help us think through what are those measures of effectiveness and how do we capture that information best? VADM CRANDALL: I would just note on the Navy/Marine Corps side we talked about four

phases: the planning, the building, execution -the fourth phase is assessment. So we have to get that right. A lot more work to be done there to figure it out. I think that's difficult.

5 It really ties in though to what Big 6 Navy is doing, which is this whole campaign of we have to get real and get better. We have to be 7 8 better in the Navy about self-assessing, self-9 correcting, and always be learning. So we have a lot of support from Big Navy when it comes to 10 taking assessments more seriously, not just making 11 12 change and moving on to the next change. It 13 doesn't institutionally over the long term help if 14 you're not assessing and making those corrections 15 that need to be made. So really appreciate your 16 point.

MEMBER SPOHN: Thank you.
MR. BESHAR: I'd just follow up, Ms.
Spohn, on the comments in my earlier statement.
There are going to be expertise and resources that
are poured into the OSTC. One of the main focuses
of Secretary Kendall is what's happening outside

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

How is it that you really reinforce 1 of the OSTC. 2 to commanders and other leaders across the organization that they retain a vital 3 responsibility in the realm of sexual assault and 4 5 sexual harassment to be leading and reinforcing the importance of the issue, making it clear that 6 7 there's fairness for everybody, both victims and 8 accused, trying their level best to avoid 9 instances of retaliation. And so that's the critical element of accountability outside of the 10 OSTC that is a key focus of Secretary Kendall. 11 12 MEMBER SPOHN: Thank you. 13 COL BOVARNICK: Ma'am, if I could jump 14 in? So for Dr. Spohn, your question about 15 performance measures is actually a separate 16 section of the FY '22 NDAA, Section 547, which 17 requires the Secretary of Defense within a year to 18 publish three plans. Section 547(c) specifically 19 addresses performance measures that will be 20 implemented by the Office of the Special Trial 21 Counsel to measure that, but it's like --22 obviously it's going to be quite a ways after the

1

implementation in December.

2	But that provision and the plan is
3	still in the draft phase. It's also due December
4	27th of this year. It's going to be staffed with
5	the military departments so that when the plan is
6	implemented the military department will form
7	working groups so for example, it could be
8	individuals from the Office of the Special Trial
9	Counsel to look at and develop specific
10	performance measures. So in other words, it's a
11	separate section of the NDAA that actually
12	requires that to get after a lot of the technical
13	points that you had asked about.
14	MEMBER GOLDBERG: May I just make a
15	comment/maybe a question to those of you who
16	didn't respond to this before, but it does seem to
17	me to pick up on this discussion because I had
18	written down the same question, right, what are
19	the how do you measure if you've restored
20	trust? And it seems to me that at least one
21	resource that you currently have are the victims'
22	legal counsels, or their equivalent, by equivalent

2	And which is what was behind my asking
3	you how much are you working with them now to
4	understand how they would think of the metrics and
5	what are the barriers to trust, some of which are
6	obvious and any of us could guess at and some of
7	which only they may have unique access to because
8	they are the ones who are situated to most often
9	be working with victims, including I think victims
10	who don't go forward and in addition to people who
11	are already in the system. I suppose there are
12	many other ways to really be tracking this
13	information to build in up front as you're
14	thinking about the evaluation metrics.
15	And I assume you're doing that now, but
16	would like to hear whether and the extent to which
17	you are already doing that.
18	LTG RISCH: So, ma'am, I know you
19	heard, the panel heard from Colonel Carol Brewer,
20	who's the Chief of our SVC Program this morning.
21	She and I meet regularly. She brings plans and
22	programs to me. One of the things that we

identified -- so in answer to your question yes, at that level and all other levels we're engaging with our special victim counsel, what we call them.

5 But we also found out that -- we surveyed all of our victims afterwards and we 6 7 weren't getting any responses back. And so we 8 took some significant measures; and Carol can talk 9 to you off line. The number of survey responses has increased now. It stands to reason. 10 I don't 11 think many victims really want to comment after 12 the fact unless it's been bad, but I don't want to 13 -- the service has been bad, people want to comment about that. I didn't want to read that 14 I think they just didn't want to comment 15 into it. 16 any more on what's been a very horrible situation for them. And so we made it a lot easier for 17 18 Focused questions and put some other things them. 19 in place and we're getting some responses now 20 back.

VADM CRANDALL: On the Navy side
Captain Cimmino I believe spoke with the panel

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

www.nealrgross.com

earlier today and our Victims' Counsel Program has
 been also trying to survey clients. Not
 necessarily good response rates. So we are kind
 of endeavoring to do exactly what the Army is
 doing to increase that response rate from victims
 who've had victims' legal counsel.

I will say Captain Cimmino and his team
have been very involved with inputting to the OSTC
build-up process. And part of the OPT, or the
Operational Planning Team and the working group
that is coming up with ideas is to how we're going
to do all this. So he's very closely intertwined
with that as well, he and his team.

14 MAJGEN BLIGH: Ma'am, on the Marine Corps side currently your chief trial counsel and 15 16 our chief victims' legal counsel Colonel Pedden, 17 who you heard from earlier, they are separated by 18 a very thin wall. So they interact on a regular 19 basis. And as Brigadier General Select Woodard is 20 continuing to develop the planning for the office 21 he will be interacting with the VLC.

22

MR. BESHAR: Ms. Goldberg, the

proposition that you pose of being extremely in 1 2 sync with the wishes of the victim is exceptionally important. The last time that we 3 appeared before you we were asked about possible 4 5 statistics. And I broached the concept of if we tracked the percentage of conversions from 6 7 restricted to unrestricted reports wouldn't that 8 be an indicia of progress? And I broached that 9 with General Lovette, who ran A1Z for us and she said possibly, but at the same time if the wish of 10 11 the victim is to keep the report restricted, then 12 that really should be our guiding star in that 13 context. And so there's nuance and complexity in 14 almost any statistic.

And if I could just add 15 MAJGEN VERNON: 16 to that, to Honorable Beshar's point, in addition 17 to that as we know -- and Colonel Park, as you 18 heard from her as well, very tied in with really 19 not just us here at this leadership level, but 20 also with her counterparts in the defense and the 21 prosecution side. And one thing we all know is that success to a victim looks very different 22

depending on the victim. Some of them don't want 1 2 to go to trial, to Honorable Beshar's point. And so to gauge success on the number of reports, you 3 4 know, as has been mentioned earlier by General 5 Risch is -- completely agree, may not be the right statistic if really at the end of the day what we 6 7 are trying to do is understand what victims and 8 what success is going to look like for them and 9 help them heal and come forward, and is -- also build that trust for the other individuals who 10 will (audio interference). 11 12 CHAIR SMITH: I think she's frozen. 13 Okay. You have a question? Sure, go 14 ahead. 15 MEMBER BASHFORD: Have you considered 16 how you're going to deal with your creating a top 17 tier elite level of prosecutors and then you have 18 everybody else? If I was in the everybody else, 19 I'd be pretty bummed out by that. Have you 20 considered how you're going to -- you're taking 21 away a lot of cases from them that they won't have 22 jurisdiction over and they're not going to be part

of the elite -- how you keep up morale for the rest of the trial counsel?

LTG RISCH: Another great question, 3 4 ma'am. That's the essence of leadership is just 5 getting with them and letting them know that they may not be where they are -- need to be right now, 6 but here's how you can get there in terms of 7 8 training, education, trying your cases, whether 9 they're non-covered cases or sitting second chair on some covered cases. That's where SJAs continue 10 11 to have to play a role down at that level by 12 supporting the special trial counsel who are 13 prosecuting the case with everything they need, 14 and that could be a second chair, another prosecutor who's going to learn from the special 15 16 trial counsel. So I think it's just the training 17 and education type thing, working with them. 18 VADM CRANDALL: I will say on the Navy 19 side, I agree with General Risch, it's a 20 leadership issue. And I'm not going to refer to 21 them as the elite and the non-elite or the Team A 22 and the Team B, right? The Navy needs prosecutors

1

prosecuting general crimes. Commanders need 1 2 people who can prosecute larcenies and move those cases through quickly for good order and 3 discipline. We need the very best doing defense 4 5 And I intend to over time move people work. between various litigation billets so when they 6 7 become judges they've had experience in all 8 different types of litigations so they will serve 9 well as military judges at the trial and later at 10 the appellate level.

11 So I think we have an additional 12 challenge as we're standing this up because it is And I will echo what General Risch said 13 new. earlier: there's a lot of enthusiasm out there 14 when I go out and visit the fleet for people who 15 16 want to be involved in something new like this and 17 see the merits in it and want to be part of it. 18 But I need those people, some of those people 19 staying in those general crime shops because 20 there's a lot of good order and discipline that 21 still needs to be maintained across the fleet. So 22 that needs to be our message. Thank you.

i	28 I
1	MAJGEN BLIGH: And, ma'am, we've been
2	on this since the FY '22 NDAA gave us the term
3	special. We knew this was going to be a potential
4	issue. And so the general crime side, that's a
5	really great training ground to get your sets and
6	reps in litigation, also second chair, the special
7	trial counsel. So it's leadership, it's
8	motivating folks to continue to grow.
9	LTG RISCH: I will add we've had five
10	individuals actually withdraw resignations because
11	they now have an opportunity prosecute cases at an
12	04, 05 and potentially 06 level. So that's the
13	type of enthusiasm that I'm talking about, a real
14	tangible result.
15	CHAIR SMITH: All right. Do we have
16	any other
17	MEMBER WALTON: I guess (audio
18	interference) question. We've been talking about
19	evaluating what are the quality of services? And
20	the quality of prosecution is going to be
21	evaluated and what metrics you use in making that
22	assessment? What about from the defense

1	standpoint? I mean are there metrics that you can
2	use in assessing whether better quality
3	representation is being provided to the accused,
4	which is also very important. I mean, I don't
5	that's a hard metrics I think to do, but it's
6	important. And I think at the same from the
7	standpoint of the judiciary. Are evaluations
8	being made of whether the judges are doing I
9	mean we don't like to be judged obviously
10	(Laughter.)
11	MEMBER WALTON: but I do think it's
12	important that we have some appreciation as to
13	whether we're performing our tasks at a high level
14	also.
15	LTG RISCH: So in terms of selecting
16	sort of our proficiency codes apply to all jobs in
17	military justice. So when you write and there
18	are assignment folks along with our general
19	officers when we put somebody in those measures of
20	effectiveness, those prior performance in whatever
21	job you had. And not just military justice, but
22	leadership jobs, all those intangibles that we

talked about that you need to do jobs that ever increasing levels get factored in.

And then we do have -- we have talent 3 scouts out there. Our judges will serves as 4 5 talent scouts of -- and will report to other individuals. We've got bench builders that feed 6 7 that information back to our assignment process and our general officers. So there's a constant 8 9 mechanism of feeding effectiveness or lack of 10 effectiveness from everyone back into the system. Sir, on the Navy side 11 VADM CRANDALL: 12 we went through the comprehensive review of the Navy's uniformed legal community several years and 13 14 one of the things that came out of that was we realized an increasing need for more assessments 15 16 across our enterprise.

So we hired a GS-15 chief counsel for assessments and oversight originally to help us work through the 51 recommendations that came out of that comprehensive review to be able to figure out how to implement them and then to assess how that was done, but also to increase our

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

assessments across the enterprise so that we 1 2 weren't just visiting the 13 legal commands, but we figured out how do we assess divisions at 3 headquarters and the missions they have in support 4 5 of DOJ, for example, and how do we better assess And actually just within the last several 6 judges? 7 months the Chief Judge of the Navy has begun 8 formally assessing the trial judiciary now and has 9 done Norfolk and is headed to the southeast. So it's a growth industry for us. 10 And SJAs are also part of that. So I think it's a 11 12 really important question because we do have to

13 get after that across the enterprise, not just for 14 example in the OSTC.

Yes, sir, in the Marine 15 MAJGEN BLIGH: 16 Corps, on your defense-specific question, we rely 17 on the defense leadership to assess the quality. 18 As you well know, sir, the client drives a 19 particular case. There's privileged communication, 20 so outside of that it's tough to assess 21 effectiveness. But within the defensible our 22 chief defense counsel and her regional defense

1

counsels do the assessing right now.

2	MAJGEN VERNON: And on the Air Force
3	side, in addition to what's already been discussed
4	by the other services, we also have an extensive
5	vetting process for both our defense counsel and
6	our judges. They are nominated and they are
7	evaluated in the beginning and then also
8	throughout their careers and while they are
9	currently sitting in their positions. The very
10	structure of our defense community as well as our
11	judges allows for that continual feedback in order
12	to identify if we have any issues and if there
13	needs to be additional training. Or if somebody's
14	just not up to snuff, then there's a procedures
15	for that as well. Thank you.
16	CHAIR SMITH: Ms. Tokash?
17	MEMBER TOKASH: What recommendations
18	could we make as a panel that would be helpful to
19	you and your work forces in terms of standing up
20	these offices? For example, we heard from the
21	Navy with respect to some concerns with
22	resourcing. I believe Mr. Beshar also mentioned

that with respect to taking -- potentially taking on sexual harassment. In terms of potential recommendations what could we do that could be most helpful to you in terms of recommendations to the Secretary? Thank you.

I'll start. I would ask 6 MR. COFFEY: 7 you to take a look at what's going to come out in 8 the '23 NDAA, and to the extent it expands things 9 that we need to do, whether additional covered offenses or shifting from the convening authority 10 to OSTC, additional tasks like giving immunity and 11 12 things like that. Have us back to give you 13 specifics about what we think we need in terms of 14 your recommendations to the Secretary in terms of additional resources. 15

It looks to me like sexual harassment is coming -- and if I may on that point, as it stands today if sexual harassment is a related offense to a covered offense, it's already being investigated. But there are some pure sexual harassment cases. Who's going to investigate those? And in the DON we've made the decision,

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

after considerable debate and analysis, that it's going to be NCIS since they will already be doing the covered offenses and those collateral sexual harassment cases, and of course the professional cadre that they are, et cetera. But it's going to cost resources. And we've done some estimates.

7 So I don't have specific dollar numbers 8 for you now. And we have a process for budgeting 9 that doesn't run from me. But a general statement 10 that if we want to get after this, we got to get 11 it right and to get it right it's going to cost 12 resources. And so please urge the Secretary and all concerned that -- to listen to that demand 13 14 signal. Thank you.

I'll just add also General 15 MS. RICCI: 16 Risch mentioned attorney wellness, and that's 17 something that I had not thought about as we were 18 working through the OSTC. And I think that is an 19 important point. And so to the extent if it's 20 amenable to comment about ensuring that the 21 services also consider that. And I know that the 22 Army is asking for -- to have an appointment of a

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

wellness coordinator and that is when you're 1 2 working in this type of -- with these types of cases we should not forget that. 3 4 MAJGEN BLIGH: It would be very helpful 5 if we could pressurize the staffing of the executive orders to adjust, you know, just the 6 7 RCMs --8 (Laughter.) 9 MAJGEN BLIGH: -- so that we're 10 planning it against certain certainty. 11 Ms. Tokash, I sometimes MR. BESHAR: 12 feel like you're Columbo at these hearings. You wait until the end and then you always ask a good 13 14 provocative question that tries to get underneath 15 the surface a little bit. 16 This is a long-term effort. And people 17 don't want to hear that because they want swift 18 results, but the reality is that the focus has to 19 be sustained over a multi-year period, and that's 20 hard to do just in reality because so many other 21 priorities arise and kind of intrude. So I think 22 all of us in this room are trying to really

maintain visibility, maintain focus, maintain accountability so that this is an enduring effort that really produces tangible results as promptly as possible.

COL BOVARNICK: Judge Smith, I just 5 kind of wanted to know for the record -- it was --6 7 the Committee had in the letter that you drafted 8 inviting the members mentioned an interest in 9 potentially attending courses. And so we'll coordinate with the staffs of the respective 10 11 departments. Obviously General Risch mentioned 12 they had a list of a number of cases. And we have 13 that from the Navy and the Air Force as well. 14 So as I mentioned this morning, I'll circulate that with the members and if there's 15

16 interest in courses, we'll coordinate with those 17 course administrators to get members out to those 18 courses, like the few that were already attended. 19 That's all I had, ma'am.

20 CHAIR SMITH: Well, I don't think 21 anyone has any additional questions, so thank you 22 very much for spending part of your afternoon with

1

2

3

I	29
1	us.
2	COL BOVARNICK: We'll break for 15
3	minutes. Can say 1530.
4	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
5	went off the record at 3:17 p.m. and resumed at
6	3:34 p.m.)
7	COL BOVARNICK: Okay, so we're going to
8	have our staff presentation from Mr. Mason on the
9	racial disparities. I think it's at tab 6 of the
10	hand outs for the members. And then right after
11	that at 1600 we'll stop, and we have our three
12	public comments. We will cover that at 1600. So,
13	over to you.
14	MR. MASON: Thank you sir, Madam Chair,
15	members. We are going to do a little bit of data
16	talk, and if you go to the second slide, the
17	reason that we're here is to discuss the RFI that
18	the committee requested back in June. And that
19	specifically was dealing in response to
20	testimony that you received, dealing with the
21	diversity of the practitioners within the JAG
22	Corps.

1	Specifically paralegals, trial counsel,
2	everybody that are a player in the game. And we
3	requested the sex, race, ethnicity, and pay grade
4	by member, as well as sex, race, ethnicity by pay
5	grade for the total force, as well as for the JAG
6	Corps specifically. So, that is the context by
7	what we're talking to now, and we'll get back to
8	that RFI at the end of the presentation.
9	So, the next slide shows you kind of
10	the history of where we're going to go in a rather
11	abbreviated time. Starting with the OMB standards
12	for race, and ethnicity, all the way through to
13	the report that you as a committee did in 2022 on
14	race, and ethnicity. First, I acknowledge some of
15	you were here for the first report, so this is
16	going to be old hat for you.
17	For everybody else, we're going to get
18	up to speed on what the background is. And to
19	keep in mind, we're talking the big picture. So,
20	we're talking about a personnel system, data
21	system. We're talking about an investigative
22	system, we're talking about the military justice

It's not specific to sexual assault, and 1 system. 2 I know that's our focus, but these issues are much larger, and they impact what ability you have as 3 a committee to make determinations. 4 So, the first one that we're looking at 5 is OMB 15, this is the Office of Management and 6 7 Budget, Statistical Policy Directive Number 15. Shorthand OMB 15, you'll see it in many 8 9 publications that way. And this is the information that we use for census gathering. 10 So, it's a standard for the federal government. 11 And 12 by saying standard, that's kind of a misnomer. Because I like to look at it as choose 13 14 your own adventure. You can go one route, and you can answer it this way, and you have a whole 15 16 different set of answers, but you're going to get 17 to the same point hopefully. And again, that's 18 important, you'll see that at the end of the 19 presentation, where that comes into play. 20 Specifically in 1997 we have the 21 original executive order, and this policy that was In 2000 there were some revisions to established. 22

it, and it's what we use for the census, and again 1 2 in 2010, 2020. In the most recent year they have started through the White House, a process of 3 revising these standards again. 4 So, they are not set in stone, they are 5 constantly evolving, and it's based on what the 6 general practice of society is at that point. One 7 thing, there's five minimum categories, so you're 8 9 talking American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or 10 Other Pacific Islander, and then White. 11 12 Those are your five minimum categories. 13 You can classify more than five categories, but 14 when you aggregate down, when you report out the 15 data, there's supposed to be at least those five. 16 So, you have to be able to pull -- if you break as 17 you're data taking, American Indian, and Alaskan 18 Native separately, when you aggregate it out, they 19 have to be one category. 20 With respect to ethnicity, there are

22

21

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

two possible options. Hispanic, or Latino, not

Hispanic or Latino. That's where we're supposed

Now, what does ethnicity mean? 1 to be at. And 2 it's one of those questions a lot of people have, we're talking about individuals with a Cuban, 3 Mexican, Puerto Rican, South, or Central American, 4 or other Spanish cultural origin regardless of 5 6 race. 7 So, one of the things that we're 8 looking at, race should be a category, and 9 ethnicity should be a category, because that's how 10 it's defined. But you will see, you can combine them into one if that's how you'd like to report 11 12 So, the next slide that comes into play for it. how we're dealing with the data is the Article 13 14 140a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. And we've talked about that as a 15 16 committee before, this is a statutory requirement 17 to create a case management, data collection, and 18 accessibility. So, the ability for individuals to 19 access courts-martial records, to dockets, to see 20 what's happening within the system. But at the 21 same time, the Secretary of Defense has to 22 prescribe uniform standards, and criteria for the

1

collection, and analysis of this data.

2	And the key to it is that we are
3	looking for standard definitions, and standard
4	collection criteria, so that everybody is using
5	that same set going forward. Additionally that
6	information is to be used by the Article 146
7	panel, which is the Military Justice Review Panel.
8	That data is supposed to be available for them as
9	well.
10	So, we are interested in what's being
11	collected on the sexual aspect of it, the MJRP
12	would be looking at the uniform code in total.
13	So, where this comes into play for us, in 2018,
14	the General Counsel issued a memorandum that
15	basically said adopt the OMB standards. So, with
16	that we now have American Indian/Alaskan Native,
17	Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian
18	or Other Pacific Islander, White, and then a
19	category for other.
20	That the services are all supposed to
21	be using when they do their data collection. And
22	then as well, they have the same Hispanic or

Latino, and then Not Hispanic, or Latino. 1 In 2 total for this Article 140 system, there are 155 data points that the general counsel, working with 3 4 the Joint Service Committee, they established what they were going to collect. 5 However, of those 155, roughly 10, or 6 7 11 deal with demographics, and mostly on the 8 accused standpoint with a limited focus on the 9 victim. So, they're gathering a lot of information throughout the process of the military 10 11 justice, but again, it is military justice 12 focused. We're looking at preferral of charges 13 through appellate review. 14 So, it's not the investigative side for 15 the most part, and it's not the personnel system, 16 it's a separate system that's being created. And 17 that is part of where the problem will present 18 itself. Additionally, the services have a 19 requirement under Article 146a in its annual 20 reports that the services have to provide on the 21 military justice system to Congress. 22 And the statutory language is not

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

explicit on what they should be gathering, or how 1 2 they need to report it. It has evolved over time, and what you now see is for the accused, the 3 4 services are collecting gender, race, and 5 ethnicity. For the victim, they're collecting gender, race, and ethnicity. But if you remember 6 7 on the last slide, that's not part of their 155 categories for the victim. 8

9 So, now we have a break by what the General Counsel has established as the minimum 10 11 standards, and we know that they're collecting 12 more than that, but it's not in that 155. Now, 13 again the 155 standards are not the end all be 14 all, it is a starting point, and it's a common language for all of their systems. 15 The other 16 component, and we heard a lot about this today, is the distinction between sex, and gender. 17

And part of the problem with our gathering is that we use the term interchangeably. Sex, in Article 140a, that data system, they use the term sex. But in the 146a report that they're giving to Congress, they use the term gender. So,

we think we're gathering the same information, but 1 2 there is a difference in definition. So, we've got a disconnect right at 3 4 that point of what exactly is being collected. 5 Now, in your materials for today, there is an example of 146, the appendix to one of the 146a 6 7 reports. And you'll see in that it's the Air 8 Force that I excerpted, but they are using the 9 right categories for race, using the right categories for ethnicity, and they're using the 10 right, in theory, gender, or sex. 11 12 This, over the past three years, if you 13 looked at the last three years of the reports, you 14 would see a definite change in how it's being 15 reported. So, the services are definitely 16 improving, their data collection is improving, and 17 they're able to report it using the same standard, 18 which is a positive. However, this takes us to 19 this part in the conversation of what have we determined in looking over the past few years 20 21 through studies? 22 And we're going to highlight two

reports that were done by the GAO, and then the
DAC-IPAD's report on race, and diversity, because
it's sandwiched between the two GAO reports. So,
the first one, the GAO in 2019, in their report,
one, they acknowledge the application of the 140a
standards. And those were through the General
Counsel in 2018.

So, the GAO said yes, these standards 8 9 are out there, make sure you're using them. That way we're going to eliminate some of the problems 10 They said at that point, that the 11 that we have. 12 146a annual reports lacked demographic data for 13 the service members. Well, you just saw the 14 example that I showed you, they fixed that.

So, since 2019, when the GAO said you 15 16 need to include this, the services have gone 17 further, because they now have it on the accused, 18 and they have it as well on the victim. So, we 19 are making progress. Their recommendations were 20 that the race, and ethnicity data, investigation, 21 and personnel databases should mirror the 140a standards. 22

1	So, now we're moving outside of the
2	military justice, and saying the overall personnel
3	system should be the same, and the investigative
4	system, they should all be using the same
5	definitions. They recommended that the reports
6	include race, ethnicity, and gender, and that that
7	is happening, and that you incorporate non-
8	judicial punishment information in the database.
9	That was the long goal. It's something
10	that they weren't doing at that point, and we are
11	getting there now, but it was a big
12	recommendation, and it required a lot of
13	investment to get there. So, one of the questions
14	that you asked, and I'm only highlighting it now,
15	because it's something that has been asked, but
16	it's not really the focus of what this discussion
17	is.
18	But there was a question on are Black
19	service members being treated differently? Are
20	White service members treated differently? Are
21	women treated differently? The GAO, based on
22	their observations, and you have to take this not

with a grain of salt, but you have to in the back 1 2 of your mind remember, they're saying that the data they're collecting is not comprehensive. 3 So, they were taking data in, and then 4 5 having to use essentially assumptions to get to the point where they could then make their 6 However, based on what they 7 determinations. observed, they said Black, and Hispanic male 8 9 service members were more likely than White, or female service members to be subject of 10 11 investigations, and to be tried. 12 So, they're more likely, but then when 13 you get to the outcome, and the punishment, or 14 conviction, race, and gender were not statistically significant. So, what the GAO said 15 16 is there may be discrepancies within the system at 17 various stages, but the ultimate outcome, there 18 doesn't show to be a correlation that as race, or 19 gender, it's more likely, or not that you're going 20 to be punished, or convicted. 21 So, their data was not comprehensive, 22 but what they got in, they were able to make this

determination. So, that takes us then to 2020, 1 2 when the DAC-IPAD was tasked by Congress through the NDAA to do a study on the disparities in the 3 investigation, prosecution, and conviction. 4 We as a committee, staff, we presented it to the 5 committee, and the committee endorsed it. 6 7 However, as you probably remember, it 8 is not a comprehensive assessment on racial 9 disparities. And the reason for that is we ran into the same issue as the GAO. We asked for what 10 11 is the racial composition of individuals, and the 12 ethnicity? And one example, at the time, the Air Force gave us 20 different categories for race. 13 And then we had to make a determination 14 how to break that 20 down into 5 so we had a 15 16 standard. With ethnicity, there's two accepted 17 categories, they had 17. So, if you go back to 18 our report, you'll see all of those eye charts, 19 where we tried to connect it, and get to a standard. We were comfortable that we came to a 20 21 standard, and we could do some preliminary comparisons. 22

But it takes us back to the same
problem as that when the services aren't using the
same reporting, we're unable to make an apples to
apples comparison. Now, the committee did have
five findings, and recommendations as a result of
that report. One of them, and just for
background, you'll see it starts at recommendation
33.
1 through 32 are previous
recommendations of the committee, and they were in
previous reports. So, starting at 33 is the one
related to the data, and disparity.
Recommendation 33 was to designate the military
personnel system as the primary data system. And
then building on that was to record race, and
ethnicity data utilizing the same standard in the
military criminal investigative system, the
military justice system, and the personnel.
Now, I've highlighted those as red, and
yellow, because in theory they have adopted that,
that they're using a common standard. But in
practice, we know that there's still a disconnect.

So, I guess orange would probably be the right color, it's somewhere between red, and yellow. The next one that the committee had recommended was that we collect the race, ethnicity, sex, gender, age, and grade of both the victim, and the accused.

7 And the 140a standard that we just 8 talked about, they are doing the race, ethnicity, 9 sex, age, and grade, so we're halfway there. The 10 victim, it's just sex at this point in the 140a standards, and then status, whether it's military 11 12 personnel, or not. We know that they're 13 collecting more than that, but we're still not 14 making the distinction between sex, and gender in what we're recording. 15

And then the last recommendation that I wanted to highlight was to collect the race, and ethnicity of the participants in the process. This ties in again to our RFI that we did in the presentations that you've heard today, there really isn't a good way to gather that information yet. There isn't a central database that you can

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 go to, and see the trial counsel was Black, non-2 Hispanic.

That type of information isn't just in 3 4 one database, and you would have to pull from 5 different systems, and hope you're getting the right information. So, we had those 6 recommendations, which then takes us to the GAO 7 8 doing a report right after that. And in the GAO's 9 report in 2021, it was an update of their findings. 10 11 Their first major one is DOD, and the services have improved their ability to collect, 12 13 and report consistent demographic, and NJP data. 14 So, in their analysis, everybody was moving in the right direction, so it gets the green, because 15 16 they've made progress from where they've started. And the Coast Guard was the furthest behind on NJP 17 18 data, and they've caught up. 19 They're not there 100 percent yet, but 20 they're getting closer. However, they had two 21 other components, and one is DOD has not identified when the disparities exist, it should 22

be further reviewed, and they don't know the causes for the disparities. So, we're getting this data in, we know what the what is, but we 4 don't know why, or how.

5 And GAO is saying that's something you need to work on, which takes us to the next slide, 6 7 which is the developments in race, and ethnicity. And the very first one is DOD is doing it, they 8 9 have started an internal review team on racial disparities in the investigative, and military 10 11 justice systems. They're looking for why, how is 12 something happening?

13 And the results, the findings are 14 pending at this point, but we should be seeing something that will come out, and explain how can 15 16 we change policies? What are the programs, and 17 processes that need to be changed in order to 18 address disparities that are identified? Key to that is having the right data to begin with. 19 20 So, at least you can make the 21 assumption if we have correct data, we're going to

be able to start looking at why the disparities

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

The second one that was in the FY '22 1 exist. 2 NDAA, and it directly impacts what this committee does going forward, is a change in policy that the 3 4 SAPRO annual report, Sexual Assault Prevention and 5 Response Office. Their annual report include race, and ethnicity in their documentation, in their 6 data set. And then additionally, there needs to 7 8 be an annual report on racial, and ethnic 9 demographics in the overall military justice 10 system. So, specific to sexual assault, they're 11 saying yes, you need to include that, as well as 12 the overall system.

13 So, this committee will have access to 14 better data based on that. And if you look at the 15 language, it's fairly extensive, and it has 16 different categories referenced against each 17 other. So, it is going to be a comprehensive 18 So, that brings us back to where we report. started. We heard testimony on the -- in June, we 19 20 heard testimony on the promotions, and the 21 demographics within the JAG Corps.

22

And we sent out an RFI, and we asked

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	them again, sex, race, ethnicity, pay grade of
2	members, and then by pay grade for the total
3	force, as well as the Jag Corps. We intentionally
4	did not provide them categories. So, we didn't
5	say here are your five categories, make it fit.
6	The testimony that you received is that
7	they're all aware of the diversity, and that
8	they're aspiring to improve their diversity, and
9	make sure that they're representative. And before
10	I slip to the next slide, you're going to see that
11	the Army is grayed out. And the Army is grayed
12	out, and the slide after, one for race, and
13	ethnicity, I'll explain that in a second.
14	They did respond, we did get a
15	response. So, don't go into it thinking they're
16	ignoring, they did, it's just it's different. So,
17	looking at the next slide for race, you can see
18	where the services are essentially matching up.
19	When you look across American Indian/Alaskan
20	Native, you can see that the Navy, Marine Corps,
21	Air Force, Coast Guard, are all using that same
22	category.

(202) 234-4433

1	And the only difference that you see on
2	this is that the Marine Corps doesn't include more
3	than one, or other as a category. So, they're
4	breaking them out, and it's either decline to
5	respond, or they're fitting them into one of these
6	other five categories. The other declined, or
7	more than one race is something that with your
8	committee report, and what the Article 140a
9	standards, you get into that with the other.
10	So, for the most part, four of the five
11	services right on board using the same language.
12	Looking at the next slide, you'll see a break, and
13	this is ethnicity. It looks a little discouraging
14	when you first look at it, but it's a statistical
15	issue, or a reporting issue. The Hispanic, Not
16	Hispanic or Latino, all of the services we're
17	doing that of the four we're looking at right now,
18	except for the Marine Corps.
19	And they're breaking out further, and
20	they're putting the race categories back in for
21	ethnicity, which OMB says you can do that, so
22	they're kind of doing it on their ethnicity. What

the rules is with respect to that is whether they respond as Hispanic is a category. Anything else is non-Hispanic, and when you total it up, it still equals 100 percent.

5 So, once you have that 100 percent, however else you categorize it, you can do it, but 6 7 when you aggregate, you're still back to those two 8 So, even though the Marine Corps has categories. 9 a bunch of other categories listed, it's still an 10 acceptable way to record it. It's just when they 11 aggregate it, we'd prefer to see Hispanic or 12 Latino, and then Not Hispanic or Latino as just 13 two categories, rather than us having to figure 14 it.

Now, here's where the Army comes into play. One of the things that we first said is the OMB allows you to do a choose your own adventure. And one of them is you can do Hispanic, and then racial categories. So, the Army, they responded with one set of data. We asked the two questions, race, and ethnicity.

22

1

2

3

4

They responded with one set of data

saying Hispanic, and then American Indian/Alaska 1 2 Native, and going down the categories. So, they've lumped the two into one. It's perfectly 3 acceptable to do that, and we're not going to say 4 5 they're wrong to do it. The problem is none of the other services are reporting it that way, so 6 7 we can't do the apples to apples comparison.

We only have to look at what the Army 8 9 is doing, and then look at -- we can put the other services against each other because they're using 10 11 The reason we didn't ask for the same standard. 12 specific categories is we wanted to see what 13 they're doing. And the interesting point is you 14 saw on the military justice, the 146a reports, they're using a different set of reporting 15 16 statistics there, or categories.

But then when they're looking at the personnel system, and diversity within their force, they're reporting it differently. So, it's not a problem, it's just now even within a service, you're looking at it differently. And the GAO, as well as the DAC-IPAD have said use one

1

set as a standard.

2	Have your personnel system, have your
3	investigative system, your military justice all
4	use the same categories. And that way you don't
5	have the possible error through interpretation, or
6	input. And so what we learned from this is
7	they're doing it their way, and they're able to
8	give their answers, but it's still different than
9	what everybody else is doing.
10	So, the potential options are we can go
11	back, and ask the question again, and give
12	everybody the same categories, and get an apples
13	to apples comparison. Or we can do the analysis
14	of all this data for each individual service, and
15	not try to compare services against each other.
16	I would just note in the last presentation, the
17	Air Force was talking about their OSTC Office, and
18	their representation.
19	And they were using the numbers of 75
20	percent diversity, 25 percent diverse. If you
21	compare that to the service, and their JAG Corps,
22	they're right on. So, their JAG Corps, and the

OSTC Office is identical statistically. And then 1 2 they said that 50 percent of their OSTC attorneys are 50 percent male, 50 percent female, that is 3 4 the exact representation of their JAG Corps. 5 So they are, their JAG Corps is 50 50, 6 the OSTC Office is 50 50. When you compare it to 7 the overall Air Force though, it's 75 percent 8 male, 25 percent female. So, within the JAG 9 Corps, female representation would be over represented, but within the OTSC it's exactly the 10 11 same. 12 So, we have all of this data, and the 13 guidance that I would be asking from the committee 14 is would you like to see the data Servicespecific, or would you like us to go back, and get 15 16 the Army, and everybody on the same page, and try 17 to do an overall comparison? We have it, but we 18 haven't done the analysis yet. We wanted to get 19 the guidance from you of which way you would like 20 to go. 21 And that really is the presentation, 22 it's just to tell you that we have data. We asked

for it based on what you were looking for, you can 1 2 see there's still a problem in how it's reported, so it's going to take more work on our end. 3 But 4 I think it helps inform you that as much as the 5 GAO, and the DAC-IPAD have said, and other people have said in the past you need to standardize, 6 7 it's still not happening 100 percent. We are better than where we were 8 9 though. Any questions? 10 MEMBER LONG: I was going to make a recommendation, but I feel like Dr. 11 Spohn should 12 probably -- you probably have an idea as an academic, otherwise -- well, I mean I guess I 13 14 would turn -- I have two questions. The first 15 would be is there a way that would come up with 16 more accurate data? And if the -- so, that's 17 accuracy. 18 And the second, is there a way that would encourage the services to do what they're 19 20 supposed to do? If they don't want to enable 21 more, if everyone wants to get together, and they just need a push to do the right thing. 22 That

1 seems like the right answer.

2	MR. MASON: The potential exists to get
3	better data, and that's by asking the question
4	again, and being very prescriptive of the response
5	that we're looking for. We know it's in their
6	system to some degree, so if we ask it in a
7	defined way, and say all services please answer it
8	exactly the same, we will get that. The problem
9	is the systems are not the same.
10	And that is something that the 140a
11	requires the system, it's something the services
12	struggle with. The DAC-IPAD had its own database
13	for years, it was put together with shoestring,
14	and gum. And we even like when we reported the
15	sex of an accused, or a victim, we did that by
16	reading, and trying to figure out what their name
17	is.
18	And then looking at the specification
19	or offense, and trying to figure out the sex
20	through that. We don't have an actual document in
21	the record of trial that says this is the sex. So,
22	our system is flawed in that sense. We knew our

methodology, and we did it, but we didn't have the 1 2 background. So, the bigger question is we need to keep pushing -- this committee could keep pushing 3 to DOD to say you need a system. 4 You need one system that pulls 5 everything together in one. 6 Yes ma'am. 7 MEMBER SPOHN: So Chuck, I'm a little So, the Army has Hispanic, African 8 confused. 9 American, non-Hispanic African American? 10 MR. MASON: No ma'am. They have one 11 category Hispanic, then they have American 12 Indian/Alaskan Native, then they have a category 13 Black --14 Under Hispanic? MEMBER SPOHN: MR. MASON: No ma'am. 15 It's either 16 Hispanic, and then it's all of the other race 17 categories. So, they're exclusive answers. You 18 can answer that you're Hispanic, or you can answer 19 that you are American Indian. You can answer that 20 you're Hispanic, or you're Black. You are given 21 those set, and that's how they categorize it. 22 MEMBER SPOHN: Got it, as --

Pardon me? All as one. 1 MR. MASON: In 2 the way they reported it here, they do not It's race, and ethnicity wrapped into 3 separate. 4 But we know that in the other reports that one. 5 they do, they break it into separate categories. So, for this one when we asked the question, for 6 your diversity in the JAG Corps, they combined it 7 8 all into one group. 9 But you're saying they MEMBER SPOHN: have it in the other --10 11 They absolutely have it, MR. MASON: 12 because it's their personnel system. 13 MEMBER SPOHN: So, it seems then that 14 we should go back, and say we want you to break it 15 down the way everybody else has broken it down, 16 and then look at those numbers, no? 17 MEMBER GARVIN: No, I'm not 18 disagreeing, I have kind of a -- if we ask that 19 question, I wonder if we could ask a follow up 20 question, which is -- or a tag along question, 21 which is just to document the effort that it required to do that through some metrics, even if 22

1

it's personnel hours, or something.

