

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

+ + + + +

RESPONSE SYSTEMS TO ADULT SEXUAL
ASSAULT CRIMES PANEL

VICTIM SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

CONFERENCE CALL

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
MARCH 20, 2014

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee convened telephonically at 2:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, Mai Fernandez, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

Mai Fernandez, Chair
Dean Michelle J. Anderson
William Cassara
Meg Garvin
Honorable Elizabeth Holtzman
Honorable Christel Marquardt
Brigadier General Colleen McGuire, Retired

STAFF:

Maria Fried, Designated Federal Official
Colonel Patricia Ham, Staff Director
Commander Sherry King

Terri Saunders

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2:48 p.m.

MS. FRIED: Good afternoon,
everyone. This Victim Services Subcommittee is
now open.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Hi, this is Mai
Fernandez. First of all, I want to thank
everybody on the call, and for indulging my
lateness for 15 minutes. I was on a plane
getting off in Miami and everything got a
little delayed.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Liz Holtzman.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Hey, Liz, how are
you?

REP. HOLTZMAN: How are you? Who is
this?

MS. FERNANDEZ: It's Mai.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Hi, Mai, how are
you?

MS. FERNANDEZ: I am good. We are
just starting the meeting.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Excellent.

1 MS. FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to
2 thank everybody who's on the call today, and
3 I wanted to thank the staff. I thought that
4 this was an excellent draft, and given it was
5 our first round at looking at something, I
6 think it was the right place to start. It's
7 well laid out; it's concise. I think it really
8 gives us something that we can respond to.

9 As far as the content is
10 concerned, I don't have any opening remarks.
11 And I hate to do this to Meg, to put her on
12 the spot, but given that she probably has the
13 most background on this part of the report, I
14 wanted to see if she could start by just
15 giving us her first impressions of the draft.

16 MS. GARVIN: Um, okay. And I know
17 - I realize that um just landed in the
18 transcript. So, excellent. Yes, I, too,
19 applaud the staff. This is really dense
20 material and I thought it was covered really
21 well in here.

22 I'm not sure whether we want to

1 talk substance or structure, and structure
2 might be - my recommendation probably is that
3 structure wait until we think about other
4 chapters also, perhaps. So, substantively, I
5 just had a handful of things that I had seen
6 in the recommendations and in the language of
7 the recommendations that I thought the
8 Subcommittee might want to focus on just to
9 make sure that the language choices are the
10 ones that we actually want in there, so I'm
11 happy to go through those.

12 But, overall, I thought it was
13 excellent and captured our prior discussion.
14 And I think from my perspective we're at some
15 language-choice moments because I think
16 language choice is going to matter in the
17 recommendations.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Could I make a
19 suggestion? You know, I find it difficult
20 structurally to have the recommendation first
21 and then the finding. I thought the finding
22 should precede the recommendation.

1 COURT REPORTER: Sorry, this is the
2 court reporter. I was wondering if the current
3 speaker could please identify themselves for the
4 record.

5 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Christel
6 Marquardt.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is Liz
8 Holtzman. I completely agree. I was going to
9 make that suggestion, as well. It's very easy
10 to get lost if you don't have the finding
11 first, then the recommendation afterwards.

12 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai. I also
13 think that that is a good recommendation.

14 MS. GARVIN: Yes, and this is Meg
15 Garvin. I concur. That was one of the
16 structural things I thought, also.

17 CDR KING: And we switched them
18 back and forth a couple of times, just to let
19 you know. We weren't sure which way that we
20 should start it out, so we can always switch
21 those back. That's not a hard thing.

22 MS. GARVIN: But one thing I

1 thought structurally when - this is Meg
2 Garvin. When it all is said and done and we
3 read through all of it, the chapters, or
4 whatever they end being called. And I think
5 that structurally it might make sense to have
6 all recommendations in one place, like a
7 listing of recommendations that flow out of
8 every chapter or whatever, subsection we end
9 up considering. And then within those chapters
10 it goes finding, recommendation, finding,
11 recommendation. But that all recommendations
12 it might be desirable to have in one place,
13 and then supported within the chapters in that
14 structure. But, again, I don't know whether
15 that recommendation of mine makes sense until
16 we see everything.

17 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think we should
18 wait. Christel.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: I agree. And I also
20 - this is Liz Holtzman. I agree with that.
21 Why don't we wait and see what it looks like.
22 But the other thing I wanted to say in terms

1 of structure is that I'm not sure the findings
2 and recommendations should come before we have
3 the DoD current victims policy, and
4 differences between CVRA. I mean, I was
5 wondering about the order of that. I'm not
6 sure.

7 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I like that
8 suggestion. This is Christel.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Because I think
10 it's kind of strange to read the findings and
11 the recommendations first, then have
12 everything laid out, so this is how I see it.

13 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai. I
14 think you've get more of a sense of a
15 narrative if we do it the way that Liz and
16 Christel are talking about.

17 JUDGE MARQUARDT: But then again,
18 we may want to see the other parts before we
19 make all the structural recommendations.

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Meg, why don't you
21 go ahead and start talking the substance, and
22 then maybe towards the end of this

1 conversation we can revisit some of the
2 structural issues.

3 MS. GARVIN: Okay, I can flag mine.
4 I imagine other folks have some, also, but
5 maybe I'll just focus mine on recommendations.

6 So, my first - I have some stuff
7 prior to this, but the first real substantive
8 one is on page 2, Recommendation 2. And it's
9 actually quasi-global because I think it would
10 apply to Recommendation 1, also, I believe.
11 So, it's a quasi-global comment, and that is
12 I'm wondering if in our recommendations if the
13 Subcommittee might want to consider saying the
14 victim, him or herself, or through counsel can
15 do these things. And the reason, I think
16 making explicit that whether our
17 recommendation is personal just to the victim
18 or includes through counsel is to avoid future
19 litigation about what counsel can do. And
20 that, obviously, was the entire litigation, or
21 one huge chunk of the litigation in Kastenberg
22 was what can the victim do, but also what can

1 the victim's counsel do. And I know we are not
2 making specific narrow recommendations on the
3 SVC's duties, but I think in our
4 recommendations, when we're saying the victim
5 should have a right to do something, I would
6 strongly encourage us saying that victim or
7 the victim's counsel can do it.

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Meg, this is Liz
9 Holtzman. Would it make sense to refer - to
10 have this completely as a separate finding and
11 recommendation, find the problem in the --
12 whatever the name of that case, Kastenber, g,
13 and say given that and to avoid these problems
14 we recommend that it be clear that the
15 reference to victim shall include reference to
16 victim's counsel.

17 MS. GARVIN: That's a much cleaner
18 way to do that. I really like that, yes. I
19 would agree with that.

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: How do others feel
21 about that?

22 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think that's a

1 good way to handle it. This is Christel.

2 MR. CASSARA: This is Bill. That
3 makes sense to me.

4 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, this is
5 Michelle. I agree.

6 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai. I
7 agree, so let's do that.

8 JUDGE MARQUARDT: This is Christel.
9 I would like to go through Finding 1, and then
10 Recommendation 1 in that sequence because I
11 think they feed off of one another. And I have
12 difficulty because in my profession as an
13 appellate judge we do a lot of editing, and so
14 I have edited a number of these.

15 MS. GARVIN: Me, too. This is Meg.
16 I have, also. I didn't know what to do with
17 edits.

18 CDR KING: This is Sherry. The idea
19 is, I think, if you send me the edits I will
20 incorporate all the substantive edits into
21 like bubbles, and I can put them together, and
22 then you can all - and send it out to

1 everybody with the report with those edits,
2 comments in it. And then you can all see each
3 other's.

4 MS. FERNANDEZ: I probably didn't
5 make that very clear.

6 CDR KING: Just send them to me,
7 not to each other.

8 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes. I have a
9 question about in that first recommendation,
10 implement mechanisms. And I know that you use
11 that word mechanisms in a lot of places, but
12 I think it's procedure or something like that.
13 Mechanisms just seems strange to me in a legal
14 sense.

15 CDR KING: Ma'am, I think - just
16 to let you know where that came from, it came
17 from the statute, the Victims Rights Act that
18 lists all the rights.

19 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I saw that.

20 CDR KING: So, that's where we got
21 that word from, just to let you know.

22 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes, I know, and

1 it just seems strange.

2 REP. HOLTZMAN: Implement isn't --
3 this is Liz Holtzman. Implement isn't really
4 a great word either, establish or create is
5 better. But, you know, that's a very minor
6 change.

7 DEAN ANDERSON: I guess I'm
8 wondering just - I apologize if this is
9 obvious to everyone else - this is Michelle.
10 I'm wondering why it doesn't just say the DoD
11 should grant the victim's right to confer with
12 trial counsel, or should establish the
13 victim's right to confer with trial counsel.

14 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think it should
15 say the government's trial counsel because it
16 could be confusing if it's his trial counsel,
17 or -

18 COL. HAM: Ma'am, this is Colonel
19 Ham. Trial counsel is the prosecutor. That's
20 the term of art in the military for the
21 prosecutor.

22 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, for a non-

1 military person, it was confusing.

2 COL HAM: Understood, ma'am.

3 REP. HOLTZMAN: Maybe the first
4 time you use it just put a footnote in,
5 explain what it is, or at some point.

6 MR. CASSARA: Hi, this is Bill.
7 Will there be a glossary of terms?

8 COL HAM: Yes, there'll be a
9 glossary of terms in the report and we'll cite
10 to, I think, the Manual for Courts-Martial
11 defines trial counsel. We'll put a footnote in
12 that describes that.

13 MS. FERNANDEZ: Just for the sake
14 of organization, would people like to go
15 through the findings and recommendations one
16 by one rather than just talking about all of
17 them?

18 MS. GARVIN: I think that makes
19 sense. This is Meg.

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, then
21 let's start with Finding 1 and see other than
22 - I want to focus on substantive edits right

1 now. And I think non-substantive edits, I
2 think, we could just send to Sherry and she
3 can, like I said, put them in the bubbles.

4 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Could somebody
5 define for me service policy? I know service
6 is capitalized; policy is not. Is that a word
7 of art also in Finding 1?

8 CDR KING: Yes, ma'am. Service
9 means all the four or five military services,
10 the Coast Guard, Army, Navy, Marines and Air
11 Force.

12 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Would it be
13 better to say the Armed Forces Policy?

14 COL HAM: This is Colonel Ham.
15 Services generally denotes all five of the
16 different Services. I guess I don't know how
17 else to say it.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, it would
19 have to be plural then, possessive, Services'
20 policy.

21 REP. HOLTZMAN: Not necessarily.
22 But I think the reason to do that is DoD is

1 separate as an entity from each one of the
2 Services so, you know, I think I don't have
3 any problem, frankly, with making clear that
4 - I think what it's trying to do is just
5 indicate that at every single level, the
6 policy of the military is to grant victims
7 whatever these rights are.

8 COL HAM: That's right,
9 Representative Holtzman. This is Colonel Ham.
10 The DoD sets the overarching policy and the
11 Services then each have their own implementing
12 policy.

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: That's why I think
14 if you just said military - this is Liz
15 Holtzman again. That's why I just think if you
16 said military, it might be confusing because
17 it might not be clear that that includes DoD,
18 or all the Services, you know. I mean, these
19 are technical words, I think.

20 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I just
21 needed an explanation.

22 REP. HOLTZMAN: I could be wrong

1 about that, but this is my sense.

2 MS. FERNANDEZ: What else do we
3 have on Recommendation or Finding 1?

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: I wanted to add
5 something on Finding 1. This is Liz Holtzman,
6 if nobody else has anything to say. It's not
7 really clear - I mean, I know what you're
8 trying to do here, but it should be clear in
9 the findings that the reason that the role of
10 the commander is not comparable to the right
11 to consult on the CVRA is because the trial
12 counsel does not have the authority to refer
13 matters for prosecution. I mean, I think it
14 should be explicit as to why it's not
15 comparable in the findings.

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 REP. HOLTZMAN: However, due to the
18 role of the commander, the CVA is not directly
19 comparable. Well, you don't spell that out.

20 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. I would
21 agree adding to that would make sense in
22 particular in light of the shifting

1 legislative plans. And if something does
2 change explaining our rationale for this
3 finding will help explain whether it stays
4 relevant if legislation passes, or if the
5 legislation has changed the recommendations.
6 So, I think a little more detail there about
7 why we don't think it's comparable will help
8 ensure interpretation of our recommendation
9 later.

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is Liz
11 Holtzman again. I think I found that problem
12 in a few places, so if I could just suggest to
13 the staff that you just make sure that it's
14 very - that the rationale is clear in all of
15 the findings, that would be great. I mean, I
16 don't know that I have another example where
17 I made notes on it, but I think I was feeling
18 that same problem elsewhere, so just make
19 sure.

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll move on
21 to Recommendation 2.

22 REP. HOLTZMAN: I think the same

1 thing - I'm sorry. I think the same problem
2 exists in Recommendation 6, so okay, anyway.
3 I don't mean to get ahead of ourselves at this
4 point, another example of that. So, there may
5 be others.

6 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Are we going to
7 look at the recommendation also for Number 1?

8 MS. FERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Christel.

9 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, in the
10 Recommendation it says the victim's specific
11 concerns discussions, I don't know what that
12 means, or desires. I think it should be
13 requests, not desires. I think desires is a
14 bad word. And then in the second to last line,
15 Authority may consider those issues prior.

16 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, I agree with
17 Christel. This is Michelle. I was sort of
18 stopped by the question of - the lack of
19 parallelism between concerns, discussions, and
20 desires. And I agree that it could be the
21 victim's specific concerns and preferences
22 regarding case disposition would take into

1 account whatever discussions means, and have
2 a better word, I think, than desires. And then
3 that then makes more sense, I think, vis a vis
4 the latter part of the sentence where the
5 convening authority may consider those views.
6 Those views being, you know, referring to
7 concerns and preferences.

8 JUDGE MARQUARDT: But I still think
9 issues is a better word.

10 DEAN ANDERSON: Where is issues?
11 Where would you put issues?

12 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, instead of
13 views.

14 DEAN ANDERSON: Oh, I see. Yes.

15 JUDGE MARQUARDT: And I know we're
16 going to send these to Sherry, but I just
17 thought it was unusual.

18 DEAN ANDERSON: It's a substantive
19 question, you know, the concerns, discussions,
20 and desires, I think would be substantive
21 edits.

22 MS. GARVIN: I think another -

1 this is Meg. Another potential substantive
2 edit there is whether we're comfortable with
3 it being a may consider, or whether we want
4 our recommendation to be shall consider.

5 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, I would like
6 it to be shall, not a permissive may.

7 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai. This
8 is shall, too.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Where are you?
10 Sorry.

11 MS. GARVIN: Recommendation 1,
12 second to last line where it says, convening
13 authority may consider, I'm recommending that
14 our recommendation be shall consider.

15 DEAN ANDERSON: I agree. This is
16 Michelle.

17 MS. FERNANDEZ: Members, Terri
18 Saunders is here. She was on the committee
19 that, what's the right word, redrafted all the
20 Rules of Evidence based on all the changes to
21 the Federal Rules of Evidence, and they
22 changed shall to will. That appears to be the

1 -

2 COL HAM: Is everyone okay with
3 will rather than shall?

4 MS. FERNANDEZ: Everyone okay with
5 will instead of shall?

6 (Chorus of yeses.)

7 MR. CASSARA: That's fine with me.

8 CDR KING: Before you're done with
9 this can we just go over it to make sure I'm
10 clear?

11 REP. HOLTZMAN: You mean the
12 recommendation?

13 CDR KING: There was - yes. I'm
14 just not clear, one person discussed changing
15 the word desires to I think preferences. And
16 then change it to issues, so - or maybe
17 issues is - oh, views to issues. Okay.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes, we want the
19 word discussions gone. Concerns is fine, it
20 should say concerns and preferences. We get
21 rid of discussions, we get rid of desires.
22 Later instead of saying those views, it says

1 those issues.

2 CDR KING: Okay.

3 JUDGE MARQUARDT: And instead of
4 saying may on the second to last line, it says
5 will.

6 CDR KING: Okay. I just wanted to
7 make sure I understood that as we were writing
8 it.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, also, at the
10 very beginning where it says DoD should create
11 and implement -

12 MS. FERNANDEZ: Yes, I guess I'm
13 still not clear on why we have a lot of --
14 there's a lot of verbiage in that first part
15 of the sentence.

16 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I don't know
17 what should denotes.

18 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is a
19 recommendation. Recommendation, what other
20 word would you use?

21 COL HAM: The Panel doesn't have
22 the authority to direct DoD or Congress to do

1 anything, only to recommend.

2 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Okay. But I
3 think Liz said that create was a good word
4 there.

5 REP. HOLTZMAN: Better than
6 implement. Implement is -

7 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, that you
8 can create and implement.

9 MS. GARVIN: Yes, I would not leave
10 it at just create. This is Meg. I would
11 recommend that if we're going to say create,
12 it's create and implement, something that
13 directs them to actually put it into practice.
14 I mean, that our recommendation has got to be
15 practiced and driven, that we create it and
16 then put it into practice.

17 CDR KING: I think in some of our
18 charts that we have, some of the Services
19 already do it in practice in their
20 instructions, or in their policy says Services
21 do that in practice already, but it's not in
22 any statutory language. And in practice I

1 think probably all the Services do it at least
2 to a point.

3 MR. CASSARA: Bill Cassara. Sorry,
4 folks, I hit the wrong button. I disconnected
5 myself. I know you missed me. I'm back.

6 MS. FERNANDEZ: Yes, Bill, we did.
7 Do we have anything else on Finding or
8 Recommendation 1?

9 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Where it says in
10 the fourth line of the finding, disposition of
11 the matter, is there a better word? I'm not
12 sure what word would be better used.

13 MS. FERNANDEZ: Christel, do you
14 have a recommendation for a better word?

15 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I wondered
16 if charges or the allegations --

17 CDR KING: I think that word was
18 meant to relate to the administrative -- if
19 there was some other administrative procedure,
20 or administrative action that was taken.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I think the
22 beginning of that line should say pursue a

1 non-judicial or administrative, some other
2 disposition I think is not good wording.

3 CDR KING: So, take out some other
4 and just leave it pursue non-judicial or
5 administrative disposition of the matter?

6 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, you could
7 put an A in there, Pursue a non-judicial or
8 administrative disposition of the whatever.

9 MS. FERNANDEZ: Can we move on to
10 Recommendation 2 and Finding 2?

11 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is Liz
12 Holtzman. On Recommendation 2 in line 4 it
13 should be gender neutral so it's -

14 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Exactly.

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: And then in the
16 parenthesis at the very end when it says,
17 submission in writing or personal meeting, I
18 could think of a circumstance where it might
19 be via email, via video, so maybe submission
20 in writing, personal meeting, or otherwise. I
21 don't know, but something that's not - well,
22 I guess you say e.g., so that's okay. I'm okay

1 with that, just make it gender neutral.

2 MS. GARVIN: I'm going to actually
3 - this is Meg. I'm going to comment on that
4 same thing in the parenthetical. The e.g.
5 certainly clarifies, it's for example, but
6 having it be or in the parenthetical means
7 it's one or the other even though those are
8 for examples, and I have a problem with a
9 recommendation that makes it sound like it's
10 a disjunctive. I'd rather just have a comma
11 there so we're not saying it has to be one or
12 the other, that the decision maker might say
13 it's multiple ways.

