

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

+ + + + +

RESPONSE SYSTEMS TO ADULT SEXUAL
ASSAULT CRIMES PANEL

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
MAY 16, 2014

+ + + + +

The Panel met in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Ceremonial Courtroom 20, 6th Floor, 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., The Honorable Barbara Jones, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT

THE HONORABLE BARBARA JONES, Chair
THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN
VICE ADMIRAL (RETIRED) JAMES HOUCK
BRIGADIER GENERAL (RETIRED) COLLEEN MCGUIRE
BRIGADIER GENERAL (RETIRED) MALINDA DUNN
COLONEL (RETIRED) HOLLY COOK
PROFESSOR ELIZABETH HILLMAN (by telephone)
HARVEY BRYANT
MAI FERNANDEZ (by telephone)

ALSO PRESENT

MARIA FRIED, Designated Federal Official
THE HONORABLE CHRISTEL MARQUARDT, Victim
Services Subcommittee (by telephone)
MEG GARVIN, Victim Services Subcommittee
COLONEL PATRICIA HAM, Staff Director
LIEUTENANT COLONEL KYLE GREEN, Supervising
Attorney
COMMANDER SHERRY KING, Supervising Attorney

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Comments From the Panel Chair 4

Subcommittee Report to Panel and Panel
Deliberations 6

Public Comment

Adjourn

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

9:35 a.m.

CHAIR JONES: First of all, good morning. And I want to explain that on May 5th and 6th, the Response Panel began to hear the reports from each of its three subcommittees, and to deliberate on and accept or modify or reject the various recommendations that came from those subcommittees.

This morning, we are going to finish the report out of the Role of the Commander Subcommittee and the recommendations made by that subcommittee to the full Panel which we were unable to complete on May 6th.

As I think you all know by now, we have three subcommittees, The Role of the Commander, Victim Services, and Comparative Systems. And many of the Panel members, all of the Panel members are on one or more of those subcommittees, plus we have a number of other members of subcommittees who are subject

1 matter experts.

2 This morning, you will see that we
3 have Elizabeth Holtzman and Jim Houck who are
4 both subcommittee members of the Role of the
5 Commander Subcommittee as well as Panel
6 members. And so we wear both hats.

7 Right now, I'm reporting out as
8 the chair of the Subcommittee on the Role of
9 the Commander.

10 We have already briefed the Panel
11 on three major areas of study that we've done.
12 Ms. Joye Frost, who is the Director of the
13 Office for Victims of Crime at the Department
14 of Justice, discussed the role of the
15 commander in sexual assault prevention.

16 And Professor Geoffrey Corn, who
17 is the Presidential Research Professor of Law
18 at the South Texas College of Law was the
19 subcommittee member who presented our report
20 on climate assessment and command
21 accountability.

22 We were able to discuss,

1 deliberate, and accept either in whole or with
2 some modifications on May 6th, the
3 subcommittee's recommendations in these areas
4 which were 5 through 13 and 20 through 28.

5 We actually have three additional
6 recommendations in the area of commander
7 accountability which I would like to go
8 through now.

9 The first recommendation I'd like
10 to talk about is Recommendation 21. This
11 recommendation is right in line with
12 Recommendations 27 and 28, and it's meant to
13 complement and strengthen both the Department
14 of Defense and Congress' efforts to hold
15 commanders accountable.

16 From the beginning of our
17 discussions as a subcommittee, we quickly
18 realized the importance of command
19 accountability, commander accountability, if
20 there was going to be success in implementing
21 the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
22 Programs. And in fact, the Secretary of

1 Defense, as you will recall, just to do a
2 little recap, directed the secretaries of the
3 services to report on how they were going to
4 implement SAPRO's 2013 Strategic Plan and as
5 such, specifically directed them to develop
6 metrics to enhance commander accountability,
7 which they did.

8 The first action in the services
9 was to modify performance evaluations so that
10 they would now require specific consideration
11 of SAPRO issues for officers and
12 noncommissioned officers.

13 But 29, our recommendation there
14 goes to the basic issue which is that before
15 you, can hold the commander and anyone else
16 accountable, they have to know what the goals
17 are and what is expected of them. And so the
18 services have made efforts in that direction.
19 A particularly good example comes from the
20 Navy. The Navy has provided tailored and
21 specific guidance to commanders on the
22 implementation of the Navy's Sexual Assault,

1 Prevention, and Response Program initiatives
2 and have sent it to the entire fleet. These
3 programs give guidance which is, as I said,
4 specific on how to implement these
5 initiatives. And they also explain and set
6 out the standards and expectations so that a
7 commander reading these will have a good idea
8 of what's expected of him and then can be held
9 accountable.

10 So our recommendation in 29 is in
11 order to hold commanders accountable, DoD
12 SAPRO and the service secretaries must ensure
13 that Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
14 Programs and initiatives are clearly defined
15 and establish objective standards when
16 possible. So that's basically our
17 recommendation for 29.

18 Recommendation 30, which we'll go
19 to now, is really just an extension of that.
20 The service secretaries, it reads, should
21 ensure sexual assault prevention, response,
22 performance assessment requirements extend

1 below unit commanders to include subordinate
2 leaders including officers, noncommissioned
3 officers and civilian supervisors. This could
4 not be more important and it's been touched on
5 before during these proceedings.

6 We know that subordinate leaders
7 in a unit play a significant role in the
8 success or failure of sexual assault
9 prevention and response efforts, and
10 accountability has to extend beyond commanders
11 to junior officers, noncommissioned officers,
12 and civilian supervisors. So that is the
13 basic backdrop for Recommendation 30.

14 The last recommendation which is
15 31 is actually a much broader recommendation
16 which goes beyond the topic of command
17 accountability. And it reads that, the
18 Secretary of Defense should ensure all
19 officers preparing to assume senior command
20 positions at the grade of O6 and above receive
21 dedicated, legal training that fully prepares
22 them to perform the quasi-judicial authority

1 and functions assigned to them under the UCMJ.

2 As we know from all of our
3 interviews and all of our information and our
4 study of the UCMJ, many of the decisions made
5 by commanders are ones that do require
6 assessing, making judgments about conduct, and
7 then deciding what should be done about it,
8 and it's a justice system. Obviously, all
9 commanders need some training with respect to
10 this and they receive it. But our
11 recommendation is that it should be more
12 intense and be dedicated legal training, not
13 an ad hoc system.

14 I would just also add that
15 obviously senior commanders have judge
16 advocates on their staff who provide constant
17 advice and training with respect to what we're
18 calling these quasi-judicial issues. But we
19 think our recommendation will promote, and we
20 hope will promote, more dedicated and more
21 training for commanders in an O6 and above
22 range to help them with this kind of decision

1 making.

2 So those are the three
3 recommendations that came from the commander
4 accountability section which we didn't finish
5 last week and I would open it up now to any
6 comments, questions, or deliberation.

7 Colonel? I guess I'll be chair
8 now. Go ahead, Colonel.

9 COL COOK: Judge Jones, on -- for
10 the most part I agree with all three, just
11 some clarifications or some nuances in the
12 wordings. On Recommendation 29, I agree with
13 the DoD and SAPRO making sure that everything
14 is specific. I recommend to change that
15 introductory language. The goal, I don't
16 think, is to hold people accountable. The
17 goal is to identify -- part of me wants to
18 just say to ensure military leaders understand
19 their duties and responsibilities, DoD and
20 service secretaries. The goal is to get them
21 to adhere to those duties and
22 responsibilities. It's not to find

1 accountability after the fact. That may be a
2 consequence if they don't do it, but I would
3 just recommend stating it more positively.
4 It's to make sure they know what they're
5 supposed to do, make sure they do it. The
6 system is written in a way that if they don't
7 do it, they could be held accountable
8 afterward as long as it was clearly defined.
9 So that's a comment on 28.

10 CHAIR JONES: And are you thinking
11 along the lines of to ensure the commanders
12 know what is expected of them, language along
13 those lines?

14 COL COOK: Since you in
15 Recommendation 30 had extend below, just below
16 commanders to supervisors, I would say to
17 ensure military leaders, supervisors and
18 leaders. Make it more generic to go in
19 accordance with your recommendation at the
20 next one. And I'd be okay with that.

21 And then on Recommendation 31, I
22 have no objection to the wording of the

1 recommendation. I would recommend a change to
2 the finding that's in the report itself
3 because it's not quite accurate.

4 I agree with giving mandatory
5 training, but dedicated legal training could
6 be at a capstone course, it could be any kind
7 of leadership training, but the finding 31-1
8 said that at the Army and the Navy JAG Schools
9 they provide senior commanders with mandatory
10 resident or on-site courses. The courses are
11 available and they are encouraged to go
12 resident or on-site, but there are occasions
13 where military exigencies prevent them from
14 going. It's not mandatory on site or
15 residence. They have to get that training.
16 If they can get to the JAG School that's the
17 gold standard, but if they can't, there are
18 SJAs in the field that provide them one-on-one
19 training. So I would just take the word
20 mandatory out of that finding.

21 CHAIR JONES: Are you saying that
22 there is mandatory training, but it doesn't

1 necessarily have to be residential or on-site?

2 COL COOK: No, it's not
3 necessarily resident of the JAG Schools which
4 is what your point is in that finding. You
5 say, for example, the Army and Navy JAG
6 Schools provide senior commanders -- I would
7 say with resident and on-site courses on legal
8 issues. There are other places -- they're
9 going to get resident training as part of
10 their leadership courses. It's not always at
11 the JAG Schools.

12 CHAIR JONES: Okay, then my only
13 question is, is there any mandatory training?

14 COL COOK: I would say yes. I
15 would say in the --

16 CHAIR JONES: I'm not taking
17 mandatory -- there is mandatory training.

18 COL COOK: It's incorporated into
19 courses of instruction.

20 CHAIR JONES: Okay, fine.
21 Understood. Yes, General Dunn?

22 BG DUNN: I was just going to

1 clarify that the Army does have mandatory
2 legal training incorporated into the mandatory
3 commanders' training at Fort Leavenworth. And
4 in addition has courses at the Judge Advocate
5 Generals Legal Center and School which are
6 focused specifically on commanders that
7 provide additional training.

8 CHAIR JONES: Anything else? All
9 right, well I think with those suggestions, we
10 can make modifications acceptable to
11 everybody. Based on our discussion, I believe
12 Recommendations 29, 30, and 31 have been
13 accepted with those modifications.

14 All right, the remaining session
15 of our subcommittee report centers on the role
16 of the commander as convening authority.

17 And on January 30th, this
18 subcommittee presented its initial assessment
19 that senior commanders should retain authority
20 to refer cases of sexual assault to courts-
21 martial. After deliberations on that initial
22 assessment, the Panel adopted it with a

1 dissent from Professor Beth Hillman joined in
2 by Mr. Bryant.

3 Today, the subcommittee reports
4 out that it remains in agreement that senior
5 commanders should retain convening authority
6 and recommends against current legislation
7 that would modify or remove that authority.
8 In this regard, we have three recommendations
9 and Professor Hillman, are you on the phone,
10 Professor?

11 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, Judge Jones.

12 CHAIR JONES: Okay, who is a
13 member of our subcommittee who has presented
14 -- is dissenting and has presented her written
15 dissent in Section 10 of our subcommittee
16 report. Let me begin by presenting some of
17 our basic findings surrounding the issue of
18 the convening authority which I think are
19 important to understand and to our
20 conclusions.

21 First of all is the fact that the
22 term commander is not synonymous with the term

1 convening authority. Convening authority is
2 a person authorized to convene courts-martial
3 for serious violations of the Uniform Code of
4 Military Justice. Most commanders are not
5 convening authorities and only a very few
6 senior commanders have convening authority.

7 We've also found that commanders
8 with authority to refer sexual assault
9 allegations for trial by court-martial are
10 elevated in the chain of command to the point
11 that they will not only be removed from any
12 personal knowledge of an accused or the
13 victim. And specifically, under the new
14 legislation enacted by Congress in NDAA 2014
15 and under current practice, only a general
16 court-martial convening authority is
17 authorized to make the decision whether or not
18 to take the case to trial for the offenses of
19 rape, sexual assault, and forcible sodomy, as
20 well as the attempts to commit those crimes.

21 We've also found that the victim
22 of a sexual assault does not have to report

1 that sexual assault to anyone in their
2 military unit or any member of their chain of
3 command. Victims have a number of channels
4 outside of the chain of command to report
5 incidents of sexual assault.

6 In addition, under current law and
7 practice unrestricted reports of sexual
8 assault must be referred to and investigated
9 by military criminal investigative
10 organizations that are independent of the
11 chain of command and no commander or convening
12 authority may refuse to forward an allegation
13 or impede in an investigation.

14 In addition, any attempt to do so
15 would constitute a dereliction of duty or
16 obstruction of justice in violation of that
17 Uniform Code of Military Justice.

18 This subcommittee, as well as the
19 full Panel, has listened carefully to the very
20 powerful testimony of victims' advocates and
21 victims of sexual assaults and we have
22 witnessed personally the pain and the damage

1 to the community, body, and spirit caused by
2 those assaults. We are aware that this is not
3 a new problem in the military and that there
4 have been many previous efforts by the
5 military to respond to this problem with not
6 enough success.

7 We recognize that virtually all of
8 the victims' advocate groups we heard from and
9 most of the victims who have testified before
10 us, earnestly believe that removing the
11 commander as the convening authority will not
12 increase victim confidence in military justice
13 system and promote reporting.

14 We have also listened to a number
15 of current and former commanders. While some
16 agree with the position that the convening
17 authority should be removed, most do not. The
18 majority stressed the unique society that is
19 the military, a society based upon discipline
20 and the need for commanders to maintain good
21 order and discipline if they are to remain
22 mission-ready. They honestly believe that the

1 authority to order courts-martial in felony
2 cases is necessary if commanders are to remain
3 credible leaders and to enforce values, and
4 they maintain that if they're to be held
5 accountable in reducing sexual assaults, they
6 should also remain responsible for
7 administering justice.

8 After analyzing these positions,
9 the subcommittee finds that it is not clear
10 what impact removing convening authority from
11 some of the commanders would have on the
12 military justice process or what consequences
13 would result to organization, discipline, or
14 operational capability and effectiveness.
15 Having said that, we also find that the
16 evidence does not support a conclusion that
17 removing authority to convene courts-martial
18 from senior commanders will reduce the
19 incidence of sexual assault, increase
20 reporting of sexual assaults, improve the
21 quality of investigations or prosecutions or
22 increase the conviction rate in these cases.

1 These findings are supported by a
2 volume of analysis that this subcommittee did
3 and the experience of the military justice
4 systems employed by our allies. Although they
5 have eliminated the role of the convening
6 authority and have placed prosecution
7 decisions with independent military or
8 civilian entities, the evidence does not
9 indicate that the removal of the commander
10 from the decisionmaking process has affected
11 the reporting of sexual assaults. In fact,
12 despite this fundamental change to their
13 military justice systems, our allies still
14 face many of the same issues in preventing and
15 responding to sexual assaults as the U.S.
16 military does.

17 In this regard, we also found that
18 civilian jurisdictions face under-reporting
19 challenges in sexual assault cases that are
20 similar to the military and it is not clear
21 that the criminal justice response in civilian
22 jurisdictions where prosecutorial decisions

1 are supervised by elected or appointed lawyers
2 is more effective.

3 It is also worth noting that we
4 find that senior commanders vested with
5 convening authority do not face an inherent
6 conflict of interest when they convene courts-
7 martial for sexual assault offenses allegedly
8 committed by members of their command. First,
9 if a convening authority has other than an
10 official interest in a particular case, a
11 convening authority is required to recuse
12 himself or herself just as a prosecuting
13 authority or judge in the civilian world would
14 have to do.

15 Second, as with leaders of all
16 organizations, commanders often must make
17 decisions that will negatively impact
18 individual members of the organization when
19 those decisions are in the best interest of
20 the organization.

21 Our mandate from Congress and so
22 our focus with respect to the subcommittee on

1 the Role of the Commander is to analyze the
2 problem of sexual assault and recommend
3 measures that will be successful in preventing
4 it and reducing it. The subcommittee does not
5 believe that there is sufficient evidence to
6 support that eliminating the convening
7 authority from the Uniform Code of Military
8 Justice will achieve either of those results.

9 If we could go to Recommendation -
10 - well, you have. Recommendation 15 and I
11 should say here that Recommendation 19 and 15
12 are virtually identical, so I will go with 15.
13 It simply reads that Congress should not
14 further modify the authority under the UCMJ to
15 refer charges for sexual assault crimes to
16 trial by a court-martial beyond the recent
17 amendments to the UCMJ and Department of
18 Defense policy.

19 And if we could go to
20 Recommendation 1 now. Recommendation 1
21 follows from the findings and the
22 recommendation that I just read which support

1 our recommendation which is that we recommend
2 against any further modification to authority
3 vested in commanders also designated as court-
4 martial convening authorities. So we do not
5 recommend Congress adopt the reforms in either
6 the Sexual Assault Training Oversight and
7 Prevent Act, the STOP Act, or the Military
8 Justice Improvement Act, also known as the
9 MJIA.

10 In this regard, we believe that
11 Congress should not make any further changes
12 to the convening authority until current
13 important initiatives that have begun can be
14 evaluated for their success or failure in
15 responding to sexual assaults. Congress, over
16 the last two years, has enacted significant
17 amendments to the Code to enhance the response
18 to sexual assault in the military and the
19 Department of Defense has enumerated and
20 implemented numerous changes to policies and
21 programs for the same purpose.

22 Some changes have just been

1 implemented; other amendments to the UCMJ have
2 not yet been implemented. The Department of
3 Defense has yet to fully evaluate what impact
4 these reforms will have on the incidence of
5 reporting or prosecution of sexual assault in
6 the military. And so for that reason, we
7 believe that those changes and implementations
8 should be given some time.

9 Now to go specifically to the MJIA
10 and I just will make this distinction between
11 the two acts, the STOP Act and the Military
12 Justice Improvement Act both call for the
13 removal of the commander as the convening
14 authority, but in the STOP Act, it would be
15 the creation of a prosecutorial judicial
16 process which would not include commanders,
17 but it would only cover sexual assault crimes.

18 In the Military Justice
19 Improvement Act, it would call for a new set
20 of military prosecutors and I'll get into that
21 a little bit more in a moment, but all cases
22 that one might consider, I guess the easiest

1 way to describe it is felony cases which would
2 be all serious cases including sexual assault
3 cases would no longer be in the jurisdiction
4 of the convening authority, but would go to a
5 separate group of military lawyers. And I
6 should say in that regard with respect to
7 serious felony cases, some have been exempted
8 under the MJIA which were considered to be
9 specifically military crimes such as desertion
10 and other crimes of that type. But otherwise,
11 all serious felonies are included in the MJIA.

12 In addition to the reasons that
13 the subcommittee has already given with
14 respect to this issue, there are a couple of
15 things that we also find that are of concern
16 with respect to the Military Justice
17 Improvement Act. It seems to us that it would
18 involve significant personnel and
19 administrative costs. Essentially, it is a
20 bill that calls for a separate military
21 prosecution system outside the chain of
22 command staffed by military lawyers who must

1 be senior judge advocates with prosecutor
2 qualifications at the level of O6 or above.

3 We have found that the existing
4 pool of O6 advocates is finite and to
5 implement the MJIA, these qualified judge
6 advocates would have to be reassigned from
7 other assignments that are related to
8 important aspects of military legal practice.
9 The problem with this -- in regard to this
10 specific issue is that this bill, although we
11 believe that it would involve significant
12 personnel and administrative costs includes
13 the statutory restriction on the expenditure
14 of additional resources or authorization of
15 additional personnel. That's merely an
16 additional specific comment with respect to
17 the MJIA that went into our considerations.

18 Professor Hillman, did you want to
19 make a statement or present your dissent at
20 this point?

21 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
22 Thank you for the opportunity to speak and I

1 apologize for not being able to attend in
2 person.

3 I think these are very important
4 recommendations and I appreciate the work that
5 the subcommittee has put into this effort and
6 also to the members of the Panel for convening
7 to review these findings and recommendations.
8 So I won't reiterate what I said before when
9 I explained why I thought that prosecutorial
10 discretion belongs with trained and
11 experienced prosecutors, the same people that
12 civilian systems and federal and state and
13 also most well respected military systems rely
14 on. But I'll just focus on what I view as a
15 fundamental difference between the way I see
16 the chain of command and the way the other
17 subcommittee members see it.

18 Commanders are critical to
19 military operational success and also to
20 success in solving difficult problems like
21 military sexual assault, but the hierarchy of
22 the military and the impact of rank and of the

1 demographic balance of the military leaves us
2 with a different problem with respect to
3 sexual assault than in other circles. And the
4 subcommittee report likens the sexual violence
5 in the military precisely to what happens in
6 the civil sector and I just don't think that
7 that's a reasonable conclusion, nor do I think
8 that commanders can be considered as the
9 solution without some checks on the power that
10 they have in the military justice system.

11 And really, our military justice
12 system has already evolved significantly to
13 reduce the authority of commanders in many
14 ways that Judge Jones just recounted. This
15 would be a step that would make the court-
16 martial process and the entire, from beginning
17 to end, response to sexual assault something
18 the commander had a role in, but not something
19 the commander controlled in a way that
20 undermines the legitimacy of the entire system
21 and rejects international norms and U.S. norms
22 of procedural justice.

1 So I'll just note that to me, the
2 fact that commanders continue to run into
3 trouble in the high profile ways here means
4 that despite the training which we just
5 recommended also that be increased for
6 commanding officers, that putting excessive
7 legal authority in the chain of command
8 doesn't solve the problem of commanders erring
9 in this really critical role. And the quasi-
10 judicial role that Judge Jones just mentioned,
11 the training that we're adding to help
12 commanders manage that, puts them in a very
13 difficult position.

14 So the subcommittee report
15 actually talks quite a bit about the training,
16 grooming officers for command, and yet we've
17 had officers groomed for command who have --
18 who continue to make missteps in this area
19 that redound to the detriment of victims of
20 sexual violence in the military today just as
21 has happened in the past. And I would
22 privilege the comments of those survivors of

1 military sexual assault rather than those of
2 commanding officers who I think should retain
3 the authority to take all these steps that are
4 so important in changing the climate and
5 advancing the cultural changes that will
6 reduce the incidence of sexual assault in the
7 military, but I see no reason to leave this
8 decision to prosecute in the chain of command.

9 Thank you, Judge Jones. That's
10 all I have to say.

11 CHAIR JONES: Thank you, Professor
12 Hillman.

13 Is there comment, deliberations,
14 questions from the Panel?

15 MR. BRYANT: Yes, Judge Jones.

16 CHAIR JONES: Mr. Bryant.

17 MR. BRYANT: I had intended to
18 save the majority of my remarks for
19 Recommendation 19, but --

20 CHAIR JONES: You know, I think 19
21 and 15 are so similar that -- feel free to go
22 ahead now.

1 MR. BRYANT: Okay, I thought I
2 would wait until they got -- it was actually
3 on the board. I disagree with Recommendation
4 15, Recommendation 1, Recommendation 18, and
5 I don't know at what point we're going to get
6 to that, and Recommendation 19.

7 And let me say that in terms of
8 specifying sexual assault offenses, I agree
9 with those who say that if we're going to
10 limit or change the authority to prefer
11 charges and initiate general courts-martial,
12 it should be for all felony-level offenses,
13 not just for sexual assault. To take that one
14 crime and carve that out of the rest of the
15 mix really is -- really will cause some
16 problems. So when I speak of this, I'm
17 talking about the general authority of
18 commanders who have the rank and the position
19 to initiate general courts-martial in any
20 felony-level offense.

21 My memory and my understanding of
22 my notes from when we were in this very

1 courtroom at one point is that the generals
2 and admirals who came before us, all well
3 intentioned, all well experienced -- and I
4 want to say before I go further that I
5 certainly admire the work and the diligence
6 that the Role of the Commander Subcommittee
7 has put into this. I respect your work and
8 your findings and your effort to come up with
9 these recommendations. So it is with all of
10 that respect for the work that you've put in
11 that I respectfully disagree with these
12 following recommendations.

13 When we were here at one point
14 with several generals and admirals on this
15 very topic, what came through to me and what
16 my notes and memory seem to say is that the
17 primary reason they did not want this
18 authority taken away from them was they felt
19 that it would somehow affect morale in the
20 unit. Well, what are we going to say to the
21 men and women who we send into battle? Are we
22 going to suddenly say that Congress does not

1 trust us to make the decisions in courts-
2 martial when they trust us to send the sons
3 and daughters of this country into battle?

4 And the other thing was that some
5 idea that I want the troops to know that if
6 they have committed these crimes, I'm the
7 person they're going to have to answer to, and
8 I just don't see realistically that either one
9 of those are true, are going to be true. I
10 asked during other deliberations, do we have
11 any idea that the average soldier, whether he
12 be enlisted or even an officer, is going to
13 have less respect for their commander and all
14 the other war-fighting decisions that have to
15 be made just because they're not now going to
16 be the ones who will decide who is going to be
17 court-martialed if we give that over to the
18 professional prosecutors who exist in the
19 military.

20 The reason that I just don't
21 believe that is going to be true is that we
22 have heard nothing publicly, nothing from

1 Congress, nothing before this committee that
2 the changes that Congress has already made in
3 restricting the authority of the convening
4 authorities in a variety of ways in terms of
5 what punishments and when they can do and
6 initiate certain charges, we have heard
7 nothing that suddenly there's a lack of
8 respect or a lack of morale within the units
9 because, gee whiz, Congress doesn't trust
10 General Smith and I don't mean any General
11 Smith in particular. I mean a hypothetical
12 General Smith or an Admiral Jones. So we
13 haven't seen any of that. And I just really
14 doubt that we would see it if suddenly or
15 through legislation the convening authority
16 was taken away in general courts-martial and
17 given to prosecutors as, much more eloquently,
18 Dean Hillman has told us about today and
19 earlier.

20 The other reason that I don't
21 think it would have that effect is that I
22 honestly don't believe that the majority of

1 the people in the military even know who the
2 convening authority is for general courts-
3 martial. I just don't believe it. And some
4 proof of that, if you don't mind, is that
5 obviously, unscientific, random survey that I
6 have taken the liberty over the last several
7 months of asking people, both active and
8 retired, in my neighborhood, in my social
9 circles, in airports, at Portsmouth Naval
10 Hospital where for family reasons I've had to
11 be several days recently, asking active duty
12 and retired and in my neighborhood, like a lot
13 of neighborhoods in the Norfolk-Virginia Beach
14 area, we have -- this is just to my knowledge,
15 there may be others, a retired commodore, five
16 retired Navy captains, one active duty Navy
17 captain and a retired Army O6 colonel.

18 When I take these random surveys
19 and just go up and say who's the convening
20 authority in your unit for general courts-
21 martial, often the enlisted people just give
22 me a blank stare because they don't know what

1 I'm talking about. The officers know what I'm
2 talking about and are generally unsure. When
3 I say this is random, I'm talking 12 to 15
4 people total, that's all, just walk up and say
5 hi, I'm conducting a random anonymous survey,
6 do you know who the convening authority of
7 general courts-martial is?

8 Some of the officers will give me
9 a name or a position. And I will say are you
10 sure? And they'll say no, I'm not sure.

11 I remember a particular active
12 duty field grade Army officer who was at a
13 particular post in the United States, that's
14 where he was stationed. And when I asked him
15 he said I think it's the post commander. That
16 would make sense because we're all within his
17 purview. But, said this field grade Army
18 officer, it might be the division commander
19 because our division headquarters are at a
20 different post. He wasn't sure. And I just
21 don't think as we talk about that and look at
22 that and use our common sense that this idea

1 that the average soldier needs to know that
2 General So and So or Admiral So and So is the
3 person they're going to have to answer to and
4 who can potentially cause them to be charged
5 with felony offenses, I don't think they know
6 that any more than the average citizen can
7 name their prosecutor, except when they see it
8 on the ballot every four years or can name who
9 their chief of police is because it's not
10 something that's in the forefront of their
11 mind.

12 I hope that our sailors and
13 soldiers and airmen do not constantly have in
14 the forefront of their mind with all the other
15 things that we expect of them who is the
16 convening authority if I commit a felony. If
17 that were true in the civilian world, then
18 maybe we wouldn't have as much crime if they
19 had constantly in the forefront of their minds
20 who is the prosecutor, who is the chief of
21 police. I hope what they have in mind is how
22 they're going to do their jobs and they have

1 no idea that at some point they may commit
2 something that's going to cause them to come
3 before a general court-martial.

4 So I don't think it's going to
5 affect morale. I don't think that the idea
6 that the average person in the military knows
7 who the convening authority is true because I
8 did not find that to be true in my informal
9 survey of primarily O6s and below.

10 So the other aspect of that that
11 comes in my mind is that on one of our site
12 visits -- this was just the Comparative
13 Systems Subcommittee, and we agreed that those
14 comments would be off the record and not
15 attributable to anyone in particular. But
16 among the site visits at a major military
17 facility, we found that the convening
18 authority there had absorbed convening
19 authority from other lower-level convening
20 authorities and was the convening authority
21 for about 100,000 troops.

22 We also heard that that convening

1 authority always followed the advice of his
2 SJA. We also heard that that convening
3 authority for approximately 100,000 troops,
4 and a direct question was how long is spent on
5 convening authority matters in a week or a
6 month, and without hesitation, the answer was
7 15 minutes a week.

8 Assuming that's all it needs and
9 that's all it takes, and I have every belief
10 that that is all it takes, if you're just
11 doing what the SJA says every time it comes
12 up. I don't know why it would be the end of
13 good order and discipline as we know it if
14 those decisions were being made by a
15 professional military prosecutor.

16 Another example and I'm sorry that
17 this answer is long, but since it's going to
18 cover several recommendations, we all bring
19 our own experiences and many of you have
20 fantastic experience way beyond anything that
21 I could imagine in terms of your military
22 background. And I respect that and I

1 appreciate that from every one of you. But I
2 recall when I was first enlisted before I went
3 to Infantry OCS, guard duty. And for guard
4 duty, you had to be able to name the, quote,
5 chain of command. It was amazing how many
6 people could not remember the chain of command
7 beyond, say, the brigade commander, even
8 though you know that when you went to guard
9 duty, if you didn't know those things, you
10 were going to be standing in front of a first
11 sergeant the next morning and then over and
12 over. So they drilled us. They had us
13 memorize it before we ever went. And many,
14 many people could not remember their chain of
15 command, even as important we stressed that it
16 was. So again, I have to wonder who is aware
17 of, in the military today -- I don't even know
18 if people stand guard duty anymore, but I can
19 recall once I became an officer, being the
20 officer of the guard and when I was the one
21 asking the questions about chain of command,
22 and again it was difficult for those who were

1 assigned guard duty, even though they had been
2 drilled and knew from former guard duties that
3 when they came there they better know the
4 chain of command which did not frankly involve
5 a question of who is the convening authority
6 of a general court-martial. And I don't mean
7 to be flip about it, but it involved the
8 normal general chain of command, those who
9 have their pictures on the wall.

10 And at Portsmouth Medical
11 Hospital, by the way, the picture of the
12 convening authority is not on the wall over
13 there because that's not what affects the
14 average person at that facility which is a
15 major facility treating Army, Navy, Air Force,
16 all sorts of people in our region.

17 But even as officer of the guard,
18 I found that the ire of the lower commands
19 came the most when a soldier couldn't name who
20 the first sergeant was and I'll never forget
21 the day I went back the next morning and said,
22 "First Sergeant, So and So didn't know who is

1 his first sergeant." And of course, you could
2 imagine the verbiage that came out of his
3 mouth and said he will know who I am before
4 this day is over.

5 So all those anecdotal stories
6 just support how, in my mind, it's not really
7 going to have a morale effect, nor the other
8 effects in terms of good order and discipline
9 or I want them to know they're going to be
10 answering to me because I don't think the --
11 I don't mean to repeat myself -- I don't think
12 he average troop and my informal,
13 unscientific, admittedly unscientific survey,
14 I didn't find that field grade officers were
15 sure who was the convening authority for
16 general courts-martial were, was, is.

17 The other thing that we heard from
18 the admirals and generals here that was, if we
19 took this away from commanders, whether it's
20 the convening authority or commanders, in
21 general, and it was being handled somewhere
22 else, that they really wouldn't be paying

1 attention to it. If I'm not responsible for
2 charging, then I'm not really going to care
3 about the other aspects of this which struck
4 me as a very odd thing, if not a very
5 dangerous thing to be saying. Because I can't
6 believe that just because I'm not going to be
7 convening authority, that suddenly sexual
8 assault in their unit isn't going to be on
9 their radar.

10 The third or fourth aspect was,
11 well, just like -- and they gave us an
12 example, when these offenses occur in town,
13 they're, quote, off my radar, said one of the
14 general officers. Off my radar when they
15 occur in town. And frankly, again, at one of
16 our site visits, at a major military facility
17 there, you've got an awful lot of prosecutions
18 were taking place in the surrounding cities,
19 we heard just the opposite, no, I track those
20 every minute. Those cases that are going to
21 be prosecuted by civilians I track every
22 minute. I believe our commanders, as

1 conscientious as they are in preparing their
2 troops for war-fighting, are going to follow
3 charges whether they are initiated by a
4 military commander or whether initiated by a
5 senior military prosecutor who does this as a
6 profession.

7 The other thing that strikes me
8 about the necessity to do that is, and this
9 may get into other aspects, Judge Jones, of
10 other recommendations is the recommendation
11 against higher review. It would be higher
12 review of these decisions by the secretaries
13 of the services or the next highest general
14 court-martial level. It would seem to me,
15 with the presentation and attitude of, yes, we
16 should do this, we should keep this, this
17 should be within our purview, I'm confident
18 that I'm doing the right thing. I'm confident
19 that I'm getting good advice from my SJA, it
20 just seems to me that the better tactic and
21 the better strategy and I'm surprised that
22 we're not hearing it from the military would

1 be, yes, review what I do. I'm not -- I have
2 every confidence that what I do is right. Go
3 ahead and review it. Secretary of the Army,
4 he can send it to the President, because I
5 know what I'm doing. And yet, we're hearing
6 just sort of the opposite. We don't want to
7 do that. It may cause undue pressure,
8 unnecessary command influence.

9 And so I don't understand,
10 frankly, the military for whom I have a great
11 deal of respect in their many, many functions
12 that they have to do and do for us, I don't
13 understand why they are resisting review of
14 their decisions at a higher level if they're
15 so confident that what they're doing is, in
16 fact, the right thing.

17
18 The last -- I'm going to stop in
19 just a minute. The last thing that occurs to
20 me is that at least when you have prosecutors
21 making these decisions, lawyers, licensed
22 lawyers in whatever state, there is always the

1 possibility of a review of their decision
2 making in terms of whether or not it's ethical
3 by their state bar associations and I realize
4 that there is a body of law that goes back and
5 forth at the state bar associations can't
6 dictate what a government lawyer can do and I
7 experienced that when I was in the U.S.
8 Attorney's Office. But that prospect is there
9 that those decisions to prosecute without
10 sufficient grounds are reviewable as an
11 ethical violation. That doesn't exist in the
12 military commanders. So again, I wonder why
13 they would be critical of a review of their
14 decision making process.

15 In short and to sum up, I
16 respectfully disagree with the subcommittee's
17 Recommendations 1, 15, and 19 and associated.

18 CHAIR JONES: Thank you, Mr.
19 Bryant. I guess I should say we are now
20 deliberating as the Panel, so I think I've
21 made most of the remarks that I intended to
22 make.

1 Are there additional statements or
2 remarks that anyone else would like to make?
3 And I know, Professor Hillman, you're on
4 there. Ms. Fernandez, are you on
5 there?

6 MS. FERNANDEZ: I am.

7 CHAIR JONES: Thank you very much.
8 Okay. Any other comments?

9 Admiral?

10 VADM HOUCK: As a member of the
11 subcommittee who is supportive of the
12 recommendations of the subcommittee, I want to
13 make just a couple of very brief remarks.

14 I think fundamentally the Uniform
15 Code of Military Justice has played a
16 fundamental role in the success of the U.S.
17 armed forces over the past several decades and
18 that the role of the commander in the UCMJ has
19 also been fundamental to the success of the
20 UCMJ and the role that the UCMJ has played.

21 Throughout this nearly year-long
22 process, at every turn, at every opportunity,

1 I and others have asked the question of
2 proponents of change of removing the commander
3 from the process for empirical evidence, for
4 some evidence to suggest that this would make
5 a difference, that the significant and
6 arguably radical change, removing the
7 commander from the process would be supported
8 by some notion that it was going to make a
9 difference. This question has been asked of
10 the domestic proponents. It's been asked of
11 proponents from foreign militaries. It's been
12 asked of law enforcement and judicial officers
13 from civilian jurisdictions, even in the
14 United States.

15 There has been no evidence, none,
16 zero evidence that this change would make a
17 difference. Judge Jones made that point in
18 her preliminary remarks, but I wanted to
19 reinforce it. There has been speculation.
20 There has been anecdote, but there has been no
21 evidence that this would make a difference.

22 I think one of the things that has

1 gone a little but unnoticed in this process is
2 that what I think is the interesting
3 phenomenon that of the proposal for these
4 changes, that the proposals are not to remove
5 the military from the process, but to put the
6 onus of the decision making on military
7 prosecutors. I find it interesting and
8 fascinating that not a single trained,
9 licensed, military prosecutor that has
10 appeared before this Panel throughout the
11 course of the past year has supported the very
12 change that is supposed to put military
13 prosecutors in charge of this process.

14 I think some might argue that
15 yeah, that's because many of them were on
16 active duty and are beholden to the chain of
17 command and are going to be unwilling to speak
18 freely about that. I'm not. Having served
19 for 27 years as a licensed attorney in the
20 United States armed forces, I've seen it in a
21 variety of vantage points.

22 I think it would be a significant

1 error to remove commanders from this decision-
2 making process because I believe that the
3 commanders play a constructive role which is
4 not to say that commanders are always perfect.
5 In a system as large as the United States
6 armed forces and as many people who are
7 involved in decisions, you will have people
8 that make decisions that are questionable.
9 You will have people who make decisions that
10 are arguably wrong. But I think that by and
11 large, and this admittedly is anecdotal on my
12 own part, the dialogue that goes on between
13 judge advocates and commanders who know their
14 units is enormously productive and enormously
15 beneficial and serves the interest of justice.

16 I think that there are many, many
17 changes that this Panel is going to endorse,
18 not only the Role of the Commander
19 Subcommittee, but the other two subcommittees
20 as well, significant changes that are going to
21 make a difference in fighting the scourge and
22 contemptible crime of sexual assault in the

1 military. I think those changes will make a
2 difference. I do not think that removing the
3 commander from the process is going to be
4 productive, but that the other changes are the
5 way to go. Thank you.

6 CHAIR JONES: Thank you, Admiral
7 Houck.

8 Is there anyone else who would
9 like to comment? Ms. Holtzman?

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Judge
11 Jones. I made comments on this issue before,
12 but since the dissenters are speaking out, I
13 just thought that the public should not think
14 that by our silence we are not responding to
15 the dissent. So I just want to make a few
16 points on which I made before. I'll try to be
17 real brief.

18 First of all, the claim that we
19 need to privilege victims, we have heard from
20 no victims of crimes other than sexual assault
21 and yet, this is a change over the fact the
22 prosecution of every serious crime in the

1 military, aside from specifically military
2 crimes, as you mentioned, Judge Jones, such as
3 desertion. We have no evidence to support the
4 need for such a change with regard to those
5 crimes and yet that demand has been made to us
6 without evidence.

7 Secondly, the idea that somehow
8 putting the decision making into the hands of
9 professional prosecutors is a panacea is
10 wrong. I want to say first I have no military
11 experience and I don't speak from that
12 perspective. But I was a prosecutor in the
13 fourth largest office in the United States for
14 eight years. I have some familiarity with
15 that system. I would say most of the people
16 who worked for me were dedicated,
17 conscientious, trained, caring people. But
18 they made mistakes and right now, in Brooklyn,
19 New York there is a special panel that has
20 been convened to review cases of serious
21 prosecutorial misconduct over the past 20 or
22 25 years.