2	Because I think what we're getting at
3	is we keep all the services are having to
4	continue to band aid their systems in order to get
5	data responsive to these questions. But we're not
6	looking at the burden that we put on the services
7	as they have to collect the data, to have it speak
8	to each other.
9	And if we knew information about the
10	burden that's put on them to get their systems to
11	talk more effectively together, then the ask of
12	put your create a singular system, could be
13	more create in the ask of what resources are
14	necessary.
15	MR. MASON: We can absolutely do that,
16	and we did in a previous RFI, request for
17	information, we did ask them please give us this
18	answer, and then tell us how you did it step by
19	step. And we haven't done that since you've been
20	reconstituted, and the systems have definitely
21	changed since then. So, with your approval, we
22	can go, and do a new request.

1	с І
1	And we can give them specific
2	categories that we're looking for, and then ask
3	them exactly what systems they've accessed, and
4	how they queried it to get to the result that
5	they're giving us. And then we would be able to
6	further discuss okay, this system is connected
7	this way, but not here, and figure out how they
8	work together. We can absolutely do that.
9	CHAIR SMITH: I see head nodding that
10	people are in agreement with that. Go ahead.
11	MEMBER GOLDBERG: I guess I would
12	underscore just two things that others have said,
13	and maybe add one layer. One, that it seems, at
14	least to me, that we to be able to do our job,
15	we need to be able to make a good service to
16	service comparison. It seems like it would not
17	only be useful to DAC-IPAD, but also for the
18	services in their own work.
19	And in particular, thinking back to the
20	last panel, as in this moment of building a new
21	system, to be able to collect data accurately, to
22	be able to assess, sort of not just trust as

building, rebuilding trust as a whole, but whether 1 2 there are particular groups that are either gaining, or losing in the building trust would be 3 very important for the tracking. 4 It's a good moment to be revisiting 5 this question I think. And then the second to the 6 7 burden point, which seems incredibly important, This is -- it's sort of the what is the 8 right? 9 information, and what would you need to be able to produce this information more easily, and 10 11 accurately? 12 And then the kind of background 13 question I have is the census has long enabled 14 people -- fairly long enabled people to select multiple categories, and it seems that in 2022, on 15 16 the verge of 2023 to not have a category that 17 allows for multi-racial, or multi-ethnic identity 18 misses a large segment of the population. 19 And not only that, but I think to the 20 extent people have to self-report, that can have 21 a negative effect on the individuals who are being 22 asked, sort of looking at a form that doesn't

actually enable them to provide an accurate answer.

3	CHAIR SMITH: This comment is probably
4	completely muddying the waters, but I'm going to
5	make it anyway. On the heels of all the things we
6	discussed today, and I don't know if it would be
7	asked as part of this, or not, but while they're
8	looking at data, it seems to me that the committee
9	might be interested in knowing what the juror
10	makeup is.
11	Because we heard one thing today, and
12	then we heard other things from some of the
13	committee members, and so the proof is in the
14	numbers with respect to women on juries, and also
15	minority representation on juries compared between
16	officers courts-martial for officers, versus
17	enlisted, so that would be one.
18	And then also looking at the lawyer
19	data. What's the makeup of the JAG Corps, I guess
20	it is, right? And that might be, this might be
21	the wrong moment to be saying it, but I want to
22	put it out there, because I think everybody would

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

be interested. And rather than hearing little 1 2 vignettes here, and there, getting some concrete information. For sexual assault cases, yes. 3 4 MR. MASON: And ma'am, I was taking 5 notes earlier, and those issues came up. I had a side bar with some of the Service reps, and 6 7 setting expectations, the first one, the panel 8 compositions is going to be difficult to 9 accommodate. And the reason for that is once you have a convening order, and you have the 10 11 individuals listed, and they get into a court-12 martial, you don't keep -- a personnel record 13 doesn't go with it. 14 So, you could go in the record of 15 trial, and see who the individuals were listed, 16 and then you would have to go back into a 17 personnel system, and try to find them, make sure 18 you have the right person, and then get that data. 19 It's actually a manual search, and I talked with 20 Dr. Wells briefly.

You might be able to do a statistical
sample, but it's still -- we don't even know what

the numbers are we'd be dealing with. So, the first one could be problematic, but I think what we'd need to do, with your permission again, is go to the services, and have them explain to us what they would have to do to get that. With respect to the participants, the lawyers in it, that's an easier pull.

Because they're in the Jag Corps, and 8 9 if they were assigned to a case, their information is there, and you can pull directly from their own 10 records, and that would be easier to do. 11 It's 12 still manual, but it's not the one step removed 13 from the systems. And the overall demographics of 14 the JAG Corps, we absolutely have that, and will be easy -- that will be available for us to 15 16 present to you.

17 CHAIR SMITH: So, down the line one 18 potential recommendation that we might consider as 19 a body would be that they start keeping data on 20 who the jurors are, what the makeup is of the 21 panels. Because certainly, that would be 22 important for making sure there is fair

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1

representation.

2	MEMBER LONG: I mean not to minimize
3	it, but it almost seems easier than in the regular
4	world, because they have a finite amount of
5	trials, and they do collect that initial
6	information with the personnel records. So, I
7	mean even going back doesn't seem like a heavy
8	lift. I'm not trying to burden anyone, but going
9	forward for sure, I feel like you could definitely
10	do that.
11	MR. MASON: Most definitely. And not
12	to speak out of turn, but the other thing that's
13	happening parallel to all of this with Section 547
14	in the NDAA, which was developing a larger system
15	that the services could utilize. And that's
16	something that is separate from what the DAC-IPAD
17	is doing, separate from the MJRP.
18	But under those requirements of
19	developing a new system, you may see some of that,
20	if it's implemented, that you would be able to
21	pull more information into it, and track what's
22	happening through the military justice system.

	د ا
1	That is pre-decisional, it's not made it to the
2	point where it's published, but it is a
3	requirement under the NDAA. Yes ma'am.
4	MEMBER BASHFORD: The data, and
5	personnel databases on race, and ethnicity, it's
6	self-generated?
7	MR. MASON: It would be self-reported,
8	yes ma'am, when they join the Service.
9	MEMBER BASHFORD: But you also mention
10	investigations databases. Now, is that self-
11	reported, or is that a detective sitting down, and
12	saying okay, you're female, you're black, your
13	name is Gonzalez, you're Hispanic, or are they
14	actually asking people?
15	MR. MASON: If I remember correctly
16	ma'am, during the case review study, there was a
17	lot of the it was the interpretation, or the
18	opinion of the investigator, what they put onto
19	the form. Tying it into a personnel system would
20	be another step, and it would be a good question
21	for the investigative the MCIOs, of do they
22	correlate those?

I	3.
1	Or are they still allowing it based on
2	what is the observation, or the opinion of the
3	investigator. That would be another request that
4	we could send out, and ask them how do they
5	reconcile that information?
6	COL BOVARNICK: Ma'am, we'll summarize
7	this tomorrow as well, when do the kind of
8	deliberation sessions, we'll be able to nail down
9	the exact request for information that the
10	committee has, and discuss it in more detail
11	tomorrow.
12	MR. MASON: That's all I have, thank
13	you very much.
14	COL BOVARNICK: So, ma'am, I think we
15	can go right into the public comment session next.
16	And so, before we invite our first public speaker
17	up, we have two here in person, and we have one
18	who will start with virtual. I just want to note
19	for the record that we obtained written public
20	comment, which is included in the member's packets
21	at tab 11.
22	So, 11A is written public comment for

Mr. Clarence Anderson III, who appeared before the committee at the September meeting. He provided additional materials regarding his petition for a new trial, and petition for reconsideration with CAF. So, those documents have been provided to the committee.

7 And then tab 11B is written public comment from Lieutenant Commander Dominguez, who 8 9 appeared before the committee at the June meeting, 10 and there are three separate documents in that tab, it includes comments I just mentioned from 11 12 Lieutenant Commander Dominguez, comments from his 13 attorney, Ms. Tammy Mitchell, and comments from 14 his wife, Ms. Sarah Gonzalez.

So, that's just written materials that 15 16 were submitted, and I already provided to the 17 committee. And so, we'll start with our first 18 public commenter. We have virtual -- Mr. Antiwan 19 Henning, who will provide his oral comments to the 20 committee about -- I'm sorry, Mr. Christopher 21 Hines is virtual, my apologies. So, he has five minutes, Mr. Hines, are you up there? 22

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

I	3
1	MR. HINES: Yes, I'm here.
2	COL BOVARNICK: Okay, go ahead sir,
3	your time starts.
4	MR. HINES: All right. Ladies, and
5	gentlemen, thank you for allowing me the
6	opportunity to speak. I'm Christopher Hines, I
7	was wrongfully convicted of sexual assault in
8	2013. I was incarcerated for over six years, and
9	it continues to wreak havoc over my life. While
10	attending a house party, I met a female soldier,
11	we'll call her Jane.
12	Jane and I hit it off that evening, we
13	talked for hours, and at some point in the
14	evening, we went into one of the bedrooms with
15	another female soldier, who we'll call Angel.
16	Jane, Angel, and I started engaging in sexual
17	activities, and at some point Angel decided she
18	wanted to stop. She got up, and left. Jane and
19	I continued to have sex.
20	During this period though, Angel and
21	another male friend, who we'll call Ralph, entered
22	the room. They both witnessed us having sex, we

I

completed having sex, and life went on. It wasn't until several days later, her fiancee found out about what happened, and she accused me of sexual assault. Jane admitted during her testimony that she could have yelled, screamed, pushed me off, but she didn't.

7 She never said no, or indicated that 8 she wasn't interested in continuing. Angel left 9 with zero issues, I tell you this for background 10 though, the reason I'm speaking today is the 11 flawed -- all of the changes in the military that 12 has been in these type of cases, taking review out 13 of the commander's hand.

14 Unanimous panel decisions to that of two thirds, these, and the other would help 15 16 alleviate situations like mine. However, the 17 military has yet to address the injustice that was 18 done in the past. I came from a family with 19 modest means, I was an E4 when this happened. Ι 20 could not afford expensive lawyers, hire 21 detectives, or find an expert that would have 22 assisted in clearing my name.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

s
2
.1
t
e.
ut.
x
we
.3

believe -- yeah, so Mr. Antiwan Henning is here in
 person, sir?

Thank you ladies and 3 MR. HENNING: gentlemen, for allowing me this opportunity to 4 I will be referring to my notes in my 5 speak. phone, so if I do not have direct eye contact, you 6 will know why. My name is Army Major Retired 7 Antiwan Henning, and that's important. 8 I was 9 wrongfully convicted in 2016 of a sexual assault. Not only did I not commit the sexual 10 11 assault, the events never happened, they were completely fabricated. This fabrication almost 12 13 cost me 13 years of my life. In 2018, after being 14 incarcerated for over 19 months, my case was 15 overturned. I was returned to active duty, and 16 allowed to continue on with my profession. The installation commander decided that 17 18 I needed to have a second court-martial, because

18 I needed to have a second court-martial, because 19 it was within his right. It was within his right 20 based on the way that my case was overturned. In 21 2019, I had a retrial, and it took the panel less 22 than 40 minutes to return a not guilty verdict.

And I think they took more time completing the 1 2 paper work than they did discussing my case. In 2021, I retired from the Army. 3 As you can imagine, I could have continued my career 4 5 at this point, but as you can imagine, my mental health was not where it needed to be to continue 6 7 on with service. I provided that information not 8 for sympathy, but as background. I am not seeking 9 any relief for myself, my situation has been resolved in a favorable manner, so I am whole at 10 this moment. 11 12 I am here to request your consideration 13 for two items that will, in my opinion, assist 14 wrongfully convicted service members. Before I ask those two items, I would like to applaud this 15 16 panel, and the DOD for making the changes that 17 they have made taking certain significant cases 18 out of commander's hands, which I think was a 19 problem, as well as going to a unanimous panel 20 verdict. 21 I think those, and some of the other 22 recommendations will go a long way in ensuring

that the current service members, and future service members do not suffer the fate that I, and others have had. So, the first area I'd like to discuss is panel selection. I've heard a lot here regarding panel selection, and in my personal case, that was an issue.

7 The prosecutors worked hard to ensure 8 that there was as few people of color on my panel 9 as possible. Fortunately I had my second trial. 10 My first trial was a judge alone trial. My second trial was a trial by panel, and they worked hard 11 12 to try to ensure that there were no people of 13 color on my panel. Why is that though? Why did 14 they work so hard?

I don't have an answer why, but I will tell you I am currently a DE&I executive for a large insurance carrier, so I'm going to put on my DE&I hat, and kind of give my thoughts. The prosecutors felt that people of color may be more sympathetic, and potentially biased in my favor. We don't know if that's true.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

We all believe that our military

officers are able to separate their biases, and continue on with their military duty. But the prosecutors didn't see it that way. So, with that, I ask you wearing my DE&I hat, I ask everyone here, how comfortable would you be if you were sitting in a trial for your life, and the entire panel was black?

How would you feel, would there be a 8 9 sense of hesitation, or trepidation? And for some of us, that's the case, that's how I felt. That's 10 how we feel, that's how people of color, that's 11 12 how women feel when you're sitting in a court-13 martial, and the prosecutor is adamant about 14 ensuring that there is few people of color sitting 15 on that panel as possible.

16 The military works hard to ensure 17 diversity in its ranks. Why does that not apply 18 to the panel selection process? Why do we not 19 work as hard to ensure we have diversity on a 20 panel as we do in our military ranks? So, that's 21 my first request, and I heard a lot of 22 conversation about panel selection, and things of that nature.

2	So, I applaud those efforts, it seems
3	like you guys, that this body is moving towards
4	that direction. The second request is similar to
5	what Chris asked for. Criminal integrity units.
6	Criminal integrity units are designed to
7	investigate cases where the evidence is not
8	consistent with the verdict, or there may be some
9	discrepancies.
10	We have done a lot of work to help
11	service members going forward, all of the efforts
12	that I mentioned ahead of time, previously. Now
13	it's time to help those that are wrongfully
14	convicted, that have been wrongfully convicted,
15	that are still languishing in prison, or they are
16	out of prison, similar to what Chris is going
17	through, where their lives have been up ended for
18	something that they did not do.
19	And they do not have the means to hire
20	an attorney, to hire an investigator, to right the
21	wrong that has been done to them. We do not have
22	a body a wrongful conviction unit to help

individuals within the military. So, those 1 2 members such as Chris, once you have exhausted your two appeals, that's all you have. 3 There is 4 no longer a mechanism, or an avenue of redress. And there are thousands, the University 5 of Michigan does a study every year, and they 6 7 estimate that between six and ten percent of 8 individuals that are incarcerated are wrongfully 9 convicted. How do we help those six to ten percent of military members who have been 10 wrongfully convicted that are either again, 11 12 languishing in prison for double digit years? 13 In the facility that I was in, it was 14 full, and everyone there, to be there, you had to 15 be sentenced to over ten years. So, everyone 16 there had a minimum of ten years up into life in 17 prison. Now, I know everyone there was not 18 innocent. I know that for a fact, I listened to 19 their stories, they allowed me to read their case, 20 because they wanted my assistance, but there are 21 several.

22

(202) 234-4433

Even if there's only one, that's one

Individuals like Chris deserve a second 1 too many. 2 opportunity at life. He was a young man when he went into prison, and he came out, and his life --3 he can't even start, it's challenging for him to 4 So, with that I thank you for the 5 start over. opportunity, are there any questions? 6 7 MEMBER TOKASH: I have a question, this 8 is Ms. Tokash. 9 MR. HENNING: Yes ma'am. 10 MEMBER TOKASH: Thank you for your testimony, thank you for being here. Could you 11 12 tell us, at your second trial, you said it was a 13 members trial, two things. First, you said the 14 prosecutors were trying hard to make sure that it was not a racially diverse panel? 15 16 MR. HENNING: Correct. What were they doing, 17 MEMBER TOKASH: 18 was that in terms of challenges that they were 19 making to members? 20 MR. HENNING: Yes. 21 MEMBER TOKASH: And then my second question is what was the end result of your panel 22

makeup?

2	MR. HENNING: The end result, they used
3	all of their challenges, so we were able to sit
4	I had an all-male panel, it was an all-male panel
5	of six, four white members, four white officers,
6	and two black officers. So, that was the final
7	makeup. And it only worked that way, because they
8	exhausted all of their challenges, and there were
9	still additional people of color on the list.
10	MEMBER TOKASH: Did the prosecutor
11	challenge any minority members, and if so, did
12	your defense counsel issue back some challenges,
13	and were those successful?
14	MR. HENNING: Yes, that's how we
15	ultimately sat the two that were on the panel,
16	absolutely.
17	MEMBER TOKASH: Thank you.
18	CHAIR SMITH: Any other question for
19	Mr. Henning? No? Yes.
20	MEMBER GOLDBERG: Just one question,
21	and thank you very much for your testimony. Have
22	you thought about a criminal integrity unit, how

to structure that, so it doesn't become kind of an 1 2 appeals unit for everybody? Because I think that's always going to be the guestion, right? 3 4 Because why wouldn't somebody who feels wrongfully convicted, even if they weren't, seek --5 Right, absolutely, yes, 6 MR. HENNING: I have thought a lot about this. I did not 7 8 mention this, while incarcerated, I created a 9 nonprofit specifically for this reason, to help wrongfully convicted members. 10 So, I know the 11 challenge with receiving a lot of requests at one 12 time, where everyone believes that they're 13 innocent. 14 So, the makeup of the criminal integrity unit would be one prosecutor, one 15 16 defender, one defense attorney, one prosecutor, 17 one defense attorney, as well as an investigator, and then a paralegal. And someone to kind of comb 18 19 through their record of trial for inconsistencies. 20 But the impetus falls onto the 21 individual who is requesting relief to provide -and there is a questionnaire, and details that you 22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

provide to the CIU. And the CIU will cross reference that information based on your record of trial. But so that's kind of how you cull through everyone that has been -- that feels they have been wrongfully convicted.

6 However, a great place to be would be 7 like with organizations such as Save our Heroes, 8 who has done a lot of that work as well. And some 9 other organizations that I can provide you a list 10 of that has done that work already to provide a 11 great start, if that's something that we were 12 interested in pursuing.

MEMBER GOLDBERG: How many military members have you been contacted by in your nonprofit, how many -- when did you start it first of all?

MR. HENNING: So, I started it in 2017
while I was incarcerated, and it continues today.
I've probably received over 300 requests for
assistance.
MEMBER GOLDBERG: And have you had any

success? Well we've had -- well, some of the

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

limitations for our success is financial, it's 1 2 hard to receive donations, and lawyers are expensive. So, we've had success with two cases, 3 one was overturned, and one was not. Fortunately 4 those cases were still within their appeal window. 5 So, it was -- their appeal went up to 6 7 CAF, so we were able to help them craft language, 8 and do research to assist them. If I had the 9 financial means, we could have done more for more people. Of the 300, or so requests that I 10 received, I would say there were 20 that I believe 11 12 were wrongfully convicted. That if I had 13 additional funds, I would look to assist. 14 MEMBER GOLDBERG: And do you keep any data on the breakdown, male versus female, White, 15 16 Black, Hispanic? 17 MR. HENNING: Yes, I do have data. 18 Remarkably enough, it's 100 percent male, it's 100 19 percent male. And then there are 30 percent 20 African American, 30 percent Black, 15 percent 21 Hispanic, less than 10 percent -- correction, yes, 22 35 percent, 15 percent, Asian population was

1	negligible, it was less than 1 percent. And then
2	the remainder were White males.
3	And the one case that was overturned
4	was a White male who was at West Point when his
5	case and he returned back to active duty.
6	MEMBER TOKASH: This is Ms. Tokash
7	again, you mentioned unanimous verdicts. How
8	could unanimous verdicts, in your opinion, help
9	ameliorate the problem of wrongful convictions?
10	MR. HENNING: Well, with two thirds,
11	that's a low bar. A unanimous verdict allows
12	to me, it's an equitable process, it's what works
13	in the civilian courts, and that is there for a
14	reason, and we're talking about significant
15	crimes, we're not talking about misdemeanor
16	crimes. Every time you're up for a court-martial,
17	that's a felony conviction. So, I think a felony
18	conviction deserves a unanimous verdict.
19	That's only part of it though, that's
20	only part of the solution. I listened to a
21	portion of the events here today, and the
22	prosecutors, they were aligning a dream team, a

special forces type of team for prosecutors, but the defense does not have the same resources. So, it's an unbalanced system, especially if you can't afford to hire outside attorneys.

I hired an outside attorney for my 5 retrial, and he was able to bring to bear 6 7 investigators. Not only investigators, we had specialists testify on my behalf. I did not have 8 9 that in my first trial, that was not because of the lack of finances, only simply because I knew 10 11 the events did not happen at all, and I trusted 12 the system, and believed that I would not be found 13 guilty, because I did not do anything.

14 So, while I did hire another attorney, we put forward very little defense. We thought 15 16 that the story, the accusation would speak for 17 itself, and it didn't. And the other part of that 18 is, and I don't know where to place this, but I 19 had a judge alone trial, that after I was found 20 guilty by the judge, the prosecutor requested 21 seven years imprisonment.

22

1

2

3

4

We requested dismissal, the judge

decided to give me 13 years. And I'm not sure why 1 2 he decided to add additional time. Based on the accusation, because I was not even accused of 3 4 having sex with someone, like actual intercourse. 5 I'm not sure, there was nothing violent -- I'm not sure where he pulled the 13 years from. 6 But 7 there's a lot of inconsistencies that are outlined 8 in my case. 9 Given more time, I could share that That I think there are a lot of other 10 with you. 11 individuals experiencing at this moment, however 12 they don't have the financial means to seek the 13 relief that they need. 14 MEMBER TOKASH: This is Ms. Tokash 15 again, I wanted to make sure I heard you 16 correctly. Am I correct in saying that your first 17 judge alone trial, you had a military defense 18 counsel at no cost to you? 19 MR. HENNING: I had a military defense 20 counsel, as well as a civilian defense counsel, I 21 had both. 22 MEMBER TOKASH: You did, okay, thank

1

2	MR. HENNING: Yes, I had both. Just
3	fervor, the level of fervor was different the
4	second time, because we went into it thinking
5	there was no way they were going to find me
6	guilty.
7	CHAIR SMITH: Any other questions?
8	MEMBER CASSARA: Very briefly, Madam
9	Chair, this is Mr. Cassara again. Thank you for
10	your presentation, very helpful for those of us
11	that are on the defense side of the bar. You are,
12	to some degree, preaching to the choir, but I do
13	appreciate the comments. And Madam Chair, this
14	problem may be outside the scope of what we are
15	currently doing.
16	But one of the biggest concerns that I
17	have as a defense counsel is the lack of
18	meaningful habeas relief to military members. I
19	realize habeas relief is I've got a shadow in
20	my face, I'm sorry for that. I realize habeas
21	relief is difficult in the best of circumstances

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

for state, and federal prisoners. It is nearly

non-existent for military prisoners. 1 2 There are several reasons for that, but I think it might be a helpful out branch of what 3 we do to look into the lack of habeas relief for 4 military prisoners, and military accused. 5 Thank you for that, we 6 CHAIR SMITH: 7 can add it to our long list of things that we're looking at. 8 9 MEMBER CASSARA: Yes ma'am, yeah, I 10 hate to bring on more work. 11 CHAIR SMITH: I have one question for 12 you actually. You spoke about kind of this dream 13 team for the prosecutors, and the defense being 14 left without the resources, is that something in 15 your trial that was evident to you, or in your 16 working with these other men who were coming to 17 you because they felt they had been wrongly 18 convicted? 19 Is this lack of equity between the two 20 sides, is that something that's evident all the 21 time, or? It's not evident all the 22 MR. HENNING:

time, but a majority of the time the prosecution 1 2 has unlimited financial resources, they have an investigative body, whether it's NCIS, or CID, 3 they have the military police at their disposal, 4 and they get to direct the direction of the 5 investigation, and they're not investigating to 6 7 ensure that the defendant is receiving a fair trial. 8

9 They're investigating to prove that individual's guilt, and any information that they 10 receive that would direct them towards that is 11 12 something that they do. For instance in my trial, 13 they were able -- the prosecution was able to 14 reach out to several women that I have dated in the past to ask if this behavior was something 15 16 that they have experienced from me.

And of course they all said no, but the defense doesn't have the resources to go out, and investigate, and request additional information, or to send an investigator out to get information as part of their defense. So, the prosecutor has all of the cards, and they have -- that's where

the, let's say the best attorneys.

1

2 I won't call them the best -- I'm hesitant to say the best, but they are. 3 And the defense attorneys are generally new, junior to the 4 5 prosecutor, with less experience. And you would think that would be the other way around. 6 That you want a vigorous defense of individuals 7 8 regardless of their level of guilt, a vigorous 9 defense, versus the prosecutor holding all of the 10 cards. 11 It's an unbalanced justice system. 12 It's an unbalanced justice system in the design, 13 to include the way the judges are evaluated, to 14 the evaluations. I was an Army officer, and my goal was to achieve the next rank, and I knew what 15 16 my bosses, my senior leaders wanted me to do in 17 order to have that top block in my evaluation, to 18 be part of the best, among the best. 19 And the lawyers, the prosecutors, the 20 defense attorneys, as well as the judges are no 21 different. They all want to succeed in their 22 careers, and if you are the reason that a general

does not receive his -- that commanding general 1 2 does not receive his second, or third star, or their second, or third star, that's not going to 3 bode well for you if you continuously not perform 4 5 to the level of expectations. CHAIR SMITH: All right, well thank you 6 7 so much. COL BOVARNICK: I think we have one more 8 9 person for five minutes pending the panel 10 questions. Thank you. 11 MS. PULVER: Good afternoon, my name is 12 Nicole Pulver. When I was 14 years old, it was 13 the dawn of the internet, does anybody remember 14 AOL chat rooms? ASL? My age, sex, location was 16, not 14, female, in Colorado. 15 I met an 16 undisclosed age male in Colorado in a chat room, 17 and snuck out of my house to meet him in person. 18 Undisclosed age male in Colorado was well into his 19 20s, or even 30s. 20 My first interaction with the opposite 21 sex was this man. I was molested, and it made me feel so dirty, I did not want to have any 22

It took me three years before I'd want 1 relations. 2 to date again. I began dating my now husband --He was so patient with me, and supportive 3 sorry. of me, even though I had never told him why. 4 I have so many other traumas in my 5 life, starting with that my mother gave me up when 6 7 I was very young, she was addicted to drugs. I was fortunate enough that my grandparents raised me. 8 9 However, I had four younger half siblings, much 10 younger, ten plus years, that were not as lucky, 11 and they were raised in the foster system. 12 The youngest had three failed adoptions 13 due to her extreme behaviors before my husband, 14 and I petitioned to adopt her when she was eight. My sister came to us with a diagnosis of reactive 15 16 attachment disorder, or RAD. Just a few symptoms 17 of RAD are superficially charming, triangulation 18 of adults, mental, or physical abuse of their 19 siblings, and, or care givers, and false 20 allegations of abuse. 21 My two biological sons, and I lived in absolute chaos for the eight years after adoption. 22

I had been choked, slapped, and made to feel crazy by my daughter. My oldest son, he was pushed, choked, and had a gun held to his head by her. And my youngest had his fingers slammed in doors, or run over by a vacuum, and one time she pushed him off the bed.

And we had to take him in the ambulance 7 8 down to have plastic surgery to stitch his lip 9 Because of all of these behaviors, and her shut. attempt to claim that I physically abused her, I 10 11 had cameras inside my home to protect my children, 12 for since about a year after we adopted her. In 13 2020, amidst COVID lockdowns, after we had just 14 PCSed to Hawaii, my half-brother passed away due to drug overdose. 15

16 This spurred even more erratic 17 behaviors in our daughter that culminated in her 18 making an allegation of sexual abuse against my 19 husband to get out of being grounded, and to move 20 back to Colorado with our sisters. She claimed 21 her abuse happened one time in an RV, to which she 22 could not remember how old she was.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1 And the government was able to look up 2 that we were in an RV at a new duty station for a short period of time prior to a deployment, and 3 said so you were ten, to which she agreed. I have 4 5 documentation however, of another RV incident when she was about six. The report is from a social 6 7 worker, that the foster mom reported while camping 8 in an RV. 9 The mom, and other children were 10 outside, while the father and my daughter were inside, when my daughter began screaming, throwing 11 12 things, and scratched the father in the face. Α later report states that the child continues to be 13 14 distant from father, and has continued to be violent with him. Earlier, I stated I had cameras 15 16 in my home, I also had them in the RV. 17 Everything I have told you today, I was 18 not allowed to share during my husband's trial. 19 While my daughter was allowed to have witnesses 20 about her character, my husband was allowed none. 21 Nearly every piece of evidence we had was blocked by the government. My husband was assumed guilty, 22

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

not innocent, as evidenced by the trial counsel
 calling him a pedophile during his trial before
 the verdict was even read.

During the trial my daughter changed 4 5 her story, she tried to add new charges to my husband, and changed the time line of her 6 allegations. Despite this, my husband was 7 8 convicted on December 5th, 2021, and he is 9 currently serving 18 months. He is hopeful for his appeal, but has said he felt silenced by the 10 11 process, and that his trial was incredibly one 12 sided.

13 My grandfather, who adopted me, and 14 raised me, was a man that myself and my husband truly admired. He was a retired colonel in the 15 16 Air Force, and he passed away this past March. He 17 was too ill to travel during my husband's trial, 18 but he told me that he was very upset by what was, 19 and what was not happening at my husband's trial. 20 He wanted nothing more than to fly to

Hawaii, and put on his uniform one last time to be by my husband's side. And one of the last things

he told me before he passed away was that he 1 2 wanted me to keep fighting for what is right, and to uplift my husband as much as I can. 3 Sorry. As a victim myself, I have felt that the one sided 4 court-martial devalidated my experience. 5 And it hurts me to know that any person 6 7 can make a statement, no matter how inconsistent, resulting in a conviction by court-martial. 8 Due 9 process should look at all of the evidence on both sides, and especially if there is motive to 10 fabricate, or in my daughter's case, a diagnosis 11 12 exists, and other circumstances that could result

13 in her allegations.

14 I will close with this. I am broken, I had to choose between my daughter, who despite 15 16 it all, I absolutely love, and I want her to have the best life that she can. Or I had to choose to 17 18 stand with my husband, and what is right. I've 19 heard today that this panel is making a lot of 20 positive proposals moving forward, but how do we 21 right the wrongs of the past?

22

I love the military, but this process

is broken, and I hope that this panel will be able to make a difference for both victims, and the accused. Thank you.
accused. Thank you.
CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. Any questions?
MEMBER TOKASH: This is Ms. Tokash,
what service is your husband in?
MS. PULVER: He's in the Army.
MEMBER TOKASH: In the Army, okay, and
where was the court-martial held?
MS. PULVER: In Hawaii.
MEMBER TOKASH: Was it a trial by judge
alone, or was it a members trial?
MS. PULVER: He changed it to trial by
judge alone at the last minute, because the
prosecution kept trying to introduce a whole bunch
of hearsay, and the defense counsel advised that
even though hearsay would not be allowed, the
panel would still hear it. So, literally the last
minute, they changed it.
MEMBER TOKASH: And was that the case,
or I guess the theory for you mentioned that
during closing argument, the prosecutor said that

your husband was a pedophile before there were 1 2 findings of guilt, or innocence. Was there any objection, and how did the judge rule on that? 3 I was not allowed to be in 4 MS. PULVER: 5 the room, so I can't recall exactly what period of time that was. But his appellate attorney raised 6 7 that to us. 8 MEMBER TOKASH: Why were you excluded 9 from the court-martial? 10 MS. PULVER: The government called me in as a witness. 11 12 MEMBER TOKASH: But you were also 13 excluded from argument? 14 MS. PULVER: Correct. So, any witness during the court-martial proceedings was not 15 16 allowed to be in the room at all for the entire 17 trial, only during their time they were on the 18 stand. 19 MEMBER TOKASH: Was a reason given as 20 to why you were not allowed in the court-martial 21 after the close of all the presentment of the evidence? 22

MS. PULVER: No. I was allowed in 1 2 there for sentencing, that was it. MEMBER TOKASH: Thank you. 3 4 CHAIR SMITH: Any other questions? No? 5 Thank you. Thank you. 6 MS. PULVER: So, before Mr. Sullivan 7 COL BOVARNICK: 8 closes out, we'll reconvene at 8:55 in the 9 morning, and it'll be for the subcommittee 10 updates. 11 MEMBER TOKASH: I have a question 12 Colonel Bovarnick. 13 COL BOVARNICK: Yes ma'am. 14 MEMBER TOKASH: Is there an agenda for 15 tomorrow? What tab is it under? 16 COL BOVARNICK: Tab one. I think it 17 should be page three, or so. There may have been 18 a mistake with printing. 19 MEMBER TOKASH: I'll get one, thank you. 20 COL BOVARNICK: So, I guess I can just 21 go real quickly, yeah, we'll make sure everyone has an agenda. But 8:55 just welcome, and then we 22

1 have the case review subcommittee update, special 2 projects update, then we'll take a little break. We'll take our morning break, then the policy 3 subcommittee update, and we'll go into the --4 you'll have deliberations on victim impact 5 statement that Ms. Saunders mentioned today. 6 Then I'll cover the deliberations on 7 8 the March 2023 report. We close out at noon 9 tomorrow, and then of course there's the afternoon sessions, which aren't part of the public meeting. 10 11 Anything else? We'll make sure everyone has the 12 agendas. 13 MR. SULLIVAN: All right, this public 14 meeting of the DAC-IPAD is closed. 15 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 16 went off the record at 4:47 p.m.) 17 18 19 20 21 22

Α **A.J** 1:16 **a.m** 1:10 4:2 6:21 94:12 94:13 146:10.11 A1Z 285:9 abbreviated 299:11 ability 16:16 19:8,12 54:13 65:1 100:12 118:1 121:14,20 128:10 130:2 131:2 139:18 195:13 205:7 214:22 252:16 254:1 258:18 266:15 300:3 302:18 313:12 able 14:12 15:13 16:2 52:11 98:9 104:7.13 105:15,16 108:16,21 111:17 112:22 124:10 136:6,16,17 141:8 149:12 162:21 171:9 175:6,19 178:9 179:10 192:22 256:4 258:5 263:4 274:15 291:20 301:16 306:17 309:22 314:22 320:7 327:5,14,15,21,22 328:9 330:21 332:20 334:8 342:1 346:3 349:7 351:6 355:13 355:13 360:1 363:1 above-entitled 94:11 146:9 202:18 298:4 366:15 absent 140:21 absolute 108:20 246:1 358:22 absolutely 176:20 215:22 325:11 326:15 327:8 331:14 346:16 347:6 362:16 abuse 102:13 103:18 104:10 105:11.19 106:18 107:17 108:1 143:16,16 358:18,20 359:18.21 abused 359:10 abuser 106:3,6,8,14,20 112:5 113:17 114:2 135:22 abuser's 113:11 academic 28:1 275:4 322:13 Academy 11:11 18:9 22:3 38:14 69:17 accept 66:10 191:2 acceptable 318:10 319:4 accepted 310:16

access 12:22 103:20 154:19 162:12 282:7 302:19 315:13 accessed 327:3 accessibility 302:18 accessions 272:14 accommodate 330:9 accomplish 31:5 178:10 200:9 accomplished 197:4 accomplishments 113:19 218:7 account 27:9 30:3 92:15 211:8 274:6 accountability 3:13 173:15 207:6 217:7 222:13 223:15 276:6 280:10 297:2 accountable 205:8 246:20 accounts 213:7 222:20 accuracy 322:17 accurate 66:13 322:16 329:1 accurately 215:1 327:21 328:11 accusation 351:16 352:3 accused 13:18 15:12 17:4 22:22 32:7 35:21 37:13,16,18 39:10,14 39:21 65:10 66:8 76:16,22 77:11 78:2 81:5 83:7 89:5 90:4 93:11,11,12 100:13 101:6 105:20 138:11 141:2 142:11 159:13 165:1 179:13 194:22 220:3 223:10 231:9 237:22 254:9 268:22 280:8 290:3 304:8 305:3 307:17 312:6 323:15 337:3 352:3 354:5 363:3 accused's 139:4 144:17 accuser 13:20 39:8 40:12 achieve 261:11 356:15 achieved 208:11 achieving 27:14 204:21 206:10 acknowledge 299:14 307:5 acknowledged 8:7 acquitted 138:17,17 acronyms 116:18 205:6 act 5:4 71:18 137:3 216:10

acting 40:12 210:16 216:21 250:14 267:15 action 8:13 42:2,14 actionable 240:6 actions 106:16 144:17 active 37:1 72:18 73:3,7 73:20 74:3,14,16 104:22 165:16 187:22 194:6 200:13 202:2 339:15 350:5 actively 249:7 activities 9:11 219:5 255:6 336:17 actual 56:8 60:9,10,15 61:1,7 89:5,13 90:4 98:20 109:15 118:9 160:9 201:20 323:20 352:4 acumen 221:19 247:14 adamant 342:13 add 39:6 55:13 65:4 67:19 113:16 117:10 174:4 191:3 193:19 200:7 267:14 270:4 270:18 272:10 276:14 285:15 289:9 295:15 327:13 352:2 354:7 361:5 addendum 35:3 addicted 358:7 adding 27:2 200:8 201:18 223:2 addition 39:7 118:6 120:19 137:21 148:2 203:15 227:13 241:16 248:22 255:19 262:5 282:10 285:16 293:3 additional 11:5 15:9 16:13,20 35:14 168:14 184:18 194:3 208:10 210:18 215:4 222:22 231:7 235:12 237:18 238:3 263:11 270:3,13,19 288:11 293:13 294:9,11,15 297:21 335:3 346:9 349:13 352:2 355:19 additionally 30:22 32:2 214:18 228:16 229:15 235:4,15 250:1 303:5 304:18 315:7 address 10:4 18:12 31:10 32:11 63:15,21 82:10 95:12 99:11 102:11 123:18 128:8 146:20 148:20 168:10 174:16 215:3,8 242:2 261:5 263:22 265:16