14 REP. HOLTZMAN: Do you want an and?

15 MS. GARVIN: No, just a comma, so
16 it's a for - I mean, we're recommending that
17 they should implement the policy, and the
18 convening authority retains the discretion. I
19 just don't want to - so I want it to be a
20 comma so the discretion includes that they
21 could do it in multiple ways within the same
22 case if they wanted to.

1 JUDGE MARQUARDT: So, in other
2 words, put a comma in and take the or out.

3 MS. GARVIN: Correct.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: But that's not
5 grammatical.

6 CDR KING: Well, then we could add
7 in or otherwise, or something like that if you
8 wanted.

9 MS. GARVIN: Well, yes, we could do
10 or otherwise, but then again we have the or.
11 I actually think it - Liz, I think it does
12 work grammatically if we use kind of the legal
13 version of the e.g. parentheticals where --
14 but it will depend on the style guide we're
15 following for writing this. If it was a legal
16 parenthetical, the comma actually achieves it
17 and you don't need to do anything else. If
18 it's not, then we need to think about it. And
19 then I'd recommend at the end and/or.

20 COL HAM: This is Colonel Ham.
21 Right now the right to be heard during a plea
22 is not included in the statutory language

1 Congress just enacted. Is there any
2 recommendation on whether that word should be
3 added, or the - I mean, it might be more than
4 a word.

5 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I had a
6 problem with the ending of that first sentence
7 because it's the right to be heard regarding
8 a plea. Is that the plea negotiation, the plea
9 agreement after it's been made, whatever? I
10 mean, if you're going to have any effective
11 influence on the plea, it's got to be during
12 the negotiation process and not after the
13 agreement has been made.

14 COL HAM: I think that was the
15 intent, certainly, ma'am, if it's not carried
16 because it says, should include the right to
17 be heard before the convening authority makes
18 his or her decision to accept, reject or
19 propose a counter-offer to a pretrial
20 agreement. So, that's during the negotiations.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I think it
22 should be made clear. It looks like a pretrial

1 agreement has already been made, so a pretrial
2 proposal or something?

3 COL HAM: Again, that's a term of
4 art, ma'am. It's a - the document is called
5 a pretrial agreement, what you would think of
6 as a plea bargain. The document is called a
7 pretrial agreement.

8 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Okay, because
9 agreement means it's already set.

10 COL HAM: Proposed, maybe?

11 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Proposed pretrial

12 -

13 MR. CASSARA: Colonel Ham, this is
14 Bill. How about just any pretrial offer? I
15 mean, in the Navy I think it's called a PTO,
16 isn't it, Sherry? Or maybe that's the Air
17 Force.

18 COL HAM: It's not the Air Force.

19 CDR KING: Yes, I think it's called
20 a PTO.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think offer is
22 good.

1 MR. CASSARA: I mean, we could say
2 for offers of military pretrial agreements.

3 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes.

4 COL HAM: Offer pretrial
5 agreements?

6 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Or just - I like
7 the idea just to a pretrial offer and don't
8 even - submitted by the accused. How do we
9 know who's submitting it?

10 COL HAM: It has to be submitted by
11 him.

12 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, what about
13 a counter-offer. I guess you have a counter-
14 offer. Okay. Well, but you see, it could be
15 the pretrial offer, then you have a counter-
16 offer, so what's the victim responding to?
17 That's all I'm saying. So, that's why we leave
18 it more general, but it's up - it's not a big
19 deal.

20 REP. HOLTZMAN: I think the
21 negotiation word should be in there, because
22 that's what it is.

1 COL HAM: Under the federal statute
2 there's no - well, I'm wondering, Ms. Garvin,
3 my recollection is there's no right to
4 participate in the negotiations -

5 (Simultaneous speech.)

6 MS. GARVIN: You're correct,
7 Colonel Ham. The broad term that's used in the
8 federal system is plea, the word plea is used,
9 and the way it is navigated in practice is the
10 right to confer with a prosecuting attorney is
11 leveraged to be involvement in plea
12 negotiations as they're happening and to be
13 kept in the loop as they're happening. The
14 right to be heard regarding plea is the right
15 to be heard prior to a final decision being
16 made about a plea agreement that has been
17 reached as it's presented to the court, so
18 it's the right to be heard by the court prior
19 to acceptance. I'm not sure that's the best
20 way to go, but that is the way it's currently
21 laid out in the federal system, and it's used,
22 the right to confer to ensure participation in

1 negotiation, and you have the right to be
2 heard on plea, to be heard by the court prior
3 to acceptance.

4 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, it seems to
5 me the word "plea," even though that's what
6 everybody thinks it says is subject to
7 interpretation by the court at that point.

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: You know, this is
9 only a recommend - this is not the statute.

10 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I know.

11 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is just a
12 recommendation, so I don't know that the words
13 must be - each word is going to have that
14 kind of significance. And particularly since
15 it's the mechanism includes the right to be
16 heard before the Convening Authority makes its
17 decision to accept, reject, or propose a
18 counter offer. So, it sounds to me clearly -
19 I mean, the word "negotiation" might be
20 better, but it sounds like you're right in the
21 process there, to me.

22 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. I would

1 tend to agree with that. And I think if we're
2 trying to make an explicit recommendation
3 about involvement in negotiations rather than
4 having interest and rights specifically heard
5 by the decision maker before decision, that
6 might be a separate recommendation which is -
7 because it sounds like we might be making a
8 recommendation of a tripartite negotiation,
9 which is a little bit different than being
10 heard about the plea.

11 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I agree with you
12 on that.

13 DEAN ANDERSON: Meg, isn't that
14 going further than what you get with civil
15 court?

16 MS. GARVIN: In civilian - yes,
17 that is. I'm not, necessarily, endorsing that.
18 I'm saying if we are - I think we need
19 clarity on whether that's what we are
20 recommending or not. The civilian system right
21 now, you just get to be heard by the decision
22 maker before it becomes final, and you hope

1 that the right to confer allows you some level
2 of participation, but because you're not a
3 decision maker that's it.

4 MS. FERNANDEZ: I see very - I
5 don't know if the word is reluctance, but
6 we've got to be careful to go - if we're
7 going to be doing things that go farther than
8 the civilian system.

9 (Off microphone comment.)

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: Especially since
11 I'm not sure we had testimony on the subject.

12 MS. GARVIN: That we have not?

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: And I'm not sure
14 whether we have.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ: No, I don't think
16 we have. I mean, that kind of recommendation
17 I think wouldn't be prudent.

18 REP. HOLTZMAN: I agree without
19 support.

20 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I'll concede.

21 COL HAM: So, is it clear what the
22 intent of this one is, Subcommittee members?

1 This is Colonel Ham. Our understanding of your
2 intent was to make a military equivalent of
3 what Ms. Garvin just described as the right to
4 be heard during the plea, which you discussed
5 and heard issues about why that is difficult
6 to do in an equivalent manner to how Ms.
7 Garvin described it in the civilian system.
8 So, as the staff drafting this we were trying
9 to implement your intent as we gleaned it from
10 your deliberations, that this is to replace
11 that, or to put something in place as
12 equivalent as it can be in the Military
13 Justice process as it exists now.

14 REP. HOLTZMAN: Colonel Ham, this
15 is Liz Holtzman. I don't think we are
16 suggesting, in fact now, any change aside from
17 the content of the - changing the gender
18 neutral issue, and changing the content of the
19 parenthetical statement.

20 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I thought
21 we were going to change pretrial offer or
22 proposal instead of agreement.

1 REP. HOLTZMAN: Yes, right. Offer,
2 right. You're right.

3 MS. GARVIN: And with those - this
4 is Meg Garvin. With those changes I think,
5 Colonel Ham, it does capture the conversation
6 and our discussion, and our recommendation and
7 intent.

8 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay, then let's
9 move on to Recommendation 3 and Finding 3.

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: This is Liz
11 Holtzman. On Finding 3 I think I have the same
12 problem that I had mentioned earlier. It's
13 kind of a generic issue. It doesn't - it's
14 too general, and it should refer to the
15 appellate rights point which is what we're
16 talking about here. Isn't that correct?

17 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg Garvin.
18 I'm going to agree with that. I have two
19 comments, one on Recommendation 3, and one on
20 Finding 3. To echo Liz' on Finding 3, the
21 finding seems to be mixing and matching trial
22 level standing and appellate standing. And I

1 think our recommendation was about appellate
2 standing, so I think Finding 3 should be about
3 appellate. And that there's no clarity of
4 appellate device right now rather than
5 something broader that seems to be going on to
6 trial and it's appellate. And in my notes, my
7 edits I can send some suggested language on
8 that. I have it, but that was the Finding 3.

9 And then on the Recommendation 3,
10 I have concerns about the last clause or
11 phrase. My grammar is bad today. The "is
12 pending in appropriate circumstances." Mainly,
13 it's just a phrase, "in appropriate
14 circumstances," I would recommend removing
15 that because I think that is getting into
16 details that we shouldn't include.

17 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I agree that I
18 would cross that out.

19 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, I agree with
20 that. I also am wondering about the first part
21 of - this is Michelle. The first part of
22 Recommendation 3. The first part says, "The

1 DoD should complete its study on the issue."
2 And because we don't know what the findings
3 are, that just sort of comes out of nowhere
4 and it's not clear in reading what it's about,
5 and why we should be making a recommendation
6 on it, moreover. It could just say, "The DoD
7 should develop mechanisms for an appropriate
8 appellate device to insure" - or, actually,
9 "The DoD should develop mechanisms to insure
10 mandatory expedited interlocutory review of an
11 alleged violation the rights listed in," blah,
12 blah, blah.

13 I just think that there's more
14 language here - the language is cumbersome
15 and I'm not sure that we need the "for an
16 appropriate appellate device," if there is a
17 mechanism.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I like
19 "process" instead of "device," for an
20 "appropriate appellate process."

21 DEAN ANDERSON: That sounds good to
22 me, too. But then I would take out the "for

1 the appropriate appellate device."

2 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes.

3 MS. GARVIN: I agree. I think if it
4 just said "develop mechanisms to insure
5 mandatory expedited interlocutory review,"
6 that's good.

7 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Could you say
8 "appellate review?"

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: That's a good
10 point.

11 MS. GARVIN: Well, as long as we're
12 sure that it can include pretrial appellate
13 review, and it's not locked into a post
14 moment, which is why I think we have
15 interlocutory in there.

16 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, maybe you
17 should say both.

18 MS. GARVIN: Good point, good
19 point.

20 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Maybe "develop
21 mechanism for appropriate review of pretrial
22 and post-trial."

1 MS. GARVIN: I think that would be
2 an excellent edit. This is Meg.

3 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, what about
4 during the trial? I mean, you've got pre and
5 post, but what about during the trial?

6 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, you could
7 pre, during -

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Because it raises
9 that question. That's all I'm - that's why
10 I'm raising it.

11 PARTICIPANT: Maybe all -

12 MS. GARVIN: Or it could be - and
13 this might be wordsmithing that we can do
14 through edits, but we can do "to insure
15 mandatory expedited interlocutory review,"
16 which does include pretrial and trial, as well
17 as post-trial review. I mean, we could do it
18 that way, or in our wordsmithing and editing
19 we could come up with a - to insure we
20 capture all three moments.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think it should
22 be explicitly stated because it's going to

1 leave it up to judicial review and it's going
2 to take a long time to get down to exactly
3 what we had intended. And it is hard to draft
4 by committee, I agree.

5 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. Is this
6 something staff could attempt, if our intent
7 is clear that it's all three moments, that you
8 all could draft language?

9 COL HAM: Actually, the way it's
10 drafted, it's even broader than that, Ms.
11 Garvin, because we say "interlocutory review
12 of alleged violation of the rights in Article
13 6-B," which are - some are, what's the right
14 word, in the absence of a trial.

15 MS. GARVIN: Does interlocutory in
16 the military not - it means any time that
17 something is pending, so it would capture --
18 interlocutory isn't limiting. Is that
19 correct, Colonel Ham?

20 COL HAM: I wish Dean Schenck was
21 on today to check my - I mean, the
22 extraordinary work process is not limited to

1 when there is a set of charges proceeding. For
2 example, a Writ of Habeas Corpus, as you all
3 know, can be filed when there are no charges
4 pending. So, I guess we're asking what exactly
5 is your intent. We thought your intent was to
6 enforce all the rights in Article 6-B, but if
7 you say pretrial, trial, and post-trial you
8 may be limiting it more than it is right now.
9 And if that's your intent, then -

10 MS. GARVIN: No, I think you all
11 have the intent correctly. And I was hung up
12 on the word "interlocutory," making sure that
13 wasn't inappropriately limiting anything. That
14 was my concern. I want it as broad as
15 possible. And I think the Committee's
16 discussions today echo that.

17 COL HAM: So, I guess the word
18 "interlocutory" then would mean to a court
19 system, as opposed to through the chain of
20 command, which is what we understood your
21 intent to be. You want it through the
22 appellate court system.

1 MS. GARVIN: Correct.

2 COL HAM: I think - well, Mr.
3 Cassara, and I'd love to hear from Dean
4 Schenck on this one, too, if we have the right
5 word there.

6 MR. CASSARA: Okay. Direct me as to
7 - this is Mr. Cassara, I'm sorry. You
8 probably realized that since I'm the only Mr.
9 on the phone.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. CASSARA: Give me a paragraph
12 that you are looking at. Is it Recommendation
13 4?

14 COL HAM: It's Recommendation 3.

15 MR. CASSARA: I'm sorry, I'm way
16 ahead of you. Okay. "The DoD" -

17 COL HAM: The question is
18 "interlocutory," does that capture - our
19 intent was that it captures the appellate
20 process.

21 MR. CASSARA: Well, as I understand
22 the Committee's intent it is that the victim

1 through his or her counsel be allowed to file
2 an appeal at any relevant stage whether it be
3 pretrial or during trial, or I guess
4 theoretically post-trial. For example, if a
5 defense counsel were to file a post-trial 513
6 motion, so I - it would seem that if the
7 Committee's intent is to allow the victim's
8 counsel to file an appeal at any relevant
9 state of the proceeding, then interlocutory is
10 probably limiting that.

11 PARTICIPANT: How?

12 MR. CASSARA: Because when I think
13 interlocutory appeal, I think of an appeal
14 taking place during a trial.

15 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Correct.

16 MR. CASSARA: Not pretrial or post-
17 trial.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Correct.

19 COL HAM: So, should it be
20 expedited appellate review, just appellate
21 review?

22 MR. CASSARA: Why not just

1 expedited review?

2 PARTICIPANT: Well, who else -

3 COL HAM: Then it doesn't

4 necessarily have to be by a court.

5 MR. CASSARA: Okay, I see what
6 you're saying. Well, that's a valid point.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: I would say an
8 appropriate device to insure mandatory
9 expedited appellate review.

10 MR. CASSARA: Yes, I think that
11 makes the most sense.

12 REP. HOLTZMAN: Take "appellate"
13 from where it is on line 2 in front of
14 "device" and put is in front of "review," and
15 strike out interlocutory.

16 MR. CASSARA: Where it would say,
17 "develop mechanisms for an appropriate device
18 to insure mandatory expedited appellate review
19 of an alleged violation."

20 PARTICIPANT: Can I just -

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I like the word
22 "process" rather than "device."

1 PARTICIPANT: I thought we took
2 that out, anyway.

3 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, the only thing
4 that I would add - this is Michelle, on the
5 question of appellate versus interlocutory, is
6 that it - although it may be technically
7 correct that appellate signifies at any
8 particular stage of the game, the word
9 "interlocutory" has a specific meaning that
10 allows for someone to stop the process midway
11 and get expedited review of something. So, I
12 might actually add both words even though it's
13 a little bit more cumbersome.

14 MR. CASSARA: Let me ask this. What
15 about if it just said mandatory - well, I
16 want to talk about the word "mandatory," but
17 what if it said to insure judicial review --
18 expedited judicial review?

19 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, but I guess my
20 concern is the implication that the word
21 "appellate" or "judicial", that the possible
22 implication that it awaits until the end of

1 the process. Even though I understand
2 technically it doesn't have to imply that, it
3 can imply that, as opposed to interlocutory
4 which means intermediate, in the mid stage of
5 the process. And I wouldn't want to lose that.

6 MS. GARVIN: And I would echo that,
7 which is where that word in our
8 deliberations/debate - that's where that word
9 came from, was our deliberations previously to
10 make sure it didn't wait until the end.

11 DEAN ANDERSON: Right.

12 MS. GARVIN: I'm just not sure how
13 we wrap both those things in and capture the
14 intent, and make sure people understand that.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ: Is there a problem
16 with just saying before, during, and after
17 trial? I mean, just sort of say what it is.

18 MS. GARVIN: Well, except as
19 Colonel Ham was pointing out, some of these
20 things might not go to trial. Am I
21 understanding that right, Colonel Ham?

22 COL HAM: That was our

1 understanding of your intent, that you wanted
2 it to reach all the rights, which don't
3 necessarily involve any trial.

4 MS. GARVIN: Right. And that is the
5 same in civilian, right, there doesn't have to
6 be a pending case in order to initiate review
7 of a denial.

8 MS. FERNANDEZ: Well, doesn't
9 pretrial then cover everything that would
10 happen if it didn't go to trial? You're saying
11 pre, during, and after, we're kind of covering
12 everything.

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: Didn't I hear
14 suggestions that we let the staff try to
15 figure this one out and come back to us with
16 some language.

17 PARTICIPANT: Good idea.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, they can
19 consult with Colonel Schenck, too.

20 REP. HOLTZMAN: Yes, and go through
21 an appellate review while they're at it.

22 (Laughter.)

1 COL HAM: Can I just ask one more
2 wordsmith question. This is Colonel Ham.
3 Somebody raised an issue with mandatory, does
4 that engender -

5 MR. CASSARA: That was me.

6 COL HAM: What's your thought
7 there, Mr. Cassara? Did you want to -

8 MR. CASSARA: Well, I may be wrong.
9 I'm wrong a lot, just ask my wife. But my
10 concern would be do we want to - I mean, are
11 we telling a court that they have to do
12 something? Is that our desire? You know,
13 that's really my concern.

14 COL HAM: In other words, that they
15 have to address the substance of something
16 rather than deny or grant outright?

17 MR. CASSARA: Right.

18 COL HAM: Okay.

19 CDR KING: I think we meant the
20 mandatory to go with the expedited.

21 MR. CASSARA: Aha, not with the
22 review.

1 CDR KING: Right.

2 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. I guess
3 I'm not sure I had read it that way, or
4 thought we - I thought we were directing the
5 court to take review kind of akin to the
6 civilian one of shall take up and decide
7 forthwith language.