1 So the idea that, oh, if we take
2 it away from a commander and give it to a
3 professional prosecutor we are going to have
4 justice. I mean that's just nonsense. And I
5 think sadly contemporary history shows the
6 contrary. People are human beings and they
7 can make mistakes. What you try to do is have
8 trained, competent people and actually this
9 system in the military justice has its checks
10 and balances which we don't really have in a
11 prosecutorial system. After all, the
12 convening authority must, M-U-S-T, has to,
13 discuss the decision of whether to prefer
14 charges with his or her SJA which means there
15 is already a discussion of a need to prove
16 your case. And the special judge advocate can
17 raise any disagreement that he or she has with
18 the convening authority to higher level. But
19 the idea that there's no review, I think, with
20 all due respect is not quite accurate. There
21 is a check and balance in this system.

22 And I think without spelling out

1 how the prosecutorial role is going to be
2 played here, it would be irresponsible to
3 change a system and say oh, we'll let the
4 professional prosecutors handle it without
5 describing how that's going to happen and
6 without funding it.

7 And finally, the idea that people
8 don't know who the convening authority is and
9 the anecdotal research that's been done, I
10 think that that's -- my own sense is that that
11 is the results of that endeavor reflect my own
12 intuition which is that many people don't know
13 who the convening authority is and the
14 conclusion that can be drawn from that is not
15 that you need to change the system, but that
16 the absence of knowledge of who the convening
17 authority is, is not affecting the decision
18 one way or another of the person who is a
19 victim of crime to come forward. That's the
20 conclusion that I draw. I know everybody is
21 very passionate about changing a system that
22 has produced too much sexual assault and too

1 much pain and sorrow for the victims and too
2 much disgrace for a great military and to this
3 nation. But we should not be looking for a
4 silver bullet that's going to solve this
5 problem. It's an unrealistic effort. We owe
6 the victims more than that.

7 I think there are serious and
8 important and systematic changes that are
9 being made, need to be made such as Special
10 Victims' Counsel that will have an enormous
11 and profound effect on how the military
12 handles this system and how victims handle it.
13 But I think this is an ill-advised, not
14 thought through proposal, very well
15 intentioned because people want to solve this
16 problem, but the problem -- this is not the
17 solution to the problem. Thank you.

18 CHAIR JONES: Thank you, Ms.
19 Holtzman. Anyone else? Colonel Cook?

20 COL COOK: If I may? And I agree
21 with the subcommittee on this and with the
22 comments just offered by Representative

1 Holtzman and Admiral Houck. And one of the
2 things I just wanted to take on from what
3 Representative Holtzman had said and one of my
4 biggest concerns is as you noted, the
5 convening authority now must confer with the
6 judge advocate. If we take this out and put
7 it just in the judge advocate channels, that
8 reciprocal requirement wouldn't be there and
9 I will say that you would take away a fairness
10 perspective that's there.

11 The military is not the civilian
12 community where somebody may get into trouble.
13 You go through a disciplinary action. They go
14 to jail. They go home. They get probation.
15 And the problem is solved. Within the
16 military that command structure and that
17 command unit continues to exist. The
18 questions that are presented are not always
19 just legal decisions. Good order and
20 discipline is more than that. Things like bad
21 checks; somebody not doing their job or
22 they're late for work, dereliction of duty, if

1 you will; an improper relationship, for us,
2 fraternization. They affect the way that
3 command is going to operate. They affect the
4 morale and welfare of everybody if they're not
5 addressed and I do agree with that concept.

6 You don't pull the convening
7 authority out of one offense, but not all. So
8 assume you pull them out of all, you need that
9 judge advocate and commander discussion. The
10 lawyer is going to bring to the perspective,
11 hey, this is what the requirements are. This
12 is everything you need to be aware of. And
13 the commander is going to bring to the
14 discussion the holistic impact it has on that
15 unit, what should be done.

16 The fact that somebody does
17 something wrong doesn't automatically mean
18 it's a court martial and there's a whole host
19 of tools that are out there. So I'd say that
20 the system the way it is now that forces a
21 convening authority to confer with the judge
22 advocate, especially if the general court

1 martial convening authority, it is a high-
2 level officer who's got a lot of experience
3 providing that advice, the benefit to the
4 entire community that's affected, the unit,
5 the accused, and the victims that are
6 involved, it's not all crimes, have a person
7 as a victim, some of them are victimless, but
8 everybody's interests are considered as part
9 of a holistic review with those two people
10 being involved. And to take out one side or
11 the other, the military is going to lose that
12 synergy that, as Admiral Houck said, has
13 proven effective and the perception of
14 fairness over the years.

15 CHAIR JONES: Thank you, Colonel
16 Cook.

17 Ms. Fernandez, General Dunn,
18 General McGuire, any further comments?

19 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai
20 Fernandez. I don't have any at the time.

21 CHAIR JONES: All right, thank
22 you. PROF. HILLMAN: Judge

1 Jones?

2 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

3 PROF. HILLMAN: This is Beth
4 Hillman.

5 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry,
6 Professor.

7 PROF. HILLMAN: I'd just like to
8 make a point briefly.

9 CHAIR JONES: Sure, go ahead.

10 PROF. HILLMAN: I just wanted to
11 say that I appreciate the comments of
12 everybody on these issues. I understand that
13 we disagree. It's a perspective on where the
14 system is headed and how we're negotiating
15 around what I see as a central problem as
16 opposed to whether this is -- that all the
17 changes actually are able to support this sort
18 of central premise.

19 I just wanted to mention in
20 response to Admiral Houck's statement that
21 there's no judge advocate for the record
22 stating that we should make this change.

1 I have heard from many judge
2 advocates who think that we should, but
3 they're not on the record for a reason,
4 because they're in the line of duty, because
5 it doesn't help their -- there are some who
6 have written about this, but it's not in their
7 interest and it's actually not in their job
8 description to get out there and to make
9 statements that are contrary to what their
10 commands are saying on this very issue and
11 testimony before us.

12 The military is not monolithic.
13 There are many brilliant lawyers throughout
14 the services who have a range of different
15 opinions on all the issues that we're trying
16 to address. And I appreciate all of that
17 experience that we hear from, but considering
18 all of those judge advocates out there with
19 all the different experiences they have as
20 agreeing on any particular point is just a
21 mistake in terms of understanding where
22 they're coming from on this. That's all.

1 Thanks, Judge Jones.

2 CHAIR JONES: Thank you,
3 Professor. All right, then with respect to --
4 and let me just go back up to the podium for
5 a minute. Will you put Recommendation 19 up
6 there, the actual recommendation? Pardon me?
7 I think we were showing 15 originally,
8 correct? Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

9 The reason 19 is not even in the
10 deck is it says the same thing as 15. So at
11 this point, I believe that we have two
12 dissents from the recommendations which are 15
13 and 1 of the Role of the Commander
14 Subcommittee, with the remaining members of
15 the Panel in favor of those recommendations.
16 Is that correct?

17 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, that's
18 correct.

19 CHAIR JONES: Then those two
20 recommendations are accepted.

21 All right, I'd like to move on
22 then to Recommendation 2 of the Role of the

1 Commander Subcommittee.

2 This is actually a recommendation
3 that's also been made in substance by the
4 Comparative Systems Committee. And it's our
5 recommendation that Congress should not adopt
6 Section 2 of the Victims Protection Act of
7 2014. And we believe that the decision
8 whether to refer a case to courts martial
9 should continue to be a decision formed by the
10 convening authority in consultation with his
11 or her staff judge advocate.

12 The act that we're recommending
13 against is actually legislation that would
14 mandate secretarial review of cases involving
15 sex-related offenses when the senior trial
16 counsel on a case recommends that charges
17 should be referred to trial and the convening
18 authority
19 upon the advice of her staff judge advocate
20 decides not to refer charges. And I think you
21 alluded to this, Mr. Bryant, a little bit.

22 MR. BRYANT: Yes, ma'am.

1 CHAIR JONES: Basically, our
2 subcommittee, as well as the Comparative
3 Systems Subcommittee, think it's just simply
4 inappropriate to elevate the assessments of a
5 trial counsel and trial counsel are generally
6 more junior and less experienced than the
7 staff judge advocate who is advising the
8 convening authority to elevating that
9 assessment to require review when it's in the
10 convening authority and a much more
11 experienced staff judge advocate.

12 So we agree with Comparative
13 Systems, and although theirs has not been
14 deliberated or voted on yet, we would
15 recommend that you agree with our
16 Recommendation 2. Is there any discussion
17 with respect to that?

18 Mr. Bryant?

19 MR. BRYANT: Yes. Judge Jones,
20 thank you. Again, it goes without saying that
21 I have the great respect for the work that
22 this Role of the Commander Subcommittee has

1 done.

2 In terms of review at a secretary
3 level, I would re-adopt my earlier statements.
4 I guess in a courtroom, Judge Jones, you would
5 hear one of the lawyers say "I have a
6 continuing objection."

7 CHAIR JONES: You've got it, Mr.
8 Bryant.

9 MR. BRYANT: Yes, to that. But I
10 just want to point out that our commanders at
11 almost every level, at every level are subject
12 to review in almost everything else they do,
13 especially when they are in their war-fighting
14 capacity. The decision to launch an air
15 strike, the decision to call in artillery, the
16 decision even to where to place a particular
17 outpost is going to be subject to review,
18 especially when something goes wrong.

19 There have been numerous times in
20 Afghanistan and one in particular stands out
21 in my mind that I'm aware of and watched young
22 Sergeant White receive the Congressional Medal

1 of Honor this week in the East Room of the
2 White House and that particular unit, not that
3 event that he was involved in, but another
4 event by that unit was highly scrutinized at
5 all levels, up through the United States
6 Senate over the decision of where that unit
7 was placed, what preparations were made to
8 defend the perimeter, to supply water, all
9 sorts of things was questioned and reviewed up
10 through two- and three-star generals.

11 Who was being reviewed? A company
12 commander, a battalion commander, and a
13 brigade commander. It went on for over a
14 year, maybe two. I may be short on how long
15 it went on. But the point is -- and they were
16 all eventually cleared of having -- of any
17 wrongdoing or dereliction of duty or any of
18 those things. But my point is our military
19 commanders are subject to review in much, much
20 more serious events when life and death is on
21 the line for our young soldiers and sailors
22 and airmen and why there wouldn't be the

1 tactic, the strategy, for the military to come
2 in here and say yes, by golly, go ahead,
3 review me, I ask that you review me because
4 I'm confident that the things that I do are
5 right. Or when I play prosecutor, when I play
6 judge, I know I'm confident that I'm doing the
7 right thing. So please, review my decisions.
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIR JONES: All right. I just
10 have one comment which is to say that I think
11 Recommendation 2 is not so much about kicking
12 a decision to a higher up, it's about --
13 because frankly, with respect to charging
14 decisions by convening authorities, there are
15 provisions for when there's a disagreement
16 with the staff judge advocate for there to be
17 higher review. Article 6 provides for it.
18 Congress has now more legislation that will
19 send it to as high as the secretary.

20 This provision, I think, is really
21 about having someone junior in the process
22 being able to stop the train and ask for a

1 review to go forward. And it seems even -- I
2 won't say even from, in my experience it would
3 be unusual to have or to permit someone who is
4 junior in the system to be able to not just
5 challenge and debate, but also have the
6 ability to engender a review above a more
7 senior person. And I think that's the main
8 reason behind that.

9 Did anyone else have a comment?

10 Mr. Bryant, I understand that you
11 dissent. Does anyone else dissent from
12 Recommendation 2? All right, then that's
13 accepted. Thank you.

14 Recommendation 3.

15 COL COOK: I'm sorry, Judge Jones,
16 just to qualify, Recommendation 2 that's
17 accepted, but you're using the language that
18 the Comparative Systems report had done or the
19 language that you have --

20 CHAIR JONES: No, our --

21 COL COOK: Your language, okay.

22 CHAIR JONES: Our language.

1 Recognizing that we may have to reconcile them
2 when we deliberate Comparative Systems.

3 COL COOK: I just wanted to
4 clarify.

5 CHAIR JONES: Right, thank you,
6 Colonel.

7 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, can
8 you hear me? This is Beth Hillman.

9 CHAIR JONES: Oh, yes, Professor.

10 PROF. HILLMAN: I'm just in the
11 continuing objection category of Mr. Bryant,
12 just to be clear on that.

13 CHAIR JONES: Oh, all right.
14 Thank you.

15 PROF. HILLMAN: Thank you.

16 CHAIR JONES: Do we have three?
17 Let me start talking about it anyway. Section
18 3(d) of the Victims Protection Act of 2014
19 calls for a climate assessment following each
20 report of a sexual offense. And frankly, our
21 thinking in recommending that Congress not
22 adopt this fairly straight-forward, it's just

1 not clear to us at least, the subcommittee,
2 how that assessment would necessarily be
3 effective. And also, we have a lot of concern
4 that has been discussed by the subcommittees
5 and panels before about more surveys causing
6 more survey fatigue. And frankly, we think
7 there are probably better ways to respond to
8 each individual sexual assault incident.

9 And our recommendation is not only
10 that Congress should not adopt 3(d) of the
11 VPA, but also that the Secretary of Defense
12 should direct the formulation of a review
13 process to be applied following each reported
14 instance of sexual assault to determine the
15 noncriminal factors surrounding the event.
16 And such reviews should address what measures
17 ought to be taken to lessen the likelihood of
18 recurrence and that could be physical
19 security, lighting, access to alcohol offered
20 at establishments, etcetera. I have very
21 little doubt that those types of things are
22 not being done now by military investigators,

1 but I think as with all things, having a
2 formulation for such a review process could
3 standardize it and would be very helpful.

4 And I know that some of commands
5 have developed review processes and we think
6 they should be evaluated in connection with
7 this so that the DoD can formulate a review
8 process. Are there any comments with respect
9 to Recommendation 3?

10 COL COOK: Judge Jones, a
11 question. You're not suggesting that they
12 come up the review process, but the --

13 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry, I'm just
14 having a little trouble hearing you.

15 COL COOK: I'm sorry. In that
16 recommendation, I don't have a problem with
17 the review process. I guess my question is
18 you're not suggesting that be pulled up at a
19 higher level to review them more centrally.
20 It can be a review process that's built in at
21 the local command as they do it.

22 CHAIR JONES: Yes, I think that

1 only the local command can do it. I agree.

2 Thank you. Anything else?

3 MR. BRYANT: Judge Jones --

4 CHAIR JONES: Yes, Mr. Bryant.

5 MR. BRYANT: -- I just want to

6 make it clear for the record that my

7 continuing objection does not apply to

8 Recommendation 3. I do agree with

9 Recommendation 3.

10 CHAIR JONES: Okay, thank you. I

11 think we can move now to -- you can tell me

12 what's next on your slide deck. Fourteen,

13 okay.

14 You know, in the course of the

15 subcommittee's review of reporting, generally,

16 by sexual assault victims or failure to report

17 for that matter, we learned that a number of

18 -- could you put the findings up, please?

19 Particularly junior members of the

20 military scored lowest in understanding the

21 options for filing a restricted report and the

22 results of this survey that was done showed

1 that nearly one half of junior enlisted
2 personnel surveyed thought that they could
3 make a restricted report to someone in their
4 chain of command.

5 So for that reason, we have
6 recommended 14 and let me read the text of it
7 to you: "that the Secretary of Defense should
8 direct DoD SAPRO to ensure sexual assault
9 reporting options are clarified to ensure all
10 members of the military, including the most
11 junior personnel, understand their options for
12 making a restricted or an unrestricted report
13 and the channels through which they can make
14 a report."

15 It was pretty clear as we listened
16 to witnesses and also did site visits, for
17 instance, that there was some confusion about
18 who you could report to and still have a
19 restricted report. And so we think that this
20 is a very important recommendation so that in
21 this particular area which is so important to
22 victims that there is a real effort to clarify

1 the rules.

2 Are there any comments with
3 respect to 14?

4 MR. BRYANT: Just to say that my
5 standing objection does not apply to
6 Recommendation 14.

7 CHAIR JONES: All right, thank
8 you, Mr. Bryant. Then the Panel will accept
9 Recommendation 14. Thanks.

10 I think then we should have 16,
11 17, or 18 next? Seventeen, okay.

12 All right, Recommendation 17, "the
13 Secretary of Defense should direct the
14 Military Justice Review Group or the Joint
15 Service Committee to evaluate if there are
16 circumstances when a general court martial
17 convening authority should not have authority
18 to override an Article 32 investigating
19 officer's recommendation against referral of
20 an investigative charge for trial by court
21 martial."

22 Obviously, at this stage and never

1 has a convening authority been bound by the
2 recommendation made by an investigating
3 officer from an Article 32. And so obviously
4 the question here is whether or not they
5 should now under certain circumstances be
6 bound by it. And our recommendation is simply
7 that this is something that ought to be
8 reviewed in either the Joint Service Committee
9 or the Military Justice Review Group, or both
10 of them review appropriate places to review
11 it.

12 Obviously, Article 32 has changed
13 with most recent legislation. And I think at
14 this point it's fair to say that it's not
15 entirely clear what the scope of Article 32s
16 are going to be in the future. They appear to
17 be trending more towards preliminary hearings
18 and clearly the victim under the new
19 legislation can no longer be ordered to appear
20 for testimony.

21 Nonetheless, it appears that
22 defense -- defendants will still be calling

1 witnesses and having testimony taken before
2 their investigating officer and so the report
3 of the investigating officer is still likely
4 not just to have a finding of probable cause
5 or no probable cause, but may still contain
6 findings with respect to the facts and the
7 strength of the proof in recommendations with
8 respect to the case on those grounds.

9 So I think at this point that's
10 one very good reason since everything is in a
11 bit of a state of flux not to be making any
12 recommendations ourselves and to be suggesting
13 -- recommending it go to these two other
14 potential reviewers.

15 Are there comments or
16 considerations anyone would like to make with
17 respect to that recommendation?

18 MR. BRYANT: Judge Jones, as a
19 member of the Comparative Systems
20 Subcommittee, I am in favor of our
21 Recommendation 45(d) which is listed as being
22 somewhat comparable, but it's not quite the

1 same as Recommendation 17, so I have some
2 hesitancy in not opposing Recommendation 17.

3 CHAIR JONES: You know what, Mr.
4 Bryant? You are completely right. There is
5 a Comparative Systems recommendation and if I
6 recall it correctly, it's that if the
7 investigating officer finds no probable cause
8 essentially, that that should be binding on
9 the convening authority and we have not
10 deliberated that because there's not yet a
11 final report.

12 I would be happy to wait on taking
13 a vote on this until we --

14 MR. BRYANT: Obviously, I defer to
15 you as chairman of your subcommittee and
16 chairman of this Panel as to whether or not we
17 do that. I would point out that one
18 difference in the Comparative Systems
19 Subcommittee recommendation is that military
20 judges would become the hearing officers in
21 what the revised Article 32 is. So that would
22 be a difference and a nuance that I don't see

1 as part of the recommendations or findings in
2 17.

3 CHAIR JONES: Well, actually, you
4 make a good point. I think I would be in
5 favor of our recommendation now that I realize
6 we're only talking about investigating
7 officers who are judge advocates, but not
8 judges, not military judges.

9 I will switch my position thanks
10 to your help and go back to recommending our
11 subcommittee's Recommendation 17. I don't see
12 that it is in conflict now with Comparative
13 Systems.

14 Any -- Colonel?

15 COL COOK: I would agree with the
16 Role of the Commander's Recommendation 17 and
17 I would object to the Comparative Systems'
18 recommendation with all due respect.

19 CHAIR JONES: Well, we're actually
20 not deliberating that now, but please feel
21 free to --

22 COL COOK: One of the big

1 differences is that you're going to mandate
2 that a military judge become the Article 32
3 officer in all cases and if they make a
4 determination in some regards it becomes
5 binding. I don't think we've had sufficient
6 evidence to jump to that. I don't think
7 there's been a need and I don't think anyone
8 has looked at the feasibility of requiring
9 military judges to sit as that 32 officer in
10 all cases.

11 And the testimony that we heard at
12 our last proceeding said that the military
13 judge that had been -- the former military
14 judge and member of the subcommittee that had
15 been presenting us information had advocated
16 that it be that same judge at the Article 32
17 and then later at the trial in most cases.

18 And again, not knowing what an
19 Article 32 is going to develop into -- if the
20 defense attorney presents their case there and
21 they have the opportunity to see how the
22 evidence lays out, do you have the same judge

1 sitting at the trial later on? So I strongly
2 concur with the recommendation that's on the
3 screen now, but I'm not sure I agree with the
4 other one.

5 CHAIR JONES: All right, thank
6 you.

7 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones?

8 CHAIR JONES: Yes, Professor.

9 PROF. HILLMAN: Thank you, Judge
10 Jones. I'm sorry -- I want to let our staff
11 -- our staff is working really hard to get
12 this report out and I regret that the Panel
13 doesn't yet have the Comparative Systems
14 Subcommittee's full report and discussion, but
15 because of all the hard work and site visits
16 and efforts of the subcommittee members and
17 then the staff, I'd like to wait to talk about
18 those until actually the Panel members have
19 the benefit of that report.

20 CHAIR JONES: All right. Are you
21 saying you don't want to take a position on
22 the recommendation we're making now?

1 PROF. HILLMAN: No, ma'am, I'm
2 not. Seventeen was fine.

3 CHAIR JONES: Okay, got you.
4 You're fine with 17. Very good. Okay.

5 Then Role of the Commander
6 Recommendation 17 is accepted, despite my best
7 efforts to confuse people.

8 What's our next -- Recommendation
9 18, "Congress should not adopt additional
10 amendments to Article 60 of the Uniform Code
11 of Military Justice beyond the significant
12 limits on discretion already adopted and the
13 President should not impose additional limits
14 to the post-trial authority of convening
15 authorities."

16 I think we're all aware of the
17 provisions in FY14 NDAA which modifies Article
18 60. And really does significantly limit post-
19 trial authority and discretion for convening
20 authorities with respect to sexual offenses.
21 They cannot disapprove findings and they can't
22 -- and it reduces their discretion to reduce

1 the court martial sentence for sexual assault
2 offenses.

3 I think I may ask Professor
4 Hillman for some help here. You have a
5 similar provision about Article 60, Professor,
6 and I think it has to do with possibly
7 amending it so that convening authorities
8 would have the right to hold off on the
9 forfeiture of the accused's assets so that
10 their families might be able to keep those for
11 their support. Am I right about that?

12 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

13
14 CHAIR JONES: Am I right about
15 that?

16 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

17 CHAIR JONES: That would be
18 something we're recommending. I frankly don't
19 know. Are there more or additional amendments
20 that are floating around right now to Article
21 60? I'll have to go to Colonel Green. Okay.

22 So it's basically then without

1 prejudice to the Comparative Systems
2 recommendation which we'll talk about at an
3 upcoming session. The Role of the Commander
4 Subcommittee's recommendation is straight out
5 that there shouldn't be any additional
6 amendments to Article 60 that would
7 significantly limit, further limit the
8 convening authority's authority.

9 Are there any comments about that?

10 MR. BRYANT: I disagree.

11 CHAIR JONES: All right, then.

12 That recommendation is also accepted.

13 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, I
14 disagree, too. I just wanted to clarify. My
15 disagreements are actually on the record in
16 the separate statement, so I'm not going to
17 interrupt you from a long distance any more on
18 that. Thank you.

19 CHAIR JONES: All right, thank
20 you, Professor.

21 Next. This recommendation has to
22 do with a topic that both the Role of the

1 Commander and the Comparative Systems
2 Committees have looked at to some extent,
3 Comparative Systems, I believe, more than the
4 Role of the Commander Subcommittee. And it
5 relates to modifying authority for specific
6 quasi-judicial responsibilities. What we're
7 talking about is discovery, selecting the
8 court martial panel, authorizing searches,
9 appointment and funding of experts and
10 witnesses and consultants, the procurement of
11 witnesses. And basically, there has been a
12 lot of discussion about the feasibility of
13 modifying the authority of the convening
14 authorities in these areas and switching some
15 of this authority to military judges.

16 It's the consensus of the Role of
17 the Commander Subcommittee that the Secretary
18 of Defense should direct the Military Justice
19 Review Group or the Joint Service Committee to
20 evaluate the feasibility and consequences of
21 doing this, of modifying authority for
22 specific quasi-judicial responsibilities that

1 are currently assigned to convening
2 authorities.

3 And as I said earlier, including
4 discovery oversight, court martial panel
5 member selections, search authorization and
6 other magistrate duties, appointment and
7 funding of expert witnesses, and expert
8 consultants and procurement of witnesses.

9 Our subcommittee just thinks that
10 a lot of further study is necessary in order
11 to fully assess what the positive and negative
12 impacts would be from changing some of these
13 pre-trial or trial responsibilities that
14 convening authorities now have.

15 Comments?

16 PROF. HILLMAN: Your Honor, this
17 is Beth Hillman. I just wondered where is
18 that in the subcommittee report? Are you
19 talking about a particular recommendation?
20 I'm sorry if I got lost there.

21 CHAIR JONES: I'm talking about
22 Recommendation 16.

1 PROF. HILLMAN: Sixteen.

2 CHAIR JONES: Sorry.

3 PROF. HILLMAN: No, no. It's my
4 fault. Fair enough, so I'm caught up. This
5 is -- I was just reading in the report about
6 it there.

7 CHAIR JONES: And this would
8 obviously be a recommendation that would
9 differ from the one that I believe your
10 subcommittee is planning to make. But I'd
11 love to hear from you on that.

12 PROF. HILLMAN: That's correct,
13 Your Honor.

14 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

15 BG DUNN: May I speak for one
16 moment?

17 CHAIR JONES: Yes, General Dunn.

18 BG DUNN: Professor Hillman, this
19 is Malinda Dunn. If I speak in error, please
20 correct me. But I think that the RSS
21 Subcommittee vision is that you would insert
22 the military judge in the process sooner, not

1 necessarily change the authority of the
2 convening authority, but insert the military
3 judge in the process sooner.

4 So in terms of this recommendation
5 and what may be discussed when the RSS
6 recommendations are discussed, I think if we
7 approve both of them it would be a little
8 inconsistent. At some point, we're going to
9 have to square this recommendation with the
10 RSS recommendation.

11 PROF. HILLMAN: Agreed, General
12 Dunn.

13 CHAIR JONES: All right. I think
14 that is exactly what my concern was. So why
15 don't we discuss Recommendation 16 and the CSS
16 recommendation together because they will be
17 inconsistent.

18 And I think actually, General
19 Dunn, it goes way beyond just having the
20 military judge come in sooner, although I
21 think that's your point that it probably would
22 be completely opposite to what we're talking

1 about here.

2 We're not against any of these
3 things. We're merely recommending study. But
4 you're right, there would be a different
5 position in the CSS recommendation.

6 BG DUNN: And these would be the
7 bodies that would study the concept of putting
8 the judge into the process earlier, so it may
9 just be a matter of modifying that --

10 CHAIR JONES: I am happy to hold
11 Recommendation 16 of our committee, the
12 subcommittee, Role of the Commander, until we
13 get to the relevant CSS recommendation.

14 All right. I think we're at the
15 last of the Role of the Commander
16 recommendations. And this recommendation is
17 that "the Secretary of Defense should
18 establish an advisory panel comprised of
19 persons external to the Department of Defense
20 to offer to the secretary and other senior
21 leaders in DoD independent assessment and
22 feedback on the effectiveness of DoD sexual

1 assault prevention and response programs and
2 politics."

3 I think the Panel has heard this
4 before, particularly from Joye Frost not so
5 long ago that in order for the Department of
6 Defense to have credibility, there need to be
7 independent organizations and evaluations by
8 independent entities conducted and that was
9 the genesis for this final recommendation for
10 the Role of the Commander Committee.

11 Are there any comments or
12 questions with respect to that?

13 I'm looking at you, Colonel Cook.
14 Any? Okay.

15 COL COOK: There's no problem.
16 External will give validation to what's out
17 there.

18 CHAIR JONES: All right, anyone
19 else? All right, thank you.

20 Recommendation 4 is also accepted.

21

22 I think, unless I've overlooked

1 one, that that concludes the recommendations
2 made by the Role of the Commander
3 Subcommittee. And I think we'll take a ten-
4 minute break at this point and come back and
5 we'll begin to discuss some of the remaining
6 Victim Services recommendations. Thanks.

7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
8 matter briefly went off the record.)

9 CHAIR JONES: We're going to
10 resume the Response Panel meeting now. And we
11 have Meg Garvin with us this afternoon.
12 Welcome, Meg. And Ms. Garvin is a member of
13 the Victims' Services Subcommittee. Mai,
14 you're still on the phone, right?

15 MS. FERNANDEZ: I am.

16 CHAIR JONES: Great. And Mai
17 Fernandez who couldn't be here with us in
18 person is the Chair of that subcommittee and
19 a Panel member. And I don't know if there are
20 any subcommittee members for Victim Services
21 on the line. Are there? Okay.

22 So what we're going to do this

1 afternoon is go through a few of the
2 recommendations that we did not finish
3 deliberating on. And, Ms. Garvin, you're
4 going to make the presentations. And so if
5 you will just direct us to each recommendation
6 as you go along.

7 MS. GARVIN: Certainly. Thank
8 you. Happy to be here and I'm sorry I missed
9 the last meeting but glad I can participate in
10 this one. We're going to start with -- I'm
11 going to go through the pending Panel
12 discussion recommendations.

13 That's how they are labeled on the
14 PowerPoint. I'm going to go through just a
15 handful of those. And then two additional
16 ones that I had asked to comment on that are
17 also on the slide deck, Recommendations 26 and
18 33.

19 But I will start with
20 Recommendation 5. Make sure everyone gets
21 there. This is pending Panel discussion.
22 There were some modifications made during the

1 last meeting. I'm going to start each time
2 reiterating the findings, which are the
3 context in which the subcommittee came to its
4 recommendations.

5 And I think reiterating those
6 while they're on the slide deck but framing
7 the recommendation first with the findings
8 helps to explain the context. So I'm going to
9 start with the findings on 5.

10 And I will read some of them and
11 also paraphrase some of them. So findings 5-1
12 through 5-5. The subcommittee found that
13 there's no current mechanism for a sexual
14 assault victim to keep a report of sexual
15 assault restricted and yet still request an
16 expedited transfer.

17 DoD policy does not permit victims
18 who file a restricted report of sexual assault
19 to request temporary or permanent expedited
20 transfer from their assigned command or
21 installation to a different location within
22 their assigned duty or living location.

1 If the commander knows or learns
2 about the sexual assault and report it, it
3 becomes unrestricted. We heard a great deal
4 of testimony about this issue and how
5 troubling it was for survivors.

6 We did also hear and received
7 evidence that there may be inherent
8 flexibility, inherent powers of the commander
9 and flexibility to transfer members or place
10 them on limited duty status due to medical
11 conditions.

12 Based on those findings and the
13 great deal of weight of evidence about why
14 it's important that restricted reports still
15 be allowed, individuals who file restricted
16 reports still to be able to transfer without
17 the report going unrestricted, which is a
18 significant moment for survivors.

19 We have made a recommendation that
20 you all looked at at the last meeting and made
21 some modifications. You have both versions in
22 front of you.

1 The original recommendation of the
2 subcommittee was Service Secretary's should
3 ensure that command orientation and training
4 address the commander's authority to make duty
5 or living assignment transfers based upon the
6 recommendation of medical personnel even if
7 the specific underlying reason for the request
8 for transfer is protected and cannot be
9 disclosed.

10 In the last meeting, there was
11 discussion and proposed amendments to that
12 recommendation that would read, Service
13 Secretary should create a means by which
14 sexual assault victims who file a restricted
15 report may request an expedited transfer
16 without having to make the report
17 unrestricted.

18 In reviewing everything from the
19 subcommittee's perspective the amended
20 language aligns with the great deal of
21 evidence we heard, the intent of the
22 subcommittee with regard to Recommendation 5.

1 But I was asked to re-present that
2 to you with the findings and indicate that it
3 aligns with the subcommittee. There was no
4 discussion at the last meeting with regard to
5 Recommendation 5A, however, which is that
6 there should be required training for medical
7 personnel, SARCs and VAs to include options
8 that a commander has available to make or
9 affect transfers based on recommendations from
10 medical personnel.

11 This sub-recommendation, or
12 recommendation 5A, came out of evidence we
13 heard that individuals did not know that it
14 was possible for transfers to happen, that the
15 Commander had this authority inherent and that
16 therefore victims wouldn't know that they
17 could do it.

18 And so the only answer out there
19 was to go unrestricted. So the subcommittee
20 had made Recommendations 5 and 5A to
21 accommodate the evidence that we heard and to
22 support victims' need to stay with restricted

1 reports but still be able to transfer. And
2 that's all that we have on that one, so I
3 submit it to you.

4 CHAIR JONES: So, Ms. Garvin, are
5 you asking us to reconsider the -- I'm just a
6 little --

7 MS. GARVIN: I'm sorry, Judge, I
8 read both versions just to provide the
9 context. I'm not asking, on behalf of
10 subcommittee, I'm not asking you to go back to
11 the original language. I am indicating to you
12 that your amended language of Recommendation
13 5 is in alignment with the subcommittee's
14 assessment of things.

15 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

16 MS. GARVIN: So I'm asking you to
17 stick with your amended language but then to
18 please consider Recommendation 5A --

19 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

20 MS. GARVIN: -- of the
21 subcommittee.

22 CHAIR JONES: Well, I guess my

1 question would be, I mean, it assumes that the
2 recommendation from medical personnel, which
3 is -- we may not be in a position where there
4 is any training yet on that.

5 I mean, isn't that the point if we
6 -- you're not talking about a specific means
7 by which the secretaries both might come up
8 with could be a medical transfer.

9 So I don't know that a specific
10 recommendation that they be trained based on
11 recommendations from medical personnel. I
12 don't know. Maybe it's broad enough but do
13 you see my concern?

14 MS. GARVIN: Certainly, Your
15 Honor. 5A, I believe, based on the
16 subcommittee's evidence received would still
17 stand in that Commanders do have this inherent
18 authority now under the medical provision to
19 make a transfer and that is not well known
20 based on the evidenced we've received.

21 CHAIR JONES: Oh, so --

22 MS. GARVIN: So regardless of the

1 additional mechanisms that the Service
2 Secretaries may put into place, individuals
3 that we heard from and as we understood do not
4 know about the existing opportunity for
5 transfers.

6 And it seems that recommendation
7 could move forward even though the Panel is
8 making a larger recommendation now to create
9 additional means.

10 COL COOK: Judge Jones, if I can
11 offer --

12 CHAIR JONES: Yes, Colonel.

13 COL COOK: You might be able to --
14 I think if you leave it with the language
15 that's in there now for 5A, it becomes a
16 little bit unclear with Recommendation 5.

17 But I think we can modify it
18 slightly leaving the training for medical
19 personnel, SARCs and VAs should include the
20 options to leave this to the Commander that a
21 Commander has available to make or effect
22 transfers when an unrestricted report is made.

1 Take out the portion about whether
2 it's the recommendation of the medical
3 personnel, which is whatever. And it would
4 have to be an unrestricted report because we
5 just said that in modifying Part A, that Part
6 A is they can come up with the means to effect
7 transfers.

8 And one of the discussions when
9 you weren't here the last time was outside of
10 the command channels so that once it's in the
11 hands of a Commander it's unrestricted. But
12 you can keep it outside the hands of the
13 Commander keep it restricted and go up another
14 channel through personnel or SAPRO, whatever.

15 Let them look at what that process
16 should be. So if you just put available or to
17 make or affect transfers cross out based on
18 the recommendation from medical personnel and
19 add the language when an unrestricted report
20 is made.

21 CHAIR JONES: I think that sounds
22 right.

1 MS. GARVIN: That would certainly
2 align with where the subcommittee was going,
3 which is --

4 CHAIR JONES: Right.

5 MS. GARVIN: -- ensuring that
6 there is training on available means for
7 staying restricted yet still securing a
8 transfer.

9 COL COOK: And it still allows the
10 Secretary to determine how best to effect
11 that.

12 MS. GARVIN: Right.

13 CHAIR JONES: All right then. Is
14 there any other comment or hearing none, then
15 we are going to now, if we didn't already. I
16 guess we did not, obviously. Recommendation
17 5A is accepted. Thank you.

18 CDR KING: Your Honor, So I don't
19 think that the Panel deliberated or completely
20 deliberated and either accepted or rejected 5
21 either. I think it was delayed because of
22 some of the members not being present at the

1 last meeting.

2 CHAIR JONES: All right. I think
3 you're right. And we were still talking about
4 it. And does anybody need a little bit more
5 time to consider it? Any objections to 5,
6 which basically asks the Service Secretaries
7 to figure this out and find a means for
8 someone who's filed a restricted report to get
9 an expedited transfer without having to make
10 their report unrestricted.

11 I don't know whether they'll be
12 able to figure it out but we're asking them to
13 figure it out. Any problems with that? All
14 right. 5 is accepted. Thank you, Sherry.

15 MS. GARVIN: So I'd like to turn
16 the Panel to Recommendation 31, which -- the
17 slide deck 2 --

18 CHAIR JONES: On Page 2? Yes.

19 MS. GARVIN: It refers to is the
20 right to confer. I'm going to start again
21 with the findings to provide the context for
22 this. There was, and I have reviewed the

1 transcript from the last hearing and there was
2 substantial conversation about this but then
3 it was delayed until today.

4 So the findings on Recommendation
5 31, which are findings 31-1 through 31-4. The
6 right to confer with the prosecutor under the
7 Federal Crime Victims Rights Act, which is 18
8 USC 3771, which was passed in 2004 is not
9 directly analogous to the right to confer with
10 trial counsel, which is currently afforded to
11 military victims.

12 The CVRA grants the victims the
13 right to confer with a prosecutor in the case.
14 The DoD policy and service policies as well as
15 NDAA do grant victims the right to confer with
16 the attorney for the government or trial
17 counsel in criminal cases.

18 However, that is and the evidence
19 received during the subcommittee meetings,
20 those are not analogous rights in large part
21 because the decision making moment with regard
22 to proceedings is not in trial counsel's hands

1 but instead is with the convening authority.

2 So while the victim may confer
3 with trial counsel on a variety of matters,
4 whether those are to pursue court marshal,
5 non-judicial punishment or administrative
6 action in the case.

7 And if pursuing court-martial, the
8 level of court-martial the right is afforded
9 to victims because the Commander serving as
10 the convening authority actually makes the
11 decision with regard to how to dispose of
12 cases, the victim's right to confer as
13 currently afforded in military rights is not
14 in aligned with the Federal Crime Victims'
15 Rights Act, which was one of the specific
16 responsibilities of the subcommittee to
17 analyze is whether the military systems and
18 proceedings provide the rights afforded by 18
19 USC 3771.

20 And I'm noting that right out of
21 the objectives by which we were guided. So
22 with those findings in place, the

1 recommendation of the subcommittee in order to
2 align the rights that military victims have is
3 that the Secretary of Defense direct the
4 creation and implementation of mechanisms
5 where not currently in place requiring trial
6 counsel to convey the victim's specific
7 concerns and preferences regarding case
8 disposition to the convening authority so that
9 the convening authority may consider the
10 victim's concerns and preferences prior to
11 making a decision on case disposition.

12 The procedures will account for
13 the convening authority's role in the
14 disposition of cases under military justice
15 system and create a process more analogous to
16 the victim conferring with the prosecutor
17 under the CVRA.

18 The import of this is that under
19 the CVRA and in the civilian system, victims
20 have the right to confer all along with the
21 prosecuting attorney from the get go of the
22 case.

1 In fact, we heard evidence along
2 the way that it actually can happen
3 precharging in the civilian system all the way
4 through the moment of charging or not and then
5 what charges.

6 And in order to align military
7 victims' rights with that, which was our
8 directive in large part, we tried to find a
9 mechanism by which that would happen.