269:3 276:21 314:18 337:17 addressed 66:15 105:3 121:22 166:11 181:3 270:14 addresses 207:6 280:19 addressing 31:6 219:15 241:7 adept 268:9 adequacy 240:15 adequate 193:8 adjacent 112:15 Adjourned 3:21 adjudication 214:11 adjust 296:6 administer 28:6,10 administered 28:11 administration 12:11 207:18 219:6 226:8 administrative 14:10 20:20 150:21 153:17 237:19 270:6 administratively 258:21 administrators 297:17 admiral 38:21 46:13 50:3,9 203:12 216:5 218:2 221:9 222:4 224:19 225:1 226:13 251:14 admired 361:15 admissibility 179:1 admitted 337:4 adopt 81:14 92:14 303:15 358:14 adopted 83:1 311:20 359:12 361:13 adopting 214:15 adoption 81:18 358:22 adoptions 358:12 Adrian 94:16 101:14 102:1 111:11,19 adult 105:12 133:13 adults 130:18 358:18 advance 100:1,14 118:13 119:2 178:18 190:4 advanced 27:20 119:20 140:10 165:22 advancement 226:13 advancing 153:8 advantage 38:8 adventure 300:14 318:17 adverse 132:20 advice 15:2 23:22 31:19 152:9 153:18 158:22

218:13 224:12 advise 5:5 22:17 26:2 99:20 117:4 153:21 189:16 217:5 245:1 advised 15:5 111:12 363:16 advises 272:8 advising 9:20 22:16 31:15 154:13 209:19 245:18 advisor 86:2 233:14 advisors 237:20 advisory 1:1,9 4:5,14 82:4 111:1 216:19 272:5,7 273:4 advocacy 87:2 103:1 109:4 147:8 155:7 212:9.20 advocate 6:4,13 9:20 11:7,11,12 12:5 18:19 18:22 27:21 31:4 33:8 40:17 71:6 108:11 109:21 110:22 114:2 130:2 132:16 136:6 140:2,13 144:19 148:14 150:12 151:14 153:21 154:12 155:16 168:6 169:17 193:22 199:6 203:11,12,15 203:20 205:16 207:10 207:11 209:17 219:13 219:13 222:15 223:13 229:7 230:13,18 234:9,10,18 245:8,12 245:15 249:4 260:16 272:8 Advocate's 6:12 advocated 136:7 advocates 22:10 27:18 28:12 30:10,17 31:12 122:18 153:12 161:10 169:22 208:20 212:13 223:10 229:3 231:7 234:5,16 235:4 236:17,21 237:1,19 238:4 246:22 247:20 249:5,22 252:19 266:8 267:10 advocating 136:21 Affairs 150:13 217:1 affect 36:10 72:20 198:22 affiliation 152:19 157:11 afford 99:6 337:20 351:4 afforded 109:6 AFI 73:15

afoul 100:22 122:19 afraid 187:1 African 36:13 63:4,9 76:16,17,21,22 77:8 77:10 81:20 261:13 301:10 303:17 324:8 324:9 349:20 afternoon 204:10 208:8 238:18 297:22 357:11 366:9 age 21:11 23:15 71:14 91:4 113:6 312:5,9 357:14,16,18 agencies 248:8 agency 205:14 217:18 agenda 365:14,22 agendas 366:12 agents 248:17 249:3,7 aggravation 129:19 142:2 aggregate 301:14,18 318:7,11 aggressive 189:4 agile 213:6 ago 78:3 95:21 121:18 163:13 264:4 272:6 agree 54:20 69:4 86:18 92:12 137:16 139:11 142:8 168:20 172:18 191:4 195:10,11 264:20 286:5 287:19 agreed 360:4 agreement 121:3,7 327:10 ahead 10:1 115:8 126:5 143:9 185:21 186:1.8 186:11 195:11 204:19 244:20 246:7 286:14 327:10 336:2 343:12 aid 326:4 Air 11:8,8 12:2,4,8,10 15:12 18:5 39:17 59:9 59:10 60:5,7 64:8,13 64:18 73:15 76:21 77:12 88:14 89:2 145:12 147:6 153:5 166:9 180:11 181:4 190:12 191:20 203:9 203:16,20 204:3 212:4,4 242:9,19 244:2 245:11,14 246:5,13 248:4,6,17 249:3 255:11,14 256:10 265:19 266:5 268:13 293:2 297:13 306:7 310:12 316:21 320:17 321:7 361:16 airman 242:11

airmen 70:20 aisle 270:22 Alaskan 301:17 alert 161:9,12 algorithm 79:7,15 Alice 2:6 align 246:18 aligned 157:16 aligning 350:22 alignment 205:10 260:6 **all-male** 346:4,4 all-officer 90:3 allegation 359:18 allegations 5:7 358:20 361:7 362:13 alleged 242:15 alleviate 177:10 178:12 179:16 182:3 337:16 allow 16:1 66:15 73:16 84:10 88:19,20,20 94:3 100:2 113:21 143:14 175:13 186:19 215:6 260:17 allowed 34:10 100:6 105:13 107:20 108:13 111:13 113:7,9,12,22 114:1 141:3 179:6 183:9 184:2 339:16 344:19 360:18,19,20 363:17 364:4,16,20 365:1 allowing 140:1 175:9 176:2 177:11 200:2 334:1 336:5 339:4 allows 52:18 60:16 293:11 318:17 328:17 350:11 alluding 93:6 alpha 33:12 45:12 47:18 48:3 52:7 59:17 68:19 228:2,11 alphabetical 25:20 26:13 43:19 alter 22:14 alternate 26:20 61:13 Alternatively 99:9 Amanda 2:8 amazing 133:2,17,17 136:14 ambiguity 120:2 123:11 ambulance 359:7 ameliorate 350:9 amenable 295:20 Amendment 5:22 America 271:21 American 63:4 76:16 76:17,21 77:1,11 81:20 261:14 301:9

301:10,17 302:4 303:16,17 316:19 319:1 324:9,9,11,19 349:20 Americans 36:14 63:9 69:22 77:8 amicus 184:6 190:22 191:7 amidst 359:13 amount 17:20 18:2 67:12,15 70:6 77:7 109:16 332:4 analogous 230:6 235:13 analysis 36:11 77:3 159:19 248:12 270:12 295:1 303:1 313:14 320:13 321:18 analyst 2:9 214:21 analysts 278:17 analyzing 240:16 247:2 248:21 and/or 27:14 195:1 Anderson 1:13 9:5 62:10,11 68:4 71:22 72:2.13 74:1 201:5.8 201:9 335:1 Andrew 11:10 anecdotal 100:4 anecdotally 74:11 93:21 anecdote 46:22 47:19 195:16 Angel 336:15,16,17,20 337:8 anger 98:17 angry 113:1 anguish 106:15 annual 7:13 29:14 148:4 304:19 307:12 315:4,5,8 answer 6:16 34:21 75:15 91:17,19 108:13 114:13 118:19 118:20 127:1 129:21 137:8 149:5,21 175:20,21 177:14 238:16 258:10 268:19 283:1 300:15 323:1,7 324:18,18,19 326:18 329:2 341:15 answered 75:20 answering 23:2 101:18 155:3 156:3 answers 166:10 204:4 277:17 300:16 320:8 324:17 anticipate 188:22

199:16 204:19 221:15 anticipated 138:21 250:3 anticipating 183:14 anticipatory 183:8 antiseptic 20:20 Antiwan 335:18 339:1,8 **Antonio** 12:6 anxiety 131:1 anybody 72:21 78:7 172:1 180:18 357:13 anymore 275:17 anyway 62:4 329:5 AOL 357:14 AOR 30:2 apologies 335:21 apologize 89:19 124:6 128:3 apology 195:2 Apparently 338:21 appeal 83:21 125:2 137:19,22 163:11 164:12,19,22 165:2 166:14 184:3,5 191:10 241:3 349:5.6 361:10 appealed 221:8 appeals 35:6,13 131:6 137:1 160:9 164:5,11 166:10,15 183:11 184:11 188:3,18 190:13,14,15,19 191:22 233:14 344:3 347:2 appear 12:7 95:17 96:1 197:13 216:6 232:3 239:2 243:15 251:3 appearance 191:6 214:1 217:10 appeared 95:19 122:12 216:18 285:4 335:1,9 appearing 202:17 appears 93:12 appellant's 36:16 appellate 18:22 22:13 130:7,13 137:20 146:16 151:21 153:13 155:13,16,17 164:1 164:20,21 165:11,11 165:19 166:3,4 167:4 182:13,22 184:10,12 184:15,19,20 185:2,7 187:9,11,13,15,19,21 187:22 188:5,9,14 189:1,9,20 190:21 191:5 229:12,14 235:1,2,3 245:10 248:13 288:10 304:13

364:6 appendix 306:6 **applaud** 340:15 343:2 **apple** 189:9 apples 311:3,4 319:7,7 320:12,13 applicable 160:16 applicants 215:7 229:15 application 307:5 applied 256:21 applies 72:17 apply 22:3 67:7,18 83:1 179:10 273:5 290:16 342:17 applying 172:22 appoint 19:20 26:20 46:14.14 appointed 7:2 9:1 appointment 295:22 appreciate 56:16 94:8 101:11 110:17 114:17 134:12 146:2 175:5 189:8 201:10 204:8 213:21 243:18 279:15 353:13 appreciates 100:7 appreciation 97:5 290:12 apprise 223:16 approach 70:8 87:11 99:19 217:18 225:11 appropriate 20:1 104:20 172:20 176:4 178:8 180:6 240:7,19 270:6 appropriately 140:15 205:8 approval 326:21 approve 157:13,19,19 158:15 159:9,10 221:3 227:18 approved 8:20 158:1,13 159:3 217:8 230:5 approximately 226:2 April 165:13 aptitude 229:3 arbiter 101:2 area 45:6 63:5 123:9,17 130:20 162:1 170:14 181:13 183:10 188:3 188:11,15 192:3 230:12 341:3 areas 21:13 45:18 148:19 151:22 165:5 176:5 197:13 201:3 260:7 274:17 arena 266:16

arenas 215:6 argue 141:22 170:16 argued 119:7 argument 35:12 36:17 86:4 124:3 128:11 141:5 363:22 364:13 arguments 126:10 140:1 141:11,13 142:7 178:22 Arlington 1:10 Armed 1:2 4:7,16 5:9 6:6 35:7,13 166:15 224:14 army 2:3 10:15,17,19 11:3,5 27:22 28:2 32:21 33:3 40:7 47:1 52:15 56:21 71:4 73:1 76:20 77:13,15 81:5 88:9 147:17 148:9 155:11,12 156:22 162:14 165:15 184:9 184:11 187:10 189:13 195:19 197:9 203:7 203:11 204:2,7 205:6 205:13,18 206:2,12 206:17,19 207:1,10 208:16 209:6 211:18 211:21 212:9,15 253:8 257:7 260:14 260:21 263:2 268:13 272:19 277:22 284:4 295:22 316:11,11 318:15,19 319:8 321:16 324:8 339:7 340:3 356:14 363:7.8 Army's 147:1,15 204:15 205:1,4,11 206:7 210:6 215:9 216:13 Arnold 136:13 arrangement 112:4 Article 10:7 13:4 14:8 14:20 16:14 17:2,13 19:18 20:4 22:18 23:11 24:1.22 25:13 26:5 27:5 34:1,8,16 34:18 38:19 39:7 43:9 43:14 44:7 45:2,7,22 48:18 52:18,20 68:15 72:16 73:21 74:15 79:17 80:6,12 91:11 91:18,19 92:1,3,15 94:3 98:21 128:21 166:12 168:11 172:22 173:1,22 201:12 219:11 228:2,9,11 234:3,10,11 257:5 258:12 302:13 303:6 304:2,19 305:20

317:8 articles 19:9 articulate 186:13 Asian 301:9 303:17 349:22 asked 92:20 112:8 126:16 135:2 139:16 147:12 148:5,17 163:20 189:3,3 197:14 201:12 253:21 263:1,8 269:6,8 277:13,13 281:13 285:4 308:14,15 310:10 315:22 318:20 321:22 325:6 328:22 329:7 343:5 asking 84:15 160:2 164:2 174:16 184:17 195:18 270:1 282:2 295:22 321:13 323:3 333:14 338:3,17 ASL 357:14 aspect 222:6 303:11 aspects 223:14 265:20 aspiring 316:8 assailant 98:10 assault 1:1 4:7.16 5:8 6:5 73:9 85:21 87:12 96:3,17 97:20 98:15 102:14.20 103:6 105:12 110:13 120:12 120:21 121:3,4 122:8 132:16 133:6 152:10 154:8,9 157:18 165:22 168:5 173:10 187:2 231:14 239:8 239:10,16 244:9,12 275:12 280:4 300:1 315:4,10 330:3 336:7 337:4 339:9.11 assaulted 93:16 133:5 assaulting 157:8 assaults 117:18 278:9 assembled 55:3 assembly 24:19 26:18 assert 173:2 189:5 assess 207:20 291:21 292:3,5,17,20 327:22 assessed 237:7 assesses 247:17 assessing 69:13 240:15 279:14 290:2 292:8 293:1 assessment 69:9 172:19 203:2 211:2 223:2 279:2 289:22 310:8 assessments 279:11

Washington DC

291:15.18 292:1 assiduously 243:3 assign 24:5 249:21 assigned 46:11 135:18 136:11 158:17 187:13 218:18 219:21 220:7 237:11 246:22 249:3 249:5 331:9 assignment 21:14 22:2 197:7 199:12,17 209:8 228:4 231:3 234:9 247:6 262:12 262:20 269:14 290:18 291:7 assignments 21:11 150:10,11 209:1 249:16 262:14 assigns 247:17 assist 8:3 149:2,13 161:15 187:20 200:9 340:13 349:8,13 assistance 134:18 158:4 160:2 180:22 186:13 210:14 344:20 348:20 assistant 17:9 105:10 150:15 154:10 212:13 216:22 assisted 147:17 337:22 assisting 20:6 134:19 Association 231:16 assume 63:19 139:10 209:8 282:15 assumed 360:22 assuming 150:7 assumption 140:21 314:21 assumptions 140:15 309:5 assure 244:2 assured 161:13 attachment 358:16 attempt 220:8 359:10 attend 27:18,20,22 28:3 28:8,17 134:8 166:19 attended 103:11 297:18 attendee 7:20 attendees 4:13 attending 8:8 297:9 336:10 attention 96:10,13 103:11 145:14 162:4 attenuated 142:4 attorney 2:6,7,7,8,10,11 2:11,12 94:19 136:14 154:10 155:9 167:4 191:5,22 193:22 198:19 205:19 206:18

210:20 237:20 295:16 335:13 343:20 347:16 347:17 351:5,14 364:6 attorney's 154:11 attorney-adviser 189:12 attorneys 185:4 193:21 194:3 201:1 211:10 212:14 248:20 255:22 270:7 321:2 351:4 356:1,4,20 attract 215:6 audiences 252:6 audio 286:11 289:17 Audrey 2:6 augmenting 191:16 August 34:6 Austin's 218:11 authorities 9:21 15:4 16:1,19,22 17:4,18 19:20 20:6 24:8 27:5 29:19,21 30:11 31:14 32:6 55:15 65:6 71:13 154:13 206:1 207:9 245:18 251:10.19 252:20 253:3 261:12 authority 10:9,22 13:9 13:11,12 14:6,15 16:9 16:16 17:12,16 19:2,6 20:9 21:9.20 22:4 23:13,14,19 24:2,3,5 24:20 25:7,17,19 26:3 26:4,7,10,12,17,20,21 27:1,8,11 30:8 32:3 35:18 37:11 40:9,18 44:4,21 45:11 46:5 50:3 51:5 55:1 59:20 73:19 88:13 92:2 122:21,22 156:22 219:3 221:5,6 240:12 258:17 294:10 authority's 25:3 45:13 Authorization 5:4 216:10 authorize 193:9 authorized 31:18 159:8 159:10 automatic 40:8,17 165:2 automatically 40:22 41:10 autonomy 213:13 availability 43:1 available 10:4 16:14 27:16 28:17 30:5 42:6 53:15 56:13 95:12 110:8 162:12 164:17

169:13 185:12 303:8 331:15 avenue 194:20 344:4 avenues 128:1 159:15 average 198:16 Avery 36:11 avoid 8:4 187:4 280:8 awards 113:12,18 aware 29:9 50:11,13 84:20 158:7 161:19 162:10 163:1,18 181:2 200:21 243:17 265:8 316:7 awareness 38:8,9 В **B** 49:15 168:9 287:22 **back** 6:10 15:19 34:21 41:16 53:18 58:20 60:16 62:7 75:19 79:19 82:5 106:7 112:4.21.21 120:13 126:9 127:10 139:15 143:19 163:2,3 165:7 165:13 166:8 172:8 182:7,11,12,17 187:3 193:11 195:22 202:22 254:10 256:20 271:16 277:21 278:3 283:7 283:20 291:7.10 294:12 298:18 299:7 309:1 310:17 311:1 315:18 317:20 318:7 320:11 321:15 325:14 327:19 330:16 332:7 338:9,10 346:12 350:5 359:20 background 18:18 21:12 82:1 181:20 199:22 273:8 299:18 311:7 324:2 328:12 337:9 340:8 backgrounds 69:3 97:17 backwards 40:7 **bad** 283:12,13 balance 271:13 balanced 271:1 Ballroom 1:9 band 326:4 bar 209:17 269:12 330:6 350:11 353:11 barriers 153:9 273:9 282:5 base 60:8 64:18 84:14 154:2 212:5 232:22 242:22 based 23:10 27:13

39:14 44:17,18 67:1 97:9 117:17 157:17 236:18 237:2 241:4 247:12 248:12 301:6 308:21 309:7 315:14 322:1 334:1 339:20 348:2 352:2 bases 63:9 Bashford 1:14 7:4 9:3 118:6,15 119:10,15 197:3 256:13,14 286:15 333:4,9 basic 27:19,20 201:14 basically 75:8 303:15 basis 20:5 29:14 62:16 86:3,11 141:6 191:7 284:19 Batson 66:21 67:7,22 Battalion 40:20,21 battle 187:8 BAVARNICK 201:4 202:13 bear 20:1 351:6 **beat** 264:5 becoming 245:8,13 bed 359:6 bedrock 218:16 bedrooms 336:14 began 358:2 360:11 begging 338:17 beginning 6:21 59:6 81:9 293:7 begins 69:16 241:8 begun 292:7 behalf 12:2 104:8,14,18 105:5,14 128:15 131:8 136:21 156:21 181:18 190:14 239:2 243:20 351:8 behavior 242:17 355:15 behaviors 205:12 358:13 359:9,17 beholden 121:15 belief 243:7 beliefs 100:14 believe 15:10 44:22 51:13 55:12 63:21 65:18 66:11 86:10 113:20 122:15 127:7 133:22 156:2 157:15 158:12 159:2 173:7 173:14 213:5 214:22 243:16 264:13 278:9 278:13 283:22 293:22 339:1 341:22 349:11 believed 351:12 believes 14:19 23:15 26:4 44:6,6 180:14

347:12 believing 139:4 belongs 254:13 bench 271:20 291:6 beneficial 143:6 benefit 93:11 140:16 176:5benefits 213:1 benefitted 214:2 Beshar 203:8 238:18 264:3 265:3 273:16 276:19 279:18 284:22 293:22 296:11 Beshar's 285:16 286:2 best 17:1 23:15,21 26:5 43:13 44:6 45:1,8 65:18 80:9 85:1 127:22,22 128:22 149:12,17 156:15 168:22 171:15,17 175:15,21 180:16 181:19 192:12 211:8 217:6 231:1 262:3 276:7 278:20 280:8 288:4 353:21 356:1,2 356:3.18.18 362:17 better 4:7 53:22 80:8 86:22 92:6,8,9 94:2 116:14 174:1 178:9 182:7 192:14,22 196:11 259:9 262:4 264:16 273:11 279:7 279:8 290:2 292:5 315:14 322:8 323:3 Bettis 267:16 beyond 144:8 152:21 182:15 222:12 223:5 BGen(R) 1:18 bias 38:8 55:22 71:5 87:15 170:13,17 biased 171:21 341:20 **biases** 68:21 69:7,12 170:13 342:1 big 59:16 81:20 88:15 279:5,10 299:19 308:11 bigger 324:2 **biggest** 353:16 **billet** 200:19 230:4,11 billets 200:20 229:9 230:15,20 234:21 288:6 bimonthly 166:22 **binary** 134:5 **binder** 33:12,14 binders 59:16 113:10 biographics 50:21 biographies 9:22 95:9

146:18 biological 50:20 179:21 358:21 bird 136:1 **bit** 35:9 40:7 42:4 131:14 147:12 148:6 179:8 264:3 271:3,17 296:15 298:15 bite 189:9 biweekly 217:2 black 62:22 263:13 301:10 303:17 308:18 309:8 313:1 324:13 324:20 333:12 342:7 346:6 349:16,20 blessed 70:14 105:6 Bligh 203:13 216:6 218:2 221:9 222:5 224:20 225:11 231:21 232:1 238:13 251:15 270:17 284:14 289:1 292:15 296:4,9 **blind** 52:8 block 181:5 356:17 blocked 360:21 board 82:21 111:1 171:22 193:4 209:6 226:10 229:6 236:16 236:20 237:6 257:13 257:13 260:19 262:6 272:20 273:12 317:11 boards 261:21 272:15 **bode** 357:4 **body** 331:19 343:3,22 355:3 Boggess 2:5 **bolts** 28:5 **bona** 261:16 **bono** 96:2 **book** 47:18 **boot** 69:16 **boss** 33:7 34:2 66:2 104:22 bosses 104:11 356:16 bottom 208:15 261:18 262:1 263:21 **bottom-up** 261:6 bounds 186:14 Bovarnick 2:3 8:10.12 10:15 33:1 40:2 58:21 59:2 94:9 146:5 202:21 204:9 280:13 297:5 298:2,7 334:6 334:14 336:2 338:21 357:8 365:7,12,13,16 365:20 branch 180:21 259:18 354:3

branches 123:20 132:12 brave 96:9 133:14 bravery 96:14 Bravo 228:2,9 breadth 64:9 break 4:21 6:17 94:9 146:6 202:14 273:9 298:2 301:16 305:9 310:15 317:12 325:5 325:14 366:2,3 breakdown 169:20 349:15 breaking 317:4,19 breakout 28:11 breaks 201:5 Breck 94:17 101:15 110:15.20 brevity 152:6 Brewer 146:22 147:10 147:11 156:21 158:5 160:12 169:1,4 172:12 174:19 180:3 184:8 192:6 195:9 197:9 282:19 brief 146:20 briefing 6:17 163:15 briefings 248:11 253:13 briefly 8:15 72:2 200:15 265:3 330:20 353:8 brigade 47:20,22 48:5 148:14 brigadier 136:1,3 206:9 245:4,8 246:3 284:19 briaht 338:9 bring 57:4 58:18 62:2 63:18 64:20 103:11 211:10 222:5 272:15 351:6 354:10 bringing 80:22 160:19 162:3 193:4 brings 165:14 226:20 282:21 315:18 broached 285:5.8 broad 34:2 271:20 broadened 36:1 143:18 broader 131:12 137:14 144:5,14 176:2 broadest 144:19 broken 325:15 362:14 363:1 brought 54:5 112:9 116:22 184:4 Brown 245:4,9 246:3 brutally 133:5 bucket 167:10 budget 270:11,12 300:7 budgeted 223:7

budgeting 295:8 budgets 224:10 **build** 60:20 80:18 81:4 246:18 271:19 282:13 286:10 build-up 284:9 builders 291:6 building 112:15 153:8 162:17 225:14,15 259:7,8,20 274:6 279:1 311:15 327:20 328:1,3 builds 25:18 68:13 built 81:3 91:4,7 182:4 253:16 bummed 286:19 bunch 59:22 318:9 363:15 buoyed 208:19 burden 20:13 21:1 326:6,10 328:7 332:8 338:5 business 33:3 84:21 210:9 211:1,5 257:10 busted 58:17 62:1 89:22 busting 61:12 buttress 192:2 С CAAF 34:13 123:17 129:8 130:8 131:4 144:3 163:14 164:19 cabinet 161:20 cadre 31:4 70:15 223:20 230:22 246:9 249:21 266:9,17 295:5 CAF 335:5 349:7 California 133:1,20 232:20 call 14:7 37:21 54:7 59:17 60:9 61:12 97:15 113:9 205:6 283:3 336:11,15,21 356:2 called 159:5 272:4 364:10 calling 361:2 calls 151:9 cameras 359:11 360:15 camp 69:16 232:19,19 232:20 campaign 279:6 camping 360:7 candid 264:7 candidates 247:10,15 candidates' 247:13

	1	1	1
candidly 115:21 130:22	76:20,21 77:12 81:4	301:19 302:8,9	chains 220:2
131:10 145:10	87:8,13 96:14 101:8	303:19 316:22 317:3	chair 1:10,13 4:11 8:12
cap 141:22	103:17,21 106:4	318:2 324:11,12	8:15 9:3,5,8,15 11:17
capability 204:21	107:17,20 108:3	328:16	11:21 18:7,10 23:3,5
218:10 221:21 225:12	120:22 121:1 123:5	caught 313:18	29:2 32:15,17,21 35:1
226:19 244:21 246:6	123:10 124:3 126:21	cause 54:9 55:10 56:8	35:2,4 37:5 39:22
249:19	127:4 128:11,17,20	56:20 60:21 61:11	51:7 53:4 62:8,12
capable 277:2	129:3,8 131:20	93:14 130:8 170:19	68:2 71:22 72:3,7,9
capably 221:20	135:22 138:13,15	caused 98:15 107:2,16	72:12 74:6,9,21 76:10
capacity 86:2 109:22	141:6 143:16 144:1,2	113:15 120:16	78:16 83:22 85:8 88:1
153:6 154:16	145:4,11 163:11,13	causes 314:2	91:8 92:16 94:5 95:15
capital 82:12 232:21	163:17 164:22 166:15	caution 176:8	101:22 110:19 114:15
245:6	171:4 191:12 211:3	CCA 164:19 165:2	115:5,9,12,15 116:1,4
CAPT 18:10 38:3 45:17	248:21 254:10 256:20	CDR 29:2 45:3 55:13	125:3,8 130:4,15
50:1 69:15 86:13	287:13 292:19 302:17	65:4 67:19 74:10	143:9 145:22 153:2
87:22 91:18 150:2	331:9 333:16 339:14	75:17	158:2 177:8 202:16
158:18 162:15 172:2	339:20 340:2 341:6	CDRA 160:7	202:21 216:3 225:3
187:11 193:1,12	342:10 344:19 350:3	cell 338:13	232:1 238:14,19
198:11	350:5 352:8 362:11	census 300:10 301:1	251:5 254:20 255:10
captain 11:10 18:8 23:3	363:20 366:1	328:13	255:12 256:12 259:2
57:21 135:1,19 147:2	case-specific 219:4	Center 212:10,10,21	267:22 286:12 287:9
172:19 221:11,16	cases 19:6 24:19 33:10	249:6	287:14 289:6,15
226:12,14 227:6	62:20 73:1 76:14 77:5	centered 205:9	293:16 297:20 298:14
234:19 236:21 283:22	81:6 82:13 83:2,4,8	central 232:6 302:4	327:9 329:3 331:17
284:7	103:6 105:11,12	312:22	338:19 346:18 353:7
captains 33:18	107:12 109:14 122:3	centralized 29:14	353:9,13 354:6,11
capture 155:22 278:20	123:4,12 125:13,16	225:19 232:15	357:6 363:4 365:4
cards 63:3 199:13	127:5 128:7,21 129:9	certain 12:18 25:10	Chair's 53:2
355:22 356:10	130:10 132:10,11	26:10 51:3 54:4 62:16	chaired 7:4,5,6 216:21
care 70:19 154:15	137:18 155:21 157:7	63:8 70:15,17 88:19	Chairwoman 150:3
243:4 254:9,10 278:14 358:19	157:20 166:11 190:3	93:14 112:7 160:19 160:20 202:3 210:2	152:2 208:8 243:12
career 21:11 148:13	194:22 202:6 210:22 231:14 240:21 241:3	270:20 296:10 340:17	challenge 22:8 55:9 56:20 57:20 58:7,9,16
150:10 198:14 227:8	241:18,20 245:18	certainly 70:11 87:7	58:19 60:21 62:15
228:22 229:5 230:9	246:10 254:4 256:15	128:10 142:15 174:1	67:6 103:15 108:11
231:12 266:2 273:3	256:16,17 266:4,22	198:6 251:16 269:2	129:9 138:1 170:22
274:5 338:10,12	267:3 275:12 286:21	331:21	265:5 288:12 346:11
340:4	287:8,9,10 288:3	certainty 296:10	347:11
careers 47:15 86:1	289:11 294:21 295:4	certification 147:22	challenged 67:14,14
174:11 198:22 293:8	296:3 297:12 330:3	148:22 160:13 162:17	83:21
356:22	337:12 338:4,4	163:22 165:20 166:19	challenges 17:20 54:9
careful 276:17	340:17 343:7 349:3,5	180:12 181:5 210:7	54:10 55:11 56:5,7,10
carefully 173:13 214:15	Cassara 1:14 68:6,7	210:11,18 211:6,13	56:13 58:5 66:20,22
caregivers 176:15	72:1,1,5,8,10 76:10	228:3,19 229:19	103:10,20 104:6
Carlos 216:16	76:11 353:8,9 354:9	230:3 234:6,9,17	111:9 122:14 126:17
Carol 146:22 282:19	Cassara's 78:13	236:10,15,18,19	137:20 197:19 200:22
283:8	Cassia 1:19	237:2,15	260:2,4 264:8 345:18
Carolina 232:19	categories 31:16 301:8	certified 206:22 228:7	346:3,8,12
Carrie 264:16	301:12,13 305:8	235:15 236:1 237:13	challenging 130:20
carrier 341:17	306:9,10 310:13,17	246:9	345:4
Carson 2:4	315:16 316:4,5 317:6	certify 234:4 274:14	chance 22:8 143:8
case 7:3 8:18 9:2 24:10	317:20 318:8,9,13,19	cetera 25:10 276:3	change 13:15 56:14
24:12 35:7,12,15,17	319:2,12,16 320:4,12	295:5	91:9,11 98:5 177:7
35:21 36:6,11,12 37:3	324:17 325:5 327:2	CG 47:20	182:3 186:9 196:13
37:17 38:9 39:4 40:11	328:15	CG's 48:1	199:18 205:3 214:16
51:18 56:9 60:1,6,10	categorize 318:6	chain 12:14 15:6,7 16:8	222:11 223:8 273:13
60:11 61:2,7 63:19	324:21	154:2,3 161:17 207:8	274:22 275:2,6,11
64:17 67:3,15 76:19	category 65:13 77:5	227:14 242:5,8 255:5	279:12,12 306:14
	I	I	1

314:16 315:3 changed 81:2 94:3 122:16 125:4 314:17 326:21 361:4,6 363:13,19 changes 96:16 111:5 119:19 126:20 139:7 139:14 173:22 176:1 177:1 252:8 337:11 340:16 changing 199:19 chaos 358:22 character 50:4,11 113:9 213:17 229:22 236:13 360:20 characteristics 213:7 charge 121:4,4 151:8 charged 61:11 91:13 96:11 231:9 237:22 charges 121:1 257:2 304:12 361:5 charging 248:12 charming 358:17 charts 310:18 chat 357:14.16 cheap 263:8 checking 46:8 chief 2:5 11:3 29:18 146:22 147:2,4,6,7,15 150:4.8.17 151:9.10 152:4 153:4 155:6,13 155:17 199:13 200:18 210:13 212:6 227:5 233:12 269:8 271:10 282:20 284:15.16 291:17 292:7,22 chiefs 159:9 200:5 child 104:14,18 105:4,5 105:11 108:5,20 129:9 133:12 143:15 154:8 360:13 children 130:17,19 131:9,10 136:21 143:15 359:11 360:9 chime 57:16 choice 134:5 210:1 233:10 246:1 choices 49:10 choir 353:12 choked 359:1,3 choose 15:5 26:22 43:21 44:10 48:8 104:18 180:6 191:9 240:21 300:13 318:17 362:15,17 choosing 44:10 chose 33:8 77:11,13,16 109:22

chosen 26:6,14 261:14 **Chris** 32:20 343:5,16 344:2 345:1 Christopher 11:12 245:4 335:20 336:6 Chuck 2:8 324:7 CID 355:3 Cimmino 147:2 150:2 158:18 162:15 172:2 187:11 193:1,12 198:11 283:22 284:7 **Cimmino's** 172:19 circulate 297:15 circumstances 157:14 159:6 163:17 181:3 229:21 236:12 353:21 362:12 cite 254:21 255:2 **City** 1:9 **CIU** 348:1,1 **civilian** 5:21 54:7,12 66:20 97:22 105:7,18 118:2 136:17 149:7 150:21 153:12 165:11 167:4 182:1 183:21 188:8 191:17.19 192:12 193:21.22 194:3 200:8 205:19 206:21 210:20 211:8 211:9 214:1,13 224:7 226:3 231:8 237:20 237:21 247:7 262:6 350:13 352:20 civilian-level 135:4 civilians 94:20 117:15 152:15 159:7 194:1 **claim** 359:10 claimed 359:20 Clarence 335:1 clarification 202:11 clarified 74:2 101:9 120:4 clarify 201:11 clarifying 156:9 201:6 clarity 183:12 class 69:8 classes 149:3 classify 301:13 classmate 238:21 clear 34:10 61:3 92:1 108:4 118:7 129:3 169:7 220:8 239:6 242:7 251:22 254:17 255:17 275:1 280:6 **clearing** 337:22 **clearly** 78:3 **clerk** 184:12 185:4 clerks 252:11

client 30:15 156:16.16 160:16 180:4 186:8 292:18 clients 98:13 99:21 102:15,16 132:22 160:18,18 161:15 180:4 189:6 195:20 200:22 284:2 climate 180:19 239:11 240:8 243:4 246:20 close 6:18 7:11 37:3 76:1 142:10 176:7 213:20 362:14 364:21 366:8 closed 70:22 366:14 closely 22:5 30:11 284:12 closer 278:11 313:20 closes 365:8 closing 109:10 363:22 co-founder 102:2 Coast 11:14 19:6 29:11 29:12,19 30:3,13,17 31:3,7,21 45:3 63:16 64:22 70:19 74:17 75:4 147:8 155:7.10 155:20 166:18 193:20 194:2 212:12 313:17 316:21 code 3:3 60:8 219:12 302:14 303:12 codes 290:16 codified 222:14 codify 246:14 Coffey 203:7 216:3 225:2,7 226:9 233:4 238:13 240:11 251:11 253:9 254:20 263:22 275:14 276:12 294:6 Coffey's 265:4 cognitive 68:21 69:7,12 COL 8:12 11:20 23:5 32:17 39:6,16 40:2 43:4 44:14,18 46:21 52:1 54:19 56:17 57:12 58:12,21 59:1,2 64:7 65:22 67:11 71:3 73:14 79:18 82:11 84:7 89:1 90:10 91:3 92:12 93:3 94:9 146:5 147:11 153:2 156:21 158:5 159:4 160:12 165:10 169:1,4 174:3 174:19 180:3 181:4 184:8 190:1 192:6 194:16 195:9 197:9 199:16 201:4 202:13 202:21 280:13 297:5

298:2,7 334:6,14 336:2 338:21 357:8 365:7,13,16,20 collaboration 188:7 267:15 collaborative 205:15 248:22 265:1 collateral 217:16 295:3 colleague 68:14 239:4 colleagues 29:5 45:4 124:7 158:19 218:6 221:17 collect 304:5 312:4,17 313:12 326:7 327:21 332:5 collected 303:11 306:4 collecting 305:4,5,11 309:3 312:13 collection 19:11 20:21 21:5,16 135:14 302:17 303:1,4,21 306:16 collective 244:8 college 33:21 231:15 colleges 263:13 colonel 2:3 8:10 10:15 11:3,6,11,16,18 18:7 23:4 32:16,20 33:1 35:5,16 39:16 42:11 48:4 57:9 64:8 73:14 83:5 88:4,9 89:1 92:17 101:14 104:11 110:21 113:18 136:1 146:22 147:3,5,9 152:3 153:3 155:12 156:6 172:12 185:2 192:17 204:9 206:6 209:7 210:2,14 211:6 212:2 221:12,14 233:6,9,16 235:10,10 235:16 236:1,22 267:16 282:19 284:16 285:17 361:15 365:12 colonels 33:17 47:5,5 47:21 48:1,2 **color** 65:16 66:8 201:19 268:22 312:2 341:8 341:13,19 342:11,14 346:9 Colorado 357:15,16,18 359:20 Columbo 296:12 comb 347:18 combat 239:7 combination 13:17 17:6 163:22 209:21 256:8 combine 302:10

combined 173:10 325:7 **come** 46:12 51:9,12 58:4 61:15 67:4,21 68:22 69:9 75:19 79:10 80:20 87:3,4 93:8 97:16 98:7 126:9 128:6 129:12 133:13 133:15 139:15 167:1 182:17 194:6 198:5 217:14 271:21 286:9 294:7 314:15 322:15 comes 15:18 27:6 53:16,21 58:19 61:7 70:17 114:5 132:15 140:17 167:6 180:22 253:6 254:10 258:12 279:10 300:19 302:12 303:13 318:15 comfortable 131:12 256:3,7 310:20 342:5 **coming** 96:14 130:10 165:16 182:11 185:15 193:2 198:22 258:6 284:11 294:17 354:16 command 11:8,15 12:5 12:14 15:6.7 16:8 24:2 25:3.21 26:6 28:14,16 29:15,16,16 33:6,7 38:11 43:20 45:13 50:2,7 53:11 59:18 65:2 67:21 151:16 154:2,3 161:17 207:9 220:2 227:14 239:11 242:6 242:10,21 245:16 251:19 253:11 254:5 255:6 263:4 Commandant 6:13 11:13 199:6 203:14 219:14 233:18 245:13 Commandants 251:9 commander 11:13 12:21,22 37:12 39:20 43:17 47:20,22 52:3 65:2 71:17 75:1 151:15 230:2 335:8 335:12 339:17 commander's 40:17 239:12 337:13 340:18 commanders 12:12,15 12:20 16:11 21:21 25:8 28:3,5,7,9 31:8 33:15 37:9 43:7 44:3 45:22 50:10 52:2,10 71:8 154:13,17 171:9 171:12,13 242:17 246:20 253:17.21 254:6,16 280:2 288:1

commanders' 242:4 commanding 150:14 227:4 252:12 264:12 357:1 commands 21:7,18 28:6,10 30:4,6,7,15 43:16 45:5,5 46:2 59:13 252:12 292:2 commend 243:9 commensurate 224:4 comment 3:19 6:19 7:21 51:8 65:22 78:7 95:5 123:14 131:20 163:16 201:6 283:11 283:14,15 295:20 329:3 334:15,20,22 335:8 comment/maybe 281:15 commented 172:11 commenter 335:18 comments 8:1 41:20 47:8 85:10 86:19 143:21 152:22 201:14 253:9 265:4 279:19 298:12 335:11.12.13 335:19 353:13 Commission 244:11 Commission's 217:8 commissions 229:11 234:22 commit 339:10 commitment 70:21 71:1 205:5 207:22 216:16 222:9 239:14 244:6 250:20 committed 6:5 22:6,20 214:8 225:15 244:3 committee 1:1,9 4:5,14 5:18 6:16,22 7:9 8:5 8:13 9:16,18 10:5 11:21 23:6 24:5 32:18 34:21 35:9 36:22 37:7 51:13 78:16 95:7.13 95:16,19,20 96:19,22 97:2 100:8 102:1 110:20 125:12,22 126:16 134:12 143:3 146:21 152:2 165:8 191:16 202:22 203:1 204:11 208:9 211:16 213:22 216:4,4,18 217:11 222:20 224:10 238:20 243:9,13 244:6,18 272:5 273:4 297:7 298:18 299:13 300:4 302:16 304:4 310:5,6,6 311:4,10