8 JUDGE MARQUARDT: It modifies the
9 alleged violation of rights.

10 MR. CASSARA: I mean, if that's
11 what our goal is, I'm - you know, the - I
12 understand.

13 MS. GARVIN: And I will say, I
14 mean, the shall take up and decide forthwith
15 that is in the civilian has not mandated
16 substantive review. Right? Because they have
17 had to decide what the standard of review is,
18 and the standard of review at times in the
19 civilian world has dictated, in my opinion
20 inappropriately so, but it has happened, non-
21 review of substance, and instead said they
22 didn't meet the threshold standing, so the

1 shall take up and decide language in the CVRA
2 has resulted in courts, they have to look at
3 the petition and decide what track it's on,
4 basically.

5 MR. CASSARA: Okay. Then I'm good.
6 See, I told you, I'm wrong a lot.

7 MS. FERNANDEZ: Let's move on to
8 Recommendation and Finding 4.

9 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Should we have
10 the word "should" in there? "The DoD
11 implementation mechanism should include the
12 provisions for the trial court."

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: I have another
14 point to make on Recommendation 4, which is
15 that, you know, it's not clear to me the right
16 was waived by the victim, whether that's
17 sufficient. Should it be a knowing waiver, or
18 is that not necessary? Just throw it out to
19 have a question. That's all. I don't have a
20 recommendation.

21 PARTICIPANT: And this is very
22 wordy. We can -

1 MR. CASSARA: Yes. I think a lot
2 under the recommendation is missing words.

3 MS. FERNANDEZ: What was that,
4 Bill?

5 MR. CASSARA: I think that the last
6 sentence under Recommendation 4 is missing a
7 word or two.

8 COL HAM: Yes, these are combined
9 drafts, so we'll work on this one and cut it
10 down.

11 MR. CASSARA: Okay. I just - yes.

12 COL HAM: There are some obvious
13 grammatical things in there. We'll tighten it
14 up.

15 MR. CASSARA: I don't mean to
16 grammar police, but I wasn't sure what the
17 intent was of the sentence. Okay.

18 CDR KING: It was too many versions
19 being put together to get it out to you, I
20 think.

21 MR. CASSARA: You know how many
22 times I've done this with appellate argument.

1 I read my brief right before I went in and
2 found numerous typos, so I -

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. CASSARA: Embarrassing moment,
5 believe me. I was shy about pointing those
6 out, so -

7 CDR KING: Of course. So, with the
8 waiver we were just trying to get something
9 affirmative on the record, you know, make them
10 do something affirmative on the record rather
11 than just say the victim is not here so - you
12 know, the judge say that, maybe make the trial
13 counsel - somebody make an affirmative
14 finding that there was a waiver, because
15 that's what you had talked about, you know,
16 making a finding about the rights, so we kind
17 of included waiver in there based on, I think,
18 your more general discussions.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: I think we can wait
20 to see what you can work out.

21 MS. FERNANDEZ: Let's work that one
22 - let's take a hand at rewriting that one,

1 because I just had just sort of trouble
2 understanding it all together. So, I think if
3 it - if we tighten up, we may just need
4 another quick look at that one. Are we okay
5 with that? We can move to Recommendation 5?
6 Anybody?

7 MR. CASSARA: I'm reading. I'm
8 reading 5. I'm with you.

9 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I'm wondering if
10 it's the finality of court-martial findings,
11 maybe it's to insure the finality of charges
12 or something, because what we're trying to do
13 is to make sure that they can't bring charges
14 10 years later.

15 PARTICIPANT: Right. So, maybe you
16 mean proceedings instead of findings?

17 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I don't know, but
18 it should be worded differently. That's all I
19 think.

20 PARTICIPANT: I agree with that.

21 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. I
22 apologize, I'm a little - I was not following

1 exactly what our intent was with this. This
2 was to ensure that there is a limitation time
3 period on which a victim could bring charges.

4 MS. GARVIN: Charges, or was it the
5 victim could bring complaint for violation of
6 their rights? That was my confusion, so this
7 is about charges?

8 CDR KING: No, our intent was to
9 bring a complaint about a violation of their
10 rights based on -

11 MS. GARVIN: So, setting up
12 something parallel to the CVRA's time frame
13 for bringing the complaint.

14 CDR KING: Correct.

15 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Maybe we should
16 just re-look at the wording and parrot some of
17 the language from the CVRA more closely.

18 MS. FERNANDEZ: I think that's a
19 good idea.

20 MS. GARVIN: I think that's a good
21 idea, especially because the CVRA - well,
22 Colonel Ham, I would recommend that, although

1 some of it is clunky in the CVRA, too, the
2 drafting there. We didn't do such a good job
3 with some of it. There's several different
4 time frames in there, so maybe you guys can
5 actually make it cleaner than the CVRA's one.
6 The CVRA has an explicit time period for when
7 you're challenging certain -- bringing
8 complaint for certain pieces, other pieces
9 it's actually open, and there's no clarity of
10 when you have to file a complaint. So,
11 parroting the CVRA but maybe organizing it a
12 little bit better would be good.

13 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay.

14 COL HAM: We might come to you for
15 help if that's okay, Ms. Garvin.

16 MS. GARVIN: Of course, yes. And in
17 my notes, I had a - some ideas on that in my
18 edits, so I will be sending those to Sherry.

19 CDR KING: Very good, thank you. We
20 just weren't exactly sure if you wanted them
21 to be exactly the same as the CVRA or
22 something a little bit different based on your

1 discussions, so maybe your notes will help.

2 PARTICIPANT: It almost seems like
3 Recommendations 6 and 5 should be flipped. Am
4 I wrong about that?

5 PARTICIPANT: Should be what?

6 PARTICIPANT: Flipped, 6 should be
7 5, and 5 should be 6.

8 CDR KING: I think Number 6 was
9 meant to at least relate to like the ombudsman
10 proceeding in the federal system where the
11 U.S. Attorney's Office has an ombudsman to
12 respond to complaints of victims that maybe
13 the prosecutor or someone else in the system
14 didn't give them their rights, and do an
15 investigation. And a lot of times I think
16 those are - we didn't get to hear from them,
17 specifically, but those occur after the whole
18 case is over.

19 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I wondered
20 if it was similar to the mandamus that you do
21 when some official does not act the way that
22 they are required to do.

1 COL HAM: We thought the intent
2 here was the ombudsman similar to the - it's
3 in the DOJ, I don't know if it's part of the
4 Office of Victims of Crime, or separate. That
5 was what was trying to be captured there, but
6 if we are completely off -

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Yes. See, I think
8 that number 6 - this is Liz Holtzman. I think
9 that 6 using both the recommendation and the
10 finding, because it's not clear to me
11 particularly in the recommendation what it is
12 you're trying to address comparable to that
13 set forth in CVRA. We don't know what you're
14 really talking about here. And it's not clear,
15 also, in the finding what is it that you're
16 trying to do? These are not mechanisms to undo
17 the harm. That's to be done in the judicial
18 process, as I gather. What is - to kind of
19 change it to the future? I mean, what is the
20 point of this mechanism that receives
21 complaints? Is it supposed to - what is it
22 supposed to do, this mechanism, that's

1 referred to in Finding 6? What's the purpose
2 of it?

3 COL HAM: This is Colonel Ham. I
4 think the thought was, again similar to the
5 ombudsman and the Department of Justice, if
6 Department of Justice employees, the
7 prosecutor, for example, is alleged to have
8 violated the CVRA, this is where the victim
9 would file a complaint. Is that correct, Ms.
10 Garvin?

11 MS. GARVIN: Yes.

12 COL HAM: There is nothing similar
13 in the military system -

14 MS. GARVIN: Well, there are -

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay. Well, you
16 should describe it because it is completely --
17 to somebody who is not familiar with what
18 you're trying to talk about, this is just not
19 clear, what it is that you are envisioning.
20 You might give an example, but it's just not
21 clear. So, this allows - in other words, this
22 doesn't give the victim a remedy for the

1 denial in the courthouse assuming that there
2 was no remedy, aside from what she gets, or he
3 gets through the trial process. What this does
4 is allow other people who violated those
5 rights to be penalized, or by bringing this to
6 the attention of the authorities to possibly
7 improve training or develop other programs. Is
8 that correct?

9 COL HAM: Correct.

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: All right. Well,
11 maybe spell out that that's the purpose in the
12 findings, that the - you know, in the federal
13 system this is what happens. There's no
14 comparable system in the military, so the
15 recommendation is that there should be a
16 comparable system which does A, B, C, D, E.

17 CDR KING: Part of that was in
18 recognition, and we probably, we didn't spell
19 it out very good, of the NDAA that requires
20 the Armed Forces to designate an authority to
21 receive and investigate complaints relating to
22 provision or violation of the rights and

1 disciplinary sanctions for members of the
2 Armed Forces who violate - who willfully and
3 wantonly fail to comply with the requirements.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: All right. But you
5 know something, that's also - I mean, you
6 could spell out that that's what the NDAA
7 requires. You could also spell out what the
8 present system is in the federal system, but
9 wantonly and what was the other word,
10 willfully and wantonly is a pretty high
11 standard. Well, what about just negligently,
12 or what about just whatever? It should be
13 covered by that, too, that there's some way of
14 developing ways to redress violations of
15 criminal - of victim's rights that are not
16 done deliberately, I mean, wantonly and
17 willfully, too, it seems to me. I don't know.

18 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, who are the
19 DoD officials? I mean, who is this supposed to
20 cover?

21 REP. HOLTZMAN: I guess it's
22 supposed to cover - as I understand what

1 they're saying it covers prosecutors, it could
2 cover the trial judge, it could cover the
3 convening authority. It might cover the
4 convening authority's SJA.

5 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, it wouldn't
6 officials then, it would be DoD employees.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, they are
8 officials, but they could be employees. I
9 mean, sure. I don't know if they're employees.

10 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I don't think
11 that's the correct word, but I'm saying that
12 officials I think limits it.

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: I'm not looking to
14 wordsmith this. I just found it confusing. I
15 didn't know what you were trying to accomplish
16 here, so now that you've explained that, I
17 think you should - you need to explain it
18 better and more clearly. And I think you also
19 ought to deal with the situations in which
20 it's not a wanton and willful violation
21 because that seems quite narrow.

22 PARTICIPANT: Yes, you almost have

1 to prove intent, you know. It's like -

2 REP. HOLTZMAN: Have to? Yes, of
3 course. Willful always requires intent, and
4 wanton is like yes, that's - I don't even
5 know what that would be -

6 (Laughter.)

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: - normally used.
8 I don't know. It's pretty heavy duty.

9 PARTICIPANT: Can we get further
10 explanation into this recommendation?

11 CDR KING: We can try to spell it
12 out better. We were just trying to relate to
13 the CVRA's - the investigation that DOJ does
14 when there's a complaint that its employees
15 didn't follow the CVRA, or some states also,
16 like Alaska, have a similar office that can
17 investigate complaints that officials,
18 prosecutors, or whoever didn't follow the
19 actual victim rights statutes. So, we were
20 trying to do that, kind of comply with that,
21 and we assumed the stuff with the NDAA was
22 also requiring the DOJ to come up with. And

1 it's obvious we didn't explain it very well,
2 and we'll try to maybe clarify it more so that
3 not only you can understand it, but other
4 people that we're making the recommendations
5 to can understand it.

6 COL HAM: I think this was
7 discussed on the meeting you had at GW. If
8 it's something that you no longer wish to make
9 a recommendation on, that's entirely your
10 call.

11 MS. GARVIN: This is Meg. I think
12 we should make a recommendation. I think,
13 though, just explaining it more, because even
14 we who've been in it and know - and I think
15 concurred on it before, when we read the
16 language, it didn't trigger enough of our
17 recollection. So, I think it's just explaining
18 in the finding, even more than the
19 recommendation, in the finding kind of what's
20 in the CVRA, what was it intended to, because
21 that ombudsman thing, we could flesh it out
22 just a little bit more.

1 COL HAM: Yes. And, typically, that
2 - you'll notice the wording, and I'm
3 wondering if you want to leave it in. Either
4 within or outside DoD, typically, the office
5 that would be set up to receive complaints
6 about things is an IG-type office. I don't
7 know if you want to get into any more detail
8 or not.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Why would it be
10 outside of DoD? Isn't an IG office inside of
11 DoD?

12 COL HAM: Yes, ma'am. There's the
13 DoD IG office.

14 REP. HOLTZMAN: Right. So, it's
15 within DoD. I don't know why we would want
16 something outside of DoD.

17 COL HAM: Okay. Right.

18 MS. FERNANDEZ: Let's move on to
19 number 7. Do we need to explain what certain
20 documents are? I mean, that just seems so
21 vague to me that I'm not sure that it conveys
22 anything.

1 COL HAM: This is also based on
2 your discussion from the 29th of January. And
3 if I can recollect it and give you a short
4 memory, or a short reminder. There was
5 discussion as to whether the SVC should be
6 entitled to discovery. I think the case law on
7 that as reflected in that Congressional
8 Research Service study is that victims are not
9 entitled to trial counsel's file, or law
10 enforcement file. There was discussion on
11 whether that should be different in the
12 military, and the discussion went on for a
13 while, and then Judge Jones and Judge
14 Marquardt I think came to their conclusion
15 that it would be best left to the discretion
16 of the judge. There was a lot of discussion on
17 it, and we really weren't sure what the
18 consensus of the Subcommittee was on that.

19 DEAN ANDERSON: Colonel Ham, could
20 you just - I apologize. This is Michelle. I
21 just wanted to clarify which documents are we
22 talking about now, which kinds of certain

1 documents are we talking about?

2 COL HAM: Well, that was the
3 question - asking Ms. Garvin for some help
4 here, too. I think that was the open question,
5 that it wouldn't be certain, it would be
6 within the discretion of the judge most of the
7 time, that it was hard to determine what
8 documents the counsel should be entitled to.
9 That's why it's vague, there wasn't a lot of
10 details.

11 MS. GARVIN: Yes. And I think,
12 Colonel Ham, you actually captured the
13 vagaries of our conversation very well there.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. GARVIN: Because we were vague
16 when we were discussing it because, you know,
17 my position as a victim's lawyer is I should
18 get everything unless it's privileged or
19 confidential. And I think others on the
20 Subcommittee were like well, wait, do we know
21 enough in light of case law? So, we ended up
22 with this vague conversation about, well, what

1 documents? Is it the law enforcement
2 documents, is it trial counsel's? And that
3 resulted in this kind of vague language, which
4 I think is an accurate representation if where
5 we landed. And now having read it, I'm just
6 wondering if our vagueness here should
7 actually dictate that we don't make a
8 recommendation on it, and instead when we're
9 talking about the SVC section of our report we
10 talk about that SVC should have sufficient
11 authority and standing to do what's necessary
12 to represent their client. And we leave it at
13 that in that section, and we don't make a
14 specific recommendation here.

15 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I like the
16 idea of a recommendation, but if you leave it
17 up to the military judge, the military judge
18 will have the discretion to know what kinds of
19 things to give access to.

20 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, isn't the
21 word certain, this is all subsumed under a
22 study, so all the recommendation here is

1 requiring a study of what documents should be
2 provided. That seems to me to be
3 unobjectionable in my -

4 JUDGE MARQUARDT: What study - may
5 I ask what study this is referencing, because
6 I guess I was - I'm not sure I under -

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: I don't know. It
8 says that DoD should conduct further study in
9 order to determine whether Special Victims
10 Counsel should be granted access. I think the
11 word certain should be taken out. Granted
12 access to documents possessed by the trial
13 counsel, and circumstances under which
14 decisions regarding access may be in the
15 discretion of the military - maybe that
16 sentence needs to be taken - maybe that part
17 of the sentence - so, I have no problem with
18 saying that we think the issue should be
19 studied further.

20 MS. GARVIN: I guess I do have a
21 problem with that because I believe through
22 litigation right now and certain victim's

1 rights right now, I already have access to
2 these documents. So, for this - meaning SVC.
3 If I'm an SVC, I think I would go into court
4 tomorrow and argue that my right to, I don't
5 know, to be heard about something gives me the
6 right to see at least portions of those
7 records. And I think defense counsel would
8 probably object, or trial counsel might
9 object, and then we'd litigate it. This
10 recommendation to me that further studies
11 should be conducted in order to determine
12 whether the SVC counsel gets access, to me
13 says this Subcommittee has made a
14 determination that at this juncture they don't
15 get it. And I have concerns about the
16 Subcommittee saying right now in an undecided
17 area of law that they don't get something.

18 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, the other way
19 to do it is to say in some - I mean, the
20 other way is to just have the finding a little
21 bit broader, which is to say that in some
22 jurisdictions, Special Victims Counsel is

1 entitled to some documents, some parts of
2 documents in the possession of defendant's
3 counsel. I mean, of defense counsel. Is that
4 correct, is that what we talked about, defense
5 counsel or trial counsel? I'm trying to
6 remember here.

7 MS. GARVIN: Trial counsel and
8 investigative agencies.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Yes, by trial
10 counsel. And say that those - and the
11 question should be as to whether those rights
12 should be expanded, should be examined. So,
13 then you're not limiting, you're just saying
14 expansion should be examined. But I don't feel
15 strongly about it. If you think it's better
16 just to have the whole thing litigated out in
17 the future, I have no objection to that.

18 MS. GARVIN: I'm fine with that
19 change. I mean, the actual edit I made to this
20 one was there should be further study
21 conducted in order to determine the scope of
22 access to records.

1 REP. HOLTZMAN: Oh, okay.

2 MS. GARVIN: Which I think would be
3 a better edit.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay, that's fine.

5 MS. GARVIN: It's really wherever
6 the Subcommittee comes down. I'm just
7 concerned about a recommendation that -

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay, so that they
9 don't have any rights now, when they do. Okay.

10 PARTICIPANT: Well, is it a sure
11 thing that Special Victims Counsel can always
12 go into court and ask for things?

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: Why not?

14 MS. GARVIN: They can go in now and
15 ask for them, and I think the finding is an
16 accurate statement of what's happening, which
17 is current access to files appears to be ad
18 hoc. That seems to be what's happening.

19 MS. FERNANDEZ: Hi, this is Mai. I
20 guess my only thought is if we even limited
21 the study to the scope, it just seems like we
22 might end up limiting what Special Victims

1 Counsel can get by even studying it, rather
2 than just litigating it on an ad hoc basis. I
3 just think that a study might do more harm to
4 the victim that really reveal anything.

5 MS. GARVIN: I tend to agree with
6 you, Mai. If we're going to recommend the
7 study, I want it broad like the scope that
8 doesn't imply they don't get it, but I have
9 concerns that -

10 MS. FERNANDEZ: - it will limit.

11 MS. GARVIN: I think it's better to
12 litigate it on a case-by-case situation. I
13 don't know. I think that maybe we should
14 strike this one.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ: Liz, do you
16 disagree?

17 REP. HOLTZMAN: I don't know. I
18 feel - I don't have strong feelings about it.
19 I'd be really guided by the rest of your
20 views. I mean, to me if it's ad hoc, how do we
21 know how it's going to come out? And maybe if
22 we described it in a better way and say in

1 some cases courts have granted full discovery,
2 in some cases they've limited discovery, maybe
3 a study should be made of the limitations that
4 have been put on it and whether they're
5 appropriate. Maybe if you phrased it that way
6 you're not limiting anything, but you may
7 think we don't need a study, and this issue
8 will all be resolved in the next, you know,
9 before our report is made public.