10 And so our recommendation is in
11 fact that the Secretary of Defense grant and
12 implement those mechanisms but to make sure
13 that it's meaningful and actually does align
14 with the Federal Crime Victims' Right Act that
15 it should be communication to the convening
16 authority.

17 BG DUNN: I would just make one
18 comment. I don't have any problem with the
19 recommendation but in my 28 years and 5 months
20 on active duty in the United States Army,
21 Judge Advocate General's Corps would have
22 fired any prosecutor who did not convey the

1 victims' sensibilities on the trial in a
2 sexual assault case to me, as the Staff Judge
3 Advocate to carry to the convening authority.

4 So I think that this is a process
5 that is certainly in place in any well-run
6 criminal jurisdiction in any of the United
7 States military services, but.

8 MS. GARVIN: And we certainly
9 heard evidence that practice is allowing this
10 to happen right now and we took testimony that
11 many trial counsel are doing this.

12 The question is making sure there
13 is a process in place to ensure that it
14 happens so that victims know that their
15 interests are being conveyed and whether it be
16 being done right now by practice, it's not
17 mandated under the current process. And that
18 is what the gap we were trying to fill based
19 on aligning the rights.

20 CHAIR JONES: Any other comment on
21 this?

22 COL COOK: I have one comment.

1 And it's not subject to the wording of what's
2 on there. But during our discussion the last
3 time I think we had talked about the
4 possibility of combining Recommendation 31 and
5 32.

6 31 deals with being heard. You
7 have the right to convey information regarding
8 case disposition. And 32 has to do with the
9 pretrial agreement.

10 And one of the comments that I had
11 made on the record last time was you could
12 change the wording on 31 to leave most of the
13 first two lines but add the acceptance of a
14 plea here so that the wording would say, the
15 Secretary of Defense direct the creation and
16 implementation of mechanisms where not
17 currently in place requiring trial counsel to
18 convey the victim's specific concerns and
19 preferences -- delete the next three lines
20 regarding case disposition because we're going
21 to add it later -- to the convening authority
22 so the convening authority may consider the

1 victim's concerns and preferences prior to
2 making a decision on case disposition and/or
3 accepting a plea.

4 So you'd be adding the words
5 and/or accepting a plea at the end and having
6 the case disposition. And you'd be combining,
7 trial counsel you must convey what the victim
8 preferences on those two actions are during
9 the course of the proceedings. And that
10 should get rid of having to put out the next
11 recommendation.

12 CHAIR JONES: Because the
13 Secretary of Defense might decide to do it by
14 changing the venue for courts martial. Is
15 that your point?

16 COL COOK: I'm sorry?

17 CHAIR JONES: We don't need 32
18 because that could be one way the Secretary of
19 Defense would --

20 COL COOK: In the Manual for
21 Courts-Martial, there is something called the
22 pretrial advice.

1 CHAIR JONES: Right.

2 COL COOK: And you have all the
3 information that you have to put into there.
4 So that would go into it and it would just
5 become another factor that trial counsel's got
6 to put together and SJA would have to bring to
7 discuss with the convening authority.

8 But it would be two parts though.
9 Before the trial, so the case disposition. It
10 would also be if a plea is put in later you'd
11 also have to convey it at that same time.

12 MS. GARVIN: So, if I may?

13 CHAIR JONES: Sure.

14 MS. GARVIN: Is the subcommittee's
15 intent was to ensure that both those moments
16 happened. Obviously 31 and 32 address those
17 two moments.

18 But the difference in them in part
19 is that, in addition to the amendment that you
20 are recommending is that one is a specific
21 recommendation that the Manual for Court-
22 Martial -- we specified in 32 the device by

1 which this should happen whereas in 31 we left
2 it open.

3 And part of why 32 we went with a
4 direct recommendation and I will defer to the
5 military experts on this but part of why in
6 our deliberations why we went with doing it
7 right in the court-martial as well.

8 Congress can do it and others can
9 do it. The current actual process in the
10 court-martial right now does not allow for
11 this. It doesn't specify specifically the
12 victim input during the plea part.

13 And so if you -- when I reviewed
14 it last night and went through the actual
15 processes in the court-martial manual about
16 plea, it didn't specifically say where the
17 victim input for that piece came in.

18 So it seemed like the specificity
19 that the subcommittee came up with with regard
20 to directing it be in the courts martial
21 manual with regard to 32 seemed important.

22 So I just want to raise that. I

1 could be misreading the manual for courts
2 martial.

3 COL COOK: Then I would need you
4 to clarify, where are you -- in Number 32
5 then, tell me where you are advocating that a
6 victim has the right to be heard regarding a
7 plea?

8 Is that in the court itself in
9 front of the military judge or is it prior to
10 a convening authority deciding whether to
11 accept that plea.

12 MS. GARVIN: It's prior to the
13 convening authority.

14 COL COOK: Then if you're leaving
15 it the way it is right now, it's in the court-
16 martial. The plea agreement's already been
17 accepted. They've lost their opportunity.

18 If you move it to the other where
19 you're saying the trial counsel has to convey
20 it before the plea agreement is accepted,
21 before the case is referred for some kind of
22 disposition.

1 But whether it's in the manual or
2 not, I will tell you if you put if that is
3 becomes a process, whether it's in a
4 regulation or whether it's in manual, the
5 trial counsel's are going to abide by it.

6 MS. GARVIN: So, and again, I will
7 defer -- oh, I'm sorry.

8 REP. HOLTZMAN: Judge.

9 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: Maybe I'm wrong
11 here, Colonel Cook, and so I'm going to defer
12 to you but VSS Recommendation 32B says the
13 recommendators recommended changes include the
14 right to be heard before the convening
15 authority decides to accept, reject or propose
16 a counter offer to a plea agreement offer
17 submitted the accused. So that would --

18 COL COOK: That's what 32B says
19 but then the 32 says it's the right to be
20 heard regarding pretrial agreement.

21 It doesn't say where
22 Recommendation 32 is so the trying counsel has

1 to convey those concerns to the convening
2 authority, which means it's before as part of
3 the decision by the convening authority.

4 What will happen is when the case
5 goes to the convening authority to refer the
6 case wherever it's going to go, there may be
7 a plea agreement with it at that time.

8 Maybe not. I mean, it could be
9 two separate actions that could be combined.
10 But what Number 31, if it's changed as
11 recommended, you're done.

12 It requires that if the plea
13 agreement comes in after the fact, trial
14 counsel, you still have to go to the victim,
15 get what their input or their preference would
16 be and you have to submit that to the
17 convening authority as part of their
18 deliberations on whether or not to accept that
19 plea.

20 REP. HOLTZMAN: Are you saying
21 that's under 31?

22 COL COOK: I'm saying that if you

1 put, right now what you're saying
2 Recommendation 31 is trial counsel has to
3 convey the victim's concerns.

4 I'm saying add it to 31 and you'll
5 achieve both of the goals of they get the
6 right to get their information put forward to
7 the convening authority before they dispose of
8 the case and they get the right to put it in
9 front of the convening authority before they
10 accept a plea.

11 And it doesn't need necessarily to
12 be in the Manual for Courts-Martial. You'll
13 still achieve the same thing. I agree with
14 having victims' rights be heard.

15 I agree with General Dunn. In my
16 23 years being a combat division SJA or an SJA
17 at different levels, I agree, it's always been
18 done. Making it part of the process regards
19 with whether it's in the manual or in a
20 regulation, then it will be done.

21 Victims get that same
22 satisfaction. But you do want it before the

1 convening authority sees it, not necessarily
2 the way Number 32 reads where it's -- is that
3 in the court when the Judge is listening to
4 it?

MS. GARVIN: Again, you
5 know process far better than I and members in
6 the subcommittee certainly knew the process
7 better than I as a civilian. Your point's
8 well-taken though.

9 The intent of the subcommittee was
10 to ensure that victims had their information
11 heard and received so that it could have
12 impact along the way through the confer all
13 about what to do with the case as well as with
14 regard to plea.

15 The subcommittee also did want it
16 to happen in front of the court. So it was a
17 both/and. It was input before anything so
18 that there was no moment of finality that
19 occurred before the input was taken, which
20 would essentially eviscerate their rights
21 because they're meaningless then.

22 And if there is a proceeding in

1 front of the Court, also then. It was a
2 both/and. And we may have drafted poorly.

3 But your iteration of it to ensure
4 that it was before decisions were made
5 certainly achieves a significant part of what
6 the subcommittee was recommending. The second
7 part was then there is a proceeding in court
8 they also have it.

9 COL COOK: The challenge with
10 putting it before the -- a plea agreement is
11 what's considered during the findings portion
12 of the court-martial.

13 The challenge with allowing a
14 victim the opportunity, you know, maybe the
15 convening authority does hear it because it's
16 conveyed by trial counsel which is what it is
17 now and what you'd be making more formal.

18 Maybe the convening authority
19 disregards or makes another decision for
20 whatever purpose? Now you're in the court-
21 martial, the plea agreement in the military is
22 the accused stands up and says everything

1 they're guilty of.

2 They can't just say, you know, I
3 just plead guilty I'll get a better deal.
4 They have to explain everything they did
5 wrong. If the victim is allowed a say at that
6 point before the judge hears it, the
7 difference in the military system is the judge
8 or the Panel depending on who the trial fact
9 is, well, plea agreement so it's a judge, does
10 not get to see the quantum portion.

11 So having a victim stand up in a
12 court-martial at that point and make comments
13 on the recommence about the quantum portion
14 would deny the defense counsel or the accused
15 the opportunity to persuade the judge to come
16 up with a different result that maybe the
17 convening authority had agreed to up front,
18 so.

19 CHAIR JONES: So are you saying
20 there isn't a public in court moment where the
21 convening authority is saying --

22 COL COOK: I think there would be

1 for the victim during the sentence.

2 CHAIR JONES: -- I am now making
3 my decision on the plea bargain obviously.

4 COL COOK: That's kept in court.

5 CHAIR JONES: Because they're kept
6 secret.

7 COL COOK: Right. It's kept
8 secret.

9 CHAIR JONES: Right. Okay.

10 COL COOK: The victim can go in
11 during the sentencing portion, you know, once
12 the plea agreement is resolved with the Judge,
13 you can go to the sentencing portion and have
14 the impact statement.

15 But that's not the place for a
16 victim to go in and discuss whether they agree
17 with the plea agreement or not. Not under the
18 current system. It would take away from the
19 right of the defense of an accused.

20 MS. GARVIN: So, and I think --

21 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones.

22 CHAIR JONES: Where are you, Beth?

1 PROF. HILLMAN: Sorry. Judge
2 Jones?

3 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

4 PROF. HILLMAN: This is Beth.

5 CHAIR JONES: Okay, Beth. Go
6 ahead.

7 PROF. HILLMAN: I'm sorry to
8 interrupt everybody there.

9 CHAIR JONES: No, please.

10 PROF. HILLMAN: I just wanted to
11 say that the Comparative System Subcommittee
12 is making some recommendations with respect to
13 the sentencing process and has an extensive
14 discussion of the different pretrial
15 agreements, plea bargaining process in the
16 military as compared to civilian
17 jurisdictions.

18 So while this is a useful
19 discussion, I do wonder if we should bracket
20 the precise way that this happens, whether
21 it's on the record and at what point the
22 military system would embrace this that we

1 want, the Victims' Services Subcommittee wants
2 us to do in terms of making sure the process
3 that General Dunn and Colonel Cook both said
4 is routine already.

5 But just making clear that every
6 victim has that chance to do it and the
7 complicating piece here is the convening
8 authority and the trial counsel aren't the
9 single sort of prosecutor in the way it is in
10 the civilian system.

11 So the precise way we do this is a
12 little bit tricky. But I recommend we wait
13 until we get the sentencing part of the CSS
14 recommendations before the Panel to resolve
15 this particular piece.

16 CHAIR JONES: Any objection to
17 that? All right. Then on this, Meg, we'll
18 wait on 32.

19 MS. GARVIN: Judge. Judge, may I
20 just add one note --

21 CHAIR JONES: Yes, of course.

22 MS. GARVIN: -- for your

1 consideration when you get there and that is
2 one of the specific things that we were tasked
3 with looking at was the alignment of the CVRA
4 with military accommodating the differences
5 and specifically looking at how to integrate
6 the right to be heard on plea.

7 That is one of the specific pieces
8 of what we were supposed to do. And we tried
9 to accommodate the differences in what we were
10 recommending, acknowledging the difference of
11 the kind of bifurcated aspect of the plea, the
12 factual piece of a plea and the quantum piece
13 of a plea.

14 And we didn't use the word
15 quantum. You'll not find that in any parts of
16 our discussion during the subcommittee
17 meetings in part because there were a lot of
18 civilians on our subcommittee.

19 But we did talk about the reality
20 of what happens in civilian plea situations
21 and what they are allowed to say in front of
22 a court, what they know and what they aren't

1 allowed to know.

2 And we did try to factor that and
3 so I just ask that when you get there that
4 someone from the Victim Services Subcommittee
5 also be allowed to talk about it because we
6 did attempt to factor this and ensure it was
7 a meaningful input but was a direct input, so.

8 CHAIR JONES: Well, let me just
9 ask this is Recommendation 31 as amended by
10 Colonel Cook acceptable to everybody of does
11 that conflict, Professor Hillman?

12 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, can
13 you tell me what the --

14 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. It's
15 direct the creation and implementation of
16 mechanisms where they are currently in place
17 requiring trial counsel to convey the victim's
18 specific concerns and preferences to the
19 convening authority.

20 Now what it does is then says, so
21 the convening authority may consider the
22 victim's concerns and preferences prior to

1 making a decision on case disposition or
2 accepting a plea bargain or entering into a
3 plea bargain.

4 I'm just wondering if that's
5 something we can deliberate and accept or not
6 without getting into the notion of appearing
7 in court.

8 PROF. HILLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
9 That's fine with me. Does Professor Garvin
10 agree with that one?

11 MS. GARVIN: Yes. I believe that
12 that aligns with a significant portion of what
13 the subcommittee was recommending.

14 REP. HOLTZMAN: My only concern
15 about this is whether by dropping the
16 reference to the Manual for Courts-Martial we
17 are dropping some specific requirement that we
18 need to have. That's all.

19 MS. GARVIN: And as I noted
20 before, the subcommittee did spend time on 31
21 talking about -- I'm sorry, 32 talking about
22 a specific recommendation with regard to

1 quickly getting it into the Manual for Courts-
2 Martial.

3 COL COOK: And I have no, I mean,
4 I don't have an objection of saying it goes
5 into the Manual for Courts-Martial so that
6 became the recommendation as well.

7 I'm just saying that whether it's
8 in that form or something else, trial counsel
9 may say you have to do this. You're going to
10 do it.

11 But I've got no objection to
12 actually putting it in the manuals part of the
13 pretrial advice or coming up with another
14 portion that requires the affirmative passing
15 of the victims as part of a pre-agreement
16 packet when that goes forward.

17 I just don't think there's
18 anything about that plea agreement piece in
19 the manual right now so you'd be adding a new
20 provision. But I'm not positive of that.
21 You'd have to check with somebody who knows
22 the current draft.

1 COL. HAM: Actually, I think it
2 might be. This is Colonel Ham. It might
3 require a change to Article 34 of what would
4 be included in the pretrial advice and the
5 corresponding rule for court-martial. But, so
6 it may require actually statutory change but
7 I'm not saying it has to but it might.

8 COL COOK: Right. That might take
9 longer so you might want to put it in the
10 rules up front with the intent that it later,
11 you know, be considered by the joint service
12 panel to put it as a permanent one later on.
13 But the goal is affecting it to make sure it's
14 mandated now. How, is not as important as
15 getting it done.

16 MS. GARVIN: And mandating the
17 last part of your statement, the now was part
18 of the discussion, quickly getting it in.

19 CHAIR JONES: So where are we?
20 Are we accepting 31 and holding on to
21 discussions about 32A and 32C?

22 COL COOK: I think we're accepting

1 31 as changed --

2 CHAIR JONES: Right.

3 COL COOK: -- saying you have to
4 convey it and the only part of 32 that's being
5 delayed is whether or not the victim's got the
6 opportunity to be heard during the court-
7 martial process itself.

8 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

9 MS. GARVIN: And if I may?

10 CHAIR JONES: Sure.

11 MS. GARVIN: The specificity of
12 the Manual for Courts-Martial where that fits.

13 CHAIR JONES: Right. All right.
14 So we're going to accept 31 as changed, as
15 amended, and hold up on our discussion of
16 Recommendation 32 until we've had the
17 opportunity to review the CSS recommendation
18 and findings.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I'm still
20 not sure that's quite correct, Your Honor,
21 because I think what she's saying and I think
22 that Colonel Cook was agreeing to was that

1 there would be a reference to the manual for
2 courts martial now that we would include that
3 as part of the amended 31. We would take that
4 to 32.

5 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I missed
6 that.

7 MS. GARVIN: That's my
8 understanding.

9 CHAIR JONES: Is that what --

10 MS. GARVIN: There had not been
11 proposed language of exactly where to put that
12 in this conversation but the idea was the
13 subcommittee had strongly landed on making
14 sure it was in the manual for courts martial,
15 well, 32 was.

16 But the idea was to expedite that
17 process. But in this discussion there wasn't
18 a location of it. So I don't know if that's
19 something that the Panel needs to consider
20 where to put it. I don't believe I can
21 recommend where to put that in this amendment.

22 JUDGE MARQUARDT: May I ask a

1 question?

2 CHAIR JONES: Yes. Sure.

3 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Was the second
4 sentence of 31 deleted?

5 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I didn't
6 quite hear that.

7 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Was the second
8 sentence of 31 deleted?

9 CHAIR JONES: Oh, the text of 31?

10 MS. GARVIN: No. The second
11 sentence.

12 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Yes.

13 COL COOK: I think the second
14 sentence of 31 was more explanatory more than
15 it created anything else. It just said that
16 they were trying -- so it's not necessary but
17 it's not harmful to leave it in there.

18 MS. GARVIN: Correct.

19 CHAIR JONES: It's still there.
20 It was not deleted.

21 JUDGE MARQUARDT: Thank you.

22 CHAIR JONES: All right. I

1 confess. I'm confused.

2 MS. GARVIN: Judge, perhaps if I
3 may make a suggestion in light of the
4 recommendation and you all obviously have
5 authority to correct me, if there's agreement
6 on the Panel with regards to the amendment to
7 31 then maybe what is pending with regard to
8 the amendment which is and/or accepting a
9 plea, if what is still pending is there to
10 articulate that the change should include a
11 change to the Manual for Court-Martial, maybe
12 that specific piece is continued with regard
13 to the discussion of 32 and may or may not
14 then reference back to integrating it in 31
15 when you have the next conversation unless you
16 want to wordsmith and figure out where to put
17 it now.

18 CHAIR JONES: Well, maybe what we
19 should just say is that the text of 31 right
20 now, I gather is acceptable to everybody. We
21 won't formally accept the full recommendation
22 until we see if we're going to be adding

1 something from 32.

2 REP. HOLTZMAN: We agree that we
3 want to add the reference to the -- maybe I'm
4 wrong. I don't mean to --

5 CHAIR JONES: You could be right.
6 I'm not --

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: I think we agreed
8 that we wanted to add the reference to the
9 inclusion of the change in the military in the
10 Manual for Courts-Martial. Where that should
11 go, maybe we could just let staff propose the
12 language for us and that would be --

13 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, this
14 is Beth.

15 CHAIR JONES: Yes, Beth.

16 PROF. HILLMAN: I agree with
17 Representative Holtzman. I think it's fine
18 for us to accept 32, that first, not
19 necessarily the details or, I actually agree
20 with A and B. They're fine with me. But I
21 don't think we have to say exactly where it
22 goes. But we can say that it should happen.

1 CHAIR JONES: All right. Let me
2 just -- so are you saying that you think it
3 should go in the Manual for Courts-Martial or
4 not? That's where my confusion is.

5 COL COOK: Can we, in
6 Recommendation 31, can we add the word, you
7 know, in the first line can we add the word
8 immediate in front of the word creation.

9 So that would say, the Secretary
10 of Defense direct the immediate creation and
11 implementation of mechanisms were not
12 currently in place requiring trial counsel to
13 convey the victim's specific concerns and
14 preferences to the convening authority so the
15 convening authority may consider the victim's
16 concerns and preferences prior to making a
17 decision on case disposition or entering into
18 a plea agreement.

19 That becomes one of them. And the
20 second sentence unchanged. But Number 32
21 becomes, the Secretary of Defense recommends
22 to the President changes to the Manual for

1 Courts-Martial that incorporate the right to
2 recommend in Recommendation 3 above.

3 Because that will allow you to get
4 the immediate process changed and allow the
5 longer process of getting it put into the
6 manual and having it solidified there.

7 CHAIR JONES: All right. I
8 understand what you're talking about. Thank
9 you, Liz. And you, Colonel. Any disagreement
10 with that?

11 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones?

12 CHAIR JONES: Yes, Beth.

13 PROF. HILLMAN: I'm just -- if we
14 put a time element in one of these and not in
15 all kinds of other ones where we're
16 recommending things, I'm not sure where that
17 leaves all the rest of the recommendations
18 like go ahead and take your time with them.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: I agree with that,
20 Judge Jones, from just a drafting point of
21 view.

22 CHAIR JONES: Right. I think that

1 makes perfect sense actually. So I would also
2 say we should not put immediate in there. We
3 haven't done it anywhere else, nor should we.

4 But are we in agreement then that
5 31 should read as Colonel Cook has described
6 it which would include 32 in there as she's
7 amended it? Is everybody in agreement with
8 that? Okay.

9 Then we'll accept Recommendation
10 31 as amended. And as I just said, that will
11 include the first -- Recommendation 32 will
12 become part of 31 as amended, as 32 is
13 amended. All right.

14 COL COOK: And I'm sorry. Just to
15 clarify, Judge Jones, then for Recommendation
16 32A and 32B, I don't think that those are
17 necessary right now.

18 CHAIR JONES: No, I'm not --
19 right.

20 COL COOK: Okay.

21 CHAIR JONES: 32A and B are not
22 going to be any part of Recommendation 31.

1 MS. GARVIN: May I ask for one
2 clarifying point? When the other subcommittee
3 reports out that has a similar recommendation
4 with regard to the structural analysis, some
5 parts of 32A and B will be with regards to the
6 victim being heard in court --

7 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

8 MS. GARVIN: -- on plea will be
9 brought up at that juncture. Okay.

10 CHAIR JONES: That's my
11 understanding from Professor Hillman. Then we
12 can discuss it at that point.

13 REP. HOLTZMAN: Judge Jones.

14 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: Just to raise
16 another issue about this. I don't mean to do
17 this in a piece meal fashion but I'm just
18 reading the last sentence of Recommendation
19 32B, which says that the convening authority
20 should retain discretion to determine the best
21 means to comply with this right and consider
22 the victim's opinion, e.g. submission in

1 writing or in person.

2 Is that something that should be
3 there? I mean it does give the Commander in
4 the event he or she wants to the right to hear
5 from the victim directly as opposed to through
6 pretrial counsel.

7 I don't know. You probably know
8 whether this was ever done or whether this is
9 a meaningless suggestion. But I want to raise
10 it just because I want to throw this -- if
11 this is a baby in the bath water, I don't want
12 to throw that out.

13 BG DUNN: Right. And the
14 convening authorities certainly have the
15 discretion now to meet with the victim and get
16 his or her input should the convening
17 authority make that decision.

18 I think, and I'm not on this
19 particular subcommittee but I have an idea
20 that that language is in there just to make
21 sure Congress doesn't require a meeting with
22 the convening authority, which would become

1 unattainable in most cases.

2 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. Who's on
3 the line?

4 MS. FERNANDEZ: This is Mai
5 Fernandez.

6 CHAIR JONES: Hi, Mai. Go ahead.
7 What did you have to say?

8 MS. FERNANDEZ: I was saying that
9 I have a plane that's about to take off so
10 I've got to get off the phone.

11 CHAIR JONES: Oh. Well, that's
12 clear and unambiguous. Okay.

13 MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay.

14 CHAIR JONES: Thanks very much.

15 MS. FERNANDEZ: Good luck,
16 everybody. Take care.

17 CHAIR JONES: Thank you.

18 COL COOK: Judge Jones? I would
19 agree. Put that language in there just to
20 make it clear so the discretion's not taken
21 away.

22 I mean, if we're talking about

1 having a victim who's been transferred out of
2 the area, if you've got a Commander who's
3 deployed and not in the same place, you want
4 to make sure that those preferences are
5 conveyed and not strap the command in how
6 that's done.

7 If the opportunity to see somebody
8 is there, great. But if it's not you still
9 want to make sure that the written submission
10 is what's considered.

11 CHAIR JONES: All right.

12 MS. GARVIN: And that was -- the
13 subcommittee did talk specifically about this
14 piece and intending to leave discretion with
15 the method of delivery of the victim
16 information.

17 Albeit, in part this piece was
18 about the victim being heard directly rather
19 than via trial counsel also. So that's hence
20 the in-person in writing to align with what
21 happens in Federal courts when plea is
22 happening.

1 So, again, this should be, I
2 believe, based on the conversation thus far
3 this morning or this afternoon in part should
4 be carried over to when you discuss the next
5 one. But the discretionary piece that was
6 intended to allow that to happen.

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: My view is that we
8 should retain it right now as part of 31. And
9 I think that's what Colonel Cook was
10 suggesting.

11 COL COOK: Yes.

12 MS. GARVIN: My apologies.

13 COL COOK: Yes.

14 CHAIR JONES: And it's not you,
15 Meg. It's me. I now have to go back to
16 Professor Hillman. Professor, and I confess,
17 I do not recall exactly what your
18 recommendations from the CSS subcommittee are.
19 Is there a reason for us to wait or just
20 immediately adopt Recommendation 32B?

21 PROF. HILLMAN: No reason to wait,
22 Your Honor. I was flagging it only because we

1 addressed potential changes in the sentencing
2 process that do implicate the way that
3 pretrial agreements and other, you know, they
4 would roll out.

5 But it would not -- I'm happy to
6 defer to Victim's Services Subcommittee on the
7 importance of the victim being heard. And I
8 just, in terms of the process of that, we may
9 run this down the road. But there's nothing
10 that conflicts with this and I recommend going
11 ahead there. Sorry if I derailed things
12 there.

13 CHAIR JONES: No. Not at all.
14 Okay. With respect to 32B, any other issues?
15 It sounds like everyone's in agreement?
16 Colonel Cook?

17 COL COOK: One clarification. As
18 Rep. Holtzman just said, it'd be that last
19 sentence that we're retaining but put it up at
20 the end of 31 because it's going to apply to
21 case disposition as much as it does to the
22 plea. And then leave 32 as the portion to

1 ultimately incorporate it into the manual
2 somehow.

3 BG DUNN: I am not sure. You
4 know, I think that maybe the reason these
5 recommendations were separated out at the very
6 beginning is because in terms of case
7 disposition it's the victim's concerns
8 conveyed through the trial counsel up through
9 the system.

10 And in the second one, based on
11 what Meg just said, it is the victim's right
12 to be heard. So either to submit a statement
13 or to appear in person.

14 And that is different than
15 conveyed through the trial counsel, you know,
16 verbally or, you know, based on my discussion,
17 et cetera. I mean that appears to be two
18 different --

19 MS. GARVIN: That is accurate.

20 BG DUNN: -- processes.

21 MS. GARVIN: They were separated
22 in large part in our discussion because they

1 are two distinct rights legally. The right to
2 confer exists under the CVRA and under the
3 NDAA.

4 And that is conferral with the
5 decision maker, meaning you get to talk with
6 them and have some level of discussion with
7 them. That's 31. 32 is actually a right to
8 be heard, which is an individual held right
9 where you actually get to have the input.

10 The method by which that input
11 happens may not be in person, it may be in
12 writing. And the intent of both of those is
13 to have an impactful moment before decisions
14 are made, whether that be with regard to
15 whether to go forward or what plea to accept.

16 So I think what has been done with
17 regard to amending 31 including this last
18 sentence on 32B achieves a portion of what the
19 subcommittee talked about. But not the second
20 portion of what the subcommittee heard
21 evidence on, which is the importance of
22 individuals being personally heard rather than

1 having it conveyed.

2 COL COOK: But where? To the
3 convening authority or in court?

4 MS. GARVIN: We discussed both.
5 We discussed both. And 31 we ended up leaving
6 it for -- I don't have -- I just flipped my
7 page. The implementation of mechanisms --
8 that's where that language came from because
9 we heard evidence that defense doesn't go
10 directly to the convening authority, generally
11 speaking.

12 Most things go through trial
13 counsel to the convening authority and through
14 the SJA. That's how the convening authority
15 hears things with regard to whether to move
16 forward or not.

17 So we were trying to leave in
18 place and not override all of that but figure
19 out the mechanisms by which the victim
20 actually gets heard by the convening authority
21 and the conferral process pre-decision about
22 whether to move forward with a case but with

1 regard to plea to make it align we wanted it
2 to be meaningful, heard by the convening
3 authority in both/and moments, both by the
4 convening authority and the court to align
5 with the Federal Crime Victims' Rights Act and
6 the right to be heard.

7 BG DUNN: See, I think that
8 regardless of where we come down on the heard
9 on the pretrial agreement, that we should keep
10 the two provisions separate or we're going to
11 get ourselves in a position here of having
12 the, you know, victim write a statement to the
13 convening authority before he refers the case,
14 which is not the recommendation of the
15 subcommittee.

16 I mean, for all the discussion
17 we've had about trying to combine 31 and 32,
18 I think because we're talking about two
19 different levels of input that we should
20 separate those recommendations back out.

21 Leave 31 the way it is and then
22 deal with 32 and the pretrial agreement. And

1 if they go together, Holly, then, you know,
2 however we sort out the victim's right to be
3 heard on pretrial agreement could just go
4 along with the pretrial advice.

5 MS. GARVIN: And if I may also the
6 subcommittee intentionally kept them as the
7 confer with the regard to whether to move
8 forward with the case be heard with regard to
9 plea and then sentencing is taken care of
10 somewhere else.

11 There's a separate and discrete
12 right to be heard at sentencing under federal
13 law and that's different.

14 BG DUNN: That's right.

15 MS. GARVIN: And I think just
16 making sure that that doesn't get conflated,
17 the right to be heard about a plea agreement
18 with regard to a plea agreement, which is the
19 right, needs to be a separate right and
20 acknowledged.

21 BG DUNN: And I think it's good to
22 keep them separate because of the difficulty

1 of sorting through the quantum portion of the
2 plea agreement.

3 I mean that's got to be a
4 completely separate process because if the
5 military plea agreement process remains the
6 same whether or not the victim is going to
7 know what quantum portion is is going to be a
8 difficult process to work through.

9 COL COOK: And I'd be okay with
10 keeping the right to convey their interests in
11 the case disposition and the plea separate.
12 I'd be fine with that.

13 But if what you're building in is
14 the right to be heard in person in either one
15 of those, then I think that logistically
16 that's not always going to be feasible.

17 So I would like to keep them
18 separate if you want to say that there's two
19 separate rights, or two separate portions of
20 the trial, and leave it as the opportunity to
21 convey their thoughts, and a requirement to
22 convey their thoughts, to the convening

1 authority so the convening authority considers
2 it both for case disposition and for a plea
3 agreement, that's fine.

4 But if it's a right to be heard,
5 you're going to go get to talk to the person
6 in person, that may not be feasible in every
7 situation. I don't think that we ought to
8 make a recommendation to that affect.

9 MS. GARVIN: I may have confused
10 the situation. The parenthetical in 32 with
11 regard to "e.g., submission in writing or in
12 person" was to accommodate that reality. When
13 I said personally held and can personally
14 convey, it was so that it wouldn't be
15 translated through trial counsel.

16 It'd actually be, whether it's in
17 writing or in person, at some juncture it's
18 me. I write it. I say it. My counsel says
19 it. Whatever it is. I get to do it. It's a
20 personally held right, not one where I just
21 get to informally tell trial counsel and then
22 trial counsel gets to change it.

1 So with regard to the plea, that's
2 what we meant by that. So it wouldn't always
3 have to be physically in person. But the
4 Subcommittee did not go there.

5 COL COOK: Is the victim going to
6 understand that nuance?

7 MS. GARVIN: I'm sorry?

8 COL COOK: Is the victim who's
9 personally involved in the case going to
10 understand that nuance, do you think, based on
11 everything you heard talking with the victims
12 and the victims' advocates? Will they
13 understand that nuance that -- to write a
14 letter and get their input?

15 MS. GARVIN: If they have Special
16 Victims' Counsel, which they all have the
17 right to.

18 That's how this works in the
19 civilian world, too, is counsel explains their
20 rights to them and then they would then
21 advocate for -- I should step back. We did
22 not specifically address that as the

1 Subcommittee and I just put on my hat as a
2 subject matter expert, which I'm happy to
3 continue with, but I don't think that's my
4 role unless you specifically ask it of me, so.

5
6 We did not hear evidence
7 specifically about that. What we heard
8 evidence on is that Special Victims' Counsel
9 spends a lot of time explaining rights and
10 what they mean and how you can execute them in
11 court. So I would anticipate that would be
12 true here.

13 COL COOK: And it's the last part
14 of what you just said that probably concerns
15 me the most, about how they can enforce or how
16 they can execute those rights in court.

17 MS. GARVIN: Or in proceedings or
18 before adjudicators or the decision makers.
19 Special Victims' Counsel, the evidence we
20 heard and the directives they've been given,
21 they explain rights and how you can exercise
22 your rights regardless of what that avenue of

1 that exercise is.

2 COL COOK: I have no objection to
3 leaving, in Recommendation 31, the input on
4 case disposition to separating out the input
5 on a plea agreement for the victim and
6 requiring it be part of the process. That I
7 have no objection to. Keeping it flexible
8 enough that it accommodates, at the convening
9 authority's discretion, how that will happen,
10 that's fine.

11 CHAIR JONES: So are we taking
12 accepting a plea bargain out of 31 now?

13 COL COOK: I think that's what
14 General Dunn was recommending and I don't have
15 an objection to that.

16 REP. HOLTZMAN: We are keeping 31
17 and 32 the same. Am I wrong?

18 CHAIR JONES: Well, everybody
19 knows that confer doesn't mean you have a
20 right to appear in court, whereas the right to
21 be heard, Ms. Garvin, and correct me, implies
22 that you might have the right to be heard in

1 court? Or does it mean, you know, in the
2 civilian Victims' Rights Act, that you have a
3 right to be heard in court?

4 MS. GARVIN: It depends on where
5 the decision is being made. If the decision
6 is being made in a court proceeding you would
7 have and you have the right to be heard about
8 whatever is being decided. You would have the
9 right to be heard in that court proceeding.
10 If the decision is being made somewhere else,
11 you have the right to be heard about that.
12 That's where you have the right to be heard.

13 You execute your right to be heard
14 where the decision-making moment is. The
15 proceeding in which, or the opportunity in
16 which that decision is being made.

17 COL COOK: In the military court,
18 though, there are two parts to that. The
19 convening authority makes the initial decision
20 about whether to accept a plea on what might
21 be a potential cap on that plea.

22 The accused has then got to go

1 into the first part of a court-martial and say
2 what they are pleading to, why they think they
3 are guilty and then it's up to the military
4 judge to accept that plea.

5 If the victim, to the extent that
6 this right, you know, to convey your opinions
7 is saying that it's before the convening
8 authority, I have no objection.

9 If you're saying it's going to go
10 into part one of the court-martial, the
11 findings proceedings, then I would object to
12 that based on the system that we have and the
13 way the process is set up.

14 MS. GARVIN: And our
15 recommendation was for both.

16 CHAIR JONES: Well, I personally
17 couldn't agree to both because I don't know
18 how it could be done.

19 MS. GARVIN: Well, with regards to
20 the rights being heard -- I'm sorry. I'm
21 sorry, Judge.

22 CHAIR JONES: No, because of the

1 way, you know, the plea bargain works. I
2 don't know how it could be an in-court
3 presentation by a victim.

4 MS. GARVIN: Well, the victim
5 already has, and it's already operationalized,
6 the right to be heard at sentencing.

7 COL COOK: At the sentencing.

8 MS. GARVIN: Right. This is a
9 recommendation to be heard with regard to the
10 plea. That is what the Subcommittee is
11 recommending.

12 CHAIR JONES: When and where?

13 MS. GARVIN: We are recommending
14 both because there are two decision points
15 that happen. There is the first one, which is
16 the plea that includes the cap, that has the
17 quantum element. And then there is the second
18 piece, which is in court. And we were
19 recommending both in order to align it with
20 the federal CVRA.

21 My understanding from the
22 conversation is there doesn't seem to be a

1 dispute about the former of those, the
2 convening authority. And perhaps the second
3 of those might be the piece that is held until
4 the conversation with the Subcommittee.

5 BG DUNN: Well, in the military,
6 in the first part of a military court-martial
7 where there is a plea agreement, there's a
8 conversation between the judge and the accused
9 about, you know, did you do this, did you do
10 this, did you do this, tell me how you did
11 that.

12 What the judge is determining is
13 whether or not that accused, you know,
14 understands the plea, understands the
15 consequences of the plea and actually
16 committed the misconduct.

17 It's very different than it is in
18 the civilian. Much more detailed and much
19 lengthier process of making sure that the
20 accused, you know, actually is in fact
21 pleading guilty to all the elements of each
22 offense on that charge sheet.

1 And then the military judge makes
2 a decision purely whether to accept the
3 accused's plea of guilty in that first part of
4 the court-martial. And I do not see how the
5 victim comes into that to be heard in any
6 manner. I don't see where the victim belongs
7 in that process or what or how that would
8 work.

9 The second part, if the judge
10 accepts the plea -- the judge can reject the
11 plea, which means that we don't go any
12 further. It doesn't mean the case is over.
13 It means the government has to now try the
14 case. But assuming the judge accepts the
15 plea, then we move to the sentencing phase,
16 you know, where clearly the victim has the
17 opportunity to be heard on the sentence in the
18 case.

19 MS. GARVIN: So our directive was
20 to try to align the right, or see where the
21 rights are different between the military and
22 the civilian.

1 And with regard to the civilian,
2 the victim actually is heard in that first
3 moment, with regard to the plea. Under the
4 federal Crime Victims' Rights Act, the victim
5 can be heard on the pure plea moment, meaning,
6 do you accept this plea or do you not,
7 regardless of the latter terms of the plea
8 that go to sentencing.

9 So the victim, they're not a
10 decision maker in the civilian system under
11 the federal Crime Victims' Rights Act. They
12 are heard at the proceeding and can say,
13 right, in the federal system the test of
14 whether to accept a plea or not to accept a
15 plea is, is it in the interest of justice?

16 The victim can be heard to say, in
17 federal court, acceptance of this plea is not
18 in the interest of justice. Or the term of
19 this plea isn't in the interest of justice.
20 That is what is not currently aligned. And
21 then they also have the right to be heard at
22 sentence. But they can be heard purely on

1 whether or not to accept plea.

2 BG DUNN: Right. But that is tied
3 to the term of the plea. It's not tied to
4 what the military judge is doing, which is
5 just merely determining if this accused in
6 fact committed those crimes, understands what
7 his or her plea means, et cetera.

8 I mean, I think that first part is
9 not comparable. And you have the whole
10 quantum portion issue because the military
11 judge goes through the whole process without
12 ever knowing what the cap is, and so the
13 victim cannot address that.

14 MS. GARVIN: The Subcommittee
15 certainly did understand the difference --
16 again, we did not speak about the quantum
17 piece in those terms. What we were talking
18 about is making sure it was meaningful and if
19 the plea is going to be accepted in that
20 moment.

21 The victim's right to be heard
22 about anything is essentially gone after that

1 because you start to put in the cap in the
2 military terms and so you start to not have a
3 meaningful being heard about whether the plea
4 is in the interest of justice or not.

5 So we were trying to ensure, early
6 in the process, separate and apart from the
7 punishment that might be imposed, which is the
8 right to be heard at sentencing, or the
9 rehabilitative terms that come into play at
10 sentencing.