312:3 315:2.13 317:8 321:13 324:3 329:8 329:13 334:10 335:2 335:6,9,17,20 committee's 5:17 117:17 committing 81:22 common 24:14 97:17 99:19 122:4 157:2 213:10 305:14 311:21 commonality 213:3 communicate 185:1 254:1 communication 254:16 292:19 communicative 185:17 communities 200:21 community 36:3 54:12 71:1 144:17 189:2,16 192:14 213:14 222:16 223:13 261:1 266:5 274:7,12 291:13 293:10 company 40:20,21 41:7 compare 320:15,21 321:6 compared 63:5 125:15 145:5 329:15 comparison 109:16 260:22 311:4 319:7 320:13 321:17 327:16 comparisons 310:22 compassion 215:17 compatriots 33:4 compel 111:5 compelling 126:13 134:11 competent 185:6 238:2 competitive 229:6 compile 13:13 14:4 compiled 25:18 complaining 123:11 complaints 51:7 161:17 223:21 224:2 complementary 207:13 complete 7:17 25:15 55:4 234:17 247:21 completed 25:21 225:13 228:5,12,17 230:5,10 337:1 completely 286:5 329:4 339:12 completing 340:1 **completion** 234:7,12 237:14 complex 229:18 230:17 230:21 235:6,19 236:5 248:10,12

272:1 complexity 285:13 compliance 206:4 **complied** 162:11 complies 23:11 component 92:6 120:10 191:20 305:16 components 313:21 composition 53:7,8 54:14 310:11 compositions 330:8 composure 229:21 236:12 comprehensive 117:14 291:12,20 309:3,21 310:8 315:17 comprised 153:11 226:2 comprises 248:3 **computer** 79:5,9,15 con 4:10 concentration 21:13 45:18 230:12 concept 194:18 255:22 285:5 concepts 263:1 concern 54:16 101:20 109:11 177:10 273:21 concerned 66:7 100:21 104:5 180:1 253:8 260:14 269:3 295:13 concerns 95:7 117:11 118:1 142:8 145:2 166:12 178:17 179:17 179:18 201:15 223:11 293:21 353:16 **concerted** 260:20 concluded 135:7 189:12 concludes 145:22 238:14 conclusion 117:3 238:8 concrete 330:2 concretely 260:9 concur 253:7 conduct 20:15 151:8 158:10,14 166:22 189:20 213:11 255:6 conducts 31:7 **conferring** 259:17,22 confident 206:13 208:15 215:11 224:6 confidential 153:18 confirmation 221:15 **confirmed** 187:18 206:6 209:5 221:14 226:14 227:11 233:6 240:10 245:2 264:4

conflict 185:16 confront 98:16 confronted 122:14 confronts 95:19 confused 113:2 324:8 **Congress** 82:22 83:12 94:22 206:5 207:2 213:16 239:16 270:10 304:21 305:22 310:2 congressional 161:16 connect 118:2 310:19 **connected** 96:9 97:9 327:6 connection 38:9 39:4 conscientious 65:6 conscious 36:8,12 65:14 consequence 132:20 **Consequently** 24:14 consider 35:14,19 69:3 73:19 161:12 184:21 186:4 295:21 331:18 considerable 70:6 222:5 295:1 consideration 14:21 15:3 21:16 25:16 26:11 27:6 32:3 34:11 36:18 37:1 45:11 340:12 considerations 141:16 considered 31:18 73:5 73:22 286:15.20 considers 15:16 consist 232:17 consistency 213:4 consistent 18:16 24:1 70:1 123:19 168:7 219:11 249:16 313:13 343:8 consistently 275:2 consisting 225:21 consolidate 43:15 constant 214:10 291:8 constantly 199:19 301:6 constituency 213:14 constitutional 124:9 140:22 141:1 142:11 constitutionally 27:12 232:7 constrains 49:10,17,17 constraints 168:15 construction 189:10 constructive 178:9 contact 116:21 159:21 184:20 339:6 contacted 135:3,17 348:14

contain 39:18.19 containing 25:19 **contains** 10:6,10,19 contemplating 68:19 content 20:15 105:21 183:6 248:9 CONTENTS 3:1 contested 86:15 context 31:10 183:5 285:13 299:6 continual 293:11 continuation 10:12 continue 6:20 103:8 120:20 189:22 196:1 205:21 207:20 215:12 215:18 224:8 248:8 250:7 260:20 266:15 274:16 277:3 287:10 289:8 326:4 339:16 340:6 342:2 continued 97:18 336:19 340:4 360:14 continues 5:16 217:2 336:9 348:18 360:13 continuing 171:18 284:20 337:8 continuity 194:5 199:20 200:9 215:16 continuously 22:11 214:8 249:9 357:4 continuum 231:13 241:7 contours 240:13 contrary 164:7 controlled 90:12 convene 19:13 31:11 convened 45:7 53:13 226:11 236:16 convener 75:15 convenes 24:14 convening 9:21 10:9,22 11:1 13:9,12 14:6,15 15:4 16:1,9,15,19,22 17:4,12,15,18 19:2,19 20:6,8 21:9,19 22:4 23:13,14,19 24:1,3,4 24:8,9,11,15,20 25:3 25:7,16,19 26:2,4,7,9 26:12,16,17,19,21,22 27:1,4,8,11 29:8,19 29:21 30:8,10,20 31:14 32:3,6 35:18 37:11 40:9 44:4,21 45:10,13 46:5 50:3 51:4 55:1,2,14 59:20 65:5 71:13 73:18 74:12 80:15 88:13 92:2 135:14 154:13

207:9 245:18 251:9 251:19 252:20,21 253:2 258:17 294:10 330:10 conversation 196:22 253:11 259:11 306:19 342:22 conversations 70:12 71:8 conversions 285:6 convey 112:10 convict 111:14 convicted 51:10 98:11 105:20 112:5 113:11 113:17 142:6 144:17 309:20 336:7 339:9 340:14 343:14,14 344:9,11 347:5,10 348:5 349:12 354:18 361:8 conviction 117:4 125:3 125:7 138:20.22 139:2 165:1 195:3 309:14 310:4 343:22 350:17,18 362:8 convictions 277:19 350:9 convince 141:8 263:4 convinced 179:17 coordinate 160:1 185:14 297:10,16 coordination 245:3 254:15 coordinator 214:21 296:1 **copies** 191:6 core 25:22 230:22 239:12 269:19 Cornerstone 28:8 corps 6:14 11:13 19:5 23:7,19 25:4,6,22 28:7 33:5 38:13 43:6 47:1,1 79:21 101:15 104:12 124:19 132:10 135:19 147:4 151:10 152:5 173:6,8 189:1 189:13 198:16 199:14 203:14 211:21 218:4 218:9,14 219:2,14 224:21 227:6 232:22 233:8,13,19 234:5 236:17 238:9 255:1 263:2 265:21 268:4 268:15 270:18 272:11 272:16 273:14 278:22 284:15 292:16 298:22 299:6 315:21 316:3 316:20 317:2,18

318:8 320:21.22 321:4,5,9 325:7 329:19 331:8,14 Corps's 23:10 206:12 232:4,9,14 correct 56:17 82:18 156:11 314:21 345:16 352:16 364:14 correcting 279:9 correction 349:21 corrections 279:14 correctly 42:10 134:17 333:15 352:16 correlate 333:22 correlation 309:18 cost 295:6,11 339:13 352:18 council 261:21 counsel's 129:6,18 154:5 220:9 221:6 Counsel/Victims' 3:8 counseling 152:9 counsels 150:20 251:9 281:22 293:1 counter 51:16,17 counterparts 29:20 213:2 267:17 285:20 Counterterrorism 234:1 county 105:10 213:10 **couple** 51:9 59:9 92:22 159:11 199:5 259:4 272:9 **coupled** 20:19 courage 106:17 course 17:16 27:19 28:1,4,18 36:7 50:20 51:18 68:18 88:15 117:6 118:18 139:8 141:14 142:1 148:22 160:13 162:17 163:22 165:21 166:1 180:12 181:5 184:6 210:18 211:13 228:12,18,19 231:14 234:12,14,18 237:15 247:22 248:1 248:3,8,19 274:13 295:4 297:17 355:17 366:9 courses 27:21 147:22 166:19,21 297:9,16 297:18 court 8:3 13:15,16 15:11 17:11,21 19:14 22:13 35:6,13 36:5,7 36:19 41:2,12 56:9 60:11 66:20 67:8 79:9 94:20 99:11 100:2

101:1 104:8 105:18 106:14,19 107:11,22 108:17,22 109:5 110:4,9 112:2,11,17 118:14 119:8 128:8 128:13 129:14 131:5 164:10 166:9,10,15 184:11 190:7,12 233:13 245:10 258:17 259:1 court's 37:3 190:16 **court-** 5:15 13:7,8 14:5 14:16 15:22 27:9 43:2 122:11 228:8 235:7 258:15 330:11 342:12 court-martial 13:5 14:9 14:15 16:8,15 17:3,5 19:1 24:13,16,19 25:12 26:18 27:18 29:7,21 30:20 40:4 42:15 45:6 46:4,16 53:13,16,21 54:2 55:3 56:14 60:13,15 74:12 75:18 76:15 87:17 89:13 90:12,15 99:1 126:21 130:11.22 132:6 133:14.19 134:18 135:7 137:12 145:12 149:18 167:22 195:3 221:4 257:5 339:18 350:16 362:5 362:8 363:9 364:9,15 364:20 court-martials 73:18 132:19 courtroom 61:2,8,14 79:10 119:16 137:6 169:5 254:12 courts 19:13 95:2 109:13 123:7,9,18 127:20 134:8 145:18 350:13 courts- 31:11 137:3 153:16 229:17 235:5 236:4 courts-martial 17:1 19:10 24:7 29:13 55:16 56:1 173:12 227:21 230:17,21 235:19,21 236:7 247:5 250:5 252:21 277:18 302:19 329:16 courts-martials 120:6,7 cover 270:2 274:15 298:12 366:7 covered 55:12 207:16 209:11 214:11 220:3 220:15 222:22 223:3

227:17 228:15 231:9 232:8 234:15 235:7,8 235:20 236:6 237:22 240:4 241:5,10 242:5 246:11 250:4 287:10 294:9,19 295:3 **COVID** 359:13 craft 349:7 Crandall 203:12 216:5 218:2 221:9 222:4 224:20 225:2 251:14 252:1 258:1 271:2 278:21 283:21 287:18 291:11 Crawford 35:15,21 36:7 36:10,20 92:14 crazy 359:1 create 54:16 302:17 326:12,13 338:3 created 5:2 304:16 347:8 creates 143:5 creating 32:6 65:14 211:4 239:10 286:16 crept 82:5 crews 45:16 crime 81:22 93:18 95:1 105:21 107:2,15 108:19 121:19 123:5 137:2 144:5 153:22 170:6 176:6 192:3 288:19 289:4 crimes 95:3 144:9 153:10,16 210:22 223:1 228:14 234:13 288:1 350:15.16 criminal 5:11 11:4 32:21 62:20 75:22 98:12 102:22 107:7 164:10 166:10 184:11 190:12 209:19 223:19 224:14 227:1 231:15 231:16 233:13,16 235:13 247:4,9 248:7 311:17 338:3 343:5,6 346:22 347:14 Criminologist 2:12 Critchley 2:6 criteria 10:8 13:4 14:9 14:19 16:14 17:2,14 23:11 24:22 25:13 26:5 27:5 34:9 40:8 43:10,14 45:7 52:21 68:15 74:15,19 82:15 82:21 173:1 210:11 228:3 230:4 231:2 234:4,6 236:16,19 302:22 303:4

criterion 36:4 critical 117:8 134:3,5 149:1 224:4 246:15 248:15 250:21 271:19 274:17 280:10 critically 170:14 cross 115:10,16 348:1 cross-108:9 cross-examination 99:12 115:1,3,21 cross-examine 99:7 115:19 cross-pollinate 200:20 cross-section 36:2 cross-sectional 49:22 crossed 112:9 Cuban 302:3 cull 348:3 culminated 359:17 **cultural** 302:5 culturally 86:20 culture 153:8 205:9 242:11 243:4 246:20 cultures 212:22 cumbersome 81:6 curious 68:13.16 69:6 75:12 88:8.11.18 110:3 156:19 163:8 268:12 current 22:2 38:11 97:21 103:10.22 118:12 144:2 192:7 210:13 214:22 241:17 250:14,15 269:17 271:8 341:1 currently 12:4 92:3 123:2 147:14 148:1 157:8 163:10 182:16 182:18,20 192:16 223:6,7 266:20,22 281:21 284:15 293:9 341:16 353:15 361:9 cyber 241:15 cycle 200:3,6 D D.C 62:18 225:22 **DAC-** 5:4 DAC-IPAD 1:2 2:3 3:13 4:8,9,16 5:3 7:18 29:3 32:19 95:5 102:4 103:8,12,22 104:2 109:12 151:18 194:11 310:2 319:22 322:5 323:12 327:17 332:16 366:14 DAC-IPAD's 8:17 307:2 **DAF** 246:19

Dale 2:5 Dan 147:2 data 14:7,7,8 15:17 16:20 17:17 77:3 97:3 100:8 109:11 117:17 127:13 160:7 163:1,7 172:6 182:16,17 195:16,20,21 214:21 240:6,17 242:20 247:2 278:17 298:15 299:20 301:15,17 302:13,17 303:1,8,21 304:3 305:20 306:16 307:12,20 309:3,4,21 311:12,14,16 313:13 313:18 314:3,19,21 315:7,14 318:20,22 320:14 321:12,14,22 322:16 323:3 326:5,7 327:21 329:8,19 330:18 331:19 333:4 349:15,17 database 308:8 312:22 313:4 323:12 databases 307:21 333:5.10 date 166:3 231:4 246:8 249:20 358:2 dated 355:14 dating 358:2 daughter 108:12 113:4 113:15 114:2 359:2 359:17 360:10,11,19 361:4 362:15 daughter's 106:6,8 108:3 112:5 135:22 362:11 daughters 103:17 104:9 105:1 daughters' 111:17 dawn 357:13 day 3:17 6:19 28:11,20 96:7 134:7 158:15 277:8 286:6 days 337:2 DE&I 341:16,18 342:4 deadline 112:18 218:11 221:22 deal 29:13 106:17 138:7 171:22 258:18 286:16 304:7 dealing 31:9 75:22 136:4 188:4,4 298:19 298:20 302:13 331:1 debate 183:4 295:1 decade 99:16 decades 189:13 210:21 265:7

December 1:7 83:3 204:22 208:13 221:22 225:9 226:20 238:11 244:21 249:20 258:9 281:1,3 361:8 decent 67:12,15 decentralized 225:20 232:16 decide 133:22 decided 80:22 104:20 111:14 223:19 336:17 339:17 352:1,2 deciding 176:4 decision 16:16 34:13 34:14 36:10 37:2 71:20 88:12,22 104:16 164:7 167:22 183:17 190:7,9 221:7 242:18 256:16,19,22 257:3 294:22 decision's 258:13,14 decision-making 207:15 decisions 22:14,17 71:9 206:15 209:20 257:19.20.21 261:13 337:14 declared 82:2 decline 317:4 declined 317:6 decorated 113:18 decorations 113:11 decorum 119:13 142:20 dedicated 6:2,4 244:8 deep 97:5 101:20 167:2 170:3,21 deeper 258:10 deepest 207:22 deeply 225:14 defeated 113:2 134:2 defend 223:10 defendant 38:10 56:9 70:9 75:7,11 92:11 108:1 112:3 120:4 121:6,11 126:4,12 139:18 140:3 142:1 142:13,15 355:7 defendant's 75:10 106:16 141:17 defendants 21:1 134:4 134:6 defender 347:16 Defending 231:14 defense's 87:16 defense-specific 292:16 defenses 207:16 274:15

defensible 292:21 defer 130:13 152:22 176:22 deficiencies 215:3 define 176:11 defined 176:9 207:13 240:14 302:10 323:7 definite 306:14 definitely 47:17 67:13 169:6 171:5 188:21 197:21 306:15 326:20 332:9,11 definition 176:2,13 222:22 306:2 definitions 303:3 308:5 definitive 131:4 definitively 175:10 degree 323:6 353:12 **DEI** 273:4 **Del** 216:16,19 217:5 218:13,19 219:2 220:22 221:19 224:6 delay 137:11 138:6 delegate 16:2 deliberation 7:12 334:8 deliberations 366:5.7 delighted 239:3 delights 260:13 deliver 110:8 218:1 delivered 106:2,8 112:1 delivering 106:11 demand 209:1 295:13 demographic 241:3 307:12 313:13 demographically 259:14 demographics 304:7 315:9,21 331:13 demonstrated 229:3 demonstrating 208:21 denial 163:12 denied 156:17 158:20 166:16 deny 158:15 depart 83:18 department 11:4 12:10 60:7 150:16 151:11 153:5 157:11 203:7,8 203:9 204:2,2,3,7 213:15 216:8,12,21 220:12 223:14,18,22 224:8 228:17 233:19 238:15 241:22 242:9 242:18 243:3 246:5 246:13,17 247:1 248:6 265:6,19 281:6 Department's 217:3 222:8,15,19 239:22

240:17 Department-wide 218:7 departmental 217:12 departments 6:11 203:6 213:15 224:16 281:5 297:11 Departments' 218:5,18 221:10 depend 13:18 dependent 157:4 175:12 depending 13:14,15 17:21 47:6 148:20 157:13 286:1 depends 190:3 222:8 deployed 46:11 80:21 deployment 24:17 53:20 360:3 deportment 19:22 **depth** 250:13 deputy 2:4 11:12 148:15 155:16 184:11 193:21 203:15 262:11 describe 100:15 114:3 116:16 117:1 121:9 121:12.20 122:10 123:4 218:7 described 22:19 55:8 59:11 125:17 126:4 126:19 138:3,4 140:14 159:14 216:18 description 46:22 169:8 desert 133:20 deserve 338:6 345:1 deserves 350:18 **design** 259:9 356:12 designate 311:13 designated 2:1 4:4 131:7 238:4 designation 229:16 designator 21:11 209:14 designators 270:19 designed 212:12 343:6 desire 104:2 desk-side 31:13 despite 139:3 361:7 362:15 detail 17:5,5,18 73:16 100:15 127:14 208:4 221:3 244:18,20 334:10 detailed 55:4 153:14 212:18 222:19 227:21 228:8 242:19 detailing 16:22 17:16 36:18 73:19 159:16

271:11 details 33:2 208:10 258:6 347:22 detective 333:11 detectives 337:21 determination 44:5 220:10 222:6 237:9 241:13 252:17 258:22 310:1.14 determinations 300:4 309:7 determine 38:6 87:14 201:16 270:13 determined 46:19 252:22 306:20 determining 172:21 devalidated 362:5 devastation 114:3 develop 205:9 210:17 210:22 214:4 229:2 242:1,19,20 249:17 281:9 284:20 developed 30:3 50:18 160:15 181:14 211:12 247:1 developing 187:10 194:7 245:19 332:14 332:19 development 137:14 210:8 247:11 248:14 250:16 266:1 274:5 developments 314:7 deviate 108:14 **Devon** 165:12 devoted 244:14 diagnosis 358:15 362:11 dialogue 93:19 Diego 45:20 226:2 differ 21:6 difference 5:19 88:16 144:22 145:3,10,11 278:8 306:2 317:1 363:2 differences 30:4 84:18 different 29:11,12,20 51:9,10 52:2 64:14 68:14 84:10,12,13 90:13 115:12 148:8 148:16 163:6 176:5 187:2 194:20 195:5 197:12 199:22 200:2 213:16 226:5 258:19 266:6 276:18 285:22 288:8 300:16 310:13 313:5 315:16 316:16 319:15 320:8 353:3 356:21

differentiation 260:8 differently 176:12 179:21 308:19,20,21 319:19,21 differing 166:12 difficult 104:17 138:7 155:22 202:8 279:4 330:8 353:21 difficulties 4:21 difficulty 122:13 dig 258:9 digit 344:12 dignity 109:6 154:18 diligently 97:2 dire 38:1,6 39:2 41:11 46:18 54:7 55:7,19 57:1,5 60:15,19,19,20 79:11 87:3 89:16 90:7 92:4 93:6 168:14 170:7 171:19 172:20 direct 25:8 108:8,13 115:16,20 118:18.19 163:15 205:10 339:6 355:5,11 directed 25:13 204:14 210:13 276:2 direction 70:17 80:9 81:10 82:16 219:18 255:17 313:15 343:4 355:5 directive 178:6 246:7 300:7 directly 20:7 100:13 105:19 106:3,5,14 120:3 126:11 129:21 139:18 140:3 149:10 184:21 199:5 202:9 206:18 219:2 226:6 240:11 315:2 331:10 directly-related 128:5 director 2:4,4 105:10 214:19 250:15 262:6 Directorate 247:11 dirty 357:22 disability 155:9 disagree 77:19 disagreeing 325:18 disallowed 183:9 discharge 14:10,10 124:20 224:11 338:15 disciplinary 147:19 154:14 discipline 18:16 205:5 207:19 288:4,20 disciplines 269:19 disclose 181:18 disclosed 164:16 disclosing 107:15

disconnect 306:3 311:22 discouraging 317:13 discrepancies 309:16 343:9 discretion 8:2 23:20 discrimination 67:3 182:4 discuss 5:15 95:21 98:7 148:17 186:8,11 231:21 232:3 298:17 327:6 334:10 341:4 discussed 20:8 103:13 103:14 154:17 168:19 170:22 171:6 212:8 247:19 253:19,22 255:20 293:3 329:6 discussing 107:19 151:18 276:16 340:2 discussion 3:15 5:17 10:13 15:4 32:14 85:1 91:22 119:3 167:12 183:4 211:10 265:21 273:20 281:17 308:16 discussions 248:13 264:8 dishonorable 124:20 338:14 dismissal 351:22 dismissed 124:19 dismissing 112:21 disorder 358:16 disparities 298:9 310:3 310:9 313:22 314:2 314:10.18.22 disparity 3:14 6:18 81:19 82:5,8 311:12 disposal 355:4 disposition 206:1 220:10 dispositive 71:13 disproportionate 174:13 disproportionately 85:17 132:9 167:14 168:3 174:21 disqualification 13:20 disrespected 239:11 distant 360:14 distinct 129:19 165:5 distinction 164:3 305:17 312:14 distinguish 225:3 distinguished 18:11 19:21 150:3 203:1 216:3 232:2 238:19 243:13 distinguishes 190:13

district 159:9 200:5 246:16 diverse 21:10 51:22 80:19 86:17,20,21 215:7 259:14 263:16 266:11,13 320:20 345:15 diversity 52:19 62:17 70:18 80:11 88:16 103:13 201:15,18 214:19 215:13 260:13 260:15,21 261:5,20 265:18,18 266:3 268:20 271:17 272:6 272:12 273:14 298:21 307:2 316:7,8 319:18 320:20 325:7 342:17 342:19 dives 167:2 170:3 divided 114:6 division 32:21 47:3 155:13,17,17 165:21 212:6 227:1 234:1 245:11,14 divisions 5:11 292:3 divorced 157:7 docketed 163:11.14 dockets 209:19 302:19 document 40:7,10 59:17 179:5 218:16 323:20 325:21 documentation 315:6 360:5 documents 10:10,20,22 11:1 14:22 17:15 32:9 32:12 40:3 41:10 59:4 60:2 61:4 62:5 335:5 335:10 DoD 8:16 29:5,20 117:15 166:19,21 204:18 208:17 246:7 249:17 313:11,21 314:8 324:4 340:16 **Dogs** 97:16 103:1,3 doing 49:4 65:11,13 99:15 118:19 128:22 135:15 170:20 183:7 183:20 256:7 259:21 260:9 263:8 264:1.2 270:12 279:6 282:15 282:17 284:5 288:4 290:8 295:2 308:10 312:8 313:8 314:8 317:17,22 319:9,13 320:7,9 332:17 345:17 353:15 **DOJ** 292:5 DOJ's 234:1

dollar 295:7 domestic 152:10 153:16 233:21 **Dominguez** 335:8,12 **DON** 294:22 donations 349:2 door 109:3 217:13 doors 359:4 double 46:14.17 344:12 doubt 140:19 dozens 96:3,17 Dr 1:19 2:12 9:8,9 62:9 94:17 110:19 124:18 125:1,5 134:21 135:8 135:10 146:4 268:1 280:14 322:11 330:20 draft 15:1 26:16 281:3 drafted 27:1 297:7 drafting 211:5 drafts 264:16 draw 21:9 53:17 57:11 164:2 271:22 drawn 21:18 142:9 168:1 **Dray** 10:14 dream 350:22 354:12 driven 90:1.4 drives 292:18 droned 113:13 drop 58:1,2 drug 359:15 drugs 358:7 drum 264:5 due 7:13 18:17 24:16 121:16 142:4 215:18 241:1 243:8 274:1 281:3 358:13 359:14 362:8 duration 25:3 107:6 240:22 duties 19:17 22:12 52:6 87:6,9 187:20 221:1 227:16,19 228:10 247:3 255:5 duty 14:1 17:12 20:17 21:11 24:17,18 50:14 72:18 73:3,7,20 74:14 74:16 104:22 165:16 189:14 194:6 200:13 247:18,20 339:15 342:2 350:5 360:2 Dwight 2:1 4:4 265:12 Ε **E** 1:14 E4 33:20 80:3 337:19

www.nealrgross.com

E5s 33:19

E8s 33:19

E9s 33:19 eager 209:8 earlier 46:22 138:2 148:12 167:11 169:8 171:6 187:7,17 189:8 201:14 243:6 279:19 284:1,17 286:4 288:14 330:5 360:15 early 257:1 easier 283:17 331:7,11 332:3 easily 328:10 east 232:18 easy 198:7 276:17 331:15 echelons 261:8 echo 253:9 271:17 288:13 economy 152:5 edit 127:7 editor 101:2 educate 85:2 103:3 254:6 educated 20:11 33:21 110:6 170:14 educating 110:10 education 5:17 11:8 12:4 23:16 48:20 98:3 110:9 116:6 170:10 210:7 211:14 213:4 214:6 220:17 237:2 247:8 250:8 262:8 269:13,22 287:8,17 educational 142:17 228:6 234:8 effect 19:19 178:7 237:9 328:21 effective 18:14 185:20 207:18 219:6 226:7 242:1 249:19 262:19 effectively 208:16 326:11 effectiveness 249:18 276:16 277:3 278:19 290:20 291:9,10 292:21 effects 107:15 effectuated 99:2 efficiency 47:16 48:11 214:6 efficient 211:1 effort 52:8 80:18 85:6 153:8 205:1,15 210:16 211:11 244:19 249:1,8,22 260:20 296:16 297:2 325:21 efforts 84:3 215:6 217:3 220:14 231:22 232:6

237:16 240:17 243:21 244:9,20 250:13 261:19 263:12,18 343:2,11 eight 56:22 57:3 58:17 61:16 62:1 89:21 358:14,22 either 18:20 49:3 54:9 80:9 83:18,21 85:20 88:6 90:20 118:14 151:6 154:3 157:4 158:6,15 183:7 184:17,19 270:1,22 317:4 324:15 328:2 344:11 elaborate 251:15 elated 105:2 Eleanor 2:12 elect 89:5 elected 89:10 election 90:1 element 232:18 280:10 elements 120:13 240:14 eligibility 157:5 237:9 eligible 12:13 13:3 eliminate 53:18 111:6 119:20 307:10 eliminating 153:9 elite 286:17 287:1,21 Elizabeth 147:7 155:6 email 5:1 emerge 188:20 emerging 183:10 emotion 100:18 emotional 106:17 emotionally 105:22 141:8 emotions 112:14 emphasis 220:15 emphasize 207:14 215:13 emphasized 241:6 empirical 41:22 48:18 77:4 78:10 86:12 126:7,15 163:7 165:8 172:6 empirically 126:18 employ 99:21 employment 157:18 empower 153:22 242:17 empowered 161:3 240:6 empowering 109:1 empowers 143:4 enable 322:20 329:1 enabled 328:13,14

encountered 103:15.19 encourage 217:14 273:5 322:19 encourages 176:18 encouraging 160:20 endeavor 222:7 endeavoring 284:4 ended 91:9 136:14,19 343:17 endorse 93:1 endorsed 310:6 ends 22:21 276:4 endured 107:5 108:2 enduring 297:2 energy 106:17 222:5 enforcement 137:2 160:6 246:19 248:7 248:16 249:6 250:10 engage 19:5 31:1 engaged 20:11 249:7 260:18 engagement 194:19 engaging 20:5 283:2 336:16 enhances 205:7 eniov 199:8 enioved 19:3 enlisted 12:14 13:14,17 17:4,6 21:17 24:7 25:11 33:18 58:11,12 58:16,18 69:19 77:6,7 77:10,16 79:1 80:14 80:17,19 87:21 88:5,6 88:10,11,14,16,21 89:4,6,10,19,22 90:2 90:3,6,11,16,18,18,22 91:2 138:12 169:10 202:6 226:3 231:7 252:14 329:17 ensure 17:8 27:9 34:12 37:15 91:12 97:13 142:21 154:18 205:3 211:1 217:16 224:1 226:19 231:8.17 237:21 244:15 246:21 248:9 249:11,17 251:8 252:2 268:20 270:21 273:13 274:17 341:7,12 342:16,19 355:7 ensuring 102:20 207:17 207:22 215:17 217:22 240:15 259:12 260:14 267:5 270:5 274:8 295:20 340:22 342:14 entails 110:7 enter 191:5 entered 336:21

enterprise 207:17 211:22 245:22 271:14 291:16 292:1,13 enthusiasm 208:20 288:14 289:13 entire 17:13 88:20 125:6 187:19 273:14 342:7 364:16 entirely 129:19 entities 246:19 entitled 58:7 122:10 156:14 157:3,12 entrusted 210:11 environment 21:2 environments 260:4 envision 198:16 envisioned 207:5 EO 70:7 equal 70:18 270:22 equality 69:21 equals 318:4 equipment 222:17 equipped 175:15 189:20 equipping 219:10 equitable 350:12 equity 214:19 261:20 272:12 354:19 equivalent 83:6,12 124:20 269:12 281:22 281:22 eradicate 216:17 276:7 eradicating 239:9 err 49:4.5 erratic 359:16 error 184:3 320:5 escorts 176:17 especially 29:7 63:7 80:6 93:15 179:9 254:2 268:21 351:3 362:10 essence 287:4 essential 98:18 120:13 217:22 essentially 55:17 309:5 316:18 establish 24:6 82:14 204:15 209:9 210:10 225:8 237:16 238:10 277:3 established 7:1 8:17 19:9 30:18 204:20 205:14 228:3 229:1 234:4 236:19 239:5 249:1,13 300:22 304:4 305:10 establishing 205:1 218:4 236:15

establishment 203:2 205:17 231:5 232:7 esteemed 204:11 239:4 estimate 344:7 estimates 241:17 295:6 et 25:9 276:3 295:5 ethic 227:10 ethical 218:21 ethnic 62:16 315:8 ethnically 86:19 ethnicity 67:1 241:4 299:3,4,12,14 301:20 302:1,9 305:5,6 306:10 307:20 308:6 310:12,16 311:16 312:4,8,18 314:7 315:6 316:1,13 317:13,21,22 318:21 325:3 333:5 evaluate 275:6,10 276:3 evaluated 220:6 289:21 293:7 356:13 evaluating 289:19 evaluation 82:6 282:14 356:17 evaluations 290:7 356:14 evening 336:12,14 event 15:21 16:5,18 90:5 events 211:19 212:11 339:11 350:21 351:11 **eventual** 134:10 eventually 108:5 everybody 59:18 186:4 257:17 280:7 286:18 286:18 299:2,17 303:4 313:14 320:9 320:12 321:16 325:15 329:22 347:2 everybody's 41:15 evidence 20:13 99:15 100:4 115:18 129:14 129:16 135:13 338:5 343:7 360:21 362:9 364:22 evidenced 361:1 evident 354:15,20,22 evolved 305:2 evolving 183:11 187:12 188:11,14 301:6 exact 130:1,5 321:4 334:9 exactly 45:4 55:8 83:5 163:7 284:4 306:4 321:10 323:8 327:3 364:5

examination 108:10 examine 55:21 example 40:10,15,19 41:9 56:6 59:10 61:12 107:18 119:5 120:22 123:13 132:21 138:10 149:16,18 164:6,15 165:2 178:18 182:21 212:2 222:15 242:13 281:7 292:5,14 293:20 306:6 307:14 310:12 examples 125:13 143:5 212:1 excel 210:2 exception 31:15 78:6 152:17 156:17 158:12 exceptional 164:5 233:9 exceptionally 285:3 exceptions 157:1 excerpted 306:8 exchange 264:7,15 excited 266:17 exciting 198:2 exclude 31:17 66:22 excluded 36:13 37:13 37:22 38:5 39:11 85:17 86:5 87:5 132:3 137:5 167:15 168:3 170:19 364:8,13 excluding 27:13 exclusion 34:16 38:17 77:21 86:11 132:15 134:9exclusive 30:13 324:17 exclusively 77:14,17 excusal 11:1 16:7 40:8 40:18 excuse 16:3 24:20 38:4 68:6 excused 16:12 26:18 27:2 40:22 41:10 93:14.20 execute 207:1 215:2 221:19 232:13 255:4 executed 192:10 executing 19:1 22:12 execution 210:3 225:20 232:16 246:15 279:1 executive 11:14 150:14 150:15 252:13 296:6 300:21 341:16 exercise 17:20 54:9 exercised 221:5 exercises 23:20 248:20 exhausted 344:2 346:8 exist 52:21 117:19

313:22 315:1 existing 22:14 exists 82:8 92:3 169:20 323:2 362:12 exit 195:19 expand 190:6 196:1,16 222:21 223:22 expanded 101:8 expands 294:8 **expanse** 144:19 expansion 231:6 expect 46:15 145:8,9 151:3 189:22 222:15 expectation 22:9 240:5 expectations 218:17 239:6 330:7 357:5 expected 37:2 198:7 expedited 217:11 expensive 337:20 349:3 experience 9:20 14:9 20:1,10,21 22:5 23:16 29:6 44:20 50:1,8 65:5 71:15 73:6 76:13 77:4 78:1,6,10,14 86:14,21 87:21 91:5 95:18 98:6.8 99:3.15 99:16 100:11 101:16 102:6 109:19 117:6 125:10 131:10 132:1 132:1,1,13 133:3 136:17 148:6,18 149:20 154:20 155:19 162:13 165:14 168:8 169:5 170:17 171:12 173:9 177:12 180:16 181:21,22 193:15 197:11 205:20 208:5 209:22 210:21 211:9 211:15 214:7 215:13 222:6 229:9 230:15 230:19 231:19 233:11 233:17 234:20 235:12 235:18 236:4 237:3 238:6 240:20 245:17 247:3,4,13 268:6 288:7 356:5 362:5 experienced 105:17 127:5 128:19 135:21 136:10 142:18 168:4 198:5 215:8 231:10 233:2 238:1 244:14 246:21 268:9 355:16 experiences 97:16 103:5,9 127:19 128:2 212:22 experiencing 114:5 132:16 352:11

experiential 270:20 expert 189:12 207:3 217:21 218:21 225:17 227:9 230:8,18 238:10 337:21 expertise 19:22 191:17 193:16 194:5 205:4 209:2,22 212:17 214:7 215:13 220:13 220:16 221:18 231:19 232:12 238:6 241:15 247:14 269:20 279:20 experts 5:12 59:12 188:10 205:19 210:20 214:13 248:5,6,12 265:12 explain 118:5 160:17 196:4 314:15 316:13 331:4 explained 89:20 244:18 explaining 158:12 explanation 67:5 83:20 83:20 110:1 explicit 305:1 exploration 165:6 explore 199:21 exploring 195:8 express 100:17 111:17 122:13 131:8 178:7 expressed 178:17 expressing 175:3 178:6 208:21 expression 174:14 expressly 66:14 extemporaneous 118:16 extend 88:3 extended 219:18,22 extensive 222:3 226:20 233:10 245:17 255:15 293:4 315:15 extensively 151:1 extent 87:9 126:6 282:16 294:8 295:19 328:20 external 214:12 externship 230:6 extraordinary 159:5 164:5 166:9 181:20 190:18 extreme 358:13 extremely 109:1 265:1 265:10 267:18 285:1 eye 214:9 310:18 339:6 eyes 188:21 F