10 MS. GARVIN: No, it will not be
11 litigated that quickly. This is Meg.

12 DEAN ANDERSON: Let me jump in.
13 This is Michelle.

14 MR. CASSARA: Okay.

15 DEAN ANDERSON: I'm sorry, Bill.
16 You've got the floor?

17 MR. CASSARA: No, you go ahead,
18 Michelle.

19 DEAN ANDERSON: So, I just want to
20 put in a plug for not recommending further
21 study. And the reason is that I think we heard
22 repeatedly at different times that the demand

1 on different services and on the Department of
2 Defense to study and continue to study, and
3 continue to study are pretty -- that they're
4 feeling overwhelmed by that. And unless we
5 have a very - I'm not opposed to studying
6 things. Good heavens, it's a good thing to do
7 in general, but unless we have a really clear
8 reason why we want them to study this and not
9 something else, I'm not sure that just making
10 a recommendation to study is a good idea. And
11 I think because of the way this discussion has
12 gone it persuades me that Finding 7 and
13 Recommendation 7 we could probably not have.

14 MR. CASSARA: And to follow-up on
15 that, I think in the post-Kastenbergs world,
16 this is all going to be resolved in
17 litigation. I mean, I think, you know, right
18 now cases that I'm involved with, SVC are
19 given access to whatever documents the trial
20 counsel has, and if they don't have them they
21 file a discovery request, you know. And I
22 think in Kastenberg there is almost equal

1 footing, and unless it's privileged they seem
2 to be getting it. I just -

3 REP. HOLTZMAN: So, you don't even
4 really think there's an issue.

5 MR. CASSARA: I really don't. I
6 think it's something that will be worked out
7 in litigation, if at all. I think it's pretty
8 much not an issue, but if there is an issue,
9 I just think that it's something that the
10 courts will resolve on an individual basis.

11 MS. FERNANDEZ: So, it sounds like
12 a consensus potentially to just delete it.
13 Let's delete it.

14 MR. CASSARA: That would be my
15 recommendation.

16 MS. FERNANDEZ: Let's delete it.
17 Okay, folks, 8th and final.

18 MR. CASSARA: Okay. I'll pipe in
19 here first. I think I dissent. And, obviously,
20 if the Committee comes up with that as a joint
21 proposal recommendation, I understand, but I
22 just have real concerns with that. I mean, I

1 know that the civil courts - I mean the
2 civilian courts are doing it. I don't know how
3 universally, and under what percentage of
4 civilian courts the defense is allowed to
5 cross-examine the victim during sentencing.
6 But I just - I have a real concern from a
7 defense counsel standpoint with the victim
8 being able to testify without being subject to
9 cross-examination, and the defense not having
10 an opportunity to really question the
11 underlying facts as to what the victim is
12 saying, you know. And I've seen too many cases
13 recently where - in fact, I've got one right
14 now where the victim said something completely
15 inconsistent with what she said during the
16 findings portion of the trial that led the
17 military panel to want to revote on their
18 finding of guilty. I just - I think that we
19 are that point chopping too far into the
20 accused rights.

21 DEAN ANDERSON: Can I just clarify
22 - can I just ask you a question, Bill? This

1 is Michelle, just to understand Recommendation
2 8.

3 MR. CASSARA: Absolutely.

4 DEAN ANDERSON: This is about only
5 after a finding - am I correct in
6 understanding -

7 MR. CASSARA: Right, this is during
8 the sentencing -

9 DEAN ANDERSON: - after a finding
10 of guilt.

11 MR. CASSARA: Absolutely.

12 DEAN ANDERSON: Just a question of
13 whether or not the victim can submit a Victim
14 Impact Statement that's not subject to cross-
15 examination. Is that what we're -

16 MR. CASSARA: That is what we're
17 talking about.

18 DEAN ANDERSON: Okay.

19 MR. CASSARA: Right now the victim
20 once, you know, there's been a conviction and
21 he or she testifies on sentencing, they are
22 subject to cross-examination. I will tell you

1 that 90 - I'm sure Colonel Ham would agree
2 with me that probably 90 to 95 percent of the
3 time there is no cross-examination, but I'm
4 very uncomfortable with taking that right away
5 from the defense.

6 DEAN ANDERSON: Tell me what JSC
7 is.

8 COL HAM: The Joint Service
9 Committee, ma'am. The entity that proposes
10 amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial,
11 the Executive Order portion, so they would go
12 to the President as an Executive Order. The
13 Rules of Criminal Procedure, for lack of a
14 better word, the Military Rules of Criminal
15 Procedure are Executive Order.

16 DEAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

17 REP. HOLTZMAN: And what's the
18 practice now? Can a victim submit a statement?
19 I'm not talking about testifying, but can they
20 submit a written statement, and are they then
21 subject to cross-examination on that
22 statement?

1 COL HAM: They can submit a written
2 statement if defense did not object, but the
3 Rules of Evidence apply at sentencing unless
4 they are waived by the defense.

5 (Simultaneous speech.)

6 DEAN ANDERSON: Do defendants in
7 the military proceeding have a right of
8 allocution at sentencing?

9 PARTICIPANT: Yes.

10 DEAN ANDERSON: And does the right
11 of allocution - this is Michelle. Does the
12 phrase "the right of allocution" mean that one
13 can speak without being cross-examined?

14 MS. GARVIN: Generally, yes.

15 DEAN ANDERSON: And the defendant
16 has that at sentencing?

17 CDR KING: At sentencing the
18 defendant or accused as we call them in the
19 military has a right to either to make a sworn
20 or unsworn statement. The unsworn statement
21 can be made in a variety of ways, it can be
22 written, verbal, counsel if they want, however

1 they want. But that - no one can ask them
2 questions about it if they choose to make an
3 unsworn statement.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: And let me just
5 make clear about the victim. If the victim
6 chooses to make an unsworn statement written,
7 then what happens?

8 CDR KING: It can only be done that
9 way if it's an agreement with the defense.
10 And sometimes that happens with pretrial
11 agreements that the defense will agree to it.

12 REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay. So, if it's
13 not agreed to, then the only way the victim
14 gets to give the version about what happened
15 to her and the harm that's caused is through
16 a sworn statement.

17 COL HAM: I don't want to get too
18 far in the weeds, ma'am, but it's not a simple
19 yes or no. A lot of the victim impact could be
20 included in the agreed upon facts that the
21 judge has for the guilty plea, which is a
22 written document, so I don't - I think what

1 you're asking I can say generally that's
2 correct, but there are - the prosecution and
3 defense write a long document on the facts of
4 the case, and a lot of it can be included in
5 that.

6 REP. HOLTZMAN: And what happens to
7 family members and other people who want to
8 testify about that? Are they also subject to
9 cross-examination?

10 COL HAM: Yes, the prosecutor calls
11 -

12 MR. CASSARA: I mean, if
13 defendant's family - if the accused family
14 testifies they are subject to cross-
15 examination. If the victim's family comes to
16 testify, they're subject to cross-examination.
17 And Colonel Ham is right, I mean, I've done
18 certainly a number of cases in which as part
19 of a pretrial agreement the government has
20 insisted on a narrative statement from the
21 victim as to the impact that it had on him or
22 her. And if I want the pretrial agreement then

1 I've got to include that.

2 Now, obviously, if it's a
3 contested case then there's going to be no
4 pretrial agreement and, you know - and that's
5 where I get into if the victim is going to
6 testify on sentencing, I'm not comfortable
7 with removing the ability to cross-examine.

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, do we even -
9 is there a Constitutional issue here, is
10 really kind of what I'm getting at.

11 PARTICIPANT: No, I don't believe-

12 MR. CASSARA: I think that, you
13 know, I think Meg will tell you that in civil
14 courts this happens, I don't know what
15 percentage of civilian courts, but I know that
16 it is not uncommon in civilian courts for the
17 victim to testify without cross-examination.
18 And look, you know, I understand. I may be the
19 only one who disagrees with the recommendation
20 and, you know, that's something that I can
21 respond to.

22 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, but maybe

1 because of the different system with regard to
2 sentencing. Remember in the military the jury
3 sentences.

4 MR. CASSARA: Not always.

5 REP. HOLTZMAN: Not always.

6 MR. CASSARA: Whoever does the
7 findings, whether it be judge or jury, also
8 does the sentencing.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, but if you
10 have a "jury" jury trial, it's the jury that
11 makes the sentence. Right?

12 MR. CASSARA: Absolutely.

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: But the sentence is
14 not imposed by the jury in civilian trial, or
15 even in a criminal trial.

16 MR. CASSARA: Very, very few. I
17 think -

18 REP. HOLTZMAN: Unless you have a
19 trial before a judge.

20 MR. CASSARA: Right. Right.

21 REP. HOLTZMAN: Jury would never be
22 involved in the sentence. Well, maybe death

1 sentence or not -

2 MS. GARVIN: In civilian - this is
3 Meg. In civilian when the victim is being used
4 for aggravation or mitigation at the
5 sentencing, meaning called, they are subject
6 to cross-examination. Their right of
7 allocution is their Victim Impact moment which
8 is how did this crime impact me? That is not
9 subject to cross-examination in the majority
10 of civilian courts, state and federal.

11 I mean, I feel pretty strongly
12 about this one that I think something at
13 sentencing that allows actual victim voice
14 without the trauma impact of cross-examination
15 is important for us to consider as a Victim
16 Services Subcommittee but, you know, I
17 understand the challenges with having it.

18 MR. CASSARA: Well, and as I said,
19 I'm not, you know, I'm not here to speak for
20 the Committee. I may be the lone wolf on this
21 one. I mean, I don't plan on - I don't want
22 to hold up the rest of you all's thought

1 process because I'm being the naysayer.

2 MS. FERNANDEZ: No. I mean, there's
3 a couple of ways I think we can deal with
4 this. We could take a vote now on what we have
5 in front of us, but my sense is good minds
6 could come to a good agreement on this. Bill
7 and Meg, would you be willing to have - can
8 you guys talk off -

9 MS. FRIED: No

10 MR. CASSARA: I just heard our
11 Federal Official jump out of her seat.

12 MS. GARVIN: I mean, I think it
13 comes down to the Subcommittee thinking
14 through, you know, is this part of the
15 response that we want to recommend based on
16 what we've heard, you know, that victims get
17 this moment of unfettered speaking about their
18 trauma in the court process. That's what it
19 comes down to, or do we have concerns about
20 it?

21 I don't have legal - I don't have
22 the same concerns as Bill about defendant's

1 rights because I think it's a narrow moment,
2 but if I was defense counsel, I would
3 certainly want to argue that there are
4 concerns. I don't think that they rise to a
5 Constitutional level so I don't have very
6 strong concerns about it.

7 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think it is
8 important, and it's really quite therapeutic,
9 I think, for a victim to be able to present
10 those issues at sentencing.

11 COL HAM: Ms. Garvin, would you
12 want us to further explain what you've said,
13 which is the right of allocution is not
14 subject to cross-examination only applies to
15 victim impact, not to aggravation. Although,
16 in the military we don't - I mean, we really
17 don't separate these, the victim impact -

18 MS. GARVIN: Yes, you guys have it
19 slightly different.

20 MR. CASSARA: I think that's a
21 distinction without a difference.

22 COL HAM: Yes, okay.

1 MS. GARVIN: I mean, I agree with
2 Christel. I mean, part of where this comes
3 from is like the neurobiology of trauma tells
4 us this moment of being heard means half the
5 victim recovery. So, I think there's
6 literature out there to support the utility of
7 it from a survivor's perspective. And I think
8 judges, most of them, would agree with that
9 statement, too, that Christel just made that
10 it's useful. That may be where the concern
11 comes about it from a defense perspective.

12 MS. FERNANDEZ: Meg, is there some
13 way right now that you can figure out how to
14 draft this more narrowly, the actual wording?

15 MS. GARVIN: I'm happy to send in
16 my edits and suggested language that cabins
17 it, but I'm - and then we can further discuss
18 it.

19 COL HAM: And, Mr. Cassara, you can
20 - we can assist you in drafting a separate
21 statement if you never do -

22 MR. CASSARA: Yes. You know, I -

1 I'm not trying to hold up the entire
2 Committee over this. I mean, I may be the lone
3 wolf, and if I am, then I'll sit down with you
4 all and maybe write a very small separate
5 opinion on it. That's all.

6 COL HAM: Okay.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I mean, yes,
8 one of the possibilities is that it could be
9 limited in cases where there's no jury, to
10 cases where there's no jury, also.

11 MR. CASSARA: Well, I don't know
12 that that accomplishes what Meg is trying to
13 accomplish.

14 REP. HOLTZMAN: I understand that,
15 but it makes it - it raises fewer issues if
16 you are - because is this before the finding
17 of - this is after the finding of guilt.
18 Right?

19 MR. CASSARA: Yes, ma'am.

20 COL HAM: For the sentencing.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, this
22 Committee is supposed to deal with victim's

1 rights. And I think this is an important right
2 for victims.

3 PARTICIPANT: I agree.

4 JUDGE MARQUARDT: We're not here to
5 represent the accused.

6 REP. HOLTZMAN: Excuse me. I
7 disagree with that. No one is here to
8 represent anybody, but if there's a real issue
9 of fairness, then it needs to be considered as
10 part of the process, in my view. I mean, you
11 don't have to agree, but that's my view.

12 MS. FERNANDEZ: No, I think we all
13 recognize the need for Victim Impact
14 Statements. I think it's one of -

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: Right, I agree.

16 MS. FERNANDEZ: That said, I'm just
17 wondering given Bill's assertion that where he
18 found a jury to then say oh, well, we want to
19 really look at our findings again, I don't
20 think anybody wants that either. There's got
21 to be finality when there's finality. So, I
22 guess my question is, is there any way of

1 crafting this in a way that says you can give
2 a Victim Impact Statement but that can't turn
3 around the findings that were just made?

4 JUDGE MARQUARDT: I think you can
5 put that in there, that it's post-conviction,
6 and that it doesn't change the conviction and
7 the findings.

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I'm not sure
9 that that's what Bill's concern was. I think
10 his concern was that what it did was it
11 suggested a level of dishonesty, am I not
12 saying this correctly, Bill?

13 MR. CASSARA: You're correct. I
14 mean, the -

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: Yes, level of
16 dishonesty on the part of the victim to
17 suggest that the testimony at trial was
18 tainted. That, I think, is the issue. I don't
19 know how you're going to prevent that if
20 you're going to have a Victim Impact Statement
21 that is made that is subject to cross-
22 examination or not.

1 MR. CASSARA: Well, only one - in
2 that particular case that information only
3 came out as a result of cross-examination.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: Oh, okay.

5 MR. CASSARA: But, you know, I just
6 - and, again, I'm just - you know, I'll say
7 my peace one last time and then we'll go from
8 there. I just feel that when we limit the
9 ability of an accused to cross-examine, or at
10 that point a convict - you know, even a
11 person who's been convicted to cross-examine
12 the victim we limit his or her rights to
13 provide evidence to the members or to the
14 judge in mitigation. But, you know, again
15 that's my piece, and I'll leave it at that.
16 You all vote otherwise, that's - you know,
17 like I said, I'm not going to hold this up
18 just for me.

19 MS. FERNANDEZ: But how about some
20 how we also put in there -

21 MR. CASSARA: I'm sorry?

22 MS. FERNANDEZ: Hold on for a

1 second. If we somehow in our language say that
2 this Victim Impact Statement can't in any way
3 change around the findings.

4 MR. CASSARA: Well, no, that's not
5 the concern. I mean, if information comes out
6 that causes the members to question the
7 findings, then maybe it should. But I think
8 the bottom line is, you know, Meg and I, you
9 know, we disagree. If the Committee agrees
10 with - in other words, I don't think that
11 there's a way to split this baby.

12 MS. GARVIN: I don't either, yes.

13 MR. CASSARA: We're either going to
14 allow an unfettered right of allocution to the
15 victim, or we're not. And if the Committee
16 votes to allow it, then I'll write something
17 separately and we'll go from there.

18 MS. FERNANDEZ: Then I think we
19 need to take a vote amongst the members
20 because we've heard a well-rationalized
21 dissent. If you weren't rational, Bill, I
22 might take a vote anyway.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

(Laughter.)

MS. FERNANDEZ: But I think we do need to - because this is the first time that we've actually needed - that we haven't been able to figure out how to split a baby, so -

MS. GARVIN: Can I put one thing, because I do think - I think this is a dispute that I agree, you can't split the baby. I do want to comment that the note that is in there about - that I believe protects defendant's rights, and Bill disagrees, and I respect that, but I believe defendant's rights are sufficiently protected by the right of rebuttal rather than the right of cross-examination in this moment because I don't believe cross-examination catches that in the minute or in the report, but I think that's an important thing. Defendants can rebut statements that are done in allocution.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Before we take a vote because I feel a little uncomfortable

1 here. I mean, I haven't really given the
2 amount of thought that this - this is a very
3 serious issue in my judgment, because I do
4 agree that this is an important right for
5 victims. And we certainly stood up for Victim
6 Impact Statements, and feel they're very, very
7 strong, feel strongly about that. But I
8 haven't really - I don't know, perhaps we had
9 testimony and I just haven't focused on it
10 about the consequences of this in the military
11 system, particularly, and what - how it
12 exactly works in the state system. So, I mean,
13 could we postpone a vote on this so I could
14 get some materials to look at? I just don't
15 feel comfortable voting on this now. I don't
16 feel I have enough information about how it
17 works in all the states, about the existence
18 of cross-examination, where it exists, does it
19 exist anywhere aside from the military?

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Well, can I ask the
21 staff, can we get information on this? Would
22 that be a possibility for you guys to get?

1 COL HAM: Yes, we can look for it.
2 One item that might be - well, Mr. Cassara
3 has already mentioned, I mean 90 to 95 percent
4 of the time there is no cross-examination. I
5 mean, there's - that's his sense as a
6 practicing counsel. Would you - I don't know
7 if there's any way to verify that, and I don't
8 know if that would be important to know or
9 not.

10 MR. CASSARA: Yes, I don't know
11 that there is, Colonel Ham. I think you would
12 literally have to go through the records of
13 trial of every court-martial in order to come
14 up with a number. Mine is a very unscientific
15 study, but most counsel do not cross-examine
16 the victim upon a conviction, just as most
17 trial counsel don't, you know - when I put my
18 client's mom on the stand, the prosecutors
19 never cross-examine her, you know. But in the
20 rare occasions that it does happen it can
21 sometimes be useful. So, I have no problem
22 you know, I don't know what the timing is,

1 but I have no problem with postponing a vote.
2 And I have no problem if the vote is 9-1
3 against me, you know.

4 CDR KING: 8-1.

5 MR. CASSARA: Whatever the numbers
6 are.

7 COL HAM: May I ask, Ms. Garvin, in
8 the - with the jurisdictions you're familiar
9 with, ma'am, if the victim has a right of
10 allocution, is there a requirement to provide
11 the statement ahead of time to the defense, so
12 if they can rebut any of the facts they know
13 what they are ahead of time to line up their
14 evidence?