11 The victim has a separate and
12 discrete right. We were trying to find the
13 avenue by which that gets a play in the
14 military system. We may not have found the
15 right device.

16 But that's what the Subcommittee
17 was grappling with, is how do you ensure that
18 the victim has a separate and discrete right
19 to be heard about the acceptance of a plea
20 regardless of the terms of sentence? Which is
21 what the right is in the federal system.
22 That's what we were trying to achieve.

1 COL COOK: May I ask a question
2 about the federal practice? I'm sorry.
3 Because I don't know that practice much. When
4 they do that in the federal -- when the victim
5 comes in and has their right to be heard in
6 the federal system -- federal pleas, when an
7 accused stands there and says I plead guilty,
8 do they have to go into a lot of detail? Or
9 can they just plead to whatever the agreed
10 upon charge was and saying I'm pleading
11 guilty, not to rape but to sexual assault?

12 MS. GARVIN: They have to argue to
13 the facts that result in --

14 CHAIR JONES: They have to
15 allocate to sufficient conduct to satisfy each
16 and every element in their defense.

17 MS. GARVIN: There we go.

18 COL COOK: Okay.

19 CHAIR JONES: And I have to say,
20 in 17 years, I never saw a victim come in and
21 make a statement at a plea. I understand that
22 it's in the --

1 MS. GARVIN: And it was only
2 passed in 2004 and the first case interpreting
3 the federal Crime Victims' Rights Act did not
4 issue from an appellate court until 2006. So
5 it's a relatively new, specific right in the
6 federal civilian system also.

7 COL COOK: Do the victims, then,
8 when they come in and the allocution is made,
9 does the victim then make their statement
10 under oath? And, I mean, how much do they say
11 this would not be in the interest of justice,
12 or do they start contesting some of the
13 comments of the person?

14 I mean, is this under oath? Do
15 they challenge, well, what that person said is
16 not true, he or she or whoever it was, what
17 they're saying is not true, this is what
18 really happened. How far does that statement
19 go? Just as a matter of practice.

20 CHAIR JONES: Again, I don't know
21 because I've never seen it happen. I got off
22 the bench a year ago and I've never seen it

1 happen. But, you know, one judge in one
2 district, so.

3 MS. GARVIN: Ma'am, I'm happy to
4 provide some information.

5 CHAIR JONES: What I want to know
6 is this. Look. I think the concept of a
7 victim having input with respect to a plea
8 bargain makes perfect sense and obviously you
9 have to correlate talking to the prosecutor in
10 the federal system who's going to be making
11 that decision versus going to the convening
12 authority hearing with the military justice
13 system.

14 But in the military system, I
15 assume -- or maybe I'm wrong. Does the
16 accused plead to every charge, or does the
17 plea bargain permit a plea of lesser than the
18 all charges? I know there's an agreed upon
19 term.

20 COL COOK: Whatever the charge
21 sheet says, all of them by the end will be
22 accounted for. The accused, they could not

1 enter a plea on some and maybe the trial
2 counsel will withdraw some of the charges or
3 just not proceed with them.

4 They could plea to the offence
5 itself. They can plea to lesser included, but
6 what's on that charge sheet is going to be
7 addressed in the court and they do plead to
8 each thing that's alleged unless there's been
9 an agreement to withdraw that charge or
10 dismiss it.

11 CHAIR JONES: But is that done by
12 the trial counsel or by the convening -- well,
13 that would be part of the convening authority.

14 COL COOK: Part of the deal that's
15 considered by --

16 BG DUNN: And the convening
17 authority -- and you really, if you get in a
18 situation where you're really not addressing
19 every charge, because there could be two
20 charges of the convening authority agrees to
21 dismiss after the plea is accepted and the
22 sentence is imposed. And when the convening

1 authority takes action, then, in accordance
2 with the pretrial agreement, he or she will
3 dismiss those remaining charges.

4 CHAIR JONES: So potentially a
5 victim might want to come in at the point
6 where this plea is being taken and say I don't
7 like this plea because there are three charges
8 that were originally referred and now they're
9 not here anymore. So is that the --

10 MS. GARVIN: Yes, and that aligns
11 with civilian.

12 BG DUNN: They can't do that. The
13 victim can't do that because the judge does
14 not know the quantum portion of the plea.

15 CHAIR JONES: Wouldn't the Judge
16 know what was referred and then what changed
17 afterwards?

18 COL COOK: Yeah, but for each of
19 the offenses that the accused pleas to, the
20 Judge is going through all of the elements of
21 that charge to make sure the defendant knows
22 what exactly are you saying you did and have

1 you met all the elements on each of the
2 charges that are plead to. And that has
3 nothing to do with the quantum portion of
4 itself. It's the --

5 BG DUNN: Right. But the problem
6 you could have is, say you have six charges,
7 and the accused comes in, has a plea
8 agreement, comes in and is going to plead to
9 charges 1, 4 and 5.

10 Then that's what the military
11 judge goes through the process with charges 1,
12 4 and 5. And the military judge doesn't
13 inquire or know what has happened to 2, 3 and
14 6.

15 CHAIR JONES: So he doesn't know
16 that 2, 3 and 6 were referred?

17 BG DUNN: Right. Well, he knows
18 they're referred, but he doesn't know, you
19 know, what the next step is going to be with
20 regard to those because the accused is
21 pleading to these.

22 MS. GARVIN: So, if I may, that's

1 actually relatively similar, in that when the
2 victim comes in on the civilian side at the
3 front end, one piece of what they could do is
4 say this plea is inadequate because it's
5 dropping critical charges that are relevant to
6 the proceeding and therefore it's not in the
7 interest of justice to accept this limited
8 plea.

9 CHAIR JONES: That what I would
10 imagine happens in the civil court.

11 MS. GARVIN: That's what they do.
12 And I will say, when I say the victim, and one
13 of our other recommendations is about the SVC,
14 you know, in the civilian system right now,
15 this is predominately done by victim's counsel
16 coming in and saying, you know, the victim
17 objects to this, has a right to be heard.
18 They're exercising their right to be heard by
19 saying this plea is not in the interest of
20 justice because dismissal or releasing of
21 charges 2 and 3, which are critical to
22 understanding the facts, makes it not in the

1 interest of justice.

2 CHAIR JONES: I think I finally
3 got it. No matter what the victim says, the
4 judge can't do anything about it. This is
5 already heard with the convening authority.

6 BG DUNN: Right. In that first
7 part, the victim, I think we all agree, should
8 be heard by the convening authority in some
9 fashion, not necessarily face-to-face. And
10 then on sentencing. But I think that first
11 part of the court-martial is not constructed
12 in any way for the victim to be --

13 CHAIR JONES: In other words, the
14 victim, if I've got it, has already had their
15 opportunity to let the convening authority
16 know how they feel about what the charges
17 should be, and actually then appearing when
18 this has gotten to the military judge. The
19 military judge can't change anything.

20 BG DUNN: Correct.

21 CHAIR JONES: You can accept the
22 plea or you can say on whatever the guy's

1 willing to plea to. Or gal. But he can't
2 turn around and say, oh, and I think this
3 victim's right. You should have also plead to
4 that.

5 BG DUNN: Right. The military
6 judge has no authority in that regard.

7 MS. GARVIN: Part of the
8 Subcommittee's conversation though in
9 exercising or envisioning the right to align
10 with the CVRA is the judge still has the
11 authority to reject the plea.

12 CHAIR JONES: Only because there's
13 a failure to allocute. He can't reject it or
14 the whole plea because, oh, you didn't plead
15 to these and I'm sorry I'm not accepting this
16 plea. That's the difference.

17 BG DUNN: That's the convening
18 authority's decision.

19 CHAIR JONES: That's up to the
20 convening authority, so getting up there at
21 that stage wouldn't make any sense, I don't
22 think.

1 COL COOK: I agree.

2 CHAIR JONES: It's the convening
3 authority that you have to get your
4 information to and your position to. Which
5 you know, I know.

6 MS. GARVIN: No. I appreciate the
7 detailed descriptions that the Panel is going
8 through in order to get through all the
9 recommendations.

10 The Subcommittee's focus, and it
11 sounds like you all have a grip on it. The
12 Subcommittee's focus was the two rights,
13 confer about whether things go forward and
14 along the way and have an absolutely
15 meaningful right to be heard about the plea
16 itself separate and apart from the right to
17 sentence.

18 As long as that is being achieved
19 as a separate right, not being relegated to
20 the right to sentence, the military will be
21 coming in line with the federal Crime Victims'
22 Rights Act.

1 If it is lumped into the
2 sentencing portion, or only the right to
3 confer about whether a case goes forward,
4 there is a gap in the rights in the military.

5 CHAIR JONES: I don't think any of
6 us intended there to be that gap. I think
7 right from the get go we've been including the
8 right to confer with the convening authority
9 in whatever manner about any plea bargain.

10 And I think all we're talking
11 about now is, is there an appropriate moment
12 in a courtroom to be heard? And I think at
13 the point of an allocution before a judge
14 doesn't make sense.

15 So, I mean, are we talking now
16 basically about when else can a victim be
17 heard in court about a plea bargain? We all
18 agree that --

19 MS. GARVIN: They get to be heard
20 by the convening authority.

21 CHAIR JONES: -- at every stage
22 that a convening authority should be conferred

1 with about a plea bargain, the victim should
2 be able to do that.

3 MS. GARVIN: So, just for
4 clarification --

5 CHAIR JONES: I'm only confused
6 about what court proceeding is it that you
7 believe that they need to be heard in. And so
8 maybe we can go to the second one.

9 MS. GARVIN: So just for language
10 clarification, so the Subcommittee used the
11 right to confer in one recommendation and the
12 right to be heard in a second recommendation
13 intentionally. Heard not meaning in person,
14 but heard meaning something other than two-way
15 communication. Heard meaning one-way
16 communication I get to pass along to you.

17 And then we wanted to make sure it
18 was meaningful to align with the civilian
19 rights, meaning before it was accepted. We
20 believed that was both in court and out of
21 court. If what the Panel is saying is there's
22 not an opportunity in court for that, then I

1 believe the Panel needs to figure out, if it's
2 going to accept the recommendation in theory,
3 where is the moment to ensure the victim is
4 heard on plea in the proceedings or in the
5 process? I should use the word process rather
6 than proceedings.

7 CHAIR JONES: You say heard means
8 one-way communication, is that right? And
9 that's how you're --

10 MS. GARVIN: Heard means it is me
11 saying to you, writing to you, telling you
12 exactly what I think. It is the victim's
13 voice being present, actively present,
14 somewhere in the process.

15 MR. BRYANT: In the State of
16 Virginia's process, our own Victim Rights Act,
17 and my memory of what goes on in the federal
18 Victim Rights Act from having been in the U.S.
19 Attorney's Office, is that they come in and
20 they can speak directly.

21 It doesn't mean it's going to
22 change the judge's mind or that he's not going

1 to accept the plea, but sometimes it might.
2 But they actually can come into court, in the
3 State of Virginia's system, and address the
4 judge and say I don't think this plea is
5 adequate or covers the offenses committed
6 against. And even if they're not there, the
7 prosecutor has an obligation by law to inform
8 the judge if the victim disagrees.

9 "Your Honor, we are reducing this
10 to attempted rape and I want you to know that
11 the victim totally disagrees with that
12 decision to reduce this, as well as she
13 totally disagrees with the recommended
14 sentence." So sometimes the victims don't
15 want to come in and be in open court but the
16 prosecutor still has that obligation if they
17 don't come.

18 Sometimes I've seen it work the
19 other way. The judge is leery that the
20 prosecution gave up on the case and I've had
21 a couple of instances where my prosecutors
22 have had the victim there to say, no, judge.

1 I'm the victim of this and this is what I
2 want. And the judge still rejects the plea.
3 So at least it's the opportunity to be heard.

4 MS. GARVIN: And that aligns with
5 the federal, the state practice you described
6 aligns with the federal that you've also
7 described. And that's where the Subcommittee
8 was trying to get to.

9 MR. BRYANT: But I have to say,
10 like Judge Jones, in my own federal
11 experience, I can't recall, in the 13 years,
12 where we actually had a victim come in and say
13 they disagreed with what was going on, what
14 the full agreement was.

15 But at the same time, the
16 prosecutor's still required to say, "Your
17 Honor, the victim in this case does not agree
18 with the government's plea agreement."

19 And the other thing is, I think
20 this came up, yes, in every system there's a
21 witness stipulation of facts that the judge,
22 in the state system, in the federal system,

1 like the military system, goes over ad
2 infinitum.

3 The first time, when I first got
4 out of law school and went and had a case as
5 a defense attorney in federal court, after all
6 that judge went through I wondered why this
7 guy was pleading guilty myself. You know, why
8 would you do that with all the warnings?
9 That's what you get from a federal judge.
10 Anyway, that's just an aside.

11 CHAIR JONES: So where does confer
12 turn into heard? I mean, we know that a
13 victim can confer on a plea bargain, right,
14 with the convening authority?

15 MS. GARVIN: The way we crafted it
16 in our recommendations was confer about
17 whether the case is moving forward or not.
18 Charges.

19 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

20 MS. GARVIN: Heard was about the
21 plea.

22 CHAIR JONES: Oh, so you're not

1 using the conferral, here are my thoughts
2 about -- are we talking about a written
3 statement to the convening authority? That
4 would be a one-way statement that says this is
5 what I think happened in this case, he should
6 plead to everything or he should plead to
7 this?

8 MS. GARVIN: That's where
9 Recommendation 32(b) came in with the
10 parenthetical that said could be in writing or
11 in person, because we were acknowledging that
12 piece here.

13 We separated confer and the right
14 to be heard on plea because confer is the
15 right to be a part of things along the way and
16 understand what is happening along the way.
17 That is what the right to confer under the
18 federal CVRA and under the NDAA means. It
19 means you understand how things are going,
20 what's happening.

21 We grounded it in conferring with
22 regard to charge referral because that is a

1 critical moment along the process that we
2 heard testimony and took evidence on that was
3 a gap.

4 And then the right to be heard was
5 about this critical moment, the second
6 critical moment about whether the case is
7 going to go away or go in a very different
8 direction. Yes, I'm sorry.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: I just have read
10 the whole of Recommendation 32, including
11 32(a) and 32(b). I think, as drafted, it
12 solves the other problems that you've raised
13 because it says the proposed changes -- look
14 at A. It says the proposed changes should
15 provide the victim the right to be heard
16 regarding a plea with appropriate
17 consideration to account for military pre-
18 trial agreement practice. So if it doesn't
19 make any sense, then it doesn't have to
20 happen.

21 MS. GARVIN: That is where the
22 Subcommittee landed, as we did not specify the

1 moment.

2 REP. HOLTZMAN: Right. So that if
3 the moment to be heard is vis-a-vis the
4 convening authority, then the victim would
5 have a right to submit a written document to
6 the convening authority or to ask to be heard
7 and could be accepted, could be rejected.

8 In terms of being heard in court,
9 which what you're saying, General Dunn, is
10 that it's a meaningless point to make a
11 comment because the judge is just bound by
12 accepting the plea or rejecting the plea as to
13 whether or not the facts stated meet the legal
14 standard.

15 Okay, so there's no real
16 discretion there, just a dissent, you know, so
17 you can't say in the interest of justice I'm
18 for or against the plea. Well, if it doesn't
19 make sense, there's nothing in Recommendation
20 32 that would require that the victim be heard
21 at that point.

22 MS. GARVIN: You are correct.

1 REP. HOLTZMAN: You know, so I
2 think maybe the language solves the problem.

3 MS. GARVIN: Representative
4 Holtzman, you're correct. What the
5 Subcommittee did was try to leave this, the
6 moment of what this right looks like, to a
7 later time to accommodate what is and isn't
8 appropriate.

9 REP. HOLTZMAN: So I'm just trying
10 to say that the concerns that have been raised
11 appropriately here by Colonel Cook and General
12 Dunn, I think is solved by the language. And
13 then we don't have to worry that we're
14 imposing something new on a system that would
15 be irrelevant to how it actually works.

16 And if that's the case then
17 perhaps we can just go forward and accept
18 Recommendation 32. Would that be too radical?

19 MS. GARVIN: I retract everything
20 I said and leave it to Representative
21 Holtzman.

22 REP. HOLTZMAN: Is that something

1 we could do? I want other readers here to
2 validate what I --

3 BG DUNN: No, 32 and all of its
4 associated findings, I mean, it says an
5 analogous opportunity for the victim to be
6 heard in the military justice system is before
7 the convening authority decides to accept the
8 plea. I agree with that 100 percent. I was
9 concerned because, Meg, you said both/and in
10 court. Sorry, that's what started me down
11 that path.

12 MS. GARVIN: So let me be clear --

13 BG DUNN: The language that's on
14 the slides, I am fine.

15 REP. HOLTZMAN: So you have no
16 problem with it?

17 BG DUNN: I have no problem with
18 it.

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: Colonel Cook, what
20 do you think?

21 COL COOK: When I had made the
22 suggestion to combine the two is because I

1 didn't necessarily think there was much -- I
2 don't mind. They can be done the same way.
3 I don't mind having it separated so that we
4 are recognizing two different things.

5 I will note that your
6 recommendation for Number 31 never says the
7 right to confer. It says the findings where
8 you note what's going on in the civilian
9 statute, and you just talk about the fact that
10 they can convey it. That's all fine.

11 The language in 32 is fine with
12 me, for the most part. The only question I
13 want to clarify is, as long as 32(a) is the
14 right to be heard regarding a plea, it's by
15 the convening authority because it's not a
16 question of the perfect consideration for the
17 military pre-trial practice, it's because
18 that's what it is. It's got to be the
19 convening authority.

20 But the second part that says the
21 recommended changes include a right to be
22 heard before the convening authority decides

1 to accept or reject. That's what the first
2 one says. What else does it include, is what
3 my concern is.

4 If you are saying in any way by
5 the language that's there it includes this,
6 and if you want to change that to say the
7 recommended change means the right to be heard
8 before the -- the recommended change provides
9 a right to be heard before the convening
10 authority decides, fine.

11 But if it includes I'm just
12 concerned that when we've opened the
13 suggestion that you're also saying it might
14 include the right to be heard in front of a
15 military judge. And at that point I think
16 it's too late based on all the things we've
17 just discussed.

18 CHAIR JONES: Any other thoughts?

19 REP. HOLTZMAN: But 32, if I might
20 just say, doesn't discuss the judge. It talks
21 about the convening authority.

22 So includes the right to be heard

1 before the convening authority decides to
2 accept, reject or propose it. So I don't see
3 how the judge comes into that.

4 Am I misreading it? Because I'm
5 just trying to allay your concerns and if we
6 need to change language here then we should
7 change language. But if we don't really --

8 COL COOK: I'm wondering, Meg, was
9 there anything else that it was going to
10 include? That's the only question I have, is
11 it says it includes --

12 MS. GARVIN: I don't have a
13 specific recollection of the Subcommittee.
14 When I said both/and the court, that was part
15 of a conversation. We did not specifically
16 say here the include was more than that with
17 regard to the convening authority. I don't
18 have a recollection of that.

19 COL COOK: If it's limited to the
20 convening authority then I have no objection.

21

22 CHAIR JONES: Well, neither would

1 I, but I don't know if it's limited.

2 COL COOK: Because that's not
3 clear.

4 CHAIR JONES: Yes. On the phone.

5 PROF. HILLMAN: Sorry, Judge
6 Jones. This is Beth. I have to sign off in
7 eight minutes so I don't know if we're going
8 to -- just to let you know on that. I think
9 the language that's drafted, I'm in support of
10 the language as drafted.

11 CHAIR JONES: You think the
12 language in this recommendation is what?

13 PROF. HILLMAN: I just said I am
14 in support.

15 CHAIR JONES: Oh. Okay. Thanks.

16 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I think that
17 if the Committee conversation suggests that
18 we're not talking about the right to be heard
19 before the judge, in 32(b), that should
20 satisfy everybody's concern about the meaning
21 of that one section.

22 CHAIR JONES: I understand Colonel

1 Cook's concern with the word include. So
2 maybe we could just modify that, unless you're
3 talking about being heard by anyone but the
4 convening authority. Are you saying the
5 recommended changes ensure the right to be
6 heard before the convening authority?

7 REP. HOLTZMAN: Is that fine with
8 you?

9 COL COOK: That it ensures the
10 right to be heard by the convening authority,
11 yes. In 32(a), I would just add after the
12 words "regarding a plea" -- the right to be
13 heard regarding a plea, the right to be heard
14 by the convening authority regarding a plea.
15 I'd put the words convening authority into
16 32(a).

17 My concern is these are going to
18 be stand-alone recommendations. Nobody's
19 going to go and look for some of the
20 background discussions. So I'd rather leave
21 this is what was intended and make it clear
22 that they don't have to go search for it and

1 nobody can misinterpret it.

2 REP. HOLTZMAN: Are you talking
3 about (b)?

4 COL COOK: I'm talking about in
5 32(a) where it says the proposed change should
6 provide victims with the rights we heard
7 regarding a plea.

8 I just want to modify that to say
9 the right to be heard by a convening authority
10 regarding a plea with appropriate
11 consideration to the pre-trial agreement
12 practice.

13 So the convening authority goes
14 into Part (a). And (a) gets clarified to say
15 this is what it ensures. It doesn't mean it
16 includes anything else other than what it
17 currently states.

18 CHAIR JONES: And would accept it
19 with that additional language. Does anyone
20 else still have a disagreement with respect to
21 this?

22 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, let

1 me just ask, for the Subcommittee. This
2 means, if we put this in, then the victim is
3 never going to be heard in court.

4 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I
5 couldn't understand what you said, Judge
6 Hillman.

7 CHAIR JONES: I think Professor
8 Hillman's saying that if we put this language
9 in, it means it's not going to be heard in
10 court. Well, I think this language doesn't go
11 there. That's right.

12 At the moment, it ensures the
13 right to be heard before the convening
14 authority, which we're all in agreement makes
15 sense. And also amended in 32(a), again, it
16 reiterates it's the right to be heard by the
17 convening authority.

18 So we're saying yes to that and we
19 really haven't found a moment in court yet
20 where we think there is an appropriate moment
21 for the victim to be heard with respect to the
22 plea bargain. I think that's a fair --

1 PROF. HILLMAN: My only question,
2 for the Victims' Services Subcommittee, is
3 that sufficient? Because we're not only
4 saying we haven't found a moment. We're
5 saying there's no right to be heard in court
6 if we narrow it to the convening authority
7 because the convening authority is never in
8 court. And I just want to understand what
9 we're saying will not happen.

10 REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, this doesn't
11 apply to sentencing, isn't that correct?

12 CHAIR JONES: Right. Right.

13 MS. GARVIN: The victim has a
14 separate and distinct right to be heard at
15 sentencing. This would not touch -- I will
16 say the preclusion of the opportunity to be
17 heard in court if, by chance, there is an
18 opportunity. I hear the Panel clearly saying
19 they do not believe that currently with regard
20 to plea there is an opportunity in court that
21 makes sense. The Subcommittee did, during
22 discussions, contemplate that if there was a

1 moment that made sense in court that it would
2 be available.

3 So if the Panel is precluding that
4 future potential, that would be in conflict
5 with the Panel contemplating it.

6 CHAIR JONES: Well, right now all
7 we're doing adopting the right to do what can
8 be done by a victim right now. And at the
9 moment, we can't contemplate a moment that
10 makes sense. So I don't think we're
11 precluding anything, but I'm not sure there's
12 anything out there that's an opportunity that
13 we are precluding.

14 Obviously, Professor Hillman,
15 we'll hear more from your Subcommittee on this
16 issue. Correct?

17 PROF. HILLMAN: You Honor, not on
18 the victims' rights so much because that went
19 with the Victims' Services Subcommittee, but
20 recommendations on how to bring sentencing in
21 alignment with the civilian practices, yes,
22 you will hear more on that.

1 CHAIR JONES: Okay. And then we
2 can think about it then. Okay, then I think
3 with the amendments that make it clear what
4 we're talking about their right to be heard by
5 the convening authority from the victim, 32,
6 32(a) and 32(b) are accepted. Okay. Next,
7 Meg.

8 MS. GARVIN: Recommendation 37 is
9 next. Recommendation 37 was discussed during
10 the last meeting and there were some changes
11 proposed, but the Panel did not loop back
12 around and finish discussion of it.

13 The findings with regard to this
14 one, which is labeled Victim Unsworn Statement
15 During Sentencing. The findings with regard
16 to this, the Subcommittee, again, did a
17 comparison.

18 Our job was to look at the
19 civilian rights, the CVRA, and see if they
20 were incorporated. The CVRA includes an
21 opportunity for the victim to be reasonably
22 heard at sentencing by allowing a statement

1 that's neither under oath nor subject to cross
2 examination.

3 In fact, in the materials you'll
4 see the Subcommittee reviewed and was
5 presented with, the case of Kenna v. District
6 Court, which interpreted the federal Crime
7 Victims' Rights Act and the right to be heard
8 and noted that it was akin to a defendant's
9 right of allocution, which is an unsworn, not
10 under oath moment.

11 Under military rules, a sexual
12 assault victim may present evidence of impact.
13 That is, financial, social, psychological and
14 medical impact of an offense, that unless
15 there's an agreement from the defense, the
16 victim has to testify under oath and is
17 subject to cross-examination. So in order to
18 bring it in line with the Federal Crime
19 Victims' Rights Act, it was a clarification
20 that the victim's right in military
21 proceedings to be heard at sentencing when it
22 is not with regard to aggravation on

1 mitigation, but it would be a right of
2 allocution.

3 So in the federal system if the
4 victim is being used as aggravation or a
5 mitigation with regard to a sentence rather
6 than with regard to impact, those moments,
7 they are subject to cross-examination and it's
8 under oath. But when they are doing their
9 allocution, which is impact, they are not
10 subject to cross-examination. And so the
11 subcommittee made a recommendation that they
12 be allowed to do it unsworn.

13 The language in front of you is
14 the modification that came out of your
15 deliberation last time. So I will read the
16 modified version that you all have in front fo
17 view and make a comment from the subcommittee
18 with regard to one piece of it.

19 So the current amended
20 Recommendation 37 is that the Secretary of
21 Defense recommends the President changes to
22 the manual for the court's martial and

1 prescribe appropriate regulations to provide
2 the right to make an unsworn victim impact
3 statement not subject to cross-examination
4 during the pre-sentencing proceeding with the
5 following safeguards.

6 The members should be instructed
7 similarly to the instruction they received
8 when the accused makes an sworn statement. If
9 there was a, quote, new matter that could
10 affect sentence brought up the in victim's
11 unsworn statement, sentencing could be delayed
12 so they have time to respond. And the unsworn
13 statement should be in writing and available
14 to the defense counsel before sentencing,
15 subject to the same objections available to
16 the government regarding the accused's unsworn
17 statement.

18 With regard to the subcommittees,
19 that is your modified language that is
20 currently before you with regard to the
21 evidence and information that the subcommittee
22 received. We did spend significant time

1 talking about whether it should be in writing
2 and available to the defense prior to the
3 moment and we had concluded it should not be
4 in order to align it with the CVRA and to
5 align the practice, in large part because
6 asking a survivor to -- and we had significant
7 conversation about the impact that sentencing
8 has on survivors -- asking a survivor to put
9 their statement in writing in advance and
10 submit it to others to read in advance can
11 actually add to the trauma they experience.

12 And so we made the recommendation
13 that since the federal courts have determined
14 the Federal Crime Victims' Rights Act right to
15 be heard at sentencing is right of allocution,
16 we are making it a right of allocution to
17 alignment.

18 MS. KING: And just for the
19 subcommittee or for the committee's
20 recollection, there was an alternative
21 statement from Mr. Cassara that I read. It's
22 on Page 153 of your report, for the people who

1 may not have been here at the last meeting.

2 MS. GARVIN: So you have language
3 in front of you that was crafted by the Panel
4 last time. The first edits in bullet 2 align
5 with the subcommittee's conversations and
6 deliberations. The last one with regard to
7 the writing does not align.

8 BG DUNN: Yes, but I think worked
9 -- we tried to work it out last time to
10 comport with the military sentencing process,
11 which is so different in terms of the
12 immediacy and the time than the federal
13 sentencing process is.

14 So, you know, there has to be some
15 mechanism that allows the defense a quick
16 opportunity to respond to matters that the
17 victim may raise on sentencing.

18 Unlike in the federal system,
19 where you've got really all the facts laid out
20 and probably any rebuttal to what the victim
21 might say unless one statement is available
22 there, but that's not the case in the military

1 proceedings.

2 MS. GARVIN: I just wanted to -- I
3 was asked to re-present this one and note that
4 we had discussed that and that was not where
5 we had landed, so I was asked to kind of put
6 that before the Panel again.

7 And also to note that after having
8 reviewed the transcript from the last hearing,
9 I did see the conversation about this and the
10 very detailed and substantive conversation
11 about this.

12 What I will say with regard to
13 that is there was discussion about in the
14 federal practice there is a pre-sentence
15 report and the victim participates in that and
16 therefore I believe it was actually said on
17 the record there are no surprises in federal
18 sentencing, and I think that's a misstatement
19 with regard to what happens in federal
20 practice with regard to victims.

21 They may participate in a pre-
22 sentence report. They do not always submit an

1 independent statement. Their pre-sentence
2 report writer generally writes their statement
3 or can write their statement. They may attach
4 a statement to the pre-sentence report, but
5 very often their actual statement is the
6 allocution that has not been heard by anyone
7 before and that happens at sentencing and the
8 constitutional right of the defendant in that
9 moment is to rebut that statement but not to
10 cross-examine. So I just wanted clarification
11 on the record of that.

12 COL COOK: Going back to the point
13 that General Dunn had just said. One of the
14 safeguards that you have included into the
15 recommendation says, well, you know, if there
16 is a surprise, we can always get a delay and
17 let the defense the opportunity -- it doesn't
18 work. It's not that easy.

19 I mean, the courts martial where
20 the cases are. They can happen incredibly
21 quicky. You took out the safeguard that Mr.
22 Cassara had recommended on Page 155 that said

1 that if a victim doesn't agree to at least a
2 pre-sentencing interview, they don't get the
3 opportunity to be spoken to.

4 So the way I'm reading this now is
5 the defense would get no rights. There's not
6 an absolute right for them to get access to
7 the victim to at least understand what might
8 come out in court. They wouldn't necessarily
9 see that statement in advance because we hold
10 the victim's rights. And when it comes out in
11 court, if they don't like what comes out, then
12 your case gets the opportunity to request a
13 delay and go out and get evidence.

14 In a military court-martial
15 process, I don't think that there's an
16 adequate safeguard that protects the rights of
17 the accused as well and this is a justice
18 system. The victim does have that right to be
19 heard and should be heard and should be able
20 to say how this has detrimentally affected
21 every aspect of their life. I agree with
22 that.

1 I also agree with the concept that
2 there is a person sitting there who's now been
3 convicted of a crime, about to be sentenced
4 for a crime, their due process rights are at
5 issue as well and then a constitutional piece
6 of that's going to outweigh. I don't think
7 that just saying we can delay, but you're
8 sitting in Afghanistan or Baghdad or Nigeria,
9 wherever it is we are, that that will
10 adequately protect the defense interest in
11 that case.

12 MS GARVIN: I certainly respect
13 your assessment of it. The conversation we
14 had as a subcommittee was the analysis of what
15 constitutional right actually attaches to the
16 defendant at the time and it is a right of
17 rebuttal.

18 It is not a right of cross-
19 examination. And rebuttal in the federal
20 system happens on the fly and we were making
21 a recommendation to align it. And the
22 subpoints here came after substantial

1 negotiation at the subcommittee level. It did
2 not originally include those. And then the
3 recommendation to ensure that defendant's
4 rights were protected included the three
5 bullets that we had put forward.

6 So I certainly understand the
7 Panel's position on this and have been asked
8 and am representing the subcommittee's
9 position that in writing and available to
10 defense before sentencing is not in line with
11 the Federal Crime Victims' Rights Act or the
12 rights that a victim of sexual assault would
13 have in the civilian world and may be
14 detrimental to victims.

15 CHAIR JONES: All right. Well,
16 let me ask this, does anybody disagree with
17 Recommendation 37 as it was amended. And I
18 think it was the last thing we spoke about
19 either -- at the end of the day the last time.

20 COL. COOK: Yes. I would disagree
21 with it.

22 BG MCGUIRE: Disagree.

1 CHAIR JONES: Recommendation 37 as
2 amended?

3 BG MCGUIRE: Yes.

4 PROF. HILLMAN: This is Beth. I
5 disagree with the amendment.

6 CHAIR JONES: Okay.

7 COL. COOK: Now, I disagree with
8 it as is and I disagree with it as amended.
9 So that's the distinction. I disagree with
10 the recommendation.

11 REP. HOLTZMAN: I disagree with it
12 as amended.

13 CHAIR JONES: All right. Well,
14 you know what, I think it could take us a
15 very long time to unravel this. And this is
16 not an easy one. I personally would like to
17 go back and reread the sections in the report
18 and think about this. So, Ms. Garvin, you
19 have brought us to an impasse.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIR JONES: I'm joking. All
22 right. Let's go to 38 then and we're still

1 holding on to 37.

2 MS. GARVIN: So again, this was
3 brought up in your last discussion but was not
4 resolved. It was asked to be continued until
5 today. The finding 38-1 and 38-2 are the
6 findings that support it.

7 Finding 38-1 discussed the
8 Kastenberg decision, which is that the court
9 of appeals for the Armed Forces had addressed
10 the issue of whether a victim has the right to
11 be heard through counsel with regard to certain
12 issues, absent formal clarification regarding
13 whether references to a victim's right to be
14 heard includes through counsel litigation on
15 this issue is likely to continue.

16 Our recommendation is that the
17 Secretary of Defense recommend to the
18 President changes to the manual for courts-
19 martial and prescribe appropriate regulations
20 to clarify that all victims rights include the
21 right for the victim to be heard include the
22 right to be heard through counsel.

1 I did review, again, the
2 transcript from the last hearing and I noted
3 that there was discussion about whether this
4 recommendation coming from the subcommittee
5 was about would allow for the counsel to be
6 the one that testified or presented the --
7 it's about the right to be heard and ensuring
8 that the right to be heard is meaningful.
9 It's not about evidentiary submissions. It's
10 about presentation of information to the
11 adjudicator, decision maker, whoever is on the
12 receiving end of the right to be heard.

13 Kastenbergs -- this was squarely
14 presented in Kastenbergs, but it was on a
15 narrow moment of rape shield. And it was, the
16 discussion was, does the victim have to be the
17 one that stands up there by herself or himself
18 and debate the legal aspects of rape shield,
19 right, or can their lawyer do it for them.
20 That was a core piece of Kastenbergs that
21 actually had to be litigated and decided
22 whether the right to be heard included that

1 the lawyer could stand up and make the
2 argument.

3 And I will tell you, and I told
4 the subcommittee so it's part of our
5 deliberations, this has actually had to happen
6 in civilian systems across the country, that
7 you have to figure out -- when it says the
8 victim has the right to be heard -- does that
9 mean through counsel, when it has legal
10 argument or not?

11 And so the committee made the
12 recommendation about that counsel, that when
13 the victim has a right to be heard, not when
14 they're a witness because they don't have a
15 right to be a witness. Testimonial
16 introduction is not a right. But when they
17 have the right to be heard, does that
18 contemplate that that could be exercised
19 through counsel? And we here make the
20 recommendation that your clarify that, yes, it
21 contemplates that counsel can present
22 information.

1 COL. COOK: Then can you clarify
2 the wording of the recommendation itself to
3 say it includes the right to be heard on legal
4 aspects of opinion case as opposed to -- to be
5 taken out of saying, is it anything
6 evidentiary, is this person now going to
7 testify in terms of information that would
8 have otherwise.

9 If it's put that way and we're
10 asking the Secretary of Defense to clarify
11 that piece of it, and you could say to clarify
12 -- maybe it's what right the victim has to be
13 heard during the case. And just leave it and
14 that and let them consider it. So look at the
15 cases, what's out there and carve out what's
16 there but I just, as long as it's not the
17 evidentiary piece, the fact that you have a
18 victim standing up and arguing at a rape
19 shield statute, I think that's ridiculous and
20 unfair probably.

21 But that doesn't mean if you're
22 asking for the factual basis behind it and

1 providing evidence to that affect but that
2 wouldn't be the counsel providing it, it would
3 be the victim at that point. But that's a
4 line that could be drawn through the court
5 proceedings.

6 MR. BRYANT: May I ask a question?
7 This is a curiosity question really, but it's
8 related to this. I ask everybody. Was it
9 ever contemplated that victim counsel from the
10 military would be victim counsel in a civilian
11 prosecution?

12 Because I learned last Friday that
13 in the city of Virginia Beach and this is just
14 -- I'm quoting now. We have -- we meaning I'm
15 talking to the prosecutor -- we have a have a
16 handful of Navy cases that we are prosecuting
17 and we are getting calls from victims' counsel
18 in the civilian prosecutions. Now, there was
19 no information that they were causing a
20 problem. They were just getting calls saying,
21 I'm victim's counsel and, yes, you have the
22 right to talk to my client.

1 So I'm just wondering what in the
2 concept of this if anybody ever thought or
3 understood that this was going to carry over
4 to, in our area, many, many, many sexual
5 assault prosecutions in the civilian courts
6 involving military victims?

7 MS. GARVIN: I don't believe I can
8 answer that question. I don't know if it was
9 contemplated by anybody. I don't know.

10 MR. BRYANT: Okay.

11 CHAIR JONES: Can I just ask you,
12 because I haven't read Kastenberg. What did
13 they decide in Kastenberg? What did the court
14 --

15 MS. GARVIN: Victim counsel can
16 represent the victim and has standing to aid
17 in the assistance in presenting legal
18 arguments.

19 CHAIR JONES: So isn't that the
20 end of the story?

21 MS. GARVIN: It was limited to
22 412, rape shield. So the issue is, is are we

1 going to have to, well, someone may correct
2 me. I don't believe they decided on 513 but
3 I could be wrong. I'm looking to see if
4 anyone can shake their head yes or no.

5 COL. HAM: It's a 412 issue. This
6 is Colonel Ham and it did not specify that the
7 attorney had the right to speak. That was
8 left to the discretion of the military judge,
9 if I recall correctly. Is that right, Ms.
10 Garvin?

11 MS. GARVIN: Yes. Yes. So what
12 the scope of what the right to be heard
13 counsel gets to do is slightly up in the air.
14 It was a narrow 412 issue, so rape shield, not
15 a 513, which is the privileges issue. And now
16 there's a whole myriad of other rights that
17 the victim now has the right to be heard on
18 and so the subcommittee discussed are we going
19 to -- is there going to be litigation on every
20 single right to be heard about what it means.

21 And we were recommending that you
22 preempt that because when a victim is about to

1 be heard about their right, their lawyer
2 should have standing. The order specifically
3 asked -- I just wanted to point this out to
4 you. In part of our directives, we were asked
5 to look at this issue about legal standing to
6 represent the victim by counsel. And so this
7 was one of our areas to look at and this was
8 where we came down on it.

9 COL. COOK: Can we just refer the
10 issue to the joint services committee to
11 consider it as part of the, or the UCMJ Review
12 Board that's actually looking at potential
13 changes, instead of us making that change.

14 I mean, this thing's just saying
15 SECDEF tell the President the changes, but it
16 doesn't tell them the substance of that those
17 changes should be. I think there's going to
18 need to be more input and probably more input
19 than what we can provide from the point of
20 view of this Panel.

21 CHAIR JONES: Well, we are -- go
22 ahead, Liz.

1 REP. HOLTZMAN: I think this is
2 relatively simple and straightforward. It
3 just says that when the victim has a right to
4 be heard, that that right include the right to
5 be heard through counsel.

6 And if that's going to avoid
7 litigation, isn't that a good thing?
8 Especially on an issue like this where I don't
9 think everyone in this room would find
10 objectionable the fact that the victim's
11 counsel can represent the victim in court.