F.E 64:17

fabricate 362:11 fabricated 339:12 fabrication 339:12 face 62:16 63:14 107:6 112:2 114:1 120:15 177:20 182:5 200:22 201:1 353:20 360:12 faced 104:5 111:8 facet 226:21 facie 67:2 facilitate 31:2 218:22 facilitating 28:21 facility 222:18 344:13 facing 106:7 142:13,14 fact 43:12 67:3 129:17 129:22 170:8,10,16 175:16 221:2 252:16 283:12 344:18 factor 48:22 49:1 58:10 71:13 factored 291:2 factors 20:7,10 38:19 38:20 46:1 48:17 49:2 49:6 79:16 91:6 159:11 173:10 275:13 facts 30:2 163:17 faculty 212:19 failed 189:8 358:12 failing 110:12 162:7 fair 18:14 22:6 34:12 36:2 64:3 69:20 75:8 75:11 86:7 134:4 170:9 217:22 274:1 331:22 355:7 fairly 315:15 328:14 fairness 53:8 54:17 166:14 229:22 236:13 280:7 faith 27:9 faithfully 20:12 179:10 221:19 Falk 2:6 fall 53:6 252:9 falls 170:17 347:20 false 358:19 familiar 37:17,17 49:19 139:7 familiarity 44:17,19 families 144:10 278:4 family 73:9 76:1 93:17 103:14 105:13 113:15 114:4 117:15 176:10 176:13 337:18 far 68:10 87:1 104:4 136:20 147:16 155:21 167:3 171:1 193:16 224:18 253:7 261:4 fate 341:2

father 113:4 360:10,12 360:14 favor 138:19 341:20 **favorable** 340:10 fear 186:17 217:15 fearful 122:18 features 214:5 February 95:5 148:1 fed 71:16 federal 2:1 4:4 56:7,9 81:14 213:9 214:3 249:6 300:11 353:22 feed 291:6 feedback 104:1 134:8 195:6 197:1 259:20 293:11 feeding 291:9 feeds 71:19,20 feel 30:14 61:3 63:8,11 64:2 70:3 75:13 78:7 131:11 135:21 136:5 138:18 141:6 196:2 197:17 256:5,6 262:9 275:21 276:22 296:12 322:11 332:9 342:8 342:11.12 357:22 359:1 feeling 53:22 113:1 feelings 93:18 feels 239:11 242:11 347:4 348:4 fell 77:5 fellow 70:19 216:4 233:19 fellowship 235:14 felon 338:15 felony 56:9 210:22 350:17,17 felt 134:2 341:19 342:10 354:17 361:10 362:4 female 93:7,21 169:21 174:21 175:2 266:10 266:14 309:10 321:3 321:8,9 333:12 336:10,15 349:15 357:15 females 93:4,4 fervor 353:3.3 fewer 47:7 162:1 169:6 169:12 173:7 fiancee 337:2 fiances 176:15 fidelity 275:3 fides 261:16 field 78:11 150:20 205:14 225:21 237:19 238:3 261:21 262:9

fifth 7:13 fighting 362:2 figure 123:7 279:4 291:20 318:13 323:16 323:19 327:7 figured 292:3 file 161:20 164:9 filed 160:9 161:18,21 166:7,14 185:11 188:3 filing 161:16 190:2,9 **fill** 117:20 214:22 filled 249:2 final 77:22 101:2 241:12 256:17 257:21 262:13 346:6 finally 9:7 11:16 28:15 106:13 122:1 137:11 148:17 229:18 236:9 250:6 276:6 finances 351:10 financial 349:1,9 352:12 355:2 financially 106:1 find 54:8 70:5 126:12 129:12 159:14 170:18 202:8 261:21 330:17 337:21 353:5 findings 27:15 83:2 186:2 311:5 313:10 314:13 364:2 fine 68:12 168:21 finger 262:18 269:4 fingers 359:4 finish 46:21 112:22 338:8 finite 332:4 firmly 22:5 244:3 first 9:14 11:6 36:6 52:2 59:8 76:15,20 79:18 79:19 88:12 89:3 95:19 96:8 99:5 109:2 111:16,19 114:7,22 115:13 116:21 117:16 124:4 126:15 133:1 134:16 146:21 147:12 163:6 176:16 183:1 199:5 206:3,7 217:18 218:6 231:1 233:7 238:22 240:2,9 246:9 253:19 260:12,12 265:16 268:12 272:17 273:20 299:14,15 300:5 307:4 313:11 314:8 317:14 318:16 322:14 330:7 331:2 334:16 335:17 341:3 341:10 342:21 345:13

348:15 351:9 352:16 357:20 fiscal 5:3 208:17 216:9 222:21 244:13 250:3 fit 14:19 100:17 273:10 316.5 fitness 55:22 198:20 fits 142:22 fitting 317:5 five 124:22 125:1 148:2 166:7,8 187:12 236:6 269:19 289:9 301:8 301:12,13,15 311:5 316:5 317:6,10 335:21 357:9 five-minute 10:2 fix 264:14 338:17 fixed 219:17,19,21 249:15 307:14 flag 226:6 flawed 323:22 337:11 fleet 21:13 45:18 226:4 230:12 252:7 288:15 288:21 fleshed 251:14 flip 59:8 flipped 190:12 flips 48:3 flood 112:14 flooded 59:3 floor 11:18 208:3 flows 144:4 fly 361:20 focus 6:2 71:5 161:4 210:6 214:6 240:1 262:7 280:11 296:18 297:1 300:2 304:8 308:16 focused 7:13 105:21 205:2 227:16 228:13 228:14 234:13,14 268:14 283:18 304:12 focuses 279:21 focusing 220:13 272:22 folks 41:16 44:2 59:13 68:17 69:2 159:7 162:19 172:13 182:2 182:5 188:9 189:19 200:13 251:17 256:6 267:7 269:14 270:19 271:20,22 289:8 290:18 338:22 follow 20:14,15 44:9 48:14 53:2 56:3 78:20 91:21 172:2 194:14 200:14 216:13 220:21 265:3 279:18 325:19 follow-up 85:12 87:18

118:22 130:5 158:14 followed 11:10 147:1 243:8 252:5 following 9:1 20:16 34:7 156:2 218:12 223:17 267:1 football 96:11 forbids 251:13 force 11:8 12:2,9 15:12 39:17 59:9,10 60:5,7 64:8,13,18 73:15 76:21 77:12 88:14 89:3 145:12 147:6 153:5 166:9 180:11 181:5 190:12 191:20 203:9,16,20 204:3,16 212:4,4 239:17 242:9 242:19 244:2,3 245:11 246:5,13 248:4,6,17 249:3 255:11,14 256:10 260:15,16 265:19 266:5 268:13 293:2 297:13 299:5 306:8 310:13 316:3.21 319:19 320:17 321:7 361:16 Force's 12:10 18:5 forces 1:2 4:7,16 5:9 6:6 35:7,13 166:15 170:20 224:15 262:1 293:19 351:1 forensic 248:11 foreseeable 199:11 forget 296:3 forgot 128:2 form 116:17,19,20,22 271:8 281:6 328:22 333:19 formal 223:21 formally 7:1 8:16 237:12 292:8 format 110:1 formation 47:21 79:22 171:10 242:7 former 97:21 110:22 188:8,9 238:20 formerly 187:14 forms 44:13 242:15 Fort 278:1 forth 118:22 127:11 257:18 fortunate 358:8 Fortunately 341:9 349:4 forum 20:22 196:8 forward 23:2 40:12 96:14 101:18 104:2

133:15 137:15.19 138:5,8 151:17 153:1 155:3 156:3 158:11 186:5 198:9 200:2 216:1 217:14 242:16 246:2 250:16 251:3 252:22 260:21 274:16 277:4 282:10 286:9 303:5 315:3 332:9 343:11 351:15 362:20 forwarded 14:22 16:9 158:9 foster 232:20 240:7 242:10 358:11 360:7 found 9:22 30:19 80:10 95:9 102:16 146:18 175:1 186:6 254:21 269:15 272:20 283:5 337:2 351:12,19 foundation 215:19 foundational 96:15 242:10 247:21 founded 97:8 founding 94:17 101:13 four 6:15 64:14.19 96:10 151:3 163:21 187:12 197:5 198:15 232:18 237:10 263:17 278:22 317:10,17 346:5,5 358:9 four-phase 225:11 four-week 211:13 fourth 241:3 279:2 frame 14:3 **Frankly** 45:17 free 78:7 206:15 207:16 255:7 freeing 109:1 freely 107:22 177:11 freighted 83:14 frequent 151:9 217:19 frequently 30:5,9 99:20 151:14 157:2 159:7,8 159:10 171:2 friend 133:3 176:17 336:21 friend's 133:4 fringe 189:4 front 84:8 282:13 frozen 286:12 fulfilling 198:13 full 6:22 7:9 16:4,5 28:10 90:18 113:10 136:1 144:16 153:10 204:21 208:6 221:20 225:12 226:19 244:21 249:18 344:14 full-throated 192:5

fully 22:6 84:20 90:6 95:2 106:22 107:12 109:6 110:6,10 149:11 175:9,21 207:8 225:8 232:12 238:9 260:18 277:1 function 155:9 188:19 225:22 258:4 functions 29:15 213:19 funding 274:9 funds 349:13 further 152:22 181:14 219:18 228:20 234:18 237:6 248:15 307:17 314:1 317:19 327:6 furtherance 205:17 furthered 179:19 furthest 313:17 future 65:10 103:10 109:4 186:17,22 221:16 338:10,13 341:1 futures 274:6 FY 217:4 222:14 280:16 289:2 315:1 G G 43:7 G1 25:9 G2 25:9 **G3** 25:9 GAD-DAC 185:4 gained 200:17 gaining 328:3 Gallagher 2:7 9:13,15 gallery 112:21,22 game 193:4 299:2 gang 96:12 GAO 3:14 307:1,3,4,8 307:15 308:21 309:15 310:10 313:7 314:5 319:22 322:5 GAO's 313:8 gap 81:20 117:20 130:15 gaps 262:15 garnered 96:10,13 Garvin 1:15 9:3 68:2,9 68:10 130:4 131:13 182:10 325:17 gather 312:21 gathering 100:8 300:10 304:9 305:1,19 306:1 gauge 286:3 GC 222:1 GCM 13:9 61:16 89:21 **GCMCA** 14:20 15:1,3 15:15,19,22 16:10,15

17:22 39:19 47:18 64:15 GCMCAs 64:8 gears 94:14 131:13 GEN 243:12 255:10,13 gender 27:7,8,13 31:16 31:18 32:1 34:11 52:4 52:9 65:12 69:8 86:16 86:20 92:15,20 172:9 175:4 180:7 305:4,6 305:17,22 306:11 308:6 309:14,19 312:5,14 generally 31:12,19 33:15 46:14 50:3 57:6 87:19 157:19 166:13 199:1 356:4 generated 79:6,16 131:1 generates 79:9 generation 245:20 generously 180:17 Gentile 1:17 gentleman 135:20 gentlemen 153:3 336:5 339:4 geographic 226:5 **Georgia** 36:11,12 getting 63:11 64:3 78:17 84:21 89:15 144:16 187:21 201:7 271:13 276:22 283:7 283:19 287:5 308:11 313:5,20 314:2 326:2 330:2 girl 132:22 133:8 give 14:8 52:5 54:13 56:4 61:11 98:2,14 112:1 114:20 116:7 118:8 119:11 120:21 126:6 127:10 132:21 186:4 294:12 320:8 320:11 326:17 327:1 341:18 352:1 given 65:2 95:1 109:15 147:21 178:19,19 180:6 193:8 195:14 324:20 352:9 364:19 givers 358:19 gives 47:22 giving 116:12 147:13 158:21 294:11 305:22 327:5 glide 277:1 global 150:19 **globe** 231:3 goal 97:17 178:10 215:20 243:5 308:9

356:15 Goldberg 1:15 9:6 39:22 41:18 44:8,16 48:13 68:5 85:8,9 87:18 92:18 125:8,9 128:4 132:14 139:5 139:13 142:12 167:8 167:18,20 174:5 194:8 238:20,22 259:2,3 265:16 281:14 284:22 327:11 346:20 348:13,21 349:14 Gonzalez 333:13 335:14 gosh 183:17 gotten 137:11 159:19 196:17 govern 38:20 governed 21:8 83:4 213:10 governing 218:14 246:13 255:1 272:10 government 3:13 20:13 20:22 22:7 56:10,19 92:7.10 155:16.17 157:16 173:14 178:21 184:20 187:22 229:12 235:1 269:5,18 300:11 360:1,22 364:10 government's 175:19 governs 99:1 grab 57:4 grade 237:19 238:3 245:5 247:6 299:3,5 312:5,9 316:1,2 grades 25:11 graduate 28:1 grain 309:1 Grand 1:9 grandfather 361:13 grandparents 358:8 grant 140:18 152:17 156:22 163:15 164:10 granted 145:13 157:9 167:7 granting 177:5 granular 251:16 grappling 265:6 grateful 136:15 239:1 243:19 grayed 316:11,11 greater 92:2 177:5 250:12 263:18 greatly 213:21 green 313:15 grew 62:21

Grimm 1:16 9:8 53:1,1 53:5 56:3 57:8 59:2 Grimm's 59:6 60:2 Gross 265:13 **around** 130:14 289:5 grounded 359:19 group 6:4 12:15,21 13:19 37:22 43:2 49:15,15 60:19 98:1 103:1 171:15 271:5 272:7 284:10 325:8 group's 61:5 groups 281:7 328:2 grow 190:5 222:16 266:15 267:2,3 270:3 270:7 289:8 growth 215:9 222:20 223:6 269:8,11,15 292:10 GS-14 187:18 **GS-15** 189:11 291:17 quard 11:15 29:11,12 30:3,13,17 31:3,7,21 45:3 48:11 63:17 64:22 72:17 74:17.17 74:18 75:4 155:7.10 155:20 166:18 193:20 194:2 201:13,21 202:3 212:12 313:17 316:21 Guard's 29:19 147:8 guardian 131:7 242:11 guardians 144:9 Guardsmen 70:20 guess 37:10 40:6 52:8 60:3 63:17 67:22 135:21 163:6 269:1 282:6 289:17 312:1 322:13 327:11 329:19 363:21 365:20 guidance 20:14 135:16 143:1,4 321:13,19 guide 240:17 guided 66:21 guideline 83:12 guidelines 81:15,18 82:2 83:14 guiding 174:14 285:12 Guilds 94:18,21 95:6,10 95:14,15 114:17,19 115:4,7,11,14,16 116:2,16 118:11,17 119:14,18 122:22 126:14 128:18 130:12 130:20 131:22 137:8 138:10,14 139:12 140:5 142:14 143:22 145:8 146:3 149:8

152:14 Guillen 278:1 quilt 139:4 355:10 356:8 364:2 guilty 83:2 109:16 111:22 339:22 351:13 351:20 353:6 360:22 gum 323:14 gun 359:3 Gupta 2:7 Gymnastics 107:17 н habeas 353:18,19,20 354:4 Hagy 2:8 half 226:13 358:9 half-brother 359:14 halfway 312:9 hallmark 207:4 hallmarks 54:11 hand 9:12 298:10 337:13 handle 274:15 handling 191:22 hands 340:18 happen 68:17,18 82:20 90:19,20 113:21 115:22 123:15 131:3 256:7 261:13 351:11 happened 66:10 100:16 120:21 121:10,14,21 123:5 125:14 126:22 130:21 187:2 337:3 337:19 339:11 359:21 happening 135:13 278:9 279:22 302:20 308:7 314:12 322:7 332:13,22 361:19 happens 42:14 58:3 61:6 78:10 93:19 126:1 257:2,5 happy 23:7 32:10 81:7 85:11 114:12 149:4 149:21 168:21 182:6 197:15 204:17 238:16 264:17 269:9 harassment 97:20 153:20 223:1,2,11,22 224:1 239:8,10,17 240:4 241:5,8,9,16,20 242:3 280:5 294:2,16 294:18,21 295:4 hard 70:4 129:1 214:9 268:20 273:16 276:13 290:5 296:20 341:7 341:11,14 342:16,19 345:14 349:2

harm 98:15 143:13.15 143:16,17,17 241:7 harmed 105:1 107:21 harmful 205:12 harsh 170:3 hasten 117:10 hat 275:5 299:16 341:18 342:4 hate 57:12 354:10 havoc 336:9 Hawaii 359:14 361:21 363:10 Hawaiian 301:10 303:17 Hayes 1:10 head 327:9 359:3 headed 292:9 headquarters 60:7 225:22 227:1 232:17 292:4 heal 286:9 healing 98:19 109:3,9 health 340:6 hear 6:3,6 7:3 35:9 68:3 75:16 91:17 92:22 101:12 105:15 106:4 125:21 168:21 210:15 221:17 282:16 296:17 363:18 heard 8:1 51:8 88:4,8 97:14 98:22 102:21 106:22 109:8 114:9 114:21 132:13 133:11 137:7 141:13 143:14 149:17 167:14 168:2 169:8 175:10,13,15 194:21 195:16 201:20 261:7 267:6 268:3 275:22 282:19,19 284:17 285:18 293:20 305:16 312:20 315:19 315:20 329:11,12 341:4 342:21 352:15 362:19 hearing 35:12 111:11 111:22 113:20 176:5 243:10 330:1 hearings 229:18 230:17 230:21 235:6,19 236:5 296:12 hearsay 363:16,17 heart 18:14 224:15 heart-wrenching 111:15 heartened 265:11 heavy 135:16 332:7 heels 329:5 held 36:7 129:14 144:4

247:22 359:3 363:9 help 48:10 50:17 54:1 54:18 90:8 94:4 171:21 187:9 192:2 196:10 270:21 273:8 278:18 279:13 286:9 291:18 337:15 343:10 343:13,22 344:9 347:9 349:7 350:8 helped 91:6 helpful 35:8 48:15 75:14 125:21 136:18 137:15 141:4 186:7 191:15 192:2 267:19 293:18 294:4 296:4 353:10 354:3 helping 6:5 171:12 182:2 187:3 helps 30:19 47:9,10,16 52:17 322:4 Henning 335:19 339:1 339:3.8 345:9,16,20 346:2,14,19 347:6 348:17 349:17 350:10 352:19 353:2 354:22 Heroes 348:7 hesitant 356:3 hesitate 122:5 hesitation 342:9 hey 35:17 41:3 **Hi** 76:11 134:14 high 169:18 175:2 290:13 high-ranking 136:4 highest 256:10 highest-level 209:13 highlight 306:22 312:17 highlighted 191:21 227:15 311:19 highlighting 29:10 97:1 250:17 308:14 highly 206:2 210:20 238:1 Hines 335:21,22 336:1 336:4,6 338:20 hire 337:20 343:19,20 351:4,14 hired 187:18 189:11 193:2,8,14 214:18 262:6 291:17 351:5 hiring 214:20 Hispanic 91:12 262:16 301:21,22 303:22 304:1 309:8 313:2 317:15,16 318:2,11 318:12,18 319:1 324:8,11,14,16,18,20 333:13 349:16,21

historical 160:14 162:16 historically 212:16 263:13 history 21:12 87:1 247:6 299:10 hit 336:12 hitter 135:17 hitting 187:6 hold 20:13 28:20 131:19 205:7 holding 243:9 274:14 356:9 holds 209:13 holistic 247:13 holistically 273:22 home 359:11 360:16 Hon 1:13,15,16,18,20 honestly 270:14 278:11 338:2 honor 18:19 82:22 132:22 149:9 152:1 177:14 178:12 Honorable 1:10 9:5,6 203:6,7,8 204:7 276:19 285:16 286:2 honored 21:4 103:7 155:3 **Hood** 278:1 hook 258:8 hope 61:2 97:17 111:4 172:5,13 224:11 313:5 363:1 hopeful 109:3,4 361:9 hopefully 193:3 300:17 hopes 108:16 horrible 283:16 horrific 114:3 hosted 212:11,11 hours 66:1 163:21 326:1 336:13 hours' 119:11 house 11:10 18:8,10 38:3 45:17 50:1 69:15 86:13 87:22 91:18 301:3 336:10 357:17 huge 59:16 265:18 278:5 hundreds 21:17 hurts 362:6 husband 101:14 102:5 104:5,15 106:5,6 110:15 358:2,13 359:19 360:20,22 361:6,7,14 362:3,18 363:6 364:1 husband's 104:10 360:18 361:17,19,22

hypothetical 79:20 182:15 L i.e 134:19 lain 147:4 152:3 **IAP** 216:20 217:2,11,19 218:13 idea 49:12 51:20 138:5 175:9 264:17 322:12 ideal 210:1 ideals 18:17 ideas 192:13 196:14.15 264:7 284:11 identical 321:1 identifiable 140:22 141:1 identification 17:10 identified 76:4 132:17 181:13 215:3 230:22 236:22 247:15 263:14 283:1 313:22 314:18 identify 47:10 179:21 180:5 181:7 219:8 229:2 236:16 240:18 262:3 274:16 293:12 identifying 23:20 identity 328:17 ignore 179:11 ignoring 316:16 **III** 335:1 **ill** 361:17 illegitimate 109:7 imagine 84:22 104:17 115:19 141:12 142:7 176:15 340:4,5 imbalance 268:11 **immediate** 105:13 immense 265:14 immensity 265:8 **immunity** 294:11 impact 6:3 22:14 65:9 93:21 94:15 95:3,8 98:8,11,17 99:3,19 101:4 102:7 104:4,7 104:13,21 105:5,8,14 106:3,11 107:9,10,19 108:1 109:12,15,18 110:2,5,7 111:3,6,12 112:1 113:8,14,22 114:7,20 116:8,9,12 117:2 120:14 121:21 122:3,19 123:3 124:1 124:16 125:13,18 129:13,20 130:3,16 131:9 140:11 143:12 144:5,10,10,16 145:4 145:6 146:15,16

148:18 151:19,20 154:21 155:19 156:1 170:4,5 175:11,17 176:2,6,18,21 177:22 182:19 186:20 188:2 188:12,18 196:3 223:8 241:19 252:8 275:6,10 300:3 366:5 impacted 105:21 111:18 144:18 impactfully 106:19 impacts 170:11 241:11 315:2 imparted 114:4 impartial 71:18 168:9 172:3,14 impartiality 54:17 impediments 204:20 impermissible 179:12 179:14 impetus 347:20 implement 196:18 216:8 217:4 225:6 243:22 275:2 291:21 implementation 204:18 208:12 216:19 217:7 218:8 244:7,19 250:7 281:1 implemented 280:20 281:6 332:20 implementing 208:16 243:5 245:21 implicated 124:9 implications 240:3 implicit 71:5 importance 5:18 65:8 91:22 241:6 280:6 important 29:4 36:21 50:14 69:21 84:17 92:5,10 95:18 96:18 96:22 97:4 98:19 112:10 120:1,10 121:16 134:3 139:20 140:12 144:11 164:3 170:14 173:18 198:21 213:6 217:11 218:12 224:12 240:18 241:11 242:21 243:10 252:4 264:14 265:2 266:3 267:4,12 272:2,22 273:13 285:3 290:4,6 290:12 292:12 295:19 300:18 328:4,7 331:22 339:8 importantly 123:21 207:7 imposed 100:19 112:17 122:21 145:16

imposes 183:19 imprisonment 351:21 improper 36:18 206:16 207:16 improve 217:6 316:8 **improved** 313:12 improvement 97:18 214:10,17 improvements 217:12 **improving** 306:16,16 in-depth 175:20 248:11 inability 123:13 inappropriate 39:3 141:16 144:15 inaugural 246:1 247:22 incapable 107:14 incarcerated 336:8 339:14 344:8 347:8 348:18 incident 360:5 include 15:16 20:11 22:13 33:16 34:8 35:19 201:21 234:6 237:17 240:14,19 274:13 307:16 308:6 315:5.11 317:2 356:13 included 37:19 52:20 214:13 334:20 includes 28:10 97:20 152:15,18 229:10 231:5,13 234:21 272:1 335:11 including 10:21 21:3 24:17 27:12 28:13 30:12 46:5 85:15 101:19 150:11 151:12 153:19 154:15 155:15 213:19 217:12 223:1 227:20 229:20 235:7 235:12,20 236:6,11 240:4,22 241:15 247:2 248:4 282:9 inclusion 34:16 36:9 49:5 66:16 80:13 91:22 94:4 171:7 214:19 241:9 261:20 272:5,12 inclusive 34:11 52:18 171:15 incoming 207:12 212:3 inconsistencies 347:19 352:7 inconsistent 129:7 362:7 incorporate 308:7 incorporated 92:14 incorrectly 106:21

increase 201:17 223:4 223:9 241:18 250:2 274:3 284:5 291:22 increased 209:1 269:8 283:10 increases 19:12 250:4 increasing 291:2,15 incredible 136:14 incredibly 91:20 177:7 328:7 361:11 independence 205:3 206:10 207:3,22 213:18 218:22 220:4 240:16 252:15 253:15 255:3,18,21 256:5 independent 44:5 127:3,8 142:19,20 200:17 207:8,15 217:8,21 218:20 220:2 225:16 227:13 232:11 238:10 242:7 244:11 251:18 254:19 278:2 independently 206:14 219:4,8 224:2 255:5 Indian 301:17 324:19 Indian/Alaska 319:1 Indian/Alaskan 301:9 303:16 316:19 324:12 indicate 122:17 184:18 256:4 indicated 51:14 63:16 114:19 131:6 233:5 337:7 indicates 161:22 indicia 285:8 individual 39:21 42:15 60:20 98:16 138:10 138:11 206:3 213:8 213:12 242:22 275:9 320:14 347:21 individual's 172:5 266:2 355:10 individually 151:5 individuals 13:1 16:17 21:21 42:6 43:1 53:12 54:5 60:14 64:10 105:16 136:4 144:11 144:18 179:20 263:2 281:8 286:10 289:10 291:6 302:3,18 310:11 328:21 330:11 330:15 344:1,8 345:1 352:11 356:7 industry 292:10 ineffective 32:5 inexperienced 135:1 inflicted 106:16

influence 28:14 67:21 154:4 206:16 207:16 220:9 251:8 252:18 253:12 255:7 inform 95:2 322:4 information 9:18 10:16 10:17 11:5 12:16 26:15 50:21 54:8 56:4 68:10 85:5 100:9 103:21 116:12 146:15 164:14 181:11 191:8 191:9,13 222:17 278:20 282:13 291:7 300:10 303:6 304:10 306:1 308:8 312:21 313:3,6 326:9,17 328:9,10 330:3 331:9 332:6,21 334:5,9 340:7 348:2 355:10 355:19,20 informative 195:22 informed 96:19 116:8 117:21 158:17 242:18 informing 20:5 informs 96:6 infrequent 57:22 initial 26:12 158:10 203:2 211:12 218:10 220:17 246:6 249:21 266:9,17 267:8 332:5 initially 81:15 93:2 94:22 135:18 initiative 127:6 initiatives 250:17 **injury** 113:16 **injustice** 337:17 innocence 70:10 104:19 113:5 364:2 innocent 21:4 338:2 344:18 347:13 361:1 innovative 227:11 input 237:4 254:17,18 259:19 320:6 inputting 284:8 inquiries 161:16 inquiry 158:10 170:21 inquisitive 20:12 insert 128:5 inside 359:11 360:11 insight 51:4 insights 213:21 216:1 242:21 insignificant 120:17 installation 12:9,16,17 15:8,11 64:12 254:13 339:17 installations 42:9 64:14 64:19 73:3 202:4

208:19 233:4 instance 15:7 26:11 64:12 355:12 instances 280:9 instituted 249:15 institution 201:3 institutional 259:9 institutionalize 222:10 institutionally 279:13 instruct 28:21 instructing 28:9 instruction 12:11 28:9 instructions 5:1 251:13 251:16 instructor 212:3 233:12 instructors 212:17 248:4 insult 113:16 insulting 107:3 **insurance** 341:17 intangibles 290:22 integration 204:16 250:9 integrity 230:1 236:14 338:4 343:5,6 346:22 347:15 intend 255:15 288:5 intended 28:4 207:2 intending 176:14 intensified 215:5 263:12 intent 27:14 118:8 246:14 intention 132:4 intentional 71:5 intentionally 316:3 interact 284:18 interacted 44:11 interacting 284:21 interaction 222:4 357:20 interactions 265:11 interchangeably 102:11 305:19 intercourse 352:4 interest 103:22 152:5 152:21 156:15 164:14 174:14 247:8 297:8 297:16 interested 75:5 78:17 86:8 92:22 211:17 256:14 270:15 303:10 329:9 330:1 337:8 348:12 interesting 34:14 163:5 175:1 194:17 319:13 interestingly 138:17 interests 157:15 175:19

interfere 124:12 interfered 251:18 interference 286:11 289:18 interim 226:18 271:9 interlocutory 137:1,19 190:13,17 internal 214:12 314:9 internally 273:22 international 233:22 internet 357:13 interpersonal 153:19 247:7 interpret 123:10 interpretation 182:17 320:5 333:17 interrupt 145:9 intertwined 284:12 intervening 219:3 240:12 intractable 265:4 introduce 9:13 12:2 102:3 363:15 introduction 3:2 10:3 146:20 152:6 introductory 11:19 intrude 296:21 intruded 256:5 inure 93:10 inures 93:10 invaluable 165:14 194:5 invariably 80:20 investigate 223:21 294:21 343:7 355:19 investigated 224:3 294:20 investigates 96:16 investigating 227:17 241:14 355:6,9 investigation 1:1 4:6,15 5:6 97:19 107:7 135:12 154:7 157:8 209:10 214:10 220:14 224:13 233:21 257:2 307:20 310:4 355:6 investigations 241:1 248:18 250:5 309:11 333:10 investigative 116:22 147:18 159:20 223:4 223:19 248:7 299:21 304:14 308:3 311:17 314:10 320:3 333:21 355:3 investigator 40:12 158:6 333:18 334:3 343:20 347:17 355:20

investigators 248:16 250:10 274:10 351:7 351:7 investment 308:13 invite 334:16 inviting 23:6 102:4 110:17 155:2 297:8 involved 27:17 28:21 86:15 148:21 149:6 154:6 186:7 215:21 225:14 284:8 288:16 involvement 17:9 151:21 involving 5:8 73:18 107:17 166:13 202:6 227:21 235:6,8,20 236:5 246:11 IPAD's 5:5 ipad.whs.mil 7:19 ipad@mail.mil 8:1 **IRC** 241:6 ironic 179:9 irony 178:14 Islander 301:11 303:18 **issue** 36:15 54:15 66:14 67:22 85:14 94:22 101:20 103:12 105:2 128:22 130:6 131:5 134:3,13 137:13 138:7 141:18 142:12 167:5 180:10.18 184:7,13,16,20,22 239:19,20,20 255:16 264:10,13 265:2 267:14 280:6 287:20 289:4 310:10 317:15 317:15 341:6 346:12 **issued** 218:13 246:12 303:14 issues 6:2 30:12 35:14 36:5,22 70:7 95:19 97:4 103:10 104:1 130:8 138:2 139:16 140:17 146:16 151:18 154:22 162:22 173:16 179:22 180:14 181:8 181:21 185:14,18 188:4 194:10 227:2 243:10 293:12 300:2 330:5 337:9 it'll 365:9 items 103:22 340:13,15 iterate 17:12 J Jacksonville 45:20

Jag 10:15 27:22 28:2

189:13 198:16 206:12

273:14 298:21 299:5 315:21 316:3 320:21 320:22 321:4,5,8 325:7 329:19 331:8 331:14 **JAGC** 2:3 James 1:18 Jane 336:11,12,16,18 337:4 January 150:22 151:4 193:3 272:7 Japan 232:21 Jeeter 35:7,12 36:6,16 37:2 51:18 Jeff 2:3 Jenifer 1:17 Jennifer 1:17,18 **Jim** 143:7 **job** 65:18 66:4 197:18 198:3,14 268:10 290:21 327:14 338:11 jobs 290:16,22 291:1 ioin 203:19 333:8 joined 5:13 29:5 239:3 joining 4:19 11:9 203:16 joint 84:2,14 211:22 212:11 213:12 304:4 jointness 212:2 213:1 Jonathan 221:11 226:12 Jones 40:19 239:15 **JSC** 175:8 judge-alone 83:9 178:11,14 179:4 judged 290:9 judges 123:22 124:12 127:2 142:18 143:14 156:1,2 161:10 171:19 175:13 288:7 288:9 290:8 291:4 292:6 293:6,11 356:13,20 judges' 162:4 judgment 19:21 50:5,9 76:2,7 229:20 236:11 judicial 23:17 48:21 49:13 68:15,20 69:4 69:10,13 71:12,15 152:5 213:10 308:8 judicially 122:21 judiciary 50:18 206:11 227:6 290:7 292:8 **Julie** 2:4 July 153:6 220:21 246:8 258:7

211:21 212:4 263:2

265:21 272:11,16

jump 52:1 78:18 79:18 84:7 260:11 271:16 280:13 June 147:20 203:2 205:13 207:21 212:8 214:2 225:10 226:18 231:22 244:20 246:6 298:18 315:19 335:9 junior 199:3 356:4 juries 91:9 329:14,15 jurisdiction 33:5 119:10 286:22 jurisdictions 209:18 211:8 213:12 214:4 jurisprudence 35:22 67:12 123:9 137:14 juror 83:7 140:20 167:15 329:9 jurors 62:22 331:20 jury 5:21 36:13 51:20 54:5,11 59:21 60:9 61:7 79:8 91:14 101:19 103:13,16 106:7 111:14 112:3 113:13.17 131:17 132:3 140:17 145:16 167:12 Κ **K** 2:4 221:12 Karla 1:10,13 Kate 2:11 keenly 211:16 265:8 keep 13:6 14:12 38:17 124:6 176:10 185:10 188:21 246:19 271:1 285:11 287:1 299:19 324:3,3 326:3 330:12 349:14 362:2 keeping 200:12,13 331:19 Kendall 239:2,5 240:3 240:11 242:6 243:20 246:12 255:16 279:22 280:11 Kennebeck 11:3,16 32:16,17,20 35:5,16 39:6 42:12 46:21 52:1 56:17 57:9,12,22 58:12 59:1 65:22 67:11 71:3 79:18 82:11 83:5 84:7 88:9 90:10 91:3 92:12 93:3 Kentucky 66:21 kept 25:1 363:15 key 240:16 246:18 280:11 303:2 314:18

kicked 89:17 90:7

Kismet 11:14 knew 289:3 323:22 326:9 338:2 351:10 356:15 knowing 108:18 329:9 knowledge 98:3 110:9 110:9 175:20 181:1 226:20 known 4:7 103:1 knows 41:6 133:16,18 222:21 **Kramer** 1:16 9:8 88:1,2 90:9 91:1 268:1.2 Krass 265:11 L L 2:5 lack 116:14 291:9 351:10 353:17 354:4 354:19 lacked 307:12 ladies 153:3 336:4 339.3 laid 225:11 lane 173:22 language 123:12 142:16 177:18,21 178:6 179:18 187:4 193:9 304:22 305:15 315:15 317:11 349:7 languishing 343:15 344:12 larcenies 288:2 large 21:9 29:22 33:12 47:2 53:11,11 77:7 175:7 189:2 230:12 252:7 271:5 328:18 341:17 larger 21:13 46:4 50:7 132:10 202:5 300:3 332:14 largest 209:18 Larry 107:18 laser 227:16 late 188:19 203:14 Latino 301:21,22 304:1 304:1 317:16 318:12 318:12 latitude 92:3 Laughter 169:3 277:9 290:10 296:8 launch 214:5 law 5:11 11:4 18:17 32:21 67:15 100:22 101:8 123:5,10 124:3 127:17,18 129:3,8 141:6,9 144:2,2 162:1 179:10 181:22 183:10

183:12 192:3 209:19 227:1 230:6 235:13 238:20 246:19 248:7 248:13,16 249:6 250:10 263:15 267:1 272:17 laws 95:22 lawyer 27:19 124:8 133:17 329:18 lawyer's 78:9 lawyers 231:17 263:6 331:6 337:20 349:2 356:19 lay 62:5 90:15 layer 327:13 lays 218:16 lead 20:10 49:20 148:13 150:18 206:3,7,18 207:12 209:6,9 210:16 216:13 218:22 219:3,19 221:2,6,11 221:20 226:15,18 227:18 233:7 240:10 241:14 243:1 245:1 246:1,10 249:14 250:14 257:11 259:8 267:15 271:9 leader 28:4 41:3 227:12 leader's 239:12 leaders 103:4 151:12 216:20 224:7 235:11 235:16 240:6 242:9 242:17 252:14 278:4 280:2 356:16 leadership 150:7 151:12 209:22 215:9 230:4,11 237:5 239:20 247:12 249:9 261:9,22 263:9 269:6 285:19 287:4,20 289:7 290:22 292:17 leading 107:7 280:5 leads 78:1 84:20 lean 225:21 232:17 learn 38:2 97:12 192:16 267:19 287:15 learned 114:5 195:17 198:6 214:3 320:6 learning 69:20,21 212:21 279:9 leave 14:2 24:17 52:22 166:9 176:13 led 205:18 206:21 226:6 233:1 245:11,13 left 58:17 61:19 80:6 89:18 123:7 157:6 176:12 189:17 197:20 269:18 336:18 337:8

354:14 legal 3:8 6:8 11:15 12:16,17 13:6 19:4 23:22 28:11,15,18,19 29:16 30:12,22 31:2 46:7 96:2 100:20 117:6,8,12 118:3 122:21,22 127:15 129:2,6 134:22 135:4 147:3,5 150:4,17,20 151:15 152:4,8,8,9 153:17,18 159:14,16 173:21 174:9 181:8 182:4 199:13 200:18 229:13 235:2 252:11 259:17 261:1 269:19 281:22 284:6,16 291:13 292:2 legislation 268:16 275:3 legislative 111:5 150:12,13 legislators 103:3 legitimacy 54:13 legitimate 54:16 Lejeune 232:19 length 23:16 91:5 104:16 199:12 219:19 261:19 lengthy 121:2 lent 193:16 lessons 97:11 149:14 214:3 267:19 let's 61:18 62:12 79:19 81:13 196:18 356:1 lethality 239:17 letter 112:16 297:7 letting 12:7 287:5 level 12:9 13:9,10 18:22 48:20 64:12 106:15 107:1 130:11,14 161:8 245:15,16,19 245:22 257:20 266:12 280:8 283:2 285:19 286:17 287:11 288:10 289:12 290:13 353:3 356:8 357:5 levelheadedness 229:22 236:13 levels 17:8,14 97:14 102:21 162:22 242:22 256:10 270:20 283:2 291:2 Lewis-McChord 84:14 LGBTQ 181:6 liaison 154:11 184:12 249.1liaisons 5:12

liberal 140:18 liberating 111:16 licensing 228:6 234:8 lies 18:13 lieutenant 33:16 47:5 47:21 48:1,2,4 101:14 110:21 147:3 152:3 156:6 203:10,19 204:12 208:4 235:10 235:16 236:22 243:14 244:1,4 246:8 247:16 249:20 250:19 335:8 335:12 life 19:22 58:20 84:12 96:10 336:9 337:1 338:9,13 339:13 342:6 344:16 345:2,3 358:6 362:17 lift 332:8 light 30:2 36:16 lightly 124:1 likes 205:6 likewise 206:14 limit 56:6,19 124:4 limitation 125:18 138:16 140:9 limitations 100:5.9 120:20 121:17 122:19 122:20 123:6 128:9 128:19 130:6 137:21 144:7 145:15,17,19 349:1 limited 26:7 100:12 118:5 121:11,14 125:14 128:16 129:22 130:1 131:7 141:21 155:20 196:3 223:12 233:17 271:12 304:8 limiter 172:6 limits 100:18 101:3 linchpin 277:22 line 4:22 53:6,16 123:8 142:9 204:1 208:15 283:9 331:17 361:6 lined 119:7 link 273:8 lip 359:8 list 13:13 14:4,5 15:3,18 37:11,14 45:12,14 46:1,12 49:2 51:16 52:6 68:19 79:9 117:1 194:13 211:18 237:7 263:15 297:12 346:9 348:9 354:7 listed 40:21 318:9 330:11,15 listen 111:2 278:14 295:13

listened 214:14 344:18 350:20 **lists** 40:8 46:3 literally 21:17 60:4 61:14 119:4 203:18 363:18 litigate 189:4 litigating 19:6 litigation 148:6 166:1 183:21 189:1,11 197:13 207:15 209:1 209:15 220:14 227:8 228:13,14,22 229:4,5 229:9 230:6,9,15,20 234:13,14,21 235:18 236:3 237:20 247:3,9 247:14 248:10 271:14 273:3,15 274:5 288:6 289:6 litigations 288:8 litigator 149:21 litigators 215:14 233:2 245:20 248:5 271:12 little 35:9 40:7 75:8 131:14 147:12 148:5 167:9 179:8 196:11 196:19 271:3.17 296:15 298:15 317:13 324:7 330:1 351:15 366:2 live 99:5,18 114:22 115:14 lived 358:21 lives 133:9 343:17 local 28:19 105:10 154:11 161:8 214:4 246:18 location 183:5 357:14 locations 63:17,18 151:2,4 153:13 226:5 lockdowns 359:13 long 1:17 9:3 48:19 65:1 72:3 74:6,7,22 89:17 105:19,20 106:13 107:6,8 138:5 156:5,18 171:8 173:19 199:9 206:12 213:16 224:18 279:13 308:9 322:10 328:13 328:14 332:2 340:22 354:7 long-term 296:16 longer 197:8,15 199:15 200:13 254:8 344:4 longevity 198:21 **look** 7:15 13:3,10 23:2 45:8 64:4 66:8 71:2 73:19 80:12 84:5