15 MS. GARVIN: No, there is not. I
16 shouldn't say that globally. There are a
17 handful of jurisdictions that they require it
18 to be in advance, but not very many. I am
19 happy to submit to the Committee, to staff if
20 this would be useful, a citation list with
21 annotations of the 50 states on where they
22 stand on cross-examination of VIS. It has all

1 the citations to the statutes and to case law
2 if that would be useful for the staff to have.
3 And then that might at least give the
4 landscape. It doesn't answer the question of
5 propriety of it from a rights perspective, but
6 at least then you'd have the law.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Do we have some
8 experience in the federal system of how this
9 - I mean, about this issue, not just in the
10 states?

11 CDR KING: We did have some
12 testimony on it from Mr. Jeffress, I think, on
13 some discussion of it in his testimony, or his
14 discussion before the Subcommittee in January,
15 I think it was.

16 MR. CASSARA: It was snowing, I
17 remember that. Meg, are there any
18 jurisdictions besides the military that you're
19 aware of where sentencing commences
20 immediately upon findings, or in all
21 jurisdictions is there a -

22 MS. GARVIN: Several commence

1 immediately.

2 MR. CASSARA: Okay.

3 MS. GARVIN: Not always by
4 directive, meaning the statutes don't mandate
5 it, but courts do it.

6 MR. CASSARA: Okay. Okay.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Generally, there's
8 some time for, you know, probation - I mean,
9 reports about - I mean, there's a probation
10 report, there are other reports that are made
11 so it's not - I mean, in New York it's not.

12 MS. GARVIN: Yes. Generally, there
13 are pre-sentence reports or probation reports
14 done depending on the level of the crime, but
15 some jurisdictions will move, in particular,
16 in plea situations, they'll move immediately
17 to sentencing.

18 REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay, but that's a
19 different story.

20 COL HAM: And you all know the
21 sentencing proceeding is a - it looks like a
22 trial in the Military Justice to determine the

1 sentence, instead of determining guilt or
2 innocence. I don't know how - what the
3 parallel to that is, if there is any in the
4 civilian system.

5 MS. GARVIN: The closest parallel
6 is when it's actually a capital case because
7 then it's a full-blown trial-type proceeding,
8 generally speaking, though it is different. I
9 believe - I know that he did not - or I
10 don't believe he testified unless he testified
11 when I was not in attendance, but Professor
12 Cassell, Paul Cassell out of Utah has written
13 on this subject. And, again, from a victim's
14 perspective so it's not a defense perspective,
15 but I believe there is a Law Review article
16 that the staff might be able to pull and
17 circulate, if that would be of use. I believe,
18 I'm not positive. Again, that's a victim-
19 centered one, not a defense-oriented rights
20 one, so -

21 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, any side
22 would be helpful to me. I'm sorry, I just feel

1 very - I just feel I need more information.

2 I'm sorry.

3 MS. FERNANDEZ: No, you shouldn't
4 be sorry, Liz. I think it's - I think Bill
5 brought up some good arguments, and all of us
6 understand why Victim Impact Statements are
7 important. But I think it's a good idea that
8 before we make a decision that we have some
9 more background information. So, let's wait on
10 number 8.

11 REP. HOLTZMAN: And, Meg, when you
12 give us this annotated list and so forth, is
13 there any effort in the states that don't have
14 this cross-examination right to create it, or
15 is the movement the other way, or is this not
16 an issue any more, I mean, people just
17 accepting the way the system works, however it
18 works in their own jurisdiction?

19 MS. GARVIN: I'm not sure that I
20 could identify a clear trend. I know in Texas
21 over the last several years there's been -
22 Texas does a lot of cross-examination and

1 also does allow - doesn't allow the victim to
2 speak, actually, until after sentence has been
3 imposed.

4 REP. HOLTZMAN: Wow.

5 MS. GARVIN: There's been an
6 attempt to change that. That has gone nowhere.
7 Victims have tried to tilt at it, and it
8 hasn't changed. Maryland allows cross-
9 examination of - or requires sworn statements
10 of victims. I don't believe there's an effort
11 to change that. In other jurisdictions there
12 is, and some case law has gone that way, but
13 it - what I can send to staff is the 50 state
14 chart with actual language, as well as case
15 citations that explain how it's been
16 interpreted. And then there's a memo that goes
17 with it. It's one of our public policy pieces
18 that's been published.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: Oh, that's great.

20 MS. GARVIN: So people can take a
21 look at it, and it does talk a little bit
22 about trend in theory, but I don't believe

1 there's - I would not use the word "trend" in
2 assessing what's happening.

3 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I think that
4 would be really helpful to me. I don't know if
5 anybody else needs it, but I feel that would
6 be really helpful to me.

7 DEAN ANDERSON: Yes, I'd love to
8 see it. This is Michelle.

9 COL HAM: Ms. Garvin, is there - I
10 think you discussed this in the meeting, but
11 is there then a - again, realizing a lot of
12 jurisdictions don't have jury sentencing, if
13 there's a jury there's an instruction that
14 says it's not evidence, but instead it's an
15 authorized manner in which to present matters
16 for the juror's consideration?

17 MS. GARVIN: That is my
18 understanding. We've never done a 50-state
19 analysis on that issue, Colonel Ham. The ones
20 we've worked in, that is what happens, but
21 it's not in the chart, and I don't have a 50-
22 state analysis of that.

1 COL HAM: Thank you. That's the
2 instruction given if the accused chooses an
3 unsworn statement, just as reflected, that
4 it's not evidence, but it's an authorized
5 manner in which to bring matters for their
6 consideration. And they can consider the fact
7 that it's unsworn.

8 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay. We've been
9 going for an hour and 45 minutes, folks. I
10 hate to be the timekeeper, but we said we
11 would try to keep these to an hour and a half.
12 I think other than Recommendation 8 we've
13 given the staff what we need, and I think we
14 can move forward on this one?

15 COL HAM: If there are other
16 substantive comments, which I suspect there
17 are, on the body can everybody send them to
18 Sherry so she can consolidate them all?

19 DEAN ANDERSON: Sure. This is
20 Michelle, and I want to just make a request
21 for more than 24 hours to read a document that
22 stands in the coming weeks. I understand that

1 there are limitations and stresses on all
2 sides because this is a difficult thing to
3 write, but it's extremely difficult to process
4 in a limited amount of time. And I worry that
5 we won't have enough time to really digest it
6 without more than 24 hours.

7 CDR KING: Our plan is definitely
8 to give - it was this time to give you more
9 time. It didn't work out, partly because of
10 the short time since the last meeting, and
11 then the federal storm that we had, but our
12 plan - we're working on the next one and
13 trying to get it to you earlier.

14 PARTICIPANT: There's a rumor
15 there's snow again for next week.

16 CDR KING: Yes, it's in the
17 forecast. I don't know that we're going to get
18 snow again, so anything that can go wrong for
19 -

20 MR. CASSARA: That's going to
21 reflect on your OER. You have done nothing to
22 stop the snow -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

(Laughter.)

COL HAM: We had a white St. Patrick's Day, and yes, they're talking about more next Tuesday and Wednesday, although with a lot of caveats.

CDR KING: Our biggest snowstorm of the year was last Monday.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Have you had more snow than we've had in New York? I'm just curious.

CDR KING: Well, I don't know, but we close down the federal government any time we have any, or threaten any.

COL HAM: We got about a foot out at my house on Monday.

MR. CASSARA: It's 80 degrees here. I don't know what the problem is.

PARTICIPANT: We're coming down.

CDR KING: We're holding these meetings in the wrong place.

MR. CASSARA: There you go.

JUDGE MARQUARDT: Well, I have a

1 question about the May meeting. Have you made
2 a decision on where that's going to be?

3 COL HAM: Yes, ma'am, we confirmed
4 yesterday, I'm getting my days - yesterday,
5 the 5th and 6th are going to be George
6 Washington University School of Law in the
7 Faculty Conference Center, which is where we
8 were on the 29th of January. For the 29th and
9 30th of May, we don't have a location yet, but
10 it's tentatively in New York at Manhattan.

11 DEAN ANDERSON: So, let me just
12 clarify, on the 5th and 6th of May it's going
13 to be in D.C.

14 COL HAM: Yes, ma'am.

15 DEAN ANDERSON: And on the - I'm
16 sorry, what are the dates?

17 COL HAM: The 29th and 30th.

18 DEAN ANDERSON: The 29th and 30th are
19 going to be in New York. Okay.

20 JUDGE MARQUARDT: What are we doing
21 in New York?

22 PARTICIPANT: Having fun.

1 PARTICIPANT: No, that's a joke.

2 COL HAM: Ma'am, the 5th and 6th of
3 May is when all three of the Subcommittees
4 will issue their report and their findings and
5 recommendations to the full panel. However,
6 Ms. Fernandez determines you should do that,
7 and then the panel will deliberate on all the
8 findings and recommendations of the
9 Subcommittees. The 29th and 30th is their final
10 review of the report, and again because on the
11 Federal Advisory Committee, they go line by
12 line or page by page, however the Judge
13 determines to review the final report. And
14 then it gets polished up and sent to Congress
15 and Secretary Hagel.

16 REP. HOLTZMAN: And you think it's
17 appropriate for us to be at the 29th and 30th,
18 as well. That's a question.

19 COL HAM: That's up to you, ma'am.
20 It's not - it's certainly not required. Our
21 process has been that you're invited to attend
22 all the panel's public meetings.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

JUDGE MARQUARDT: All right, thank
you.

MR. CASSARA: All right, folks.
Everybody have a good weekend. Stay warm,
hahaha.

MS. FRIED: Thank you all. The
meeting is closed. Bye all, thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went
off the record at 4:37 p.m.)

A	
ability 83:7 92:9	87:15
able 77:8 87:9 94:5 100:16	agree 5:8 6:19,20 9:19 10:5,7 16:21 18:16,20 20:15 33:1,11 34:18 36:18 37:17,19 39:3 41:4 54:20 73:5 79:1 81:11 88:1,8 90:3,11,15 94:9 95:4
absence 41:14	agreed 81:13,20
Absolutely 78:3,11 84:12	agreement 28:9,13 28:20 29:1,5,7,9 31:16 35:22 81:9 82:19,22 83:4 86:6
accept 28:18 32:17	agreements 30:2,5 81:11
acceptance 31:19 32:3	agrees 93:9
accepting 101:17	Aha 49:21
access 68:19 69:10 69:12,14 70:1,12 71:22 72:17 75:19	ahead 7:21 18:3,8 43:16 74:17 97:11 97:13
accomplish 62:15 89:13	Air 14:10 29:16,18
accomplishes 89:12	akin 50:5
account 19:1	Alaska 63:16
accurate 68:4 72:16	all's 85:22
accused 30:8 77:20 80:18 82:13 90:5 92:9 104:2	allegations 24:16
achieves 27:16	alleged 38:11 41:12 45:19 50:9 59:7
act 11:17 57:21	allocution 80:8,11 80:12 85:7 87:13 93:14 94:20 97:10
action 24:20	allow 44:7 60:4 93:14,16 102:1,1
actual 63:19 71:19 85:13 88:14 102:14	allowed 44:1 77:4
ad 72:17 73:2,20	allows 34:1 46:10 59:21 85:13 102:8
add 16:4 27:6 46:4 46:12	amendments 79:10
added 28:3	amount 95:2 105:4
adding 16:21	analysis 103:19,22
address 49:15 58:12	and/or 27:19
administrative 24:18,19,20 25:1 25:5,8	Anderson 1:14 10:4 12:7 18:16 19:10,14,18 20:5 20:15 33:13 37:19 38:21 46:3,19
ADULT 1:3	47:11 66:19 74:12 74:15,19 77:21 78:4,9,12,18 79:6 79:16 80:6,10,15 103:7 104:19 107:11,15,18
advance 97:18	annotated 101:12
Advisory 108:11	annotations 97:21
affirmative 53:9,10 53:13	answer 98:4
afternoon 2:3	anybody 54:6 90:8 90:20 103:5
agencies 71:8	anyway 18:2 46:2 93:22
aggravation 85:4	apologize 12:8 54:22 66:20
	appeal 44:2,8,13,13
	appears 20:22 72:17
	appellate 10:13 36:15,22 37:1,3,4 37:6 38:8,16,20 39:1,8,12 42:22 43:19 44:20,20 45:9,12,18 46:5,7 46:21 48:21 52:22
	applaud 3:19
	applies 87:14
	apply 8:10 80:3
	appropriate 37:12 37:13 38:7,16,20 39:1,21 45:8,17 74:5 108:17
	area 70:17
	argue 70:4 87:3
	argument 52:22
	arguments 101:5
	Armed 14:13 60:20 61:2
	Army 14:10
	art 12:20 14:7 29:4
	article 41:12 42:6 100:15
	aside 35:16 60:2 95:19
	asking 42:4 67:3 82:1
	ASSAULT 1:3
	assertion 90:17
	assessing 103:2
	assist 88:20
	assumed 63:21
	assuming 60:1
	attempt 41:6 102:6
	attend 108:21
	attendance 100:11
	attention 60:6
	attorney 31:10
	Attorney's 57:11
	authorities 60:6
	authority 16:12 18:15 19:5 20:13 22:22 26:18 28:17 32:16 60:20 62:3 68:11
	authority's 62:4
	authorized 103:15 104:4
	avoid 8:18 9:13
	awaits 46:22
	aware 98:19
	B
	B 60:16
	baby 93:11 94:5,10
	back 5:18,21 24:5 48:15
	background 3:13 101:9
	bad 18:14 37:11
	bargain 29:6
	based 20:20 53:17 55:10 56:22 66:1 86:15
	basically 51:4
	basis 73:2 76:10
	beginning 22:10 24:22
	believe 8:10 53:5 69:21 83:11 94:11 94:13,17 100:9,10 100:15,17 102:10 102:22
	best 31:19 66:15
	better 12:5 14:13
	19:2,9 23:5 24:11 24:12,14 32:20 56:12 62:18 63:12 71:15 72:3 73:11 73:22 79:14
	big 30:18
	biggest 106:6
	Bill 10:2 13:6 24:3 24:6 29:14 52:4 74:15 77:22 86:6 86:22 91:12 93:21 94:12 101:4
	Bill's 90:17 91:9
	bit 33:9 46:13 56:12,22 64:22 70:21 102:21
	blah 38:11,12,12
	body 104:17
	bottom 93:8
	brief 53:1
	Brigadier 1:16
	bring 54:13 55:3,5 55:9 104:5
	bringing 55:13 56:7 60:5
	broad 31:7 42:14 73:7
	broader 37:5 41:10 70:21
	brought 101:5
	bubbles 10:21 14:3
	button 24:4
	Bye 109:7
	C
	C 60:16
	cabins 88:16
	call 1:6 2:8 3:2 64:10 80:18
	called 6:4 29:4,6,15 29:19 85:5
	calls 82:10
	capital 100:6
	capitalized 14:6
	capture 36:5 40:20 41:17 43:18 47:13
	captured 4:13 58:5

67:12 captures 43:19 careful 34:6 carried 28:15 case 9:12 18:22 26:22 48:6 57:18 66:6 67:21 82:4 83:3 92:2 98:1 100:6 102:12,14 case-by-case 73:12 cases 74:1,2 75:18 77:12 82:18 89:9 89:10 Cassara 1:14 10:2 13:6 21:7 24:3,3 29:13 30:1 43:3,6 43:7,11,15,21 44:12,16,22 45:5 45:10,16 46:14 49:5,7,8,17,21 50:10 51:5 52:1,5 52:11,15,21 53:4 54:7 74:14,17 75:14 76:5,14,18 78:3,7,11,16,19 82:12 83:12 84:4 84:6,12,16,20 85:18 86:10 87:20 88:19,22 89:11,19 91:13 92:1,5,21 93:4,13 96:2,10 97:5 98:16 99:2,6 105:20 106:16,21 109:3 Cassell 100:12,12 catches 94:17 caused 81:15 causes 93:6 caveats 106:5 CDR 5:17 10:18 11:6,15,20 14:8 21:8,13 22:2,6 23:17 24:17 25:3 27:6 29:19 49:19 50:1 52:18 53:7 55:8,14 56:19 57:8 60:17 63:11	80:17 81:8 97:4 98:11 105:7,16 106:6,11,19 Center 107:7 centered 100:19 certain 56:7,8 65:19 66:22 67:5 68:21 69:11,22 certainly 26:5 28:15 82:18 87:3 95:5 108:20 chain 42:19 Chair 1:12,13 challenges 85:17 challenging 56:7 change 12:6 17:2 21:16 35:16,21 58:19 71:19 91:6 93:3 102:6,11 changed 17:5 20:22 102:8 changes 20:20 36:4 changing 21:14 35:17,18 chapter 6:8 chapters 4:4 6:3,9 6:13 charges 24:16 42:1 42:3 54:11,13 55:3,4,7 chart 102:14 103:21 charts 23:18 check 41:21 choice 4:16 choices 4:9 choose 81:2 chooses 81:6 104:2 chopping 77:19 Chorus 21:6 Christel 1:16 5:5 6:18 7:8,16 10:1,8 18:8,17 24:13 88:2,9 chunk 8:21 circulate 100:17 circumstance	25:18 circumstances 37:12,14 69:13 citation 97:20 citations 98:1 102:15 cite 13:9 civil 33:14 77:1 83:13 civilian 33:16,20 34:8 35:7 48:5 50:6,15,19 77:2,4 83:15,16 84:14 85:2,3,10 100:4 clarifies 26:5 clarify 64:2 66:21 77:21 107:12 clarity 33:19 37:3 56:9 clause 37:10 cleaner 9:17 56:5 clear 9:14 11:5 15:3,17 16:7,8 17:14 21:10,14 22:13 28:22 34:21 38:4 41:7 51:15 58:10,14 59:19,21 75:7 81:5 101:20 clearly 32:18 62:18 client 68:12 client's 96:18 close 106:12 closed 109:7 closely 55:17 closest 100:5 clunky 56:1 Coast 14:10 COL 12:18 13:2,8 14:14 15:8 21:2 22:21 27:20 28:14 29:3,10,18 30:4 30:10 31:1 34:21 41:9,20 42:17 43:2,14,17 44:19 45:3 47:22 49:1,6 49:14,18 52:8,12 56:14 58:1 59:3	59:12 60:9 64:6 65:1,12,17 66:1 67:2 79:8 80:1 81:17 82:10 87:11 87:22 88:19 89:6 89:20 96:1 97:7 99:20 103:9 104:1 104:15 106:2,14 107:3,14,17 108:2 108:19 Colleen 1:16 Colonel 1:18 12:18 14:14 15:9 27:20 29:13 31:7 35:1 35:14 36:5 41:19 47:19,21 48:19 49:2 55:22 59:3 66:19 67:12 79:1 82:17 96:11 103:19 combined 52:8 come 7:2 40:19 48:15 56:14 63:22 73:21 86:6 96:13 comes 38:3 72:6 76:20 82:15 86:13 86:19 88:2,11 93:5 comfortable 20:2 83:6 95:15 coming 104:22 106:18 comma 26:10,15,20 27:2,16 command 42:20 commander 1:19 16:10,18 commence 98:22 commences 98:19 comment 8:11 26:3 34:9 94:10 comments 11:2 36:19 104:16 committee 20:18 41:4 76:20 79:9 85:20 89:2,22 93:9,15 97:19	108:11 Committee's 42:15 43:22 44:7 comparable 16:10 16:15,19 17:7 58:12 60:14,16 complaint 55:5,9 55:13 56:8,10 59:9 63:14 complaints 57:12 58:21 60:21 63:17 65:5 complete 38:1 completely 5:8 9:10 58:6 59:16 77:14 comply 61:3 63:20 concede 34:20 concern 42:14 46:20 49:10,13 77:6 88:10 91:9 91:10 93:5 concerned 3:10 72:7 concerns 18:11,19 18:21 19:7,19 21:19,20 37:10 70:15 73:9 76:22 86:19,22 87:4,6 concise 3:7 conclusion 66:14 concur 5:15 concurred 64:15 conduct 69:8 conducted 70:11 71:21 confer 12:11,13 31:10,22 34:1 Conference 1:6 107:7 confidential 67:19 confirmed 107:3 confusing 12:16 13:1 15:16 62:14 confusion 55:6 Congress 22:22 28:1 108:14
---	---	---	---	---