12 That's what they're there for. So
13 if anyone's going to litigate it, let's just
14 avoid -- that's what I thought the objective
15 here was, a potential issue of litigation.

16 COL. COOK: Then I would add the
17 words you just said, on has the right to be
18 heard on legal issues. It just says the right
19 to be heard. So that concept of whoever's
20 testifying or whatever, has the right to be
21 heard on legal issues. Let the person
22 advocate for them.

1 MS. GARVIN: That would
2 accommodate the discussions that the
3 subcommittee had. I will note this one. I'm
4 not trying to throw a hank out. That's the
5 wrong word. Whatever word. I was thinking
6 some wrinkle in things, that's the word.

7 I don't want what you all decide
8 to be perceived as limiting something that
9 already exists, which is folks can read other
10 folks' victim impact statements into the
11 record, generally speaking. So, and victim
12 counsel sometimes read victim impact
13 statements. So they wouldn't -- they would be
14 being heard, so I don't want it to be
15 perceived as taking that component away, but
16 heard on legal issues would accommodate the
17 discussion otherwise, so.

18 CHAIR JONES: Well, I guess I was
19 surprised we needed this. So maybe that means
20 we should make the recommendation and avoid
21 litigation. And so the only question is do we
22 put on -- I can't imagine anyone would not

1 permit someone, a counsel, to read on behalf
2 of his client a statement. But you are
3 shaking your head and you say, you never know,
4 right.

5 MS. GARVIN: I have been befuddled
6 by this for 11 years in my practice. I've --

7 CHAIR JONES: So are you objecting
8 to on legal issues?

9 MS. GARVIN: Not at all. I think
10 that align with the subcommittee's
11 discussions.

12 CHAIR JONES: All right. Then
13 does anyone dissent from this recommendation,
14 adding the words on legal issues. No? Okay.
15 38's accepted. How many -- who do -- let's
16 see.

17 Professor Hillman, are you still -
18 - I think you're gone. Professor Hillman, are
19 you still there? Okay. And Mai's gone, so I
20 think we might have to adjourn.

21 COL. HAM: Ma'am, we have one
22 public comment.

1 CHAIR JONES: Oh, okay.

2 COL. HAM: In person.

3 CHAIR JONES: Then we should
4 definitely -- Ms. Garvin, I'm really sorry
5 that we weren't able to get through everything
6 --

7 MS. GARVIN: I certainly
8 understand the importance of public comment.

9 CHAIR JONES: It was still very
10 helpful.

11 MS. GARVIN: Absolutely.

12 CHAIR JONES: It's been very
13 helpful having you here and I do want to take
14 the time now to have the public comment.
15 Thanks a lot. We'll be seeing you again.

16 MS. GARVIN: Yes.

17 COL. HAM: Ma'am, the public
18 comment is Ms. Jen McClendon. And she's here.
19 Her written statement is in your folders and
20 also posted to the website.

21 CHAIR JONES: Thank you.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT

1 CHAIR JONES: Good afternoon, Ms.
2 McClendon.

3 MS. MCCLENDON: Good afternoon.
4 Can you hear me?

5 CHAIR JONES: Yes.

6 MS. MCCLENDON: Okay. I'm going
7 to attempt to make this a little bit more
8 brief than I had originally developed it to
9 be. I want to thank the Panel for hearing me
10 today.

11 My name is Jenny McClendon and I'm
12 coming before this Panel to introduce myself
13 as the founding mother of a collaborative
14 think tank that wishes to address this and
15 other sexual assault related issues.

16 I wish to address finite questions
17 of this Panel and other Panels that have to
18 have anything to do with rape in the military.
19 This think tank is about a year old. We
20 didn't necessarily expect to come forward this
21 quickly, but your Panel was convening and your
22 Panel is eventually going to disband, so we

1 wanted to be heard here first.

2 My cofounder is Diana Danis of the
3 National Women's Veteran's Conference and
4 former professor at the University of Colorado
5 at Denver. Together, we have hand-selected
6 people from a number of age groups, people who
7 served at different times and people who have
8 varied experiences in and outside of the
9 military.

10 Our think tank includes myself.
11 I'm a philosophy, ethics, logic, humanities
12 and history professor. I'm a public educator
13 and a mother, protector and provider for four
14 young children.

15 My cofounder, Diana Danis, is a
16 former faculty of the University of California
17 -- I'm sorry, I work for the University of
18 California. University of Colorado at Denver.
19 Sociologist, speaker, cultural diversity
20 instructor and social activist.

21 Amber Mathwig is a graduate
22 student of Gender Studies. She's a veteran

1 Master-at-arms, which means that she is a
2 military police officer who would have
3 investigated some of these cases. Today,
4 she's labeled as a feminist on gender in the
5 military.

6 Monisha Rios is a licensed
7 clinical social worker and macro social worker
8 and she's a post-graduate student in humanist
9 psychology relating to trauma care.

10 Geri Lynn Weinstein Mathews is a
11 licensed clinical social and she's the
12 coproducer of the film Justice Denied, which
13 has to deal with specifically men who were
14 assaulted in service.

15 Ginny Branam you heard from last
16 week. She's a registered nurse, activist,
17 educator. She is also a teacher. And she's
18 currently decided to go back to school to
19 become a forensic psychologist.

20 Rosie Palfy served as a combat
21 correspondent in the Marine Corps, and she's
22 currently a veteran advocate for homeless

1 veterans in Cleveland, Ohio. And she's well
2 awarded in both the military and in her
3 practice outside the military.

4 I'm going to skip an entire
5 paragraph for the sake of time. At this time,
6 I'm reporting to you that I really like the
7 way that your legal discussions are going. I
8 might comment that when a victim's statement
9 is written, there might be some undue command
10 influence on that statement.

11 When I was on active duty, some of
12 the things that I witnessed, I was encouraged
13 to see them differently than I see them today.
14 I was encouraged to understand things through
15 watered-down terms. And I think that that's
16 something that you may want to consider, when
17 it comes to victim's statements.

18 A lot of victims, if they want to
19 keep their career are going to have to go
20 along to get along and say, you know, it was
21 terrible but I'm getting past it. It's not a
22 very good victim impact statement if you want

1 a long sentence for a perpetrator. And if you
2 want a discharge for a perpetrator, that's not
3 going to be helpful.

4 There's been significant advocacy
5 on this issue. My think tank doesn't deviate
6 from any of the advocacy. There have been
7 films such as Service: When Women Come
8 Marching Home, the Invisible War and Justice
9 Denied which I mentioned earlier. We don't
10 deviate from any of their requests either. We
11 don't deviate from the idea of taking the
12 reporting out of the chain of command, but
13 that's not, by itself, going to solve the
14 problem.

15 What we're here to talk about is
16 culture change. And legal action, legal
17 activity can drive culture change. That's
18 part of the reason that we selected an
19 interdisciplinary team is because culture
20 change is going to require people from varied
21 backgrounds.

22 We're developing a set of courses

1 that we want to present to the war colleges.
2 We want to present to several universities,
3 and the goal of these courses is to help
4 facilitate culture change through a
5 transformative, competency-based instruction
6 that will be offered to both senior, enlisted
7 leadership and senior officer leadership.

8 What I witnessed on active duty is
9 middle management problems, and I don't mean
10 to deviate that much from my statement, but
11 middle management problems were really, really
12 critical to whether a case got out of the
13 chain of command, got out of the division. So
14 the first class petty officer in the Navy, the
15 Chief, the junior officers, the Department
16 Head, they would hear of a case and sometimes
17 the Commanding Officer couldn't. In fact, on
18 behalf of my own Commanding Officer, when he
19 got the information, he was absolutely
20 flabbergasted. It was the first time he had
21 heard of it, of some of the issues that were
22 happening on the ship that I was on.

1 So we're developing this set of
2 competency-based courses to help facilitate
3 culture change, kind of in tandem with the
4 legal activity that you guys are discussing
5 and hashing out here. I'm going to skip
6 another paragraph except to say one thing out
7 of this paragraph.

8 When I went into the military, I
9 was already well-educated. Not as well
10 educated as later in life but was already
11 well-educated. I was a strong woman and still
12 am. I was a self defense instructor and still
13 am. And I never expected in any way -- I was
14 one of those people who thought oh, well, that
15 would never happen to me. It just doesn't
16 happen to people like me.

17 And I'm sorry to say that that
18 wasn't true. I didn't expect to see the
19 blatant violence that I saw. And what shocks
20 me and what I want to bring forth to you guys
21 today, because it needs to influence legal
22 discussion on this, is there are blatant

1 excuses for violence within the ranks.

2 When I was on active duty, I
3 witnessed a first class petty officer telling
4 me basically, we need to torment each and
5 every one of you junior enlisted people in
6 case we're ever captured as a division, we
7 might say to the enemy, well, at this point,
8 this person's going to break. You need to
9 stop.

10 I don't -- if the enemy is going
11 to torture prisoners of war, I don't think
12 they're going to stop because senior
13 leadership within the division says oh, you've
14 hit their breaking point. So some of these
15 excuses really need to be addressed. And if
16 they can be addressed legally, that would be
17 helpful.

18 When I challenged service members,
19 they would give outrageous excuses. You ever
20 think about the prisoner of war status that
21 was used as an example of why we need to
22 torture our junior enlisted personnel?

1 As an undergraduate, I was a
2 Holocaust Studies major. Well, Holocaust
3 Studies minor. History major with an emphasis
4 in Holocaust Studies. I sat in hearings with
5 Holocaust survivors. I listened to testimony
6 of Holocaust survivors. And I've personally
7 interviewed at least two Holocaust survivors,
8 one of which was a political prisoner of war
9 during the Holocaust. And not one of them
10 needed to be tortured by somebody in order to
11 be ready to be tortured there.

12 So some of the things that, some
13 of the conversations that go on as a junior
14 enlisted, toward junior enlisted people need
15 to be brought forth and perhaps addressed
16 legally. Excuses for violence probably should
17 have some type of legal ramifications. Now I
18 know that in our American culture, we don't
19 like to police verbiage. We don't like to
20 police words. But the military does answer to
21 a different calling. And, again, I don't mean
22 to deviate so much.

1 I'm going to skip another
2 paragraph. After a training episode, a senior
3 enlisted person, I want to talk about the
4 concept of anti-training. When the military
5 comes forward, we often hear about their
6 training improvements. And I believe that
7 they're improving their training processes.
8 I'd like to sit in on some of the training
9 processes that are going on, but I believe
10 that most members of the military are on the
11 right side of this.

12 The problem is is that the people
13 who are on the wrong side of this can provide
14 a pretty convincing argument. And a lot of
15 times after there's been a training episode,
16 you'll have an anti-training episode, which is
17 where perhaps a training episode would include
18 some victim testimony, would include some
19 problems with not using victim-blaming
20 language. And maybe the training episode is
21 fantastic. It could be a remarkable
22 experience for the soldiers and sailors that

1 witness this. Then the next morning at
2 quarters, a senior enlisted person would say
3 something like, look, those people that are
4 complaining about rape, maybe 20 percent of
5 them are honest people and maybe this does
6 happen, but in reality most of them are guilty
7 of buyer's remorse.

8 Buyer's remorse is probably --
9 buyer's remorse and the character of the
10 victim fallacy are probably the number one
11 excuses for rape going on in the military,
12 rape and sexual assault and harassment. Anti-
13 training happens probably every time there's
14 a training evolution, which almost negates
15 training.

16 Another problem with training is
17 the -- that if I tell you this is not allowed
18 in my Navy anymore. I'm a Navy veteran, so
19 this is not allowed in my Navy anymore. A lot
20 of times what's been said is not allowed in
21 the Navy will be renamed. So when hazing was
22 declared illegal long ago and far away, it was

1 now termed extra-military instruction, paint
2 locker counseling.

3 So you were not being hazed
4 anymore, but you were still being taken into
5 a paint locker and physically assaulted by
6 your Chief. It was just called something
7 else. So you can't charge somebody for
8 something that's not currently on the books.
9 These things that make the legal conversation
10 very difficult. So I've covered anti-training
11 and I've covered some of the problems with
12 training.

13 Another problem with training is -
14 - and I use an example from math. When I was
15 on active duty I was asked to be the command
16 math tutor. And I enjoyed that part of my
17 position. If I teach you the Pythagorean
18 theorem as $A^2 + B^2 = C^2$ and then I say, now that you
19 understand the Pythagorean theorem, please
20 reconstruct this wall behind you.

22 That's not really taking the

1 training to the level that it needs to go.
2 It's basically asking you to apply a theory to
3 a set of circumstances that you haven't
4 necessarily been prepared for. For that
5 reason, I'd like to have people, like my think
6 tank and some of the other advocacy groups,
7 heard a little bit more often by the
8 Department of Defense and by members of the
9 Congress because I've sat in almost every one
10 of these hearings one way or another, whether
11 it was sitting at home with my kids watching
12 them or -- not having the kids watch them
13 necessarily, but sitting at home -- or in the
14 hearings themselves.

15 And I hear over and over again the
16 we're training, we're training, we're
17 training. When I sat in the civil rights
18 hearing authority training, hearing authority
19 inquiries, one of the SAPRO officers said, I
20 don't even use PowerPoint in my training. I'm
21 not sure that the method or modality of the
22 training is as important as the content of the

1 training and how to apply the training. So
2 I'd like to be heard more often about this
3 training matter. I mean I am, after all, a
4 teacher after I got out of the military.

5 So some of the things that are
6 said in these training episodes when I was on
7 active duty are -- I gave a list, and the list
8 I'll explain in a minute. I suspect that this
9 training is well-intended. Treat others with
10 respect. Real soldiers don't rape. That's a
11 great message, real soldiers don't rape. It's
12 not the message that's happening, but it's a
13 great message.

14 Not in my service. One of the --
15 I used to hear it all the time. Not in my
16 Navy. Don't talk to women. I'm just going to
17 look around at the women in the room, see what
18 you're thinking. We don't retaliate. That
19 has not been the experience that you guys have
20 heard from anybody, has it? We don't
21 retaliate. We take all allegations seriously.
22 Ad infinitum.

1 All of these have some merit
2 except for the don't talk to women, and I put
3 that in there because that's what I heard when
4 I was being trained in the mid-1990s at Fleet
5 ASW Training Center in California, out in San
6 Diego. Don't talk to women. If you talk to
7 women, they'll charge you with rape. That
8 does two things. It gives men the idea that
9 women are the enemy. And it gives women
10 who've been assaulted the idea that you'd
11 better not report that because it will just
12 prove Statement A.

13 It seems to lend too much credence
14 to Statement A. Some male veterans, after
15 they get out of the military, because they've
16 been taught such harsh attitudes toward women
17 have difficulty maintaining employment. I
18 have a person that I know. Actually, it's a
19 family member who hired two male veterans.
20 They couldn't work for her because they
21 couldn't work for a woman. And here she was
22 trying to do her due diligence as an American

1 citizen. America hires heroes. But both of
2 these male veterans walked off the job at
3 different times.

4 I'm going to skip this next
5 paragraph. I'm interested in continuing this
6 conversation. I know that the lifespan of
7 this Panel is limited. The conversation needs
8 to continue even after you guys disband. I'm
9 asking this Panel to hear my colleague,
10 Monisha Rios, at the end of the month. She's
11 already contacted people in New York. I'm
12 asking the Department of Defense to continue
13 to hear from me. I live in the DC metro area.
14 I can be reached. And I can get time. I can
15 make time happen, despite my many
16 responsibilities. I can make time happen. I
17 thank you for hearing me and I want to thank
18 everybody that is on the right side of this
19 matter.

20 I want to thank the members of the
21 Department of Defense that are very
22 uncomfortable with these hearings because

1 they've been standing on the right side of
2 this matter for their entire careers.
3 Hopefully for the world, the kids that are
4 coming up today, to include my own, I'd like
5 us to have a safer world for them to live in.
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR JONES: Well, I want to
8 thank you, Ms. McClendon. That was a very
9 worthwhile presentation for us to hear. And
10 the specific examples you were there, you are
11 a person who can speak with authority. Your
12 group sounds terrific with -- between their
13 education and their experience. And I guess
14 I should add that, you know, obviously I come
15 to this task with a great deal of energy. So
16 I can't thank you enough for coming. We'd
17 very much like to hear from your colleague and
18 you say she'll be coming to New York --

19 MS. MCCLENDON: Yes, I believe
20 so.

21 CHAIR JONES: -- near the end of
22 the month. And we'd be delighted to hear from

1 her.

2 MS. MCCLENDON: We should have the
3 white paper that we promised last hearing
4 ready for you guys. It's in production now.

5 CHAIR JONES: Is that the one
6 Jamie Wi was talking about?

7 MS. MCCLENDON: Yes. Yes.

8 CHAIR JONES: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. MCCLENDON: And we'll have
10 more if you need more.

11 CHAIR JONES: No. I very, very
12 much appreciate this. Thanks very much.

13 Yes. I can't hear you, Maria.
14 Are you closing the meeting?

15 COL. HAM: The Panel has finished
16 its work for today, ma'am.

17 CHAIR JONES: All right, anybody
18 else? The Panel has finished its work for
19 today. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, the hearing in the
21 above-entitled matter was concluded at 1:35
22 p.m.)

A				
a.m 1:13 4:2	accepts 154:10,14	170:16,18 189:7	adequate 171:5	advocates 10:16
abide 112:5	access 70:19 196:6	189:19 192:14	196:16	18:20 27:1,4,6
ability 68:6	accommodate	198:11	adequately 197:10	51:13 61:2,18
able 5:22 28:1 41:4	95:21 121:9	action 7:8 57:13	adhere 11:21	78:7 147:12
60:17 67:22 68:4	146:12 177:7	103:6 162:1	adjourn 3:19	advocating 111:5
82:10 93:16 96:1	209:2,16	216:16	210:20	affect 33:19 39:5
98:13 101:12	accommodates	actions 108:8 113:9	adjudicator 201:11	58:2,3 95:9 99:17
169:2 196:19	149:8	active 36:7,11,16	adjudicators	146:8 191:10
211:5	accommodating	37:11 50:16	148:18	204:1
above-entitled 90:7	121:4	105:20 215:11	administering 20:7	affirmative 124:14
229:21	account 104:12	217:8 219:2	administrative	afforded 102:10
absence 55:16	175:17	223:15 225:7	26:19 27:12 103:5	103:8,13,18
absent 200:12	accountability 5:21	actively 170:13	Admiral 1:17	Afghanistan 65:20
absolute 196:6	6:7,19,19 7:6 9:10	activist 213:20	35:12 38:2 48:9	197:8
absolutely 167:14	9:17 11:4 12:1	214:16	52:6 57:1 59:12	afternoon 90:11
211:11 217:19	accountable 6:15	activity 216:17	60:20	91:1 138:3 212:1
absorbed 39:18	7:16 8:9,11 11:16	218:4	admirals 33:2,14	212:3
accept 4:8 6:1 74:8	12:7 20:5	acts 25:11	43:18	afterward 12:8
111:11 112:15	accounted 160:22	actual 62:6 110:9	admire 33:5	age 213:6
113:18 114:10	accurate 13:3	110:14 195:5	admittedly 43:13	aggravation 189:22
123:5 126:14	54:20 140:19	ad 10:13 173:1	51:11	190:4
129:21 130:18	accused 17:12 59:5	225:22	adopt 24:5 63:5	ago 89:5 159:22
133:9 141:15	112:17 116:22	add 10:14 99:19	69:22 70:10 81:9	222:22
150:20 151:4	117:14 118:19	107:13,21 114:4	138:20	agree 11:10,12 13:4
154:2 155:6,14,14	150:22 153:8,13	120:20 130:3,8	adopted 15:22	19:16 32:8 56:20
156:1 164:7	153:20 156:5	131:6,7 183:11	81:12	58:5 64:12,15
165:21 170:2	158:7 160:16,22	192:11 208:16	adopting 187:7	72:1,8 78:15 80:3
171:1 177:17	162:19 163:7,20	228:14	ADULT 1:3	114:13,15,17
178:7 180:1 181:2	191:8 196:17	adding 30:11 108:4	advance 192:9,10	118:16 123:10
184:18	accused's 82:9	124:19 129:22	196:9	130:2,16,19
acceptable 15:10	154:3 191:16	210:14	advancing 31:5	132:19 136:19
122:10 129:20	achieve 23:8 114:5	addition 15:4 18:6	advice 10:17 40:1	151:17 165:7
acceptance 107:13	114:13 157:22	18:14 26:12	45:19 59:3 63:19	167:1 168:18
155:17 157:19	achieved 167:18	109:19	108:22 124:13	172:17 178:8
accepted 15:13	achieves 116:5	additional 6:5 15:7	125:4 144:4	196:1,21 197:1
62:20 68:13,17	141:18	27:14,15,16 48:1	advising 64:7	agreed 39:13 87:11
81:6 83:12 89:20	acknowledged	81:9,13 82:19	advisory 88:18	117:17 130:7
100:17,20 101:14	144:20	83:5 91:15 98:1,9	advocacy 216:4,6	158:9 160:18
111:17,20 156:19	acknowledging	184:19	224:6	agreeing 61:20
161:21 169:19	121:10 174:11	address 61:16	advocate 15:4 19:8	126:22
176:7 188:6	act 24:7,7,8 25:11	70:16 94:4 109:16	54:16 57:6,7 58:9	agreement 16:4
210:15	25:12,14,19 26:17	147:22 156:13	58:22 60:21 63:11	107:9 111:20
accepting 108:3,5	63:6,12 69:18	171:3 212:14,16	63:19 64:7,11	112:16,20 113:7
123:2 125:20,22	102:7 103:15	addressed 58:5	67:16 105:21	113:13 116:10,21
129:8 149:12	105:14 143:5	139:1 161:7 200:9	106:3 147:21	117:9 118:12,17
166:15 176:12	150:2 155:4,11	219:15,16 220:15	208:22 214:22	124:18 129:5
	159:3 167:22	addressing 161:18	advocated 79:15	131:18 133:4,7

139:15 143:9,22 144:3,17,18 145:2 145:5 146:3 149:5 153:7 161:9 162:2 163:8 172:14,18 175:18 184:11 185:14 189:15	allies 21:4,13 allocate 158:15 allocute 166:13 allocution 159:8 168:13 189:9 190:2,9 192:15,16 195:6 allow 110:10 132:3 132:4 138:6 201:5 allowed 93:15 117:5 121:21 122:1,5 190:12 222:17,19,20 allowing 106:9 116:13 188:22 allows 100:9 193:15 alluded 63:21 alternative 192:20 amazing 41:5 Amber 213:21 amended 94:19 96:12,17 122:9 126:15 127:3 133:7,10,12,13 185:15 190:19 198:17 199:2,8,12 amending 82:7 141:17 amendment 109:19 127:21 129:6,8 199:5 amendments 23:17 24:17 25:1 81:10 82:19 83:6 94:11 188:3 America 227:1 American 220:18 226:22 analogous 102:9,20 104:15 178:5 analysis 21:2 134:4 197:14 analyze 23:1 103:17 analyzing 20:8 and/or 108:2,5	129:8 anecdotal 43:5 51:11 55:9 anecdote 49:20 anonymous 37:5 answer 34:7 38:3 40:6,17 95:18 205:8 220:20 answering 43:10 Anti 222:12 anti-training 221:4 221:16 223:10 anticipate 148:11 anybody 101:4 198:16 205:2,9 225:20 229:17 anymore 41:18 162:9 222:18,19 223:4 anyone's 208:13 anyway 69:17 173:10 apart 157:6 167:16 apologies 138:12 apologize 28:1 appeals 200:9 appear 75:16,19 140:13 149:20 appeared 50:10 appearing 123:6 165:17 appears 75:21 140:17 appellate 159:4 applied 70:13 apply 72:7 74:5 139:20 186:11 224:2 225:1 appointed 22:1 appointment 84:9 85:6 appreciate 28:4 41:1 60:11 61:16 167:6 229:12 appropriate 75:10 168:11 175:16 177:8 184:10	185:20 191:1 200:19 appropriately 177:11 approve 87:7 approximately 40:3 area 6:6 30:18 36:14 73:21 137:2 205:4 227:13 areas 5:11 6:3 84:14 207:7 arguably 49:6 51:10 argue 50:14 158:12 arguing 203:18 argument 202:2,10 221:14 arguments 205:18 armed 48:17 50:20 51:6 200:9 Army 13:8 14:5 15:1 36:17 37:12 37:17 42:15 46:3 105:20 Article 67:17 74:18 75:3,12,15 77:21 79:2,16,19 81:10 81:17 82:5,20 83:6 125:3 articulate 129:10 artillery 65:15 aside 53:1 173:10 asked 34:10 37:14 49:1,9,10,12 91:16 95:1 194:3 194:5 198:7 200:4 207:3,4 223:15 asking 36:7,11 41:21 96:5,9,10 96:16 101:12 192:6,8 203:10,22 224:2 227:9,12 asks 101:6 aspect 39:10 44:10 121:11 196:21 aspects 27:8 44:3	45:9 201:18 203:4 assault 1:3 5:15 6:21 7:22 8:13,21 9:8 15:20 17:8,19 17:22 18:1,5,8 20:19 21:19 22:7 23:2,15 24:6,18 25:5,17 26:2 28:21 29:3,17 31:1,6 32:8,13 44:8 51:22 52:20 55:22 70:8,14 72:16 73:8 82:1 89:1 92:14,15,18 93:2 94:14 106:2 158:11 189:12 198:12 205:5 212:15 222:12 assaulted 214:14 223:5 226:10 assaults 18:21 19:2 20:5,20 21:11,15 24:15 assess 85:11 assessing 10:6 assessment 5:20 8:22 15:18,22 64:9 69:19 70:2 88:21 96:14 197:13 assessments 64:4 assets 82:9 assigned 10:1 42:1 85:1 92:20,22 assignment 94:5 assignments 27:7 assistance 205:17 associated 47:17 178:4 associations 47:3,5 assume 9:19 58:8 160:15 assumes 97:1 assuming 40:8 154:14 ASW 226:5 attach 195:3
---	--	---	--	--

attaches 197:15	107:21,22 109:7	avoid 208:6,14	168:16 219:4	beyond 9:10,16
attempt 18:14	111:10,13 112:15	209:20	224:2	23:16 40:20 41:7
122:6 212:7	113:2,3,5,17	awarded 215:2	basis 203:22	81:11 87:19
attempted 171:10	114:7,9 115:1	aware 19:2 41:16	bath 135:11	BG 14:22 86:15,18
attempts 17:20	116:15,18 117:17	58:12 65:21 81:16	battalion 66:12	88:6 105:17
attend 28:1	117:21 120:8	awful 44:17	battle 33:21 34:3	135:13 140:3,20
attention 44:1	122:19,21 129:5		Beach 36:13	143:7 144:14,21
attitude 45:15	131:14,15 134:19	B	204:13	153:5 156:2
attitudes 226:16	135:17,22 142:3	b 130:20 133:21	befuddled 210:5	161:16 162:12
attorney 2:5,5	142:10,13,14,20	134:5 184:3	began 4:5	163:5,17 165:6,20
50:19 79:20	143:3,4,13 146:1	223:18	beginning 6:16	166:5,17 178:3,13
102:16 104:21	146:1 150:19	baby 135:11	29:16 140:6	178:17 193:8
173:5 206:7	151:8 153:2	back 42:21 47:4	begun 24:13	198:22 199:3
Attorney's 47:8	160:12 161:13,17	62:4 78:10 90:4	behalf 96:9 210:1	bifurcated 121:11
170:19	161:20 162:1	96:10 129:14	217:18	big 78:22
attributable 39:15	165:5,8,15 166:6	138:15 143:20	beholden 50:16	biggest 57:4
authorities 17:5	166:11,20 167:3	147:21 188:11	beings 54:6	bill 26:20 27:10
24:4 35:4 39:20	168:8,20,22	195:12 199:17	belief 40:9	binding 77:8 79:5
67:14 81:15,20	173:14 174:3	214:18	believe 15:11 19:10	bit 25:21 30:15
82:7 84:14 85:2	176:4,6 178:7	backdrop 9:13	19:22 23:5 24:10	63:21 76:11 98:16
85:14 135:14	179:15,19,22	background 40:22	25:7 27:11 34:21	101:4 120:12
authority 9:22	180:10,21 181:1	183:20	35:22 36:3 44:6	212:7 224:7
15:16,19 16:5,7	181:17,20 183:4,6	backgrounds	44:22 51:2 62:11	blank 36:22
16:18 17:1,1,6,8	183:10,14,15	216:21	63:7 84:3 86:9	blatant 218:19,22
17:16 18:12 19:11	184:9,13 185:14	bad 57:20	97:15 123:11	board 32:3 207:12
19:17 20:1,10,17	185:17 186:6,7	Baghdad 197:8	127:20 138:2	bodies 88:7
21:6 22:5,9,11,13	188:5 224:18,18	balance 29:1 54:21	169:7 170:1	body 19:1 47:4
23:7,14 24:2,12	228:11	balances 54:10	186:19 194:16	books 223:8
25:14 26:4 29:13	authority's 83:8	ballot 38:8	205:7 206:2 221:6	both/and 115:17
30:7 31:3 32:10	104:13 149:9	bar 47:3,5	221:9 228:19	116:2 143:3 178:9
32:17 33:18 35:3	166:18	Barbara 1:13,16	believed 169:20	181:14
35:15 36:2,20	authorization	bargain 118:3	belongs 28:10	bound 75:1,6
37:6 38:16 39:7	27:14 85:5	123:2,3 149:12	154:6	176:11
39:18,19,20 40:1	authorized 17:2,17	152:1 160:8,17	bench 159:22	bracket 119:19
40:3,5 42:5,12	authorizing 84:8	168:9,17 169:1	beneficial 51:15	Branam 214:15
43:15,20 44:7	automatically	173:13 185:22	benefit 59:3 80:19	break 90:4 219:8
54:12,18 55:8,13	58:17	bargaining 119:15	best 22:19 81:6	breaking 219:14
55:17 57:5 58:7	available 13:11	based 15:11 19:19	100:10 134:20	brief 48:13 52:17
58:21 59:1 63:10	95:8 98:21 99:16	93:12 94:5 95:9	Beth 16:1 60:3 69:8	212:8
63:18 64:8,10	100:6 187:2	97:10,15,20 99:17	85:17 118:22	briefed 5:10
74:17,17 75:1	191:13,15 192:2	106:18 138:2	119:4,5 130:14,15	briefly 60:8 90:8
77:9 81:14,19	193:21 198:9	140:10,16 147:10	132:12 182:6	brigade 41:7 66:13
83:8 84:5,13,15	avenue 1:12 148:22	151:12 180:16	199:4	BRIGADIER 1:17
84:21 87:1,2 94:4	157:13	basic 7:14 9:13	better 42:3 45:20	1:18
95:15 97:18 103:1	average 34:11 38:1	16:17	45:21 70:7 115:5	brilliant 61:13
103:10 104:8,9	38:6 39:6 42:14	basically 8:16 64:1	115:7 117:3	bring 40:18 58:10
105:16 106:3	43:12	82:22 84:11 101:6	226:11	58:13 109:6

187:20 189:18 218:20 broad 97:12 broader 9:15 Brooklyn 53:18 brought 134:9 191:10 199:19 200:3 220:15 Bryant 1:19 16:2 31:15,16,17 32:1 47:19 63:21,22 64:18,19 65:8,9 68:10 69:11 72:3 72:4,5 74:4,8 76:18 77:4,14 83:10 170:15 172:9 204:6 205:10 building 145:13 built 71:20 bullet 56:4 193:4 bullets 198:5 buyer's 222:7,8,9	caring 53:17 carried 138:4 carry 106:3 205:3 carve 32:14 203:15 case 17:18 22:10 54:16 63:8,16 76:8 79:20 102:13 103:6 104:7,11,22 106:2 107:8,20 108:2,6 109:9 111:21 113:4,6 114:8 115:13 123:1 131:17 139:21 140:6 142:22 143:13 144:8 145:11 146:2 147:9 149:4 154:12,14,18 159:2 168:3 171:20 172:17 173:4,17 174:5 175:6 177:16 189:5 193:22 196:12 197:11 203:4,13 217:12 217:16 219:6 cases 15:20 20:2,22 21:19 25:21 26:1 26:2,3,7 44:20 53:20 63:14 79:3 79:10,17 102:17 103:12 104:14 136:1 195:20 203:15 204:16 214:3 Cassara 192:21 195:22 category 69:11 caught 86:4 cause 32:15 38:4 39:2 46:7 76:4,5 77:7 caused 19:1 causing 70:5 204:19 CDR 100:18 Center 15:5 226:5	centers 15:15 central 60:15,18 centrally 71:19 Ceremonial 1:12 certain 35:6 75:5 200:11 certainly 33:5 91:7 97:14 100:1 106:5 106:8 115:6 116:5 135:14 156:15 197:12 198:6 211:7 cetera 140:17 156:7 chain 17:10 18:2,4 18:11 26:21 28:16 30:7 31:8 41:5,6 41:14,21 42:4,8 50:16 73:4 216:12 217:13 chair 1:13,16 3:12 4:3 5:8 11:7 12:10 13:21 14:12 14:16,20 15:8 16:12 31:11,16,20 47:18 48:7 52:6 56:18 59:15,21 60:2,5,9 62:2,19 64:1 65:7 67:9 68:20,22 69:5,9 69:13,16 71:13,22 72:4,10 74:7 77:3 78:3,19 80:5,8,20 81:3 82:14,17 83:11,19 85:21 86:2,7,14,17 87:13 88:10 89:18 90:9,16,18 96:4 96:15,19,22 97:21 98:12 99:21 100:4 100:13 101:2,18 106:20 108:12,17 109:1,13 112:9 117:19 118:2,5,9 118:22 119:3,5,9 120:16,21 122:8 122:14 125:19	126:2,8,10,13 127:5,9 128:2,5,9 128:19,22 129:18 130:5,15 131:1 132:7,12,22 133:18,21 134:7 134:10,14 136:2,6 136:11,14,17 137:11 138:14 139:13 149:11,18 151:16,22 152:12 158:14,19 159:20 160:5 161:11 162:4,15 163:15 164:9 165:2,13,21 166:12,19 167:2 168:5,21 169:5 170:7 173:11,19 173:22 180:18 181:22 182:4,11 182:15,22 184:18 185:4,7 186:12 187:6 188:1 198:15 199:1,6,13 199:21 205:11,19 207:21 209:18 210:7,12 211:1,3 211:9,12,21 212:1 212:5 228:7,21 229:5,8,11,17 chairman 77:15,16 challenge 68:5 116:9,13 159:15 challenged 219:18 challenges 21:19 chance 120:6 186:17 change 11:14 13:1 21:12 32:10 49:2 49:6,16 50:12 52:21 53:4 55:3 55:15 60:22 87:1 107:12 125:3,6 129:10,11 130:9 146:22 165:19 170:22 180:6,7,8 181:6,7 184:5	207:13 216:16,17 216:20 217:4 218:3 changed 75:12 113:10 126:1,14 132:4 162:16 changes 24:11,20 24:22 25:7 31:5 35:2 50:4 51:17 51:20 52:1,4 56:8 60:17 112:13 131:22 139:1 175:13,14 179:21 183:5 188:10 190:21 200:18 207:13,15,17 changing 31:4 55:21 85:12 108:14 channel 99:14 channels 18:3 57:7 73:13 99:10 character 222:9 charge 50:13 74:20 153:22 158:10 160:16,20 161:6,9 161:19 162:21 174:22 223:7 226:7 charged 38:4 charges 23:15 32:11 35:6 45:3 54:14 63:16,20 105:5 160:18 161:2,20 162:3,7 163:2,6,9,11 164:5,21 165:16 173:18 charging 44:2 67:13 105:4 check 54:21 124:21 checks 29:9 54:9 57:21 chief 38:9,20 217:15 223:6 children 213:14 CHRISTEL 2:2
C				
C 223:18 California 213:16 213:18 226:5 call 25:12,19 65:15 called 108:21 223:6 calling 10:18 75:22 220:21 calls 26:20 69:19 204:17,20 cap 150:21 152:16 156:12 157:1 capability 20:14 capacity 65:14 capstone 13:6 captain 36:17 captains 36:16 captured 219:6 care 44:2 136:16 144:9 214:9 career 215:19 careers 228:2 carefully 18:19				

circles 29:3 36:9	clearly 8:14 12:8 75:18 154:16 186:18	colleges 217:1	41:5,6,15,21 42:4 42:8 46:8 50:17 57:16,17 58:3 71:21 72:1 73:4 92:20 94:3 99:10 137:5 215:9 216:12 217:13 223:15	comment 3:17 12:9 27:16 31:13 52:9 67:10 68:9 91:16 100:14 105:18 106:20,22 176:11 190:17 210:22 211:8,14,18,22 215:8
circumstances 74:16 75:5 224:3	Cleveland 215:1	colonel 1:18 2:4,4 11:7,8 36:17 56:19 59:15 69:6 78:14 82:21 89:13 98:12 112:11 120:3 122:10 125:2 126:22 132:9 133:5 138:9 139:16 177:11 178:19 182:22 206:6	commander 2:5 4:13,18 5:5,9,15 6:6,19 7:6,15 8:7 11:3 15:16 16:22 18:11 19:11 21:9 23:1 25:13 29:18 29:19 33:6 34:13 37:15,18 41:7 45:4 48:18 49:2,7 51:18 52:3 54:2 58:9,13 62:13 63:1 64:22 66:12 66:12,13 81:5 83:3 84:1,4,17 88:12,15 89:10 90:2 93:1,8 95:8 95:15 98:20,21 99:11,13 103:9 135:3 137:2	comments 3:12 11:6 30:22 39:14 48:8 52:11 56:22 59:18 60:11 71:8 74:2 76:15 83:9 85:15 89:11 107:10 117:12 159:13
cities 44:18	client 204:22 210:2	Colorado 213:4,18	commander's 78:16 94:4	committed 22:8 34:6 153:16 156:6 171:5
citizen 38:6 227:1	climate 5:20 31:4 69:19	Columbia 1:12	commanders 6:15 7:21 8:11 9:1,10 10:5,9,15,21 12:11,16 13:9 14:6 15:3,6,19 16:5 17:4,6,7 19:15,20 20:2,11 20:18 22:4,16 24:3 25:16 28:18 29:8,13 30:2,8,12 32:18 43:19,20 44:22 47:12 51:1 51:3,4,13 65:10 66:19 97:17	committee 17:20 38:16 39:1
city 204:13	clinical 214:7,11	combat 114:16 214:20	commanding 30:6 31:2 217:17,18	committee's 192:19
civil 29:6 164:10 224:17	closing 229:14	combine 143:17 178:22	commands 42:18 61:10 71:4	Committees 84:2
civilian 9:3,12 21:8 21:18,21 22:13 28:12 38:17 49:13 57:11 104:19 105:3 115:7 119:16 120:10 121:20 147:19 150:2 153:18 154:22 155:1,10 159:6 162:11 164:2,14 169:18 179:8 187:21 188:19 198:13 202:6 204:10,18 205:5	Code 17:3 18:17 23:7 24:17 48:15 81:10	combined 113:9		commodore 36:15
civilians 44:21 121:18	cofounder 213:2,15	combining 107:4 108:6		common 37:22
claim 52:18	COL 11:9 12:14 14:2,14,18 56:20 68:15,21 69:3 71:10,15 78:15,22 89:15 98:10,13 100:9 106:22 108:16,20 109:2 111:3,14 112:18 113:22 116:9 117:22 118:4,7,10 124:3 125:1,8,22 126:3 128:13 131:5 133:14,20 136:18 138:11,13 139:17 142:2 145:9 147:5,8 148:13 149:2,13 150:17 152:7 158:1,18 159:7 160:20 161:14 162:18 167:1 178:21 181:8,19 182:2 183:9 184:4 195:12 198:20 199:7 203:1 206:5 207:9 208:16 210:21 211:2,17 229:15	come 33:8 39:2 55:19 67:1 71:12 87:20 90:4 97:7 99:6 117:15 143:8 157:9 158:20 159:8 162:5 170:19 171:2,15 171:17 172:12 196:8 212:20 216:7 228:14	communication 105:15 169:15,16 170:8	community 19:1 57:12 59:4
clarification 139:17 169:4,10 189:19 195:10 200:12	COLLEEN 1:17	comes 7:19 39:11 40:11 113:13 154:5 158:5 163:7 163:8 164:2 181:3 196:10,11 215:17 221:5		company 66:11
clarifications 11:11	College 5:18	coming 61:22 124:13 164:16 167:21 201:4 212:12 228:4,16 228:18		comparable 76:22 156:9
clarified 73:9 184:14		command 5:20 6:18 9:16,19 17:10 18:3,4,11 22:8 26:22 28:16 30:7,16,17 31:8		Comparative 4:18 39:12 63:4 64:2 64:12 68:18 69:2 76:19 77:5,18 78:12,17 80:13 83:1 84:1,3 119:11
clarify 15:1 69:4 73:22 83:14 111:4 133:15 179:13 200:20 202:20 203:1,10,11	collaborative 212:13			compared 119:16
clarifying 134:2	colleague 227:9 228:17			comparison 188:17
class 217:14 219:3				
clear 20:9 21:20 69:12 70:1 72:6 73:15 75:15 120:5 136:12,20 178:12 182:3 183:21 188:3				
cleared 66:16				