101:18 126:16.18 129:7 134:12 151:17 153:1 155:3 156:3 159:11 169:14 171:10 173:13 195:17 198:17 214:9,12 216:1 244:20 246:2 251:3 277:2,14 281:9 286:8 294:7 300:13 315:14 316:19 317:14 319:8 319:9 325:16 349:13 354:4 360:1 362:9 looked 80:15 173:15 269:4 306:13 looking 14:1 43:19 51:16 66:3,3 78:2 80:7,9 81:11 92:16 124:6 127:17 251:20 257:14 270:10 272:15 272:18 276:18 300:5 302:8 303:3,12 304:12 306:20 314:11 314:22 316:17 317:12 317:17 319:17,21 322:1 323:5,18 326:6 327:2 328:22 329:8 329:18 354:8 looks 39:14 78:4 105:8 107:19 116:13 133:20 195:5 250:16 267:2 285:22 294:16 317:13 loop 259:20 losing 328:3 lost 157:5 278:3,4 338:12 lot 33:2,17 46:8 47:19 48:22 59:3 65:6 87:8 93:7,13 125:17 178:12 182:3 185:9 188:5 195:11,17 259:6 264:2 266:6 279:3,10 281:12 283:17 286:21 288:14 288:20 302:2 304:9 305:16 308:12 333:17 338:6 341:4 342:21 343:10 347:7,11 348:8 352:7,10 362:19 lots 42:12 169:21 262:22 loud 34:15 love 338:7 362:16,22 loved 105:15 106:12 loves 116:17 Lovette 285:9 low 57:2 109:16 163:9 350:11

lower 77:6,6,10 162:22 226:13 **LSAT** 272:14 LSTC 209:7,13 210:16 212:3 240:2 246:16 275:8 LSTCs 219:16 LTCOL 152:1 156:10 163:4 172:18 177:13 181:16 188:17 193:13 199:3 200:14 LTG 208:7 253:7 257:7 261:4 269:2 270:9 277:6,10 282:18 287:3 289:9 290:15 LTSC 210:1 lucky 29:5 171:13 358:10 lumped 319:3 lunch 6:10 202:14 Μ ma'am 38:3 45:17 73:14 74:10 75:17 86:13 87:22 91:19 134:21 135:8 156:10 158:5 162:15 174:19 188:16 193:12,14 198:12 199:4 200:15 202:13 203:22 208:7 253:6.7 261:4 277:6 280:13 282:18 284:14 287:4 289:1 297:19 324:6 324:10,15 330:4 333:3,8,16 334:6,14 345:9 354:9 365:13 madam 18:10 32:17 35:2 95:15 101:22 110:19 150:2 152:2 153:2 173:20 208:8 216:3 225:3 232:1 238:14,19 243:12 254:20 255:10 298:14 353:8,13 Magers 2:12 main 225:22 279:21 maintain 17:14 58:13 213:6 220:13 249:18 297:1,1,1 maintained 249:11,13 288:21 MAJ 243:12 255:10,13 MAJGEN 232:1 265:17 270:17 273:18 284:14 285:15 289:1 292:15 293:2 296:4,9 major 10:14 71:17 112:20 135:2 136:11

203:13.16 216:5 234:19 236:21 239:4 239:21 243:11 245:16 271:18 313:11 339:7 majority 18:20 77:4 80:2,4,5 157:20 355:1 majors 33:17 makers 103:4 makeup 65:15 81:2 329:10,19 331:20 346:1,7 347:14 making 71:9 81:18 91:14 105:3 112:3 167:21 171:8 201:22 256:19 273:22 274:11 279:11,14 280:6 289:21 307:19 312:14 331:22 340:16 345:19 359:18 362:19 male 66:12 80:5 169:21 175:5,6 181:6 309:8 321:3,8 336:21 349:15,18,19 350:4 357:16,18 males 103:16 350:2 malice 162:8 man 345:2 357:21 361:14 management 2:9 201:2 300:6 302:17 manager 155:14 189:14 managers 146:13 managing 19:1 270:11 mandate 140:18 224:1 mandatorily 82:3 mandatory 81:16,19 manner 18:16 23:20 124:11 340:10 manning 219:9 manpower 216:22 270:12 manual 330:19 331:12 March 7:13,15 361:16 366:8 Marcia 1:13 Marguerite 2:9 Marine 6:13 11:13 19:5 23:7,9,19 25:4,6,22 28:6 43:6 45:4 101:15 104:12 110:21 124:19 132:10 133:4 135:19 147:4 151:10 152:5 173:6,8 189:1 199:14 203:14 218:4,9,14 219:1,14 224:21 232:4,9,14,22 233:8 233:19 234:4 236:16 238:9 268:4,15

270:18 284:14 292:15 316:20 317:2,18 318:8 Marines 24:7 25:11 70:19 114:4 218:1 223:10 Marines' 231:22 Markowitz 1:17 9:9 78:12 Marotta 147:7 155:5,6 159:18 166:18 191:3 193:19 200:7 married 133:4 Martha 1:14 martial 5:16 13:8,9 14:6 14:17 16:1 27:10 31:12 43:3 137:4 153:17 228:9 229:18 235:6,8 236:5 258:16 330:12 342:13 martials 122:12 Mason 2:8 298:8,14 323:2 324:10,15 325:1,11 326:15 330:4 332:11 333:7 333:15 334:12 master's 235:13 masters 230:5 matching 316:18 material 112:16 materials 10:1,6 59:9 95:10 146:19 178:5 306:5 335:3,15 matter 75:22 94:11 136:8 137:14 146:9 156:12,14 170:9 175:14,16 181:21,22 202:18 241:12 251:20 298:4 362:7 366:15 matters 22:11 66:7 97:10 153:17 154:15 160:19 162:3 164:1 165:19 166:5 233:15 maturity 19:21 229:21 236:12 maximize 266:3,7 **Maxwell** 212:4 MCIOs 333:21 McKinney 2:9 mean 52:19 60:3 63:13 66:1 69:18 70:4,21 71:14 72:5,15 93:9 110:12 124:2 136:2 142:15 145:9,13 167:21 171:20 172:15 172:20 261:7 271:18 275:9 290:1,4,9 302:1 322:13 332:2,7

meaning 122:6 meaningful 96:18 98:5 124:9 140:22 141:1 142:10 143:3 353:18 means 27:16 83:15 140:19 164:13 178:1 189:5 276:4 278:12 337:19 343:19 349:9 352:12 meant 48:10 93:10 108:11 measure 96:13 144:16 276:2 277:15 278:8 280:21 281:19 measures 272:16 275:8 276:16 277:2 278:19 280:15,19 281:10 283:8 290:19 measuring 275:20 mechanism 137:2 194:21 262:1 291:9 344:4 mechanisms 160:6 meet 13:4 16:14 19:12 21:1,21 22:16 73:21 151:5,7 194:22 217:2 230:4 231:1 249:18 250:3,11 274:4 282:21 338:5 357:17 meeting 1:4 3:2,17,21 4:9,14,17 6:20 7:3,11 7:14,15,16,20 8:11,14 10:1,13,21 19:16 32:22 95:9 103:12 109:12 216:20 225:10 231:22 335:2,9 366:10,14 meetings 7:10 136:5 214:2 meets 158:6 267:17 Meg 1:15 Meghan 1:19 2:10 134:14 160:3 191:14 member's 145:4 334:20 membership 14:11 99:17 134:9 memo 254:22 memorandum 158:11 303:14 men 169:21 170:2 174:22 175:7 354:16 mental 340:5 358:18 mentally 105:22 mention 57:10 109:10 189:8 255:21 333:9 347:8 mentioned 8:15 35:6,15 35:16 55:5 59:15

111:8 116:5 131:14 131:16 144:22 185:2 209:4 226:9 256:9 261:19 274:8 276:19 278:17 286:4 293:22 295:16 297:8,11,14 335:11 343:12 350:7 363:21 366:6 mentoring 272:2 mentors 273:6 merit 165:5 merits 288:17 message 224:15 288:22 met 1:9 244:17 336:10 357:15 methodology 67:15 324:1 methods 40:14 41:5,14 metric 278:7 metrics 240:19 242:19 276:18,20 282:4,14 289:21 290:1,5 325:22 **Mexican** 302:4 MG(R) 1:13 Michigan 344:6 microphone 218:6 Mid-Atlantic 21:15 mid-July 218:11 mid-level 200:4 middle 47:13 112:6 133:20 midshipman 96:9 milestones 204:20 military's 5:19 military- 96:8 97:8 mind 32:7 176:10 194:15 299:19 309:2 mindful 274:11 mindset 227:11 mine 21:14 264:18 337:16 338:5 minimize 152:6 173:11 332:2 minimizing 107:1 minimum 229:8 230:14 230:19 235:5,17 301:8,12 305:10 344:16 minor 217:15 minority 51:11 117:18 329:15 346:11 minute 112:18 363:14 363:19 minutes 4:21 94:10 95:11 112:13 298:3 335:22 339:22 357:9

mirror 307:21 misconduct 5:8 216:17 217:16 224:14,18 misdemeanor 350:15 misnomer 300:12 missed 75:2 114:22 misses 328:18 missing 262:15,19 mission 31:5 65:19 84:11 103:3 152:7 153:21 198:8 207:2 213:8 224:5 225:20 232:13,17 239:18 246:15 250:21 missions 213:17 292:4 mistake 365:18 mistaken 173:14 Mitchell 335:13 mitigation 142:2 178:1 mixed 88:7,14 MJRG 189:15 MJRP 303:11 332:17 mobilize 270:2 mobilized 269:21 model 246:17 modest 337:19 modifications 173:2 177:17 modified 26:22 molested 357:21 mom 360:7.9 moment 98:12 106:12 107:4 109:2 120:17 134:2 137:13 163:19 182:14 183:7,16,17 260:22 327:20 328:5 329:21 340:11 352:11 monitor 127:3 191:12 207:20 217:3 249:10 month 119:5 151:1 167:7 220:20 246:7 month-and-a-half 163:13 monthly 151:8 162:18 months 12:20 24:12 133:7 138:6 166:7 193:18 197:20 229:8 230:14 234:20 235:17 236:3 262:7 264:4 292:7 339:14 361:9 morale 287:1 morning 4:3,12 6:1,21 7:12 9:15 11:21 18:9 18:10 23:5 29:2 38:3 43:4 62:14 72:13 110:19 147:11 150:2 152:1 153:2 155:5 159:4 165:10 203:18

282:20 297:14 365:9 366:3 morning's 259:11 **MOS** 270:19 mother 108:4,20 358:6 motion 191:2 motivating 289:8 motive 362:10 move 4:21 34:5 83:8 137:15,18 138:8 149:22 169:2 198:9 200:1 222:11 252:22 260:21 269:17 277:4 288:2,5 359:19 moved 242:5 moving 42:13 201:7 279:12 308:1 313:14 343:3 362:20 **MRE** 164:8,15 muddying 329:4 multi-ethnic 328:17 multi-racial 328:17 multi-state 30:2 multi-year 296:19 multiple 8:4 21:18 58:8 113:10 209:15 247:2 328:15 multitudes 241:18 **mute** 4:20 myriad 30:11 104:5 Ν **N** 1:10,13 nail 334:8 Nalini 2:7 name 7:21 8:6 33:13 102:1 110:20 152:3 182:3 189:16 282:1 323:16 333:13 337:22 339:7 357:11 named 144:3 names 16:13 18:1 26:13 52:5 59:14 80:16 narrative 71:20 100:17 121:6,15 144:20 narrow 130:5 narrowing 121:19 Nassar 107:18 nation 96:7 national 5:4 74:17,18 96:10 216:9 231:15 231:16 232:21 234:1 245:6 Native 301:9,10,18 303:16,17 316:20 319:2 324:12 nature 20:18,19 50:4,13

53:20 121:5,5 159:13 343:1 Naval 11:11 18:9 22:2 27:19,21 28:3,17 38:14 69:17 151:15 navigating 122:14 Navy 18:19,21 19:4 21:14 22:10 45:18 50:18 70:2 96:11 147:2 150:4,8,9,16,17 150:19 151:2,10,11 151:15 152:7 158:18 193:5 198:17 203:8 203:13 204:3 216:12 216:13,15,21,22 218:3,9,14 219:1,13 222:1 223:18,19 224:21 225:15,20 228:4 229:1 231:6,12 231:17 232:9 238:15 258:2 264:10 268:4 268:15 271:2,7,10 272:4,16 279:6,8,10 283:21 287:18,22 291:11 292:7 293:21 297:13 316:20 Navy's 38:4 216:8 220:12 223:14 225:6 225:18 226:16 227:7 227:12,15 228:18 234:7 291:13 Navy-Marine 227:6 233:13 255:1 Navy/Marine 38:13 278:22 NCIS 223:20 224:3 295:2 355:3 NDAA 82:22 204:18 208:17 217:5 222:14 222:21 244:13 280:16 281:11 289:2 294:8 310:3 315:2 332:14 333:3 near 194:12 221:16 near-term 210:6 nearly 189:12 353:22 360:21 necessarily 38:17 164:4,11 195:4 200:12 263:6 284:3 necessary 15:22 101:6 127:7,8 139:2 159:2 162:19 228:6 232:12 234:8 240:7 326:14 necessity 70:8 need 13:7 15:13 16:5 31:1,13 44:22 58:18 119:4 130:18 165:3

168:19 180:1 184:18 193:5 213:18 222:11 224:16 263:14 267:12 271:14 273:11 274:4 274:12 277:11 278:5 278:18 279:15 287:6 287:13 288:1,4,18 291:1,15 294:9,13 305:2 307:16 314:6 314:17 315:11 322:6 322:22 324:2,4,5 327:15 328:9 331:3 352:13 needed 26:19 89:21 135:16,16 136:7 198:8 200:12 241:16 338:1 339:18 340:6 needing 16:4 needs 121:22 159:14 181:13 213:14 252:4 252:7 270:13,13 287:22 288:21,22 293:13 315:7 negative 328:21 negligible 350:1 negotiated 119:7 negotiating 126:4,5 127:20 negotiations 162:3 neither 98:1 neutral 67:5 never 66:8 90:5 91:2 105:17 115:22 120:18 128:18 132:6,7 156:17 337:7 339:11 358:4 Nevertheless 213:5 new 24:18,21 26:19,22 27:2 28:7 29:17 34:6 34:7 59:1 83:1 151:13 162:9 177:18 193:3 195:21 209:2,8,13 252:14 253:4,18 255:22 288:13.16 326:22 327:20 332:19 335:4 356:4 360:2 361:5 newcomer 265:10 newest 199:3 nexus 157:17 Nicole 357:12 nine 61:18 233:3 NJP 313:13,17 NMCCA 163:13 no-fail 250:21 nodding 174:17 327:9 nominate 12:13 13:2 14:18 25:10 43:8

59:14 nominated 21:20 26:1 42:6,18,21 44:3 45:15 47:11,15 59:19 72:21 73:11,12 206:2 221:13 226:12 233:5 293:6 nominating 12:20 14:17 16:11 24:2 25:14 nomination 10:22 15:18 42:1,13,18 48:10 52:6 59:12 221:15 nominations 30:7 33:14 43:16 68:18 nominees 39:12 40:16 43:9 non- 308:7 313:1 non-covered 214:11 227:21 287:9 non-delegable 221:7 non-elite 287:21 non-existent 354:1 non-Hispanic 318:3 324:9 non-lawyers 252:11 non-military 156:8 158:3 nonbinding 254:18 nonprofit 97:7 102:18 347:9 348:15 noon 366:8 Norfolk 11:15 21:15 45:20 226:1 292:9 norm 78:5 normal 118:20 162:3 184:14 normally 55:14 North 232:19 note 77:18 126:8 131:16 278:21 320:16 334:18 noted 9:10 60:22 190:20 194:20 notes 143:3 166:8 330:5 339:5 notice 118:8 119:11,20 162:11 186:1 noticed 197:3 notices 184:14 notified 110:5 notion 71:16 85:4 131:6 144:5 notions 68:20 novel 85:5 215:5 262:22 263:11 November 221:14

now-convicted 184:2 nuance 285:13 number 13:15 17:19 24:16 25:10 26:10 30:1 33:9 42:5 47:17 50:19 52:3 53:11 54:4 56:5,7 85:13 116:19 120:2 125:15,16 129:10 132:10 139:3 155:21 165:8 169:11 174:11 175:7 190:1 247:5 253:9 261:5 264:10 268:21 271:12 274:3 278:9 283:9 286:3 297:12 300:7 numbered 60:4 numbers 77:22 78:17 81:7 109:14 116:18 139:2 160:8 163:9 172:7,10,10 173:5,13 189:21 272:22 278:10 295:7 320:19 325:16 329:14 331:1 numerous 155:15 **nuts** 28:5 Ο **O'Connor** 1:18 9:6 oath 99:6 object 100:3 186:10 objection 118:21 364:3 objectionable 175:17 187:5 objections 127:9 175:11 objective 205:11 241:22 objectives 182:1 obligation 19:13 70:2 127:2 142:19,21 210:3 observation 76:12 78:13 94:1 334:2 observations 308:22 observe 193:17 observed 309:8 observing 211:17 obtained 334:19 obvious 163:17 282:6 obviously 14:16 16:19 66:5 74:18 169:9 175:14 185:1,12 192:9 193:3,20 255:14 266:22 269:4 274:21 280:22 290:9 297:11 Occasionally 33:20 occasions 155:18

occur 83:3 98:5 144:10 occurred 157:18 occurring 137:3 occurs 229:6 OCS 69:16 October 8:22 35:11 150:6 162:21 offend 102:12 offender 154:4 offenders 205:7 offense 83:10 121:1 142:3 159:13 178:9 220:3,11 223:3 231:9 235:8 238:1 240:4 241:6,10 278:12 294:19,19 323:19 offenses 51:10 83:3,10 129:10 152:11 153:15 154:8 209:11 214:11 220:15 222:22 227:17 227:22 228:15 232:9 234:15 235:7,20 236:6 241:14 242:5 244:10 246:11 250:4 294:10 295:3 offer 22:7 156:12 177:22 181:17 258:1 offered 109:19 180:13 180:17 offering 131:12 office 3:14 12:16,17 13:6 15:1 29:17 147:8 150:13 151:13 154:12 155:6 158:9,11 173:15 204:15 205:2 205:15,16 208:1,13 209:2 210:4,17 216:11 219:7 225:6,8 225:15,18 227:5,20 232:4,10,14 235:11 237:5,11,16 238:11 243:22 248:17 252:22 254:11 255:18 261:9 262:5,12 267:21 268:8 269:17 280:20 281:8 284:20 300:6 315:5 320:17 321:1,6 officer 2:1 4:5 11:14 28:18 73:8 77:8,13 78:14 87:20 89:8,9 90:11,20,21 91:13 138:12,14 150:12,14 150:14 151:7 206:5 226:3,6 227:4 229:5 245:7 249:2 262:16 264:12 356:14 officers 12:13 13:3,13 13:17 17:6 21:17 24:6

25:10 28:15 51:9.12 63:8 69:18 78:22 79:14 80:16,19 88:6 88:13,21 89:17 90:7 169:10 202:7 217:21 221:18 237:11,20 252:11,12,13 290:19 291:8 329:16,16 342:1 346:5.6 offices 3:11 6:15 30:15 31:2 150:9 191:17 203:3 207:9 215:5 218:15 224:21 226:1 231:3,6 232:18 233:1 246:18 259:13 293:20 officially 4:10 officials 195:1 oftentimes 28:19 71:14 OJAG 226:22 Okinawa 232:21 **old** 103:18 299:16 338:4 357:12 359:22 oldest 359:2 **Olympic** 107:17 OMB 299:11 300:6,8 303:15 317:21 318:17 once 15:15 25:18 55:1 55:3 56:8 108:10,12 110:1 136:3 162:10 204:13 216:7 247:14 318:5 330:9 344:2 one's 69:12 80:21 one-star 261:10 one-third 58:13,14 241:17 ones 53:17 106:12 282:8 ongoing 223:1 243:21 246:4 250:13 259:20 open 4:10 37:6 48:3 109:2 170:9 188:21 192:13 196:21 opening 204:1 212:9 238:14 276:20 277:20 openness 50:14 operate 29:10 173:11 206:14 213:13 operates 45:3 operating 204:21 205:14 220:20 226:19 250:9 258:3 277:2 operation 219:6 operational 206:13 211:7 218:10 221:21 225:12 239:18 244:21 246:6 249:19 284:10 operations 226:8 240:8 opinion 19:14 109:14

131:12 333:18 334:2 340:13 350:8 opinions 51:3 opportunities 19:3 105:7 148:7 214:16 260:5 opportunity 12:1 18:12 23:1 29:4 32:13 54:6 55:9,20 95:2 98:14,16 99:7,11 100:3 101:11 109:20 114:8,11 115:19 118:16 120:5 144:12 147:14,21 178:14 193:17 196:7 201:10,17 202:2 204:13 208:10 225:4 232:3 239:1 243:18 243:19 250:12 251:2 260:6 289:11 336:6 339:4 345:2,6 opposed 156:13 opposite 130:1 357:20 **OPT** 284:9 optimal 249:18 optimistic 266:14 optimized 207:18 option 83:7 options 99:6 110:8 301:21 320:10 oral 35:12 36:17 335:19 orange 312:1 **ORBs** 66:3 order 15:19 18:16 24:9 24:15 26:16,22 35:6 55:2 60:6 74:20 80:15 106:18 152:14 205:5 207:19 274:14 288:3 288:20 293:11 300:21 314:17 326:4 330:10 356:17 ordered 166:10 orders 11:1 20:16,16 24:11,18 296:6 ordinarily 156:11 ordinary 184:3,5 organization 96:5 97:8 97:20 102:19 103:19 150:19 152:8 192:9 206:17,20 209:10 237:18 253:15 280:3 organizational 209:22 organizations 73:4 118:2 202:5 219:10 348:7,9 organizing 219:9 Orientation 228:18 orienting 80:8 origin 302:5

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

original 300:21 originally 16:21 104:12 291:18 **OSD** 253:22 265:12 **OSI** 249:2.6 **OST** 240:21 OSTC 84:20 205:6,7,14 205:17,22 206:14,17 210:9 211:4,7 215:11 216:12 217:20 219:21 220:7,8 221:2,5,20 222:13 223:9 225:12 225:21 226:5,8,16,18 227:12,15 230:3 231:3,5 239:3 240:1 240:15,16 241:11,21 242:6 243:1 244:7,16 246:4,5,22 247:12,16 247:18,20 248:16 249:4,7,9,19 250:2,6 250:14,17,20 252:16 255:1 256:15 257:4 258:14 263:20 265:21 266:9 267:3 269:18 271:9 274:6 275:8 279:21 280:1.11 284:8 292:14 294:11 295:18 320:17 321:1 321:2.6 **OSTC's** 215:10 220:17 250:9 258:22 **OSTCs** 218:5,9,18,20 220:12 223:5 other's 85:3 212:21 **OTJAG** 32:21 OTSC 321:10 ought 143:11 outcome 34:18 309:13 309:17 outcomes 275:12 outlined 352:7 outs 298:10 outset 19:8 outside 30:7 64:18 65:1 68:11 85:20 117:15 127:21 220:8 221:1 227:19 279:22 280:10 292:20 308:1 351:4,5 353:14 360:10 over- 181:17 over-representation 174:8 overall 51:5 107:15 125:16 153:8 211:13 215:12 240:22 308:2 315:9,12 321:7,17 331:13 overarching 243:5

overcome 80:10 overdose 359:15 overrule 36:19 oversaw 148:14 overseas 151:4 oversee 147:22 187:19 210:4 219:4 overseed 64:20 oversees 37:13 oversight 145:3,5 154:21 162:8 225:19 232:16 233:2 240:2,9 240:13 291:18 overstating 82:17 overt 242:14 overturned 125:2,4 339:15,20 349:4 350:3 overview 18:4 25:5 239:22 overwhelming 77:4 overwhelmingly 78:15 owe 258:7 Ρ P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1 **p.m** 7:22 202:19,20 298:5,6 366:16 Pacific 232:20 301:11 303:18 package 13:12 14:14 14:18 15:16 16:4,6 25:19 158:21 270:8 packages 17:22 188:1 packets 334:20 page 40:7 60:4,12 321:16 365:17 pages 59:4,9 60:3 178:4 pain 98:17 106:15 107:1 114:6,6,8 120:16 122:13 panel's 61:15 panelist 75:10 panelists 41:19 53:6 93:1 panels 20:11 25:1 30:9 32:5 33:9 35:18 53:7 67:13 72:22 78:14,15 78:22 80:11 85:14,18 87:20,21 89:12 90:11 92:9,21,21 93:5 132:3 134:10,11 167:17 169:6,8,13 171:2,11 171:12 173:12 174:2 201:13 331:21 paper 182:6 340:2

paragraph 255:2 paralegal 2:5,8,10 347:18 paralegals 150:21 153:12,14 165:19 208:21 263:6 299:1 parallel 67:22 268:6,17 332:13 parameter 83:11,11,17 83:19 parameters 82:21 119:13 142:22 Pardon 325:1 pare 39:13 parents 105:4 143:16 parity 274:18 Park 147:6 153:2,3 159:4 165:10 174:3 181:4 185:2 190:1 192:18 194:16 199:16 285:17 parlance 122:5 part 29:22 31:19 49:8 73:4 74:12 89:2 117:20 121:6,21 126:15 127:1.1 128:2 130:9 133:8 168:3.5 169:15 171:7 174:7 180:19 183:1 185:16 196:12,22 198:10 206:12 222:7 225:21 227:7 248:18 252:1 257:16 260:12 266:21 267:13 268:18 270:5 270:8 278:6 284:9 286:22 288:17 292:11 297:22 304:15,17 305:7,18 306:19 317:10 329:7 350:19 350:20 351:17 355:21 356:18 366:10 **PARTICIPANT** 167:17 167:19 participants 312:18 331:6 participate 29:4 32:14 240:21 participated 86:1 148:13 233:20 235:5 247:5 participating 184:4 participation 153:10 191:7 229:17 230:16 230:20 235:18 236:4 particular 27:15 31:22 32:7 34:4 37:22 49:21 56:1 60:1 65:12,16 97:1 100:11,14 123:9

127:19 137:4 154:2 181:12 183:5 191:20 192:2 222:2 241:15 243:2 292:19 327:19 328:2 particularly 23:12 69:7 87:12 126:18 130:8 213:2 265:12,20 269:7 parties 54:6 186:7 partly 198:18 partnered 210:19 partnering 246:3 248:20 partnership 207:13 248:15 parts 72:22 184:7 party 58:6 83:21 133:4 133:5 179:15 336:10 pass 12:15 34:20 171:22 264:17 276:10 passage 244:13 251:21 passed 83:12 136:2 359:14 361:16 362:1 passing 191:8 passionate 199:8 path 161:14 277:1 pathway 98:18 patient 358:3 Paul 1:16 53:1 pay 299:3,4 316:1,2 **PCS** 47:12 PCSed 359:14 **Pedden** 147:4 152:1,3 156:6.10 163:4 172:18 177:13 181:16 188:17 193:13 199:3 200:14 284:16 pedophile 361:2 364:1 peer-to-peer 248:14 peers 51:21 88:18 91:14 202:8 pending 314:14 357:9 **Pendleton** 232:20 Pentagon 1:9 73:7 people 8:4 37:16,18 40:15 42:13,18,19,21 44:10,13 46:9,17 47:7 47:10,12,13 48:11 49:14,18 50:5,10 53:15,18 59:14,22 64:2,5 65:17 66:22 70:15 75:14 76:4 79:21 93:14 127:13 157:3,10 158:10 168:9 176:9,14 196:12 198:4 201:18 252:3 259:13 268:22

271:5 272:15.18.21 273:5,6,8,9 275:20 282:10 283:13 288:2 288:5,15,18,18 296:16 302:2 322:5 327:10 328:14,14,20 333:14 341:8,12,19 342:11,14 346:9 349:10 perceive 63:13 161:7 perceived 160:10 161:10 242:2 percent 157:9 266:10 266:11,13,13 313:19 318:4,5 320:20,20 321:2,3,3,7,8 322:7 344:7,10 349:18,19 349:19,20,20,21,22 349:22 350:1 percentage 42:5 88:20 240:20 241:2 285:6 perception 53:8 63:2 64:1 66:7,12,14 86:6 88:17 peremptories 56:8 peremptorily 58:15 peremptory 54:10 55:10 56:5,10,18 57:10.20 58:5.7.9.19 60:22 61:18,20,22 66:19.22 perfect 212:2 246:1 perfectly 319:3 perform 221:1 227:19 228:10 357:4 performance 50:12 249:10 272:17 275:8 280:15,19 281:10 290:20 performed 87:10 performing 290:13 period 12:18,19 13:22 28:8 170:12 222:2 237:10 296:19 336:20 360:3 364:5 permanent 8:17 permissible 34:16,17 35:18 36:4,9 105:3 129:15 186:15 permission 65:3 331:3 permissively 66:15 permit 152:13 permitted 34:18 111:21 120:6,7 122:13 131:8 143:6 171:7 permitting 126:11 perpetrated 95:3 perpetrator 124:15

Perry 94:17 101:14,15 101:22 102:1 110:16 110:19,21 112:20 114:16 116:5 124:18 124:22 125:1,5,6 134:21 135:8,10,18 138:4 146:4 **Perrys** 95:6,10 118:4 127:4 130:22 134:15 134:17 142:18 person 4:17 17:1 38:16 41:7,12 45:1 48:7 49:4 51:6 61:20 71:16 72:8 76:7 81:21 87:15 119:12 120:11,15 144:6 151:6 157:7 168:20 170:11,20 172:21 175:15 176:3 176:19 179:6 184:2 192:21 193:2,8 200:12,18 220:8 243:16 267:4 273:7 330:18 334:17 339:2 357:9,17 362:6 person's 41:3 87:10 88:17 personal 12:22 21:12 73:6 76:6 87:10 106:10 113:11 181:22 202:9 247:8 277:17 341:5 personally 21:19 23:13 26:3 52:14,16 103:15 176:8 193:7 247:16 264:9 personnel 21:18 38:13 69:19 88:5,10 97:21 201:1,13 202:7 215:4 215:9 218:19 220:6 222:16 226:3 299:20 304:15 307:21 308:2 311:14,18 312:12 319:18 320:2 325:12 326:1 330:12.17 332:6 333:5,19 perspective 19:2 38:5 49:16 70:9 75:5 87:16 95:18 96:5 97:4,13 98:4 123:21 125:22 160:14 197:14 201:2 255:14 264:21 perspectives 95:11 127:16 persuade 177:18 pertained 105:19 pervade 223:13 Peter 189:16 Peters 2:10

petition 335:3,4 petitioned 358:14 petitions 166:8,11 190:17 phase 225:13,14,14 250:6 279:2 281:3 phased 244:18 phases 111:11 152:11 279:1 phone 339:6 phrase 186:21 physical 121:5 358:18 physically 105:22 359:10 pick 16:17 18:2,2 26:10 34:3,6,7 36:2 43:13 44:2 45:14,15 52:7,12 93:11 171:12 281:17 picked 39:12 83:15 picking 34:17 35:17 53:11 65:17 69:18 71:17 259:10 picks 15:15 59:20 **picture** 299:19 pictures 113:12 piece 142:17 253:5 271:17,19 360:21 piggybacks 79:2 Pittsburgh 62:20 63:4 place 25:2 38:21 96:6 96:18 117:19 119:3 127:8 136:8 145:18 173:2 180:16,22 208:12 251:7 256:22 260:22 276:22 283:19 348:6 351:18 placed 100:9,19 132:17 places 12:17 49:3 84:12 plaqued 224:18 plain 107:2 plan 7:14 215:1 250:2 258:8 281:2,5 planned 223:6 planning 148:1 211:7 211:10 212:18 214:14 222:19 225:13 279:1 284:10,20 296:10 plans 208:11 224:9 239:22 250:8 280:18 282:21 plastic 359:8 play 68:22 254:5 287:11 300:19 302:12 303:13 318:16 player 138:18 299:2 plea 121:3,7 pleadings 191:6 please 4:19 7:21 295:12

323:7 326:17 pleased 96:1 216:6 245:1 pleasure 9:16 11:22 32:18 101:12 137:9 plenty 69:1 204:4 Plummer 203:19 243:14 244:1,5 246:9 247:16 249:21 250:19 plus 14:9 263:11 358:10 point 37:6 40:3 41:13 43:11 67:13 84:3 86:1 152:13 159:20 178:14 182:6,18 198:18 259:5 275:22 276:17 279:16 285:16 286:2 294:17 295:19 300:17 301:7 305:14 306:4 307:11 308:10 309:6 312:10 314:14 319:13 328:7 333:2 336:13 336:17 340:5 350:4 points 247:2 281:13 304:3 poker 138:18 police 245:7 355:4 policies 72:19 154:17 215:2 217:14 218:14 220:18 221:20 246:13 253:16 254:22 264:16 314:16 **policy** 7:6 8:19 9:4 52:16 73:11 103:4 140:6 152:17 156:11 156:17 157:1 158:12 205:21 213:4,11 217:13,13 220:7,19 220:22 227:2 245:14 245:21 249:17 251:21 257:16 274:22 300:7 300:21 315:3 366:3 pool 12:18 13:3,6,10,11 16:20 21:10,16 31:2 39:13,17,19 40:16 42:3 46:4 49:20 55:17 56:2 59:21 60:9 68:17 132:11 169:11 201:17 pools 22:1 201:19 populating 259:13 population 27:11 63:2 180:1 328:18 349:22 populations 263:16 pornography 129:9 154:9 Porter 136:13 portion 12:13 71:6 350:21

portions 179:11,13 271:13 pose 285:1 **position** 147:16,20 150:5 158:20 162:9 193:14 197:11,21 199:7 257:14 positions 155:15 169:18 174:12 192:12 197:10,21 209:15 249:2 261:10 270:3 271:4 293:9 positive 177:7 195:22 196:13,17 198:10 264:22 306:18 362:20 posits 57:22 possess 221:18 234:19 possessing 232:11 possibility 92:13 possible 144:19 183:15 276:19 285:4 297:4 301:21 320:5 341:9 342:15 possibly 199:10 285:10 post-trial 190:14,19 posted 7:18 199:7 potential 10:21 15:2 21:10 22:4,20 24:3 25:14,14 27:13 31:3 38:7,7,22 42:3 50:6 53:12 55:18 84:16 119:19 132:18 133:21 196:6 241:9,19 270:11 289:3 294:2 320:10 323:2 331:18 potentially 25:12 45:19 48:22 57:19 133:13 178:22 236:17 237:1 258:19 289:12 294:1 297:9 341:20 poured 279:21 power 101:4 110:10 120:11,12 powerfully 106:19 107:22 powerlessness 101:5 powers 263:5 practical 33:11 248:20 practice 5:21 20:4 21:6 22:14 31:21 32:4 58:7 71:11 145:2,20 151:21 164:1,4,9,18 164:20,21 166:3 167:4 182:2,13,13 185:19 187:12,19 188:15 189:20 190:16 190:21 191:4 200:21 208:22 213:5 274:22

301:7 311:22 practices 80:9 85:1 211:8 212:22 262:4 practitioners 244:15 298:21 pre 125:17 pre- 126:18 pre-advanced 186:1 pre-decisional 276:15 333:1 preaching 353:12 preceded 214:1 precedence 34:10 precedent 34:19 67:13 precise 21:5 116:19 240:12 251:20 predator 98:1 predecessor 95:20 200:1 predecessors 198:15 preemptory 170:21 preexisting 260:7 prefer 52:16 102:17,17 318:11 preference 175:3 preferral 304:12 preliminary 140:8 310:21 prep 194:17 preparation 111:10 154:7 prepare 111:12 205:21 prepared 112:1 175:20 209:9 prepping 183:6 prescribe 302:22 prescribed 142:22 prescriptive 323:4 present 1:12 2:1 23:7 43:17 113:10 129:5 141:19 142:1 149:3 149:12,13 304:17 331:16 338:22 presentation 10:12 100:2 113:8 298:8 299:8 300:19 320:16 321:21 353:10 presentations 66:18 72:15 167:9 274:21 275:1 312:20 presented 114:14 186:3 310:5 presentencing 111:10 presenter 11:6 146:21 presenters 4:19 9:14 presenting 114:7 149:14 173:16 presentment 364:21

preservation 205:4 preside 62:18 **President** 221:13 226:11 233:5 presiding 1:11 62:19 pressed 70:4 pressure 252:17 pressurize 296:5 presume 256:17 presumed 21:4 179:10 presumption 70:9 141:4 presumptively 178:1 pretrial 15:2 122:4 126:1 154:7 pretty 34:9 38:12 42:7 81:6 138:18 157:1 198:7 286:19 prevalence 175:3 prevented 73:12 prevention 205:10 207:7 217:6 222:12 223:15 243:3 276:6 315:4 prevents 192:7 **Preview** 3:17 previous 104:11 109:11 311:9,11 326:16 previously 27:4 32:8 55:5 103:13 157:3 225:13 228:7,10,21 230:7,9 235:15 236:1 343:12 prima 67:2 primary 25:9 43:18 161:4 187:20 189:18 311:14 principal 233:14 principals 30:19 principle 81:17 97:9 272:11 principles 67:17 272:11 printing 365:18 printouts 25:22 prior 10:20 16:3 21:14 24:19 26:18 87:6 103:14 125:18 135:11 150:7 155:10 157:11 169:16,17 170:17 212:7 244:5 247:2,4 290:20 360:3 prior-entitled 157:22 priorities 296:21 prioritize 49:6 194:10 224:9 priority 242:13 244:7 265:19 prison 125:1 338:13