Congressional 66:7	70:22 71:3,3,5,5,7	83:17 85:6,9,14	51:1,3	Designated 1:18
consensus 66:18	71:10 72:11 73:1	87:14 92:3 94:17	decision 26:12	desirable 6:12
76:12	75:20 77:7 80:22	95:18 96:4 97:22	28:18 31:15 32:17	desire 49:12
consequences	87:2 96:6,15,17	101:14,22	33:5,5,21 34:3	desires 18:12,13,13
95:10	counsel's 66:9 68:2	cross-examine 77:5	101:8 107:2	18:20 19:2,20
consider 8:13	counter 30:13,15	83:7 92:9,11	decisions 69:14	21:15,21
18:15 19:5 20:3,4	32:18	96:15,19	defendant 80:15,18	detail 17:6 65:7
20:13,14 85:15	counter-offer	cross-examined	defendant's 71:2	details 37:16 67:10
104:6	28:19 30:13	80:13	82:13 86:22 94:12	determination
consideration	couple 5:18 86:3	cumbersome 38:14	94:13	70:14
103:16 104:6	course 53:7 56:16	46:13	defendants 80:6	determine 67:7
considered 90:9	63:3	curious 106:10	94:19	69:9 70:11 71:21
considering 6:9	court 5:1,2 31:17	current 5:2 7:3	defense 1:1 44:5	99:22
consolidate 104:18	31:18 32:2,7	72:17	70:7 71:3,4 75:2	determines 108:6
Constitutional 83:9	33:15 42:18,22	currently 31:20	77:4,7,9 79:5 80:2	108:13
87:5	45:4 49:11 50:5	cut 52:9	80:4 81:9,11 82:3	determining 100:1
consult 16:11 48:19	51:12 70:3 72:12	CVA 16:18	87:2 88:11 97:11	develop 38:7,9 39:4
content 3:9 35:17	86:18	CVRA 7:4 16:11	100:14	39:20 45:17 60:7
35:18	court-martial	51:1 55:17,21	defense-oriented	developing 61:14
contested 83:3	54:10 96:13	56:1,6,11,21	100:19	device 37:4 38:8,16
continue 75:2,3	courthouse 60:1	58:13 59:8 63:15	define 14:5	38:19 39:1 45:8
convened 1:11	courts 51:2 74:1	64:20	defines 13:11	45:14,17,22
convening 19:5	76:10 77:1,2,4	CVRA's 55:12 56:5	definitely 105:7	dictate 68:7
20:12 26:18 28:17	83:14,15,16 85:10	63:13	degrees 106:16	dictated 50:19
32:16 62:3,4	99:5		delayed 2:11	difference 87:21
conversation 8:1	Courts-Martial	D	delete 76:12,13,16	differences 7:4
36:5 67:13,22	13:10 79:10	D 60:16	deliberate 108:7	different 14:16
conveys 65:21	cover 48:9 61:20,22	D.C 107:13	deliberately 61:16	33:9 56:3,22
convict 92:10	62:2,2,3	dates 107:16	deliberations 35:10	66:11 74:22 75:1
convicted 92:11	covered 3:20 61:13	Day 106:3	47:9	84:1 87:19 99:19
conviction 78:20	covering 48:11	Daylight 1:11	deliberations/de...	100:8
91:6 96:16	covers 62:1	days 107:4	47:8	differently 54:18
Corpus 42:2	crafting 91:1	deal 30:19 62:19	demand 74:22	difficult 4:19 35:5
correct 27:3 31:6	create 12:4 22:10	86:3 89:22	denial 48:7 60:1	105:2,3
36:16 41:19 43:1	23:3,8,10,11,12	Dean 1:14 10:4	denotes 14:15	difficulty 10:12
44:15,18 46:7	23:15 101:14	12:7 18:16 19:10	22:17	digest 105:5
55:14 59:9 60:8,9	crime 58:4 85:8	19:14,18 20:5,15	dense 3:19	direct 22:22 43:6
62:11 71:4 78:5	99:14	33:13 37:19 38:21	deny 49:16	directing 50:4
82:2 91:13	CRIMES 1:3	41:20 43:3 46:3	Department 1:1	directive 99:4
correctly 42:11	criminal 61:15	46:19 47:11 66:19	59:5,6 75:1	directly 16:18
91:12	79:13,14 84:15	74:12,15,19 77:21	depend 27:14	Director 1:18
counsel 8:14,18,19	cross 37:18 78:14	78:4,9,12,18 79:6	depending 99:14	directs 23:13
9:1,7,16 12:12,13	82:14 91:21 94:15	79:16 80:6,10,15	describe 59:16	disagree 73:16 90:7
12:15,16,19 13:11	102:8	103:7 104:19	described 35:3,7	93:9
16:12 44:1,5,8	cross-examination	107:11,15,18	73:22	disagrees 83:19
53:13 67:8 69:10	77:9 78:22 79:3	death 84:22	describes 13:12	94:12
69:13 70:7,8,12	79:21 82:9,16	decide 50:6,14,17	designate 60:20	disciplinary 61:1

disconnected 24:4	driven 23:15	71:1	64:13,17	73:10,15 76:11,16
discovery 66:6 74:1 74:2 75:21	due 16:17	entity 15:1 79:9	explanation 15:21	86:2 88:12 90:12
discretion 26:18,20 66:15 67:6 68:18 69:15	duties 9:3	envisioning 59:19	63:10	90:16 92:19,22
discuss 88:17	duty 63:8	equal 75:22	explicit 8:16 16:14 33:2 56:6	93:18 94:2 95:20 101:3 104:8 108:6
discussed 21:14 35:4 64:7 103:10	E	equivalent 35:2,6 35:12	explicitly 40:22	fewer 89:15
discussing 67:16	E 60:16	especially 34:10 55:21	extraordinary 41:22	figure 48:15 88:13 94:5
discussion 4:13 36:6 66:2,5,10,12 66:16 75:11 98:13 98:14	e.g 25:22 26:4 27:13	establish 12:4,12	extremely 105:3	file 44:1,5,8 56:10 59:9 66:9,10 75:21
discussions 18:11 18:19 19:1,19 21:19,21 42:16 53:18 57:1	earlier 36:12 105:13	everybody 2:8 3:2 11:1 32:6 104:17 109:4	F	filed 42:3
dishonesty 91:11 91:16	Eastern 1:11	evidence 20:20,21 80:3 92:13 97:14 103:14 104:4	fact 35:16 77:13 104:6	files 72:17
disjunctive 26:10	easy 5:9	exactly 25:14 41:2 42:4 55:1 56:20 56:21 95:12	facts 77:11 81:20 82:3 97:12	final 31:15 33:22 76:17 108:9,13
disposition 18:22 24:10 25:2,5,8	echo 36:20 42:16 47:6	examination 78:15 82:15 91:22 94:16 102:9	Faculty 107:7	finality 54:10,11 90:21,21
dispute 94:9	edit 20:2 40:2 71:19 72:3	examined 71:12,14	fail 61:3	find 4:19 9:11
dissent 76:19 93:21	edited 10:14	example 17:16 18:4 26:5 42:2 44:4 59:7,20	fairness 90:9	finding 4:21,21 5:10 6:10,10 9:10 10:9 13:21 14:7 16:3,5 17:3 24:7 24:10 25:10 36:9 36:11,20,20,21 37:2,8 51:8 53:14 53:16 58:10,15 59:1 64:18,19 70:20 72:15 75:12 77:18 78:5,9 89:16,17
distinction 87:21	editing 10:13 40:18	excellent 2:22 3:4 3:18 4:13 40:2	familiar 59:17 97:8	findings 7:1,10 13:15 16:9,15 17:15 38:2 54:10 54:16 60:12 77:16 84:7 90:19 91:3,7 93:3,7 98:20 108:4,8
document 29:4,6 81:22 82:3 104:21	edits 10:17,19,20 11:1 13:22 14:1 19:21 37:7 40:14 56:18 88:16	Excuse 90:6	family 82:7,13,13 82:15	fine 21:7,19 71:18 72:4
documents 65:20 66:21 67:1,8 68:1 68:2 69:1,12 70:2 71:1,2 75:19	effective 28:10	Executive 79:11,12 79:15	far 3:9 77:19 81:18	first 2:7 3:5,15 4:20 5:11 7:11 8:6,7 11:9 13:3 22:14 28:6 37:20,21,22 76:19 94:3
DoD 7:3 12:10 14:22 15:10,17 22:10,22 38:1,6,9 43:16 51:10 61:19 62:6 65:4,10,11 65:13,15,16 69:8	effort 101:13 102:10	exist 95:19	federal 1:18 20:21 31:1,8,21 57:10 60:12 61:8 85:10 86:11 98:8 105:11 106:12 108:11	five 14:9,15
doing 34:7 77:2 107:20	either 12:4 65:3 80:19 90:20 93:12 93:13	existence 95:17	feel 10:11 9:20 71:14 73:18 85:11 92:8 94:22 95:6,7,15 95:16 100:22 101:1 103:5	flag 8:3
DOJ 58:3 63:13,22	embarrassing 53:4	exists 18:2 35:13 95:18	feeling 17:17 75:4	flesh 64:21
draft 3:4,15 41:3,8 88:14	employees 59:6 62:6,8,9 63:14	expanded 71:12	feelings 73:18	
drafted 41:10	enacted 28:1	expansion 71:14	Fernandez 1:12,13 2:6,7,13,17,20 3:1 5:12 7:13,20 9:20 10:6 11:4 13:13 13:20 16:2 17:20 18:8 20:7,17 21:4 22:12 24:6,13 25:9 34:4,15 36:8 47:15 48:8 51:7 52:3 53:21 55:18 56:13 65:18 72:19	
drafting 35:8 56:2 88:20	encourage 9:6	expedited 38:10 39:5 40:15 44:20 45:1,9,18 46:11 46:18 49:20		
drafts 52:9	ended 67:21	experience 98:8		
	endorsing 33:17	explain 13:5 17:3 62:17 64:1 65:19 87:12 102:15		
	enforce 42:6	explained 62:16		
	enforcement 66:10 68:1	explaining 17:2		
	engender 49:4			
	ensure 17:8 31:22 55:2			
	entire 8:20 89:1			
	entirely 64:9			
	entitled 66:6,9 67:8			

flipped 57:3,6	9:17 10:15 13:18	glossary 13:7,9	Guard 14:10	handle 10:1
floor 74:16	16:20 19:22 20:11	go 4:11 7:21 10:9	guess 12:7 14:16	happen 48:10
flow 6:7	23:9 26:2,15 27:3	13:14 18:8 21:9	22:12 25:22 30:13	96:20
focus 4:8 8:5 13:22	27:9 31:2,6 32:22	31:20 34:6,7	42:4,17 44:3	happened 50:20
focused 95:9	33:16 34:12 35:3	47:20 48:10,20	46:19 50:2 61:21	81:14
folks 8:4 24:4 76:17	35:7 36:3,4,17,17	49:20 70:3 72:12	69:6,20 72:20	happening 31:12
104:9 109:3	39:3,11,18 40:1	72:14 74:17 79:11	90:22	31:13 72:16,18
follow 63:15,18	40:12 41:5,11,15	92:7 93:17 96:12	guide 27:14	103:2
follow-up 75:14	42:10 43:1 47:6	105:18 106:21	guided 73:19	happens 60:13 81:7
following 27:15	47:12,18 48:4	108:11	guilt 78:10 89:17	81:10 82:6 83:14
54:22	50:2,13 54:21	goal 50:11	100:1	103:20
foot 106:14	55:4,11,20 56:15	goes 6:10 102:16	guilty 77:18 81:21	happy 4:11 88:15
footing 76:1	56:16 59:10,11,14	going 4:16 5:8 18:6	guys 56:4 86:8	97:19
footnote 13:4,11	64:11 67:3,11,15	19:16 23:11 26:2	87:18 95:22	hard 5:21 41:3 67:7
Force 14:11 29:17	69:20 71:7,18	26:3 28:10 32:13	GW 64:7	harm 58:17 73:3
29:18	72:2,5,14 73:5,11	33:14 34:7 35:21		81:15
Forces 14:13 60:20	74:10 80:14 85:2	36:18 37:5 40:22	H	hate 3:11 104:10
61:2	86:12 87:11,18	41:1 73:6,21	Habeas 42:2	hear 43:3 48:13
forecast 105:17	88:1,15 93:12	75:16 83:3,5	Hagel 108:15	57:16
forth 5:18 58:13	94:7 97:7,15	91:19,20 92:17	hahaha 109:5	heard 27:21 28:7
101:12	98:22 99:3,12	93:13 104:9	half 88:4 104:11	28:17 31:14,15,18
forthwith 50:7,14	100:5 101:19	105:17,20 107:2,5	Ham 1:18 12:18,19	32:2,2,16 33:4,10
forward 104:14	102:5,20 103:9,17	107:12,19	13:2,8 14:14,14	33:21 35:4,5 70:5
found 17:11 53:2	gather 58:18	good 2:3,20 5:13	15:8,9 21:2 22:21	74:21 86:10,16
62:14 90:18	gender 25:13 26:1	10:1 23:3 25:2	27:20,20 28:14	88:4 93:20
four 14:9	35:17	29:22 38:21 39:6	29:3,10,13,18	heavens 75:6
fourth 24:10	general 1:16 30:18	39:9,18,18 48:17	30:4,10 31:1,7	heavy 63:8
frame 55:12	36:14 53:18 75:7	51:5 55:19,20	34:21 35:1,14	help 17:3,7 56:15
frames 56:4	generally 14:15	56:2,12,19 60:19	36:5 41:9,19,20	57:1 67:3
frankly 15:3	80:14 82:1 99:7	75:6,6,10 86:5,6	42:17 43:2,14,17	helpful 100:22
Fried 1:18 2:3 86:9	99:12 100:8	101:5,7 109:4	44:19 45:3 47:19	103:4,6
109:6	generic 36:13	government 82:19	47:21,22 49:1,2,6	Hey 2:13
front 45:13,14 86:5	George 107:5	106:12	49:14,18 52:8,12	Hi 2:6,18 13:6
full 74:1 108:5	getting 2:10 37:15	government's	55:22 56:14 58:1	72:19
full-blown 100:7	76:2 83:10 107:4	12:15	59:3,3,12 60:9	high 61:10
fun 107:22	give 43:11 57:14	grammar 37:11	64:6 65:1,12,17	hit 24:4
further 33:14 63:9	59:20,22 66:3	52:16	66:1,19 67:2,12	hoc 72:18 73:2,20
69:8,19 70:10	68:19 81:14 91:1	grammatical 27:5	79:1,8 80:1 81:17	hold 85:22 89:1
71:20 74:20 87:12	98:3 101:12 105:8	52:13	82:10,17 87:11,22	92:17,22
88:17	105:8	grammatically	88:19 89:6,20	holding 106:19
future 8:18 58:19	given 3:4,12 9:13	27:12	96:1,11 97:7	Holtzman 1:15
71:17	75:19 90:17 95:1	grant 12:11 15:6	99:20 103:9,19	2:12,12,15,18,22
G	104:2,13	49:16	104:1,15 106:2,14	5:7,8 6:19,20 7:9
game 46:8	gives 3:8 70:5	granted 69:10,11	107:3,14,17 108:2	9:8,9 12:2,3 13:3
Garvin 1:15 3:16	giving 3:15	74:1	108:19	14:21 15:9,13,15
5:14,15,22 6:2 8:3	gleaned 35:9	great 12:4 17:15	hand 53:22	15:22 16:4,5,17
	globally 97:16	102:19	handful 4:5 97:17	17:10,11,22 20:9