competency-based 217:5 218:2	149:19 167:13 168:3,8 169:11	134:21 203:14 207:11 215:16	200:4	166:17,20 167:2 168:8,20,22
competent 54:8	173:11,13,16	consideration 7:10	continues 57:17	173:14 174:3
complaining 222:4	174:13,14,17	121:1 175:17	continuing 65:6	176:4,6 178:7
complement 6:13	179:7	179:16 184:11	69:11 72:7 227:5	179:15,19,22
complete 4:15	Conference 213:3	considerations	contrary 54:6 61:9	180:9,21 181:1,17
completely 77:4	conferral 141:4	27:17 76:16	controlled 29:19	181:20 183:4,6,10
87:22 100:19	142:21 174:1	considered 26:8	convene 17:2 20:17	183:14,15 184:9
145:4	conferred 168:22	29:8 59:8 116:11	22:6	184:13 185:13,17
complicating 120:7	conferring 104:16	125:11 137:10	convened 53:20	186:6,7 188:5
comply 134:21	174:21	161:15	convening 15:16	212:21
component 209:15	confess 129:1	considering 61:17	16:5,18 17:1,1,5,6	conversation 102:2
comport 193:10	138:16	considers 146:1	17:16 18:11 19:11	127:12 129:15
comprised 88:18	confidence 19:12	constant 10:16	19:16 20:10 21:5	138:2 152:22
concept 58:5 88:7	46:2	constantly 38:13	22:5,9,11 23:6	153:4,8 166:8
160:6 197:1 205:2	confident 45:17,18	38:19	24:4,12 25:13	181:15 182:17
208:19 221:4	46:15 67:4,6	constitute 18:15	26:4 28:6 35:3,15	192:7 194:9,10
concern 26:15 70:3	conflated 144:16	Constitution 1:12	36:2,19 37:6	197:13 223:9
87:14 97:13	conflict 22:6 78:12	constitutional	38:16 39:7,17,18	227:6,7
123:14 180:3	122:11 187:4	195:8 197:5,15	39:19,20,22 40:2	conversations
182:20 183:1,17	conflicts 139:10	constructed 165:11	40:5 42:5,12	193:5 220:13
concerned 178:9	confuse 81:7	constructive 51:3	43:15,20 44:7	convey 104:6
180:12	confused 129:1	consultants 84:10	54:12,18 55:8,13	105:22 107:7,18
concerns 57:4	146:9 169:5	85:8	55:16 57:5 58:6	108:7 109:11
104:7,10 107:18	confusion 73:17	consultation 63:10	58:21 59:1 63:10	111:19 113:1
108:1 113:1 114:3	131:4	contacted 227:11	63:17 64:8,10	114:3 122:17
122:18,22 131:13	Congress 6:14	contain 76:5	67:14 74:17 75:1	126:4 131:13
131:16 140:7	17:14 22:21 23:13	contemplate	77:9 81:14,19	145:10,21,22
148:14 177:10	24:5,11,15 33:22	186:22 187:9	82:7 83:8 84:13	146:14 151:6
181:5	35:1,2,9 63:5	202:18	85:1,14 87:2	179:10
concluded 192:3	67:18 69:21 70:10	contemplated	103:1,10 104:8,9	conveyed 106:15
229:21	81:9 110:8 135:21	204:9 205:9	104:13 105:15	116:16 137:5
concludes 90:1	224:9	contemplates	106:3 107:21,22	140:8,15 142:1
conclusion 20:16	Congressional	202:21	109:7 111:10,13	convicted 197:3
29:7 55:14,20	65:22	contemplating	112:14 113:1,3,5	conviction 20:22
conclusions 16:20	connection 71:6	187:5	113:17 114:7,9	convincing 221:14
concur 80:2	consciousness 45:1	contemporary 54:5	115:1 116:15,18	Cook 1:18 11:9
conditions 93:11	53:17	contemptible 51:22	117:17,21 120:7	12:14 14:2,14,18
conduct 10:6	consensus 84:16	content 224:22	122:19,21 131:14	56:19,20 59:16
158:15	consequence 12:2	CONTENTS 3:10	131:15 134:19	68:15,21 69:3
conducted 89:8	consequences	contesting 159:12	135:14,16,22	71:10,15 78:15,22
conducting 37:5	20:12 84:20	context 92:3,8 96:9	142:3,10,13,14,20	89:13,15 98:10,13
confer 57:5 58:21	153:15	101:21	143:2,4,13 145:22	100:9 106:22
101:20 102:6,9,13	consider 25:22	continue 30:2,18	146:1 149:8	108:16,20 109:2
102:15 103:2,12	96:18 101:5 104:9	63:9 148:3 200:15	150:19 151:7	111:3,14 112:11
104:20 115:12	107:22 122:21	227:8,12	153:2 160:11	112:18 113:22
141:2 144:7	127:19 131:15	continued 129:12	161:12,13,16,20	116:9 117:22
			161:22 165:5,8,15	

118:4,7,10 120:3 122:10 124:3 125:8,22 126:3,22 128:13 131:5 133:5,14,20 136:18 138:9,11 138:13 139:16,17 142:2 145:9 147:5 147:8 148:13 149:2,13 150:17 152:7 158:1,18 159:7 160:20 161:14 162:18 167:1 177:11 178:19,21 181:8 181:19 182:2 183:9 184:4 195:12 198:20 199:7 203:1 207:9 208:16 Cook's 183:1 coproducer 214:12 core 201:20 Corn 5:16 Corps 105:21 214:21 correct 62:8,16,18 86:12,20 126:20 128:18 129:5 149:21 165:20 176:22 177:4 186:11 187:16 206:1 correctly 77:6 206:9 correlate 160:9 correspondent 214:21 corresponding 125:5 costs 26:19 27:12 counsel 56:10 63:16 64:5,5 102:10,17 103:3 104:6 106:11 107:17 108:7 111:19 112:22	113:14 114:2 116:16 117:14 120:8 122:17 124:8 131:12 135:6 137:19 140:8,15 142:13 146:15,18,21,22 147:16,19 148:8 148:19 161:2,12 164:15 191:14 200:11,14,22 201:5 202:9,12,19 202:21 204:2,9,10 204:17,21 205:15 206:13 207:6 208:5,11 209:12 210:1 counsel's 102:22 109:5 112:5 counseling 223:2 counter 112:16 country 34:3 202:6 couple 26:14 48:13 171:21 course 13:6 43:1 50:11 72:14 108:9 120:21 courses 13:10,10 14:7,10,19 15:4 216:22 217:3 218:2 court 1:11 24:3 29:15 58:18,22 74:16,20 82:1 84:8 85:4 103:4 109:21 111:8,15 115:3,16 116:1,7 116:20 117:20 118:4 121:22 123:7 126:6 134:6 142:3 143:4 148:11,16 149:20 150:1,3,6,9,17 152:18 155:17 159:4 161:7 164:10 168:17 169:6,20,21,22	171:2,15 173:5 176:8 178:10 181:14 185:3,10 185:19 186:5,8,17 186:20 187:1 189:6 196:8,11 200:8 204:4 205:13 208:11 court's 190:22 court-martial 17:9 17:16 23:16 39:3 42:6 45:14 103:7 103:8 110:7,10,15 116:12 117:12 125:5 129:11 151:1,10 153:6 154:4 165:11 196:14 court-martialed 34:17 courtroom 1:12 33:1 65:4 168:12 courts 15:20 22:6 34:1 36:2,20 63:8 108:14 110:20 111:1 124:1 127:2 127:14 137:21 192:13 195:19 200:18 205:5 courts-martial 17:2 20:1,17 32:11,19 35:16 37:7 43:16 108:21 114:12 123:16 124:5 126:12 130:10 131:3 132:1 cover 25:17 40:18 covered 223:10,11 covers 171:5 crafted 173:15 193:3 create 94:13 98:8 104:15 created 128:15 creation 25:15 104:4 107:15	122:15 131:8,10 credence 226:13 credibility 89:6 credible 20:3 crime 5:13 32:14 38:18 51:22 52:22 55:19 102:7 103:14 105:14 143:5 155:4,11 159:3 167:21 189:6,18 192:14 197:3,4 198:11 crimes 1:3 17:20 23:15 25:17 26:9 26:10 34:6 52:20 53:2,5 59:6 156:6 criminal 18:9 21:21 102:17 106:6 critical 28:18 30:9 47:13 164:5,21 175:1,5,6 217:12 cross 99:17 189:1 197:18 cross-examination 189:17 190:7,10 191:3 cross-examine 195:10 CSS 87:15 88:5,13 120:13 126:17 138:18 cultural 31:5 213:19 culture 216:16,17 216:19 217:4 218:3 220:18 curiosity 204:7 current 16:6 17:15 18:6 19:15 24:12 92:13 106:17 110:9 118:18 124:22 190:19 currently 85:1 102:10 103:13 104:5 107:17 122:16 131:12	155:20 184:17 186:19 191:20 214:18,22 223:8 CVRA 102:12 104:17,19 121:3 141:2 152:20 166:10 174:18 188:19,20 192:4 <hr/> D <hr/> D.C 1:13 damage 18:22 dangerous 44:5 Danis 213:2,15 daughters 34:3 day 42:21 43:4 198:19 days 36:11 DC 227:13 deal 46:11 93:3,13 94:20 117:3 143:22 161:14 214:13 228:15 deals 107:6 Dean 35:18 death 66:20 debate 68:5 201:18 decades 48:17 decide 34:16 108:13 205:13 209:7 decided 150:8 201:21 206:2 214:18 decides 63:20 112:15 178:7 179:22 180:10 181:1 deciding 10:7 111:10 decision 10:22 17:17 31:8 47:1 47:14 50:6 51:1 53:8 54:13 55:17 63:7,9 65:14,15 65:16 66:6 67:12 102:21 103:11
--	--	--	--	--

104:11 108:2	197:10 198:10	described 133:5	88:4 92:21 114:17	disband 212:22
113:3 116:19	200:17 203:10	172:5,7	117:16 119:14	227:8
118:3 123:1	218:12 224:8	describing 55:5	140:14,18 143:19	discharge 216:2
131:17 135:17	227:12,21	description 61:8	144:13 153:17	disciplinary 57:13
141:5 148:18	defer 77:14 110:4	descriptions 167:7	154:21 175:7	discipline 19:19,21
150:5,5,10,16,19	112:7,11 139:6	desertion 26:9 53:3	179:4 193:11	20:13 40:13 43:8
152:14 154:2	defined 8:14 12:8	designated 2:2 24:3	213:7 220:21	57:20
155:10 160:11	definitely 211:4	despite 21:12 30:4	227:3	disclosed 94:9
166:18 171:12	delay 195:16	81:6 227:15	differently 215:13	discovery 84:7 85:4
200:8 201:11	196:13 197:7	detail 158:8	difficult 28:20	discrete 144:11
decision-making	delayed 100:21	30:13 41:22 145:8	223:10	157:12,18
150:14	102:3 126:5	167:7 194:10	difficulty 144:22	discretion 28:10
decisionmaking	191:11	details 130:19	226:17	81:12,19,22
21:10	delete 107:19	determination 79:4	diligence 33:5	134:20 135:15
decisions 10:4 21:7	deleted 128:4,8,20	determine 70:14	226:22	137:14 149:9
21:22 22:17,19	deliberate 4:7 6:1	100:10 134:20	direct 40:4 70:12	176:16 206:8
34:1,14 40:14	69:2 123:5	determined 192:13	73:8 74:13 84:18	discretion's 136:20
45:12 46:14,21	deliberated 64:14	determining	91:5 104:3 107:15	discretionary
47:9 51:7,8,9	77:10 100:19,20	153:12 156:5	110:4 122:7,15	138:5
57:19 67:7,14	deliberating 47:20	detriment 30:19	131:10	discuss 5:22 54:13
116:4 141:13	78:20 91:3	detrimental 198:14	directed 7:2,5	87:15 90:5 109:7
deck 62:10 72:12	deliberation 11:6	detrimentally	directing 110:20	118:16 134:12
91:17 92:6 101:17	190:15	196:20	direction 7:18	138:4 180:20
declared 222:22	deliberations 3:15	develop 7:5 79:19	175:8	discussed 5:14 70:4
dedicated 9:21	15:21 31:13 34:10	developed 71:5	directive 105:8	87:5,6 142:4,5
10:12,20 13:5	110:6 113:18	212:8	154:19	180:17 188:9
53:16	193:6 202:5	developing 216:22	directives 148:20	194:4 200:7
defend 66:8	delighted 228:22	218:1	207:4	206:18
defendant 162:21	delivery 137:15	deviate 216:5,10,11	directly 102:9	discussing 218:4
195:8 197:16	demand 53:5	217:10 220:22	135:5 137:18	discussion 15:11
defendant's 189:8	demographic 29:1	device 109:22	142:10 170:20	54:15 58:9,14
198:3	Denied 214:12	157:15	Director 2:4 5:12	64:16 80:14 84:12
defendants 75:22	216:9	dialogue 51:12	disagree 32:3 33:11	91:12,21 94:11
defense 1:1 6:14	Denver 213:5,18	Diana 213:2,15	47:16 60:13 83:10	95:4 107:2 119:14
7:1 9:18 23:18	deny 117:14	dictate 47:6	83:14 198:16,20	119:19 121:16
24:19 25:3 70:11	Department 1:1	Diego 226:6	198:22 199:5,7,8	125:18 126:15
73:7 74:13 75:22	5:13 6:13 23:17	differ 86:9	199:9,11	127:17 129:13
79:20 84:18 88:17	24:19 25:2 88:19	difference 28:15	disagreed 172:13	140:16,22 141:6
88:19 89:6 104:3	89:5 217:15 224:8	49:5,9,17,21	disagreement	143:16 188:12
105:11 107:15	227:12,21	51:21 52:2 77:18	54:17 67:15 132:9	194:13 200:3
108:13,19 117:14	depending 117:8	77:22 109:18	184:20	201:3,16 209:17
118:19 131:10,21	depends 150:4	117:7 121:10	disagreements	218:22
142:9 158:16	deployed 137:3	156:15 166:16	83:15	discussions 6:17
173:5 189:15	derailed 139:11	differences 79:1	disagrees 171:8,11	99:8 125:21
190:21 191:14	dereliction 18:15	121:4,9	171:13	183:20 186:22
192:2 193:15	57:22 66:17	different 29:2	disapprove 81:21	209:2 210:11
195:17 196:5	describe 26:1	37:20 61:14,19		215:7

disgrace 56:2	drafted 116:2 175:11 182:9,10	edits 193:4	endeavor 55:11	65:13,18 208:8
dismiss 161:10,21 162:3	drafting 132:20	educated 218:10	ended 142:5	essentially 26:19 77:8 115:20 156:22
dismissal 164:20	draw 55:20	education 228:13	endorse 51:17	establish 8:15 88:18
dispose 103:11 114:7	drawn 55:14 204:4	educator 213:12 214:17	enemy 219:7,10 226:9	establishments 70:20
disposition 104:8 104:11,14 107:8 107:20 108:2,6 109:9 111:22 123:1 131:17 139:21 140:7 145:11 146:2 149:4	drilled 41:12 42:2	effect 35:21 43:7 56:11 98:21 99:6 100:10	energy 228:15	et 140:17 156:7
dispute 153:1	drive 216:17	effective 22:2 59:13 70:3	enforce 20:3 148:15	etcetera 70:20
disregards 116:19	dropping 123:15 123:17 164:5	effectiveness 20:14 88:22	enforcement 49:12	ethical 47:2,11
dissent 16:1,15 27:19 52:15 68:11 68:11 176:16 210:13	due 54:20 78:18 93:10 197:4 226:22	effects 43:8	engender 68:6	ethics 213:11
dissenters 52:12	Dunn 1:18 14:21 14:22 59:17 86:15 86:17,18,19 87:12 87:19 88:6 105:17 114:15 120:3 135:13 140:3,20 143:7 144:14,21 149:14 153:5 156:2 161:16 162:12 163:5,17 165:6,20 166:5,17 176:9 177:12 178:3,13,17 193:8 195:13	effort 28:5 33:8 56:5 73:22	enhance 7:6 24:17	evaluate 25:3 74:15 84:20
dissenting 16:14	duties 11:19,21 42:2 85:6	efforts 6:14 7:18 9:9 19:4 80:16 81:7	enjoyed 223:16	evaluated 24:14 71:6
dissents 62:12	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	eight 53:14 182:7	enlisted 34:12 36:21 41:2 73:1 217:6 219:5,22 220:14,14 221:3 222:2	evaluations 7:9 89:7
distance 83:17	duties 11:19,21 42:2 85:6	either 6:1 23:8 24:5 34:8 75:8 100:20 100:21 140:12 145:14 198:19 216:10	enormous 56:10	event 66:3,4 70:15 135:4
distinct 141:1 186:14	duties 11:19,21 42:2 85:6	elected 22:1	enormously 51:14 51:14	events 66:20
distinction 25:10 199:9	duties 11:19,21 42:2 85:6	element 132:14 152:17 158:16	ensure 8:12,21 9:18 11:18 12:11,17 73:8,9 94:3 106:13 109:15 115:10 116:3 122:6 157:5,17 170:3 183:5 198:3	eventually 66:16 212:22
district 1:11,11 160:2 189:5	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	elements 153:21 162:20 163:1	ensures 183:9 184:15 185:12	everybody 15:11 55:20 58:4 60:12 119:8 122:10 129:20 133:7 136:16 149:18 204:8 227:18
diversity 213:19	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	elevate 64:4	ensuring 100:5 201:7	everybody's 59:8 182:20
division 37:18,19 114:16 217:13 219:6,13	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	elevated 17:10	enter 161:1	everyone's 139:15
document 176:5	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	elevating 64:8	entering 123:2 131:17	evidence 20:16 21:8 23:5 49:3,4 49:15,16,21 53:3 53:6 79:6,22 93:7 93:13 94:21 95:12 95:21 97:16 102:18 105:1 106:9 141:21 142:9 148:6,8,19 175:2 189:12 191:21 196:13 204:1
DoD 8:11 11:13,19 71:7 73:8 88:21 88:22 92:17 102:14	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	eliminated 21:5	entire 8:2 29:16,20 59:4 215:4 228:2	evidenced 97:20
doing 40:11 45:18 46:5,15 57:21 67:6 84:21 106:11 110:6 156:4 187:7 190:8	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	eliminating 23:6	entirely 75:15	evidentiary 201:9 203:6,17
domestic 49:10	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	Elizabeth 1:16,19 5:3	entities 21:8 89:8	
doubt 35:14 70:21	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	eloquently 35:17	enumerated 24:19	
draft 124:22	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	embrace 119:22	envisioning 166:9	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	emphasis 220:3	episode 221:2,15 221:16,17,20	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	empirical 49:3	episodes 225:6	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	employed 21:4	equals 223:18	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	employment 226:17	erring 30:8	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	enacted 17:14 24:16	error 51:1 86:19	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7	encouraged 13:11 215:12,14	especially 58:22	
	duty 18:15 36:11 36:16 37:12 41:3 41:4,9,18 42:1 50:16 57:22 61:4 66:17 92:22 93:10 94:4 105:20 215:11 217:8 219:2 223:15 225:7			

eviscerate 115:20	61:19 213:8	fair 75:14 86:4	32:20	183:7
evolution 222:14	expert 85:7,7 148:2	185:22	felt 33:18	finish 4:12 11:4
evolved 29:12	experts 5:1 84:9	fairly 69:22	feminist 214:4	91:2 188:12
exactly 87:14	110:5	fairness 57:9 59:14	Fernandez 1:20	finished 229:15,18
127:11 130:21	explain 4:4 8:5	fallacy 222:10	48:4,6 59:17,19	finite 27:4 212:16
138:17 162:22	92:8 117:4 148:21	familiarity 53:14	59:20 90:15,17	fired 105:22
170:12	225:8	families 82:10	136:4,5,8,13,15	first 4:3 6:9 7:8
examination 189:2	explained 28:9	family 36:10	field 13:18 37:12	16:21 22:8 41:2
197:19	explaining 148:9	226:19	37:17 43:14	41:10 42:20,22
example 7:19 14:5	explains 147:19	fantastic 40:20	fighting 51:21	43:1 52:18 53:10
40:16 44:12	explanatory 128:14	221:21	figure 101:7,12,13	92:7 107:13
219:21 223:14	extend 8:22 9:10	far 115:5 138:2	129:16 142:18	130:18 131:7
examples 228:10	12:15	159:18 222:22	170:1 202:7	133:11 151:1
excessive 30:6	extension 8:19	fascinating 50:8	file 92:18 93:15	152:15 153:6
excuses 219:1,15	extensive 119:13	fashion 134:17	94:14	154:3 155:2 156:8
219:19 220:16	extent 84:2 151:5	165:9	filed 101:8	159:2 165:6,10
222:11	external 88:19	fatigue 70:6	filing 72:21	173:3,3 180:1
execute 148:10,16	89:16	fault 86:4	fill 106:18	193:4 213:1
150:13	extra-military	favor 62:15 76:20	film 214:12	217:14,20 219:3
exempted 26:7	223:1	78:5	films 216:7	fits 126:12
exercise 148:21	F	feasibility 79:8	final 77:11 89:9	five 36:15
149:1	face 21:14,18 22:5	84:12,20	finality 115:18	flabbergasted
exercised 202:18	face-to-face 165:9	feasible 145:16	finally 55:7 165:2	217:20
exercising 164:18	facilitate 217:4	146:6	financial 189:13	flagging 138:22
166:9	218:2	federal 2:2 28:12	find 11:22 20:15	fleet 8:2 226:4
exigencies 13:13	facility 39:17 42:14	102:7 103:14	22:4 26:15 39:8	flexibility 93:8,9
exist 34:18 47:11	42:15 44:16	105:14 137:21	43:14 50:7 101:7	flexible 149:7
57:17	fact 6:22 12:1	143:5 144:12	105:8 121:15	flip 42:7
existing 27:3 98:4	16:21 21:11 30:2	152:20 155:4,11	157:12 208:9	flipped 142:6
exists 141:2 209:9	46:16 52:21 58:16	155:13,17 157:21	finding 13:2,7,20	floating 82:20
expect 38:15	105:1,11 113:13	158:2,4,6,6 159:3	14:4 76:4 200:5,7	Floor 1:12
212:20 218:18	117:8 153:20	159:6 160:10	findings 16:17 21:1	flux 76:11
expectations 8:6	156:6 179:9 189:3	167:21 170:17	23:21 28:7 33:8	fly 197:20
expected 7:17 8:8	203:17 208:10	172:5,6,10,22	72:18 76:6 78:1	fo 190:16
12:12 218:13	217:17	173:5,9 174:18	81:21 92:2,7,9,11	focus 22:22 28:14
expedite 127:16	factor 109:5 122:2	189:6,18 190:3	93:12 95:2 101:21	167:10,12
expedited 92:16,19	122:6	192:13,14 193:12	102:4,5 103:22	focused 15:6
94:15 101:9	factors 70:15	193:18 194:14,17	116:11 126:18	folders 211:19
expenditure 27:13	facts 76:6 158:13	194:19 197:19	151:11 178:4	folks 209:9,10
experience 21:3	164:22 172:21	198:11	179:7 188:13,15	follow 45:2
40:20 53:11 59:2	176:13 193:19	feedback 88:22	200:6	followed 40:1
61:17 68:2 172:11	factual 121:12	feel 31:21 78:20	finds 20:9 77:7	following 33:12
192:11 221:22	203:22	165:16	fine 14:20 81:2,4	69:19 70:13 191:5
225:19 228:13	faculty 213:16	felonies 26:11	123:9 130:17,20	follows 23:21
experienced 28:11	failure 9:8 24:14	felony 20:1 26:1,7	145:12 146:3	Force 42:15
33:3 47:7 64:6,11	72:16 166:13	38:5,16	149:10 178:14	forces 48:17 50:20
experiences 40:19		felony-level 32:12	179:10,11 180:10	51:6 58:20 200:9

forcible 17:19	front 41:10 93:22	148:17 149:21	124:1 125:15,18	124:16 130:22
forefront 38:10,14	111:9 114:9	150:4 151:14,19	132:5 166:20	156:11 163:11
38:19	115:16 116:1	152:4,8,13 154:19	204:17,20 215:21	168:3 170:17
foreign 49:11	117:17 121:21	156:14 158:12,17	Ginny 214:15	173:1 184:13
forensic 214:19	125:10 131:8	159:1 160:3	give 8:3 34:17	going 4:11 6:20 7:3
forfeiture 82:9	164:3 180:14	162:10 163:22	36:21 37:8 54:2	13:14 14:9,22
forget 42:20	190:13,16 193:3	164:11 166:7	89:16 135:3	32:5,9 33:20,22
form 124:8	Frost 5:12 89:4	167:6 168:19	219:19	34:7,9,12,15,16
formal 116:17	full 4:14 18:19	169:3,9 170:10	given 25:8 26:13	34:21 38:3,22
200:12	80:14 129:21	172:4 173:15,20	35:17 148:20	39:2,4 40:17
formally 129:21	172:14	174:8 175:21	gives 226:8,9	41:10 43:7,9 44:2
formed 63:9	fully 9:21 25:3	176:22 177:3,19	giving 13:4	44:6,8,20 45:2
former 19:15 42:2	85:11	178:12 181:12	glad 91:9	46:18 49:8 50:17
79:13 153:1 213:4	functions 10:1	186:13 188:8	go 6:7 8:18 11:8	51:17,20 52:3
213:16	46:11	193:2 194:2	12:18 13:11 23:9	54:3 55:1,5 56:4
formulate 71:7	fundamental 21:12	197:12 199:18	23:12,19 25:9	58:3,10,13 59:11
formulation 70:12	28:15 48:16,19	200:2 205:7,15,21	26:4 31:21 33:4	65:17 75:16 79:1
71:2	fundamentally	206:10,11 209:1	36:19 46:2 52:5	79:19 83:16 87:8
Fort 15:3	48:14	210:5,9 211:4,7	57:13,13,14 60:9	90:9,22 91:4,10
forth 47:5 218:20	funding 55:6 84:9	211:11,16	62:4 67:2 68:1	91:11,14 92:1,8
220:15	85:7	gather 129:20	76:13 78:10 82:21	93:17 100:2,15
forward 18:12	further 23:14 24:2	gee 35:9	91:1,6,11,14	101:20 107:20
55:19 68:1 98:7	24:11 33:4 59:18	gender 213:22	95:19 96:10 99:13	112:5,11 113:6
114:6 124:16	83:7 85:10 154:12	214:4	104:21 109:4	124:9 126:14
141:15 142:16,22	future 75:16 187:4	general 1:17,18	113:6,14 118:10	129:22 133:22
144:8 167:13	FY14 81:17	14:21 17:15 32:11	118:13,16 119:5	139:10,20 143:10
168:3 173:17		32:17,19 35:10,10	130:11 131:3	145:6,7,16 146:5
177:17 198:5	G	35:12,16 36:2,20	132:18 136:6	147:5,9 151:9
212:20 221:5	gal 166:1	37:7 38:2 39:3	138:15 141:15	156:19 160:10,11
found 17:7,21	gap 106:18 168:4,6	42:6,8 43:16,21	142:9,12 144:1,3	161:6 162:20
21:17 27:3 39:17	175:3	44:14 45:13 58:22	146:5 147:4	163:8,19 167:7
42:18 92:12	Garvin 2:3 90:11	59:17,18 74:16	150:22 151:9	170:2,21,22
157:14 185:19	90:12 91:3,7 96:4	86:17 87:11,18	154:11 155:8	172:13 174:19
186:4	96:7,16,20 97:14	114:15 120:3	158:8,17 159:19	175:7 179:8 181:9
founding 212:13	97:22 100:1,5,12	149:14 176:9	167:13 168:7	182:7 183:17,19
four 38:8 213:13	101:15,19 106:8	177:11 195:13	169:8 175:7,7	185:3,9 195:12
Fourteen 72:12	109:12,14 111:12	General's 105:21	177:17 183:19,22	197:6 203:6 205:3
fourth 44:10 53:13	112:6 115:4	generally 37:2 64:5	185:10 196:13	206:1,18,19
framing 92:6	118:20 120:19,22	72:15 142:10	199:17,22 207:21	207:17 208:6,13
frankly 42:4 44:15	123:9,11,19	195:2 209:11	214:18 215:19	212:6,22 215:4,7
46:10 67:13 69:20	125:16 126:9,11	generals 15:5 33:1	220:13 224:1	215:19 216:3,13
70:6 82:18	127:7,10 128:10	33:14 43:18 66:10	goal 11:15,17,20	216:20 218:5
fraternization 58:2	128:18 129:2	generic 12:18	125:13 217:3	219:8,10,12 221:1
free 31:21 78:21	134:1,8 137:12	genesis 89:9	goals 7:16 114:5	221:9 222:11
freely 50:18	138:12 140:19,21	Geoffrey 5:16	goes 7:14 9:16 47:4	225:16 227:4
Friday 1:7 204:12	142:4 144:5,15	Geri 214:10	51:12 64:20 65:18	gold 13:17
FRIED 2:2	146:9 147:7,15	getting 45:19 123:6	87:19 113:5 124:4	golly 67:2

good 4:3 7:19 8:7 19:20 40:13 43:8 45:19 57:19 76:10 78:4 81:4 136:15 144:21 208:7 212:1,3 215:22	guys 218:4,20 225:19 227:8 229:4	harsh 226:16 HARVEY 1:19 hashing 218:5 hat 148:1 hats 5:6 hazed 223:3 hazing 222:21 head 206:4 210:3 217:16 headed 60:14 headquarters 37:19 hear 4:5 61:17 65:5 69:8 86:11 93:6 116:15 128:6 135:4 148:6 186:18 187:15,22 212:4 217:16 221:5 224:15 225:15 227:9,13 228:9,17,22 229:13	168:12,17,19 169:7,12,13,14,15 170:4,7,10 172:3 173:12,20 174:14 175:2,4,15 176:3 176:6,8,20 178:6 179:14,22 180:7,9 180:14,22 182:18 183:3,6,10,13,13 184:6,9 185:3,9 185:13,16,21 186:5,14,17 188:4 188:22 189:7,21 192:15 195:6 196:19,19 200:11 200:14,21,22 201:7,8,12,22 202:8,13,17 203:3 203:13 206:12,17 206:20 207:1 208:4,5,18,19,21 209:14,16 213:1 214:15 217:21 224:7 225:2,20 226:3	hesitancy 77:2 hesitation 40:6 hey 58:11 hi 37:5 136:6 hierarchy 28:21 high 30:3 59:1 67:19 higher 45:11,11 46:14 54:18 67:12 67:17 71:19 highest 45:13 highly 66:4 Hillman 1:19 16:1 16:9,11 27:18,21 31:12 35:18 48:3 59:22 60:3,4,7,10 62:17 69:7,8,10 69:15 80:7,9 81:1 82:4,12,16 83:13 85:16,17 86:1,3 86:12,18 87:11 118:21 119:1,4,7 119:10 122:11,12 123:8 130:13,16 132:11,13 134:11 138:16,21 182:5 182:13 184:22 185:6 186:1 187:14,17 199:4 210:17,18
gotten 165:18 government 47:6 102:16 154:13 191:16 government's 172:18 grade 9:20 37:12 37:17 43:14 graduate 213:21 grant 102:15 105:11 grants 102:12 grappling 157:17 great 46:10 56:2 64:21 90:16 93:3 93:13 94:20 137:8 225:11,13 228:15 Green 2:4 82:21 grip 167:11 groomed 30:17 grooming 30:16 grounded 174:21 grounds 47:10 76:8 group 26:5 74:14 75:9 84:19 228:12 groups 19:8 213:6 224:6 guard 41:3,3,8,18 41:20 42:1,2,17 guess 11:7 25:22 47:19 65:4 71:17 96:22 100:16 209:18 228:13 guidance 7:21 8:3 guided 103:21 guilty 117:1,3 151:3 153:21 154:3 158:7,11 173:7 222:6 guy 173:7 guy's 165:22	half 73:1 Ham 2:4 125:1,2 206:5,6 210:21 211:2,17 229:15 hand-selected 213:5 handful 91:15 204:16 handle 55:4 56:12 handled 43:21 handles 56:12 hands 53:8 99:11 99:12 102:22 hank 209:4 happen 55:5 95:14 105:2,9 106:10 110:1 113:4 115:16 130:22 138:6 149:9 152:15 159:21 160:1 175:20 186:9 195:20 202:5 218:15,16 222:6 227:15,16 happened 30:21 109:16 159:18 163:13 174:5 happening 137:22 174:16,20 217:22 225:12 happens 29:5 106:14 119:20 121:20 137:21 141:11 164:10 194:19 195:7 197:20 222:13 happy 77:12 88:10 91:8 139:5 148:2 160:3 harassment 222:12 hard 80:11,15 harmful 128:17	heard 19:8 34:22 35:6 39:22 40:2 43:17 44:19 52:19 61:1 79:11 89:3 93:3 94:21 95:13 95:21 98:3 105:1 106:9 107:6 111:6 112:14,20 114:14 115:11 121:6 126:6 134:6 137:18 139:7 140:12 141:8,20 141:22 142:9,20 143:2,6,8 144:3,8 144:12,17 145:14 146:4 147:11 148:7,20 149:21 149:22 150:3,7,9 150:11,12,13 151:20 152:6,9 154:5,17 155:2,5 155:12,16,21,22 156:21 157:3,8,19 158:5 164:17,18 165:5,8 167:15	206:20 207:1 208:4,5,18,19,21 209:14,16 213:1 214:15 217:21 224:7 225:2,20 226:3 hearing 45:22 46:5 71:14 77:20 100:14 102:1 160:12 194:8 201:2 212:9 224:18,18 227:17 229:3,20 hearings 75:17 220:4 224:10,14 227:22 hears 117:6 142:15 held 8:8 12:7 20:4 141:8 146:13,20 153:3 help 10:22 30:11 61:5 78:10 82:4 217:3 218:2 helpful 71:3 211:10 211:13 216:3 219:17 helps 92:8 heroes 227:1	Hillman's 185:8 hired 226:19 hires 227:1 history 54:5 213:12 220:3 hit 219:14 hoc 10:13 hold 6:14 7:15 8:11 11:16 82:8 88:10 126:15 196:9 holding 125:20 200:1 holistic 58:14 59:9 Holly 1:18 144:1 Holocaust 220:2,2 220:4,5,6,7,9 Holtzman 1:16 5:3

52:9,10 56:19	54:1,19 55:7	125:14 224:22	incorporated 14:18	inquire 163:13
57:1,3 112:8,10	127:12,16 135:19	impose 81:13	15:2 188:20	inquiries 224:19
113:20 123:14	216:11 226:8,10	imposed 157:7	increase 19:12	insert 86:21 87:2
126:19 130:2,7,17	identical 23:12	161:22	20:19,22	installation 92:21
132:19 134:13,15	identify 11:17	imposing 177:14	increased 30:5	instance 70:14
138:7 139:18	ill-advised 56:13	improper 58:1	incredibly 195:20	73:17
149:16 175:9	illegal 222:22	improve 20:20	independent 18:10	instances 171:21
176:2 177:1,4,9	imagine 40:21 43:2	Improvement 24:8	21:7 88:21 89:7,8	instructed 191:6
177:21,22 178:15	164:10 209:22	25:12,19 26:17	195:1	instruction 14:19
178:19 180:19	immediacy 193:12	improvements	indicate 21:9 95:2	191:7 217:5 223:1
182:16 183:7	immediate 131:8	221:6	indicating 96:11	instructor 213:20
184:2 186:10	131:10 132:4	improving 221:7	individual 22:18	218:12
199:11 208:1	133:2	in-court 152:2	70:8 141:8	integrate 121:5
home 57:14 216:8	immediately	in-person 137:20	individuals 93:15	integrating 129:14
224:11,13	138:20	inadequate 164:4	95:13 98:2 141:22	intended 31:17
homeless 214:22	impact 20:10 22:17	inappropriate 64:4	Infantry 41:3	47:21 138:6 168:6
honest 222:5	25:3 28:22 58:14	incidence 20:19	infinitum 173:2	183:21
honestly 19:22	115:12 118:14	25:4 31:6	225:22	intending 137:14
35:22	189:12,14 190:6,9	incident 70:8	influence 46:8	intense 10:12
Honor 27:21 66:1	191:2 192:7	incidents 18:5	215:10 218:21	intent 94:21 109:15
82:12,16 85:16	209:10,12 215:22	include 9:1 25:16	inform 171:7	115:9 125:10
86:13 97:15	impactful 141:13	95:7 98:19 112:13	informal 39:8	141:12
100:18 123:8	impacts 85:12	127:2 129:10	43:12	intentionally 144:6
126:20 138:22	impasse 199:19	133:6,11 179:21	informally 146:21	169:13
171:9 172:17	impede 18:13	180:2,14 181:10	information 10:3	intentioned 33:3
187:17	implement 7:4 8:4	181:16 183:1	79:15 107:7 109:3	56:15
Honorable 1:13,16	27:5 105:12	198:2 200:20,21	114:6 115:10	interdisciplinary
1:16 2:2	implementation	208:4 221:17,18	137:16 160:4	216:19
hope 10:20 38:12	7:22 104:4 107:16	228:4	167:4 191:21	interest 22:6,10,19
38:21	122:15 131:11	included 26:11	201:10 202:22	51:15 61:7 155:15
Hopefully 228:3	142:7	125:4 161:5	203:7 204:19	155:18,19 157:4
Hospital 36:10	implementations	195:14 198:4	217:19	159:11 164:7,19
42:11	25:7	201:22	inherent 22:5 93:7	165:1 176:17
host 58:18	implemented 24:20	includes 27:12	93:8 95:15 97:17	197:10
Houck 1:17 5:3	25:1,2	152:16 180:5,11	initial 15:18,21	interested 227:5
48:10 52:7 57:1	implementing 6:20	180:22 181:11	150:19	interesting 50:2,7
59:12	implicate 139:2	184:16 188:20	initiate 32:11,19	interests 59:8
Houck's 60:20	implies 149:21	200:14 203:3	35:6	106:15 145:10
House 66:2	import 104:18	213:10	initiated 45:3,4	international 29:21
human 54:6	importance 6:18	including 9:2 26:2	initiatives 8:1,5,14	interpreted 189:6
humanist 214:8	139:7 141:21	73:10 85:3 141:17	24:13	interpreting 159:2
humanities 213:11	211:8	168:7 175:10	input 110:12,17	interrupt 83:17
hypothetical 35:11	important 9:4	inclusion 130:9	113:15 115:17,19	119:8
	16:19 24:13 27:8	inconsistent 87:8	122:7,7 135:16	interview 196:2
	28:3 31:4 41:15	87:17	141:9,10 143:19	interviewed 220:7
	56:8 73:20,21	incorporate 132:1	147:14 149:3,4	interviews 10:3
	93:14 110:21	140:1	160:7 207:18,18	introduce 212:12
I				
idea 8:7 34:5,11				
37:22 39:1,5 53:7				

introduction
202:16
introductory 11:15
intuition 55:12
investigated 18:8
214:3
investigating 74:18
75:2 76:2,3 77:7
78:6
investigation 18:13
investigations
20:21
investigative 18:9
74:20
investigators 70:22
Invisible 216:8
involve 26:18 27:11
42:4
involved 42:7 51:7
59:6,10 66:3
147:9
involving 63:14
205:6
ire 42:18
irrelevant 177:15
irresponsible 55:2
issue 7:14 16:17
26:14 27:10 52:11
61:10 93:4 134:16
156:10 159:4
187:16 197:5
200:10,15 205:22
206:5,14,15 207:5
207:10 208:8,15
216:5
issues 7:11 10:18
14:8 21:14 60:12
61:15 139:14
200:12 208:18,21
209:16 210:8,14
212:15 217:21
it'd 139:18 146:16
iteration 116:3