343:15,16 344:12,17 345:3 prisoners 353:22 354:1 354:5 privacy 166:13 **Private** 40:19 privilege 95:17,22 150:18 privileged 104:1 292:19 pro 96:2 proactive 188:13 proactively 183:20 probably 33:22 52:14 80:3 91:4 94:2 157:20 171:17 173:19 178:13 180:16 181:13 198:13 199:12 263:14 265:9 310:7 312:1 322:12 322:12 329:3 348:19 problem 62:18 63:14,20 66:11 77:20 134:1,11 141:9 170:12 263:19 304:17 305:18 311:2 319:5,20 322:2 323:8 338:18 340:19 350:9 353:14 problematic 42:20 331:2 problems 80:11 195:15 196:6 307:10 procedures 154:17 220:20 249:13 250:9 251:7 258:3 267:20 293:14 proceed 113:7 170:15 proceeding 8:7 179:4 183:18 proceedings 86:4 94:16,20 107:7 177:6 178:15 179:15 364:15 processed 274:1 processes 9:19 10:3 11:5 16:6 182:3 314:17 produce 328:10 produced 15:20 produces 297:3 professing 132:4 profession 339:16 professional 19:16,22 21:12 106:10 108:19 109:13,19 182:2 223:20 247:11 250:16 266:1 295:4 professionally 224:2 proffer 121:6 proficiency 249:11,12 290:16

program 2:9 19:4 30:22 146:13 147:1,3,5,7,16 150:5,8,18 155:9,14 158:8 162:14 170:1 174:20.21 185:8 187:10 189:9,14 190:6 192:13 194:1 195:7 199:18 200:2 210:14 230:6 274:5 282:20 284:1 programs 6:9 146:14 215:2 223:15 260:18 261:3 282:22 314:16 progress 204:14 207:21 208:11 216:8 217:3 218:3 225:5 285:8 307:19 313:16 prohibited 27:12 prohibition 139:9 prohibits 39:8 66:21 projected 266:8 projects 7:5 8:19 9:7 366:2 promise 120:8 promising 338:10 Promotable 209:7 promoted 245:5 257:13 promotion 206:8 209:6 226:10 promotions 206:6 315:20 prompt 174:7 promptly 297:3 promulgated 220:19 promulgating 275:7 proof 21:1 329:13 338:6 proper 154:19 208:1 229:19 236:10 proportionately 173:8 proposal 139:9 proposals 175:8 362:20 propose 173:22 proposed 31:6 82:14 177:16 250:1 proposition 285:1 proscribed 151:18 prosecute 288:2 289:11 prosecutes 96:17 prosecuting 154:11 206:18 210:21 227:17 266:4 287:13 288:1 prosecution 1:1 4:6,15 5:7 29:15 39:2 97:19 108:14 205:20 209:11 209:16 224:13 232:8 233:21 242:8 260:16 270:1 285:21 289:20 310:4 355:1,13

363:15 prosecutions 207:4 241:1 243:2 prosecutor 29:18 148:10 154:6 170:7 176:19 205:18 245:9 271:7 287:15 342:13 346:10 347:15,16 351:20 355:21 356:5 356:9 363:22 prosecutorial 223:4 prosecutors 55:9 100:21 188:8 210:4 214:1 248:17 267:11 274:7 286:17 287:22 341:7,19 342:3 345:14 350:22 351:1 354:13 356:19 prospective 17:11 protect 101:6 359:11 protected 31:16 65:13 164:15 192:4 protection 139:21 protections 241:2 protocol 111:7 proud 96:1 147:16 222:1 prove 355:9 provide 6:14 9:10,18 10:2 11:4 14:20 15:2 15:17 16:13 31:12 37:11 46:1 51:4 83:19 92:2 95:6,11,17 97:3 99:9 103:8 104:1,7,13 104:15 105:4.13 107:10 108:22 109:18 109:22 110:5 115:18 117:2,7,14 118:3,8,9 136:17 146:15,20 152:8 153:18 163:3 163:21 185:5,22 186:12,13 190:17 191:12 193:6 201:18 202:2 203:4 205:8 208:4,10 224:12 239:21 248:9 254:17 268:16 273:6 304:20 316:4 329:1 335:19 347:21 348:1,9,10 provided 10:15 14:5 15:6 26:1 32:8 55:6 61:5 95:4 116:6,11,20 118:13 119:1 135:4 149:16 162:11 197:1 203:1 211:2,18 213:21 215:10 290:3 335:2,5,16 340:7 provides 10:7 20:22

23:22 57:18 98:21 99:10 117:9 184:13 267:1 providing 22:6 37:14 62:16 96:5 98:8 160:5 204:12 215:16 provision 117:12 190:20 281:2 provisional 247:12 provisionally 231:2 provisions 219:11 provocative 296:14 prudence 178:22 psychotherapy 95:22 **public** 1:4 3:2,19,21 4:13 6:19,20 7:11,21 8:14 10:1 95:4 164:16 298:12 334:15,16,19 334:22 335:7,18 366:10,13 publications 300:9 publicly 111:17 **publish** 280:18 published 333:2 **Puerto** 302:4 pull 64:10.15.20 301:16 313:4 331:7,10 332:21 pulled 46:3 352:6 **pulling** 169:9 pulls 324:5 pulse 262:18 Pulver 357:11,12 363:7 363:10,13 364:4,10 364:14 365:1.6 punished 217:15 309:20 punishment 308:8 309:13 pure 182:14 294:20 **purple** 85:7 purported 180:2 purpose 5:5 36:9 107:9 107:11 purposeful 80:12 84:8 85:6 94:4 purposefully 52:8,12 52:17,20 purposely 214:13 pursuant 164:8 199:7 228:1 234:3 pursuing 348:12 purview 173:21 push 322:22 pushback 196:12,19 **pushed** 33:10 337:5 359:2,5 pushing 324:3,3

put 13:2 39:19 74:13 107:2 141:21 176:20 194:12 283:18 290:19 319:9 323:13 326:6 326:10,12 329:22 333:18 341:17 351:15 361:21 putting 43:2 49:6 79:14 128:9 183:16 275:4 317:20 Q qualification 231:18 247:22 248:19 qualifications 238:5 247:17 qualified 17:1 23:15,21 26:5 43:12,13 44:6 45:1,9 172:22 206:2 210:20 236:17 237:1 237:7 246:21 247:15 qualities 247:7 quality 289:19,20 290:2 292:17 Quantico 232:22 quarter 151:7 queried 327:4 questioning 87:13 108:8,15 146:1 questionnaire 25:15 50:17 75:4 84:5 85:7 93:9 347:22 questionnaires 25:21 26:8 43:15 44:2 46:6 50:16 55:4,5 75:3,19 84:2,10 85:4 questions 6:16 10:4,14 18:6 23:2 31:7 32:11 34:21 37:6 41:17,21 50:19 51:2 54:14 60:16 84:11 87:8 93:15 94:6 95:12 101:18,19 108:13 114:13 125:11 146:21 148:21 149:5,22 153:1 155:4 156:4 158:14 167:10 169:16 170:3,8 178:5,13 184:17 194:17 195:14 196:2,5,15,21 197:2 204:4 216:2 238:16 251:4 257:8 258:11 259:4 260:2 265:16 269:1 283:18 297:21 302:2 308:13 318:20 322:9,14 326:5 338:20 345:6 353:7 357:10 363:4 365:4

auick 8:13 18:4 25:5 44:9 87:18 130:5 quickly 275:22,22 288:3 365:21 quite 42:4 57:13 159:6 161:18 177:18 251:21 264:3 270:14 278:10 280:22 quo 222:12 quorum 58:1,2 61:12 62:2 90:1 R **R** 2:8 race 27:7,8,14 31:16,17 31:22 34:11 35:19,19 35:20,20 36:8,12,17 52:4,9 65:12,16 67:1 92:15 172:9 241:4 299:3,4,12,14 302:6,8 305:4,6 306:9 307:2 307:20 308:6 309:14 309:18 310:13 311:15 312:4,8,17 314:7 315:5 316:1,12,17 317:7,20 318:21 324:16 325:3 333:5 race-based 54:15 racial 3:14 6:18 53:7 62:17 67:3 81:19 298:9 310:8,11 314:9 315:8 318:19 racially 67:5 345:15 racism 69:7 RAD 358:16.17 raise 54:13 151:22 raised 85:14 94:22 139:17 154:22 273:21 358:8,11 361:14 364:6 raises 184:3 Ralph 336:21 ran 112:15 285:9 310:9 random 5:21 44:17,19 79:5 80:6 81:9 randomization 81:8 randomly 79:22 range 83:11,18 248:3 rank 21:10 136:7 155:11 206:8 230:2 356:15 ranks 39:9 77:7,9 216:17 234:18 236:21 342:17,20 rape 95:22 96:12 rate 169:19 284:5 rated 255:8 rates 284:3

ratio 58:13 raw 77:22 127:12 **RCM** 139:7,20 168:18 174:6 177:1,17 179:18 RCMs 296:7 reach 57:3 162:6 171:9 180:20 185:18 206:15 225:12 241:20 355:14 reached 218:9 246:6 270:20 reaching 204:20 269:20 reactive 358:15 read 10:1 32:22 99:18 111:13 118:13 119:4 126:20 130:10 177:20 178:21 283:14 344:19 361:3 read-ahead 178:4 readiness 239:18,19 255:3 reading 112:18 113:18 125:12 323:16 ready 185:10 269:2 real 22:13 42:19 97:3 124:9 132:19 138:1 141:1 142:10 143:3 279:7 289:13 365:21 reality 64:2 296:18,20 realization 83:13 realize 65:8 353:19.20 realized 107:12 291:15 **realm** 280:4 Rear 226:13 reason 14:2 23:15 44:22 117:19 132:9 157:6,14 261:15 283:10 298:17 310:9 319:11 330:9 337:10 347:9 350:14 356:22 364:19 reasonably 98:22 137:6 183:2,3,18 reasons 24:16 47:16 48:9 76:5 81:17 85:18 130:21 163:18 243:16 258:20 260:8 354:2 rebuilding 328:1 rebut 99:13 recall 188:9 212:7 364:5 receipt 24:18 receive 6:22 75:7 103:9 124:15 134:4,8 159:16 160:13 170:2 191:6 217:17 224:3 349:2 355:11 357:1,2 received 97:14 99:4

110:1 170:10 195:7 298:20 316:6 348:19 349:11 receives 217:19 receiving 88:17 161:11 347:11 355:7 **recidivism** 186:19 recitation 179:3 recognition 123:22 recognize 132:11 194:4 211:16 recognized 84:18 213:16 recognizing 51:18 recommend 16:12 26:9 111:5 139:14 146:5 168:15 203:22 recommendation 40:13 91:15 191:15 272:13 308:12 311:7,13 312:16 322:11 331:18 recommendations 140:7,8 160:21 168:18 214:15 217:9 224:13 291:19 293:17 294:3.4.14 307:19 311:5,10 313:7 340:22 recommended 40:13 191:16 192:9 273:2 308:5 312:3 recommending 37:10 139:10 reconcile 334:5 reconnected 238:21 reconsideration 335:4 reconstituted 326:20 reconvene 94:10 146:8 365:8 record 19:16 94:12 126:20 127:21 146:10 160:4 179:3 202:19 254:21 255:2,9 297:6 298:5 311:15 318:10 323:21 330:12,14 334:19 347:19 348:2 366:16 recorded 7:16 recording 312:15 records 12:22 236:20 302:19 331:11 332:6 recruit 263:6 recruiters 263:5 recruiting 215:4 262:22 263:3,3 265:22 266:7 recruitment 271:19 red 311:19 312:2 red- 119:6

red-penned 112:9 redacted 179:2 redirect 118:22 **redress** 344:4 reduce 205:12 refer 287:20 reference 8:21 107:16 348:2 referenced 10:20 315:16 referencing 107:18 referral 13:7,12 206:15 209:20 261:12 referred 24:8,12 referring 158:3 339:5 refine 248:8 250:7 277:4 refined 237:7 refinement 210:9 reflected 220:16 reflective 75:9 reform 218:8 222:2 reforms 96:18 217:4 222:14 224:9 243:6 refresher 148:4 167:1 regard 19:7 84:4 151:20 172:19 241:8 265:18 266:19 273:19 regarding 66:19 95:8 101:19 103:4,21 105:8 111:3 114:13 151:19 175:11 179:20 201:12 220:10 239:6 239:22 246:15 254:22 335:3 341:5 regardless 74:16 161:1 180:21 217:17 302:5 356:8 **Reggie** 1:20 regiment 214:18 262:2 262:3,17 263:20 **Region** 21:15 232:22 245:6 regional 148:3 226:1 232:18 233:1 292:22 338:3 regions 148:3 registry 338:15 regular 165:21 264:5 284:18 332:3 regularly 267:17 282:21 rehabilitate 171:19 rehabilitating 170:8 reinforce 101:5 220:4 280:1 reinforced 239:14 reinforcing 237:17 244:3 250:22 280:5

reiterate 17:11 reiterating 216:15 rejected 157:21 rejoin 338:7 relate 142:3 216:10 related 33:2 67:12 126:3 139:22 146:16 146:17 168:18 174:7 179:22 188:18 194:10 208:17 222:17 294:18 311:12 relating 241:15 relations 358:1 relationship 30:18 202:10 265:1 relationships 144:10 246:18 253:4 266:20 relatively 30:20 42:21 125:15 released 244:11 relevant 84:15 248:9 **relief** 161:13 190:18 340:9 347:21 352:13 353:18,19,21 354:4 relies 50:9 relieve 242:8 religious 76:4 **relive** 106:18 rely 19:9 39:1 166:20 292:16 remain 14:16 17:21 225:8,13 237:9 244:8 remainder 6:1 350:2 remaining 22:21 151:3 remains 92:5 191:1 238:9 244:5 Remarkably 349:18 remarks 11:19 152:15 204:1 238:15 240:1 remedy 94:4 161:11 162:2 171:18 remember 57:14 78:2 112:5 305:6 309:2 310:7 333:15 357:13 359:22 remind 162:19 262:14 reminded 113:17 257:17 remiss 96:21 189:7 remote 273:17 removal 177:17,21 249:14 remove 139:9 272:14 removed 93:8 331:12 removing 27:2 140:9 renews 57:11 reoccupied 112:17 repeat 92:19

repeatedly 22:10 replace 24:21 89:11 replacement 15:21 16:4 16.5report 7:13 98:10 170:5 176:16,18 193:10 204:17 217:13 219:2 226:6 231:4 240:10 242:16 244:11 285:11 291:5 299:13,15 301:14 302:11 305:2 305:21 306:17 307:2 307:4 310:18 311:6 313:8,9,13 315:4,5,8 315:18 317:8 360:6 360:13 366:8 reported 211:3 278:10 306:15 322:2 323:14 325:2 333:11 360:7 reporter 8:3 reporting 151:16 242:8 278:12 311:3 317:15 319:6,15,19 reports 3:14 6:18 133:6 170:11 180:9 198:19 198:20 250:4 285:7 286:3 304:20 306:7 306:13 307:1,3,12 308:5 311:11 319:14 325:4 represent 36:2 149:19 153:15 154:1 156:8 181:12 266:4 271:20 representation 34:12 58:11 64:17 94:1 152:9 154:5 159:1 173:4,11,20 174:1 184:10 185:5,6 290:3 320:18 321:4,9 329:15 332:1 representative 10:2 15:11 27:10 52:13 63:12 93:12 146:19 316:9 representatives 5:10 5:15 6:7 9:17 represented 91:10 94:19 96:2,8 120:9 149:10 158:22 166:4 172:9 231:10 254:3 271:15 321:10 representing 131:10 175:18 237:22 represents 52:12 273:7 reps 289:6 330:6 request 26:12 136:9 152:18 158:8,16,20 159:6 164:9 186:10

194:2 199:7 221:3 326:16,22 334:3,9 340:12 342:21 343:4 355:19 requested 159:1 166:2 298:18 299:3 351:20 351:22 requesting 129:16 347:21 requests 11:2 152:17 156:16 157:10,21 347:11 348:19 349:10 require 19:19 88:19 118:12 123:1 144:2,3 223:6 235:12,17 required 17:20 21:15 28:7 30:17 55:16 79:16 148:4 185:22 236:2 247:20 308:12 325:22 requirement 23:12 116:10 139:1 202:1 207:14 210:10 302:16 304:19 333:3 requirements 34:1 204:18 206:5 208:18 210:19 216:9 219:9 219:15 222:18 228:6 234:8 332:18 requires 21:8 123:2 276:17 280:17 281:12 323:11 **requisite** 249:11 **research** 69:1,5 109:4 126:2 136:13 349:8 researcher 275:4 reserve 72:17 73:2,20 74:3,4,16 188:8 201:21 202:3 217:1 264:12 reservists 73:16,18 74:13 201:12 269:21 resignations 289:10 resolute 250:20 resolve 162:22 resolved 340:10 **resonates** 86:10 resource 193:6 250:14 281:21 **resources** 154:20 240:15 263:10,11 265:14 279:20 294:15 295:6,12 326:13 351:2 354:14 355:2 355:18 resourcing 208:1 219:10 222:11 223:12 224:4,17 241:19

250:2 293:22 **respect** 64:5 78:21,22 109:6 130:2 141:17 153:9 154:19 160:6,8 164:1 173:3 177:10 177:16 178:8,11 190:8 205:10 259:20 264:21 268:5 293:21 294:1 301:20 318:1 329:14 331:5 respected 21:2,21 respectful 22:22 respective 219:7 297:10 respond 74:8,9 156:20 163:6 281:16 316:14 317:5 318:2 responded 318:19,22 response 10:14 140:4 205:9 207:6 217:6,17 222:12 223:15 277:7 284:3,5 298:19 315:5 316:15 323:4 responses 75:6,13 76:8 283:7,9,19 responsibilities 19:15 22:3 31:9 87:6 218:17 responsibility 224:12 239:7,13 242:4,10 254:8,9 280:4 responsible 22:15 29:22 98:16 153:7 155:8 209:10 219:5 219:15 226:7 252:21 257:12 responsive 18:14 326:5 rest 176:22 243:2 261:1 287:2 restorative 194:18 196:16 restore 215:20 243:7 278:5 restored 281:19 restoring 276:5 restrict 106:21 113:3 restricted 74:3 105:18 107:13 285:7,11 restrictions 104:6 109:8 111:6 result 27:15 63:10 93:13,20 100:15 132:5 138:13 276:1 289:14 311:5 327:4 345:22 346:2 362:12 resulted 164:22 resulting 107:14 362:8 results 121:3 218:1 237:6 296:18 297:3

			398
314:13	287:19 288:13 289:9	running 122:19 257:12	Schwenk 1:18 7:7 9:4,5
resumed 94:12 146:10	290:15 295:16 297:11	runs 268:9,10	143:7,7,10 144:21
202:19 298:5	rise 188:22 189:21	rural 133:9	145:21
retain 215:7 229:2	risk 141:2,14 142:11	RV 359:21 360:2,5,8,16	scientific 77:3
280:3	268:9,10	Ryan 94:18 135:3,3,7	SCMCA 14:18
retaliated 278:15	risks 141:20	135:17 143:10	scope 68:11 353:14
retaliation 242:15 280:9	Ritz-Carlton 1:9	Ryan's 134:18	score 272:14
retention 215:5 262:22	RLSO 271:8	S	Scott 221:12 233:6
266:7 272:2	road 138:4		scourge 224:17 239:7
reticent 124:12	Rob 210:15	sacred 124:5	276:7
retire 47:11 53:18 80:22	robbed 338:14	safe 242:12	scouts 291:4,5
retired 101:15 110:21	robust 31:2 209:18	Safe-To- 217:12	scratched 360:12
155:11 339:7 340:3	247:1	sailors 70:19 218:1	screamed 337:5
361:15	robustly 22:8	223:10	screaming 360:11
retirement 113:14	role 71:19 117:7 149:9	salt 309:1	screening 236:20 237:6
retrial 139:1 339:21	153:6 155:1 164:21	sample 10:10,19 32:8	scrounged 112:15
351:6	194:7 240:13 254:5	330:22	seamless 244:16
return 26:16 339:22	287:11	San 12:6 45:20 226:2	search 213:3 330:19
returned 112:12 113:1	roles 31:8 117:8 148:8	sandwiched 307:3	seat 20:9 75:10 113:1
179:2 339:15 350:5	174:15 207:14 218:16	SAPRO 315:4	161:20 162:21
reversed 241:3	246:22 257:10	Sarah 335:14	seated 189:17
review 7:3 8:18 9:2	roll 267:3	sat 105:11 278:2 346:15	SECNAV's 254:21
13:19 20:12 130:11	room 190:5 271:5,7,9	satisfy 33:22	second 36:15 65:22
217:8 237:4 244:11	271:10,11 296:22	Saunders 2:11 94:14	78:13 115:2 126:8
247:13 257:20 278:2	336:22 357:16 364:5	146:12 366:6	128:2 139:15 168:13
291:12,20 303:7	364:16	Save 348:7	168:17 184:1 189:9
304:13 314:9 333:16 337:12 338:4 366:1	rooms 357:14 roster 25:20 26:13	saving 113:14 saw 176:8 307:13	190:11 240:3 241:5 268:15 272:19 287:9
reviewed 137:22 140:6			287:14 289:6 298:16
	33:12 43:20,22 44:10 45:12 47:18 48:3 52:7	319:14	315:1 316:13 322:18
221:8 236:20 314:1	45.12 47.16 46.3 52.7 59:18	saying 41:6 77:20	
reviewing 109:11 revise 112:13		87:19 116:14 138:19	328:6 339:18 341:9
revised 112:16	roughly 49:12 304:6 round 58:20	141:5 300:12 308:2	341:10 343:4 345:1 345:12,21 353:4
revising 301:4	rounds 58:8	309:2 314:5 315:11 319:1 325:9 329:21	357:2,3
revisions 300:22	roundtable 248:13	333:12 352:16	Secretary 5:2,6 8:22
revisiting 328:5	route 16:7 300:14	says 40:11 48:4 60:6	173:20 204:14 205:11
rewarding 197:16	routine 164:4,9,18	61:19 62:1 75:20	206:19 207:5 216:16
RFI 298:17 299:8	routinely 84:20 93:4	143:12 177:19,21	216:19,22 217:5
312:19 315:22 326:16	159:21 161:15 209:19	186:10 258:14 317:21	218:10,13,19 219:2,5
Rican 302:4	213:3 264:7,15	323:21	220:22 221:19 224:6
Ricci 203:6 204:7,8	Rozell 2:10	scale 269:5	226:7 239:2,5,9 240:3
260:11 264:3 270:4	rule 13:5 18:17 39:11	scattered 187:16	240:11 242:6 243:20
276:14 278:2 295:15	57:13,15,18 91:20	scenario 179:9	246:12 251:17 252:3
Rich 265:13	123:2 143:2,11	scenarios 28:13 248:21	253:10 255:16 269:7
rights 21:3 22:22 101:7	168:11 173:5 177:19	scenes 97:3	279:22 280:11,17
110:11,12 117:2	177:20 179:19 364:3	schedule 204:19	294:5,14 295:12
118:5 134:7 137:2	ruled 128:13	scheduled 198:11	302:21
141:17 146:17,17	rules 17:3 19:10 21:8	211:19 248:1	Secretary's 219:18
160:15,15,22 161:3	22:7 29:11 84:22	schedules 264:6	220:7,18 226:17
164:8 166:12 177:5	90:12,15 91:6 99:1	school 10:15 27:19,21	240:5,13 251:12
183:22 189:5 190:6	115:18 118:12 123:1	27:22 28:2,4,18 71:7	section 28:20 51:8
192:4	123:12,13,16 124:11	212:4 238:20 245:12	234:2 280:16,16,18
rigorous 211:14	156:3 172:14 190:16	249:4 272:17	281:11 332:13
Risch 203:11 204:12	192:7 210:9 211:1,5	school's 245:13	secure 18:15
208:4,7 243:6 253:7	267:1 318:1	schoolhouse 166:20	Security 234:1
257:7 261:2,4 269:2	ruling 131:4	212:18 245:20 253:18	seeing 113:20 173:4
270:9 277:6,10	run 25:5 100:22 295:9	schoolhouses 212:1	189:21 314:14
282:18 286:5 287:3	359:5	schools 85:3 263:15,16	seek 127:6 189:5 347:5
	l	l	l

352:12 245:2 seeking 27:9 130:11 139:21 340:8 seeks 18:15 seen 33:21 44:1 66:1 75:18 82:4 87:4,19 90:6,18 91:2 93:5,21 100:4 106:1 115:22 122:2,2 128:11 130:6 130:15 131:3,4 132:8 145:10,17,19 162:5 162:13 169:19 170:2 171:1 175:4 179:5 188:17 190:3 260:19 sees 184:20 segment 37:20 328:18 select 23:13 24:4,21 26:3 27:5 31:13 45:8 47:18 55:15 66:1,4 74:20 79:22 229:2 245:4,9 246:3 284:19 328:14 selected 56:2 169:9 228:21 229:7,19 344:15 230:3,7,13,18 236:9 247:20 selectees 66:4 selecting 5:20 23:21 30:6 31:21 45:1 49:3 65:9 71:10 290:15 selection 3:4 5:16.21 9:19 10:8,11,16,17,20 11:1 12:3,8 13:2,16 18:13 19:7,12 20:2,7 21:6,22 22:11,17,19 23:10 27:7 28:14,22 30:16,21 31:20 32:10 33:3 36:8 40:5 42:15 49:4 54:12 67:14 78:1 79:5.8 101:20 131:18 342:1 140:18 167:12,12 209:5 226:10,10 229:4 261:16 269:13 341:4,5 342:18,22 301:18 selections 9:21 31:10 221:10 selects 55:1 self-75:8 100:18 279:8 333:10 self-assessing 279:8 self-aware 71:9 self-editing 127:18 self-generated 333:6 self-report 328:20 self-reported 333:7 seminal 98:12 Senate 206:6 209:5 221:14 226:14 233:6

send 4:22 256:19 263:5 334:4 355:20 sending 41:12 senior 2:5,8,10 28:4,12 136:10 151:16 169:10 195:1 197:4,10 198:4 200:19 202:6,7 205:18 216:20 224:7 227:2,3 233:2 244:14 248:4,5 252:14 266:12 271:6,7,22 273:7 356:16 sense 50:4 56:12 79:4 101:5 201:22 202:6 323:22 342:9 sensitivities 181:8 sent 53:19 315:22 sentence 27:15 83:6 98:20 123:15 124:14 124:16 125:4 139:10 176:4 178:8 sentenced 142:5 sentencing 81:14,15 82:7,12,15,21 83:1,7 83:9 94:16 98:9.22 99:4,20 100:6,10,13 100:15 101:9 107:8 107:11 108:6,22 111:10,13,22 123:14 127:4 129:4 140:10 141:18,19,20 142:21 145:1,1,7 177:9,9 178:11 365:2 separate 8:20 33:9 59:17 126:9 129:18 258:21 280:15 281:11 304:16 325:3,5 332:16,17 335:10 separated 284:17 separately 187:22 September 7:2 8:14,16 33:1 37:4 228:1 234:3 239:8 254:22 335:2 sergeant 71:17 series 123:3 serious 70:2 244:10 seriously 19:15 65:20 91:20 101:3 279:11 serve 5:11 18:19 23:14 24:7 25:12 26:14 33:8 33:20 39:10 55:22 73:12 101:4 137:9 148:7 192:14,22 196:11 206:3 210:1

212:5 219:16 222:1 226:15 233:7 234:5 237:8 246:10 252:20 288:8 served 50:15 51:1 150:10 154:6,9 155:10,12,15 165:15 209:14,17 212:3 226:22 227:2 230:11 233:18 245:9,15 serves 20:4 291:4 service 5:15 6:12 9:17 10:11 20:2 21:2 23:17 27:17 29:13,16 33:6 33:13 48:20 72:18 73:5 84:16 85:2,15,15 91:5 104:22 113:19 150:9 151:15 156:13 157:5,6 189:13 201:20 206:11 210:12 213:8,17 223:20 227:5 229:10 231:6 234:21 235:14 248:5 275:16 283:13 304:4 307:13 308:19,20 309:9.10 319:21 320:14,21 327:15,16 330:6 333:8 340:7,14 341:1,2 343:11 363:6 service's 10:3 146:13 Service- 321:14 service-level 134:22 services 5:11,12 11:15 21:7 23:9 28:19 42:8 42:17 63:19 70:3 72:22 78:21 81:4 84:4 84:10 87:9 88:19 90:13,14 116:11 117:14,22 156:12,14 157:4,13 158:1,7 159:8,16,20,22 160:8 166:2 173:9 191:16 191:19 196:9 200:8 212:1,14,15,17,20 217:17 237:18 255:15 256:1,1,21 260:1,3 264:1,20 265:9 267:18 273:21 274:3 289:19 293:4 295:21 303:20 304:18,20 305:4 306:15 307:16 311:2 313:12 316:18 317:11,16 319:6,10 320:15 322:19 323:7 323:11 326:3,6 327:18 331:4 332:15 Services' 6:7 serving 22:21 39:8

50:14 101:1 105:9 150:5,20 173:7 212:13 226:17 361:9 session 6:19 7:12 8:2 9:14 334:15 sessions 28:11 334:8 366:10 set 20:8 21:22 206:5 239:6 252:3 260:2 264:5 273:3 300:16 301:5 303:5 315:7 318:20,22 319:15 320:1 324:21 sets 211:14 289:5 setting 330:7 settled 162:1 seven 62:20,21 351:21 sex 87:12 143:16 179:22 278:9 299:3,4 305:17,20,21 306:11 312:4,9,10,14 316:1 323:15,19,21 336:19 336:22 337:1 352:4 357:14,21 sex-related 153:15 sexual 1:1 4:6.15 5:7.8 6:5 73:8 85:21 96:3 96:17 97:19 102:13 102:14,19 103:6,18 104:10 105:11,12 107:17 110:13 121:4 132:16 152:10 153:20 154:9 165:22 168:5 173:10 216:17 223:1 223:2,11,21 224:1,17 231:14 239:7,8,10,16 239:16 240:4 241:5,8 241:9,20 242:3 244:9 244:12 275:12 280:4 280:5 294:2,16,18,20 295:3 300:1 303:11 315:4,10 330:3 336:7 336:16 337:3 339:9 339:10 359:18 sexually 93:16 shadow 353:19 shake 64:3 Shannon 11:7 shape 91:6 share 68:12 81:7 85:1,5 102:6 113:22 114:8 212:17 224:10 258:5 267:19 269:10 352:9 360:18 shared 93:2 114:6 214:3 sharing 114:16 125:10 125:11 139:6 259:6

SHARP 170:1 she'll 193:2 sheep 97:16 98:1 103:1 103:3 sheet 14:7,7,8 sheets 15:17 17:17 Sherwin 11:7,18,20 18:8 39:16,16 64:7,8 73:14,15 88:4 89:1,2 shield 95:22 shifting 294:10 shining 212:1 ship 84:13 shock 108:20 shoestring 323:13 shops 43:7 288:19 short 85:11 177:14 197:14 360:3 short-term 197:7 Shorthand 300:8 **show** 59:5 60:11,14 76:8 172:7 180:8 261:15 309:18 showed 121:13 307:14 showing 41:2 shown 185:20 shows 60:12 69:2 133:19 270:16 299:9 **shut** 359:9 siblings 358:9,19 side 39:17 49:5,5 67:2,4 183:21 187:21 188:5 188:13,14 258:2 269:5,9,18 270:18,22 271:2 278:22 283:21 284:15 285:21 287:19 289:4 291:11 293:3 304:14 330:6 353:11 361:22 sided 361:12 362:4 sides 209:16 269:12 354:20 362:10 sign 15:1 24:9 198:20 signal 8:5 295:14 signature 26:17 signed 24:11 27:1 significant 64:2 87:13 100:5 111:9 117:18 117:22 121:16,19 131:11 132:20 134:11 137:13 139:3 141:14 142:8 225:5 242:2 269:16 274:22 275:11 283:8 309:15 340:17 350:14 significantly 42:8 121:13 141:21 signs 55:2

silence 107:5 silenced 114:1 361:10 silent 107:8 similar 42:17 45:21 54:21,21 140:21 158:19 159:5,19 162:15 231:18 234:7 238:5 246:17 258:2 260:2 343:4.16 similarly 33:4 69:2 220:1 simple 107:3 simply 15:13 107:1 121:17 132:17 351:10 Simultaneous 44:15 58:22 68:8 simultaneously 111:15 215:15 sincere 260:20 single 43:20 76:17,22 89:16 107:21 132:19 159:3 277:8 singular 326:12 sir 65:5 89:1 90:10 124:18 134:16 138:16 265:17 270:17 271:1 273:18 291:11 292:15 292:18 298:14 336:2 338:19 339:2 sister 211:22 273:21 358:15 sisters 359:20 sit 14:2,12 46:19 49:9 70:5 76:2,6 87:16 89:19 106:18 172:22 193:7 346:3 sits 61:8 89:13 262:12 sitting 12:5 15:8 46:15 48:16 60:15 89:12 127:13 165:12 287:9 293:9 333:11 338:13 342:6,12,14 situated 69:2 146:7 282:8 situation 57:21 105:17 162:20 172:16 187:8 268:7,17 278:1 283:16 340:9 situations 162:2 337:16 six 12:20 56:11 103:18 113:6 138:6 197:20 336:8 344:7,9 346:5 360:6 six-year-old 104:9 sixth 5:22 272:10 size 41:7 47:6 SJ 254:13 SJA 15:1,19 16:2 17:14

23:22 25:7,18 26:2,9 26:15 30:14 47:1,3 148:15,15 203:13 SJA's 31:19 **SJAs** 16:1 17:8,11 251:10 287:10 292:11 skill 209:14 skilled 231:11 238:2 271:12 skip 166:8 skipping 198:18 **slammed** 359:4 slapped 359:1 slated 231:2 slating 270:21 271:3 slide 298:16 299:9 302:12 305:7 314:6 316:10,12,17 317:12 slides 253:12 269:10 slightly 21:6 **slip** 316:10 small 31:1 38:11,12 96:13 125:15 155:21 165:9 167:10 smaller 22:1 29:12,22 33:14 50:2 132:12 smart 171:20 Smith 1:10,13 4:10,11 8:12,15 9:6,16 11:17 11:21 18:7 23:3,5 29:2 32:15 35:1,4 37:5 39:22 51:7 53:4 62:8,12 68:2 71:22 72:3,7,9,12 74:6,9,21 76:10 78:16 83:22 85:8 88:1 91:8 92:16 94:5 114:15 115:5,9 115:12,15 116:1,4 125:3.8 130:15 143:9 145:22 158:2 177:8 201:4 202:14,16,21 204:10 225:3 232:1 243:12 251:5 255:12 256:12 259:2 267:22 286:12 289:15 293:16 297:5,20 327:9 329:3 331:17 338:19 346:18 353:7 354:6,11 357:6 363:4 365:4 smooth 30:20 snuck 357:17 **snuff** 293:14 **social** 360:6 society 301:7 soldier 176:16 336:10 336:15 soldiers 70:20 278:3 **solution** 350:20

solve 263:19 somebody 16:13 76:2 76:12 86:4 182:7 184:22 186:9 191:12 258:21 290:19 347:4 somebody's 293:13 somewhat 36:1 83:14 109:16 son 359:2 sons 358:21 soon 82:12 197:22 257:21 SOPs 258:7,10 sorry 55:21 60:13 62:7 72:12 74:7 75:2 88:3 88:9 93:3 115:8,9 145:8 167:18 335:20 353:20 358:3 362:3 sort 42:18,22 44:16 48:11 49:2 71:15,20 87:10 125:17 128:1 141:4 189:10 259:8 259:19 290:16 327:22 328:8,22 sought 136:13 sound 211:1 229:20 232:7 236:11 sounds 42:4 53:10 **soup** 130:14 source 101:3 sources 196:5 South 1:10 302:4 southeast 292:9 space 16:17 131:19 244:2 256:4 Spanish 302:5 **speak** 8:6 12:1 32:19 72:2 78:18 85:10,13 100:13 101:11 104:18 106:5,14 107:22 108:5,6 111:20,21 114:11 120:3 126:11 128:10,15 131:2 139:18 140:2.2 144:13 151:14 152:14 166:2 176:9 177:6,11 179:6 260:17 261:2 326:7 332:12 336:6 339:5 351:16 speaker 334:16 speaking 4:20 8:4 44:15 52:15 58:22 68:8 120:10 140:9 337:10 spearheads 165:18 Specialist 228:21 229:8 229:16 230:8,14 specialists 33:22 351:8

specialization 220:13 220:16 specialized 217:21 218:20 225:17 227:15 232:11 238:10 specially 206:21 **specific** 5:12 10:17 24:9 34:18 53:13 61:2 61:7 122:3 123:12 124:8 132:21 139:10 143:2 167:22 172:6 172:16 173:4 179:18 188:17 190:20 200:22 218:3 224:20 240:2 269:22 281:9 295:7 300:1 315:10 319:12 321:15 327:1 specifically 30:4 51:15 102:5 152:15 171:10 175:9 186:8 188:12 190:17 223:16 228:5 228:13 234:14 269:7 280:18 298:19 299:1 299:6 300:20 347:9 specification 323:18 specifics 62:4 172:11 294:13 specified 35:13 36:5,16 219:17 spectrum 52:12 speed 299:18 spending 188:5 297:22 **spends** 46:7 spent 50:10 69:19 70:6 272:20 spiritually 106:1 **Spohn** 1:19 9:9 62:9 66:17 67:17 268:1 274:20 276:11 279:17 279:19 280:12,14 322:11 324:7,14,22 325:9,13 **spoke** 106:2 205:13 283:22 354:12 **spoken** 51:12 253:14 **spouse** 143:19 spouses 143:17 spread 30:1 **spurred** 359:16 squad 41:3 squadron 12:12,21 264:12 stacked 63:3 103:16 stacking 34:17 Stacy 2:5 staff 2:3,5,6,7,7,8,10,11 2:11,12 6:12,17 9:20 11:7,10,12 12:5 18:22

25:9 27:20 30:10.17 31:3,12 33:7 40:16 43:18 46:7 97:2 150:8 150:12,22 154:12 155:15 161:9 199:6 207:10 209:17 216:4 219:13 226:3 231:8 237:21 245:14,15 252:19 255:2 267:10 298:8 310:5 staffed 281:4 staffing 247:1 250:2 296:5 staffs 297:10 stage 259:7 stages 267:6 271:22 309:17 stakeholders 243:8 stand 18:6 19:15 106:7 108:9,12 112:17 176:20 243:21 250:13 258:4 272:11 362:18 364:18 standard 23:18 25:4 32:4 116:10 140:14 202:1 220:20 250:8 252:4 256:20 258:3 300:11,12 303:3,3 306:17 310:16,20,21 311:16,21 312:7 319:11 320:1 standardize 322:6 standardized 19:11 50:17 standards 21:22 210:11 211:6,14 249:12 257:18 275:7 299:11 301:4 302:22 303:15 305:11,13 307:6,8,22 312:11 317:9 standing 24:6,12 25:1 30:9 32:4 33:9 34:4 61:14 128:8,12,19 129:2 130:6,7,10 166:13,16 201:19 210:16 272:5 288:12 293:19 standpoint 106:11 290:1.7 304:8 stands 34:6 283:10 294:18 standup 244:16 246:4,7 star 145:13 285:12 357:2,3 start 8:11 37:8 54:2 56:21 57:6 62:12 90:6 126:14 169:1 203:22 251:6,11,12 265:22