21:11 22:9,18 23:5 25:11,12,15 26:14 27:4 30:20 32:8,11 34:10,13 34:18 35:14,15 36:1,10,11 39:9 40:3,8 45:7,12 48:13,20 51:13 53:19 58:7,8 59:15 60:10 61:4 61:21 62:7,13 63:2,7 65:9,14 68:20 69:7 70:18 71:9 72:1,4,8,13 73:17 76:3 79:17 81:4,12 82:6 83:8 83:22 84:5,9,13 84:18,21 89:7,14 90:6,15 91:8,15 92:4 94:21 98:7 99:7,18 100:21 101:11 102:4,19 103:3 106:8 108:16	101:6 implement 11:10 12:2,3 22:11 23:6 23:6,8,12 26:17 35:9 implementation 51:11 implementing 15:11 implication 46:20 46:22 imply 47:2,3 73:8 important 85:15 87:8 90:1 94:19 95:4 96:8 101:7 imposed 84:14 102:3 impressions 3:15 improve 60:7 inappropriately 42:13 50:20 include 9:15 28:16 37:16 39:12 40:16 51:11 83:1 included 27:22 53:17 81:20 82:4 includes 8:18 15:17 26:20 32:15 inconsistent 77:15 incorporate 10:20 indicate 15:5 individual 76:10 indulging 2:8 influence 28:11 information 92:2 93:5 95:16,21 101:1,9 initiate 48:6 innocence 100:2 inside 65:10 insisted 82:20 instruction 103:13 104:2 instructions 23:20 insure 38:8,9 39:4 40:14,19 45:8,18 46:17 54:11	intended 41:3 64:20 intent 28:15 34:22 35:2,9 36:7 41:6 42:5,5,9,11,21 43:19,22 44:7 47:14 48:1 52:17 55:1,8 58:1 63:1,3 interest 33:4 interlocutory 38:10 39:5,15 40:15 41:11,15,18 42:12 42:18 43:18 44:9 44:13 45:15 46:5 46:9 47:3 intermediate 47:4 interpretation 17:8 32:7 interpreted 102:16 investigate 60:21 63:17 investigation 57:15 63:13 investigative 71:8 invited 108:21 involve 48:3 involved 75:18 84:22 involvement 31:11 33:3 issue 35:18 36:13 38:1 49:3 69:18 74:7 76:4,8,8 83:9 90:8 91:18 95:3 98:9 101:16 103:19 108:4 issues 8:2 18:15 19:9,10,11 21:16 21:17,17 22:1 35:5 87:10 89:15 item 96:2	job 56:2 joint 76:20 79:8 joke 108:1 Jones 66:13 JSC 79:6 judge 4:18 5:5 6:17 7:7,17 9:22 10:8 10:13 11:8,19,22 12:14,22 14:4,12 14:18 15:20 18:6 18:9 19:8,12,15 21:18 22:3,16 23:2,7 24:9,15,21 25:6,14 27:1 28:5 28:21 29:8,11,21 30:3,6,12 32:4,10 33:11 34:20 35:20 37:17 38:18 39:2 39:7,16,20 40:6 40:21 44:15,18 45:21 48:18 50:8 51:9 53:12 54:9 54:17 55:15 57:19 61:18 62:2,5,10 66:13,13,16 67:6 68:15,17,17 69:4 81:21 84:7,19 87:7 89:21 90:4 91:4 92:14 106:22 107:20 108:12 109:1 judges 88:8 judgment 95:3 judicial 41:1 46:17 46:18,21 58:17 jump 74:12 86:11 junction 70:14 jurisdiction 101:18 jurisdictions 70:22 97:8,17 98:18,21 99:15 102:11 103:12 juror's 103:16 jury 84:2,7,10,10 84:10,14,21 89:9 89:10 90:18 103:12,13	Justice 35:13 59:5 59:6 99:22 <hr/> K <hr/> Kastenberg 8:21 9:12 75:22 keep 104:11 kept 31:13 kind 7:10 27:12 32:14 34:16 36:13 48:11 50:5 53:16 58:18 63:20 64:19 68:3 83:10 kinds 66:22 68:18 King 1:19 5:17 10:18 11:6,15,20 14:8 21:8,13 22:2 22:6 23:17 24:17 25:3 27:6 29:19 49:19 50:1 52:18 53:7 55:8,14 56:19 57:8 60:17 63:11 80:17 81:8 97:4 98:11 105:7 105:16 106:6,11 106:19 know 3:16 4:19 5:19 6:14 9:1 10:16 11:10,16,21 11:22 12:5 14:5 14:16 15:2,18 16:7 17:16 18:11 19:6,15,19 22:16 24:5 25:21 30:9 32:8,10,12 34:5 38:2 42:3 49:12 50:11 51:15 52:21 53:9,12,15 54:17 58:3,13 60:12 61:5,17 62:9,15 63:1,5,8 64:14 65:7,15 67:16,20 68:18 69:7 70:5 73:13,17,21 74:8 75:17,21 77:1,2 77:12 78:20 83:4 83:13,14,15,18,20
<hr/> I <hr/> idea 10:18 30:7 48:17 55:19,21 68:16 75:10 101:7 ideas 56:17 identify 5:3 101:20 IG 65:10,13 IG-type 65:6 imagine 8:4 immediately 98:20 99:1,16 impact 78:14 81:19 82:21 85:7,8,14 87:15,17 90:13 91:2,20 93:2 95:6				
		<hr/> J <hr/> J 1:14 January 66:2 98:14 107:8 Jeffress 98:12		

85:16,19 86:14,16 88:22 89:11 91:19 92:5,6,10,14,16 93:8,9 95:8 96:6,8 96:8,10,17,19,22 96:22 97:3,12 99:8,20 100:2,9 101:20 103:4 105:17 106:11,17 knowing 51:17	36:22 87:5 91:11 91:15 99:14 leveraged 31:11 light 16:22 67:21 limit 73:10 92:8,12 limitation 55:2 limitations 74:3 105:1 limited 41:22 72:20 74:2 89:9 105:4 limiting 41:18 42:8 42:13 44:10 71:13 72:22 74:6 limits 62:12 line 18:14 20:12 22:4 24:10,22 25:12 45:13 93:8 97:13 108:11,12 list 97:20 101:12 listed 38:11 listing 6:7 lists 11:18 literally 96:12 literature 88:6 litigate 70:9 73:12 litigated 71:16 74:11 litigating 73:2 litigation 8:19,20 8:21 69:22 75:17 76:7 little 2:11 17:6 33:9 46:13 54:22 56:12 56:22 64:22 70:20 94:22 102:21 Liz 2:12,13 5:7 6:20 7:15 9:8 12:3 15:14 16:5 17:10 23:3 25:11 27:11 35:15 36:10 36:20 58:8 73:15 101:4 location 107:9 locked 39:13 lone 85:20 89:2 long 39:11 41:2 82:3	longer 64:8 look 18:7 51:2 54:4 83:18 90:19 95:14 96:1 102:21 looking 3:5 43:12 62:13 looks 6:21 28:22 99:21 loop 31:13 lose 47:5 lost 5:10 lot 10:13 11:11 22:13,14 49:9 51:6 52:1 57:15 66:16 67:9 81:19 82:4 101:22 103:11 106:5 love 43:3 103:7	79:10 MARCH 1:9 Maria 1:18 Marines 14:10 Marquardt 1:16 4:18 5:5,6 6:17 7:7,17 9:22 10:8 11:8,19,22 12:14 12:22 14:4,12,18 15:20 18:6,9 19:8 19:12,15 21:18 22:3,16 23:2,7 24:9,15,21 25:6 25:14 27:1 28:5 28:21 29:8,11,21 30:3,6,12 32:4,10 33:11 34:20 35:20 37:17 38:18 39:2 39:7,16,20 40:6 40:21 44:15,18 45:21 48:18 50:8 51:9 54:9,17 55:15 57:19 61:18 62:5,10 66:14 68:15 69:4 87:7 89:21 90:4 91:4 106:22 107:20 109:1 Maryland 102:8 matching 36:21 material 3:20 materials 95:14 matter 4:16 24:11 25:5 matters 16:13 103:15 104:5 McGuire 1:16 mean 7:4 15:18 16:7,13 17:15 18:3 21:11 23:14 26:16 28:3,10 29:15 30:1 32:19 34:16 40:4,17 41:21 42:18 47:17 49:10 50:10,14 52:15 54:16 58:19 61:5,16,19 62:9	65:20 70:19 71:3 71:19 73:20 75:17 76:22 77:1 80:12 82:12,17 85:11,21 86:2,12 87:16 88:1,2 89:2,7 90:10 91:14 93:5 95:1,12 96:3,5 98:9 99:8,9,11 101:16 meaning 46:9 70:2 85:5 99:4 means 14:9 18:12 19:1 26:6 29:9 41:16 47:4 88:4 meant 24:18 49:19 57:9 mechanism 32:15 38:17 39:21 51:11 58:20,22 mechanisms 11:10 11:11,13 38:7,9 39:4 45:17 58:16 meet 50:22 meeting 2:21 25:17 25:20 64:7 103:10 105:10 107:1 109:7 meetings 106:20 108:22 Meg 1:15 3:11 5:14 6:1 7:20 9:8 10:15 13:19 16:20 20:1 23:10 26:3 32:22 33:13 36:4 36:17 40:2 41:5 50:2 54:21 64:11 74:11 83:13 85:3 86:7 88:12 89:12 93:8 98:17 101:11 members 20:17 34:22 61:1 82:7 92:13 93:6,19 memo 102:16 memory 66:4 mentioned 36:12 96:3
L		M		
lack 18:18 79:13 laid 3:7 7:12 31:21 landed 3:17 68:5 landscape 98:4 language 4:6,9,16 23:22 27:22 37:7 38:14,14 41:8 48:16 50:7 51:1 55:17 64:16 68:3 88:16 93:1 102:14 language-choice 4:15 lateness 2:9 Laughter 43:10 48:22 53:3 63:6 67:14 94:1 106:1 law 66:6,9 67:21 68:1 70:17 98:1,6 100:15 102:12 107:6 lawyer 67:17 leave 23:9 25:4 30:17 41:1 65:3 68:12,16 92:15 led 77:16 left 66:15 legal 11:13 27:12 27:15 86:21 legislation 17:4,5 legislative 17:1 let's 10:7 13:21 36:8 51:7 53:21 53:22 65:18 76:13 76:16 101:9 level 15:5 34:1				

Miami 2:10	name 9:12	57:8 58:8 65:19	ones 4:10 103:19	51:21 54:15,20
Michelle 1:14 10:5	narrative 7:15	82:18 96:14	open 2:5 56:9 67:4	57:2,5,6 62:22
12:9 18:17 20:16	82:20	101:10	opening 3:10	63:9 72:10 80:9
37:21 46:4 66:20	narrow 9:2 62:21	numbers 97:5	opinion 50:19 89:5	83:11 90:3 105:14
74:13,18 78:1	87:1	numerous 53:2	opportunity 77:10	106:18 107:22
80:11 103:8	narrowly 88:14		opposed 42:19 47:3	108:1
104:20	navigated 31:9	O	75:5	participate 31:4
microphone 34:9	Navy 14:10 29:15	object 70:8,9 80:2	order 7:5 48:6 69:9	participation 31:22
mid 47:4	naysayer 86:1	objection 71:17	70:11 71:21 79:11	34:2
midway 46:10	NDAA 60:19 61:6	obvious 12:9 52:12	79:12,15 96:13	particular 16:22
military 12:20 13:1	63:21	64:1	organization 13:14	46:8 92:2 99:15
14:9 15:6,14,16	necessarily 14:21	obviously 8:20	organizing 56:11	particularly 32:14
30:2 35:2,12	33:17 45:4 48:3	76:19 83:2	other's 11:3	58:11 95:11
41:16 59:13 60:14	necessary 51:18	occasions 96:20	ought 62:19	partly 105:9
66:12 68:17,17	68:11	occur 57:17	outright 49:16	parts 7:18 71:1
69:15 77:17 79:14	need 27:17,18	OER 105:21	outside 65:4,10,16	passes 17:4
80:7,19 84:2	33:18 38:15 54:3	offer 29:14,21 30:4	overall 4:12	Patricia 1:18
87:16 95:10,19	62:17 65:19 74:7	30:7,14,15,16	overarching 15:10	Patrick's 106:3
98:18 99:22	90:13 93:19 94:3	32:18 35:21 36:1	overwhelmed 75:4	Paul 100:12
minds 86:5	101:1 104:13	offers 30:2		peace 92:7
mine 6:15 8:3,5	needed 15:21 94:4	office 57:11 58:4	P	penalized 60:5
96:14	needs 69:16 90:9	63:16 65:4,6,10	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-...	pending 37:12
minor 12:5	103:5	65:13	2:1	41:17 42:4 48:6
minute 94:18	negligently 61:11	official 1:18 57:21	p.m 1:11 2:2 109:9	people 13:14 47:14
minutes 2:9 104:9	negotiation 28:8,12	86:11	page 8:8 108:12,12	60:4 64:4 82:7
missed 24:5	30:21 32:1,19	officials 61:19 62:6	panel 1:3 22:21	101:16 102:20
missing 52:2,6	33:8	62:8,12 63:17	77:17 108:5,7	percent 79:2 96:3
mitigation 85:4	negotiations 28:20	oh 19:14 21:17 72:1	panel's 108:22	percentage 77:3
92:14	31:4,12 33:3	90:18 92:4 102:19	paragraph 43:11	83:15
mixing 36:21	neurobiology 88:3	okay 3:16 8:3 13:20	parallel 55:12	period 55:3 56:6
modifies 50:8	neutral 25:13 26:1	17:20 18:2 21:2,4	100:3,5	permissive 20:6
mom 96:18	35:18	21:17 22:2,6 23:2	parallelism 18:19	person 13:1 21:14
moment 39:14 53:4	never 84:21 88:21	25:22,22 29:8	parenthesis 25:16	92:11
85:7 86:17 87:1	96:19 103:18	30:14 36:8 43:6	parenthetical 26:4	personal 8:17
88:4 94:16	New 99:11 106:9	43:16 45:5 49:18	26:6 27:16 35:19	25:17,20
moments 4:15	107:10,19,21	51:5 52:11,17	parentheticals	perspective 4:14
40:20 41:7	non 12:22 50:20	54:4 56:13,15	27:13	88:7,11 98:5
Monday 106:7,15	non-judicial 25:1,4	59:15 65:17 72:1	parrot 55:16	100:14,14
motion 44:6	25:7	72:4,8,9 74:14	parroting 56:11	persuades 75:12
move 17:20 25:9	non-substantive	76:17,18 78:18	part 3:13 19:4	petition 51:3
36:9 51:7 54:5	14:1	81:12 87:22 89:6	22:14 37:20,21,22	phone 43:9
65:18 99:15,16	normally 63:7	92:4 99:2,6,6,18	58:3 60:17 69:16	phrase 37:11,13
104:14	note 94:10	104:8 107:19	82:18 86:14 88:2	80:12
movement 101:15	notes 17:17 37:6	ombudsman 57:9	90:10 91:16	phrased 74:5
multiple 26:13,21	56:17 57:1	57:11 58:2 59:5	PARTICIPANT	piece 92:15
	notice 65:2	64:21	40:11 44:11 45:2	pieces 56:8,8
N	number 10:14 18:7	once 78:20	45:20 46:1 48:17	102:17

pipe 76:18	75:15	47:15 69:17,21	108:22	really 3:7,19,20
place 3:6 6:6,12	post-trial 39:22	96:21 97:1,2	published 102:18	9:18 12:3 16:7
35:11 44:14	40:17 42:7 44:4,5	106:17	pull 100:16	49:13 58:14 66:17
106:20	postpone 95:13	problems 9:13	purpose 59:1 60:11	72:5 73:4,19 75:7
places 11:11 17:12	postponing 97:1	procedure 11:12	pursue 24:22 25:4	76:4,5 77:10
plan 85:21 105:7	potential 20:1	24:19 79:13,15	25:7	83:10 87:8,16
105:12	potentially 76:12	proceeding 42:1	put 3:11 10:21 13:4	90:19 95:1,8
plane 2:9	practice 23:13,16	44:9 57:10 80:7	13:11 14:3 19:11	103:4,6 105:5
plans 17:1	23:19,21,22 31:9	99:21 100:7	23:13,16 25:7	reason 8:15 14:22
plea 27:21 28:8,8,8	79:18	proceedings 54:16	27:2 35:11 45:14	16:9 74:21 75:8
28:11 29:6 31:8,8	practiced 23:15	109:8	52:19 74:4,20	rebut 94:19 97:12
31:11,14,16 32:2	practicing 96:6	process 28:12	91:5 92:20 94:7	rebuttal 94:15
32:5 33:10 35:4	pre 40:4,7 48:11	32:21 35:13 38:19	96:17	receive 60:21 65:5
81:21 99:16	pre-sentence 99:13	38:20 41:22 43:20		receives 58:20
please 5:3	precede 4:22	45:22 46:10 47:1	Q	recognition 60:18
plug 74:20	preferences 18:21	47:5 58:18 60:3	quasi-global 8:9,11	recognize 90:13
plural 14:19	19:7 21:15,20	86:1,18 90:10	question 11:9	recollect 66:3
point 13:5 18:4	present 1:13 61:8	105:3 108:21	18:18 19:19 40:9	recollection 31:3
24:2 32:7 36:15	87:9 103:15	profession 10:12	43:17 46:5 49:2	64:17
39:10,18,19 45:6	presented 31:17	Professor 100:11	51:19 67:3,4	recommend 9:14
51:14 58:20 77:19	President 79:12	programs 60:7	71:11 77:10,22	23:1,11 27:19
92:10	presiding 1:12	proposal 29:2	78:12 90:22 93:6	32:9 37:14 55:22
pointing 47:19 53:5	pretrial 28:19,22	35:22 76:21	98:4 107:1 108:18	73:6 86:15
police 52:16	29:1,5,7,11,14	propose 28:19	questions 81:2	recommendation
policy 7:3 14:5,6,13	30:2,4,7,15 35:21	32:17	quick 54:4	4:2,20,22 5:11,13
14:20 15:6,10,12	39:12,21 40:16	Proposed 29:10,11	quickly 74:11	6:10,11,15 8:8,10
23:20 26:17	42:7 44:3,16 48:9	proposes 79:9	quite 62:21 87:8	8:17 9:11 10:10
102:17	81:10 82:19,22	propriety 98:5		11:9 16:3 17:8,21
polished 108:14	83:4	prosecuting 31:10	R	18:2,7,10 20:4,11
portion 77:16	pretty 61:10 63:8	prosecution 16:13	raised 49:3	20:14 21:12 22:19
79:11	75:3 76:7 85:11	82:2	raises 40:8 89:15	22:19 23:14 24:8
portions 70:6	prevent 91:19	prosecutor 12:19	raising 40:10	24:14 25:10,12
position 67:17	previously 47:9	12:21 57:13 59:7	rare 96:20	26:9 28:2 32:12
positive 100:18	prior 4:13 8:7	82:10	rational 93:21	33:2,6,8 34:16
possessed 69:12	18:15 31:15,18	prosecutors 62:1	rationale 17:2,14	36:6,9,19 37:1,9
possession 71:2	32:2	63:18 96:18	re-look 55:16	37:22 38:5 43:12
possessive 14:19	privileged 67:18	protected 94:14	reach 48:2	43:14 51:8,14,20
possibilities 89:8	76:1	protects 94:11	reached 31:17	52:2,6 54:5 58:9
possibility 95:22	probably 3:12 4:2	prove 63:1	read 6:3 7:10 50:3	58:11 60:15 63:10
possible 42:15	11:4 24:1 43:8	provide 92:13	53:1 64:15 68:5	64:9,12,19 68:8
46:21	44:10 60:18 70:8	97:10	104:21	68:14,16,22 70:10
possibly 60:6	75:13 79:2	provided 69:2	reading 38:4 54:7,8	72:7 75:10,13
post 39:13 40:5	probation 99:8,9	provision 60:22	real 8:7 76:22 77:6	76:15,21 78:1
44:16	99:13	provisions 51:12	90:8	83:19 104:12
post-conviction	problem 9:11 15:3	prudent 34:17	realize 3:17	recommendations
91:5	17:11,18 18:1	PTO 29:15,20	realized 43:8	4:6,7,17 6:6,7,11
post-Kastenber	26:8 28:6 36:12	public 74:9 102:17	realizing 103:11	7:2,11,19 8:5,12