J

JAG 13:8,16 14:3,5
14:11

jail 57:14
JAMES 1:17
Jamie 229:6
January 15:17
Jen 211:18
Jenny 212:11
Jim 5:3
job 57:21 61:7
188:18 227:2
jobs 38:22
joined 16:1
joint 74:14 75:8
84:19 125:11
207:10
joking 199:21
Jones 1:13,16 4:3
11:9 12:10 13:21
14:12,16,20 15:8
16:11,12 29:14
30:10 31:9,11,15
31:16,20 35:12
45:9 47:18 48:7
49:17 52:6,11
53:2 56:18 59:15
59:21 60:1,2,5,9
62:1,2,19 64:1,19
65:4,7 67:9 68:15
68:20,22 69:5,7,9
69:13,16 71:10,13
71:22 72:3,4,10
74:7 76:18 77:3
78:3,19 80:5,7,8
80:10,20 81:3
82:14,17 83:11,13
83:19 85:21 86:2
86:7,14,17 87:13
88:10 89:18 90:9
90:16 96:4,15,19
96:22 97:21 98:10
98:12 99:21 100:4
100:13 101:2,18
106:20 108:12,17
109:1,13 112:9
117:19 118:2,5,9
118:21,22 119:2,3
119:5,9 120:16,21
122:8,12,14

125:19 126:2,8,10
126:13 127:5,9
128:2,5,9,19,22
129:18 130:5,13
130:15 131:1
132:7,11,12,20,22
133:15,18,21
134:7,10,13,14
136:2,6,11,14,17
136:18 137:11
138:14 139:13
149:11,18 151:16
151:22 152:12
158:14,19 159:20
160:5 161:11
162:4,15 163:15
164:9 165:2,13,21
166:12,19 167:2
168:5,21 169:5
170:7 172:10
173:11,19,22
180:18 181:22
182:4,6,11,15,22
184:18,22 185:4,7
186:12 187:6
188:1 198:15
199:1,6,13,21
205:11,19 207:21
209:18 210:7,12
211:1,3,9,12,21
212:1,5 228:7,21
229:5,8,11,17
Joye 5:12 89:4
judge 10:15 11:9
15:4 16:11 22:13
27:1,5 29:14
30:10 31:9,15
45:9 49:17 51:13
52:10 53:2 54:16
57:6,7 58:9,21
59:22 60:21 61:1
61:18 62:1 63:11
63:19 64:7,11,19
65:4 67:6,16
68:15 69:7 71:10
72:3 76:18 78:7
79:2,13,14,16,22

80:7,9 83:13
86:22 87:3,20
88:8 96:7 98:10
105:21 106:2
111:9 112:8 115:3
117:6,7,9,15
118:12,21 119:1
120:19,19 122:12
127:22 128:3,7,12
128:21 129:2
130:13 132:11,20
133:15 134:13
136:18 151:4,21
153:8,12 154:1,9
154:10,14 156:4
156:11 160:1
162:13,15,20
163:11,12 165:4
165:18,19 166:6
166:10 168:13
171:4,8,19,22
172:2,10,21 173:6
173:9 176:11
180:15,20 181:3
182:5,19 184:22
185:5 206:8
judge's 170:22
judges 77:20 78:8,8
79:9 84:15
judgments 10:6
judicial 25:15
30:10 49:12
jump 79:6
junction 134:9
146:17
junior 9:11 64:6
67:21 68:4 72:19
73:1,11 217:15
219:5,22 220:13
220:14
jurisdiction 26:3
106:6
jurisdictions 21:18
21:22 49:13
119:17
justice 5:14 10:8
17:4 18:16,17

19:12 20:7,12
21:3,13,21 23:8
24:8 25:12,18
26:16 29:10,11,22
48:15 51:15 54:4
54:9 74:14 75:9
81:11 84:18
104:14 155:15,18
155:19 157:4
159:11 160:12
164:7,20 165:1
176:17 178:6
196:17 214:12
216:8

K

Kastenberg 200:8
201:13,14,20
205:12,13
keep 45:16 82:10
92:14 99:12,13
143:9 144:22
145:17 215:19
keeping 145:10
149:7,16
Kenna 189:5
kept 118:4,5,7
144:6
kicking 67:11
kids 224:11,12
228:3
kind 10:22 13:6
111:21 121:11
194:5 218:3
kinds 132:15
KING 2:5 100:18
192:18
knew 42:2 115:6
know 4:16 7:16 9:6
10:2 12:4,12
31:20 32:5 34:5
36:1,22 37:1,6
38:1,5 40:12,13
41:8,9,17 42:3,22
43:3,9 46:5 48:3
51:13 55:8,12,20
67:6 71:4 72:14

77:3 82:19 90:19 95:13,16 97:9,12 98:4 101:11 106:14 115:5 116:14 117:2 118:11 121:22 122:1 125:11 127:18 131:7 135:7,7 139:3 140:4,15,16 143:12 144:1 145:7 150:1 151:6 151:17 152:1,2 153:9,13,20 154:16 158:3 159:20 160:1,5,18 162:14,16 163:13 163:15,18,19 164:14,16 165:16 167:5,5 171:10 173:7,12 176:16 177:1 182:1,7,8 193:14 195:15 199:14 205:8,9 210:3 215:20 220:18 226:18 227:6 228:14 knowing 79:18 156:12 knowledge 17:12 36:14 55:16 known 24:8 97:19 knows 39:6 93:1 124:21 149:19 162:21 163:17 KYLE 2:4	96:12,17 98:14 99:19 127:11 130:12 135:20 136:19 142:8 169:9 177:2,12 178:13 179:11 180:5 181:6,7 182:9,10,12 184:19 185:8,10 190:13 191:19 193:2 221:20 large 51:5,11 102:20 105:8 140:22 192:5 larger 98:8 largest 53:13 late 57:22 180:16 Laughter 199:20 launch 65:14 law 5:17,18 18:6 47:4 49:12 144:13 171:7 173:4 lawyer 47:6 58:10 201:19 202:1 207:1 lawyers 22:1 26:5 26:22 46:21,22 61:13 65:5 lays 79:22 leaders 9:2,6 11:18 12:17,18 20:3 22:15 88:21 leadership 13:7 14:10 217:7,7 219:13 learned 72:17 204:12 learns 93:1 leave 31:7 98:14,20 107:12 128:17 137:14 139:22 142:17 143:21 145:20 177:5,20 183:20 203:13 Leavenworth 15:3 leaves 29:1 132:17 leaving 98:18	111:14 142:5 149:3 leery 171:19 left 110:1 206:8 legal 9:21 10:12 13:5 14:7 15:2,5 27:8 30:7 57:19 176:13 201:18 202:9 203:3 205:17 207:5 208:18,21 209:16 210:8,14 215:7 216:16,16 218:4 218:21 220:17 223:9 legally 141:1 219:16 220:16 legislation 16:6 17:14 35:15 63:13 67:18 75:13,19 legitimacy 29:20 lend 226:13 lengthier 153:19 lessen 70:17 lesser 160:17 161:5 let's 199:22 208:13 210:15 letter 147:14 level 27:2 45:14 46:14 54:18 59:2 65:3,11,11 71:19 103:8 141:6 198:1 224:1 levels 66:5 114:17 143:19 liberty 36:6 licensed 46:21 50:9 50:19 214:6,11 LIEUTENANT 2:4 life 66:20 196:21 218:10 lifespan 227:6 light 129:3 lighting 70:19 likelihood 70:17 likens 29:4 limit 32:10 81:18	83:7,7 limited 93:10 164:7 181:19 182:1 205:21 227:7 limiting 209:8 limits 81:12,13 line 6:11 61:4 66:21 90:21 131:7 136:3 167:21 189:18 198:10 204:4 lines 12:11,13 107:13,19 list 225:7,7 listed 76:21 listened 18:19 19:14 73:15 220:5 listening 115:3 litigate 208:13 litigated 201:21 litigation 200:14 206:19 208:7,15 209:21 little 7:2 25:21 50:1 63:21 70:21 71:14 87:7 96:6 98:16 101:4 120:12 212:7 224:7 live 227:13 228:5 living 92:22 94:5 Liz 132:9 207:22 local 71:21 72:1 location 92:21,22 127:18 locker 223:2,5 logic 213:11 logistically 145:15 long 12:8 40:4,17 66:14 83:17 89:5 167:18 179:13 199:15 203:16 216:1 222:22 longer 26:3 75:19 125:9 132:5 look 37:21 99:15 160:6 175:13 183:19 188:18 203:14 207:5,7	222:3 225:17 looked 79:8 84:2 93:20 looking 56:3 89:13 121:3,5 206:3 207:12 looks 177:6 loop 188:11 lose 59:11 lost 85:20 111:17 lot 36:12 44:17 59:2 70:3 84:12 85:10 121:17 148:9 158:8 211:15 215:18 221:14 222:19 love 86:11 lower 42:18 lower-level 39:19 lowest 72:20 luck 136:15 lumped 168:1 Lynn 214:10
M				
M-U-S-T 54:12				
ma'am 63:22 81:1 160:3 210:21 211:17 229:16				
macro 214:7				
magistrate 85:6				
Mai 1:20 59:19 90:13,16 136:4,6				
Mai's 210:19				
main 68:7				
maintain 19:20 20:4				
maintaining 226:17				
major 5:11 39:16 42:15 44:16 220:2 220:3				
majority 19:18 31:18 35:22				
maker 141:5 155:10 201:11				
makers 148:18				

making 10:6 11:1 11:13 46:21 47:2 47:14 50:6 51:2 53:8 73:12 76:11 80:22 98:8 102:21 104:11 106:12 108:2 114:18 116:17 118:2 119:12 120:2,5 123:1 127:13 131:16 144:16 153:19 156:18 160:10 192:16 197:20 207:13	marshal 103:4 martial 15:21 22:7 24:4 29:16 34:2 36:3,21 58:18 59:1 63:8 74:16 74:21 82:1 84:8 85:4 108:14 109:22 110:20 111:2,16 116:21 124:2 126:7 127:2 127:14 190:22 195:19 200:19 Master-at-arms 214:1 materials 189:3 math 223:14,16 Mathews 214:10 Mathwig 213:21 matter 5:1 72:17 88:9 90:8 148:2 159:19 165:3 191:9 225:3 227:19 228:2 229:21 matters 40:5 103:3 193:16 McClendon 211:18 212:2,3,6,11 228:8,19 229:2,7 229:9 McGuire 1:17 59:18 198:22 199:3 meal 134:17 mean 35:10,11 42:6 43:11 54:4 58:17 97:1,5 113:8 124:3 130:4 134:16 135:3 136:22 140:17 143:16 145:3 148:10 149:19 150:1 154:12 156:8 159:10,14 168:15 170:21 173:12 178:4 184:15 195:19	202:9 203:21 207:14 217:9 220:21 225:3 meaning 141:5 155:5 169:13,14 169:15,19 182:20 204:14 meaningful 105:13 122:7 143:2 156:18 157:3 167:15 169:18 201:8 meaningless 115:21 135:9 176:10 means 30:3 54:14 94:13 97:6 98:9 99:6 100:6 101:7 113:2 134:21 154:11,13 156:7 170:7,10 174:18 174:19 180:7 185:2,9 206:20 209:19 214:1 meant 6:12 147:2 measures 23:3 70:16 mechanism 92:13 105:9 193:15 mechanisms 98:1 104:4 105:12 107:16 122:16 131:11 142:7,19 Medal 65:22 medical 42:10 93:10 94:6 95:6 95:10 97:2,8,11 97:18 98:18 99:2 99:18 189:14 meet 135:15 176:13 meeting 1:5 90:10 91:9 92:1 93:20 94:10 95:4 101:1 135:21 188:10 193:1 229:14 meetings 102:19 121:17	Meg 2:3 90:11,12 120:17 138:15 140:11 178:9 181:8 188:7 member 5:19 16:13 18:2 48:10 76:19 79:14 85:5 90:12 90:19 226:19 members 4:19,20 4:22 5:4,6 22:8,18 28:6,17 62:14 72:19 73:10 80:16 80:18 90:20 93:9 100:22 115:5 191:6 219:18 221:10 224:8 227:20 memorize 41:13 memory 32:21 33:16 170:17 men 33:21 214:13 226:8 mention 60:19 mentioned 30:10 53:2 216:9 merely 27:15 88:3 156:5 merit 226:1 message 225:11,12 225:13 met 1:11 163:1 method 137:15 141:10 224:21 metrics 7:6 metro 227:13 mid-1990s 226:4 middle 217:9,11 militaries 49:11 military 11:18 12:17 13:13 17:4 18:2,9,17 19:3,5 19:12,19 20:12 21:3,7,13,16,20 23:7 24:7,18 25:6 25:11,18,20 26:5 26:9,16,20,22 27:8 28:13,19,21	28:22 29:1,5,10 29:11 30:20 31:1 31:7 34:19 36:1 39:6,16 40:15,21 41:17 44:16 45:4 45:5,22 46:10 47:12 48:15 50:5 50:6,9,12 52:1 53:1,1,10 54:9 56:2,11 57:11,16 59:11 61:12 66:18 67:1 70:22 72:20 73:10 74:14 75:9 77:19 78:8 79:2,9 79:12,13 81:11 84:15,18 86:22 87:2,20 102:11 103:13,17 104:2 104:14 105:6 106:7 110:5 111:9 116:21 117:7 119:16,22 121:4 130:9 145:5 150:17 151:3 153:5,6 154:1,21 156:4,10 157:2,14 160:12,14 163:10 163:12 165:18,19 166:5 167:20 168:4 173:1 175:17 178:6 179:17 180:15 189:11,20 193:10 193:22 196:14 204:10 205:6 206:8 212:18 213:9 214:2,5 215:2,3 218:8 220:20 221:4,10 222:11 225:4 226:15 mind 36:4 38:11,14 38:21 39:11 43:6 65:21 170:22 179:2,3 minds 38:19 minor 220:3
--	---	---	--	--

minute 44:20,22 46:19 62:5 90:4 225:8	192:3 195:9 201:15	necessarily 14:1,3 70:2 87:1 114:11 115:1 130:19 165:9 179:1 196:8 212:20 224:4,13	night 110:14 Nobody's 183:18 non-judicial 103:5 noncommissioned 7:12 9:2,11 noncriminal 70:15 nonsense 54:4 Norfolk-Virginia 36:13 normal 42:8 norms 29:21,21 note 30:1 120:20 179:5,8 194:3,7 209:3 noted 57:4 123:19 189:8 201:2 notes 32:22 33:16 noting 22:3 103:20 notion 49:8 123:6 nuance 77:22 147:6 147:10,13 nuances 11:11 number 4:21 18:3 19:14 72:17 111:4 113:10 115:2 131:20 179:6 213:6 222:10 numerous 24:20 65:19 nurse 214:16	objections 101:5 191:15 objective 8:15 208:14 objectives 103:21 objects 164:17 obligation 171:7,16 obstruction 18:16 obviously 10:8,15 36:5 74:22 75:3 75:12 77:14 86:8 100:16 109:16 118:3 129:4 160:8 187:14 228:14 occasions 13:12 occur 44:12,15 occurred 115:19 occurs 46:19 OCS 41:3 odd 44:4 offence 161:4 offense 32:20 58:7 69:20 153:22 189:14 offenses 17:18 22:7 32:8,12 38:5 44:12 63:15 81:20 82:2 162:19 171:5 offer 88:20 98:11 112:16,16 offered 56:22 70:19 217:6 office 5:13 47:8 53:13 170:19 officer 34:12 37:12 37:18 41:19,20 42:17 59:2 75:3 76:2,3 77:7 79:3,9 214:2 217:7,14,17 217:18 219:3 officer's 74:19 officers 7:11,12 9:2 9:3,11,11,19 30:6 30:16,17 31:2 37:1,8 43:14 44:14 49:12 77:20 78:7 217:15
minutes 40:7 182:7	moments 109:15 109:17 143:3 190:6	necessary 20:2 85:10 128:16 133:17 necessity 45:8 need 10:9 19:20 52:19 53:4 54:15 55:15 56:9 58:8 58:12 79:7 89:6 95:22 101:4 108:17 111:3 114:11 123:18 169:7 181:6 207:18 219:4,8,15 219:21 220:14 229:10 needed 209:19 220:10 needs 38:1 40:8 127:19 144:19 170:1 218:21 224:1 227:7 negates 222:14 negative 85:11 negatively 22:17 negotiating 60:14 negotiation 198:1 neighborhood 36:8 36:12 neighborhoods 36:13 neither 181:22 189:1 never 42:20 74:22 158:20 159:21,22 179:6 185:3 186:7 210:3 218:13,15 new 17:13 19:3 25:19 53:19 75:18 124:19 159:5 177:14 191:9 227:11 228:18 Nigeria 197:8	Monisha 214:6 227:10 monolithic 61:12 month 40:6 227:10 228:22 months 36:7 105:19 morale 33:19 35:8 39:5 43:7 58:4 morning 4:4,11 5:2 41:11 42:21 138:3 222:1 mother 212:13 213:13 mouth 43:3 move 62:21 72:11 98:7 111:18 142:15,22 144:7 154:15 moving 173:17 myriad 206:16	<hr/> N <hr/> N.W 1:12 name 37:9 38:7,8 41:4 42:19 212:11 narrow 186:6 201:15 206:14 nation 56:3 National 213:3 Naval 36:9 Navy 7:20,20 13:8 14:5 36:16,16 42:15 204:16 217:14 222:18,18 222:19,21 225:16 Navy's 7:22 NDAA 17:14 81:17 102:15 141:3 174:18 near 228:21 nearly 48:21 73:1
misconduct 53:21 153:16 misinterpret 184:1 misreading 111:1 181:4 missed 91:8 127:5 mission-ready 19:22 misstatement 194:18 missteps 30:18 mistake 61:21 mistakes 53:18 54:7 mitigation 190:1,5 mix 32:15 MJIA 24:9 25:9 26:8,11 27:5,17 modality 224:21 modification 24:2 190:14 modifications 6:2 15:10,13 91:22 93:21 modified 190:16 191:19 modifies 81:17 modify 4:8 7:9 16:7 23:14 98:17 183:2 184:8 modifying 84:5,13 84:21 88:9 99:5 moment 25:21 86:16 93:18 102:21 105:4 115:18 117:20 141:13 150:14 155:3,5 156:20 168:11 170:3 175:1,5,6 176:1,3 177:6 185:12,19 185:20 186:4 187:1,9,9 189:10				

224:19	opinions 61:15	142:18	99:5,5 102:20	192:22 213:6,6,7
official 2:2 22:10	151:6	oversight 24:6 85:4	105:8 109:18	216:20 218:14,16
oh 54:1 55:3 62:8	opportunity 27:22	owe 56:5	110:3,5,12 113:2	219:5 220:14
69:9,13 97:21	48:22 79:21 98:4		113:17 114:18	221:12 222:3,5
112:7 128:9	111:17 116:14	P	116:5,7 120:13	224:5 227:11
136:11 166:2,14	117:15 126:6,17	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-...	121:17 124:12,15	perceived 209:8,15
173:22 182:15	137:7 145:20	4:1	125:17,17 126:4	percent 178:8
211:1 218:14	150:15 154:17	p.m 229:22	127:3 133:12,22	222:4
219:13	165:15 169:22	packet 124:16	137:17 138:3,8	perception 59:13
Ohio 215:1	172:3 178:5	page 101:18 142:7	140:22 148:13	perfect 51:4 133:1
okay 12:20 14:12	186:16,18,20	192:22 195:22	149:6 151:1,10	160:8 179:16
14:20 16:12 32:1	187:12 188:21	pain 18:22 56:1	153:6 154:3,9	perform 9:22
48:8 62:8 68:21	193:16 195:17	paint 223:1,5	156:8 161:13,14	performance 7:9
72:10,13 74:11	196:3,12	Palfy 214:20	165:7,11 166:7	8:22
81:3,4 82:21	opposed 60:16	panacea 53:9	174:15 179:12,20	perimeter 66:8
86:14 89:14 90:21	135:5 203:4	panel 1:3,11 3:12	181:14 184:14	permanent 92:19
96:15,19 118:9	opposing 77:2	3:14,14 4:5,14,19	192:5 202:4 207:4	125:12
119:5 126:8 133:8	opposite 44:19 46:6	4:20 5:5,10 15:22	207:11 216:18	permit 68:3 92:17
133:20 134:9	87:22	18:19 28:6 31:14	223:16	160:17 210:1
136:12,13 139:14	options 72:21 73:9	47:20 50:10 51:17	participate 91:9	perpetrator 216:1
145:9 158:18	73:11 95:7 98:20	53:19 62:15 74:8	194:21	216:2
173:19 176:15	order 8:11 19:21	77:16 80:12,18	participates 194:15	person 17:2 28:2
182:15 188:1,2,6	20:1 40:13 43:8	84:8 85:4 88:18	particular 22:10	34:7 38:3 39:6
199:6 205:10	57:19 85:10 89:5	89:3 90:10,19	35:11 37:11,13	42:14 55:18 59:6
210:14,19 211:1	104:1 105:6	91:11,21 98:7	39:15 61:20 65:16	68:7 90:18 135:1
212:6 229:8	152:19 167:8	100:19 101:16	65:20 66:2 73:21	140:13 141:11
old 212:19	189:17 192:4	117:8 120:14	85:19 120:15	145:14 146:5,6,12
on-site 13:10,12	207:2 220:10	125:12 127:19	135:19	146:17 147:3
14:1,7	ordered 75:19	129:6 167:7	particularly 7:19	159:13,15 169:13
once 41:19 99:10	organization 20:13	169:21 170:1	72:19 89:4	174:11 197:2
118:11	22:18,20	186:18 187:3,5	parts 109:8 121:15	203:6 208:21
one-on-one 13:18	organizations	188:11 193:3	134:5 150:18	211:2 221:3 222:2
one-way 169:15	18:10 22:16 89:7	194:6 207:20	pass 169:16	226:18 228:11
170:8 174:4	orientation 94:3	212:9,12,17,21,22	passed 102:8 159:2	person's 219:8
ones 10:5 34:16	original 94:1 96:11	227:7,9 229:15,18	passing 124:14	personal 17:12
91:16 132:15	originally 62:7	Panel's 198:7	passionate 55:21	personally 18:22
onus 50:6	162:8 198:2 212:8	panels 70:5 212:17	path 178:11	141:22 146:13,13
open 11:5 110:2	ought 70:17 75:7	paper 229:3	PATRICIA 2:4	146:20 147:9
171:15	146:7	paragraph 215:5	paying 43:22	151:16 199:16
opened 180:12	outpost 65:17	218:6,7 221:2	pending 91:11,21	220:6
operate 58:3	outrageous 219:19	227:5	129:7,9	personnel 26:18
operational 20:14	outside 18:4 26:21	paraphrase 92:11	people 11:16 28:11	27:12,15 73:2,11
28:19	99:9,12 213:8	Pardon 62:6	36:1,7,21 37:4	94:6 95:7,10 97:2
operationalized	215:3	parenthetical	41:6,14,18 42:16	97:11 98:19 99:3
152:5	outweigh 197:6	146:10 174:10	51:6,7,9 53:15,17	99:14,18 219:22
opinion 134:22	overlooked 89:22	part 11:10,17 14:9	54:6,8 55:7,12	persons 88:19
203:4	override 74:18	51:12 59:8 78:1	56:15 59:9 81:7	perspective 53:12

57:10 58:10 60:13 94:19 persuade 117:15 petty 217:14 219:3 phase 154:15 phenomenon 50:3 philosophy 213:11 phone 16:9 90:14 136:10 182:4 physical 70:18 physically 147:3 223:5 picture 42:11 pictures 42:9 piece 110:17 120:7 120:15 121:12,12 124:18 129:12 134:17 137:14,17 138:5 152:18 153:3 156:17 164:3 174:12 190:18 197:5 201:20 203:11,17 pieces 121:7 place 44:18 65:16 93:9 98:2 103:22 104:5 106:5,13 107:17 118:15 122:16 131:12 137:3 142:18 placed 21:6 66:7 places 14:8 75:10 Plan 7:4 plane 136:9 planning 86:10 play 9:7 51:3 67:5 67:5 157:9,13 played 48:15,20 55:2 plea 107:14 108:3,5 109:10 110:12,16 111:7,11,16,20 112:16 113:7,12 113:19 114:10 115:14 116:10,21 117:9 118:3,12,17 119:15 121:6,11	121:12,13,20 123:2,3 124:18 129:9 131:18 134:8 137:21 139:22 141:15 143:1 144:9,17,18 145:2,5,11 146:2 147:1 149:5,12 150:20,21 151:4 152:1,10,16 153:7 153:14,15 154:3 154:10,11,15 155:3,5,6,7,14,15 155:17,19 156:1,3 156:7,19 157:3,19 158:21 160:7,17 160:17 161:1,4,5 161:21 162:6,7,14 163:7 164:4,8,19 165:22 166:1,11 166:14,16 167:15 168:9,17 169:1 170:4 171:1,4 172:2,18 173:13 173:21 174:14 175:16 176:12,12 176:18 178:8 179:14 183:12,13 183:14 184:7,10 185:22 186:20 plead 117:3 158:7,9 160:16 161:7 163:2,8 166:3,14 174:6,6 pleading 151:2 153:21 158:10 163:21 173:7 pleas 158:6 162:19 please 67:7 72:18 78:20 86:19 96:18 119:9 223:20 plus 4:21 223:18 podium 62:4 point 14:4 17:10 27:20 32:5 33:1 33:13 39:1 49:17 60:8 61:20 62:11	65:10 66:15,18 75:14 76:9 77:17 78:4 87:8,21 90:4 97:5 108:15 117:6 117:12 119:21 132:20 134:2,12 162:5 168:13 176:10,21 180:15 195:12 204:3 207:3,19 219:7,14 point's 115:7 points 50:21 52:16 152:14 police 38:9,21 214:2 220:19,20 policies 24:20 102:14 policy 23:18 92:17 102:14 political 220:8 politics 89:2 pool 27:4 poorly 116:2 portion 99:1 116:11 117:10,13 118:11,13 123:12 124:14 139:22 141:18,20 145:1,7 156:10 162:14 163:3 168:2 portions 145:19 Portsmouth 36:9 42:10 position 19:16 30:13 32:18 37:9 78:9 80:21 88:5 97:3 143:11 167:4 198:7,9 223:17 positions 9:20 20:8 positive 85:11 124:20 positively 12:3 possibility 47:1 107:4 possible 8:16 95:14 possibly 82:6 post 37:13,15,20	81:18 post-graduate 214:8 post-trial 81:14 posted 211:20 potential 76:14 139:1 150:21 187:4 207:12 208:15 potentially 38:4 162:4 power 29:9 powerful 18:20 PowerPoint 91:14 224:20 powers 93:8 practice 17:15 18:7 27:8 106:9,16 158:2,3 159:19 172:5 175:18 179:17 184:12 192:5 194:14,20 210:6 215:3 practices 187:21 pre 175:17 194:21 pre-agreement 124:15 pre-decision 142:21 pre-sentence 194:14 195:1,4 pre-sentencing 191:4 196:2 pre-trial 85:13 179:17 184:11 precharging 105:3 precise 119:20 120:11 precisely 29:5 precluding 187:3 187:11,13 preclusion 186:16 predominately 164:15 preempt 206:22 prefer 32:10 54:13 preference 113:15	preferences 104:7 104:10 107:19 108:1,8 122:18,22 131:14,16 137:4 prejudice 83:1 preliminary 49:18 75:17 premise 60:18 preparations 66:7 prepared 224:4 prepares 9:21 preparing 9:19 45:1 prescribe 191:1 200:19 present 1:15 2:1 27:19 100:22 170:13,13 189:12 202:21 217:1,2 presentation 45:15 152:3 201:10 228:9 presentations 91:4 presented 5:19 15:18 16:13,14 57:18 189:5 201:6 201:14 presenting 16:16 79:15 205:17 presents 79:20 President 46:4 81:13 131:22 190:21 200:18 207:15 Presidential 5:17 presiding 1:13 pressure 46:7 pretrial 107:9 108:22 112:20 119:14 124:13 125:4 135:6 139:3 143:9,22 144:3,4 162:2 pretty 73:15 221:14 prevent 13:13 24:7 preventing 21:14
--	--	--	--	--

23:3	102:22 103:18	186:1 187:17	38:7,20 40:15	psychology 214:9
prevention 5:15	108:9 148:17	199:4	45:5 50:9 53:12	public 1:5 3:17
6:21 8:1,13,21 9:9	151:11 170:4,6	profession 45:6	54:3 67:5 102:6	52:13 117:20
89:1	189:21 194:1	professional 34:18	102:13 104:16	210:22 211:8,14
previous 19:4	204:5	40:15 53:9 54:3	105:22 120:9	211:17,22 213:12
primarily 39:9	process 20:12	55:4	160:9 171:7,16	publicly 34:22
primary 33:17	21:10 25:16 29:16	professor 1:19 5:16	204:15	pull 58:6,8
prior 104:10 108:1	47:14 48:22 49:3	5:17 16:1,9,10	prosecutor's	pulled 71:18
111:9,12 122:22	49:7 50:1,5,13	27:18 31:11 48:3	172:16	punishment 103:5
131:16 192:2	51:2 52:3 67:21	60:6 62:3 69:9	prosecutorial	157:7
prisoner 219:20	70:13 71:2,8,12	80:8 82:3,5 83:20	21:22 25:15 28:9	punishments 35:5
220:8	71:17,20 86:22	86:18 122:11	53:21 54:11 55:1	pure 155:5
prisoners 219:11	87:3 88:8 99:15	123:9 134:11	prosecutors 25:20	purely 154:2
privilege 30:22	104:15 106:4,13	138:16,16 185:7	28:11 34:18 35:17	155:22
52:19	106:17 110:9	187:14 210:17,18	46:20 50:7,13	purpose 24:21
privileges 206:15	112:3 114:18	213:4,12	53:9 55:4 171:21	116:20
probable 76:4,5	115:5,6 119:13,15	profile 30:3	prospect 47:8	pursue 103:4
77:7	120:2 126:7	profound 56:11	protect 197:10	pursuing 103:7
probably 70:7	127:17 132:4,5	Program 8:1	protected 94:8	purview 37:17
87:21 135:7	139:2,8 142:21	programs 6:22 8:3	198:4	45:17
148:14 193:20	145:4,5,8 149:6	8:14 24:21 89:1	Protection 63:6	put 28:5 33:7,10
203:20 207:18	151:13 153:19	promised 229:3	69:18	50:5,12 57:6 62:5
220:16 222:8,10	154:7 156:11	promote 10:19,20	protector 213:13	72:18 98:2 99:16
222:13	157:6 163:11	19:13	protects 196:16	108:10 109:3,6,10
probation 57:14	170:5,5,14,16	proof 36:4 76:7	prove 54:15 226:12	112:2 114:1,6,8
problem 19:3,5	175:1 193:10,13	proponents 49:2,10	proven 59:13	125:9,12 127:11
23:2 27:9 29:2	196:15 197:4	49:11	provide 10:16 13:9	127:20,21 129:16
30:8 56:5,16,16	processes 71:5	proposal 50:3	13:18 14:6 15:7	132:5,14 133:2
56:17 57:15 60:15	110:15 140:20	56:14	96:8 101:21	136:19 139:19
71:16 89:15	221:7,9	proposals 50:4	103:18 160:4	148:1 157:1
105:18 163:5	procurement 84:10	propose 112:15	175:15 184:6	183:15 185:2,8
177:2 178:16,17	85:8	130:11 181:2	191:1 207:19	192:8 194:5 198:5
204:20 216:14	produced 55:22	proposed 94:11	221:13	203:9 209:22
221:12 222:16	production 229:4	127:11 175:13,14	provided 7:20	226:2
223:13	productive 51:14	184:5 188:11	provider 213:13	puts 30:12
problems 28:20	52:4	prosecute 31:8	provides 67:17	putting 30:6 53:8
32:16 101:13	PROF 16:11 27:21	47:9	180:8	88:7 116:10
175:12 217:9,11	59:22 60:3,7,10	prosecuted 44:21	providing 59:3	124:12
221:19 223:11	62:17 69:7,10,15	prosecuting 22:12	204:1,2	Pythagorean
procedural 29:22	80:7,9 81:1 82:12	104:21 204:16	provision 67:20	223:17,20
procedures 104:12	82:16 83:13 85:16	prosecution 21:6	82:5 97:18 124:20	
proceed 161:3	86:1,3,12 87:11	25:5 26:21 52:22	provisions 67:15	
proceeding 79:12	118:21 119:1,4,7	171:20 204:11	81:17 143:10	Q
115:22 116:7	119:10 122:12	prosecutions 20:21	psychological	qualifications 27:2
150:6,9,15 155:12	123:8 130:13,16	44:17 204:18	189:13	qualified 27:5
164:6 169:6 191:4	132:11,13 138:21	205:5	psychologist	qualify 68:16
proceedings 9:5	182:5,13 184:22	prosecutor 27:1	214:19	quality 20:21
				quantum 117:10