294:6 314:22 331:19 334:18 335:17 345:4 345:5 348:11,15 started 71:4 112:18 128:20,20 134:22 136:12 184:8 195:19 197:5,6,6 198:7 253:8 253:10 273:20 301:3 313:16 314:9 315:19 336:16 338:8 348:17 starting 195:21 197:19 299:11 305:14 311:11 358.6 starts 12:9 19:18 201:7 311:7 336:3 state 60:8 213:9 214:3 238:9 353:22 state-of-the-art 212:9 stated 27:4 31:20 205:11 207:21 225:7 239:9 360:15 statement 36:17 98:11 99:6,10,14,14,17,19 101:4 102:9 104:8,13 104:21 105:5 106:4.9 106:11 107:10 108:22 109:15,18,22 110:2,6 110:7 111:6 112:2,6,8 112:12,19,22 113:22 114:7,20 115:2,4,5,17 115:20 116:3,8,9,13 117:3 118:9,10,11,13 118:16,17 119:1,6,8 120:14 121:13,22 123:3 124:1,5 128:16 129:6,17,20 130:3 142:21 143:4,12 145:4,6 178:18,19 179:1,11,13,14 183:4 186:2,14 188:13 196:3 212:8 262:21 276:20 277:20 279:19 295:9 362:7 366:6 statements 6:3 94:15 95:8 98:8,18 99:4,13 99:22 100:22 102:7 104:4 105:9,14,17 106:2 107:13.20 109:13 111:4,12 122:20 125:14,19 127:7 129:13 130:16 140:11 146:15 148:18 149:17 151:19,20 154:21 155:20 156:1 175:11 182:20 188:2 188:19 states 36:6,19 80:10 104:12 152:4 154:10

155:7 263:17,17 360:13 stating 8:6 station 24:18 360:2 statistic 285:14 286:6 statistical 300:7 317:14 330:21 statistically 309:15 321:1 statistics 180:8 181:11 285:5 319:16 stats 78:21 status 6:15 74:16 159:12,12 222:12 312:11 statute 34:9 83:13 213:11 258:13 statute's 221:21 statutorily 58:6 92:14 statutory 5:5 206:4 210:3,10 227:16 244:21 302:16 304:22 stay 49:21 64:11 199:9 199:14 Stayce 2:10 staying 288:19 **STC** 230:3 248:18 267:1 **STCs** 219:3 266:12 275:9 276:3 steadfast 244:5 steal 264:17 Stelle 210:15 211:6 step 80:15 84:9 192:8 218:12 242:16 326:18 326:19 331:12 333:20 Stephens 221:12,16 226:12,14 227:7 steps 240:7 277:12 sterling 227:12 stick 52:21 stitch 359:8 stolen 104:19 108:21 113:5 stone 301:5 stood 187:14 261:20,21 262:5 272:6 stop 183:18 298:11 336:18 stopped 112:19 stopping 112:6 192:16 stories 97:12 98:2 114:16 344:19 story 97:11 111:4 351:16 361:5 strange 112:3 strategic 245:22 strategies 242:1 strategy 248:11

Street 1:10 strengthening 95:21 153:7 stressed 253:15 stresses 218:19 stressful 229:21 236:11 strike 140:20 strikes 179:8 strong 93:17 157:17 structural 205:3 269:10 structure 117:16 206:13 211:4 214:4 215:15 253:18 254:19 259:16,22 271:8 293:10 347:1 structured 246:16 struggle 323:12 students 212:16,19 studies 306:21 study 57:13 82:13 310:3 333:16 344:6 stuff 60:5 62:5 subcommittee 7:2,4,5 7:6 8:18,19,20,21 9:2 9:2.4.7 365:9 366:1.4 subcommittee's 140:7 subcommittees 7:1.9 8:18 9:10 250:11 subject 57:19 58:5 108:9 115:7,10 118:21 122:20 163:12 165:1 169:15 309:10 subject-matter 214:13 248:5.6 subjected 85:21 115:1 subjects 233:22 submission 25:16 178:17 submit 7:21 45:10 submitted 17:15 26:8 44:2 99:22 158:21 335:16 subordinate 21:18 25:8 30:8 33:15 37:9,12 43:7 44:3 45:5,22 50:9 59:13 123:18 131:5 159:9 202:5 subparagraph 228:2 subparagraphs 255:3 subsequent 244:13 subsequently 133:6 substantial 211:9 229:17 230:16,20 substantive 191:2 substitute 58:3 substitutes 57:4 81:1 subtle 242:15 succeed 356:21

success 215:10 222:8 239:18 250:18,20 277:14 285:22 286:3 286:8 348:22 349:1,3 successful 117:3 191:21 205:22 207:5 208:12 216:1 234:12 237:13 244:6 277:11 346:13 successfully 225:6 228:12,17 232:12 234:16 243:21 suddenly 80:21 suffer 341:2 suffered 106:20 sufficient 17:19 57:5 103:20 sufficiently 131:16 suggest 19:8 36:1 suggested 119:19 174:10 272:10 suggests 123:6 223:2 suit 213:13 Sullivan 2:1 4:3,4,11 35:2,5 57:9,14,16 82:18.20 265:13 365:7 366:13 sum 19:19 245:17 summarily 166:16 summarize 334:6 summary 163:12 summer 34:6 148:2 198:12 199:2 231:4 266:10 superficially 358:17 superior 220:5 superiors 22:16 supervise 210:3 supervised 206:19 220:5 supervising 150:19 198:18 supervision 233:3 supervisors 253:3 supervisory 209:15 support 28:19 87:2 103:2 105:14 130:16 130:18 141:7 150:21 153:7 154:15 158:7 175:9,22 180:21 184:19 208:6 215:10 215:16 226:4 231:8 237:21 243:4 249:22 254:13 256:9 270:6,7 279:10 292:4 supported 176:1 207:8 supporter 86:2 supporting 134:6,6

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

180:19 217:18 287:12 supportive 193:6,20 196:9 358:3 supports 102:19 166:1 170:19 suppose 282:11 supposed 50:15 301:15 301:22 303:8,20 322:20 suppress 113:3 surface 296:15 surgery 359:8 surrounding 102:7 103:6 109:12 survey 128:1 195:20 283:9 284:2 surveyed 283:6 surveys 275:20 survivor 96:5,9 98:7 99:8,10,18 101:5 102:10,13,17,21 103:5 120:3,18 121:8 121:9 124:10 survivor's 97:10 121:20 survivors 3:6 6:3 94:18 94:19.21 95:4 96:3.4 97:5,7,12 98:9,13,19 98:21 99:5,9,16 100:4 100:7,12,19 101:13 101:21 102:2,3,5,15 102:18,19 103:2,7,9 103:11,20 109:3 111:1 117:11,21 118:1,2 120:9,14 122:9,12,18 132:2 134:5 suspect 163:9 sustain 139:2 sustainable 222:11 223:12 224:16 sustained 296:19 Suzanne 1:15 SVC 130:7 158:17 160:18 161:1 166:21 175:6 183:6 184:10 189:14 194:1 200:19 282:20 SVC/VLC 3:9 **SVCs** 160:13 161:15 167:5 174:9 175:10 180:12 183:2,13 184:4 194:11 259:18 **SVP** 149:6 swath 34:2 swift 296:17 Switching 94:14 131:13 sworn 99:5 108:7 115:4 115:5,17 228:10

234:11 sympathetic 341:20 sympathy 340:8 symptoms 358:16 sync 285:2 synced 151:9 synergy 30:14 system 18:15 25:22 54:8,21,22 56:7 66:20 67:8 79:13,16 81:14 82:5 83:1 91:3 96:15 97:15 102:8 105:7 109:5 122:7,15 133:9 137:20 174:22 182:5 184:9 207:4,6 213:6 214:5 215:12,22 217:22 222:3 226:21 232:7 243:7 244:4 251:1 252:9,15 274:1 274:18 276:5 277:21 278:13 282:11 291:10 299:20,21,22 300:1 302:20 304:2,15,16 304:21 305:20 308:3 308:4 309:16 311:14 311:14,17,18 315:10 315:12 319:18 320:2 320:3 323:6,11,22 324:4,5 325:12 326:12 327:6,21 330:17 332:14,19,22 333:19 351:3,12 356:11,12 358:11 system's 97:19 systematic 132:14 134:9 systematically 87:5 132:3 systemic 77:21 systems 213:10 305:15 313:5 314:11 323:9 326:4,10,20 327:3 331:13 Т tab 9:22 10:6,10,19 40:5,6 59:7 95:9 146:18 298:9 334:21 335:7,11 365:15,16 table 59:16 169:2 265:10 tactical 245:19 **TAD** 46:11 tag 325:20 Tagert 2:11 taken 84:9 96:18 99:19 108:17 120:11 125:12

164:6 211:7 258:16

278:13 338:11.12 takes 66:1,5 106:16 119:3 176:16 193:17 274:5 306:18 310:1 311:1 313:7 314:6 talent 291:3,5 talk 58:11 81:13 84:10 89:2 113:13 140:8,16 143:14 176:20 177:4 185:3,3,13 186:16,19 196:18 239:2 250:12 262:15 264:15 268:4 278:15 283:8 298:16 326:11 talked 33:2 60:16 104:16 177:3 192:11 195:10 257:9 278:22 291:1 302:15 312:8 330:19 336:13 talking 70:6 74:1 84:21 93:3 125:19 131:15 131:18 138:15 141:15 144:9 182:20 264:3 265:5 272:21 289:13 289:18 299:7,19,20 299:21.22 301:9 302:3 320:17 350:14 350:15 talks 143:13 **Tammy** 335:13 tangible 289:14 297:3 tapped 212:5 target 263:12 targeting 263:17 tarnished 107:4 task 222:7 265:8 tasked 223:21 310:2 tasks 189:18 290:13 294:11 taught 166:21 **TDS** 269:8,18 270:11,13 **TDY** 64:21 80:21 teach 28:5 212:20 teaches 165:20,22 Teaching 186:21 team 56:18 96:11 135:3 153:11 158:13 175:7 176:22 177:4 180:9 185:12,16,17 186:21 187:13 188:7 192:21 205:18 211:7 244:3 250:16 258:2 267:2,4 284:7,10,13 287:21 287:22 314:9 350:22 351:1 354:13 teams 151:6 181:15 195:18 196:22 231:11 technical 2:6 4:20

281:12 techniques 30:3 technology 222:17 teeing 183:15 teleconference 4:22 tell 42:3 106:19 147:12 148:5 163:10 180:8 221:10 257:7 262:19 277:16 321:22 326:18 337:9 341:16 345:12 telling 78:3 97:11 112:7 tells 73:17 temperament 20:1 23:17 48:21 49:13 50:5 51:5 68:15,21 69:10,14 71:12,15 211:15 229:20 236:10 247:7 temperaments 69:4 76:6 temporary 14:1 24:17 ten 4:21 226:4 229:17 235:5 344:7,9,15,16 358:10 360:4 tenant 15:8 tenants 202:4 tend 56:21 57:6 177:4 **Tennessee** 133:10 Teri 9:13 term 37:3 83:15 102:10 219:17,19,21 279:13 289:2 305:19,21,22 terminology 102:12 terms 8:20 42:2 119:21 126:17 128:22 130:13 131:1 138:4 141:10 142:14 145:16,16 165:17 166:6 169:21 175:8 181:14 190:2,9 231:18 238:6 287:7 290:15 293:19 294:2 294:4,13,14 345:18 Terri 2:11 terrorism 233:22 test 275:14,16 276:8 tested 272:20 testified 239:15 testify 99:5 351:8 testimony 108:7 111:3 114:13,22 151:17 191:18 259:4 298:20 315:19,20 316:6 337:4 345:11 346:21 Texas 11:9 12:6 text 10:7 thankfully 185:17 thanking 96:22 213:20 thanks 41:19 43:4

73:13 74:5,21 88:22 96:12 97:5 theme 259:10 theory 306:11 311:20 363:21 Theresa 2:7 thin 284:18 things 29:6 47:14 51:3 63:6 91:9 112:7 119:22 120:19 121:18 122:1 123:15 124:4 132:18 133:12 135:13 137:21 142:3 143:5 160:20 184:2 188:4 188:20 190:1 199:5 200:10 253:19,22 255:20 257:6,15 258:4 262:4,18 266:6 271:1 272:9 277:16 278:15 282:22 283:18 291:14 294:8,12 302:7 318:16 327:12 329:5,12 342:22 345:13 354:7 360:12 361:22 thinks 133:2 third 16:3 60:4 88:10 89:14,18 90:17,21 115:3 116:2 141:11 191:11 240:5 242:4 259:21 357:2.3 thirds 337:15 350:10 thorough 110:1 210:18 thoroughly 224:3 thought 36:21 56:4 65:13 137:13 177:3 259:6 275:1,5,10 276:17 277:7 295:17 346:22 347:7 351:15 thoughtful 259:8 thoughts 56:15 112:10 168:10 341:18 thousands 45:19,19 50:8.8 59:13 344:5 three 6:22 8:17 12:19 47:1,20,22 55:15 99:2 114:20 122:11 139:17 148:10,11 189:13 194:2 197:5 199:1 212:5 219:17,22 235:21 240:1 241:1 249:1 261:12 262:7 280:18 298:11 306:12 306:13 335:10 358:1 358:12 365:17 three-inch 113:10 three-year 199:12,17 200:3,5 249:15

threshold 241:12 thrilled 193:15 throwing 360:11 tie 84:11 143:19 tied 186:14 285:18 tier 286:17 ties 91:4 279:5 312:19 tight-knit 70:22 till 257:11 timeline 208:6 timelines 240:22 times 44:1 47:19 50:22 52:3 53:10 55:15 62:15 64:9 93:13 137:9,12 213:11 tireless 227:10 **TJAGS** 210:12 today 5:13,14 8:9 11:22 12:1 18:12 32:19 52:21 95:6,17 96:1 98:7 101:11,17 102:6 110:17 111:3 114:11 114:14 121:13 131:3 173:17 232:3 243:15 255:21 284:1 294:18 305:16 306:5 312:20 329:6.11 337:10 338:3 348:18 350:21 360:17 362:19 366:6 today's 4:17 8:2 23:8 32:14 151:17 Tokash 1:19 7:5 9:8 83:22 84:1 134:14,15 135:6,9 136:22 160:3 160:3 191:14.14 193:10 293:16,17 296:11 345:7,8,10,17 345:21 346:10,17 350:6,6 352:14,14,22 363:5,5,8,11,20 364:8 364:12,19 365:3,11 365:14,19 Tolar 11:12 23:4,5 43:4 44:14,18 54:19 told 67:9 104:12,14 108:6 111:19,20 112:13,14 133:17 278:3 358:4 360:17 361:18 362:1 tomorrow 6:21 7:12 9:11 173:17 210:15 250:11 334:7,11 365:15 366:9 tone 239:6 tool 171:9 top 60:7 71:3 92:4 194:13,14 244:7 251:12 253:10 261:17

263:15 286:16 356:17 top-down 261:6,7 topic 5:18 9:14 94:15 126:9 180:18 topics 167:2 240:2 248:10 Toro 217:5 218:13,19 219:2 224:6 Toro's 216:16,19 220:22 221:19 toss 194:9 total 25:22 38:13 42:5 148:15 299:5 303:12 304:2 316:2 318:3 totally 92:12 195:10 touch 124:1 tough 292:20 tour 199:12 230:10 track 67:22 129:18 180:4,7 181:2,10 208:16 225:8 227:8,9 228:22 229:1,5 230:9 238:9 273:3,4,5,7,15 332:21 tracked 285:6 tracking 270:9 282:12 328:4 **Tracy** 147:5 153:3 traditional 176:13 258:16 train 161:4 171:18 212:12,20 215:2 229:2 252:6,10 267:10 trained 22:11 70:7,8,16 85:22 87:2 154:16 168:6 189:19 206:21 238:1 253:2 267:8 trainer 149:3,20 training 9:19 11:8 12:5 22:15 23:16 27:16 28:1,16,20 31:8,11,13 69:6,11,16 71:6 86:5 91:5 92:8 124:7 148:21 149:4,15 151:19 154:22 160:5 160:13 161:6 162:16 163:20,21 165:17,18 165:21 166:22 167:1 168:9 169:16 170:4 172:4,5,15 174:10 180:13 181:7,14 185:19 186:12 192:19 194:6 200:10 208:5 210:7,10,19 211:15 211:17,19,21 213:2,4 213:12 214:7 219:9 220:17 222:18 231:13

231:14 247:4 248:10 249:1,6,8 250:8 252:2 252:5 253:5,17,17 255:15,19 256:9 258:8 262:8 267:9 268:5 269:13,22 270:1 287:8,16 289:5 293:13 trainings 148:3 162:18 trains 249:7 transcribed 7:17 transcript 7:17 32:22 transfer 205:22 transferred 46:10 245:5 transformation 208:22 transformational 222:10 transformative 96:16 transforming 205:20 transgender 180:5,13 181:19 transition 205:18 209:12 transitioning 29:17 transparency 214:5 215:16 transparent 172:20 257:22 trauma 97:9 106:20 107:1 111:17 114:5 170:11 183:19 traumas 358:5 traumatic 107:15 travel 222:17 361:17 traveled 150:22 208:18 travels 133:1 tread 123:22 treated 154:18 190:22 308:19,20,21 treating 156:1 treatment 69:20 70:18 trend 162:16 189:22 trending 242:20 trends 155:22 240:17 241:4 248:12 trepidation 342:9 Trexler 2:5 triads 252:13 triaged 256:18 257:6 trial-level 209:11 trials 62:22 74:3 86:15 111:7 148:14,15,16 170:15 332:5 triangulation 358:17 tribunal 235:8 tribunals 235:6,19,21 236:5,7 tried 76:16,19 91:14

114:2 123:18 235:9 235:21 236:7 254:6 254:10 309:11 310:19 361.5 tries 296:14 trigger 196:15 true 86:11 87:20 173:5 341:21 truly 110:17 361:15 trust 153:9 215:21,21 218:1 243:7 244:4 250:22 275:16,17,18 276:5 277:21 278:4,4 278:5,12 281:20 282:5 286:10 327:22 328:1,3 trusted 351:11 try 33:9 51:21 60:20 63:21 69:12 82:9 123:7 124:4,12 183:18 198:1 320:15 321:16 330:17 341:12 trying 36:1 37:20 76:14 245:17 272:3 280:8 284:2 286:7 287:8 296:22 323:16.19 332:8 345:14 363:15 **TUESDAY** 1:6 turn 11:18 61:21 95:13 110:15 147:9 204:6 224:19 322:14 332:12 turned 112:4 turning 140:10 218:5 **Twenty** 80:16 twice 151:8 two 13:18 16:13 17:7 28:11,20 35:14 36:5 36:22 41:21 47:7,17 55:15 58:2,17 62:22 80:21 85:18,21 89:22 90:10 103:17,21 114:21 122:11 125:11 131:14 145:13 147:22 148:19 149:3 155:18 163:6 171:4 173:10 184:7 190:1 194:1 197:18 209:18 212:11 217:14 218:5,18 219:3 221:18 225:22 240:21 259:16 261:5 261:11 264:5 265:16 268:13 270:2 272:6 301:21 306:22 307:3 310:16 313:20 318:7 318:13,20 319:3 322:14 327:12 334:17 337:15 338:22 340:13 340:15 344:3 345:13

346:6.15 349:3 350:10 354:19 358:21 **two-** 199:11,17 200:3,5 two-months-long 257:1 two-part 182:22 two-week 28:8 two-year 197:10 tying 187:3 333:19 type 13:14,16 17:21 38:7 56:14 82:6,8 87:9,15 93:18 100:14 116:6 140:21 157:21 191:19 194:21 197:17 287:17 289:13 296:2 313:3 337:12 351:1 types 76:8 90:11 170:15 191:22 247:5 266:22 288:8 296:2 typical 20:20 25:6 typically 21:8 24:4 25:7 25:18 33:19 34:5,5 39:12 43:8 47:9 75:6 75:14,21 85:13 90:20 116:20 117:5 159:11 184:9 U **U.S** 2:3 3:13 11:11 19:5 19:5 22:2 60:13 206:7 212:13 **U.S.C** 137:7 160:10 ubiquitous 129:11 UCMJ 5:20 10:7 17:2 19:10,19 21:22 23:12 228:2,9,11 234:4,11 234:12 ultimate 138:13 215:20 309:17 ultimately 24:4,8,13 26:14 46:19 56:1 98:10 104:19 121:2 124:17 137:17 190:8 346:15 unable 243:17 311:3 unacceptable 242:16 unaffiliated 98:1 152:16 unanimity 138:22 unanimous 337:14 340:19 350:7,8,11,18 unauthorized 255:7 unavailable 13:22 24:15 **unaware** 162:20 unbalanced 351:3 356:11,12 unclear 268:6 unconstitutional 82:3 under- 172:8 173:3,19

under-reporting 242:3 undergone 96:15 undermine 101:3 239:17 undermines 64:5 underneath 296:14 underscore 70:12 327:12 Undersecretary 239:15 understand 42:16 48:15 49:9 69:12 109:17 121:16 126:1 127:18 129:1 134:17 160:2,16,18,22 197:19 198:8 217:20 252:3,8,14,15 253:3 260:3 282:4 286:7 understandable 144:7 understanding 42:9 161:3 162:10 172:14 257:4 understandings 68:14 understands 138:3 understood 123:20 149:11 156:7 198:1 undertaking 100:8 underway 82:17 212:19 240:18 245:3 undisclosed 357:16,18 undue 251:8 252:18 unequivocally 238:8 239:9 278:3 unfair 38:8 unfortunately 82:4 **uniform** 3:3 84:5 219:12 302:14,22 303:12 361:21 **uniformed** 110:22 127:15 132:15 291:13 unilaterally 127:6 unique 129:4 179:22 180:14 206:17 212:21 213:7,13,17 259:5 260:4,4 264:21 282:7 unit 13:21 15:8 39:20 39:21 41:8 47:6 48:2 52:6 116:22 338:4 343:22 346:22 347:2 347:15 **United** 3:6 6:4 36:6,19 94:18,21 95:4 96:4 97:7,12 98:13 100:4,7 101:13,21 102:2,3,5 102:15,18 103:7 104:11 111:1 117:11 118:1 132:2 152:4 154:10 155:7 **United's** 99:17

units 73:2 343:5.6 universities 263:13 University 344:5 **unknown** 21:19 unlawful 28:14 67:20 253:11 255:7 unlimited 355:2 unnecessarily 106:21 107:13 unnecessary 120:20 unrelated 121:18 unrestricted 285:7 unsafe 239:12 unsuitable 87:16 unsurprisingly 223:3 unsworn 99:10,14,17 99:22 115:2 116:3 118:12,17 119:1,8 149:17 179:14 186:2 186:14 unsympathetic 62:15 untested 191:1 unusual 120:22 123:8 upcoming 148:2 update 6:14 8:13 95:7 203:4 204:13 216:7 218:3 225:4 243:20 313:9 366:1,2,4 updates 6:22 9:10 22:13 217:19 224:20 365:10 upheld 34:12 **uplift** 362:3 upper 261:8 **upset** 108:4 143:20 361:18 urge 295:12 **USA** 107:16 use 25:13 27:5 28:12 30:7,9 38:5,16 40:17 43:9 45:7,21,22 50:17 55:10 59:10,21 65:3 66:19,20,22 67:5 74:15,19 122:5 141:15 149:18,18 164:17 187:3 192:18 289:21 290:2 300:10 301:1 305:19,20,22 309:5 319:22 320:4 useful 201:2 260:9 327:17 uses 26:21 259:18 usually 25:1,15 77:11 90:6 99:4 158:14 utilize 109:7 192:12 225:19 232:15 332:15 utilized 16:21,21 utilizes 231:12

utilizing 311:16 V **v** 36:7,11,19 60:13 66:21 vacation 133:2 vacuum 359:5 VADM 225:2 252:1 258:1 271:2 278:21 283:21 287:18 291:11 validation 98:4 valuable 103:8 value 101:3 200:17 Vanessa 278:1 variation 42:5 variety 130:21 150:10 154:14 various 21:7 28:13 102:14 103:9 173:12 252:5 288:6 309:17 vary 41:22 42:7 241:17 varying 21:10 25:11 97:16 vast 157:20 **vectored** 70:17 vein 49:21 venire 36:13 134:10 venture 77:2 verdict 111:22 235:9.22 236:8 339:22 340:20 343:8 350:11,18 361:3 verdicts 109:17 350:7,8 verge 328:16 Vernon 203:16 239:4 239:21 243:11,12 255:10,13 265:15,17 271:18 273:17,18 285:15 293:2 verse 137:22 versus 5:20 177:9 195:2 329:16 349:15 356:9 vetted 247:10 vetting 293:5 vice 38:20 50:3 203:12 216:5 victim's 97:13 118:3 128:7,10,12,14 129:2 129:3,5 134:7,19 137:5,6 143:15 157:15 164:8 170:5 176:10 184:6 190:9 229:13 254:1 267:4,5 victim- 205:8 victim-centered 207:3 211.2 victim-centric 154:8

victim-created 96:4 victim-led 96:4 victimization 181:6 victimized 107:21 victims 6:5,8,8 19:4 87:2 95:1 97:8,22 100:5,9,20 101:9 103:17 106:12 108:19 109:5,20 110:3,10,13 114:6 116:6,20 117:5 117:6,8,9,12,13 127:15,16 129:10,11 130:19 137:10,18 138:8 147:18 149:2 149:10,19 152:10,19 153:7,10,15,19,20,22 154:18 156:8 158:3 166:4 175:2,5 177:6 177:11 180:2 181:12 184:14 190:6,7,14,18 190:22 191:9,10 194:19 196:11 210:22 215:17 217:14.16 235:2 240:20 242:16 256:2 259:17 280:7 282:9.9 283:6.11 284:5 286:7 363:2 victims' 3:8 6:4 137:2 146:14,17 147:3,5,6 149:2,8 150:4 152:4 153:4,14 154:5,22 155:1,8,14 156:7 159:17 160:14 165:15 165:18,19,20 173:21 174:8.20 183:22 190:21 192:3 199:13 200:4,18 266:19,21 267:9 281:21 284:1,6 284:16 video 4:19 video-teleconference 2:14 videoconference 4:18 view 22:20 128:14 164:4,9,11,20,21 170:5 178:7 182:8 214:16 views 86:9 vigilant 242:14 vignettes 28:12 330:2 vigorous 92:5 93:9 356:7,8 vindicate 164:13 violation 141:2,16 142:5 161:7,10 violations 137:3 160:10 161:18 violence 152:10 153:16

153:19 violent 122:7,8 153:10 153:22 352:5 360:15 Virginia 1:10 11:15 105:10 virtual 203:17 334:18 335:18,21 virtually 11:9 12:7 103:12 visibility 297:1 visit 151:3 288:15 visited 151:2 visiting 292:2 visitors 203:1 vital 215:22 280:3 VLC 135:19 136:10 150:8 151:2,5,19,20 158:21 163:22 164:21 165:3 183:6 187:13 187:15 189:1 198:19 284:21 **VLCP** 151:7 VLCs 183:2,14 184:4 194:11 **voice** 97:10 98:2.14 102:21 103:2 106:22 109:8 113:4 114:9 165:3 267:5,12 **voiceless** 113:5 voices 194:21 voids 214:22 voir 38:1,6 39:2 41:11 46:18 54:7 55:7,19 57:1,4 60:15,19,19,20 79:11 87:3,14 89:16 90:7 92:4 93:6 168:14 170:7 171:19 172:20 **volume** 33:5 241:19 voluminous 40:4 volun-told 174:12 **volunteer** 169:18 vote 138:19 221:15 voted 138:21 Vuono 2:12 w **W** 1:16 wait 106:13 257:11 296:13 waiting 8:7 183:15 waits 133:6 walk 28:13 wall 284:18 Walton 1:20 9:9 62:8,13 62:14 64:7 81:13 122:17 124:14 138:9 179:20 181:16 182:9 289:17 290:11

wanted 35:14 40:2 41:13 78:8 102:11 112:10 119:16 129:12 131:20 137:9,18 147:14 171:14 182:10 200:1 201:11,16 243:14,15 257:11 297:6 312:17 319:12 321:18 336:18 344:20 352:15 356:16 361:20 362:2 wants 7:20 78:7 89:6 90:2 109:18 124:11 322:21 war-fighting 239:19 warned 108:8 Warren 64:17 206:7 209:7 Washington 62:18 wasn't 116:5 337:1,8 waste 41:15 waters 329:4 way 18:18 33:18,19 50:15 57:1 63:8 70:14 71:21 75:20 82:14 91:6 99:1 113:3 116:14 123:19 126:2 126:7 127:12,19 128:16 130:8 133:11 136:6 143:18,20 154:3 168:12 170:11 171:8 180:5 186:22 192:5 242:13 258:19 272:2,3 299:12 300:9 300:15 307:10 312:21 318:10 319:6 320:4,7 321:19 322:15,18 323:7 325:2,15 327:7 339:20 340:22 342:3 346:7 353:5 356:6,13 ways 58:2 80:10 99:3 100:16 114:20 127:22 129:13 140:15 163:6 200:2 261:5 280:22 282:12 wealth 29:6 wearing 342:4 website 7:18 weed 39:3 244:9 weeding 42:19 43:11 week 187:18 216:14 233:6 245:3 weeks 24:11 216:12 264:5 weighing 116:7 welcome 3:2 4:12 5:13 6:10 9:17 94:16 146:12 174:1 194:13

202:22 203:5,10 273:10 365:22 welcomed 108:10 212:16 well-meaning 100:19 well-regarded 262:16 well-trained 231:10 wellness 214:20 215:14 295:16 296:1 Wells 2:12 165:12 185:3 206:7 209:7 210:2 212:3 330:20 went 89:21 94:12 146:10 202:19 253:12 269:6 291:12 298:5 336:14 337:1 345:3 349:6 353:4 366:16 weren't 59:19 136:19 283:7 292:2 308:10 347:5 west 227:5 232:19 350:4 whatsoever 108:14 152:20 whichever 259:18 white 51:14 63:5 66:9 66:12 77:14,17 78:15 80:5 81:21 301:3,11 303:18 308:20 309:9 346:5,5 349:15 350:2 350:4 whittled 101:1 who've 284:6 whs.pentagon.em.m... 7:22 wide 64:9 143:11 widely 241:17 242:2 wife 111:8 113:22 114:12 135:3,17 335:14 William 1:14 2:12 **willing** 138:8 willy-nilly 116:14,17 window 126:7 349:5 wing 245:16 winnowing 42:2 wise 94:2 wish 8:6 285:10 wishes 254:1 285:2 withdraw 289:10 witness 13:21 40:11 102:16 105:9 109:21 118:20,21 364:11,14 witnessed 336:22 witnesses 55:21 113:9 360:19 woman 107:21 132:7 134:1 171:3 181:20

women 85:13,16 86:16 87:5,20 92:21 132:2 134:10 167:14 168:2 169:6,11,12,17 170:2 171:2,11 173:7,9,12 174:8,11,15 201:19 261:13,14 308:21 329:14 342:12 355:14 wonder 128:13 325:19 wondered 73:10 wonderful 135:20 136:16 wondering 37:15 72:20 113:2 139:6,8,13,19 168:7 259:10 260:9 275:5 Woodard 221:12 233:7 233:9 284:19 Woodard's 221:14 233:16 word 59:21 83:15 91:21 167:15 176:11 179:5 251:16 words 42:17 91:10 122:6 130:17 179:7 281:10 work 7:9.15 13:11 19:4 24:5 29:4 30:11 31:4 84:3,12 96:19,22 97:1 97:2 99:15 100:7 101:10 137:17 149:9 151:3 169:22 172:17 183:8 185:7,21 188:1 188:1 199:5,8 205:21 207:13 227:10 240:18 243:3 258:10 261:1 263:7 264:6 266:15 267:19 276:12 279:3 288:5 291:19 293:19 314:6 322:3 327:8,18 340:2 341:14 342:19 343:10 348:8,10 354:10 worked 52:2 102:14 109:20 148:16 189:15 202:8 264:18 341:7 341:11 346:7 worker 360:7 working 38:12 50:2 79:12 108:19 149:10 154:18 183:13 206:22 226:19 227:1 242:19 257:9 258:2 281:7 282:3,9 284:10 287:17 295:18 296:2 304:3 354:16 workload 223:5,9 works 62:6 97:12 119:9

	I	I	I
146:7 167:5 200:4	208:17,19 216:9	10:40 94:10	2 225:14 230:8,14 255:4
342:16 350:12	218:12 220:21 222:21	10:41 94:13	2(a) 9:22
world 97:3 117:19	228:1 244:13 250:3	100 53:14 80:1 157:9	2(c) 10:6
185:7 187:16 278:11	270:2,21 272:17,19	313:19 318:4,5 322:7	2(d) 10:10
332:4	273:12 280:17 281:4	349:18,18	2(d)(5) 10:19
worldwide 153:13	301:2 344:6 359:12	1001 99:1 139:8,20	2:00 7:22
Wormuth 204:14 207:5	year-and-a-half 162:13	168:18 174:6,6 177:1	20 18:3 26:11 56:22
worry 186:22	years 18:20 62:20,21	177:17 179:18	57:7 80:16,19 134:1
worth 29:10 195:7	69:19 76:13,14 78:3	1001(c) 123:2 129:7	230:17 310:13,15
		11 304:7 334:21	
wouldn't 47:4 156:12	95:21 103:18 121:18		349:11
285:7 347:4	124:22 125:1 148:9	11:35 146:10	20,000 33:6,13 79:21
wow 78:4	148:10,12 155:11	11:45 146:8	80:1
wrap 7:14	197:18 198:15 199:2	11:46 146:11	200 53:14
wrapped 325:3	211:22 212:5 219:17	11A 334:22	2000 300:22
wreak 336:9	219:22 230:19 237:10	11B 335:7	2007 229:1
writ 137:22 161:13,18	239:1 265:7 269:22	12 230:19 271:5	2008 227:8
163:22 164:6,10,19	272:6,9 275:15	12:43 202:19	2010 301:2
166:14 167:7 182:12	276:10 291:13 306:12	120 121:1 257:5 258:12	2012 96:9
183:7,8,19 188:22	306:13,20 323:13	258:22	2013 336:8
189:2 252:7	336:8 338:12 339:13	1250 1:10	2015 5:3
write 131:15 290:17	344:12,15,16 351:21	128 121:3,4	2016 147:17 339:9
write-ins 15:13	352:1,6 357:12 358:1	13 292:2 339:13 352:1,6	2017 348:17
Writer-Editor 2:6	358:10,22	13,000 147:17	2018 76:19 303:13
writeup 126:19	yelled 337:5	1330 202:15	307:7 339:13
writing 85:12 112:16	yellow 311:20 312:2	14 357:12,15	2019 307:4,15 339:21
237:13	yield 22:19 208:3	140 304:2	2013 307.4, 10 303.21 202 3:11
writs 164:3 166:6 167:3	Yob 189:16 193:15	140a 302:14 305:20	2020 95:5 301:2 310:1
183:11,15 185:10,10	young 133:13 345:2	307:5,21 312:7,10	359:13
188:18 189:20 190:2	358:7	317:8 323:10	2021 147:21 150:6
190:10	younger 358:9,10	146 3:9 303:6 306:6	153:6 165:14 313:9
written 7:17 83:19,20	youngest 358:12 359:4	146a 304:19 305:21	340:3 361:8
108:16 112:8 119:6		306:6 307:12 319:14	2022 1:7 8:15 35:11
156:3 163:11 281:18	Z	15 112:13 246:6,8	79:3 150:22 226:11
334:19,22 335:7,15	Z 162:7 186:17 187:1	269:21 298:2 300:6,7	226:18 244:13 246:7
wrong 56:17 57:13	zealous 150:19	300:8 349:20,22	248:1 254:22 299:13
82:19 144:15 217:13	zealously 207:1	15- 112:17	328:15
319:5 329:21 343:21	zero 337:9	15-20 78:3	2023 7:14,15 37:4 79:4
wrongful 343:22 350:9	zip 60:8	150 33:8 66:5 222:16	83:3 151:4 204:22
wrongfully 336:7 339:9	Zoom 4:18	1530 298:3	208:14 211:20 221:22
340:14 343:13,14		155 304:2,6 305:7,12,13	225:9 231:4 238:12
344:8,11 347:4,10	0	16 56:22 57:6 76:19	244:22 249:20 328:16
348:5 349:12	0-4 271:4	357:15	366:8
wrongly 354:17	0-5 266:11	1600 298:11,12	2026 250:3
wrongs 362:21	0-6 261:10,12 262:11	17 18:3 310:17	20s 357:19
Wunder 11:14 29:2	04 289:12	18 18:3 133:7 137:7	20th 64:13
45:3 55:13 65:4 67:19	05 28:4,7 289:12	160:10 166:7 361:9	21 148:9 272:7
74:10 75:1,17	06 28:4,7 289:12	18th 8:22	21st 8:14
www.dac- 7:18	06s 33:16	19 18:3 246:9 339:14	22 208:17 216:9 217:4
Wyoming 64:18	003 00.10	19-year-old 132:22	222:14 280:16 289:2
U y c i i g c i i i c	1	138:16	315:1
X	1,000 59:4	1953 36:12	23 151:2 222:21 248:2
X 162:7 186:17 187:1			
A 102.7 100.17 107.1	1:36 202:20	1964 34:10 35:17	266:12 294:8 24 30:7 80:3 108:12
Y	10 56:10 80:17,19 94:10	1990 76:16	24 39:7 80:3 198:12
	121:18 157:21 269:21	1997 300:20	199:2 228:2 229:8
Y 162:7 186:17 187:1	304:6 349:21	1st 40:20,21 220:21	234:19
year 5:3 25:2 28:1	10-15 43:8	258:7	24(a) 234:3
29:18 34:5,7,7 47:13	10-minute 146:6		24th 8:14,16 35:11
81:6 148:4 197:6,7	10:27 94:12	2	25 13:4 14:8,20 16:14
	I	I	I

I

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DAC IPAD

Date: 12-06-22

Place: Arlington, Virginia

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate complete record of the proceedings.

near Lans &

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE. 200 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-7831

(202) 234-4433