9:2,4 13:15 17:5 57:3 64:4 108:5,8 recommending 20:13 26:16 33:20 74:20 record 5:4 53:9,10 109:9 records 70:7 71:22 96:12 recovery 88:5 redrafted 20:19 redress 61:14 refer 9:9 16:12 36:14 reference 9:15,15 referencing 69:5 referred 59:1 referring 19:6 reflect 105:21 reflected 66:7 104:3 regard 84:1 regarding 18:22 28:7 31:14 69:14 reject 28:18 32:17 relate 24:18 57:9 63:12 relating 60:21 relevant 17:4 44:2 44:8 reluctance 34:5 remarks 3:10 remedy 59:22 60:2 remember 71:6 84:2 98:17 reminder 66:4 removing 37:14 83:7 REP 2:12,15,18,22 5:7 6:19 7:9 9:8 12:2 13:3 14:21 15:13,22 16:4,17 17:10,22 20:9 21:11 22:9,18 23:5 25:11,15 26:14 27:4 30:20 32:8,11 34:10,13	34:18 35:14 36:1 36:10 39:9 40:3,8 45:7,12 48:13,20 51:13 53:19 58:7 59:15 60:10 61:4 61:21 62:7,13 63:2,7 65:9,14 68:20 69:7 70:18 71:9 72:1,4,8,13 73:17 76:3 79:17 81:4,12 82:6 83:8 83:22 84:5,9,13 84:18,21 89:7,14 90:6,15 91:8,15 92:4 94:21 98:7 99:7,18 100:21 101:11 102:4,19 103:3 106:8 108:16 repeatedly 74:22 replace 35:10 report 3:13 11:1 13:9 68:9 74:9 94:18 99:10 108:4 108:10,13 reporter 5:1,2 reports 99:9,10,13 99:13 represent 68:12 90:5,8 representation 68:4 Representative 15:9 request 75:21 104:20 requests 18:13 require 97:17 required 57:22 108:20 requirement 97:10 requirements 61:3 requires 60:19 61:7 63:3 102:9 requiring 63:22 69:1 Research 66:8	resolve 76:10 resolved 74:8 75:16 respect 94:13 respond 3:8 57:12 83:21 responding 30:16 response 1:3 86:15 rest 73:19 85:22 result 92:3 resulted 51:2 68:3 retains 26:18 Retired 1:16 reveal 73:4 review 38:10 39:5,8 39:13,21 40:15,17 41:1,11 44:20,21 45:1,9,14,18 46:11,17,18 48:6 48:21 49:22 50:5 50:16,17,18,21 100:15 108:10,13 revisit 8:1 revote 77:17 rewriting 53:22 rid 21:21,21 right 3:6 9:5 12:11 12:13 13:22 15:8 16:10 20:19 27:21 27:21 28:7,16 31:3,10,14,14,18 31:22 32:1,15,20 33:20 34:1 35:3 36:1,2,2 37:4 41:13 42:8 43:4 47:11,21 48:4,5 49:17 50:1,16 51:15 53:1 54:15 60:10 61:4 65:14 65:17 69:22 70:1 70:4,6,16 75:17 77:13 78:7,19 79:4 80:7,10,12 80:19 82:17 84:11 84:20,20 85:6 87:13 88:13 89:18 90:1,15 93:14 94:14,15 95:4	97:9 101:14 109:1 109:3 rights 11:17,18 15:7 33:4 36:15 38:11 41:12 42:6 48:2 50:9 53:16 55:6,10 57:14 60:5,22 61:15 63:19 70:1 71:11 72:9 77:20 87:1 90:1 92:12 94:12 94:13 98:5 100:19 rise 87:4 role 16:9,18 round 3:5 Rules 20:20,21 79:13,14 80:3 rumor 105:14 <hr/> S <hr/> sake 13:13 sanctions 61:1 Saunders 1:20 20:18 saw 11:19 saying 8:13 9:4,6 21:22 22:4 26:11 30:17 33:18 45:6 47:16 48:10 62:1 62:11 69:18 70:16 71:13 77:12 91:12 says 18:10 20:12 21:22 22:4,10 23:20 24:9 25:16 28:16 32:6 37:22 69:8 70:13 91:1 103:14 Schenck 41:20 43:4 48:19 School 107:6 scope 71:21 72:21 73:7 seat 86:11 second 18:14 20:12 22:4 93:1 Secretary 108:15 section 68:9,13	see 3:14 6:16,21 7:12,18 11:2 13:21 19:14 30:14 34:4 45:5 51:6 53:20 58:7 70:6 103:8 seen 4:5 77:12 send 10:19,22 11:6 14:2 19:16 37:7 88:15 102:13 104:17 sending 56:18 sense 6:5,15 7:14 9:9 10:3 11:14 13:19 16:1,21 19:3 45:11 86:5 96:5 sent 108:14 sentence 19:4 22:15 28:6 52:6 52:17 69:16,17 84:11,13,22 85:1 100:1 102:2 sentences 84:3 sentencing 77:5 78:8,21 80:3,8,16 80:17 83:6 84:2,8 85:5,13 87:10 89:20 98:19 99:17 99:21 103:12 separate 9:10 15:1 33:6 58:4 87:17 88:20 89:4 separately 93:17 sequence 10:10 serious 95:3 service 14:5,5,8 66:8 79:8 services 1:4 2:4 14:9,15,16,19 15:2,11,18 23:18 23:20 24:1 75:1 85:16 set 29:9 42:1 58:13 65:5 sets 15:10 setting 55:11
--	---	--	--	--

SEXUAL 1:3	specific 9:2 18:10 18:21 46:9 68:14	statutes 63:19 98:1 99:4	91:21 100:13	switch 5:20
Sherry 1:19 10:18 14:2 19:16 29:16 56:18 104:18	specifically 33:4 57:17	statutory 23:22 27:22	submission 25:17 25:19	switched 5:17
shifting 16:22	speech 31:5 80:5	Stay 109:4	submit 78:13 79:18 79:20 80:1 97:19	sworn 80:19 81:16 102:9
short 66:3,4 105:10	spell 16:19 60:11 60:18 61:6,7 63:11	stays 17:3	submitted 30:8,10	system 31:8,21 33:20 34:8 35:7 42:19,22 57:10,13 59:13 60:13,14,16 61:8,8 84:1 95:11 95:12 98:8 100:4 101:17
shy 53:5	split 93:11 94:5,9	stood 95:5	submitting 30:9	SYSTEMS 1:3
side 100:21	spot 3:12	stop 46:10 105:22	subsection 6:8	<hr/> T <hr/>
sides 105:2	St 106:2	stopped 18:18	substance 4:1 7:21 49:15 50:21	tainted 91:18
significance 32:14	staff 1:17,18 3:3,19 17:13 35:8 41:6 48:14 95:21 97:19 98:2 100:16 102:13 104:13	storm 105:11	substantive 8:7 10:20 13:22 19:18 19:20 20:1 50:16 104:16	take 18:22 25:3 27:2 38:22 41:2 45:12 50:5,6,14 51:1 53:22 86:4 93:19,22 94:21 102:20
signifies 46:7	stand 96:18 97:22	story 99:19	substantively 4:4	taken 24:20 69:11 69:16
similar 57:20 58:2 59:4,12 63:16	standard 50:17,18 61:11	strange 7:10 11:13 12:1	subsumed 68:21	talk 4:1 46:16 59:18 68:10 86:8 102:21
simple 81:18	stage 44:2 46:8 47:4	stresses 105:1	sufficient 51:17 68:10	talking 53:15 71:4 7:16,21 13:16 36:16 58:14 66:22 67:1 68:9 78:17 79:19 106:3
Simultaneous 16:16 31:5 80:5	standing 36:22,22 37:2 50:22 68:11	strike 45:15 73:14	sufficiently 94:14	technical 15:19
single 15:5	standpoint 77:7	strong 73:18 87:6 95:7	suggest 17:12 91:17	technically 46:6 47:2
sit 89:3	stands 104:22	strongly 9:6 71:15 85:11 95:7	suggested 37:7 88:16 91:11	telephonically 1:11
situation 73:12	start 3:6,14 5:20 7:21 13:21	structural 5:16 7:19 8:2	suggesting 35:16	tell 78:22 79:6 83:13
situations 62:19 99:16	starting 2:21	structurally 4:20 6:1,5	suggestion 4:19 5:9 7:8	telling 49:11
SJA 62:4	state 44:9 85:10 95:12 102:13 103:22	structure 4:1,1,3 6:14 7:1	suggestions 48:14	tells 88:3
slightly 87:19	statement 35:19 72:16 78:14 79:18 79:20,22 80:2,20 80:20 81:3,6,16 82:20 88:9,21 91:2,20 93:2 97:11 104:3	studied 69:19	supported 6:13	tend 33:1 73:5
small 89:4	starts 104:22	studies 70:10	supposed 58:21,22 61:19,22 89:22	tentatively 107:10
snow 105:15,18,22 106:9	start 3:6,14 5:20 7:21 13:21	study 38:1 66:8 68:22 69:1,4,5,8 71:20 72:21 73:3 73:7 74:3,7,21 75:2,2,3,8,10 96:15	sure 3:22 4:9 5:19 7:1,6 17:13,19 21:9 22:7 24:12 31:19 34:11,13 38:15 39:12 42:12 47:10,12,14 50:3 52:16 54:13 56:20 62:9 65:21 66:17 69:6 72:10 75:9 79:1 91:8 101:19 104:19	term 12:20 29:3 31:7
snowing 98:16	stated 40:22	studying 73:1 75:5	support 34:19 88:6	Terri 1:20 20:17
snowstorm 106:6	statement 35:19 72:16 78:14 79:18 79:20,22 80:2,20 80:20 81:3,6,16 82:20 88:9,21 91:2,20 93:2 97:11 104:3	stuff 8:6 63:21	supported 6:13	testified 100:10,10
somebody 14:4 49:3 53:13 59:17	state 44:9 85:10 95:12 102:13 103:22	style 27:14	supposed 58:21,22 61:19,22 89:22	testifies 78:21
sorry 5:1 18:1 20:10 24:3 43:7 43:15 74:15 92:21 100:22 101:2,4 107:16	statement 35:19 72:16 78:14 79:18 79:20,22 80:2,20 80:20 81:3,6,16 82:20 88:9,21 91:2,20 93:2 97:11 104:3	Subcommittee 1:4 1:11 2:4 4:8 8:13 34:22 66:18 67:20 70:13,16 72:6 85:16 86:13 98:14	sure 3:22 4:9 5:19 7:1,6 17:13,19 21:9 22:7 24:12 31:19 34:11,13 38:15 39:12 42:12 47:10,12,14 50:3 52:16 54:13 56:20 62:9 65:21 66:17 69:6 72:10 75:9 79:1 91:8 101:19 104:19	
sort 18:17 38:3 47:17 54:1	statements 90:14 94:20 95:6 101:6 102:9	Subcommittees 108:3,9	survivor's 88:7	
sound 26:9	states 1:1 63:15 95:17 97:21 98:10 101:13	subject 32:6 34:11 77:8 78:14,22 79:21 82:8,14,16 85:5,9 87:14	suspect 104:16	
sounds 32:18,20 33:7 38:21 76:11	statute 11:17 31:1 32:9		SVC 66:5 68:9,10 70:2,3,12 75:18	
speak 80:13 85:19 102:2			SVC's 9:3	
speaker 5:3				
speaking 16:16 86:17 100:8				
Special 69:9 70:22 72:11,22				

82:14	53:17,19 54:2,19	times 5:18 50:18	U.S 57:11	verify 96:7
testify 77:8 82:8,16	55:18,20 57:8,15	52:22 57:15 74:22	um 3:16,17	version 27:13
83:6,17	58:7,8 59:4 62:10	timing 96:22	uncomfortable	81:14
testifying 79:19	62:12,17,18 64:6	today 3:2 37:11	79:4 94:22	versions 52:18
testimony 34:11	64:11,12,14,17	41:21 42:16	uncommon 83:16	versus 46:5
91:17 95:9 98:12	66:6,14 67:4,11	told 51:6	undecided 70:16	victim 1:4 2:4 8:14
98:13	67:19 68:4 69:10	tomorrow 70:4	underlying 77:11	8:17,22 9:4,6,15
Texas 101:20,22	69:18 70:3,7	track 51:3	understand 43:21	30:16 43:22 51:16
thank 2:7 3:2,3	71:15 72:2,15	training 60:7	47:1,14 50:12	53:11 55:3,5 59:8
56:19 79:16 104:1	73:3,11,13 74:7	transcript 3:18	61:22 64:3,5	59:22 63:19 73:4
109:1,6,7	74:21 75:11,15,17	trauma 85:14	76:21 78:1 83:18	77:5,7,11,14
themselves 5:3	75:22 76:4,6,7,9	86:18 88:3	85:17 89:14 101:6	78:13,13,19 79:18
theoretically 44:4	76:19 77:18 81:22	trend 101:20	104:22	81:5,5,13,19
theory 102:22	83:12,13 84:17	102:22 103:1	understanding	82:21 83:5,17
therapeutic 87:8	85:12 86:3,12	trial 12:12,13,15,16	35:1 47:21 48:1	85:3,7,13,15 87:9
thing 5:21,22 6:22	87:1,4,7,9,20 88:5	12:19 13:11 16:11	54:2 78:6 103:18	87:15,17 88:5
18:1 26:4 46:3	88:7 90:1,12,14	36:21 37:6 40:4,5	understood 13:2	90:13 91:2,16,20
64:21 71:16 72:11	90:20 91:4,9,18	40:16 41:14 42:7	22:7 42:20	92:12 93:2,15
75:6 94:7,19	93:7,10,18 94:2,8	44:3,14,17 47:17	undo 58:16	95:5 96:16 97:9
105:2	94:8,18 96:11	47:20 48:3,10	unfettered 86:17	100:18 101:6
things 4:5 5:16	98:12,15 101:4,4	51:12 53:12 60:3	93:14	102:1
8:15 34:7 47:13	101:7 103:3,10	62:2 66:9 68:2	UNITED 1:1	victim's 9:1,7,16
47:20 52:13 65:6	104:12,13 108:16	69:12 70:8 71:5,7	universally 77:3	12:11,13 18:10,21
68:19 72:12 75:6	thinking 86:13	71:9 75:19 77:16	University 107:6	44:7 61:15 67:17
think 3:6,7 4:3,14	thinks 32:6	84:10,14,15,19	unobjectionable	69:22 82:15 89:22
4:15 5:13 6:4,17	thought 3:3,20 4:7	91:17 96:13,17	69:3	100:13
7:9,14 8:9,15 9:3	4:12,21 5:16 6:1	99:22	unscientific 96:14	victims 7:3 11:17
9:22 10:11,19	19:17 35:20 42:5	trial-type 100:7	unsworn 80:20,20	15:6 57:12 58:4
11:12,15 12:14	46:1 49:6 50:4,4	tried 102:7	81:3,6 104:3,7	66:8 69:9 70:22
13:10,18 14:1,2	58:1 59:4 72:20	trigger 64:16	unusual 19:17	72:11,22 86:16
14:22 15:2,4,13	85:22 95:2	tripartite 33:8	use 11:10 13:4	90:2 95:5 102:7
15:15,19 16:13	threaten 106:13	trouble 54:1	22:20 27:12	102:10
17:6,7,11,17,22	three 40:20 41:7	try 48:14 63:11	100:17 103:1	video 25:19
18:1,12,13 19:2,3	108:3	64:2 104:11	useful 88:10 96:21	view 90:10,11
19:8,20,22 21:15	threshold 50:22	trying 15:4 16:8	97:20 98:2	views 19:5,6,13
23:3,17 24:1,17	throw 51:18	33:2 35:8 53:8	Utah 100:12	21:17,22 73:20
24:21 25:2,18	THURSDAY 1:8	54:12 58:5,12,16	utility 88:6	violate 61:2
27:11,11,18 28:14	tighten 52:13 54:3	59:18 62:15 63:12	_____	violated 59:8 60:4
28:21 29:5,15,19	tilt 102:7	63:20 71:5 89:1	V	violation 38:11
29:21 30:20 33:1	time 1:12 13:4 41:2	89:12 105:13	vagaries 67:13	41:12 45:19 50:9
33:18 34:15,17	41:16 55:2,12	Tuesday 106:4	vague 65:21 67:9	55:5,9 60:22
35:15 36:4,11	56:4,6 67:7 79:3	turn 91:2	67:15,22 68:3	62:20
37:1,2,15 38:13	92:7 94:3 96:4	two 36:18 52:7	vagueness 68:6	violations 61:14
39:3,14 40:1,21	97:11,13 99:8	typically 65:1,4	valid 45:6	vis 19:3,3 97:22
42:10,15 43:2	105:4,5,8,9,10	typos 53:2	variety 80:21	voice 85:13
44:12,13 45:10	106:12	_____	verbal 80:22	vote 86:4 92:16
49:19 52:1,5,20	timekeeper 104:10	U	verbiage 22:14	93:19,22 94:22

95:13 97:1,2 votes 93:16 voting 95:15	52:9,13 64:2 92:7 93:17 we're 4:14 9:4 19:15 20:2 23:11 26:11,16 27:14 33:1 34:6 36:15 39:11 42:4 48:11 54:12 64:4 68:8 73:6 78:15,16 90:4 93:13,15 105:12,17 106:18 106:19 we've 34:6 86:16 93:20 94:4 103:18 103:20 104:8,12 106:9 Wednesday 106:4 weeds 81:18 week 105:15 weekend 109:4 weeks 104:22 well-rationalized 93:20 went 53:1 66:12 109:8 weren't 5:19 56:20 66:17 93:21 white 106:2 who've 64:14 wife 49:9 willful 62:20 63:3 willfully 61:2,10,17 William 1:14 willing 86:7 wish 41:20 64:8 wolf 85:20 89:3 wondered 24:15 57:19 wondering 5:2 7:5 8:12 12:8,10 31:2 37:20 54:9 65:3 68:6 90:17 word 11:11,21 12:4 14:6 18:14 19:2,9 20:19 21:15,19 22:20 23:3 24:11 24:12,14,17 28:2	28:4 30:21 31:8 32:5,13,19 34:5 41:14 42:12,17 43:5 45:21 46:8 46:16,20 47:7,8 51:10 52:7 61:9 62:11 68:21 69:11 79:14 103:1 worded 54:18 wording 25:2 55:16 65:2 88:14 words 15:19 27:2 32:12 46:12 49:14 52:2 59:21 93:10 wordsmith 49:2 62:14 wordsmithing 40:13,18 wordy 51:22 work 27:12 41:22 52:9 53:20,21 105:9 worked 76:6 103:20 working 105:12 works 95:12,17 101:17,18 world 50:19 75:15 worry 105:4 wouldn't 34:17 47:5 62:5 67:5 Wow 102:4 wrap 47:13 Writ 42:2 write 82:3 89:4 93:16 105:3 writing 22:7 25:17 25:20 27:15 written 79:20 80:1 80:22 81:6,22 100:12 wrong 15:22 24:4 49:8,9 51:6 57:4 105:18 106:20	<hr/> Y <hr/> year 106:7 years 54:14 101:21 yeses 21:6 yesterday 107:4,4 York 99:11 106:9 107:10,19,21 <hr/> Z <hr/> 0 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 8:10 10:9,10 13:21 14:7 16:3,5 18:7 20:11 24:8 10 54:14 15 2:9 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 8:8,8 17:21 25:10 25:10,12 45:13 2:30 1:11 2:48 2:2 20 1:9 2014 1:9 24 104:21 105:6 29th 66:2 107:8,8 107:17,18 108:9 108:17 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 36:9,9,11,19,20 36:20 37:2,8,9,22 43:14 30th 107:9,17,18 108:9,17 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 25:12 43:13 51:8 51:14 52:6 4:37 109:9 45 104:9 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 54:5,8 57:3,7,7 50 97:21 102:13 103:21	50-state 103:18 513 44:5 5th 107:5,12 108:2 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 18:2 57:3,6,7,8 58:8,9 59:1 6-B 41:13 42:6 6th 107:5,12 108:2 <hr/> 7 <hr/> 7 65:19 75:12,13 <hr/> 8 <hr/> 8 78:2 101:10 104:12 8-1 97:4 80 106:16 8th 76:17 <hr/> 9 <hr/>
---	---	---	--	--

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Response Systems to Adult Sexual
Assault Crimes Panel Meeting

Before: US DOD

Date: 03-20-14

Place: conference call

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under
my direction; further, that said transcript is a
true and accurate record of the proceedings.



Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701