117:13 121:12,15 145:1,7 152:17 156:10,16 162:14 163:3 quarters 222:2 quasi 30:9 quasi-judicial 9:22 10:18 84:6,22 question 14:13 40:4 42:5 49:1,9 71:11,17 75:4 97:1 106:12 128:1 158:1 179:12,16 181:10 186:1 204:6,7 205:8 209:21 questionable 51:8 questioned 66:9 questions 11:6 31:14 41:21 57:18 89:12 212:16 quick 193:15 quickly 6:17 124:1 125:18 212:21 quicky 195:21 quite 13:3 30:15 54:20 76:22 126:20 128:6 quote 41:4 44:13 191:9 quoting 204:14	rape 17:19 158:11 171:10 201:15,18 203:18 205:22 206:14 212:18 222:4,11,12 225:10,11 226:7 rate 20:22 re-adopt 65:3 re-present 95:1 194:3 reached 227:14 read 23:22 73:6 92:10 94:12 96:8 133:5 175:9 190:15 192:10,21 205:12 209:9,12 210:1 readers 178:1 reading 8:7 86:5 134:18 196:4 reads 8:20 9:17 23:13 115:2 ready 220:11 229:4 real 52:17 73:22 176:15 225:10,11 realistically 34:8 reality 121:19 146:12 222:6 realize 47:3 78:5 realized 6:18 really 8:19 29:11 30:9 32:15,15 35:13 43:6,22 44:2 54:10 67:20 80:11 81:18 159:18 161:17,18 181:7 185:19 193:19 204:7 211:4 215:6 217:11,11 219:15 223:22 reason 25:6 31:7 33:17 34:20 35:20 61:3 62:9 68:8 73:5 76:10 94:7 138:19,21 140:4 216:18 224:5	reasonable 29:7 reasonably 188:21 reasons 26:12 36:10 reassigned 27:6 rebut 195:9 rebuttal 193:20 197:17,19 recall 7:1 41:2,19 77:6 138:17 172:11 206:9 recap 7:2 receive 9:20 10:10 65:22 received 93:6 97:16 97:20 102:19 115:11 191:7,22 receiving 201:12 reciprocal 57:8 recognize 19:7 recognizing 69:1 179:4 recollection 181:13 181:18 192:20 recommence 117:13 recommend 11:14 12:3 13:1 23:2 24:1,5 64:15 120:12 127:21 132:2 139:10 200:17 recommendation 6:9,10,11 7:13 8:10,17,18 9:13 9:14,15 10:11,19 11:12 12:15,19,21 13:1 23:9,10,11 23:20,20,22 24:1 31:19 32:3,4,4,6 45:10 62:5,6,22 63:2,5 64:16 67:11 68:12,14,16 70:9 71:9,16 72:8 72:9 73:20 74:6,9 74:12,19 75:2,6 76:17,21 77:1,2,5	77:19 78:5,11,16 78:18 80:2,22 81:6,8 83:2,4,12 83:21 85:19,22 86:8 87:4,9,10,15 87:16 88:5,11,13 88:16 89:9,20 91:5,20 92:7 93:19 94:1,6,12 94:22 95:5,12 96:12,18 97:2,10 98:6,8,16 99:2,18 100:16 101:16 102:4 104:1 105:10,19 107:4 108:11 109:21 110:4 112:12,22 114:2 122:9 123:22 124:6 126:16,17 129:4 129:21 131:6 132:2 133:9,11,15 133:22 134:3,18 138:20 143:14 146:8 149:3 151:15 152:9 169:11,12 170:2 174:9 175:10 176:19 177:18 179:6 182:12 188:8,9 190:11,20 192:12 195:15 197:21 198:3,17 199:1,10 200:16 201:4 202:12,20 203:2 209:20 210:13 recommendations 4:9,13 6:3,6,12 11:3 15:12 16:8 28:4,7 33:9,12 40:18 45:10 47:17 48:12 62:12,15,20 76:7,12 78:1 87:6 88:16 90:1,6 91:2 91:12,17 92:4 95:9,20 97:11	119:12 120:14 132:17 138:18 140:5 143:20 164:13 167:9 173:16 183:18 187:20 recommenders 112:13 recommended 30:5 73:6 112:13 113:11 171:13 179:21 180:7,8 183:5 195:22 recommending 63:12 69:21 76:13 78:10 82:18 88:3 109:20 116:6 121:10 123:13 132:16 149:14 152:11,13,19 206:21 recommends 16:6 63:16 131:21 190:21 reconcile 69:1 reconsider 96:5 reconstruct 223:21 record 39:14 60:21 61:3 72:6 83:15 90:8 107:11 119:21 194:17 195:11 209:11 recounted 29:14 recurrence 70:18 recuse 22:11 redound 30:19 reduce 20:18 29:13 31:6 81:22 171:12 reduces 81:22 reducing 20:5 23:4 171:9 refer 15:20 17:8 23:15 63:8,20 113:5 207:9 reference 123:16 127:1 129:14 130:3,8
R				
radar 44:9,13,14 radical 49:6 177:18 raise 54:17 110:22 134:15 135:9 193:17 raised 175:12 177:10 ramifications 220:17 random 36:5,18 37:3,5 range 10:22 61:14 rank 28:22 32:18 ranks 219:1				

references 200:13	200:19	Rep 52:10 112:8,10	216:20	60:20 89:1 90:10
referral 74:19	rehabilitative	113:20 123:14	required 22:11	responsibilities
174:22	157:9	126:19 130:2,7	95:6 172:16	11:19,22 84:6,22
referred 18:8 63:17	reinforce 49:19	132:19 134:13,15	requirement 57:8	85:13 103:16
111:21 162:8,16	reiterate 28:8	138:7 139:18	123:17 145:21	227:16
163:16,18	reiterates 185:16	149:16 175:9	requirements 8:22	responsible 20:6
refers 101:19	reiterating 92:2,5	176:2 177:1,9,22	58:11	44:1
143:13	reject 4:8 112:15	178:15,19 180:19	requires 113:12	rest 32:14 132:17
reflect 55:11	154:10 166:11,13	182:16 183:7	124:14	restricted 72:21
reforms 24:5 25:4	180:1 181:2	184:2 186:10	requiring 79:8	73:3,12,19 92:15
refuse 18:12	rejected 100:20	199:11 208:1	104:5 107:17	92:18 93:14,15
regard 16:8 21:17	176:7	repeat 43:11	122:17 131:12	94:14 95:22 99:13
24:10 26:6 27:9	rejecting 176:12	report 3:14 4:12	149:6	100:7 101:8
53:4 94:22 95:4	rejects 29:21 172:2	5:19 7:3 13:2	reread 199:17	restricting 35:3
102:21 103:11	related 27:7 204:8	15:15 16:16 17:22	research 5:17 55:9	restriction 27:13
110:19,21 115:14	212:15	18:4 29:4 30:14	residence 13:15	result 20:13 117:16
123:22 129:7,12	relates 84:5	68:18 69:20 72:16	resident 13:10,12	158:13
134:4 141:14,17	relating 214:9	72:21 73:3,12,14	14:3,7,9	results 23:8 55:11
142:15 143:1	relationship 58:1	73:18,19 76:2	residential 14:1	72:22
144:7,8,18 146:11	relatively 159:5	77:11 80:12,14,19	resisting 46:13	resume 90:10
147:1 152:9 155:1	164:1 208:2	85:18 86:5 92:14	resolve 120:14	retain 15:19 16:5
155:3 163:20	releasing 164:20	92:18 93:2,17	resolved 118:12	31:2 134:20 138:8
166:6 174:22	relegated 167:19	94:15,16 98:22	200:4	retaining 139:19
181:17 186:19	relevant 88:13	99:4,19 101:8,10	resources 27:14	retaliate 225:18,21
188:13,15 189:22	164:5	192:22 194:15,22	respect 10:9,17	retired 1:17,17,18
190:5,6,18 191:18	rely 28:13	195:2,4 199:17	22:22 26:6,14,16	1:18 36:8,12,15
191:20 193:6	remain 19:21 20:2	226:11	27:16 29:2 33:7	36:16,17
194:12,19,20	20:6	reported 70:13	33:10 34:13 35:8	retract 177:19
200:11	remaining 15:14	reporting 5:7 19:13	40:22 46:11 54:20	review 28:7 45:11
regarding 104:7	62:14 90:5 162:3	20:20 21:11 25:5	62:3 64:17,21	45:12 46:1,3,13
107:7,20 111:6	remains 16:4 145:5	72:15 73:9 215:6	67:13 71:8 74:3	47:1,13 53:20
112:20 175:16	remarkable 221:21	216:12	76:6,8,17 78:18	54:19 59:9 63:14
179:14 183:12,13	remarks 31:18	reports 4:6 16:3	81:20 89:12	64:9 65:2,12,17
183:14 184:7,10	47:21 48:2,13	18:7 93:14,16	119:12 139:14	66:19 67:3,3,7,17
191:16 200:12	49:18	96:1 134:3	160:7 184:20	68:1,6 70:12 71:2
regardless 97:22	remember 37:11	represent 205:16	185:21 197:12	71:5,7,12,17,19
143:8 148:22	41:6,14	207:6 208:11	225:10	71:20 72:15 74:14
155:7 157:20	remorse 222:7,8,9	Representative	respected 28:13	75:9,10,10 84:19
regards 79:4	removal 21:9 25:13	56:22 57:3 130:17	respectfully 33:11	126:17 201:1
114:18 129:6	remove 16:7 50:4	177:3,20	47:16	207:11
134:5 151:19	51:1	representing 198:8	respond 19:5 70:7	reviewable 47:10
region 42:16	removed 17:11	request 92:15,19	191:12 193:16	reviewed 66:9,11
registered 214:16	19:17	94:7,15 196:12	responding 21:15	75:8 101:22
regret 80:12	removing 19:10	requests 216:10	24:15 52:14	110:13 189:4
regulation 112:4	20:10,17 49:2,6	require 7:10 10:5	response 1:3 4:5	194:8
114:20	52:2	64:9 125:3,6	6:21 8:1,13,21 9:9	reviewers 76:14
regulations 191:1	renamed 222:21	135:21 176:20	21:21 24:17 29:17	reviewing 94:18

reviews 70:16	167:16,19,20	224:17	saying 13:21 44:5	secretarial 63:14
revised 77:21	168:2,7,8 169:11	Rios 214:6 227:10	61:10 64:20 80:21	secretaries 7:2 8:12
rid 108:10	169:12 170:8	road 139:9	111:19 113:20,22	8:20 11:20 45:12
ridiculous 203:19	173:13 174:13,15	role 4:12,17 5:4,8	114:1,4 117:19,21	97:7 98:2 101:6
right 5:7 6:11 15:9	174:17 175:4,15	5:14 9:7 15:15	124:4,7 125:7	secretary 6:22 9:18
15:14 45:18 46:2	176:2,5 177:6	21:5 23:1 29:18	126:3,21 131:2	46:3 65:2 67:19
46:16 53:18 59:21	179:7,14,21 180:7	30:9,10 33:6	136:8 151:7,9	70:11 73:7 74:13
62:3,21 67:5,7,9	180:9,14,22	48:16,18,20 51:3	158:10 159:17	84:17 88:17,20
68:12 69:5,13	182:18 183:5,10	51:18 55:1 62:13	162:22 164:16,19	94:13 100:10
74:7,12 77:4 80:5	183:12,13 184:9	62:22 64:22 78:16	169:21 170:11	104:3 105:11
80:20 82:8,11,14	185:11,13,16	81:5 83:3,22 84:4	176:9 180:4,13	107:15 108:13,18
82:20 83:11,19	186:5,12,12,14	84:16 88:12,15	183:4 185:8,18	131:9,21 190:20
87:13 88:4,14	187:6,7,8 188:4	89:10 90:2 104:13	186:4,5,9,18	200:17 203:10
89:18,19 90:14	189:7,9,20 190:1	148:4	197:7 203:5	Secretary's 94:2
99:22 100:4,12,13	191:2 192:14,15	roll 139:4	204:20 207:14	section 11:4 16:15
101:2,3,14,20	192:16 195:8	room 66:1 208:9	says 40:11 62:10	63:6 69:17 182:21
102:6,9,13,15	196:6,18 197:15	225:17	112:12,18,19	sections 199:17
103:8,12,20	197:16,18 198:15	Rosie 214:20	116:22 122:20	sector 29:6
104:20 105:14	199:13,22 200:10	routine 120:4	134:19 146:18	securing 100:7
106:10,16 107:7	200:13,21,22	RSS 86:20 87:5,10	158:7 160:21	security 70:19
109:1 110:7,10	201:7,8,12,19,22	rule 125:5	165:3 174:4	see 5:2 28:15,17
111:6,15 112:14	202:8,13,15,16,17	rules 74:1 125:10	175:13,14 178:4	31:7 34:8 35:14
112:19 114:1,6,8	203:3,12 204:22	189:11	179:6,7,20 180:2	38:7 60:15 77:22
118:7,9,19 120:17	206:7,9,12,17,20	run 30:2 139:9	181:11 184:5	78:11 79:21 97:13
121:6 124:19	207:1 208:3,4,4		195:15 202:7	117:10 129:22
125:8 126:2,13,13	208:17,18,20	S	208:3,18 219:13	137:7 143:7 154:4
128:22 129:19	210:4,12 221:11	sadly 54:5	school 13:16 15:5	154:6,20 181:2
130:5 131:1 132:1	227:18 228:1	safeguard 195:21	173:4 214:18	188:19 189:4
132:7,22 133:13	229:17	196:16	Schools 13:8 14:3,6	194:9 196:9 206:3
133:17,19 134:21	rights 102:7,20	safeguards 191:5	14:11	210:16 215:13,13
135:4,13 137:11	103:13,15,18	195:14	scope 75:15 206:12	218:18 225:17
138:8 140:11	104:2 105:7	safer 228:5	scored 72:20	seeing 211:15
141:1,7,8 143:6	106:19 114:14	sailors 38:12 66:21	scourge 51:21	seen 35:13 50:20
144:2,12,14,17,19	115:20 141:1	221:22	screen 80:3	159:21,22 171:18
144:19 145:10,14	143:5 145:19	sake 215:5	scrutinized 66:4	sees 115:1
146:4,20 147:17	147:20 148:9,16	San 226:5	search 85:5 183:22	selected 216:18
149:20,20,22	148:21,22 150:2	SAPRO 7:11 8:12	searches 84:8	selecting 84:7
150:3,7,9,11,12	151:20 154:21	11:13 73:8 99:14	SECDEF 207:15	selections 85:5
150:13 151:6	155:4,11 159:3	224:19	second 22:15 116:6	self 218:12
152:6,8 154:20	167:12,22 168:4	SAPRO's 7:4	128:3,7,10,13	Senate 66:6
155:13,21 156:2	169:19 170:16,18	SARCs 95:7 98:19	131:20 140:10	send 33:21 34:2
156:21 157:8,12	184:6 187:18	sat 220:4 224:9,17	141:19 152:17	46:4 67:19
157:15,18,21	188:19 189:7,19	satisfaction 114:22	153:2 154:9 169:8	senior 9:19 10:15
158:5 159:5 163:5	192:14 196:5,10	satisfy 158:15	169:12 175:5	13:9 14:6 15:19
163:17 164:14,17	196:16 197:4	182:20	179:20	16:4 17:6 20:18
164:18 165:6	198:4,11,12	save 31:18	Secondly 53:7	22:4 27:1 45:5
166:3,5,9 167:15	200:20 206:16	saw 158:20 218:19	secret 118:6,8	63:15 68:7 88:20

217:6,7 219:12 221:2 222:2 sense 37:16,22 55:10 133:1 160:8 166:21 168:14 175:19 176:19 185:15 186:21 187:1,10 sensibilities 106:1 sent 8:2 sentence 82:1 118:1 128:4,8,11 128:14 131:20 134:18 139:19 141:18 154:17 155:22 157:20 161:22 167:17,20 171:14 190:5 191:10 194:22 216:1 sentenced 197:3 sentencing 118:11 118:13 119:13 120:13 139:1 144:9,12 152:6,7 154:15 155:8 157:8,10 165:10 168:2 186:11,15 187:20 188:15,22 189:21 191:11,14 192:7,15 193:10 193:13,17 194:18 195:7 198:10 separate 26:5,20 83:16 113:9 143:10,20 144:11 144:19,22 145:4 145:11,18,19,19 157:6,11,18 167:16,19 186:14 separated 140:5,21 174:13 179:3 separating 149:4 sergeant 41:11 42:20,22 43:1 65:22 serious 17:3 26:2,7	26:11 52:22 53:20 56:7 66:20 seriously 225:21 served 50:18 213:7 214:20 serves 51:15 service 8:12,20 11:20 74:15 75:8 84:19 94:2,12 98:1 101:6 102:14 125:11 214:14 216:7 219:18 225:14 services 2:3,3 4:18 7:3,8,18 45:13 61:14 90:6,13,20 106:7 120:1 122:4 139:6 186:2 187:19 207:10 serving 103:9 session 15:14 83:3 set 8:5 25:19 151:13 216:22 218:1 224:3 Seventeen 74:11 81:2 sex-related 63:15 sexual 1:3 5:15 6:21 7:22 8:13,21 9:8 15:20 17:8,19 17:22 18:1,5,7,21 20:5,19,20 21:11 21:15,19 22:7 23:2,15 24:6,15 24:18 25:5,17 26:2 28:21 29:3,4 29:17 30:20 31:1 31:6 32:8,13 44:7 51:22 52:20 55:22 69:20 70:8,14 72:16 73:8 81:20 82:1 88:22 92:13 92:14,18 93:2 94:14 106:2 158:11 189:11 198:12 205:4 212:15 222:12	shake 206:4 shaking 210:3 she'll 228:18 sheet 153:22 160:21 161:6 Sherry 2:5 101:14 shield 201:15,18 203:19 205:22 206:14 ship 217:22 shocks 218:19 short 47:15 66:14 showed 72:22 showing 62:7 shows 54:5 side 59:10 164:2 221:11,13 227:18 228:1 sign 182:6 significant 9:7 24:16 26:18 27:11 49:5 50:22 51:20 81:11 93:18 116:5 123:12 191:22 192:6 216:4 significantly 29:12 81:18 83:7 silence 52:14 silver 56:4 similar 21:20 31:21 82:5 134:3 164:1 similarly 191:7 simple 208:2 simply 23:13 64:3 75:6 single 50:8 120:9 206:20 sit 79:9 221:8 site 13:14 39:11,16 44:16 73:16 80:15 sitting 80:1 197:2,8 224:11,13 situation 146:7,10 161:18 situations 121:20 six 163:6 Sixteen 86:1	SJA 40:2,11 45:19 54:14 109:6 114:16,16 142:14 SJAs 13:18 skip 215:4 218:5 221:1 227:4 slide 72:12 91:17 92:6 101:17 slides 178:14 slightly 98:18 206:13 Smith 35:10,11,12 social 36:8 189:13 213:20 214:7,7,11 society 19:18,19 Sociologist 213:19 sodomy 17:19 soldier 34:11 38:1 42:19 soldiers 38:13 66:21 221:22 225:10,11 solidified 132:6 solution 29:9 56:17 solve 30:8 56:4,15 216:13 solved 57:15 177:12 solves 175:12 177:2 solving 28:20 somebody 57:12,21 58:16 124:21 137:7 220:10 223:7 somewhat 76:22 sons 34:2 sooner 86:22 87:3 87:20 sorrow 56:1 sorry 40:16 60:5 62:8 68:15 71:13 71:15 80:10 85:20 86:2 91:8 96:7 108:16 112:7 119:1,7 122:14 123:21 127:5 128:5 133:14	136:2 139:11 147:7 151:20,21 158:2 166:15 175:8 178:10 182:5 185:4 211:4 213:17 218:17 sort 46:6 60:17 120:9 144:2 sorting 145:1 sorts 42:16 66:9 sounds 99:21 139:15 167:11 228:12 South 5:18 speak 27:22 32:16 50:17 53:11 86:15 86:19 156:16 170:20 206:7 228:11 speaker 213:19 speaking 52:12 142:11 209:11 special 53:19 54:16 56:9 147:15 148:8 148:19 specific 7:10,21 8:4 11:14 27:10,16 84:5,22 94:7 97:6 97:9 103:15 104:6 107:18 109:20 121:2,7 122:18 123:17,22 129:12 131:13 159:5 181:13 228:10 specifically 7:5 15:6 17:13 25:9 26:9 53:1 110:11 110:16 121:5 137:13 147:22 148:4,7 181:15 207:2 214:13 specificity 110:18 126:11 specified 109:22 specify 110:11 175:22 206:6 specifying 32:8
---	---	--	---	--

speculation 49:19	118:14 125:17	stressed 19:18	152:10 153:4	47:10 79:5 158:15
spelling 54:22	140:12 143:12	41:15	156:14 157:16	186:3
spend 123:20	158:21 159:9,18	strike 65:15	169:10 172:7	suggest 49:4
191:22	174:3,4 188:14,22	strikes 45:7	175:22 177:5	suggesting 71:11
spends 148:9	191:3,8,11,13,17	strong 218:11	181:13 185:1	71:18 76:12
spent 40:4	192:9,21 193:21	strongly 80:1	186:2,21 187:15	138:10
spirit 19:1	195:1,2,3,4,5,9	127:13	187:19 188:16	suggestion 129:3
spoke 198:18	196:9 210:2	struck 44:3	189:4 190:11,17	135:9 178:22
spoken 196:3	211:19 215:8,10	structural 134:4	191:21 192:19	180:13
square 87:9	215:22 217:10	structure 57:16	197:14 198:1	suggestions 15:9
squared 223:18,18	226:12,14	student 213:22	201:4 202:4	suggests 182:17
223:19	statements 48:1	214:8	206:18 209:3	sum 47:15
squarely 201:13	61:9 65:3 209:10	Studies 213:22	subcommittee's 6:3	supervised 22:1
staff 2:4 10:16	209:13 215:17	220:2,3,4	47:16 72:15 78:11	Supervising 2:4,5
63:11,19 64:7,11	states 1:1,11 37:13	study 5:11 10:4	80:14 83:4 94:19	supervisors 9:3,12
67:16 80:10,11,17	49:14 50:20 51:5	85:10 88:3,7	96:13 97:16	12:16,17
106:2 130:11	53:13 66:5 105:20	sub-recommend...	109:14 166:8	supply 66:8
staffed 26:22	106:7 184:17	95:11	167:10,12 193:5	support 20:16 23:6
stage 74:22 166:21	stating 12:3 60:22	subcommittee 2:3	198:8 210:10	23:22 43:6 53:3
168:21	stationed 37:14	2:3 3:14 4:13,14	subcommittees 4:7	60:17 82:11 95:22
stand 41:18 97:17	status 93:10 219:20	5:4,5,8,19 6:17	4:10,17,21,22	182:9,14 200:6
117:11 202:1	statute 179:9	15:15,18 16:3,13	51:19 70:4 191:18	supported 21:1
stand-alone 183:18	203:19	16:15 18:18 20:9	subject 4:22 65:11	49:7 50:11
standard 13:17	statutory 27:13	21:2 22:22 23:4	65:17 66:19 107:1	supportive 48:11
176:14	125:6	26:13 28:5,17	148:2 189:1,17	supposed 12:5
standardize 71:3	stay 95:22	29:4 30:14 33:6	190:7,10 191:3,15	50:12 121:8
standards 8:6,15	staying 100:7	39:13 48:11,12	submission 134:22	sure 11:13 12:4,5
standing 41:10	step 29:15 147:21	51:19 56:21 62:14	137:9 146:11	37:10,10,20 43:15
74:5 203:18	163:19	63:1 64:2,3,22	submissions 201:9	60:9 80:3 91:20
205:16 207:2,5	steps 31:3	70:1 76:20 77:15	submit 96:3 113:16	105:12 106:12
228:1	stick 96:17	77:19 79:14 80:16	140:12 176:5	109:13 120:2
stands 65:20	stipulation 172:21	84:4,17 85:9,18	192:10 194:22	125:13 126:10,20
116:22 158:7	stop 24:7 25:11,14	86:10,21 88:12	submitted 112:17	127:14 128:2
201:17	46:18 67:22 219:9	90:3,13,18,20	subordinate 9:1,6	132:16 135:21
stare 36:22	219:12	92:3,12 94:2,22	subpoints 197:22	137:4,9 140:3
start 69:17 91:10	stories 43:5	95:3,19 96:10,21	substance 63:3	144:16 153:19
91:19 92:1,9	story 205:20	100:2 102:19	207:16	156:18 162:21
101:20 157:1,2	straight 83:4	103:16 104:1	substantial 102:2	169:17 187:11
159:12	straight-forward	110:19 115:6,9,15	197:22	224:21
started 178:10	69:22	116:6 119:11	substantive 194:10	surprise 195:16
state 28:12 46:22	straightforward	120:1 121:16,18	success 6:20 9:8	surprised 45:21
47:3,5 76:11	208:2	122:4 123:13,20	19:6 24:14 28:19	209:19
170:15 171:3	strap 137:5	127:13 134:2	28:20 48:16,19	surprises 194:17
172:5,22	Strategic 7:4	135:19 137:13	successful 23:3	surrounding 16:17
stated 176:13	strategy 45:21 67:1	138:18 139:6	suddenly 33:22	44:18 70:15
statement 27:19	strength 76:7	141:19,20 143:15	35:7,14 44:7	survey 36:5 37:5
60:20 83:16	strengthen 6:13	144:6 147:4 148:1	sufficient 23:5	39:9 43:13 70:6

72:22	take 13:19 17:18	telephone 1:19,20	89:19 91:7 100:17	76:9 78:4 79:5,6,7
surveyed 73:2	31:3 32:13 36:18	2:3	101:14 128:21	81:16 82:3,6
surveys 36:18 70:5	54:1 57:2,6,9	tell 72:11 111:5	132:8 136:17	86:20 87:6,13,18
survivor 192:6,8	59:10 80:21 90:3	112:2 122:13	211:21 212:9	87:21 88:14 89:3
survivors 30:22	99:1 118:18 125:8	146:21 153:10	227:17,17,20	89:22 90:3 92:5
93:5,18 192:8	127:3 132:18	202:3 207:15,16	228:6,8,16 229:8	98:14,17 99:21
220:5,6,7	136:9,16 199:14	222:17	229:19	100:19,21 101:2
suspect 225:8	211:13 225:21	telling 170:11	thanks 62:1 74:9	106:4 107:3
SVC 164:13	taken 33:18 35:16	219:3	78:9 90:6 136:14	117:22 118:20
switch 78:9	36:6 70:17 76:1	temporary 92:19	182:15 211:15	124:17 125:1,22
switching 84:14	115:19 136:20	ten 90:3	229:12	126:21,21 128:13
sworn 191:8	144:9 162:6 203:5	term 16:22,22	theirs 64:13	130:7,17,21 131:2
synergy 59:12	223:4	155:18 156:3	theorem 223:18,20	132:22 133:16
synonymous 16:22	takes 40:9,10 162:1	160:19	theory 170:2 224:2	135:18 138:9
system 10:8,13	talk 6:10 37:21	termed 223:1	thing 34:4 43:17	140:4 141:16
12:6 19:13 26:21	80:17 83:2 121:19	terms 32:7 35:4	44:4,5 45:7,18	143:7,18 144:15
29:10,12,20 51:5	122:5 137:13	40:21 43:8 47:2	46:16,19 62:10	144:21 145:15
53:15 54:9,11,21	141:5 146:5 179:9	61:21 65:2 87:4	67:7 114:13 161:8	146:7 147:10
55:3,15,21 56:12	204:22 216:15	120:2 139:8 140:6	172:19 198:18	148:3 149:13
58:20 60:14 68:4	221:3 225:16	155:7 156:17	208:7 218:6	151:2 156:8 160:6
104:15,19 105:3	226:2,6,6	157:2,9,20 176:8	thing's 207:14	165:2,7,10 166:2
117:7 118:18	talked 107:3	193:11 203:7	things 26:15 38:15	166:22 168:5,6,10
119:11,22 120:10	141:19	215:15	41:9 49:22 57:2	168:12 170:12
140:9 151:12	talking 32:17 37:1	terrible 215:21	57:20 66:9,18	171:4 172:19
155:10,13 157:14	37:2,3 69:17 78:6	terrific 228:12	67:4 70:21 71:1	174:5 175:11
157:21 158:6	84:7 85:19,21	test 155:13	88:3 96:14 121:2	177:2,12 178:20
159:6 160:10,13	87:22 97:6 101:3	testified 19:9 201:6	132:16 139:11	179:1 180:15
160:14 164:14	123:21,21 132:8	testify 189:16	142:12,15 167:13	182:8,11,16 185:7
171:3 172:20,22	136:22 143:18	203:7	174:15,19 179:4	185:10,20,22
172:22 173:1	147:11 156:17	testifying 208:20	180:16 209:6	187:10 188:2,2
177:14 178:6	160:9 168:10,15	Testimonial 202:15	215:12,14 220:12	193:8 194:18
190:3 193:18	174:2 182:18	testimony 18:20	223:9 225:5 226:8	196:15 197:6
196:18 197:20	183:3 184:2,4	61:11 75:20 76:1	think 4:16 10:19	198:18 199:14,18
systematic 56:8	188:4 192:1	79:11 93:4 106:10	11:16 15:9 16:18	203:19 207:17
systems 1:3 4:19	204:15 229:6	175:2 220:5	28:3 29:6,7 31:2	208:1,9 210:9,18
21:4,13 28:12,13	talks 30:15 180:20	221:18	31:20 35:21 37:15	210:20 212:14,19
39:13 63:4 64:3	tandem 218:3	Texas 5:18	37:21 38:5 39:4,5	213:10 215:15
64:13 68:18 69:2	tank 212:14,19	text 73:6 128:9	43:10,11 47:20	216:5 219:11,20
76:19 77:5,18	213:10 216:5	129:19	48:14 49:22 50:2	224:5
78:13,17 80:13	224:6	thank 27:22 31:9	50:14,22 51:10,16	thinking 12:10
83:1 84:1,3	task 228:15	31:11 47:18 48:7	52:1,2,13 54:5,19	69:21 209:5
103:17 202:6	tasked 121:2	52:5,6,10 56:17	54:22 55:10 56:7	225:18
<hr/>	taught 226:16	56:18 59:15,21	56:13 61:2 62:7	thinks 85:9
T	teach 223:17	62:2 64:20 67:8	63:20 64:3 67:10	third 44:10
TABLE 3:10	teacher 214:17	68:13 69:5,14,15	67:20 68:7 70:6	thought 28:9 32:1
tactic 45:20 67:1	225:4	72:2,10 74:7 80:5	71:1,5,22 72:11	52:13 56:14 73:2
tailored 7:20	team 216:19	80:9 83:18,19	73:19 74:10 75:13	205:2 208:14

218:14	train 67:22	120:8 122:17	type 26:10 220:17	unique 19:18
thoughts 145:21,22	trained 28:10 50:8	124:8 131:12	types 70:21	unit 9:1,7 18:2
174:1 180:18	53:17 54:8 97:10	137:19 140:8,15		33:20 36:20 44:8
three 4:6,17 5:11	226:4	142:12 145:20	<hr/> U <hr/>	57:17 58:15 59:4
6:5 11:2,10 16:8	training 9:21 10:9	146:15,21,22	U.S 21:15 29:21	66:2,4,6
69:16 107:19	10:12,17,21 13:5	161:1,12 175:18	47:7 48:16 170:18	United 1:1,11
162:7 198:4	13:5,7,15,19,22	tricky 120:12	UCMJ 10:1,4	37:13 49:14 50:20
three-star 66:10	14:9,13,17 15:2,3	tried 105:8 121:8	23:14,17 25:1	51:5 53:13 66:5
throw 135:10,12	15:7 24:6 30:4,11	193:9	48:18,20,20	105:20 106:6
209:4	30:15 94:3 95:6	troop 43:12	207:11	units 35:8 51:14
tied 156:2,3	97:4 98:18 100:6	troops 34:5 39:21	ultimately 140:1	universities 217:2
time 25:8 40:11	221:2,6,7,8,15,17	40:3 45:2	unable 4:15	University 213:4
59:20 92:1 99:9	221:20 222:13,14	trouble 30:3 57:12	unambiguous	213:16,17,18
101:5 107:3,11	222:15,16 223:12	71:14	136:12	unnecessary 46:8
109:11 113:7	223:13 224:1,16	troubling 93:5	unattainable 136:1	unnoticed 50:1
123:20 132:14,18	224:16,17,18,20	true 34:9,9,21	unchanged 131:20	unravel 199:15
148:9 172:15	224:22 225:1,1,3	38:17 39:7,8	unclear 98:16	unrealistic 56:5
173:3 177:7	225:6,9 226:5	148:12 159:16,17	uncomfortable	unrestricted 18:7
190:15 191:12,22	transcript 102:1	218:18	227:22	73:12 93:3,17
193:4,9,12 197:16	194:8 201:2	trust 34:1,2 35:9	under-reporting	94:17 95:19 98:22
198:19 199:15	transfer 92:16,20	try 52:16 54:7	21:18	99:4,11,19 101:10
211:14 215:5,5	93:9,16 94:8,15	122:2 154:13,20	undergraduate	unscientific 36:5
217:20 222:13	96:1 97:8,19	177:5	220:1	43:13,13
225:15 227:14,15	100:8 101:9	trying 61:15	underlying 94:7	unsure 37:2
227:16	transferred 137:1	106:18 112:22	undermines 29:20	unsworn 188:14
times 65:19 213:7	transfers 94:5 95:9	128:16 142:17	understand 11:18	189:9 190:12
221:15 222:20	95:14 98:5,22	143:17 157:5,12	16:19 46:9,13	191:2,11,12,16
227:3	99:7,17	157:22 172:8	60:12 68:10 73:11	unusual 68:3
today 16:3 30:20	transformative	177:9 181:5 209:4	132:8 147:6,10,13	unwilling 50:17
35:18 41:17 102:3	217:5	226:22	156:15 158:21	upcoming 83:3
200:5 212:10	translated 146:15	turn 48:22 101:15	174:16,19 182:22	USC 102:8 103:19
214:3 215:13	trauma 192:11	166:2 173:12	185:5 186:8 196:7	use 37:22 121:14
218:21 228:4	214:9	tutor 223:16	198:6 211:8	170:5 223:14
229:16,19	Treat 225:9	two 24:16 25:11	215:14 223:20	224:20
told 35:18 202:3	treating 42:15	51:19 59:9 62:11	understanding	useful 119:18
tools 58:19	treating 75:17	62:19 66:10,14	32:21 61:21 72:20	
topic 9:16 33:15	trial 17:9,18 23:16	76:13 91:15	127:8 134:11	<hr/> V <hr/>
83:22	63:15,17 64:5,5	107:13 108:8	152:21 164:22	v 189:5
torment 219:4	74:20 79:17 80:1	109:8,17 113:9	understands	VADM 48:10
torture 219:11,22	81:19 85:13	140:17 141:1	153:14,14 156:6	validate 178:2
tortured 220:10,11	102:10,16,22	143:10,18 145:18	understood 14:21	validation 89:16
total 37:4	103:3 104:5 106:1	145:19 150:18	98:3 205:3	values 20:3
totally 171:11,13	106:11 107:17	152:14 161:19	undue 46:7 215:9	vantage 50:21
touch 186:15	108:7 109:5,9	167:12 178:22	unfair 203:20	varied 213:8
touched 9:4	111:19 112:5	179:4 220:7 226:8	Uniform 17:3	216:20
town 44:12,15	113:13 114:2	226:19	18:17 23:7 48:14	variety 35:4 50:21
track 44:19,21	116:16 117:8	two-way 169:14	81:10	103:3

various 4:8	191:2 193:17,20	view 28:14 132:21	212:9 215:16,18	133:9 187:15
VAs 95:7 98:19	194:15 196:1,7,18	138:7 190:17	215:22 216:2	211:15 229:9
venue 108:14	198:12 200:10,21	207:20	217:1,2 218:20	we're 10:17 30:11
verbally 140:16	201:16 202:8,13	violation 18:16	221:3 227:17,20	32:5,9 37:16
verbiage 43:2	203:12,18 204:3,9	47:11	228:7	45:22 46:5 60:14
220:19	204:10 205:15,16	violations 17:3	wanted 49:18 57:2	61:15 63:12 78:6
version 190:16	206:17,22 207:6	violence 29:4 30:20	60:10,19 69:3	78:19 80:22 81:16
versions 93:21 96:8	208:3,11 209:10	218:19 219:1	83:14 119:10	82:18 84:6 87:8
versus 160:11	209:11,12 215:22	220:16	130:8 143:1	87:22 88:2,3,14
vested 22:4 24:3	221:18 222:10	Virginia 204:13	169:17 194:2	90:9,22 91:10
veteran 213:22	victim's 103:12	Virginia's 170:16	195:10 207:3	101:12 107:20
214:22 222:18	104:6,10 107:18	171:3	213:1	125:22 126:14
Veteran's 213:3	108:1 114:3	virtually 19:7	wants 11:17 120:1	129:22 132:15
veterans 215:1	122:17,22 126:5	23:12	135:4	136:22 139:19
226:14,19 227:2	131:13,15 134:22	vis-a-vis 176:3	war 216:8 217:1	143:10,18 168:10
VICE 1:17	139:6 140:7,11	vision 86:21	219:11,20 220:8	177:13 182:7,18
victim 2:2,3 4:18	144:2 156:21	visits 39:12,16	war-fighting 34:14	185:14,18 186:3,4
17:13,21 19:12	164:15 166:3	44:16 73:16 80:15	45:2 65:13	186:9 187:7,10
55:19 59:7 75:18	170:12 189:20	voice 170:13	warnings 173:8	188:4 199:22
90:6,20 92:14	191:10 196:10	volume 21:2	Washington 1:13	203:9 216:15,22
103:2 104:16	200:13 204:21	vote 77:13	wasn't 37:20	218:1 219:6
108:7 110:12,17	208:10 215:8,17	voted 64:14	127:17 218:18	224:16,16,16
111:6 113:14	victim-blaming	VPA 70:11	watch 224:12	we've 5:11 17:7,21
116:14 117:5,11	221:19	VSS 112:12	watched 65:21	30:16 79:5 97:20
118:1,10,16 120:6	victimless 59:7		watching 224:11	126:16 143:17
122:4 134:6 135:5	victims 5:13 18:3	W	water 66:8 135:11	168:7 180:12,16
135:15 137:1,15	18:20,21 19:8,9	wait 32:2 77:12	watered-down	wear 5:6
137:18 139:7	30:19 52:19,20	80:17 120:12,18	215:15	website 211:20
142:19 143:12	56:1,6,10,12 59:5	138:19,21	way 12:6 26:1	week 11:5 40:5,7
145:6 147:5,8	63:6 69:18 72:16	walk 37:4	28:15,16 29:19	66:1 214:16
149:5 151:5 152:3	73:22 90:13 92:17	walked 227:2	40:20 42:11 52:5	weight 93:13
152:4 154:5,6,16	94:14 95:16,22	wall 42:9,12 223:21	55:18 58:2,20	Weinstein 214:10
155:2,4,9,16	102:7,11,12,15	want 4:4 27:18	87:19 105:2,3	Welcome 90:12
156:13 157:11,18	103:9,14 104:2,19	33:4,17 34:5 43:9	108:18 111:15	welfare 58:4
158:4,20 159:9	105:7,14 106:1,14	46:6 48:12 52:15	115:2,12 119:20	well-educated
160:7 162:5,13	114:14,21 115:10	53:10 56:15 65:10	120:9,11 139:2	218:9,11
164:2,12,16 165:3	120:1 124:15	72:5 80:10,21	143:21 151:13	well-intended
165:7,12,14	143:5 147:11,12	110:22 114:22	152:1 165:12	225:9
168:16 169:1	147:16 148:8,19	115:15 120:1	167:14 171:19	well-run 106:5
170:3,16,18 171:8	150:2 155:4,11	125:9 129:16	173:15 174:15,16	well-taken 115:8
171:11,22 172:1	159:3,7 167:21	130:3 135:9,10,11	179:2 180:4 196:4	went 27:17 41:2,8
172:12,17 173:13	171:14 184:6	137:3,9 145:18	203:9 215:7	41:13 42:21 66:13
175:15 176:4,20	186:2 187:18,19	160:5 162:5	218:13 224:10	66:15 90:8 110:3
178:5 185:2,21	189:7,19 192:14	171:10,15 172:2	152:1 165:12	110:6,14 173:4,6
186:13 187:8	194:20 198:11,14	178:1 179:13	167:14 171:19	187:18 218:8
188:5,14,21	200:20 204:17	180:6 184:8 186:8	173:15 174:15,16	weren't 99:9 211:5
189:12,16 190:4	205:6 215:18	209:7,14 211:13	179:2 180:4 196:4	white 65:22 66:2

229:3	193:8	year-long 48:21	163:16 164:21	110:3,21 111:4
whiz 35:9	worker 214:7,7	years 24:16 38:8	193:4	112:19,22 115:2
who've 226:10	working 80:11	50:19 53:14,22	20 1:12 6:4 53:21	120:18 123:21
whoever's 208:19	works 147:18	59:14 105:19	222:4	126:4,16 127:4,15
Wi 229:6	152:1 177:15	114:16 158:20	2004 102:8 159:2	129:13 130:1,18
willing 166:1	world 22:13 38:17	172:11 210:6	2006 159:4	131:20 133:6,11
wish 212:16	147:19 198:13	York 53:19 227:11	2013 7:4	133:12 139:22
wishes 212:14	228:3,5	228:18	2014 1:8 17:14 63:7	141:7 143:17,22
withdraw 161:2,9	worry 177:13	young 65:21 66:21	69:18	146:10 149:17
witness 172:21	worth 22:3	213:14	21 6:10	175:10 176:20
202:14,15 222:1	worthwhile 228:9		23 114:16	177:18 178:3
witnessed 18:22	wouldn't 38:18	Z	25 53:22	179:11 180:19
215:12 217:8	43:22 57:8 66:22	zero 49:16	26 91:17	188:5
219:3	95:16 146:14	0	27 6:12 50:19	32(a) 175:11
witnesses 73:16	147:2 162:15	1	28 6:4,12 12:9	179:13 183:11,16
76:1 84:10,11	166:21 196:8		105:19	184:5 185:15
85:7,8	204:2 209:13		29 7:13 8:10,17	188:6
woman 218:11	wrinkle 209:6	1 23:20,20 32:4	11:12 15:12	32(b) 174:9 175:11
226:21	write 143:12	47:17 62:13 163:9	3	182:19 188:6
women 33:21 216:7	146:18 147:13	163:11	3 68:14 71:9 72:8,9	32A 125:21 133:16
225:16,17 226:2,6	195:3	1:35 229:21	132:2 163:13,16	133:21 134:5
226:7,9,9,16	writer 195:2	10 16:15	164:21	32B 112:12,18
Women's 213:3	writes 195:2	100 178:8	3(d) 69:18 70:10	133:16 134:19
wonder 41:16	writing 135:1	100,000 39:21 40:3	30 8:18 9:13 12:15	138:20 139:14
47:12 119:19	137:20 141:12	11 210:6	15:12	141:18
wondered 85:17	146:11,17 170:11	12 37:3	30th 15:17	32C 125:21
173:6	174:10 191:13	13 6:4 172:11	31 9:15 12:21 15:12	32s 75:15
wondering 123:4	192:1,9 193:7	14 73:6 74:3,6,9	101:16 102:5	33 91:18
181:8 205:1	198:9	15 23:10,11,12	107:4,6,12 109:16	333 1:12
word 13:19 121:14	written 12:6 16:14	31:21 32:4 37:3	110:1 113:10,21	34 125:3
131:6,7,8 170:5	61:6 137:9 174:2	40:7 47:17 62:7	114:2,4 122:9	37 188:8,9 190:20
183:1 209:5,5,6	176:5 211:19	62:10,12	123:20 125:20	198:17 199:1
wording 12:22	215:9	153 192:22	126:1,14 127:3	200:1
107:1,12,14 203:2	wrong 51:10 53:10	155 195:22	128:4,8,9,14	3771 102:8 103:19
wordings 11:12	58:17 65:18	16 1:8 74:10 85:22	129:7,14,19 131:6	38 199:22
words 108:4 165:13	112:10 117:5	87:15 88:11	133:5,10,12,22	38's 210:15
183:12,15 208:17	130:4 149:17	17 74:11,12 77:1,2	138:8 139:20	38-1 200:5,7
210:14 220:20	160:15 206:3	78:2,11,16 81:4,6	141:7,17 142:5	38-2 200:5
wordsmith 129:16	209:5 221:13	158:20	143:17,21 149:3	4
work 28:4 33:5,7	wrongdoing 66:17	18 32:4 74:11 81:9	149:12,16 179:6	4 3:12 89:20 163:9
33:10 57:22 64:21		102:7 103:18	31-1 13:7 102:5	163:12
80:15 145:8 154:8	X	19 23:11 31:19,20	31-4 102:5	412 205:22 206:5
171:18 193:9	Y	32:6 47:17 62:5,9	32 74:18 75:3,12	206:14
195:18 213:17		2	77:21 79:2,9,16	45(d) 76:21
226:20,21 229:16	yeah 50:15 162:18	2 62:22 63:6 64:16	79:19 107:5,8	5
229:18	year 50:11 66:14	67:11 68:12,16	108:17 109:16,22	
worked 53:16	159:22 212:19	101:17,18 163:13		

5 6:4 91:20 92:9
94:22 95:20 96:13
98:16 100:20
101:5,14 105:19
163:9,12
5-1 92:11
5-5 92:12
513 206:2,15
5A 95:5,12,20
96:18 97:15 98:15
100:17
5th 4:5

6

6 3:15 67:17 163:14
163:16
60 81:10,18 82:5,21
83:6
6th 1:12 4:5,15 6:2

7

8

9

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: 05-16-14

Place: Washington, DC

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

Neal R Gross

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701